In March and April 2016, the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey was administered at M State. A total of 215 employees or 40.9 percent of the employee population completed the survey. This is a terrific participation rate and a slight increase from 2014. The purpose of the survey was to obtain the perceptions of M State employees concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist M State in promoting more open and constructive communication within the college.

In the PACE model, there are four climate factors measured via 46 questions as follows:

- Institutional Structure
- Supervisory Relationships
- Teamwork
- Student Focus

The survey was designed to rate the four factors on a five-point Likert-type (satisfaction scale) from a low of 1 to a high of 5. The survey then compared the existing climate to a norm base of 69 community colleges across North America.

The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness, the administrator of the survey, indicates there are four leadership/organizational systems which range from coercive to collaborative: collaborative (rated between 4 and 5), consultative (rated between 3 and 4), competitive (rated between 2 and 3) and coercive (rated between 1 and 2). The collaborative environment is the ideal, however few institutions have been found to achieve a fully collaborative system.

At M State, the overall results from the PACE survey indicate a healthy campus climate with an overall mean score of 3.572. This shows we are within the mid-level consultative range, which aligns with where we were when the PACE survey was administered in April 2014. The preponderance of the consultative scores indicate that the institution has a relatively high level of perceived productivity and satisfaction.

The top mean scores have been identified at M State as follows:

- The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission, 4.258
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career, 4.141
- The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution, 4.068
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning, 4.005
- The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work, 3.995
- The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution, 3.928
- The extent to which my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions and beliefs of everyone, 3.902
- The extent to which faculty meet the needs of the students, 3.900
- The extent to which non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of the students, 3.831
- The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work, 3.825

Of these top mean scores, seven fell within the Student Focus climate factor and three fell within the Supervisory Relationships climate factor.

The bottom mean scores (top priorities for discussion) have been identified as areas in need of improvement at M State.

- The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized, 2.916
- The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution, 2.963
- The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution, 3.000
- The extent to which information is shared within this institution, 3.084
- The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution, 3.107
- The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution, 3.109
- The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution, 3.148
- The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes, 3.168
- The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques, 3.177
- The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance, 3.213

Of the bottom mean scores, these fell within the Institutional Structure climate factor.
Human Resources

It is important to note that these top priorities for discussion are consistent across the personnel classifications of faculty, staff and administrator/supervisor.

Data Analysis

Comparative Analysis: Personnel Classification

Of the 215 employees who completed the survey, the response by personnel classification was as follows:

- Faculty – 50 percent
- Staff – 42 percent
- Administrator/Supervisor – 7 percent

Thirteen individuals did not respond to this demographic variable.

By personnel classification, the overall mean climate scores between 2014 and 2016 increased for faculty (3.238 to 3.522) and administrators (3.879 to 4.191). There was an overall decrease for the staff (3.720 to 3.533).

Comparative Analysis: Norm Base

The norm base includes approximately 69 different climate studies conducted at two-year institutions. The norm base also falls within the consultative range. M State falls slightly below the norm base numbers yet within the consultative range.

Next Steps

M State will be working on the following areas which need improvement and are priorities for discussion:

- Employee recognition and engagement work group is being reinstated to review results and ascertain action items from the survey to enhance a healthy workplace climate.
- Professional development and training opportunities.
- Work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes.

Full Report

The full PACE report will be posted in the employee portal under HR>Files and Forms>PACE Surveys.

Please contact Dacia Johnson, chief human resources officer, with questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW Hires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jerry Covington, Interim Athletic Academic Support Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monty Johnson, Dean of Academic Affairs, resigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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