



NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP  
& INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

**Florida State College  
at Jacksonville**  
Jacksonville, Florida

**PACE Racial Diversity Subscale Report**  
PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

**Lead Researchers**  
Emily VanZoest & Greyson Norcross

**Conducted**  
October & November 2020



## NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

### Research Team

**Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.**  
Executive Director

**Andrea L. DeSantis**  
Assistant Director of Research

**Greyson A. B. Norcross**  
Research Associate

**Daniel R. West**  
Research Associate

**Emily R. VanZoest**  
Research Associate

### Additional Report Editors

**Renee Barger**  
Research Associate

**Monique Colclough, Ph.D.**  
Senior Research Associate

**Melissa Whatley, Ph.D.**  
Senior Research Associate

**Phone**  
(919)515-8567

**Web**  
[nilie.ncsu.edu](http://nilie.ncsu.edu)

**North Carolina State University**  
706 Hillsborough Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603

**Fax**  
(919)515-6305

**Email**  
[pace\\_survey@ncsu.edu](mailto:pace_survey@ncsu.edu)

Suggested Citation: National Initiative for Leadership & Institutional Effectiveness, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges Racial Diversity Subscale Report, by VanZoest, E. R., & Norcross, G. A. B. Raleigh, NC: 2020.

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Racial Diversity Literature Review	1
Table 1. Institutional Structure Frequency Distributions	4
Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions	6
Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions	8
Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions	9
Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons	10
Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons	11
Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons	12
Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons	13
Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	14
Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity	15
Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status	16
Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned	17
Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity	18
Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution	19
Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education	20
Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age	21

## Racial Diversity Literature Review

While college campuses are more diverse than they were twenty years ago, concerns of “chilly” racial climates continue to exist and institutional leaders must remain engaged in a concerted effort to ensure that faculty, staff, administrators, and students of all races and ethnicities are comfortable on campus (Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2006). Much of the literature about campus racial climates employs Hurtado’s (1992) framework; however, scholars have typically focused on the experiences of students (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). When assessing the campus climate, acknowledging the experiences of campus employees is equally important (Hurtado & Dey, 1997; Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2006).

The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) recognizes the need to address the campus racial and ethnic climate for administrators, faculty, and staff, and provides a tool that institutional leaders can use to better understand racial and ethnic diversity on their campuses. Using Hurtado’s (1992) model as a framework, NILIE researchers created a racial diversity subscale to assist campus leaders in their efforts to improve the climate on their campuses.

Much of what is observed and experienced on college campuses is influenced by both social and institutional contexts (Hurtado, 1992). Racial conflicts, specifically overt encounters, are not isolated cases. Rather, these encounters are the result of “unresolved racial issues in college environments and in society at large” (p. 540). NILIE recognizes the need to better equip colleges to understand and address their particular campus racial climates within both the social and institutional contexts, and our diversity subscale provides an opportunity to effectively address the latter.

Various factors influence the racial climate of a campus including its structural make-up, psychological climate, and behavioral climate (Hurtado et al., 1998; Umbach & Kuh, 2006). It is important to note that these dimensions are not mutually exclusive (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). A high level of exposure to these dimensions has been found to positively impact one’s racial and ethnic views, while limited exposure can have the opposite effect (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

Structural diversity refers to the racial and ethnic makeup of the campus population (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Structural diversity plays a pivotal role in improving campus climate by increasing racial and ethnic diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998). A racially and ethnically diverse campus environment provides more opportunity for cross-racial interactions (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999).

While Hurtado and associates (1998) recommend that campus leaders examine institutional policies and practices to increase the number of racial and ethnic minority students, similar steps could be taken to increase underrepresented minority employees (American Psychological Association [APA], 1996; Evans & Chun, 2007). For example, the American Association of Community Colleges (2012) reports that White, non-Hispanic employees make up nearly 80 percent of both full- and part-time community college personnel (NCES, 2004). When examining institutional hiring practices and policies, it is beneficial for campus leaders to consider applicants that may not have followed traditional career paths (APA, 1996; Evans & Chun, 2007). This allows more underrepresented minorities to be included in the hiring pool and increases the probability of a campus employing individuals who have diverse, yet valuable, backgrounds and experiences (APA,

1996). At the same time, when recruiting and hiring more racial and ethnic minority employees, it is important that these employees are not tokenized. Rather, they should be afforded opportunities to contribute to the institution in areas beyond diversity (Park & Denson, 2009).

