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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The idea of equal employment opportunity between sexes has been a growing phenomenon of the 20th century (Baer, 1978). Not until the 1960s, when federal legislation took aim at sexual equality, however, did American society truly take note of gender disparity in the job market (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978).

Characteristics of sexual discrimination in employment have been noted in large numbers of books, periodicals, and magazines. Topics of concern in these writings have ranged from why employers discriminate, to ways that employers discriminate, to economic results of discrimination, and to how and why equal employment has or has not increased (Fernandez, 1981; Tsuchigane & Dodge, 1974; Simmons, Freedman, Dunkle & Blau, 1975; Abramson, 1979).

As a means of genuinely pursuing sex equity, employing organizations have adopted the federally-mandated concept of affirmative action which involves an "active attempt to benefit or further the interests of groups that have traditionally been victimized by discrimination" (Crosby & Clayton, 1990).

The term "affirmative action" was first used in 1961, as part of a presidential directive. This directive was titled "Executive Order 10925" and was issued by President Kennedy (3 CFR. 1959-1963 Comp., p. 448-454). In general terms:
affirmative action programs exist whenever an organization goes out of its way to assure that its practices operate without disadvantaging any racial groups or either gender. More technically, affirmative action programs are required by law to be created, implemented, and monitored in any organization that holds a contract with the federal government. Most affirmative action plans specify goals and timetables for hiring and retaining members of protected classes (Crosby & Clayton, 1990, p. 61).

Executive Order 10925 established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Even though Executive Order 10925 and its requirements did not affect institutions of higher education, ensuing pieces of legislation did to one degree or another (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978). These legislative actions included:

1. Equal Pay Act of 1963,
2. Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964,
3. Executive Order 11246,
4. The Equal Opportunity Act of 1972,
5. The Title VII Amendments of 1972,

There were many objectives of these legislative directives. One was to improve the representation of women in fields of higher education (Executive Enterprises, 1974; Simmons et al., 1975; Tsuchigane & Dodge, 1975; Greenberger, 1980; Keller, 1980; Kay, 1981; Astin & Snyder, 1982; McCarthy, 1983).

Because our society has recognized its responsibilities to its members in reversing employment discrimination (Henry, 1985), particular attention has been given to traditional male domains which were forced to change their hiring practices the most. One of these traditional domains
is institutions of higher education (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978; Simmons et al., 1975).

From the onset of legislation in the 1960s, the field of higher education has attempted to meet the federal legislative guidelines (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978; Kay, 1981). This has included the efforts of public two-year, post-secondary institutions (Vaughan, 1983).

Although public two-year, post-secondary institutions (community colleges) trace their development to the turn of the 20th century, community colleges experienced their most rapid growth during the 1960s. Since the 1960s, community colleges have hired increasing numbers of female faculty and professionals. However, colleges must correct "inequities in recruitment, salaries, and advancement of women employees" (Vaughan, 1983). In addition, as recent studies have indicated, post-secondary educational environments have continued characteristics of widespread sexual discrimination and sexual harassment.

... women on college campuses are drawing the same conclusions reached in similar reports prepared 20 years ago: Female professors, staff members and administrators in academe face a hostile work environment (Blum, 1991, p. A1, A20).

In response to prevalent sexual discrimination practices within the educational field, individual states have also mandated statutes (Vaughan, 1983). In 1989, the 71st Iowa General Assembly amended Chapter 19B of the Iowa Code by adding Subsection 11. This legislative amendment seeks to provide equal opportunity in school district, area education agency, and merged area school employment to all persons. An individual shall not be denied equal access to school district or area education agency or merged area school employment opportunities because of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or physical or mental disability. It also is the policy of this state to apply affirmative action measures to correct deficiencies in school district,
area education agency, and merged area school employment systems where those remedies are appropriate. This policy shall be construed broadly to effectuate its purpose (Iowa Department of Education, 1990, p. 2).

Due to federal and state legislation, Iowa's community colleges must strive to correct any discriminatory practices, and diligently promote equal employment of the sexes.

Purpose

It is the purpose of this researcher to examine the policies and practices of community colleges through the perceptions of nonadministrative employees and determine the extent of knowledge toward the adoption of institutional policies relating to state-mandated affirmative action. In addition, this researcher wishes to determine the extent of knowledge toward the implementation of state-mandated policies relating to affirmative action, to determine if there is a need for policy implementation on the part of community colleges in order to enhance sex equity, and to determine if the Iowa Department of Education should continue to promote affirmative action policy and sex equity.

This author personally believes that sex equity is a major concern that should be addressed and communicated to those who are influential in affecting positive change. Not only is this belief based on personal perspective, but is also attributed to the fact that women comprise 41.9% of the available labor force in Iowa (Iowa Department of Economic Development, 1989), yet women represent only 28.1% of administrative positions and 31.9% of faculty positions within Iowa community colleges (Iowa Department of Education, 1992).
An influential organization that is also concerned in affecting positive change, as it relates to sex equity, is the Iowa Department of Education (Iowa Department of Education, 1992). Due to the concerns of this researcher and the state department of education, the Iowa Department of Education believes that additional data would be beneficial in promoting sex equity and therefore supports the intention of this study.

By surveying faculty and professional student service staff, this researcher expects to generate beneficial information in promoting sex equity. In turn, the Iowa State Board of Education and the Director of the Iowa Department of Education can receive information that communicates employee perceptions of affirmative action, and if necessary, initiate appropriate procedures that would enhance the achievement of sex equity within Iowa's community colleges.

Through individual state legislation, states have adopted governing structures that monitor and supervise their public post-secondary institutions at the state and local levels. In the state of Iowa, the state regulatory and local governance structures are jointly involved to varying degrees in carrying out similar functions. They include ensuring the employment of qualified chief executive officers, maintaining fiscal responsibility, developing institutional policies, and incorporating strategic planning and outcome evaluation activities.

Through the formation of community colleges corporations, each community college has a publicly elected board of directors that is in charge of selecting and supervising the chief executive officer. In turn, regulating and coordinating institutional functions are the
responsibilities of the State Board of Education and the Director of the Department of Education.

Members of the Iowa State Board of Education are selected by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate. As listed in Chapter 256.7 of the Code of Iowa, primary responsibilities of the State Board are to develop annual five-year plans for attaining state educational goals and adapt approval standards for the administration of community colleges.

Similar to the Iowa State Board of Education, the Director of the Department of Education is selected by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate. In relation to community colleges, Code of Iowa Chapters 256.9 and 280A.25 define the duties of the director. Key functions of this position call for the monitoring of community college educational programs in addition to kindergarten through twelfth grade programs, and forwarding recommendations for improvement where deficiencies exist and carrying out research on educational concerns.

Iowa community colleges are represented by a board of directors that reside in the geographic region that the community college serves. The number of individuals that can comprise a board of directors can number from five to nine individuals. Chapter 280.23 of the Code of Iowa stipulates that a major obligation of the local boards is to assign institutional policy and formulate guidelines for the administration of the local college.

It is the obligation of the Iowa General Assembly, the Iowa State Board of Education, and community college boards of trustees to monitor, assess, coordinate, and regulate the goals and objectives of public community colleges. Legislation of the 1989 General Assembly called for
specific action on the part of the Iowa State Board of Education. This involved the amending of Chapter 19B of the Iowa Code and adding Subsection 11. There are four major objectives of 19B.11: 1) apply affirmative action measures to correct deficiencies in school district, area education agency, and community college employment and provide equal opportunity; 2) the Director of the Iowa Department of Education shall promote equal employment opportunity practices and the Iowa State Board of Education shall adopt rules that specify the actions of school districts, area education agencies, and community colleges in order to accomplish equal employment opportunity goals; 3) school districts, area education agencies, and community colleges will provide annual reports outlining their organizational endeavors in fulfilling equal employment opportunity; and 4) the Director of the Iowa Department of Education will compile the individual annual reports and forward documentation to the Iowa Department of Management on the status of achieving equal employment opportunity within the educational institutions.

In order for the Director of the Iowa Department of Education and the Iowa State Board of Education to promote affirmative action practices and, subsequently, adopt guidelines that specify required activities, appropriate and useful information is necessary based on the perception and beliefs of affected nonadministrative educational professionals. This includes the following information:

1. Perceived current institutional policies that promote the philosophy of affirmative action,
2. Perceived current administrative practices that respond to affirmative action regulations, and
3. The perception of whether institutional policies and practices are adequate in promoting affirmative action.

Although this study is not directly focusing on issues of ethnicity as it relates to affirmative action, the issue of ethnicity is important. However, due to the low presence of ethnic populations in Iowa community college institutions (Iowa Department of Education, 1991), it would be difficult to perform statistical measures of significance based on this study's method of research.

Statement of the Problem

Having a more diversified workforce in our public two-year, post-secondary institutions in Iowa provides many benefits. For Iowa to maintain a qualified and effective educational system and be prepared to meet the challenges of the future decades, it is imperative that the most able and skilled professionals be recruited and employed. This need stresses the importance of diverse employee characteristics in order to meet the varied backgrounds of the students being served.

By accessing the capable individuals for employment, ethnically and culturally diverse student populations may be exposed to experiences and knowledge that best prepare them for the work environment and to life outside of their geographic region. Allowing female students to see women in various leadership roles cultivates interaction, goal establishment, and role modeling.

Also, providing maximum diversity of educational school staff is ultimately advantageous to all students by expanding their views of both women and men. Increased exposure to diversity will enhance understanding
and decrease stereotypes and prejudices toward those who are different from themselves.

With this rationale, the outpouring of literature relating the professional status of females in higher education environments, the reported need of gender equality and affirmative action in higher education settings, and the legislative mandates of the Iowa General Assembly; there is a need of pertinent information that can be of benefit to the Iowa Department of Education in affecting positive change. This is necessary due to its responsibility of monitoring, evaluating, and promoting gender equality and affirmative action policies within community colleges.

Emphasis of this research was based on perceptions, according to survey findings, of personnel in Iowa community colleges' policies and practices relating to affirmative action, and identifying policies and practices that are known or unknown to exist within the institutional environment. Perceptions were solicited from faculty and professional student service staff of community colleges. The study's objectives include:

1. To determine the extent of knowledge of the adoption of institutional policies relating to state-mandated affirmative action,

2. To determine the extent of knowledge of the implementation of state-mandated policies relating to affirmative action,

3. To determine if there is a need for policy implementation on the part of community colleges, and
4. To determine if the Iowa Department of Education should continue to promote affirmative action policy and sex equity.

For purposes of analyzing the five noted objectives, descriptive research variables will include:

1. Gender,
2. Rural or urban setting of community college,
3. Professional status,
4. Years of employment in present position, and
5. Years of formal education.

Definition of Terms

There are terms used throughout this document that have specific definitions relative to this study. To counter potential misinterpretation and misunderstanding, a listing of terms and definitions are provided. The terms and their definitions are taken from three primary sources: 1) Code of Iowa Chapters 280A and 256, Chapter 95 for the Administrative Code for the school rules of Iowa, 2) an Iowa Department of Economic Development publication, and 3) a text written by Kuh and McAleenan (1986). After each definition, the source of the definition will be noted. The terms and definitions are as follows.

1. **Community College:** a publicly-supported school which offers two years of liberal arts, pre-professional, or other instruction partially fulfilling the requirements for a baccalaureate degree but which does not confer any baccalaureate and which offers in whole or in part the curriculum of a vocational school (Chapter 280A.2).

2. **Area School:** an area vocational school or area community college (Chapter 280A.2).

3. **Governing Board:** a board of directors composed of one member elected from each director district in the community college by
the electors of the respective district. Members of the board shall be residents of the district from which elected. The term of a member of the board of directors is three years and commences at the organization meeting (Chapter 280A.11).

4. **Faculty**: those instructors who meet the standards of the Iowa Department of Education to provide instruction in the community college environment (Chapter 280A.14).

5. **Iowa Department of Education (IDOE)**: a department established to act in a policymaking and advisory capacity and to exercise general supervision over the state system of education including community colleges. The department shall act in an administrative, supervisory, and consultative state agency (Chapter 256.1).

6. **State Board of Education**: nine members appointed by the Governor subject to Senate confirmation make up the board established for the IDOE. The members shall be qualified electors of the state and hold no other elective or appointive state office. A member shall not be engaged in professional education for a major portion of the member’s time nor shall the member derive a major portion of income from any business or activity connected with education. One member shall have substantial knowledge related to vocational and technical training and one member shall have substantial knowledge related to area community college (Chapter 256.3).

7. **Affirmative Action**: an action appropriate to overcome the effects of past or present practices, policies, or other barriers to equal employment opportunity (Chapter 95.2).

8. **Availability**: the extent to which women or men are present within the relevant labor market (Chapter 95).

9. **Director of Education**: the Director of the Iowa Department of Education (Chapter 95).

10. **Equal Employment Opportunity**: equal access to employment, training, advancement, or employment benefits regardless of sex (Chapter 95).

11. **Relevant Labor Market**: the geographic area in which an agency can reasonably be expected to recruit for a particular job category (Chapter 95).

12. **Underrepresentation**: having fewer members of women or men in a particular job category than would be reasonably expected based on their availability in the relevant labor market (Chapter 95).
13. **Equal Employment Opportunity Standards**: standards providing equal employment opportunity to all persons. No person shall be denied equal access to agency employment opportunities because of his or her gender (Chapter 95).

14. **Affirmative Action Programs**: a workforce analysis that shall be performed and affirmative measures that will be developed and implemented for any major job categories in which women or men are underrepresented (Chapter 95).

15. **Policy Statements**: statements adopted by each board of directors outlining its commitment to the principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action (Chapter 95).

16. **Workforce Analysis**: a workforce analysis that shall show the numerical and percentage breakdown of the agency’s full-time and part-time employees within each major job category by gender (Chapter 95).

17. **Quantitative Analysis**: a quantitative analysis that shall compare work force analysis figures with the availability of qualified or qualifiable women or men within the relevant labor market (Chapter 95).

18. **Qualitative Analysis**: a qualitative analysis shall be implemented and included in the agency’s affirmative action plan when underrepresentation is identified in one or more major job category. The qualitative analysis is a review of employment policies and practices to determine if and where those policies and practices tend to exclude, disadvantage, restrict, or result in adverse impact on the basis of gender (Chapter 95).

19. **Goals**: numerical goals and timetables for reduction of underrepresentation in each major job category where it has been identified shall be developed. These goals shall not be treated as rigid and inflexible quotas that must be met, but as reasonable aspirations toward correcting imbalance in the agency’s workforce. The goal shall not cause any group of applicants to be excluded from the hiring process (Chapter 95).

20. **Qualitative Goals**: goals, activities, and timetables which specify the appropriate actions and time frames in which problem areas identified during the qualitative analysis are targeted and remedied (Chapter 95).

21. **Reports**: each education agency shall submit an annual progress report on equal employment opportunity and affirmative action to its local board of directors. An annual progress report shall be submitted to the Department of Education (Chapter 95).
22. **Urban Community College Setting:** the city, in which the community college is located, has a population greater than 50,000 (Iowa Department of Economic Development, 1991, p. ii).

23. **Rural Community College Setting:** the city, in which the community college is located, has a population less than 50,000 (Iowa Department of Economic Development, 1991, ii).

24. **Professional Student Service Staff:** those higher education staff that provide counseling activities associated with educational, vocational, residential, financial, and social needs of the student. This includes the areas of admissions, financial aid, student employment, registration, student orientation, health, and on/off campus residential life (Kuh & McAleenan, 1986, p. 47, 76).

**Research Hypotheses and Question**

A primary goal of this research study has been to ascertain which policies and practices are or are not known to be in existence and to identify and measure perceptions of nonadministrative community college employees as it relates to gender equity and affirmative action.

In conformance to the above stated goal and the Statement of Problem subsection, four null hypotheses have been tested and one research question studied. They are as follows.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of female and male employees that their institutions are in compliance with state affirmative action guidelines when controlling for urban or rural setting of the community college, faculty or professional student service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who work in a urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for gender, faculty or professional student service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.
Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who are employed in a faculty or professional student service staff position when controlling for gender, urban or rural setting of the community college years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Hypothesis Four: There are no significant interactions between males and females, urban or rural setting of the community college, faculty or professional student service status of the employee when controlling for years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Research Question: Under what variable conditions will female and male employees hold similar perceptions toward affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college when considering of instructor or professional student service status of the employee, urban or rural setting of the community college, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education?

Statement of Assumptions

In designing and developing the survey instrument for this research project, a number of assumptions were made. They include:

1. The faculty and professional student service staff who are surveyed are interested and involved in institutional policy making and policy implementation.

2. The surveyed employees did not refer to institutional policy handbooks to in fact determine whether their organization had such a policy and/or method of implementation.

3. The surveyed employees genuinely reflect their perceptions of institutional activity.

4. Surveying the perceptions of employees who are employed in three rural and three urban community college settings represents an accurate reflection of those employees who are employed in other rural and urban community college settings.

5. Data from the mail survey instrument can be used to determine any differences of group variation.
Limitations of the Study

In carrying out this study there are three acknowledged limitations. First, information from the research survey was reported through self-perceptions of employee awareness and understanding of institutional policies and functions, and employee awareness and understanding may not be an accurate assessment of factual occurrences associated with affirmative action. Second, mailed survey responses were only sought from faculty and professional student service staff. Administrative, clerical and maintenance personnel were not requested to provide responses of their perception. Administrative staff may be more sensitive of the results this study could generate and respond as to what should be versus what is occurring. Clerical and maintenance employees may have limited concern with institutional affirmative action policies and procedures. Third, the research study did not address affirmative action issues associated with ethnic populations due to the limited numbers of community college minority professionals who are currently employed in community college settings.

Significance of the Study

There is a sufficient number of documents that address the scope and nature of sexual discrimination and the need for affirmative action measures in the field of higher education. However, there is a lack of information on the state of Iowa level that reports the perceptions of public two-year colleges for the purpose of assessing current affirmative action policies and procedures. This shortage of information makes it
difficult to develop changes in community college affirmative action policies and implementation strategies of those policies.

This study will generate such needed information and may be helpful to the Iowa Department of Education (DE) in determining whether necessary adjustments in their state regulatory and community college governance policies need to be adopted. The adoption of such policies would be reflective of the needs of community colleges in promoting affirmative action for the purpose of sex equity.

In addition, research of this scope may provide other researchers in higher education with information that would encourage future research into the need of affirmative action in public two-year colleges.

Organization of Research

Chapter I has provided the reader with the background, purpose, and statement of the problem, definition of terms, research hypotheses and question, statement of assumptions, limitations of the study, and significance of the study. This was related to the reader to enhance comprehension of this research study. The remainder of this text will devote attention to a review of the literature, statistical methodology, survey results, summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Specifically, Chapter II will review literature that relates to employment practices of sex discrimination, why employers discriminate, results of sex discrimination, the history of female employment in higher education, laws that prohibit sex discrimination, judicial interpretation of federal legislation, development of Iowa community colleges, and procedural implications of affirmative action. These topics promote the
relevance and need for this research study, and highlight the importance of affirmative action in two-year, post-secondary higher education.

Chapter III defines and describes the characteristics of the subjects, survey instrumentation, population, data collection and treatment of the data, and general comments of survey respondents. This information allows the reader to understand the relationship between the identified research problem and the manner in which the problem will be measured.

Chapter IV provides an analysis of the descriptive data, coding of the instrument, analysis of the data, and the results of the hypotheses testing and research question. In conclusion, Chapter V will forward commentary on the findings of the survey and provide recommendations to policymakers and future researchers.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In review of literature pertaining to employee perceptions of affirmative action policies of community colleges, there is a shortage of available studies. Although there are more studies available that describe employee perceptions of four-year, post-secondary institutions, this source is also lacking.

Because there is an emphasis on achieving sex equity within Iowa community colleges, this chapter will attempt to accomplish a number of objectives. First, primary issues related to sex discrimination in our society are described. Second, the history of female employment in higher education is presented. Third, the mandated legislation of federal and state equal employment opportunity and affirmative action guidelines and their influence on community colleges is outlined, as well as the legal issues that affect the achievement of affirmative action. Fourth, a summary of the development of community colleges in the state of Iowa will be provided. Fifth, a review of State of Iowa legislative mandated affirmative action policies that are to be adopted by community colleges are reviewed.

In conclusion, this chapter will emphasize the relationship between the Iowa Department of Education (DE) and Iowa’s community colleges as it pertains to affecting change in the area of sex equity and affirmative action.
Employment Practices of Sex Discrimination

Traditional and ongoing social values have perpetuated the practices of employers treating men and women differently. These differences may be due to defined policy or attitudes of employers towards females who work. Sex discrimination can take a variety of forms. Forms can include discrimination in hiring, job assignment, promotion, organizational structure, pay scales, and benefit programs. A form of discrimination that is most common is that of hiring (Simmons et al., 1975).

Discrimination in hiring can be defined as the "use of information in employee selection which is invalid in its ability to predict satisfactory performance. This allows rejection of qualified applicants ..." (Fredrickson, Greytak & Morelli, 1971, p. 1). Gender is one criterion that employers must not base employment on in judging potential employees.

Many discrimination charges are the result of an organization not having hiring guidelines, or not having a personnel office that is in charge of monitoring policy. When this is the case, the chances of employment being based on illegal standards or personal value are enhanced.

Another frequent source of discrimination complaints is in the area of promotions. Discrimination charges often originate in this area when employers do not have an explicit promotion policy based on specific considerations (e.g., skill, education, attendance, etc.) other than seniority. Employees who lack appropriate qualifications are then promoted instead of those employees who have appropriate qualifications. This results in an adverse employment situation. The use of subjective
determination on the part of the employer can then lead to charges of discrimination.

The third major area involving discrimination complaints is that of unequal wages. Unequal wages cannot be based on gender, if a job requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility in similar work settings. Charges of sex discrimination are more likely to occur when employers do not have or follow a structured salary policy, and base pay solely on experience (Peres, 1978).

Why employers discriminate

Tradition and continuing social norms have encouraged employers to treat men and women differently. Our society, like others, has in the past explicitly defined the proper sex roles of family and professional life. From infancy, individuals are faced with how they are to conduct themselves in terms of what is proper for family and professional involvement in a social setting. Therefore, our society's culture maintains a set of boundaries which we are expected to recognize, and a set of norms to follow. This conditioning process is a key factor for individuals in choosing their vocations.

As males develop, they are raised to be independent in nature, physically adept, and aggressive. Females are socialized to expect protection, be reliant on others, be physically inactive, and receive more nurturing.

When an individual grows older, sex roles continue to develop in the educational setting. Females are directed to the areas of home economics,
arts, and music. Males are encouraged to study science and mathematics (Tsuchigane & Dodge, 1975; Tarvis & Offir, 1977).

The male's pursuit of intellectual goals and independence runs counter to the dependency of females. This societal training of the sexes affects the intellectual expectations of each (Tarvis & Offir, 1977).

