



**NC STATE
UNIVERSITY**

PACE CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

An initiative of the Belk Center at NC State

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

Ventura College

Ventura, California

PACE In-Depth Institutional Structure Report PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

Lead Researchers

Kayla Patterson &
Connor Guerin

Conducted

February & March 2026

RESEARCH TEAM

Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.

Executive Director

Sarah A. Deal, Ph.D.

Director of Research

Kaitlin S. Newhouse, Ph.D.

Associate Director of Research
and Evaluation

Daniel West, Ph.D.

Senior Research Associate

Connor Guerin

Research Associate

Jared King

Research Associate

Kayla Patterson

Research Associate

Natasha Spencer

Research Associate

Nyasia Lloyd

Research Associate

Oscar R. Miranda Tapia

Research Associate

Sam Dotson

Research Associate

CONTACT US

Phone

(919) 515-8567

Web

pace.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University

Belk Center for Community College
Leadership and Research
706 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

Fax

(919) 515-6305

Email

pace_survey@ncsu.edu

Suggested Citation: Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges In-Depth Institutional Structure Report, by Patterson, K., & Guerin, C. Raleigh, NC: 2025.

Table of Contents**Page**

Institutional Structure Literature Review	1
Table 1. Mission Frequency Distributions	3
Table 2. Leadership Frequency Distributions	4
Table 3. Decision-Making and Influence Frequency Distributions	6
Table 4. Policies and Structural Organization Frequency Distributions	7
Table 5. Teams and Cooperation Frequency Distributions	9
Table 6. Communication and Information Sharing Frequency Distributions	10
Table 7. Mission Item Mean Comparisons	11
Table 8. Leadership Item Mean Comparisons	12
Table 9. Decision-Making and Influence Item Mean Comparisons	13
Table 10. Policies and Structural Organization Item Mean Comparisons	14
Table 11. Teams and Cooperation Item Mean Comparisons	15
Table 12. Communication and Information Sharing Item Mean Comparisons	16
Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	17
Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity	18
Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status	19
Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned	20
Table 17. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity	21
Table 18. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity (Transgender)	21
Table 19. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution	22
Table 20. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education	23
Table 21. Mean Comparisons by Age	24

Institutional Structure Literature Review

As institutions of higher education seek to improve and meet external demands, issues specifically related to institutional structure—which includes the mission, leadership, structural organization, decision-making, and communication within the institution—often create challenges. Research suggests that organizations function best when they are effectively coordinated, labor and control is appropriately divided, and structural design adapts to current circumstances (Bolman & Deal, 2021). However, PACE survey data consistently reveals that community college employees have relatively negative perceptions of the climate in these areas. The Institutional Structure report is designed to provide insight into employee perceptions of institutional structure.

Assessing the perceptions around institutional structure on campus can be complicated since community colleges, like other institutions of higher education, have been described as “loosely coupled organizations” (Weick, 1976). In loosely coupled organizations, functions and units might be attached and responsive to one another, but each retains its own identity and are often minimally interdependent (Weick, 1976). While loosely coupled organizations can be more dynamic and adaptable, they are not without problems. Organizations that are loosely coupled may experience difficulty in diffusing new policies or procedures, improving weak or problematic functions, and in streamlining processes so that each autonomous unit is not duplicating the work of other units.

Among various higher education institution types, community colleges face specific challenges in their institutional structure. However, understanding the climate around institutional structure within community colleges is more important now than ever. Over the last decade, community colleges have faced a challenging environment defined by resource constraints, greater demands for services, unprecedented enrollment pressure, as well as myriad challenges further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Boggs, 2004; Grawe, 2021). Despite these challenges, organizational renewal and a better understanding of an institution’s mission and modes of operation can assist community colleges in overcoming these challenges by creating a culture that is more proactive than reactive (Ayers, 2002; Bailey et al., 2015).

The Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research recognizes the need for leaders to gain insight into how employees understand the climate around institutional structure at their campus. Accordingly, the data in the report that follows can be leveraged to further assess and improve structural organization, decision-making, and communication processes within institutions. Using PACE data to make improvements to the institutional structure and overall campus climate can strengthen an institution’s ability and drive to address existing and emerging challenges in higher education while enhancing student success outcomes (Davis et al., 2020).