The psychological dimension of diversity refers to one's attitude toward other racial and ethnic groups, perception of the racial climate on campus, and views on the manner in which the institution responds to diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998). As stated by Hurtado et al., "racially and ethnically diverse administrators, students, and faculty tend to view the campus climate differently" (p. 289). Campus leaders should develop educational initiatives to identify and address concerns that create a chilly campus climate (Hurtado et al., 1998). Such initiatives should be aimed at recognizing and addressing stereotypes and preconceived beliefs people may have about racial and ethnic groups. When individuals are involved in educational diversity-related activities, they are more likely to support an institution's diversity efforts and have a more positive attitude toward other racial and ethnic groups on campus (Hurtado et al., 1998; Park & Denson, 2009).

The behavioral dimension refers to within- and between-group interactions, as well as the quantity and nature of diversity-related activities an institution provides. These may include diversity workshops, cultural centers, and required diversity courses (Hurtado et al., 1998; Umbach & Kuh, 2006). Increased interactions with members of different racial and ethnic groups can lead to increased exposure to diverse experiences and opinions (Umbach & Kuh, 2006). Such interactions enhance active thinking processes (Gurin, 1999) and create a climate that supports constructive challenges and thoughtful responses (Umbach & Kuh). Campuses that lack structural diversity could use diversity-related activities to provide opportunities for the campus community to be engaged and learn more about racial and diverse groups (Kuh et al., 2005). When an institution makes a commitment to racial and ethnic diversity by sponsoring structured activities, it sends a positive message to all members of the campus community that cross-racial interactions are valued (Hurtado, 1992; Hurtado et al., 1998).

## References

- American Psychological Association Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention and Training in Psychology (1996). *How to recruit and hire ethnic minority faculty*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. In *The compelling need for diversity in higher education*, Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al, No. 97-75237 (E. D. Mich.) and Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75928 (E. D. Mich.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.
- Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. In M. Peterson, D. Dill, L. Mets, & Associates (Eds.), *Planning and management for a changing environment* (pp. 405-431). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.
- Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. Wilds (Ed.), *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report* (pp. 39-67). Washington, DC: American.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) fall staff survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 119-148.
- Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2009). Attitudes and advocacy: Understanding faculty views on racial/ethnic diversity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 415-438.
- Smith, D., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2005). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Umbach, P. D., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Student experiences with diversity at liberal arts colleges: Another claim for distinctiveness. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 169-192.

**Table 1. Institutional Structure Frequency Distributions**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Institutional Structure	Response Option	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>1</b> my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	Very dissatisfied	9	1%	32	2%	204	2%
	Dissatisfied	19	3%	71	5%	478	5%
	Neither	106	16%	232	18%	1628	15%
	Satisfied	264	39%	530	41%	4413	42%
	Very satisfied	279	41%	431	33%	3879	37%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1296</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10602</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>2</b> my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	Very dissatisfied	10	1%	31	2%	195	2%
	Dissatisfied	20	3%	58	4%	403	4%
	Neither	90	13%	192	15%	1325	12%
	Satisfied	262	38%	547	42%	4467	42%
	Very satisfied	299	44%	465	36%	4225	40%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1293</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10615</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>3</b> my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	8	1%	24	2%	156	1%
	Dissatisfied	11	2%	50	4%	325	3%
	Neither	77	11%	174	13%	1189	11%
	Satisfied	251	37%	542	42%	4471	42%
	Very satisfied	333	49%	509	39%	4479	42%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1299</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10620</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>4</b> employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	Very dissatisfied	9	1%	29	2%	179	2%
	Dissatisfied	13	2%	47	4%	353	3%
	Neither	97	14%	236	19%	1670	16%
	Satisfied	274	41%	505	41%	4062	40%
	Very satisfied	279	42%	419	34%	3940	39%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1236</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10204</b>	<b>100%</b>

*FSCJ compared with:*

<b>Institutional Structure (continued)</b>	Response Option	<b>FSCJ</b>		<b>Bacc./Assoc.</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>5</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	Very dissatisfied	19	3%	56	5%	470	5%
	Dissatisfied	46	7%	134	11%	1153	11%
	Neither	118	18%	304	25%	2288	22%
	Satisfied	220	34%	424	34%	3518	35%
	Very satisfied	241	37%	311	25%	2761	27%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>644</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1229</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10190</b>
<b>6</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, VP, Deans)	Very dissatisfied	23	3%	53	4%	616	6%
	Dissatisfied	52	8%	65	5%	971	9%
	Neither	152	23%	285	23%	2211	22%
	Satisfied	219	33%	438	35%	3200	31%
	Very satisfied	213	32%	409	33%	3261	32%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>659</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1250</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10259</b>
<b>7</b> a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	Very dissatisfied	16	2%	57	5%	390	4%
	Dissatisfied	25	4%	108	9%	904	9%
	Neither	138	21%	306	24%	2424	23%
	Satisfied	247	37%	463	37%	3825	37%
	Very satisfied	237	36%	331	26%	2787	27%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>663</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1265</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10330</b>



**Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Supervisory Relationships	Response Option	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>8</b> my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	Very dissatisfied	11	2%	42	3%	426	4%
	Dissatisfied	12	2%	55	4%	597	6%
	Neither	47	7%	231	18%	1722	17%
	Satisfied	187	28%	434	35%	3572	35%
	Very satisfied	421	62%	495	39%	4020	39%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>678</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1257</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10337</b>
<b>9</b> my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	Very dissatisfied	11	2%	41	3%	265	3%
	Dissatisfied	13	2%	55	4%	400	4%
	Neither	49	7%	226	18%	1614	16%
	Satisfied	170	25%	406	33%	3634	35%
	Very satisfied	428	64%	515	41%	4404	43%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>671</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10317</b>
<b>10</b> my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	12	2%	26	2%	185	2%
	Dissatisfied	10	1%	36	3%	230	2%
	Neither	43	6%	175	14%	1225	12%
	Satisfied	172	26%	415	33%	3554	35%
	Very satisfied	436	65%	590	48%	5106	50%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>673</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1242</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10300</b>
<b>11</b> my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	Very dissatisfied	8	1%	49	4%	243	2%
	Dissatisfied	15	2%	56	5%	330	3%
	Neither	56	8%	212	18%	1458	15%
	Satisfied	184	28%	367	31%	3375	34%
	Very satisfied	396	60%	504	42%	4504	45%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>659</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1188</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9910</b>

*FSCJ compared with:*

Supervisory Relationships (continued)		FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>12</b> my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	8	1%	23	2%	146	1%
	Dissatisfied	8	1%	35	3%	212	2%
	Neither	41	7%	186	16%	1298	13%
	Satisfied	185	29%	395	33%	3588	36%
	Very satisfied	387	62%	549	46%	4657	47%
<b>Total</b>		<b>629</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1188</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9901</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Teamwork	Response Option	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>13</b> racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	Very dissatisfied	8	1%	27	2%	179	2%
	Dissatisfied	9	1%	38	3%	324	3%
	Neither	119	19%	340	31%	2650	29%
	Satisfied	208	33%	373	34%	3188	34%
	Very satisfied	296	46%	330	30%	2922	32%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9263</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>14</b> racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	Very dissatisfied	5	1%	27	2%	152	2%
	Dissatisfied	13	2%	40	4%	312	3%
	Neither	120	19%	310	28%	2589	28%
	Satisfied	205	32%	394	36%	3280	36%
	Very satisfied	291	46%	336	30%	2866	31%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1107</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9199</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>15</b> the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	Very dissatisfied	7	1%	21	2%	162	2%
	Dissatisfied	10	2%	38	3%	331	4%
	Neither	101	16%	292	27%	2344	26%
	Satisfied	207	33%	399	36%	3354	37%
	Very satisfied	295	48%	348	32%	2956	32%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1098</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9147</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Student Focus	Response Option	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.		NILIE Normbase	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>							
<b>16</b> faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	11	2%	28	3%	172	2%
	Dissatisfied	22	4%	62	6%	480	6%
	Neither	138	26%	344	33%	2633	30%
	Satisfied	193	36%	371	36%	3143	36%
	Very satisfied	175	32%	226	22%	2222	26%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1031</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8650</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>17</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	Very dissatisfied	10	2%	23	2%	158	2%
	Dissatisfied	21	4%	82	8%	552	6%
	Neither	168	31%	397	39%	2965	35%
	Satisfied	162	30%	320	32%	2898	34%
	Very satisfied	174	33%	188	19%	1953	23%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1010</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8526</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>18</b> my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	Very dissatisfied	7	1%	31	3%	177	2%
	Dissatisfied	16	3%	69	6%	440	4%
	Neither	106	17%	284	24%	2098	21%
	Satisfied	245	40%	482	41%	4133	42%
	Very satisfied	240	39%	306	26%	2942	30%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1172</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9790</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>19</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	Very dissatisfied	4	1%	18	2%	112	1%
	Dissatisfied	11	2%	43	4%	309	4%
	Neither	154	29%	368	36%	2709	31%
	Satisfied	190	35%	372	37%	3436	39%
	Very satisfied	179	33%	211	21%	2142	25%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1012</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8708</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Institutional Structure	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
<b>1</b> my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony	677	4.160	3.970	***	.201	4.064	**	.102
<b>2</b> my institution values racial/ethnic diversity	681	4.204	4.049	***	.167	4.142		
<b>3</b> my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds	680	4.309	4.125	***	.208	4.205	**	.121
<b>4</b> employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another	672	4.192	4.002	***	.209	4.101	*	.100
<b>5</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty	644	3.960	3.651	***	.284	3.682	***	.248
<b>6</b> people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, Vice-President, Deans)	659	3.830	3.868			3.733	*	.083
<b>7</b> a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices	663	4.002	3.714	***	.276	3.747	***	.241

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Supervisory Relationships	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
<b>8</b> my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities	678	4.468	4.022	***	.463	3.983	***	.456
<b>9</b> my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background	671	4.477	4.045	***	.445	4.116	***	.372
<b>10</b> my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds	673	4.501	4.213	***	.320	4.278	***	.252
<b>11</b> my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity	659	4.434	4.028	***	.407	4.167	***	.279
<b>12</b> my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	629	4.486	4.189	***	.336	4.252	***	.271

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Teamwork	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
<b>13</b> racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members	640	4.211	3.849	***	.386	3.901	***	.327
<b>14</b> racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance	634	4.205	3.878	***	.350	3.913	***	.315
<b>15</b> the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs	620	4.247	3.924	***	.352	3.941	***	.327

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Student Focus	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>								
<b>16</b> faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	539	3.926	3.684	***	.250	3.782	***	.150
<b>17</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives	535	3.877	3.562	***	.326	3.696	***	.189
<b>18</b> my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	614	4.132	3.822	***	.331	3.942	***	.206
<b>19</b> students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution	538	3.983	3.707	***	.309	3.825	***	.178

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001



**Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification**

*FSCJ compared with:*

What is your personnel classification?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
Faculty	177	4.227	3.897	***	.428	3.972	***	.333
Administrator	71	4.229	3.926	**	.474	3.958	**	.391
Staff	418	4.189	3.957	***	.325	3.993	***	.281

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
African American or Black	130	4.006	3.380	***	.827	3.666	***	.393
Alaska Native or American Indian	3	--	3.453			3.890		
Asian	18	4.564	3.871	***	1.054	3.874	***	.845
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	19	4.307	3.816			3.809	*	.581
Middle Eastern or North African	0	--	--			3.363		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	--	3.719			3.769		
White	414	4.288	3.984	***	.444	4.032	***	.376
Two or more races	39	4.087	3.764	*	.455	3.776	*	.377
Prefer to self-describe	25	3.965	--			3.862		

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status**

*FSCJ compared with:*

Your status at this institution is?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
Full-Time	662	4.202	3.876	***	.460	3.920	***	.391
Part-Time	2	--	4.045			4.171		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned**

*FSCJ compared with:*

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	9	3.862	3.714			3.893		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	95	4.172	3.726	***	.597	3.786	***	.476
Master's degree	232	4.216	3.902	***	.424	3.969	***	.336
Bachelor's degree	192	4.222	3.979	***	.347	4.037	***	.269
Associate's degree	84	4.329	4.022	***	.457	4.037	***	.429
Certificate	11	4.125	--			4.035		
High School diploma or GED	37	4.010	4.041			4.095		
No diploma or degree	0	--	4.049			3.934		

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity**

*FSCJ compared with:*

What is your gender identity?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
Man	228	4.223	3.993	***	.317	4.029	***	.264
Woman	413	4.216	3.965	***	.358	4.014	***	.290
Trans Man	0	--	--			--		
Trans Woman	0	--	--			--		
Gender Queer	1	--	--			3.573		
Prefer to self-describe	14	3.727	--			3.607		

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution**

*FSCJ compared with:*

How many years have you worked at this institution?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
5 years or less	234	4.242	4.079	**	.223	4.128	*	.163
6-10 years	161	4.177	3.892	***	.378	3.926	***	.348
11-15 years	100	4.160	3.815	***	.471	3.888	***	.369
16-20 years	78	4.121	3.849	**	.389	3.915	*	.288
21-25 years	29	4.371	3.938	**	.738	3.899	***	.700
26 years or more	33	4.276	3.804	***	.725	3.938	**	.489

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education**

*FSCJ compared with:*

How many years have you worked in higher education?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
5 years or less	161	4.223	4.115			4.181		
6-10 years	136	4.200	3.944	**	.329	3.993	***	.292
11-15 years	111	4.122	3.889	**	.323	3.933	**	.267
16-20 years	103	4.217	3.975	**	.357	3.926	***	.402
21-25 years	50	4.185	3.781	***	.568	3.870	**	.428
26 years or more	74	4.315	3.758	***	.826	3.876	***	.612

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age**

*FSCJ compared with:*

What is your age?	FSCJ		Bacc./Assoc.			NILIE Normbase		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	685	4.198	3.918	***	.384	3.975	***	.305
29 or younger	26	4.489	4.191			4.176	*	.443
30 - 39	92	4.105	3.969			4.039		
40 - 49	140	4.122	3.981			4.007		
50 - 59	161	4.310	3.918	***	.548	3.992	***	.446
60 or older	163	4.259	3.934	***	.462	3.993	***	.378

\* p <.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001