The social and cultural conditioning of gender roles in our society has greatly influenced the employment of women (Tsuchigane & Dodge, 1975). A number of studies and surveys dating back to the 1940s, indicates the pervasive influence that sex role conditioning has had in employment preferences (Noland & Bakke, 1949; National Manpower Council, 1957; Ginder, 1961; Simon & Rosenthal, 1967; Epstein, 1970; U.S. Department of Labor, 1970; Schwartz, 1971; Basil, 1972).

According to Diana George (1979), the field of higher education is not excluded when applying our cultural conditioning factor. Male academics rarely permit themselves to say that women are inferior. But many males still abide by the Miltonian idea that women rank lower than men in the hierarchy of beings when pertaining to intellectual ability. George goes on to argue that as long as male academics believe that female associates are not intellectually capable, female professors will be inhibited from gaining equal treatment.

This argument is supported further through studies carried out in the 1960s. Cohen (1971) found that females employed in the higher education setting were grouped in educational departments associated with home economics, health professions, and library science. In addition, a separate study conducted by Muhich (1974) revealed that sex stereotyping was prevalent in the area of educational administration. Muhich also
determined that there was a strong correlation between female administrators and the title of "Assistant" associated with their professional position.

Not only have prevailing attitudes presented obstacles in the employment of women in higher education, but there are additional myths and attitudes that have restricted the advancement of females. This thought is supported through the research of Mattes (1971) in a report of the Task Force of Higher Education. Specifically, Mattes concluded the following:

1. There is overt discrimination by faculties, administrators, and other officials.

2. Institutional barriers are present in the form of rigid admission and residence requirements, and a shortage of institutional facilities and services that limit involvement and produce an incompatibility with female interests.

3. There are ingrained assumptions and inhibitions present within both the attitudes of males and females which inhibit abilities and goals of women.

Through these studies, our society's cultural attitudes towards employment of the sexes come to light. Sexism in our society is a major determining force in the labor market. Fernandez (1981) takes this one step further by stating that white males support the continuance of sexist attitudes through their control of social, economic, and political institutions. Sexism will continue as long as white males wish to maintain their dominant status in society.


**Results of sex discrimination**

One way of determining the impact and scope of sex discrimination is to review the general economic picture (Tsuchigane & Dodge, 1975). The Bureau of Labor statistics conducted a 1982 wage survey based on employment payrolls of the general labor force. In reviewing the wage records, it was determined that there was a noticeable gap between the earnings of male and female workers. This finding leads to the basic fact that women on the average are paid lower wages (U.S. Department of Labor, 1982). Similar conclusions were drawn from a National Education Association study (1992). Researchers determined that college educated women aged 18-24, earn an average of 92 cents for every dollar earned by college educated men of the same age bracket. The wage disparity increased further for the age range of 25-34. Women only earn 75 cents for every dollar men earn. By ages 55-64, females average only 54 cents for every dollar earned by males.

This finding is applicable to the field of higher education as well. In 1980, the Chronicle of Higher Education carried out a survey that indicated male faculty members were being paid on the average, $4,300 more that their female counterparts (Magarrell, 1980).

In a 1985 survey conducted by the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), information was gathered on females occupying post-secondary administrative positions. A total of 1,596 higher education institutions responded to the survey. Of those institutions responding, 28% were public universities, 32% were private four-year colleges, 30% were two-year colleges, and 10% were from miscellaneous post-secondary institutions. The researcher determined that job position
categories could be sectioned into five Job Families: academic affairs, administrative affairs, external affairs, student services, and executive affairs. Based on a weighted average differential, the median wages of females were 43.4% lower than males. Furthermore, when comparing employment in similar job positions, and number of years of experience, female salaries were 36.5% lower than males (Benedict, 1985).

Disparities between male and female administrative median wages continued to be evident in two-year higher education institution, as indicated in the 1991-92 CUPA salary survey. In the area of academics, 1,347 male administrative personnel, representing 47 administrative positions, reported an average median wage of $48,001. Compared to the $37,118 average median wage of 1,030 female administrative personnel in similar administrative positions. Female academic administrators received on the average 22.5% less in median wages. The average median wages for 1,191 male student service administrators, representing 38 administrative positions, received an average median wage of $36,277; in comparison to the average median wage of $31,485, as reported by 998 female student service administrators employed in similar positions. Female student service administrators received on the average 13.2% less in median wages.

Related findings were documented in 1987 and 1991 studies. McMillen (1987) reported on the national pay rankings of public higher education institutions and found that female faculty earned an average 88 cents for every dollar earned by male faculty. This wage differential is also applicable to community college campuses. Wang and Brandt (1991) determined that full-time male faculty of community colleges had a higher average salary by a difference of $3,287 over full-time female faculty.
members. Furthermore, the percent of male full-time faculty with tenure in community colleges held a 10.6% difference over full-time female faculty (see Appendix A). In a study carried out by Blum (1991), it was determined that female faculty and professional student service staff members received lower wages than men who held jobs of similar title and responsibilities.

There are other ways to assess results of discrimination in the educational setting. Several additional end results were noted in 1980 studies. Women accounted for only 24.5% of new employees hired by higher education institutions; female faculty spent more of their weekly hours teaching, whereas males carried out more research; males published more articles per year than females; male faculty members advanced more quickly in regard to tenure than did female faculty (Hornig, 1980; Astin & Snyder, 1982); and women remained in professional entry level positions for longer periods of time regardless of experience and qualifications (Cocharan, 1978).

The status of women in nonfaculty positions is difficult to evaluate due to the lack of collected information. In order to assess and compare the career developments and opportunities for nonfaculty professional staff, one can look closely at a majority of higher education institutions and conclude that the status of female faculty members are not greatly dissimilar than that of nonfaculty professional staff (Wang & Brandt, 1991).
Employment History of Females in Higher Education

To better understand the employment of women in higher education, one must review the historical data. In the 1870s, college faculties in the United States were more than 50% female. This dropped to 25% by 1890, but rose steadily after 1910, to 28% at the outbreak of World War II. From the 1940s to the 1970s, the percentage of female instructors in higher education stabilized at 22%. In the mid-1970s, another increase took place which brought the total up to approximately 26%.

An in-depth review of higher education trends is difficult to come by due to lack of data concerning female faculty in the university setting. Up to 1970, the majority of research institutions were nearly void of female professionals in academic facilities. Females who did hold faculty positions were concentrated in the schools of home economics, education, library science, and nursing. By the 1970s, women were very slowly making progress in the arts and sciences (Horing, 1980).

In 1972, the advent of affirmative action policies occurred in higher education facilities. At this point in time, women represented only 19% of all faculty. By 1985, this total climbed to 27.6%; however, this increase was disproportionate among the job categories of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and other (Appendix B).

The advancement of women from 1972 to 1985 is most prevalent in the bottom faculty ranks, and there was only a 3% increase in the number of full professors. Furthermore, the numbers of female faculty and administrators that were present were apt to be grouped in particular fields of study (e.g., nursing, home economics, library science, etc.)
which have been traditionally regarded as female domains (Wang & Brandt, 1991).

In the latest survey findings compiled by the Federal Government for school year 1989, the employment status of female instructors and professional student service staff in public two-year institutions of higher education have indicated an improvement, but still experience underrepresentation. Of the total 122,565 reported positions, female employees make up 45% of the total. As for administrative positions, women represent 37% of the survey total (U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

On the State of Iowa level, the DE carries out yearly Basic Educational Data Surveys (BEDS). For school year 1989-90, survey results indicated a gender imbalance in the area of faculty employment in community colleges. As reported, 62.3% of those faculty employed in community colleges were male as compared to 37.7% rate of female faculty employment. The disparity between male and female professional student service staff in community colleges was not as great, yet males represented a 53.1% rate of employment versus the 46.9% rate of employment for females.

The 1991-92 school year BEDS survey represented little change from the 1989-90 survey. Males represented 62.1% of full-time faculty for all community colleges versus the 37.9% rate of female full-time faculty employment. For full-time professional student service staff, males held a 52.3% to 47.7% margin over female staff employment. However, of the total number of employed female professional student service staff, 39% were employed in the traditional field of library science.
Laws that Prohibit Sex Discrimination

Because sex discrimination in employment has been prevalent in the United States labor market (Greenberger, 1980) and still occurs in the field of higher education (McMillen, 1987; Blum, 1991), numerous federal laws were enacted in the 1960s and 1970s to counter the occurrences of sex discrimination. The following legislative acts have been instrumental in combating sex bias in higher education employment. They are:

1. The Equal Pay Act of 1963—the first federal law barring discrimination according to sex (29 U.S.C.A. s. 206 [1977]). This act forbids an employer to pay differing wages on the basis of sex:

   for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions, except where such payment is made pursuant to a differential based on any factor other than sex (29 U.S.C.A. s. 206(d)(1) [1977]).

2. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act—this legislation applies to a majority of the labor market. Although public educational institutions were exempt from this law from 1964 to 1972, there are several elements of this law that later applied to higher educational institutions. First, private businesses and labor unions with 25 or more employees must recognize and follow this legislation in order to accept federal contract dollars. Second, businesses that fall under Title VII coverage are forbidden to discriminate between sexes in hiring, firing, pay, terms of employment, benefits, and training (42 U.S.C.S. s. 2000e [1978]) Employers and training programs must openly advertise without giving preference to one group of people over another, and must process applications with equal regard. An additional aspect of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the formation of an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
(EEOC). This commission has the authority to take action on discrimination claims against private employers who sexually discriminate. Discrimination complaints can be instituted by either private individuals or members of the commission (Bullock, 1966).

3. Executive Order 11246--this executive order was put into effect in 1964. The order stipulated that federal dollars would not be paid to contractors who discriminated according to race, color, religion, or national origin in their employment practices (30 Fed. Reg. 12319 [1965]). Executive Order 11246 was amended by Executive Order 11375 in 1968 to include sex (3CFR, 1966-1970 Comp., p. 684-686).

4. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972--this act increased the effect of Title VII by covering businesses and union organizations with 15 members or more, versus the original 25. Coverage was also expanded to include state and county governments and educational facilities that do not have religious orientation (42 U.S.C.S. s. 2000e [1978]). This act also increased the power of the EEOC. The legislative act enabled the commission to file class-action suits against businesses in federal court if individual complaints could show an established pattern of discrimination. Individual complaints could then be expanded into broader accusations of discrimination against a group of employees. If discrimination is proven, financial damages would have to be paid to all employees affected by the discriminatory practices of the employer (Executive Enterprises, 1974).

5. Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972--this act made it illegal for educational institutions which receive federal dollars to discriminate on the basis of sex (20 U.S.C.A. s. 1681 [1977]). This act
provides individuals with the right to file a claim to seek financial damages, but does not allow for other types of settlements such as back pay and reinstatement (McCarthy, 1983).

In order to correct purported discriminatory practices, a formal complaint must be initiated before laws can be used to help correct the alleged circumstances. The above stated laws are just some of the instruments that women can employ if they believe they have been discriminated against (Jongeward & Scott, 1974).

Although coverage and mandates of the federal government have been extended to individual state governments (Hallam, 1983), discriminatory employment practices have also promoted individual state legislative action to overcome potential discrimination in the future (Alexander & Alexander, 1985; Eberts & Stone, 1985). This circumstance has also applied to the State of Iowa.

In 1989, the 71st Iowa General Assembly addressed the issue of equal opportunity and affirmative action and came to the consensus that additional standards were necessary to further promote the value of employment equality in the public education setting, which included community colleges. Consequently, the legislative body extended the wording of Chapter 19B of the Iowa Code (Appendix C) as ordered by Senate File 2410.

Chapter 19B of the Iowa Code was initially established in 1986 through Senate File 2175. In its original form, Chapter 19B was adopted to ensure equal employment opportunity and affirmative action compliance of individual state departments of government. Chapter 19B defined the concepts of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action;
established Iowa Department of Personnel standards in monitoring individual state agency compliance; identified the need for individual state agency affirmative action plans; outlined the responsibilities of the Iowa Department of Management; and stipulated the conditions under which sanctions can be imposed on individual state agencies for not complying with equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies.

With the addition of Subsection 11 of Chapter 19B, educational entities and agencies were included in having to follow the intent of Chapter 19B. The language of the amendment stipulated the activities of the director of the Iowa Department of Education. This includes the collection of yearly goals and activities of community colleges; assessing the accomplishments of affirmative action in the recruitment, appointment, assignment, and advancement of employees; and making recommendations in solving noted deficiencies. Recommendations for policy changes within the public schools and agencies are forwarded to the Iowa State Board of Education and Iowa Department of Management for review and possible action.

Judicial Interpretation of Federal Legislation

Since the onset of legislation in the 1960s, educational institutions have attempted to meet federal guidelines (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978). During this process, the judicial system has been called upon in many instances to clarify legislative intent behind equal employment laws and to settle disputes of employment discrimination claims (Kay, 1981; Farley, 1982).
An early court case which affirmed the legislative doctrine to impose affirmative action guidelines onto employers was *Griggs v. Duke Power Company* (401 U.S. 424, [1971]). The fate of this case was ultimately determined by the Supreme Court and involved the question of whether an employer could impose minimum qualifications for employment when it is not directly related to carrying out job responsibilities. It was ruled that the minimum qualifications had an adverse impact toward minority groups because they blocked employment for minorities at a higher proportion than for white males.

The issue of hiring quotas and charges of reverse discrimination have stirred much controversy in the field of affirmative action. In developing affirmative action plans, educational institutions have had to establish hiring quotas in order to meet their employment projections (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1978). These quotas, which influence hiring decisions, do so at the possible cost of denying qualified applicants the position. Therefore, institutions may well be supporting the discrimination they wish to prevent (Roche, 1974).

A much publicized example of this scenario is the 1978 Supreme Court case *Regents of the University of California v. Allan Bakke* (438 U.S. 407, [1978]). Bakke, a white male, accused the university of not admitting him to medical school due to his race. This was attributed to protected class applicants with lower scores being allowed entrance under the affirmative action program. The trial court, California Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court all upheld Bakke's allegation that this was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. In addition, the Supreme Court stated the medical school was operating under an illegal quota system.
Although the case of Bakke involved student admission quotas, the case impacted federal affirmative action guidelines for educational institutions (Flygare, 1978). Institutions had to alter their affirmative action procedures to fall within the nonquota directive (i.e., use of the words goal and guideline in place of quota) (Middleton, 1979).

Many educational administrators believed that the victory would signify the end of affirmative action guidelines (Flygare, 1978), but a proceeding court case changed this belief. One year after the Bakke decision, the legality of affirmative action was upheld. The Supreme Court issued a ruling in Weber v. Kaiser Aluminum (433 U.S. 198, [1979]), upholding the use of quotas by employers in voluntary affirmative action programs. Although this case did not involve an educational institution, it applied pressure to employers in educational environments to continue participation in voluntary affirmative action programs.

Regarding the issue of seniority and affirmative action amid employment lay-offs, the Supreme Court heard the cases of Memphis Firefighters v. Stotts (467 U.S. 561 [1984]) and Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education (90 L. Ed. 2d 260 [1986]). The legality to be determined in both cases centered on whether recently hired minorities "under affirmative action clauses should be laid off before whites with more seniority." Because the minority employees could not prove previous discrimination in their hiring, the Supreme Court held that employer policies had precedence over affirmative action guidelines. In essence, minorities with less seniority could not receive preferential treatment over whites with more seniority during lay-offs (Lynch, 1989).
In *Johnson v. Transportation Department of Santa Clara* (94 L. Ed. 2d 615 [1987]), the Supreme Court had to determine if the use of statistical workforce data was proper reason for affirmative action programs to provide preferential promotions to minority employees. The Supreme Court ruled against Johnson, a male, and believed that voluntary employer actions to balance the percentage of employee representation to the percentage of minority representation in the relevant labor market was justifiable.

Through the accumulation of affirmative action court cases in the 1980s, the Supreme Court laid forth a delicate basis by which to judge discrimination in employment conflicts: preferences in hiring and promotion can be allowed according to minority status, but does not take precedence during lay-offs when seniority must be considered; statistical data can be used to determine discrimination; and employers can use employment goals according to proportional representation of their labor force and the relevant area labor market.

Since the adoption of federal equal employment opportunity and affirmative action legislative acts, there have been multiple court cases that have involved institutions of higher education (McCarthy, 1983). Questions about academic discrimination in employment and promotion are different from other work-related discrimination cases. Legal issues in this area question the judgements of intelligent administrators and respected professionals. Assessing issues concerning personality, quality, and predicting future success or influence is subjective. Given these circumstances, related court cases have reflected both hesitancy and
willingness on the part of judges to impinge on the academic decision making of the higher education institutions (McCarthy, 1983; Kay, 1981).


It is important to note the logic of the court in some of these decisions. The judge of the Fifth Circuit Court in Green v. Texas Tech University (474 F. 2d 594 [1973]), believed that his judgement should not be imposed on the rational judgement of experts in the field of higher education. In Faro v. New York University (502 F. 2d 1229, [1974], the judge of the Second Circuit criticized the plaintiff and felt that federal courts were not suited for deciding faculty appointments. Also, in Cohen v. Illinois Institute of Technology (524 F. 2d 818, [1975]), charges of discrimination in promotion and pay were dismissed by the lower court. This decision was upheld by the court of appeals and the Supreme Court, which was requested to review the issue, but declined the opportunity to review the case.

In 1978, the First Circuit Court steered away from the previously established course and ruled in favor of the plaintiff in Sweeney v. Keene State College (439 U.S. 24, [1978]). In this case, the judge believed that women were subjected to higher standards of evaluation than their male counterparts. Similar outcomes were also documented in Kunda v. Muhlenberg College (621 F. 2d 532, [1980]) and Powell v. Syracuse
University (439 U.S. 984, [1978]). Then in Williams v. Colorado Springs School District (706 F. 2d 813, [1975]), and Evans v. Harnett (473 f. 2d 629 [1985]), the Fourth and Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals asserted that if practices of employment discrimination are confirmed, the burden of proof shifts to the educational institution; whereas before it was the responsibility of the claimant.

When illegal discrimination is established, the courts then have flexibility in directing equitable compensation. This may include hiring, promoting, and reinstatement of position. The Supreme Court, in 1982, stated that an employer may limit back pay by offering the claimant the denied job position. By doing so, the court felt this would be an incentive to end discrimination voluntarily. But it is up to the individual court to decide if both compensation and job security are warranted (McCarthy, 1983).

Development of the Iowa Community College System

The establishment of the community college system in the United States has its earliest roots at the start of the 20th century. It was not until the 1960s when this form of higher education became an acknowledged source in providing remedial and vocational education to disadvantaged members of our society. Community colleges achieved this recognition through their philosophy of identifying with the needs of their local communities and offering educational training that best served the interests of the local constituents (Vaughan, 1983). This feature was to eventually be an influential factor in the decision-making process for the 61st Iowa General Assembly (Moench, 1988).
In 1965, the 61st Iowa General Assembly convened to pass Senate File 550 which allowed for the establishment of two-year, post-secondary institutions (Ullom, 1981). Chapter 280A of the Iowa Code was an outcome of Senate File 550 passage. Chapter 280A outlined the 11 major responsibilities of the community colleges. They include:

1. The first two years of college work including preprofessional education,
2. Vocational and technical training,
3. Programs for in-service training and retraining,
4. Programs for high school completion for students of post-high school age,
5. Programs for all students of high school age who may best serve themselves by enrolling for vocational and technical training while also enrolled in a local high school, public or private,
6. Programs for students of high school age to provide advanced college placement courses not taught at a student’s high school while the student is also enrolled in the high school,
7. Student personnel services,
8. Community services,
9. Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent succeeding in regular vocational education programs,
10. Training, retraining, and all necessary preparation for productive employment of all citizens, and
11. Vocational and technical training for persons who are not enrolled in a high school and who have not completed high school.

Governance of the community colleges falls under the guidelines of Chapters 256.(7)(9) and 280A.25 of the Code of Iowa. Guidelines of these chapters require the Iowa State Board of Education, along with the Director of the DE, to design and adopt administrative and personnel
policies, pursuant to legislation, for community colleges to operate under.

In turn, Chapter 280A.(11)(12)(23) defines the boundaries of responsibilities of the community college governing board, particularly in regards to the formulation of institutional policies and rules. In addition, the governing board has the ability to appoint a chief executive officer and approve policy recommendations and implementation strategies consistent with State of Iowa policies. Furthermore, Chapter 280A stipulated that the development of community colleges:

were to be organized by merged areas which included two or more counties ... and the county boards of education were to plan for the merger of county school systems or parts thereof ... (Moench, 1988, p. 5).

By 1971, 15 community college districts (see Appendix D) were in operation (Moench, 1988). Since the inception of the Iowa community college movement, student enrollment has steadily climbed. In 1966, there were 12,419 students enrolled in Iowa community college credit programs, and upon the 25th anniversary of the birth of community colleges, there were 49,726 students enrolled in fall 1990 credit programs. This represented 21.49% of 1989 Iowa high school graduates. There were 521,069 citizens who took part in continuing education coursework; 46,711 students who were enrolled in adult basic education/high school completion programs; and 5,000 students who were completing their high school equivalency requirements. Of the total number of Iowa community college enrollees, 94.7% were Iowa residents; and they received instruction in one of 601 cities and towns that Iowa community colleges offer credit and/or
noncredit classes (Iowa Association of Community College Trustees and Iowa Association of Community College Presidents, 1991).

Procedural Implications of Affirmative Action

President Johnson's 1965 Executive Order 11246 states:

The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin (30 Fed, Reg. 12319 [1965], 3 C.F.R. & 169 202(1) [1974]).

Affirmative action plans are required of all organizations that contract for dollars from the Federal Government. It was not until 1971, that Executive Order 11246 applied to higher education contracts. In 1972, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs developed guidelines for higher education institutions. In complying with guidelines, post-secondary schools must be genuinely active in establishing and implementing policies that promote workforce equality and integration and to recruit and hire those who have been historically shunned from participating in certain vocations.

Traditionally, affirmative action plans utilize organizational strategies that promote the theme of equal employment opportunity and attempt to break the cycle of self-perpetuating discriminatory practices (Bunzel, 1990). The primary emphasis of affirmative action plans are to increase workforce parity through equal job evaluation methods and job related criteria, therefore, ensuring the selection of the most qualified candidate (Larsen, 1982).

For higher education to carry this out, various concepts must be recognized. These concepts include assessing policies to ensure that they
are not discriminatory in principle or practice, if so, changes must occur such as: reviewing policies and procedures that may seem acceptable, but in reality have negative effects on women; being gender-sensitive when making hiring decisions; and designating hiring goals that can be attained for the appointment of female faculty members (Affirmative Action Plans: Recommended Procedures for Increasing the Number of Minority Persons and Women on College and University Faculties (AAP), 1982).

In order to correlate affirmative action efforts, specific procedures are required. They are:

1. Develop an affirmative action plan that is abided by the administration,

2. Provide annual status reports,

3. Recruit women and minorities,

4. Select the most qualified candidate, and

5. Provide for grievance procedures in processing complaints (Carnegie Council, 1980).

Of the recommended practices, the action plan sets the tempo of commitment and directly influences the accomplishment of the other steps. The action plan will cover concerns such as how the Affirmative Action office operates, how recruitment is carried out, how candidates will be screened, how applicants are selected, provisions for advancement opportunities, and how the plan will be monitored (AAP, 1982).

In relation to the action plan, it is significant to have a monitoring body that critiques administrative compliance. These bodies are usually recognized as affirmative action committees.
Affirmative action committees (AAC) influence affirmative action plans by working in close association with the officer(s) responsible for compliance. There may be one AAC on campus or several AACs according to departments and individual schools. Committee responsibilities usually include the reviewing of affirmative action plans; assessing the progress of affirmative action goals; reviewing the recruitment, selection, and promotion policies of individual departments; and reviewing employee grievances. AAC's should be comprised of members of diverse ethnic and minority backgrounds from within the institution. In addition, administrative, faculty, and support staff personnel should be represented on AAC's (Carnegie Council, 1975; AAP, 1982).

The concept of affirmative action has greatly affected the employee selection process of higher education institutions. Although many institutions have implemented policies reflective of affirmative action requirements, few have achieved success in increasing the representation of female professionals (Bowen, 1986; Thornell, 1986).

"The failure of affirmative action is perhaps most apparent in two-year colleges" (Exum, 1983, p. 392). As explained by Exum, two-year institutions are bound to the interests and beliefs of their geographic area and the college may feel inhibited in hiring minority members. Also, government and state educational regulations have been slow in affecting the hiring guidelines of two-year colleges.

Affirmative action not only has the ability to increase minority employment, but can influence the provision of culturally diverse educational opportunities. This position is supported by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the Iowa Higher
Education Planning Council (IHESPC), and the DE. Specifically, the AACJC advocates the adoption of priority policies. The policies are intended to help two-year postsecondary institutions prepare for the challenges that will be present as a result of our ever changing and increasingly diverse multicultural society.

One such policy that the AACJC endorses is an initiative that focuses on providing quality minority education. To achieve this goal, the AACJC recommends that community colleges incorporate policies and practices to improve recruitment, retention, and job placement of minority students. A primary objective in achieving this goal is to employ a culturally mixed background of faculty and support service staff (Keyser & Parnell, 1991).

In support of the AACJC's position, the IHESPC (1992) and the DE (1992) both agree that in order to increase the learning and achievement levels of all students in the state of Iowa, higher educational institutions need to establish necessary policies. These policies should be designed with the focus of promoting positive environments for minorities and developing strategies to recruit minority faculty members.

In relation to the positions held by the AACJC, IHESPC, and DE, two separate studies were carried out by Fadele (1990) and Richardson (1990). Both of these studies linked minority student success with a culturally diverse community college environment. This included the employment of staff that represented multicultural backgrounds.

There has been extensive documentation regarding the limited availability of professional female employment figures in higher education (Thornell, 1986; Hyer, 1985; Segers, 1983). Direct measures of employment trends analysis on the effect of affirmative action activities are
difficult to ascertain, however, there have been several studies that have depicted the ongoing inequities of employment (Kolbert, 1985; Stone, 1985; Thornell, 1986; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1985).

One such study that determined there was continued employment inequity in the state of Iowa, was carried out by the DE in 1989. The 1989 study, assessed and evaluated the postsecondary educational needs of minority students. An outcome of this study included three recommendations as they pertained to minority hiring within community colleges. First, each community college should develop a faculty ratio that is in proportion to the demographics of the region which is represented by the community college; second, each community college needs to develop a faculty recruitment network with Iowa Regent Universities and independent colleges; and third, each community college should develop a minority awareness program that would enhance minority sensitivity and cultural diversity within the community college environment (Iowa Department of Education, 1989).

This study proved to be an influential factor in the 1990 legislative amendment to Chapter 19B of the Iowa Code; thus the establishment of Subsection 19B.11. As previously stated, Section 19B.11 authorized the DE to monitor and promote affirmative action among school districts, community colleges, and educational agencies.

In order to effectively monitor and promote affirmative action programs, the DE amended the Administrative Code for the Schools of Iowa by adding Chapter 95 (Appendix E). It is the intention of Chapter 95 to carry out the objectives of Chapter 19B.11 of the Iowa Code:
... by requiring specific steps by school districts, area education agencies, and merged area colleges to accomplish the goals of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in the recruitment, appointment, assignment and advancement of personnel (Iowa Department of Education, 1990, p. 8).

Therefore, Chapter 95 provides for necessary guidelines and procedures to promote affirmative action. Specifically, the DE established the following standards for community colleges to institute:

1. Equal employment opportunity policy statements,
2. Affirmative action programs,
3. Boards of directors policy statements and plans for implementation,
4. Board of directors policy statement of commitment for affirmative action and an employee grievance procedure,
5. Written equal employment opportunity and affirmative action plans,
6. Assignment of an employee for responsibility of coordinating the implementation of plans,
7. A board of directors’ statement that requires the input and involvement of women in the adoption and implementation of affirmative action policies,
8. Staff development in-services for hiring personnel concerning principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action,
9. Documenting affirmative action activities through a system of record keeping,
10. Administrative statement on plans for implementing affirmative action,
11. Workforce analysis of full and part-time employees,
12. Quantitative analysis that identifies qualified females in relevant labor market,
13. Qualitative analysis that reviews employment policies and activities that ensure equality of employment opportunity,
14. Internal and external method of disseminating policies and plans,
15. Scheduled distribution of policy and plans to internal employees and external organizations,

16. Annual distribution of policy statements to current institutional employees and those applying for employment,

17. Submission of annual reports to board of directors and the IDOE,

18. Adoption of numerical goals and time tables for the alleviation of underrepresentation in each major job category, and not to be interpreted as quotas, and

19. Adoption of qualitative goals that provide time frames for the adjustment of employment practices that may present obstacles for females in having equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. (Appendix E contains a more complete definition of terms.)

Conclusion

By reviewing pertinent literature, the reader has been presented with primary issues and concerns related to sex discrimination. In relation to this societal problem, the effects of discrimination on female employment in higher education was described, as was federal and State of Iowa legislation that was developed to curtail this form of discrimination. In addition, the roles of Iowa public two-year, post-secondary institutions were explained as was their responsibility to incorporate and implement state of Iowa legislative mandates.

Through the regulatory and coordinating structure of the DE and individual community colleges, methods of affirmative action are to be specified, promoted, and put into practice. Because of the DE's responsibility to the State of Iowa's legislature, the DE seeks to build a base of understanding toward affirmative action programs within Iowa's community colleges, and determine programming effectiveness among the 15 community colleges.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Examined in this study are the perceptions of faculty and professional student service staff who are employed in public two-year post-secondary institutions located in the state of Iowa. The perceptions of these community college professionals are examined due to their employment in a community college environment, nonadministrative responsibilities, limited affirmative action policy development, and the affect affirmative action policies and procedures have upon their employment. Because of their position within the community college, these professionals would have access to specific institutional affirmative action policies and procedures and would be able to determine if the policies and practices are currently being carried out by the institution. In addition, due to the issue of sex equity, it is important to seek the perceptions of both males and females. This will allow for assessment and evaluation of similar and dis-similar perceptions of institutional affirmative action policies and practices.

Based on this rationale, there are four major objectives to be accomplished in examining the perceptions of faculty and professional student service staff: determine the extent of knowledge toward the adoption of institutional policies relating to state-mandated affirmative action: determine the extent of knowledge toward the implementation of state-mandated policies relating to affirmative action; determine if there is a need for policy implementation on the part of community colleges in
order to enhance sex equity; and to determine if the DE should continue to promote affirmative action policy and sex equity. The perceptions of community college policies and practices were gathered from two constituencies: 1) community college faculty and 2) community college professional student service staff.

Responses of the two constituencies were studied in order to learn their perceptions about specific statements pertaining to affirmative action policies and practices in community colleges as they pertained to state mandated legislation. Furthermore, efforts were made to discover if there are relationships between identified descriptive variables and perceptions of the survey respondents.

This chapter will highlight the study's methodology which includes subjects, instrumentation, description of the population, sample totals, collection of the data, and treatment of the data.

Subjects

A total of 240 community college employees were requested to provide feedback on their perceptions of affirmative action within their community college. Of this total, 120 subjects were employed as full-time faculty members, and the other 120 were employed as full-time professional student service staff. Those who responded to the request included 90 faculty members and 86 professional student service staff.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study (Appendix F) included a cover letter that outlined the objectives of the survey. The instrument was printed and mailed by the researcher with the cover letter being
produced on Iowa State University letterhead and signed by the researcher and his major professor, Dr. Daniel C. Robinson.

The instrument had three parts: definition of terms, descriptive information, and perceptions of policies and practices carried out or not carried out by the community college. Assistance in designing the instrument was received from Dr. Richard Warren, Distinguished Professor of Iowa State University, and Dr. Tom Anderson, Sex Equity Consultant for the DE. Furthermore, Dr. Tom Anderson provided a formal letter of support on behalf of the DE (Appendix G) which increased the legitimacy of the research process and enhanced the recognition of importance.

The first section of the survey defined terms associated with affirmative action in order to promote further understanding of the survey. The following terms were defined:

1. Affirmative action,
2. Equal employment opportunity,
3. Workforce analysis,
4. Qualitative analysis, and
5. Hiring goals.

The second section of the survey sought information that included:

1. Age,
2. Ethnicity,
3. Physical handicap,
4. Gender,
5. Highest educational degree attained, and
6. Years of community college work experience.
Subsequent to the third section, respondents were requested to individually document the degree to which they agreed or disagreed to a series of 70 statements. The origin of the 70 statements were developed as an outcome of the need based on the literature review and communications with the DE. The series of statements were used to determine if respondents perceived that specific affirmative action related activities were being carried out; if respondents perceived that current affirmative action activities were meeting institutional responsibilities; if respondents perceived that administrators were genuinely promoting the policies of affirmative action; and if respondents perceived that the board of directors were genuinely promoting the principles of affirmative action. Respondents were asked to complete the left-hand indicators for each of the 70 statements of activity (presently being done or should be done) by making one of two choices: 1) "A" for Agree and 2) "D" for Disagree. Following this choice, respondents were directed to complete the right-hand scale (degree of surety) for the statement of activity. Therefore, in accordance with the diagram below, respondents were given the option to make 1 of 11 choices:
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Beginning with the possible responses of A1 or D1, respondents would represent an absence of surety as to their agreement or disagreement with the proceeding numbers representing an increasing belief of surety to number 5, which represented positive surety of agreement or disagreement. In total, there were 71 possible responses; 70 statements of activity and
an additional request for a written statement reflecting the opinion of
the respondent toward the issues raised in the survey.

After the initial design of the survey instrument, two faculty and
two professional student service staff were asked to review the
instrument. Several suggestions were received and were incorporated into
the final survey form.

Before distributing the surveys, the Iowa State University Committee
on the Use of Human Subjects on Research (Appendix G) determined that the
format of the research study properly ensured individual rights and
well-being of the participating subjects and protected confidentiality.

Description of the Population

As shown in Chapter IV, individuals selected for the survey were
classified into two general categories of faculty and professional student
service staff. These members are employed in public two-year,
post-secondary higher education institutions in the state of Iowa.

Total Sample

To achieve random sampling, employee lists of 6 community colleges
generated the necessary constituents that were needed for the survey. The
6 community colleges were selected according to either their rural or
urban setting and whether they were located in either the western,
central, or eastern part of the state. Because there was a minimum of one
community college being rurally based in each sector of the state (i.e.
west, central, and east), three community colleges were selected for their
urban status and three were selected for their rural status. This
procedure enhanced statewide representation and urban and rural parity.
Lists of faculty and professional student service staff were maintained separately according to community college representation. By incorporating the systematic sampling method (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 224), 40 individuals were chosen from each of the 6 community colleges.

After the community colleges were randomly chosen according to their noted characteristics, applicable employee lists from each of the community colleges were assembled as they pertained to faculty and professional student service staff positions and gender. In response to the random drawing of numbers (e.g., 3), every third individual was selected as corresponding to the number chosen in the random drawing. To fulfill the desired number of respondents necessary for the survey, the process was duplicated until the required number had been met.

Collection of the Data

The institutional perception of affirmative action policies and practices survey was mailed in April of 1991. In relation to the stated survey population and the random sampling techniques, 240 community college professionals were requested to provide their perceptions.

To assure a high percentage of return, a contact person was designated within each community college in order to respond to any comments or questions selected survey participants may have had and to promote initial compliance with the survey request. In addition, the survey instruments were coded in order to identify survey respondents, and participants were instructed to forward their completed survey to the institutional contact person; whereupon the surveys were mailed at the
expense of the surveyor. All returned surveys were received by May 30, 1991.

Treatment of the Data

At the time of receiving the 176 completed surveys, information was being gathered through the review of related literature and from the DE. It was determined by this researcher that the survey would be best utilized to determine if respondents perceived that specific affirmative action related activities were being carried out by their community college. Survey items that best fulfilled the selected research purpose include the following survey questions.

1. Your college has an identified board policy statement that outlines the intentions of equal employment opportunity on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.

3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.

4. Your college performs a yearly workforce analysis of institutional job categories that are broken down by gender.

5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.

6. A self-evaluative analysis that assesses the personnel employment policies and practices of your institution, as related to equal employment and affirmative action, is assembled each year.

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.
9. An affirmative action plan is made available to all employees who seek this information at your college.

10. All news releases and institutional documents and advertisements identify the institution as an "Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer" at your college.

11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.

12. Your college holds staff development in-services that relay goals, policies, and procedures of equal opportunity employment.

13. Your college formally communicates to external organizations its willingness to accept and serve protected class individuals.

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

15. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.

16. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information sheets that document gender percentages of those hired, gender percentages of current employees, reasons for demotions and terminations according to gender, and changes in job classification based on gender.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

18. Your college has the necessary policies and procedures in place to effectively promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.

19. The governing board of directors at your institution has adopted policy guidelines that exceed the minimum state laws that mandate affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.

20. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job descriptions, and necessary experience.

In addition to these 20 statements of perception, it was deemed beneficial to be aware of any general thoughts that the respondents believed to be relevant to the topic addressed in the survey. Therefore,
general comments related to the 20 survey items were collected for purposes related to the final analysis.

Data from each of the 20 survey items of perception were entered into the Iowa State University mainframe computer, and the SPSS-X computer program was used to statistically assemble the data. Survey responses were entered into statistical format in relation to the criterion variables of years of education and years of community college work experience.

The basic statistical design used in this study was a 2x2x2 analysis of covariance, with two levels of gender, job position, and community college setting. The covariates were the rankings of perception with the two aforementioned criterion variables. This form of analysis was selected so that the focus could be placed on each variable of gender, job position, and community college setting, while controlling for years of education and community college experience.

The analysis of covariance treatment was applied to four null hypotheses of this study. They are as follows.

**Hypotheses One:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of female and male employees that their institutions are in compliance with state affirmative action guidelines when controlling for demographic setting, faculty or professional status of the employee, years of professional experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypotheses Two:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who work in an urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for gender, professional status, years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypotheses Three:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who are employed in a faculty or professional student service staff position when
controlling for gender, demographic setting of college, years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.

Hypotheses Four: There are no significant interactions between males and females, urban or rural setting of the community college, and faculty or professional student service status of the employee when controlling for years of college experience, and years of formal education.

Research Question: Under what variable conditions will female and male employees hold similar perceptions toward affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college when considering faculty or professional student service status of the employee, urban or rural setting of the community college, years of professional experience in the community college setting; and years of formal education?

All four of the hypotheses are treated as null hypotheses of no difference between the subgroupings. Descriptive information was used to answer the research question.

Emphasis of research was placed on the variability of survey respondents between subgroups since it is frequently believed that variability within subgroups occurs less frequently. Subsequently, F values between subgroups are noted in Chapters IV and V.

To determine the significant F value differences between subgroups, the analysis of covariance interaction indicators were employed to gauge which subgroups were different. When using the interaction indicators of significance, F values were correspondingly related to the necessary tables in order to assess the differences of significance that were exhibited between the survey subgroups.

A .05 alpha level of significance in the covariance treatments was used in correspondence to the four hypotheses. When applicable, descriptive statistical information (i.e., standard deviation, mean,
percentages) was incorporated to enhance the interpretation of the research findings.
CHAPTER VI. RESULTS

Introduction

The foundation for this chapter is based on the survey returns of 176 respondents. Survey respondents included community college faculty and professional student service staff. Table 1 illustrates the total number of surveys that were mailed, number of surveys returned, percentage of surveys returned, number of surveys that were acceptable, and the percent of surveys that were acceptable for use in this study.

Table 1. Number of surveys mailed and number and percentage of surveys returned, and acceptable for use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Surveys Mailed</th>
<th>Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Surveys Acceptable</th>
<th>Percentage Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College Faculty (full-time)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Professional Student Support Staff (full-time)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows 176 out of a possible 240 survey instruments were returned. This rate of response translates into a 73.3% response rate. A total of 3 (1.2%) returned surveys were unable to be used for research purposes due to incorrect use of survey question indicators. The remainder of this chapter will devote attention towards analyzing and
Descriptive Data

One hundred and seventy-six community college faculty and professional student service staff supplied the necessary information for this research study. Statistical analysis of the survey respondents indicates that 90 (51.1%) of the respondents were male and 86 (48.9%) were female. Table 2 highlights the total percentage of males and females according to faculty and professional student service status.

There are 60 (69.8%) male and 26 (30.2%) female faculty that responded to the survey. The professional student service staff included 60 (66.7%) females and 30 (33.3%) males. Although the number of respondents are somewhat balanced according to gender, they are unevenly balanced within the two job categories. The frequency of male faculty is 34 points more than (39.6 percentage points) female faculty; and in the professional student service category, females have a frequency that is 30 points more than (33.4 percentage points) males. By comparing these percentages with DE employment statistics of the 1992 BEDS survey, the representation of faculty gender percentages closely reflects the state employment breakdown (62.1% male and 37.9% female), but the representation of professional student service staff gender percentages does not reflect the breakdown of the BEDS survey results (52.3% male and 47.7% female). Therefore, a higher percentage of female professional student service staff were motivated to respond to the survey request.
Table 2. Gender and professional status of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency of Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Student Support Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 highlights the urban and rural demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. There are 63 (35.8%) urban and 113 (64.2%) rural respondents. Of the 63 urban participants, 35 (55.6%) are male and 28 (44.4%) female; and there is near equal representation between faculty (30 at 47.6%) and professional student service staff (33 at 52.4%). The 113 rural participants number 55 (48.7%) males and 58 (51.3%) females with a strong balance of representation between 56 (49.6%) faculty members and 57 (50.4%) professional student service staff.

In Table 4, the criterion variables of years of community college professional and years of formal education of survey respondents are analyzed according to total frequency of their occurrence. For years of community college professional experience, respondents reported to have
Table 3. Demographic setting of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Setting</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency of Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Student</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Staff</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Faculty</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Student</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Staff</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

anywhere from 0 years to 31 years of professional experience. The largest frequency per category is the 0-5 years with 59 (33.6%) occurrences. The other educational categories reported having 26 (14.8%) in the 6-10 year range, 27 (15.3) in the 11-15 year range, 40 (22.7%) in the 16-20 year range, 21 (11.9%) in the 21-25 year range, 2 (1.1%) in the 26-30 year range, and 1 (0.6%) in the 31-35 year range. Additional analysis indicates that a significant majority of respondents (113 at 63.7%) have 0-15 years
Table 4. Community college professional experience and formal education of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Professional Experience</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency of Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Education</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency of Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175^a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Missing response.

of professional experience. Also, community colleges have had a traditional vocational/technical orientation; therefore, those who have been employed more than 15 years are more apt to be employed in a vocational/technical education program.

As for years of formal education, 91 (52.0%) survey participants communicated that their highest degree achieved was a master of arts and 50 (28.6%) reported that a bachelor of arts degree was the highest held degree. For the other educational categories 7 (4.0%) achieved a high school diploma, 12 (6.9%) held the degree of doctorate, and 15 (8.5%) fell
under the heading of "other" formal educational level. The formal educational level breakdown is consistent with the DE minimum certification requirements. To instruct arts and sciences courses in community colleges, a masters of arts is necessary, and a bachelor of arts is necessary to instruct vocational/technical courses.

T-tests of means by survey statements according to gender, demographic setting, and professional position are the next descriptive variables to be examined. Table 5 displays the 20 statements and compares the descriptive differences between males and females by number of frequency, mean, and standard deviation, with each of the 20 questions. In addition, the degree of the statistical differences are indicated by t value. In Table 5, the frequency for male responses to the 20 statements range from 89 to 86; the mean responses range from 9.10 to 3.63; and the standard deviations range from 1.31 to 3.49. The frequency of the female responses to the 20 statements range from 86 to 82; the mean responses range from 8.87 to 4.30; and the standard deviations range from 1.37 to 3.44. As for the degree of the statistical differences between males and females to each of the 20 statements, the t value range is from .10 to 2.38. There are three occurrences of statistical significant differences at the .05(*) level. The statements that have significant differences include the following:

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action.

14. A procedural method form investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

19. The governing board of directors at your institution has adopted policy guidelines that exceed the minimum state laws that mandate affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>89 9.10 1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>88 8.70 1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that details implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>87 7.64 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.</td>
<td>87 6.10 2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.</td>
<td>86 5.74 2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.</td>
<td>87 6.39 2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.</td>
<td>88 5.15 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.</td>
<td>88 5.80 2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.</td>
<td>89 7.88 2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>89 8.89 1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference at .05 level.

** Significant difference at .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Method for investigating charges of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and changes in job classification.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed state laws.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly review of jobs.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 2 had a t value of 2.35*, Statement 14 had a t value of 2.05*, and Statement 19 had a t value of 2.38*.

Table 6 offers an accounting of the descriptive t-tests by survey statements in relation to the demographic setting. The frequency for rural responses to the 20 statements range from 113 to 107; the mean responses range from 8.89 to 4.23; and standard deviations range from 3.57 to 1.43. Urban frequency responses to the 20 statements range from 62 to 60; mean responses range from 9.16 to 4.53; and the standard deviations range from 3.17 to 1.15. The degree of the statistical differences between rural and urban survey participants range from a t value of .05 to 5.49. There are 3 occurrences of a statistical significant differences at the .05(*) level and 11 occurrences of statistical significant difference at the .01(**) level. Statements that represent significant differences include the following:

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action.

3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.

4. Your college performs a yearly workforce analysis of institutional job categories that are broken down by gender.

5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.

6. A self-evaluative analysis that assesses the personnel employment policies and practices of your institution, as related to equal employment and affirmative action, is assembled each year.

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.
Table 6. Descriptive t-test by compacted survey statement according to demographic setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that details implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at .05 level.

**Significant difference at .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and changes in job classification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed state laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly review of jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.

9. An affirmative action plan is made available to all employees who seek this information at your college.

11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

15. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.

16. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information sheets that document gender percentages of those hired; gender percentages of current employees; reasons for demotions and terminations according to gender; and changes in job classification based on gender.

18. Your college has the necessary policies and procedures in place to effectively promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.

20. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job descriptions, and necessary experience.

Table 7 provides t-tests by survey statements as they apply to the professional position variable. The frequency for faculty responses to the 20 statements range from 83 to 86; the mean responses range from 9.13 to 4.06; and the standard deviations range from .24 to 3.52. For professional student service staff members, the frequency of third responses to the 20 statements range from 89 to 85; the mean responses range from 8.85 to 3.86; and the standard deviations range from 3.54 to 1.35. The degree of the statistical differences between faculty and professional student service staff range from a t value of .12 to 2.62.
Table 7. Descriptive t-test by compacted survey statement according to professional position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that details implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at .05 level.

**Significant difference at .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected class individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Method for investigating charges of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in job classification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action/equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review of jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>( \overline{x} )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>Value of ( t )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two occurrences of a statistical significant difference at the .05(*) level and one occurrence of a statistical significant difference at the .01(**) level. Statements that represent significant differences include the following:

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action.

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

15. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.

Statement 2 had a t value of 2.48*, Statement 14 had a t value of 2.64**, and Statement 15 had a t value of 1.97*.

It is important to truly measure specific perceptions. For this reason, the final method of bivariate analysis is the correlation matrix. Because there is a lack of prior research, as emphasized in this study, the means for determining the reliability of the statements in the survey instrument is difficult to achieve. Although composite scores are not computed, the correlation matrix is employed to obtain an indication of internal reliability of total items and subgroups of items, prior to applying the analysis of covariance statistical technique. The correlational matrix depicts the strength of the relationship of the respondent ratings for the 20 survey statements, and determines if there is a strong relationship between how an individual would respond to any one of the 20 statements based on their years of community college professional experience and years of formal education. Strong correlational relationships can be used in affirming the reliability of the survey instrument.
Appendix H displays the correlational relationships. By following the left hand column, the strength of the relationships of the 22 variables can be determined by coordinating one variable's intersection with another.

Statement 1 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 2-16 and 18-20. Statement 1 is not significantly correlated with Statement 17 or with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 2 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 3-20. Statement 2 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 3 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 4-20. Statement 3 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 4 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 5-9 and 11-20 and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with Statement 10. Statement 4 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 5 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 6-9 and 11-20. Statement 5 is not significantly correlated with Statement 10 or with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 6 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 7-9 and 11-20 and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with Statement 10. Statement 6 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.
Statement 7 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 8-10 and 12-20. Statement 7 is not significantly correlated with Statement 11 or with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 8 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 9 and 11-20 and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with Statement 10. Statement 8 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 9 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 11-20 and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with Statement 10. Statement 9 is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 10 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 11, 14, 15, 19, and 20, and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with Statements 12 and 16-18. Statement 10 was not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 11 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 11-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 12 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 13-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 13 is significantly correlated at the .01(**) level with Statements 14-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.
Statement 14 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statements 15-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 15 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statements 16-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 16 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statements 17-20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 17 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statements 18-20 and significantly correlated at the .05(*) level with the covariate of employment. Statement 17 is not significantly correlated with the education covariate.

Statement 18 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statements 19 and 20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education.

Statement 19 is significantly correlated at the .01( **) level with Statement 20 and is not significantly correlated with the covariates of employment and education. The covariates of employment and education were not significantly correlated.

In summary, among the 20 survey statements, there are only 4 occurrences of nonsignificant correlational relationships between one survey statement and another. The vast majority of correlations among the survey statements reveal that there is a strong relationship between how a respondent would answer the 20 statements. In addition, there was only one occasion of a significant relationship between the 20 survey
statements and covariates of employment and education; therefore, nullifying any effect that years of community college professional experience and years of formal education may have on how a respondent rates his/her perception of affirmative action within the community college. Finally, the correlation matrix (Appendix H), which is a substitute measure for assessing internal reliability, appears to be a positive indicator that the survey statements have moderate to relatively strong relationships indicating high internal consistency under the assumption the statements are measuring the same general concept of affirmative action perception.

Coding of the Instrument

As depicted in Appendix F, the survey instrument contained 70 statements concerning institutional matters related to affirmative action, of which 20 were selected for purposes of this study. Each survey statement contained two criterion variables that are conducive to statistical covariance analysis. The left-hand column scale represents whether the respondent's perception Agrees (A) or Disagrees (D) with the statement relating to their institution's affirmative action policies or practices.

The right-hand row of numbers for each statement of affirmative action policy or practices allows the respondent the opportunity to express the degree of their perception according to their claim of agreement or disagreement. The responses were weighted in relation to the following scale:
Analysis of the Data

This study attempts to evaluate four null hypotheses that were developed in order to determine if there are significant differences between the groups of survey respondents on their perceptions of the independent variables. The four null hypotheses are as follows.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of female and male employees that their institutions are in compliance with state affirmative action guidelines when controlling for demographic setting, professional status of the employee, years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who work in a urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for gender, professional status, years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who are employed in a faculty or professional student service staff position when controlling for gender, demographic setting of the community college, years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Four:** There are no significant interactions between males and females, urban or rural setting of the community college, and instructor or professional student service status of the employee when controlling for years of professional college experience, and years of formal education.
Research Question: Under what variable conditions will female and male employees hold similar perceptions towards affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college when considering faculty or professional student service status of the employee; urban or rural setting of the community college; years of professional experience in the community college setting; and years of formal education?

The F values were determined for the variables employed in this research study. Tables of group means and commentary for the remainder of this chapter relate to the four null hypotheses and their association to the statistical results and the research question.

Hypotheses Testing and Research Question

To test the four hypotheses and communicate rationale for drawing conclusions, an ANOVA with covariance table is provided that addresses each of the 20 survey statements (Table 8). Table 8 represents this indicator of descriptive statistical analysis and depicts a matrix relating each survey statement to each of the two covariates, three main effects, three two-way interactions, and one three-way interaction. This table contains the basic foundation of information necessary to draw conclusions in response to the four hypotheses and research question.

Responses to the four hypotheses are as follows.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of female and male employees that their institutions are in compliance with state affirmative action guidelines when controlling for urban or rural setting of the community college, faculty or professional student service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

In reference to the ANOVA with covariance for survey statements in Table 8, there are no occurrences of a significant difference at either
the .01(**) or .05(*) level. Table 9 provides insights about the absence of significant differences. This table displays the small differences between the group means for females and males per each statement. Although the male means were greater than the female means for 18 of the 20 statements, the average difference of the group means was 0.32. In addition, examination of the male means reveal that male perceptions agreed with 19 of the 20 statements (Table 9). The males did not agree with the following statement.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

The female means represent similar results by showing agreement with 18 of the 20 statements. Statements that did not produce agreement for the females mean included:

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

Further examination of the female mean scores reveal that although females agreed with 18 of 20 statements of perception, 12 of the 18 statements yielded marginal means of agreement of 5.05 to 6.93. When compared to male mean scores, 8 of the 19 statements of perceived agreement produced marginal means of agreement of 5.15 to 6.39.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the first null hypothesis cannot be rejected and that there is no significant difference in perception of adequacy of female and male employees when controlling for the four variables of demographic setting, professional status, years of professional experience and years of formal education.
Table 8. ANOVA with covariance by survey statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Significance of Variance of 20 Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Setting</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Position</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Position</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Setting</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position-Setting</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Way Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Position-Setting</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS = Not Significant.

*Significant difference at .05 level.

**Significant difference at .01 level.
### Significance of Variance of 20 Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.55**</td>
<td>24.17**</td>
<td>8.30**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10.26**</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4.94*</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>5.77*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6.33*</td>
<td>4.60*</td>
<td>6.57*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10.44*</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Significance of Variance of 20 Statements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4.94*</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>6.66*</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>5.77*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.57*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10.44*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Gender frequency and means by 20 compacted survey statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that details implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Male Frequency</td>
<td>Male Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Method for investigating charges of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and changes in job classification.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed state laws.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly review of jobs.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for each statement</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who work in an urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for gender, faculty or professional student service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Table 8 indicates that there are 10 instances of significant difference at the .01(**) level and 5 instances of significant difference at the .05(*) level. The following statements were significant at the .01(**) level:

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.

3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.

4. Your college performs a yearly workforce analysis of institutional job categories that are broken down by gender.

5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.

6. A self-evaluative analysis that assesses the personnel employment policies and practices of your institution, as related to equal employment and affirmative action, is assembled each year.

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.

9. An affirmative action plan is made available to all employees who seek this information at your college.

11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.

20. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly
systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job
descriptions, and necessary experience.

The following statements were significant at the .05(*) level:

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual
harassment is available.

15. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are
entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination
claims.

16. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information
sheets that document gender percentages of those hired; gender
percentages of current employees; reasons for demotions and
terminations according to gender; and changes in job
classification based on gender.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated
to all institutional departments.

18. Your college has the necessary policies and procedures in place
to effectively promote affirmative action/equal opportunity
employment.

Table 10 notes the increased difference in group means according to
the rural or urban status of the survey participant. It is particularly
interesting to point out that the rural means are less than the urban
means for each statement with the exception of Statement 19, in which the
group means are equal. This consistent pattern of mean differences
coupled with the overall average mean difference of 1.09 accounts for the
15 statements that produced significant differences at the .01(**) and
.05(*) level.

The mean group results for each statement also show that on 5 of the
20 statements of rural respondent perception there was a group mean score
that indicated a disagreement with the statement that an affirmative
action activity was being carried out. This occurred in the following
statements.
Table 10. Demographic frequency and means by 20 compacted survey statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Rural Frequency</th>
<th>Rural Means</th>
<th>Urban Frequency</th>
<th>Urban Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.**</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.**</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.**</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.**</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.**</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.**</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.**</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.**</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statements that produced a significant difference at .05 level.

**Statements that produced a significant difference at .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Rural Frequency</th>
<th>Rural Means</th>
<th>Urban Frequency</th>
<th>Urban Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.**</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and changes in job classification.*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed state laws.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly review of jobs.**</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for each statement</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.

16. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information sheets that document gender percentages of those hired, gender percentages of current employees, reasons for demotions and terminations according to gender, and changes in job classification based on gender.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

Group means for urban respondent perception experienced only one instance out of 20 that an affirmative action activity was not being carried out. This statement was as follows.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

In addition, of the 15 rural statements that generated a mean score of perceived agreement, 8 statements produced marginal means of agreement of 5.13 to 6.96. When compared to the 19 urban mean scores, only 6 of the 19 statements of perceived agreement generated marginal means of agreement of 8.82 to 6.80.

Due to the majority of statements that produced significant differences between urban and rural group means, the second null hypothesis can be rejected. There are significant differences in perception of adequacy for employees who work in a urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for the variables of gender,
professional status, years of professional experience, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who are employed in a faculty or professional student service staff position when controlling for gender; urban or rural setting of the community college; years of professional experience in the community college setting; and years of formal education.

As depicted in Table 8, the third main effect, professional position, has one occurrence of a significant difference at the .05(*) level which was Statement 14.

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

Table 11 indicates the small differences between the group means for each of the statements except for Statement 14. The average group mean difference for each statement was 0.33. Faculty group means were larger than professional student service means for 15 out of 20 statements. Also, faculty group means were in agreement on 19 out of the 20 statements. The lone statement that prompted a group mean disagreement reads as follows.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

Professional student service staff means were in agreement 18 out of 20 statements. The following two statements came under disagreement.