References

Ayers, D. F. (2002). Developing climates for renewal in the community college: A case study of dissipative self-organization. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26 (2), 165-185.

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success*. Harvard University Press.

Boggs, G. R. (2004). Community colleges in a perfect storm. *Change*, 36 (6), 6-11.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey Bass.

Davis, J. S., Desantis, A. L., Maldonado, L. G., Morris, N., & Jaeger, A. J. (2020). Improving campus climate for employees as a strategy for promoting student success. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 27 (1), 1-16.

Grawe, N. D. (2021). *The agile college: How institutions successfully navigate demographic changes*. John Hopkins University Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21 (1), 1-19.

Table 1. Mission Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Mission	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
1 Employees in this institution share a common definition of its mission	Strongly Disagree	25	14%	477	4%	150	3%	33	4%
	Disagree	44	25%	991	9%	290	7%	71	8%
	Neither	41	24%	2481	21%	967	22%	213	24%
	Agree	53	31%	5232	45%	1906	43%	375	43%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	2372	21%	1069	24%	189	21%
	Total	173	100%	11553	100%	4382	100%	881	100%
2 Employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	Strongly Disagree	15	9%	243	2%	77	2%	15	2%
	Disagree	26	15%	467	4%	136	3%	25	3%
	Neither	52	30%	2049	18%	727	17%	176	20%
	Agree	67	38%	5904	51%	2123	49%	423	49%
	Strongly Agree	16	9%	2876	25%	1297	30%	230	26%
	Total	176	100%	11539	100%	4360	100%	869	100%
3 Employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	Strongly Disagree	12	7%	204	2%	68	2%	14	2%
	Disagree	32	18%	483	4%	139	3%	28	3%
	Neither	48	27%	2189	19%	748	17%	172	20%
	Agree	69	39%	5887	51%	2149	49%	431	50%
	Strongly Agree	15	9%	2759	24%	1254	29%	222	26%
	Total	176	100%	11522	100%	4358	100%	867	100%
4 There is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	Strongly Disagree	30	17%	566	5%	189	4%	40	5%
	Disagree	41	23%	1394	12%	444	10%	96	11%
	Neither	47	27%	2995	26%	1173	27%	247	28%
	Agree	48	27%	4694	41%	1786	41%	340	38%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	1868	16%	800	18%	164	18%
	Total	176	100%	11517	100%	4392	100%	887	100%

Table 2. Leadership Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Leadership	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
5 Institutional leadership communicates a clear sense of purpose	Strongly Disagree	45	26%	976	8%	251	6%	74	8%
	Disagree	49	28%	1564	14%	463	11%	122	14%
	Neither	41	23%	2310	20%	869	20%	186	21%
	Agree	29	17%	4500	39%	1830	42%	328	37%
	Strongly Agree	11	6%	2235	19%	974	22%	178	20%
	Total	175	100%	11585	100%	4387	100%	888	100%
6 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with internal constituents	Strongly Disagree	45	27%	1139	10%	272	6%	69	8%
	Disagree	45	27%	1711	15%	500	12%	103	12%
	Neither	52	31%	3014	27%	1178	28%	233	28%
	Agree	18	11%	3621	33%	1523	36%	285	34%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	1644	15%	718	17%	142	17%
	Total	168	100%	11129	100%	4191	100%	832	100%
7 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with external constituents	Strongly Disagree	25	17%	509	5%	137	4%	40	5%
	Disagree	20	14%	626	6%	203	5%	60	8%
	Neither	66	46%	3292	32%	1169	30%	260	35%
	Agree	25	17%	3810	37%	1507	39%	247	33%
	Strongly Agree	8	6%	1977	19%	862	22%	146	19%
	Total	144	100%	10214	100%	3878	100%	753	100%
8 Institutional leadership effectively address crises	Strongly Disagree	58	34%	1109	10%	313	7%	79	9%
	Disagree	39	23%	1316	12%	447	10%	127	15%
	Neither	44	25%	2489	22%	864	20%	138	16%
	Agree	24	14%	4150	37%	1670	39%	320	37%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	2179	19%	1022	24%	207	24%
	Total	173	100%	11243	100%	4316	100%	871	100%

VC compared with:

Leadership (continued)	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
9 Institutional leadership carefully plans resource allocation	Strongly Disagree	38	23%	1137	10%	295	7%	104	12%
	Disagree	35	21%	1513	14%	500	12%	121	14%
	Neither	51	30%	3189	29%	1212	29%	205	24%
	Agree	34	20%	3475	32%	1465	35%	263	31%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	1621	15%	699	17%	152	18%
	Total	168	100%	10935	100%	4171	100%	845	100%

Table 3. Decision-Making and Influence Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Decision-Making and Influence	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
10 Institutional leadership uses employee feedback to improve this institution	Strongly Disagree	49	30%	1405	12%	438	10%	100	11%
	Disagree	38	23%	1934	17%	702	16%	137	16%
	Neither	52	32%	3270	29%	1288	29%	236	27%
	Agree	20	12%	3281	29%	1297	30%	253	29%
	Strongly Agree	6	4%	1481	13%	654	15%	153	17%
	Total	165	100%	11371	100%	4379	100%	879	100%
11 Institutional leadership considers employee feedback in decision-making	Strongly Disagree	49	30%	1517	13%	466	11%	110	13%
	Disagree	37	22%	2013	18%	720	16%	127	14%
	Neither	48	29%	3249	29%	1318	30%	239	27%
	Agree	26	16%	3150	28%	1262	29%	258	29%
	Strongly Agree	6	4%	1414	12%	614	14%	145	16%
	Total	166	100%	11343	100%	4380	100%	879	100%
12 Employees participate in decision-making	Strongly Disagree	32	19%	1392	12%	461	11%	86	10%
	Disagree	50	30%	2306	20%	815	19%	128	14%
	Neither	46	27%	3142	27%	1184	27%	217	24%
	Agree	35	21%	3311	29%	1352	31%	299	34%
	Strongly Agree	6	4%	1277	11%	578	13%	158	18%
	Total	169	100%	11428	100%	4390	100%	888	100%
13 Employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	Strongly Disagree	26	15%	819	7%	252	6%	57	6%
	Disagree	51	30%	1774	15%	586	13%	138	15%
	Neither	42	25%	2643	23%	960	22%	194	22%
	Agree	42	25%	4670	40%	1865	42%	343	38%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	1662	14%	776	17%	162	18%
	Total	169	100%	11568	100%	4439	100%	894	100%

Table 4. Policies and Structural Organization Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Policies and Structural Organization	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
14 Institutional policies allow for collaboration	Strongly Disagree	30	18%	733	6%	210	5%	52	6%
	Disagree	34	20%	1217	11%	381	9%	91	11%
	Neither	52	30%	3088	27%	1129	26%	205	24%
	Agree	47	27%	4503	40%	1769	41%	333	39%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	1759	16%	824	19%	181	21%
	Total	171	100%	11300	100%	4313	100%	862	100%
15 The structure of this institution allows for collaboration	Strongly Disagree	34	20%	930	8%	267	6%	64	7%
	Disagree	41	24%	1537	13%	510	12%	110	12%
	Neither	44	26%	2597	23%	939	21%	189	21%
	Agree	42	25%	4568	40%	1841	42%	335	37%
	Strongly Agree	9	5%	1841	16%	849	19%	198	22%
	Total	170	100%	11473	100%	4406	100%	896	100%
16 The structure of this institution fosters innovation	Strongly Disagree	44	26%	963	8%	271	6%	59	7%
	Disagree	38	22%	1677	15%	550	13%	153	17%
	Neither	45	27%	3014	27%	1125	26%	202	23%
	Agree	36	21%	4020	35%	1670	38%	304	35%
	Strongly Agree	6	4%	1691	15%	739	17%	163	19%
	Total	169	100%	11365	100%	4355	100%	881	100%
17 This institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	Strongly Disagree	41	24%	1140	10%	291	7%	63	7%
	Disagree	43	25%	1799	16%	544	13%	117	14%
	Neither	51	30%	3027	27%	1122	26%	228	27%
	Agree	29	17%	3689	33%	1567	36%	298	35%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	1655	15%	794	18%	153	18%
	Total	172	100%	11310	100%	4318	100%	859	100%

VC compared with:

Policies and Structural Organization (Continued)		VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
18 Institutional policies govern activities at this institution	Strongly Disagree	21	13%	522	5%	154	4%	37	4%
	Disagree	19	12%	732	6%	241	6%	63	7%
	Neither	59	36%	3031	27%	1056	24%	213	24%
	Agree	53	32%	5080	45%	1993	46%	378	43%
	Strongly Agree	13	8%	1940	17%	931	21%	187	21%
Total		165	100%	11305	100%	4375	100%	878	100%

Table 5. Teams and Cooperation Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Teams and Cooperation	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
19 There is effective collaboration among employees	Strongly Disagree	30	18%	539	5%	184	4%	31	3%
	Disagree	40	24%	1373	12%	440	10%	84	9%
	Neither	34	20%	2646	23%	1054	24%	209	23%
	Agree	53	31%	5101	44%	1926	44%	377	42%
	Strongly Agree	12	7%	1842	16%	820	19%	192	22%
	Total	169	100%	11501	100%	4424	100%	893	100%
20 Employee expertise is considered when forming teams	Strongly Disagree	28	17%	859	8%	283	7%	53	6%
	Disagree	36	22%	1563	14%	556	13%	112	13%
	Neither	50	31%	2790	25%	1082	26%	204	25%
	Agree	40	25%	4137	38%	1580	37%	310	37%
	Strongly Agree	8	5%	1656	15%	733	17%	151	18%
	Total	162	100%	11005	100%	4234	100%	830	100%
21 Teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	Strongly Disagree	23	14%	486	4%	129	3%	32	4%
	Disagree	24	15%	865	8%	263	6%	54	6%
	Neither	56	34%	2445	22%	839	20%	166	20%
	Agree	50	31%	5169	47%	2002	47%	391	46%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	2134	19%	1043	24%	202	24%
	Total	163	100%	11099	100%	4276	100%	845	100%
22 Teams accomplish tasks	Strongly Disagree	11	7%	307	3%	102	2%	27	3%
	Disagree	21	13%	604	5%	177	4%	47	6%
	Neither	59	36%	2427	22%	861	20%	171	20%
	Agree	64	39%	5601	50%	2136	50%	399	47%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	2190	20%	1004	23%	199	24%
	Total	165	100%	11129	100%	4280	100%	843	100%

Table 6. Communication and Information Sharing Frequency Distributions

VC compared with:

Communication and Information Sharing	Response Option	VC		PACE Normbase		Large		California	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
23 There is sufficient communication at this institution	Strongly Disagree	40	24%	1522	13%	411	9%	73	8%
	Disagree	58	34%	2422	21%	772	18%	167	19%
	Neither	42	25%	2445	21%	934	21%	181	21%
	Agree	19	11%	3650	32%	1580	36%	322	37%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	1459	13%	695	16%	139	16%
	Total	169	100%	11498	100%	4392	100%	882	100%
24 Campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	Strongly Disagree	70	41%	1534	14%	465	11%	86	10%
	Disagree	40	23%	2165	19%	747	17%	153	17%
	Neither	32	19%	2806	25%	1054	24%	182	21%
	Agree	19	11%	3404	30%	1458	33%	294	34%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	1448	13%	659	15%	162	18%
	Total	171	100%	11357	100%	4383	100%	877	100%
25 Institutional leadership at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	Strongly Disagree	42	25%	1255	11%	348	8%	82	9%
	Disagree	40	24%	1854	16%	576	13%	125	14%
	Neither	48	28%	2572	22%	950	22%	190	22%
	Agree	30	18%	4034	35%	1673	38%	328	37%
	Strongly Agree	9	5%	1753	15%	850	19%	158	18%
	Total	169	100%	11468	100%	4397	100%	883	100%
26 The information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	Strongly Disagree	34	20%	732	6%	193	4%	50	6%
	Disagree	26	15%	1075	9%	310	7%	76	9%
	Neither	63	38%	2817	25%	1001	23%	206	23%
	Agree	35	21%	4928	43%	1997	45%	380	43%
	Strongly Agree	10	6%	1921	17%	894	20%	171	19%
	Total	168	100%	11473	100%	4395	100%	883	100%

