



NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP
& INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

Grays Harbor College Aberdeen, Washington

PACE Racial Diversity Subscale Report PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

Lead Researchers
Daniel West & Greyson Norcross

Conducted
January & February 2021



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

Kara Reddish
Research Intern

Melissa Whatley, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Phone
(919)515-8567

Web
nilie.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University
706 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

Fax
(919)515-6305

Email
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 West, D.R., & Norcross, G.A.B. Raleigh, NC: 2021.

Table of Contents

Page

| | |
|---|----|
| 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

GHC compared with:

| Institutional Structure | Response Option | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 1 my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony | Very dissatisfied | 5 | 5% | 204 | 2% | 15 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 8 | 8% | 478 | 5% | 36 | 5% |
| | Neither | 29 | 30% | 1628 | 15% | 142 | 18% |
| | Satisfied | 43 | 44% | 4413 | 42% | 338 | 43% |
| | Very satisfied | 13 | 13% | 3879 | 37% | 259 | 33% |
| | Total | 98 | 100% | 10602 | 100% | 790 | 100% |
| 2 my institution values racial/ethnic diversity | Very dissatisfied | 4 | 4% | 195 | 2% | 14 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 7 | 7% | 403 | 4% | 27 | 3% |
| | Neither | 23 | 23% | 1325 | 12% | 124 | 16% |
| | Satisfied | 47 | 48% | 4467 | 42% | 338 | 43% |
| | Very satisfied | 17 | 17% | 4225 | 40% | 290 | 37% |
| | Total | 98 | 100% | 10615 | 100% | 793 | 100% |
| 3 my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds | Very dissatisfied | 5 | 5% | 156 | 1% | 11 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 6 | 6% | 325 | 3% | 22 | 3% |
| | Neither | 14 | 14% | 1189 | 11% | 111 | 14% |
| | Satisfied | 54 | 55% | 4471 | 42% | 350 | 44% |
| | Very satisfied | 19 | 19% | 4479 | 42% | 304 | 38% |
| | Total | 98 | 100% | 10620 | 100% | 798 | 100% |
| 4 employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another | Very dissatisfied | 2 | 2% | 179 | 2% | 14 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 5 | 5% | 353 | 3% | 17 | 2% |
| | Neither | 29 | 31% | 1670 | 16% | 141 | 19% |
| | Satisfied | 43 | 46% | 4062 | 40% | 290 | 38% |
| | Very satisfied | 14 | 15% | 3940 | 39% | 299 | 39% |
| | Total | 93 | 100% | 10204 | 100% | 761 | 100% |

GHC compared with:

| Institutional Structure (continued) | Response Option | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|---|-------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 5 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty | Very dissatisfied | 19 | 20% | 470 | 5% | 41 | 5% |
| | Dissatisfied | 18 | 19% | 1153 | 11% | 105 | 14% |
| | Neither | 22 | 24% | 2288 | 22% | 201 | 26% |
| | Satisfied | 25 | 27% | 3518 | 35% | 242 | 31% |
| | Very satisfied | 9 | 10% | 2761 | 27% | 184 | 24% |
| | Total | | 93 | 100% | 10190 | 100% | 773 |
| 6 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, VP, Deans) | Very dissatisfied | 20 | 21% | 616 | 6% | 48 | 6% |
| | Dissatisfied | 19 | 20% | 971 | 9% | 64 | 8% |
| | Neither | 27 | 29% | 2211 | 22% | 175 | 23% |
| | Satisfied | 20 | 21% | 3200 | 31% | 220 | 29% |
| | Very satisfied | 8 | 9% | 3261 | 32% | 259 | 34% |
| | Total | | 94 | 100% | 10259 | 100% | 766 |
| 7 a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices | Very dissatisfied | 9 | 9% | 390 | 4% | 25 | 3% |
| | Dissatisfied | 15 | 16% | 904 | 9% | 65 | 8% |
| | Neither | 39 | 41% | 2424 | 23% | 205 | 26% |
| | Satisfied | 21 | 22% | 3825 | 37% | 288 | 37% |
| | Very satisfied | 11 | 12% | 2787 | 27% | 198 | 25% |
| | Total | | 95 | 100% | 10330 | 100% | 781 |

Table 2. Supervisory Relationships Frequency Distributions

GHC compared with:

| Supervisory Relationships | Response Option | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 8 my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities | Very dissatisfied | 2 | 2% | 426 | 4% | 24 | 3% |
| | Dissatisfied | 0 | 0% | 597 | 6% | 30 | 4% |
| | Neither | 13 | 14% | 1722 | 17% | 136 | 18% |
| | Satisfied | 33 | 35% | 3572 | 35% | 279 | 36% |
| | Very satisfied | 46 | 49% | 4020 | 39% | 299 | 39% |
| | Total | 94 | 100% | 10337 | 100% | 768 | 100% |
| 9 my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 265 | 3% | 17 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 400 | 4% | 27 | 4% |
| | Neither | 18 | 20% | 1614 | 16% | 144 | 19% |
| | Satisfied | 23 | 25% | 3634 | 35% | 281 | 37% |
| | Very satisfied | 49 | 53% | 4404 | 43% | 298 | 39% |
| | Total | 92 | 100% | 10317 | 100% | 767 | 100% |
| 10 my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 185 | 2% | 13 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 0 | 0% | 230 | 2% | 10 | 1% |
| | Neither | 16 | 17% | 1225 | 12% | 104 | 14% |
| | Satisfied | 26 | 28% | 3554 | 35% | 280 | 37% |
| | Very satisfied | 51 | 54% | 5106 | 50% | 360 | 47% |
| | Total | 94 | 100% | 10300 | 100% | 767 | 100% |
| 11 my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 243 | 2% | 11 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 4 | 4% | 330 | 3% | 20 | 3% |
| | Neither | 21 | 23% | 1458 | 15% | 117 | 16% |
| | Satisfied | 23 | 25% | 3375 | 34% | 268 | 36% |
| | Very satisfied | 44 | 47% | 4504 | 45% | 319 | 43% |
| | Total | 93 | 100% | 9910 | 100% | 735 | 100% |

GHC compared with:

| Supervisory Relationships (continued) | | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 12 my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 146 | 1% | 9 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 212 | 2% | 11 | 1% |
| | Neither | 13 | 14% | 1298 | 13% | 112 | 15% |
| | Satisfied | 36 | 39% | 3588 | 36% | 289 | 38% |
| | Very satisfied | 41 | 45% | 4657 | 47% | 330 | 44% |
| Total | | 92 | 100% | 9901 | 100% | 751 | 100% |

Table 3. Teamwork Frequency Distributions

GHC compared with:

| Teamwork | Response Option | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 13 racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 179 | 2% | 10 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 3 | 4% | 324 | 3% | 33 | 5% |
| | Neither | 32 | 42% | 2650 | 29% | 212 | 33% |
| | Satisfied | 22 | 29% | 3188 | 34% | 211 | 32% |
| | Very satisfied | 18 | 24% | 2922 | 32% | 185 | 28% |
| | Total | 76 | 100% | 9263 | 100% | 651 | 100% |
| 14 racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 152 | 2% | 8 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 3 | 4% | 312 | 3% | 28 | 4% |
| | Neither | 31 | 40% | 2589 | 28% | 226 | 35% |
| | Satisfied | 25 | 32% | 3280 | 36% | 206 | 32% |
| | Very satisfied | 17 | 22% | 2866 | 31% | 172 | 27% |
| | Total | 77 | 100% | 9199 | 100% | 640 | 100% |
| 15 the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs | Very dissatisfied | 1 | 1% | 162 | 2% | 11 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 3 | 4% | 331 | 4% | 27 | 4% |
| | Neither | 28 | 36% | 2344 | 26% | 202 | 32% |
| | Satisfied | 28 | 36% | 3354 | 37% | 224 | 35% |
| | Very satisfied | 17 | 22% | 2956 | 32% | 174 | 27% |
| | Total | 77 | 100% | 9147 | 100% | 638 | 100% |

Table 4. Student Focus Frequency Distributions

GHC compared with:

| Student Focus | Response Option | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | Small 2-year | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | |
| 16 faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | Very dissatisfied | 6 | 8% | 172 | 2% | 10 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 5 | 6% | 480 | 6% | 32 | 5% |
| | Neither | 39 | 49% | 2633 | 30% | 232 | 36% |
| | Satisfied | 20 | 25% | 3143 | 36% | 222 | 34% |
| | Very satisfied | 10 | 13% | 2222 | 26% | 154 | 24% |
| Total | | 80 | 100% | 8650 | 100% | 650 | 100% |
| 17 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives | Very dissatisfied | 6 | 8% | 158 | 2% | 12 | 2% |
| | Dissatisfied | 11 | 14% | 552 | 6% | 31 | 5% |
| | Neither | 37 | 47% | 2965 | 35% | 243 | 38% |
| | Satisfied | 18 | 23% | 2898 | 34% | 221 | 34% |
| | Very satisfied | 7 | 9% | 1953 | 23% | 141 | 22% |
| Total | | 79 | 100% | 8526 | 100% | 648 | 100% |
| 18 my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | Very dissatisfied | 5 | 6% | 177 | 2% | 10 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 13 | 15% | 440 | 4% | 22 | 3% |
| | Neither | 33 | 37% | 2098 | 21% | 172 | 24% |
| | Satisfied | 29 | 33% | 4133 | 42% | 293 | 41% |
| | Very satisfied | 9 | 10% | 2942 | 30% | 218 | 30% |
| Total | | 89 | 100% | 9790 | 100% | 715 | 100% |
| 19 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution | Very dissatisfied | 2 | 2% | 112 | 1% | 4 | 1% |
| | Dissatisfied | 11 | 13% | 309 | 4% | 17 | 3% |
| | Neither | 35 | 43% | 2709 | 31% | 217 | 33% |
| | Satisfied | 24 | 29% | 3436 | 39% | 267 | 40% |
| | Very satisfied | 10 | 12% | 2142 | 25% | 162 | 24% |
| Total | | 82 | 100% | 8708 | 100% | 667 | 100% |

Table 5. Institutional Structure Item Mean Comparisons

GHC compared with:

| Institutional Structure | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|---|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 1 my institution has a strong commitment to promoting racial/ethnic harmony | 98 | 3.520 | 4.064 | *** | -.583 | 4.000 | *** | -.512 |
| 2 my institution values racial/ethnic diversity | 98 | 3.673 | 4.142 | *** | -.517 | 4.088 | *** | -.456 |
| 3 my institution is accepting of people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds | 98 | 3.776 | 4.205 | *** | -.496 | 4.145 | *** | -.423 |
| 4 employees of different racial/ethnic backgrounds communicate well with one another | 93 | 3.667 | 4.101 | *** | -.475 | 4.108 | *** | -.488 |
| 5 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among faculty | 93 | 2.860 | 3.682 | *** | -.730 | 3.547 | *** | -.591 |
| 6 people of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are well-represented among senior administrators (e.g. President, Vice-President, Deans) | 94 | 2.755 | 3.733 | *** | -.831 | 3.755 | *** | -.838 |
| 7 a racially/ethnically inclusive institution is created through my institution's practices | 95 | 3.105 | 3.747 | *** | -.603 | 3.729 | *** | -.599 |

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

Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons

GHC compared with:

| Supervisory Relationships | | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | my supervisor maintains an environment that is supportive of people from different races/ethnicities | 94 | 4.287 | 3.983 | ** | .283 | 4.040 | * | .250 |
| 9 | my supervisor treats all employees equally based on racial/ethnic background | 92 | 4.283 | 4.116 | | | 4.064 | * | .230 |
| 10 | my supervisor is open to the views of people from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds | 94 | 4.340 | 4.278 | | | 4.257 | | |
| 11 | my supervisor provides feedback and evaluates subordinates fairly, regardless of race/ethnicity | 93 | 4.129 | 4.167 | | | 4.176 | | |
| 12 | my supervisor promotes meeting the needs of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | 92 | 4.250 | 4.252 | | | 4.225 | | |

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

Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons

GHC compared with:

| Teamwork | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|--|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 13 racial/ethnic diversity increases the level of trust among my immediate team members | 76 | 3.697 | 3.901 | | | 3.811 | | |
| 14 racial/ethnic diversity enhances my work team's performance | 77 | 3.701 | 3.913 | * | -.227 | 3.791 | | |
| 15 the racial/ethnic diversity of my work team members contributes to the ability to meet student needs | 77 | 3.740 | 3.941 | | | 3.820 | | |

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

Table 8. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons

GHC compared with:

| Student Focus | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|---|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| <i>The extent to which...</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 16 faculty pedagogical decisions integrate the experiences and voices of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | 80 | 3.288 | 3.782 | *** | -.517 | 3.735 | *** | -.477 |
| 17 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds believe that institutional policies incorporate their perspectives | 79 | 3.114 | 3.696 | *** | -.610 | 3.691 | *** | -.617 |
| 18 my institution advances the educational persistence of students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds | 89 | 3.270 | 3.942 | *** | -.727 | 3.961 | *** | -.763 |
| 19 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds are satisfied with their educational experience at my institution | 82 | 3.354 | 3.825 | *** | -.532 | 3.849 | *** | -.582 |

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

Table 9. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

GHC compared with:

| What is your personnel classification? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|--|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| Faculty | 31 | 3.861 | 3.972 | | | 3.936 | | |
| Administrator | 27 | 3.362 | 3.958 | *** | -.855 | 3.850 | ** | -.660 |
| Staff | 38 | 3.582 | 3.993 | *** | -.589 | 3.967 | ** | -.560 |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 10. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity

GHC compared with:

| Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|---|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| African American or Black | 1 | -- | 3.666 | | | 3.597 | | |
| Alaska Native or American Indian | 1 | -- | 3.890 | | | 4.341 | | |
| Asian | 2 | -- | 3.874 | | | -- | | |
| Hispanic/Latina/o/x | 3 | -- | 3.809 | | | 3.884 | | |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 0 | -- | 3.363 | | | -- | | |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 | -- | 3.769 | | | -- | | |
| White | 77 | 3.592 | 4.032 | *** | -.645 | 3.952 | *** | -.511 |
| Two or more races | 4 | -- | 3.776 | | | 4.316 | | |
| Prefer to self-describe | 6 | -- | 3.862 | | | -- | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 11. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status

GHC compared with:

| Your status at this institution is? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| Full-Time | 94 | 3.593 | 3.920 | *** | -.451 | 3.891 | *** | -.412 |
| Part-Time | 3 | -- | 4.171 | | | 4.246 | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 12. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned

GHC compared with:

| What is the highest level of education you have earned? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|--|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.) | 0 | -- | 3.893 | | | -- | | |
| Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.) | 9 | 3.781 | 3.786 | | | 3.752 | | |
| Master's degree | 45 | 3.559 | 3.969 | *** | -.556 | 3.908 | ** | -.466 |
| Bachelor's degree | 19 | 3.570 | 4.037 | ** | -.678 | 4.039 | ** | -.719 |
| Associate's degree | 14 | 3.786 | 4.037 | | | 3.941 | | |
| Certificate | 3 | -- | 4.035 | | | -- | | |
| High School diploma or GED | 5 | -- | 4.095 | | | 4.027 | | |
| No diploma or degree | 0 | -- | 3.934 | | | -- | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity

GHC compared with:

| What is your gender identity? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| Man | 36 | 3.594 | 4.029 | *** | -.591 | 3.995 | ** | -.587 |
| Woman | 54 | 3.605 | 4.014 | *** | -.589 | 4.002 | *** | -.559 |
| Trans Man | 0 | -- | -- | | | -- | | |
| Trans Woman | 0 | -- | -- | | | -- | | |
| Gender Queer | 0 | -- | 3.573 | | | -- | | |
| Prefer to self-describe | 4 | -- | 3.607 | | | -- | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution

GHC compared with:

| How many years have you worked at this institution? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|---|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| 5 years or less | 31 | 3.616 | 4.128 | *** | -.725 | 4.112 | *** | -.678 |
| 6-10 years | 20 | 3.748 | 3.926 | | | 3.980 | | |
| 11-15 years | 15 | 3.439 | 3.888 | * | -.604 | 3.824 | | |
| 16-20 years | 11 | 3.939 | 3.915 | | | 3.936 | | |
| 21-25 years | 2 | -- | 3.899 | | | 3.908 | | |
| 26 years or more | 5 | -- | 3.938 | | | 3.794 | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education

GHC compared with:

| How many years have you worked in higher education? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|---|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| 5 years or less | 16 | 3.867 | 4.181 | | | 4.184 | | |
| 6-10 years | 18 | 3.584 | 3.993 | * | -.580 | 3.989 | * | -.579 |
| 11-15 years | 22 | 3.674 | 3.933 | | | 3.890 | | |
| 16-20 years | 17 | 3.579 | 3.926 | | | 3.885 | | |
| 21-25 years | 7 | 3.595 | 3.870 | | | 3.881 | | |
| 26 years or more | 8 | 3.102 | 3.876 | ** | -1.070 | 3.811 | ** | -1.060 |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Age

GHC compared with:

| What is your age? | GHC | | NILIE Normbase | | | Small 2-year | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|------|-------------|
| | N | Mean | Mean | Sig. | Effect size | Mean | Sig. | Effect size |
| Overall | 99 | 3.618 | 3.975 | *** | -.489 | 3.936 | *** | -.440 |
| 29 or younger | 3 | -- | 4.176 | | | 4.208 | | |
| 30 - 39 | 15 | 3.489 | 4.039 | ** | -.771 | 4.090 | ** | -.791 |
| 40 - 49 | 21 | 3.697 | 4.007 | * | -.430 | 4.042 | * | -.477 |
| 50 - 59 | 21 | 3.591 | 3.992 | * | -.562 | 3.992 | ** | -.625 |
| 60 or older | 22 | 3.688 | 3.993 | * | -.430 | 3.817 | | |

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality