

NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Tacoma Community College Tacoma, Washington

Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Custom Report

by

Difei Li & Alessandra Dinin

The National Initiative for Leadership & Institutional Effectiveness

North Carolina State University

March 2016



National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness

Audrey Jaeger, PhD, Executive Director Dawn Crotty, Executive Assistant Alessandra Dinin, Director of Research Difei Li, Co-Assistant Director of Research Katie Ratterree, Co-Assistant Director of Research Greg King, Researcher

Phone: 919-515-8567

919-515-6289

Fax: 919-515-6305

Web: http://ced.ncsu.edu/ahe/nilie

College of Education North Carolina State University 300 Poe Hall, Box 7801 Raleigh, NC 27695-7801

Table of C	ontents	Page
Table 1.	Custom Items Frequency Distributions	1
Table 2.	Custom Item Mean Comparisons	4
Table 3.	Custom Demographic Frequency Distributions	5
Table 4.	Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	6
Table 5.	Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	7
Table 6.	Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	8
Table 7.	Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	9
Table 8.	Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	10
Table 9.	Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Division	11
Table 10.	Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Division	12
Table 11.	Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Division	13
Table 12.	Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Division	14
Table 13.	Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Division	15

Table 1. Custom Items Frequency Distributions

		TCC		20	013
Custom Items	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
The extent to which					
1 innovation is encouraged at the college	Very dissatisfied	24	7%	9	3%
	Dissatisfied	37	11%	22	8%
	Neither	91	27%	49	18%
	Satisfied	124	37%	113	42%
	Very satisfied	57	17%	73	27%
	Total	333	100%	266	100%
2 the college plans for change	Very dissatisfied	34	11%	8	3%
	Dissatisfied	42	13%	16	6%
	Neither	114	36%	53	20%
	Satisfied	96	30%	113	43%
	Very satisfied	34	11%	72	27%
	Total	320	100%	262	100%
3 priorities are clearly understood at the college	Very dissatisfied	33	10%	12	5%
	Dissatisfied	71	22%	23	9%
	Neither	93	28%	73	28%
	Satisfied	98	30%	100	38%
	Very satisfied	32	10%	54	21%
	Total	327	100%	262	100%
4 the college is committed to improvement	Very dissatisfied	27	8%	6	2%
	Dissatisfied	38	11%	16	6%
	Neither	82	25%	38	14%
	Satisfied	133	40%	117	44%
	Very satisfied	54	16%	90	34%
	Total	334	100%	267	100%

		TCC		20	013
Custom Items (continued)	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
The extent to which					
5 the college is achieving its diversity goals	Very dissatisfied	29	9%	5	2%
	Dissatisfied	34	10%	21	8%
	Neither	91	28%	56	22%
	Satisfied	119	37%	93	36%
	Very satisfied	53	16%	85	33%
	Total	326	100%	260	100%
6 differences of opinion are encouraged at the	Very dissatisfied	49	15%	23	9%
college	Dissatisfied	60	18%	31	12%
	Neither	102	31%	94	36%
	Satisfied	94	28%	76	29%
	Very satisfied	29	9%	38	15%
	Total	334	100%	262	100%
7 resource allocation decisions are participatory	Very dissatisfied	45	15%	25	10%
	Dissatisfied	64	21%	40	16%
	Neither	103	34%	88	34%
	Satisfied	73	24%	70	27%
	Very satisfied	18	6%	33	13%
	Total	303	100%	256	100%
8 there is campus-wide input on matters of	Very dissatisfied	48	15%	20	8%
importance	Dissatisfied	68	21%	37	14%
	Neither	89	27%	79	30%
	Satisfied	95	29%	82	31%
	Very satisfied	26	8%	44	17%
	Total	326	100%	262	100%

		TCC		2	
Custom Items (continued)	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
The extent to which					
9 technological innovation is supported at the	Very dissatisfied	18	5%	1	0%
college	Dissatisfied	30	9%	6	2%
	Neither	71	21%	34	13%
	Satisfied	135	41%	90	34%
	Very satisfied	78	23%	133	50%
	Total	332	100%	264	100%
10 there is a shared vision for the college	Very dissatisfied	28	9%	11	4%
	Dissatisfied	47	14%	12	5%
	Neither	91	28%	66	25%
	Satisfied	119	36%	103	39%
	Very satisfied	43	13%	74	28%
	Total	328	100%	266	100%

Table 2. Custom Item Mean Comparisons

		TCC		2013		
	Custom Items	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
The	extent to which					
_1	innovation is encouraged at the college	333	3.459	3.823	***	337
2	the college plans for change	320	3.169	3.859	***	649
3	priorities are clearly understood at the college	327	3.076	3.615	***	487
4	the college is committed to improvement	334	3.446	4.007	***	529
5	the college is achieving its diversity goals	326	3.408	3.892	***	444
6	differences of opinion are encouraged at the college	334	2.982	3.286	**	263
7	resource allocation decisions are participatory	303	2.851	3.180	***	289
8	there is campus-wide input on matters of importance	326	2.948	3.355	***	348
9	technological innovation is supported at the college	332	3.678	4.318	***	654
10	there is a shared vision for the college	328	3.311	3.816	***	465

Table 3. Custom Demographic Frequency Distributions

	TCC)13
Demographic Items	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
1 What is your Tacoma personnel	Full-time Faculty	81	22%	72	27%
classification?	Part-time Faculty	67	19%	60	22%
	Classified	128	35%	72	27%
	Exempt	85	24%	64	24%
	Total	361	100%	268	100%
2 In which division of the college are	Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	55%	153	58%
you employed?	Student Services or Student Affairs	90	27%	58	22%
	Administrative Services	49	15%	48	18%
	Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8	2%	4	2%
	Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4	1%	N/A	N/A
	Total	332	100%	263	100%

Table 4. Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	TCC			2013	3
What is your Tacoma personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.232	3.521	***	328
Full-time Faculty	81	3.222	3.587	**	445
Part-time Faculty	67	3.564	3.756		
Classified	128	3.242	3.291		
Exempt	85	2.975	3.460	**	552

Table 5. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	TCC			2013	;
What is your Tacoma personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	361	3.945	4.160	***	342
Full-time Faculty	81	4.018	4.228	*	404
Part-time Faculty	67	4.036	4.253		
Classified	128	3.910	4.061		
Exempt	84	3.852	4.099	*	413

Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	T	CC		3	
What is your Tacoma personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.683	3.632		
Full-time Faculty	81	3.784	3.705		
Part-time Faculty	67	3.936	3.830		
Classified	128	3.627	3.402		
Exempt	85	3.472	3.611		

Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	TCC			2013	3
What is your Tacoma personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.846	3.764		
Full-time Faculty	81	3.876	3.963		
Part-time Faculty	67	3.974	3.739		
Classified	128	3.803	3.549		
Exempt	85	3.783	3.815		

Table 8. Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	TCC			2013	3
What is your Tacoma personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.620	3.748	*	171
Full-time Faculty	81	3.669	3.838		
Part-time Faculty	67	3.841	3.908		
Classified	128	3.587	3.546		
Exempt	85	3.450	3.714	*	358

Table 9. Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Division

	TCC		20		3
In which division of the college are you employed?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.232	3.521	***	328
Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	3.338	3.414		
Student Services or Student Affairs	90	3.235	3.771	*	614
Administrative Services	49	2.777	3.781	***	-1.342
Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8				
Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4				

Table 10. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Division

	TCC		2013		
In which division of the college are you employed?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	361	3.945	4.160	***	342
Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	4.036	4.115		
Student Services or Student Affairs	90	3.899	4.283	*	609
Administrative Services	49	3.613	4.163	**	849
Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8				
Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4				

Table 11. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Division

	TCC		2013		
In which division of the college are you employed?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.683	3.632		
Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	3.823	3.544	**	.314
Student Services or Student Affairs	90	3.666	3.859		
Administrative Services	49	3.112	4.046	***	-1.003
Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8				
Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4				

Table 12. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Division

	T	CC	2013		
In which division of the college are you employed?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.846	3.764		
Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	3.966	3.735	*	.236
Student Services or Student Affairs	90	3.941	4.198		
Administrative Services	49	3.292	4.079	**	811
Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8				
Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4				

Table 13. Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Division

	T	CC	2013		
In which division of the college are you employed?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	362	3.620	3.748	*	171
Academic and Student Affairs or Instruction	181	3.739	3.671		
Student Services or Student Affairs	90	3.620	3.985		
Administrative Services	49	3.138	3.994	***	-1.224
Institutional Advancement and Foundation	8				
Human Resources and Legal Affairs	4				