Table 7. Mission Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Mission	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
1 Employees in this institution share a common definition of its mission	173	2.879	3.695	***	-.798	3.788	***	-.907	3.699	***	-.789
2 Employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	176	3.244	3.928	***	-.774	4.015	***	-.882	3.953	***	-.787
3 Employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	176	3.244	3.913	***	-.769	4.006	***	-.883	3.945	***	-.785
4 There is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	176	2.813	3.513	***	-.663	3.584	***	-.742	3.555	***	-.692

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

Table 8. Leadership Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Leadership	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
5 Institutional leadership communicates a clear sense of purpose	175	2.497	3.471	***	-.819	3.641	***	-1.028	3.466	***	-.809
6 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with internal constituents	168	2.399	3.262	***	-.728	3.457	***	-.957	3.394	***	-.867
7 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with external constituents	144	2.799	3.599	***	-.781	3.710	***	-.923	3.530	***	-.688
8 Institutional leadership effectively address crises	173	2.335	3.442	***	-.916	3.612	***	-1.096	3.515	***	-.949
9 Institutional leadership carefully plans resource allocation	168	2.661	3.268	***	-.514	3.425	***	-.683	3.282	***	-.496

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

Table 9. Decision-Making and Influence Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Decision-Making and Influence	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
10 Institutional leadership uses employee feedback to improve this institution	165	2.370	3.132	***	-.632	3.235	***	-.732	3.253	***	-.722
11 Institutional leadership considers employee feedback in decision-making	166	2.416	3.082	***	-.548	3.191	***	-.655	3.229	***	-.659
12 Employees participate in decision-making	169	2.604	3.068	***	-.390	3.176	***	-.483	3.355	***	-.630
13 Employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	169	2.734	3.396	***	-.590	3.524	***	-.719	3.464	***	-.640

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

Table 10. Policies and Structural Organization Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Policies and Structural Organization	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
14 Institutional policies allow for collaboration	171	2.819	3.472	***	-.605	3.607	***	-.751	3.580	***	-.680
15 The structure of this institution allows for collaboration	170	2.712	3.423	***	-.619	3.566	***	-.769	3.550	***	-.715
16 The structure of this institution fosters innovation	169	2.538	3.334	***	-.691	3.472	***	-.844	3.407	***	-.742
17 This institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	172	2.535	3.258	***	-.610	3.470	***	-.828	3.420	***	-.771
18 Institutional policies govern activities at this institution	165	3.109	3.635	***	-.530	3.756	***	-.666	3.700	***	-.572

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

Table 11. Teams and Cooperation Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Teams and Cooperation	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
19 There is effective collaboration among employees	169	2.864	3.551	***	-.657	3.623	***	-.734	3.689	***	-.779
20 Employee expertise is considered when forming teams	162	2.778	3.379	***	-.529	3.454	***	-.603	3.475	***	-.617
21 Teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	163	3.000	3.685	***	-.677	3.834	***	-.859	3.801	***	-.786
22 Teams accomplish tasks	165	3.248	3.787	***	-.589	3.879	***	-.702	3.826	***	-.599

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

Table 12. Communication and Information Sharing Item Mean Comparisons

VC compared with:

Communication and Information Sharing	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
23 There is sufficient communication at this institution	169	2.414	3.096	***	-.547	3.313	***	-.749	3.325	***	-.772
24 Campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	171	2.175	3.094	***	-.742	3.251	***	-.887	3.334	***	-.936
25 Institutional leadership at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	169	2.550	3.277	***	-.596	3.478	***	-.791	3.402	***	-.710
26 The information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	168	2.768	3.543	***	-.721	3.703	***	-.920	3.618	***	-.785

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

Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

VC compared with:

What is your personnel classification?	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
Faculty	104	2.598	3.423	***	-.858	3.576	***	-1.061	3.488	***	-.927
Administrator	12	2.536	3.539	***	-1.205	3.669	***	-1.390	3.553	***	-1.143
Staff	49	2.955	3.428	***	-.558	3.542	***	-.708	3.594	***	-.769

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity

VC compared with:

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you:	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
African American or Black	1	--	3.503			3.593			3.572		
Alaska Native or American Indian	0	∅	3.717			3.973			--		
Asian	8	2.591	3.706	***	-1.282	3.751	***	-1.394	3.652	**	-1.170
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	41	2.589	3.417	***	-.845	3.620	***	-1.035	3.569	***	-.989
Middle Eastern or North African	3	--	3.465			3.491			3.387		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	∅	3.475			3.319			--		
White	80	2.832	3.488	***	-.757	3.643	***	-.976	3.596	***	-.885
Two or more races	18	2.627	3.151	*	-.565	3.336	**	-.810	3.341	**	-.763
Prefer to self-describe	12	2.306	2.918	*	-.645	2.958	*	-.716	3.174	**	-.908

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status

VC compared with:

Your status at this institution is:	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
Full-Time	135	2.534	3.361	***	-.939	3.475	***	-1.098	3.440	***	-1.005
Part-Time	32	3.388	3.775	*	-.443	3.862	**	-.558	3.810	*	-.483

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned

VC compared with:

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	5	--	3.491			3.678			3.645		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	31	2.401	3.311	***	-.919	3.467	***	-1.151	3.483	***	-1.084
Master's degree	88	2.641	3.415	***	-.858	3.539	***	-1.020	3.432	***	-.858
Bachelor's degree	28	2.974	3.500	**	-.626	3.633	***	-.790	3.629	***	-.793
Associate's degree	8	3.384	3.534			3.694			3.591		
Certificate	2	--	3.566			3.680			3.970		
High School diploma or GED	3	--	3.534			3.609			4.082		
No diploma or degree	0	∅	3.756			3.811			--		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 17. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity

What is your gender identity?	<i>VC compared with:</i>										
	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
Man	52	2.694	3.486	***	-.859	3.640	***	-1.076	3.745	***	-1.163
Woman	109	2.705	3.473	***	-.892	3.597	***	-1.056	3.487	***	-.882
Non-binary	2	--	2.797			--			--		
Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming	0	∅	3.062			3.145			--		
Prefer to self-describe	2	--	2.825			2.835			2.857		

Table 18. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity (Transgender)

Do you identify as transgender?	<i>VC compared with:</i>										
	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
Yes	1	--	3.008			--			--		
No	164	2.702	3.355	***	-.724	3.430	***	-.814	2.882		

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 19. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution

VC compared with:

How many years have you worked at this institution?	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
5 years or less	57	3.237	3.654	***	-.486	3.766	***	-.618	3.738	***	-.589
6-10 years	27	2.496	3.377	***	-.983	3.533	***	-1.170	3.347	***	-.886
11-15 years	34	2.130	3.332	***	-1.395	3.438	***	-1.604	3.480	***	-1.622
16-20 years	22	2.379	3.279	***	-1.004	3.439	***	-1.256	3.372	***	-1.171
21-25 years	10	2.429	3.234	**	-.901	3.500	***	-1.271	3.172	*	-.788
26 years or more	15	3.006	3.359			3.521	*	-.595	3.741	**	-.812

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 20. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education

VC compared with:

How many years have you worked in higher education?	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
5 years or less	28	3.425	3.716			3.829	*	-.481	3.804	*	-.462
6-10 years	20	2.825	3.458	**	-.729	3.642	***	-.964	3.585	***	-.866
11-15 years	25	2.541	3.385	***	-.980	3.490	***	-1.139	3.569	***	-1.214
16-20 years	37	2.438	3.308	***	-.964	3.437	***	-1.149	3.389	***	-.995
21-25 years	24	2.304	3.249	***	-1.060	3.413	***	-1.282	3.260	***	-1.025
26 years or more	32	2.717	3.354	***	-.669	3.520	***	-.903	3.505	***	-.842

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 21. Mean Comparisons by Age

VC compared with:

What is your age?	VC		PACE Normbase			Large			California		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	179	2.748	3.440	***	-.776	3.570	***	-.944	3.531	***	-.860
29 or younger	9	3.538	3.623			3.723			3.538		
30 - 39	17	2.692	3.493	***	-.902	3.642	***	-1.090	3.521	***	-.932
40 - 49	55	2.536	3.417	***	-.980	3.564	***	-1.159	3.630	***	-1.229
50 - 59	49	2.468	3.434	***	-1.080	3.592	***	-1.334	3.427	***	-1.020
60 or older	33	3.129	3.536	**	-.453	3.697	***	-.662	3.669	**	-.604

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

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses