



**NC STATE
UNIVERSITY**

PACE CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

An initiative of the Belk Center at NC State

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

Walla Walla Community College

Walla Walla, Washington

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

Lead Researchers

Jared King & Oscar R. Miranda Tapia

Conducted

September & October 2025

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 King J., & Miranda Tapia, O. R. 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

WWCC compared with:

Mission	Response Option	WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
1 Employees in this institution share a common definition of its mission	Strongly Disagree	6	3%	13	8%	468	4%	25	4%
	Disagree	34	14%	18	11%	969	9%	72	10%
	Neither	49	21%	44	28%	2439	22%	163	23%
	Agree	123	51%	73	46%	5093	45%	325	47%
	Strongly Agree	27	11%	11	7%	2305	20%	111	16%
	Total	239	100%	159	100%	11274	100%	696	100%
2 Employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	Strongly Disagree	4	2%	6	4%	236	2%	16	2%
	Disagree	16	7%	8	5%	455	4%	40	6%
	Neither	47	20%	22	14%	2008	18%	110	16%
	Agree	136	57%	96	60%	5766	51%	390	56%
	Strongly Agree	37	15%	27	17%	2794	25%	141	20%
	Total	240	100%	159	100%	11259	100%	697	100%
3 Employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	Strongly Disagree	4	2%	2	1%	199	2%	12	2%
	Disagree	18	8%	12	8%	467	4%	50	7%
	Neither	49	20%	27	17%	2145	19%	142	20%
	Agree	133	55%	95	60%	5749	51%	365	52%
	Strongly Agree	36	15%	23	14%	2685	24%	128	18%
	Total	240	100%	159	100%	11245	100%	697	100%
4 There is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	Strongly Disagree	11	5%	20	13%	555	5%	42	6%
	Disagree	35	15%	33	21%	1368	12%	107	16%
	Neither	60	25%	36	23%	2938	26%	175	25%
	Agree	105	44%	56	35%	4564	41%	265	38%
	Strongly Agree	27	11%	14	9%	1815	16%	101	15%
	Total	238	100%	159	100%	11240	100%	690	100%

Table 2. Leadership Frequency Distributions

WWCC compared with:

Leadership	Response Option	WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
5 Institutional leadership communicates a clear sense of purpose	Strongly Disagree	28	12%	28	17%	946	8%	83	12%
	Disagree	37	15%	36	22%	1537	14%	118	17%
	Neither	45	19%	30	19%	2258	20%	108	15%
	Agree	104	43%	56	35%	4405	39%	264	38%
	Strongly Agree	26	11%	11	7%	2163	19%	126	18%
	Total	240	100%	161	100%	11309	100%	699	100%
6 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with internal constituents	Strongly Disagree	35	15%	29	19%	1105	10%	89	13%
	Disagree	40	17%	37	24%	1665	15%	126	19%
	Neither	68	30%	40	26%	2946	27%	160	24%
	Agree	66	29%	42	28%	3548	33%	201	30%
	Strongly Agree	21	9%	4	3%	1597	15%	92	14%
	Total	230	100%	152	100%	10861	100%	668	100%
7 Institutional leadership effectively interacts with external constituents	Strongly Disagree	20	10%	21	15%	499	5%	45	8%
	Disagree	13	7%	20	14%	599	6%	52	9%
	Neither	76	38%	55	38%	3214	32%	201	34%
	Agree	67	34%	37	26%	3732	37%	198	33%
	Strongly Agree	23	12%	11	8%	1925	19%	100	17%
	Total	199	100%	144	100%	9969	100%	596	100%
8 Institutional leadership effectively address crises	Strongly Disagree	33	15%	39	25%	1071	10%	98	15%
	Disagree	38	17%	27	17%	1275	12%	104	16%
	Neither	54	24%	37	24%	2444	22%	138	21%
	Agree	71	32%	41	26%	4065	37%	223	34%
	Strongly Agree	27	12%	11	7%	2117	19%	98	15%
	Total	223	100%	155	100%	10972	100%	661	100%

WWCC compared with:

Leadership (continued)	Response Option	WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
9 Institutional leadership carefully plans resource allocation	Strongly Disagree	26	12%	29	19%	1112	10%	88	14%
	Disagree	33	15%	35	23%	1473	14%	113	18%
	Neither	67	30%	38	25%	3123	29%	173	27%
	Agree	71	32%	42	27%	3400	32%	194	30%
	Strongly Agree	28	12%	9	6%	1564	15%	76	12%
	Total	225	100%	153	100%	10672	100%	644	100%

Table 3. Decision-Making and Influence Frequency Distributions

WWCC compared with:

Decision-Making and Influence	Response Option	WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
10 Institutional leadership uses employee feedback to improve this institution	Strongly Disagree	32	14%	36	23%	1372	12%	117	17%
	Disagree	41	17%	39	25%	1894	17%	121	18%
	Neither	80	34%	44	28%	3194	29%	183	27%
	Agree	66	28%	28	18%	3202	29%	181	27%
	Strongly Agree	17	7%	11	7%	1436	13%	72	11%
	Total	236	100%	158	100%	11098	100%	674	100%
11 Institutional leadership considers employee feedback in decision-making	Strongly Disagree	34	15%	37	24%	1479	13%	116	17%
	Disagree	42	18%	41	26%	1969	18%	125	19%
	Neither	77	33%	39	25%	3180	29%	183	27%
	Agree	63	27%	30	19%	3075	28%	174	26%
	Strongly Agree	17	7%	10	6%	1371	12%	71	11%
	Total	233	100%	157	100%	11074	100%	669	100%
12 Employees participate in decision-making	Strongly Disagree	26	11%	34	21%	1362	12%	105	15%
	Disagree	56	24%	38	24%	2261	20%	149	22%
	Neither	61	26%	42	26%	3069	28%	176	26%
	Agree	80	34%	38	24%	3220	29%	198	29%
	Strongly Agree	12	5%	7	4%	1243	11%	54	8%
	Total	235	100%	159	100%	11155	100%	682	100%
13 Employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	Strongly Disagree	16	7%	19	12%	793	7%	61	9%
	Disagree	41	17%	44	28%	1738	15%	137	20%
	Neither	53	22%	38	24%	2592	23%	153	22%
	Agree	110	46%	47	29%	4561	40%	259	37%
	Strongly Agree	20	8%	12	8%	1608	14%	83	12%
	Total	240	100%	160	100%	11292	100%	693	100%

Table 4. Policies and Structural Organization Frequency Distributions

Policies and Structural Organization		WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
14 Institutional policies allow for collaboration	Strongly Disagree	17	7%	22	14%	720	7%	55	8%
	Disagree	35	15%	22	14%	1186	11%	80	12%
	Neither	64	27%	51	32%	3013	27%	192	29%
	Agree	102	43%	54	34%	4396	40%	275	41%
	Strongly Agree	17	7%	9	6%	1714	16%	68	10%
	Total	235	100%	158	100%	11029	100%	670	100%
15 The structure of this institution allows for collaboration	Strongly Disagree	21	9%	27	17%	913	8%	62	9%
	Disagree	37	15%	29	18%	1501	13%	99	14%
	Neither	65	27%	50	31%	2521	23%	186	27%
	Agree	101	42%	46	28%	4467	40%	261	38%
	Strongly Agree	16	7%	10	6%	1796	16%	78	11%
	Total	240	100%	162	100%	11198	100%	686	100%
16 The structure of this institution fosters innovation	Strongly Disagree	21	9%	31	19%	942	8%	79	12%
	Disagree	40	17%	38	24%	1628	15%	141	21%
	Neither	85	36%	48	30%	2928	26%	212	31%
	Agree	73	31%	41	26%	3949	36%	181	27%
	Strongly Agree	17	7%	2	1%	1648	15%	64	9%
	Total	236	100%	160	100%	11095	100%	677	100%
17 This institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	Strongly Disagree	33	14%	39	26%	1105	10%	108	16%
	Disagree	58	25%	44	29%	1764	16%	146	22%
	Neither	76	32%	33	22%	2953	27%	194	29%
	Agree	57	24%	31	21%	3603	33%	157	24%
	Strongly Agree	11	5%	4	3%	1613	15%	56	8%
	Total	235	100%	151	100%	11038	100%	661	100%

WWCC compared with:

Policies and Structural Organization (Continued)		WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
18 Institutional policies govern activities at this institution	Strongly Disagree	17	7%	23	14%	512	5%	51	8%
	Disagree	24	10%	24	15%	711	6%	71	11%
	Neither	76	33%	52	33%	2960	27%	212	32%
	Agree	102	44%	52	33%	4966	45%	256	39%
	Strongly Agree	14	6%	9	6%	1894	17%	74	11%
Total		233	100%	160	100%	11043	100%	664	100%

Table 5. Teams and Cooperation Frequency Distributions

Teams and Cooperation		WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Response Option	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
19 There is effective collaboration among employees	Strongly Disagree	9	4%	14	9%	529	5%	42	6%
	Disagree	20	8%	32	20%	1343	12%	114	17%
	Neither	61	26%	41	26%	2576	23%	173	25%
	Agree	125	53%	60	38%	4980	44%	271	40%
	Strongly Agree	22	9%	13	8%	1799	16%	81	12%
	Total	237	100%	160	100%	11227	100%	681	100%
20 Employee expertise is considered when forming teams	Strongly Disagree	15	7%	26	17%	845	8%	72	11%
	Disagree	35	16%	27	17%	1529	14%	106	16%
	Neither	67	30%	49	32%	2714	25%	183	28%
	Agree	84	37%	42	27%	4037	38%	224	34%
	Strongly Agree	24	11%	11	7%	1619	15%	68	10%
	Total	225	100%	155	100%	10744	100%	653	100%
21 Teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	Strongly Disagree	13	6%	6	4%	473	4%	35	5%
	Disagree	25	11%	18	12%	842	8%	79	12%
	Neither	60	26%	37	24%	2368	22%	173	27%
	Agree	108	47%	76	49%	5055	47%	280	43%
	Strongly Agree	26	11%	19	12%	2094	19%	85	13%
	Total	232	100%	156	100%	10832	100%	652	100%
22 Teams accomplish tasks	Strongly Disagree	8	3%	5	3%	298	3%	21	3%
	Disagree	18	8%	20	13%	583	5%	62	9%
	Neither	62	27%	38	24%	2361	22%	181	27%
	Agree	119	51%	85	54%	5469	50%	306	46%
	Strongly Agree	26	11%	9	6%	2147	20%	90	14%
	Total	233	100%	157	100%	10858	100%	660	100%

Table 6. Communication and Information Sharing Frequency Distributions

WWCC compared with:

Communication and Information Sharing		WWCC		2022		PACE Normbase		Washington	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
23 There is sufficient communication at this institution	Strongly Disagree	36	15%	36	23%	1472	13%	129	19%
	Disagree	63	26%	42	26%	2364	21%	170	25%
	Neither	47	20%	41	26%	2387	21%	173	25%
	Agree	72	30%	34	21%	3579	32%	166	24%
	Strongly Agree	20	8%	7	4%	1422	13%	52	8%
	Total	238	100%	160	100%	11224	100%	690	100%
24 Campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	Strongly Disagree	34	15%	33	20%	1495	13%	130	19%
	Disagree	48	21%	44	27%	2108	19%	158	23%
	Neither	63	27%	32	20%	2736	25%	174	26%
	Agree	73	31%	43	26%	3332	30%	159	23%
	Strongly Agree	15	6%	11	7%	1414	13%	58	9%
	Total	233	100%	163	100%	11085	100%	679	100%
25 Institutional leadership at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	Strongly Disagree	34	14%	35	22%	1217	11%	108	16%
	Disagree	39	16%	43	27%	1805	16%	141	20%
	Neither	57	24%	31	19%	2528	23%	139	20%
	Agree	84	35%	44	27%	3946	35%	224	33%
	Strongly Agree	24	10%	9	6%	1700	15%	76	11%
	Total	238	100%	162	100%	11196	100%	688	100%
26 The information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	Strongly Disagree	22	9%	23	14%	711	6%	70	10%
	Disagree	26	11%	28	18%	1049	9%	75	11%
	Neither	61	26%	39	24%	2754	25%	193	28%
	Agree	100	42%	58	36%	4818	43%	264	39%
	Strongly Agree	28	12%	12	8%	1867	17%	81	12%
	Total	237	100%	160	100%	11199	100%	683	100%

Table 7. Mission Item Mean Comparisons

Mission		<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
		WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
		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	239	3.548	3.321	*	.230	3.692	*	-.141	3.611		
2	Employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	240	3.775	3.818			3.926	**	-.172	3.861		
3	Employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	240	3.746	3.786			3.912	**	-.192	3.785		
4	There is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	238	3.429	3.069	**	.329	3.509			3.400		

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

Table 8. Leadership Item Mean Comparisons

Leadership		<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
		WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
		N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
5	Institutional leadership communicates a clear sense of purpose	240	3.263	2.913	**	.288	3.469	**	-.174	3.332		
6	Institutional leadership effectively interacts with internal constituents	230	2.991	2.704	*	.244	3.264	***	-.230	3.121		
7	Institutional leadership effectively interacts with external constituents	199	3.302	2.979	**	.291	3.600	***	-.292	3.430		
8	Institutional leadership effectively address crises	223	3.094	2.729	**	.288	3.445	***	-.291	3.180		
9	Institutional leadership carefully plans resource allocation	225	3.187	2.784	**	.338	3.265			3.089		

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

Table 9. Decision-Making and Influence Item Mean Comparisons

Decision-Making and Influence		<i>WWCC compared with:</i>											
		WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington			
		N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	
10	Institutional leadership uses employee feedback to improve this institution	236	2.979	2.614	**	.313	3.129				2.955		
11	Institutional leadership considers employee feedback in decision-making	233	2.944	2.586	**	.304	3.080				2.939		
12	Employees participate in decision-making	235	2.983	2.660	**	.283	3.065				2.922		
13	Employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	240	3.321	2.931	***	.353	3.394				3.240		

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

Table 10. Policies and Structural Organization Item Mean Comparisons

WWCC compared with:

Policies and Structural Organization	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
14 Institutional policies allow for collaboration	235	3.285	3.038	*	.229	3.471	**	-.172	3.330		
15 The structure of this institution allows for collaboration	240	3.225	2.895	**	.297	3.423	**	-.172	3.283		
16 The structure of this institution fosters innovation	236	3.106	2.656	***	.419	3.336	**	-.201	3.015		
17 This institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	235	2.809	2.450	**	.319	3.259	***	-.380	2.859		
18 Institutional policies govern activities at this institution	233	3.309	3.000	**	.294	3.636	***	-.330	3.348		

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

Table 11. Teams and Cooperation Item Mean Comparisons

WWCC compared with:

Teams and Cooperation	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
19 There is effective collaboration among employees	237	3.553	3.163	***	.392	3.550			3.345	**	.199
20 Employee expertise is considered when forming teams	225	3.298	2.903	***	.354	3.378			3.168		
21 Teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	232	3.470	3.538			3.688	**	-.216	3.462		
22 Teams accomplish tasks	233	3.588	3.465			3.791	***	-.222	3.579		

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

Table 12. Communication and Information Sharing Item Mean Comparisons

WWCC compared with:

Communication and Information Sharing	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
23 There is sufficient communication at this institution	238	2.903	2.588	*	.262	3.099	*	-.157	2.771		
24 Campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	233	2.944	2.724			3.096			2.789		
25 Institutional leadership at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	238	3.105	2.685	***	.342	3.278	*	-.142	3.028		
26 The information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	237	3.363	3.050	**	.273	3.543	*	-.168	3.309		

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

Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

WWCC compared with:

What is your personnel classification?	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
Faculty	92	3.186	3.073			3.419	*	-.242	3.259		
Administrator	26	3.463	3.036			3.530			3.340		
Staff	116	3.259	2.959	*	.355	3.432	*	-.206	3.236		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you:	<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
African American or Black	1	--	∅			3.502			--		
Alaska Native or American Indian	1	--	--			3.717			3.345		
Asian	0	∅	∅			3.700			--		
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	24	3.634	3.045	*	.812	3.424			3.333		
Middle Eastern or North African	1	--	∅			3.465			--		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	∅	∅			3.468			--		
White	174	3.244	3.089			3.486	***	-.280	3.302		
Two or more races	13	3.402	2.775			3.160			3.177		
Prefer to self-describe	12	3.176	2.288	*	1.022	2.914			2.672		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status

WWCC compared with:

Your status at this institution is:	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
Full-Time	202	3.209	2.963	**	.299	3.360	*	-.172	3.204		
Part-Time	32	3.533	3.431			3.776			3.638		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned

WWCC compared with:

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	2	--	∅			3.477			3.324		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	19	2.772	3.065			3.306	*	-.534	3.387	*	-.641
Master's degree	84	3.198	3.020			3.414	*	-.239	3.269		
Bachelor's degree	65	3.349	3.045			3.498			3.339		
Associate's degree	46	3.335	3.025			3.538			3.197		
Certificate	10	3.519	--			3.564			2.951		
High School diploma or GED	7	3.665	--			3.548			3.124		
No diploma or degree	0	∅	∅			3.828			--		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 17. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity

What is your gender identity?	<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
Man	85	3.267	2.980			3.481	*	-.232	3.293		
Woman	136	3.301	3.151			3.474	*	-.201	3.329		
Non-binary	2	--	N/A			2.774			2.930		
Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming	3	--	--			3.062			--		
Prefer to self-describe	2	--	2.124			2.830			2.684		

Table 18. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity (Transgender)

Do you identify as transgender?	<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	N/A			3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
Yes	2	--	N/A			3.005			--		
No	224	3.264	N/A			3.348			3.343		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 19. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution

WWCC compared with:

How many years have you worked at this institution?	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
5 years or less	118	3.381	3.287			3.653	***	-.316	3.433		
6-10 years	42	3.288	2.763	**	.642	3.378			3.070		
11-15 years	32	3.084	2.887			3.333			3.290		
16-20 years	24	3.006	2.831			3.284			3.152		
21-25 years	7	2.707	2.942			3.226			3.235		
26 years or more	11	3.125	--			3.352			3.335		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 20. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education

WWCC compared with:

How many years have you worked in higher education?	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
5 years or less	81	3.475	3.251			3.720	*	-.290	3.427		
6-10 years	39	3.352	3.004			3.457			3.108		
11-15 years	42	3.129	3.088			3.381			3.315		
16-20 years	32	3.083	2.949			3.315			3.081		
21-25 years	14	2.714	2.766			3.245	*	-.596	3.172		
26 years or more	22	3.110	2.947			3.344			3.515		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses

Table 21. Mean Comparisons by Age

What is your age?	<i>WWCC compared with:</i>										
	WWCC		2022			PACE Normbase			Washington		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	242	3.262	2.999	**	.303	3.440	**	-.200	3.255		
29 or younger	13	3.784	--			3.632			3.760		
30 - 39	50	3.144	3.399			3.493	**	-.393	3.249		
40 - 49	63	3.303	3.208			3.414			3.142		
50 - 59	55	3.241	3.078			3.432			3.332		
60 or older	43	3.248	2.883			3.535	*	-.320	3.435		

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

N/A indicates survey item or response option previously unavailable

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

∅ indicates 0 responses