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Faculty Frequency</th>
<th>Faculty Means</th>
<th>Student Service Frequency</th>
<th>Student Service Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College has identified board policy on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that implementation of policies and methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College performs a yearly workforce analysis by gender.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing workforce availability according to gender.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-evaluative analysis that assesses policies and practices assembled each year.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. College establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. College establishes hiring goals for correcting employment weaknesses.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affirmative action plan available to all employees.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87 5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. College communicates to external organizations to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Method for investigating charges of sexual harassment.*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86 6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Procedures to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Institution compiles annual equal employment data that document percentages of those hired, reasons for demotions and terminations, and changes in job classification.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual reports to all institutional departments.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. College has necessary policies and procedures to promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89 7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governing board of directors has adopted policy guidelines that exceed state laws.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly review of jobs.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86 5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for each statement</td>
<td>85.15</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.50 6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statements that produced a significant difference at .05 level.
Upon closer examination, the faculty mean scores show that although faculty agreed with 19 of the 20 statements of perception, 10 of the 19 statements produced marginal means of agreement of 5.08 to 9.92. When compared to professional student service staff mean scores, 10 of the 18 statements of perceived agreement produced marginal means of agreement of 5.17 to 6.83.

With this information, the third null hypothesis cannot be rejected and there are no significant differences in perception of adequacy for employees who are employed in a faculty or professional student service staff position when controlling for gender, urban or rural setting of the community college, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

**Hypothesis Four:** There are no significant interactions between males and females, urban or rural setting of the community college, faculty or professional student service status of the employee when controlling for years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

The fourth null hypothesis relates to the three-way interaction for each statement among the variables of gender, professional position, and demographic setting and the two-way interactions involving these same variables. Table 8 shows that there is only one significant interaction at the .05(*) level according to the 20 survey statements of perception. The single statement that generated the significant difference was Statement 2: Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.
Table 12 depicts the interaction of the variable subgroups and their frequency and mean totals in relation to Statement 2. In Table 12, gender and professional status is partitioned according to the rural or urban setting of the survey respondent. Although the gender means for the urban setting do not greatly vary, the rural setting means for male and female survey respondents show noticeable differences, particularly between female faculty members and professional student services staff. The female mean totals indicate a 2.82 mean difference between professional positions. Therefore, the influencing factor in this variable relationship can be attributed to the rural setting; between faculty and professional student support service staff; and most noticeably among female survey respondents.

Table 12. Gender, position, and setting by frequency and mean interaction for Statement 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Professional Student Services Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interaction between gender and professional status is further distinguished in Table 8. Gender and professional position produced one significant difference at the .01(***) level and six significant differences at the .05(*) level for the following statements:

2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.

3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.

10. All news releases and institutional documents and advertisements identify the institution as an "Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer" at your college.

11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.

12. Your college holds staff development in-services that relay goals, policies, and procedures of equal opportunity employment.

14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

20. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job descriptions, and necessary experience.

Gender and setting and position and setting were the other two combinations of variables that fell under the heading of the two-way interactions. Neither two-way interaction had any instances of significant interaction.

Table 13 highlights the frequency and mean differences of gender according to faculty and professional student support service position for each statement of perception that experienced a significant difference. As was the circumstance with the single instance of significant difference
Table 13. Two-way interactions of gender and position according to compacted survey statements of perception that reduced significant differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Gendera</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Service Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, an identified employee responsible for</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative directive that details implementation of policies and</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods of reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Institutional documents identify the institution as an Equal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affirmative action statements on staff bulletin boards, in employee</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lounges, and in administrative offices.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. College holds staff development in-services.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Method for investigating charges of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees are responsible for implementation of policies and a yearly</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review of jobs.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aGender denotes M = male and F = female.
with the three-way interaction of gender, professional position, and demographic setting, the mean responses of the female participants indicate noticeable decreases as you move from female faculty responses to female professional student service staff responses.

Due to the lack of significant three-way interaction differences, it can be safely stated that there is no significant interaction between the subgroups of gender, demographic setting, and professional position when controlling for years of professional experience and formal education. Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis cannot be rejected. However, the number of significant two-way interactions among the gender and professional position variables does provide reason to believe that there is an influential variable combination that affects survey responses to statements of affirmative action perception.

**Research Question:** Under what variable conditions will female and male employees hold similar perceptions towards affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college when considering faculty or professional student service status of the employee; urban or rural setting of the community college; years of professional experience in the community college setting; and years of formal education?

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to refer to Tables 2 and 5-12. Tables 2-7 and Appendix H provide descriptive analysis of survey variables and Tables 8-12 elaborate on the ANOVA of covariance findings.

As indicated in Table 2, a total of 90 males and 86 females responded to the survey instrument. These respondents reported their professional position, demographic setting of their community college, years of
professional experience associated with their community college, and years of formal education. From the 70-item survey instrument, 20 statements were selected for statistical analysis based on the identified purpose of this study.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 present the findings of t-tests by individual survey statement according to the variables of gender, demographic setting, and professional position. Table 5 reveals that there were three instances of a significant difference between genders at the .05(*) level. Table 6 shows that there are three instances of significant difference at the .05(*) level and eleven instances of significant difference at the .01(**) level between rural and urban respondents. Table 7 indicates one occurrence of a significant difference at the .05(*) level and two occurrences of significant difference at the .01(**) level between faculty and professional student service staff.

Appendix H depicts the strong correlational relationships that the 20 statements have with each other. Also, the matrix shows the nearly nonexistent correlational relationship between years of professional experience and formal education with each of the 20 statements.

Table 8 represents the ANOVA with covariance analysis by survey statement. By taking into account the influence of years of employment and education, there were no significant differences according to gender; 5 occurrences of significant difference at the .05(*) level and 10 occurrences of significant difference at the .01(**) level according to demographic setting; and 1 significant difference at the .05(*) level according to professional position.
In addition to the findings for the variation of main effects, the two-way interaction of gender and professional position had six occurrences of significant interaction; and the three-way interaction of gender, position, and setting had only one instance of a significant interaction.

Tables 9-12 further describe the findings of Table 8. Table 9 indicates that although male means for each statement were higher than female means for 19 of the 20 statements, the average difference per each statement was 0.32; therefore, explaining the absence of any significant difference.

For Table 10, urban mean differences are greater than rural means for 19 of the 20 statements. Of the 19 statements, 15 exhibit significant differences. The average mean difference for the 20 statements represent a 1.09 margin of difference in favor of urban means.

Table 11 depicts faculty means being greater than professional student service staff means for 15 of 20 statements. Nevertheless, the mean differences were small and produced only one significant difference at the .05(*) level.

Table 12 presents the lone significant interaction of gender, position, and setting that occurred among the possible 20 statements. Due to the mean variation of males in the urban setting, and the mean variation of females in the rural setting, a significant interaction occurred.

Analysis of the statistical data provides the basis for the following belief: female and male employees appear to hold similar perceptions towards affirmative action policies and procedures of their community
college. This is also the case for professional status, even though female professional staff responses influenced lower mean scores between faculty and professional student service staff. Similar perceptions according to gender and professional position are indicated further when considering the findings of the bivariate relationships and the ANOVA with covariance statistical procedure. As for years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education, the effect of these variables also proved to be insignificant. However, in relation to the data presented in Tables 6, 8, 10, and 13, females who are employed in a rural setting may be more likely to hold dissimilar affirmative action perceptions than males. Although it appears that community colleges have adopted the necessary state mandated affirmative action policies and practices, the lack of progress in alleviating gender inequities of employment may influence the degree of perception on the part of women professionals. The lack of progress would then call into question the commitment of community colleges in attaining gender balance.

**General Comments of Survey Respondents**

In addition to requesting the perceptual rating of affirmative action adequacy, respondents were given the opportunity to communicate their general opinions regarding affirmative action and its use in the survey instrument. Of the comments received, it was observed that there were five general categories of thought:

1. Support for the nature and the need of the study.
2. Criticism over the length and design of the questionnaire.
3. Frustration over not being aware of institutional policies or practices.

4. Disapproval of the questionnaire topic and negative attitude towards the philosophy of affirmative action.

5. Discontent over the lack of institutional commitment to established affirmative action policies and practices.

Comments related to the five predominant themes of respondent opinions did not appear to be imbalanced according to gender, demographic setting, or professional position. In general, comments were kept brief and extensive elaboration occurred infrequently. Examples of comments received included the following:

1. This is an important consideration that needs to be addressed and more staff need to be involved in.

2. Many questions difficult to answer on a specific A or D and 1-5 basis.

3. I am not very sure on many of the policies that the college has on affirmative action /equal opportunity employment.

4. There are times when I feel the "normal" need an advocate. What is the best for the job not impeded by gender, race, creed, and the many other descriptors.

5. I feel more could/should be done to encourage positions of leadership being offered to current staff.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In 1965, the 61st Iowa General Assembly passed into law Senate File 550 which allowed for the establishment of two-year, post-secondary institutions. Pursuant to this legislation, the Iowa General Assembly adopted Chapter 280A of the Code of Iowa that led to the corporation of 15 educational institutions known as community colleges. Each community college has a publicly elected board of directors that is in charge of selecting and supervising the chief executive officer.

Chapter 280A also stipulated statutory provisions that included the areas of responsibility for the State Board of Education and the Director of the Department of Education. Therefore, regulation of the community colleges falls under the Iowa State Board of Education in coordination with the Director of the Iowa Department of Education (DE). It is the responsibility of the DE to design and adopt administrative and personnel policies, pursuant to state legislation, for community colleges to operate under.

In particular, it is the responsibility of the Iowa State Board of Education to develop educational state plans for attaining educational goals, and adapt approval standards for the administration of community colleges. In relation to this process, the key function of the Director of the DE is to monitor community college educational programs and forward recommendations for improvement where deficiencies exist; and carry out research on educational matters of concern.
Legislation of the 1989 Iowa General Assembly called for specific action on the part of the Iowa State Board of Education through passage of Senate File 2410 and the subsequent amending of Chapter 19B of the Code of Iowa. This action led to the incorporation of Subsection 19B.11 of the Iowa Code. There are four major objectives of 19B.11: apply affirmative action measures to correct deficiencies in school district, area education agency, and community college employment and provide equal opportunity; the Director of the DE shall promote equal employment opportunity practices and the Iowa State Board of Education shall adopt rules that specify the actions of school districts, area education agencies, and community colleges in order to accomplish equal employment opportunity goals; school districts, area education agencies, and community colleges will provide annual reports outlining their organizational endeavors in fulfilling equal employment opportunity; and the Director of the DE will compile the individual annual reports and forward documentation to the Iowa Department of Management on the status of achieving equal employment opportunity within the educational institutions.

A major factor in amending Chapter 19B is motivated by the belief that having a more diversified workforce in Iowa's two-year, post-secondary colleges provides important social benefits. For Iowa to maintain a qualified and effective educational system and be prepared to meet the challenges of the future decades, it is necessary to locate, recruit, and employ the most able and skilled professionals available. Through this process, Iowa may expose ethnically and culturally diverse student populations to experiences and knowledge that best prepares them for the work environment and to life outside of their geographic region.
Allowing female and male students to see women in various leadership roles, cultivates interaction, goal establishment, and role modeling.

Also, providing maximum diversity of educational school staff is ultimately advantageous to all students by expanding their views of both women and men. Increased exposure to diversity will enhance understanding and decrease stereotypes and prejudices towards those who are different from themselves.

With this rationale in mind and the responsibilities bestowed through the establishment of Subsection 19B.11 of the Iowa Code, the DE and Iowa State Board of Education must promote affirmative action practices and adopt guidelines that specify required activities. To achieve this objective, appropriate and useful information is necessary on the internal operations and behavior of the affected educational entities in accomplishing equal employment opportunity through affirmative action. This includes the following:

1. Current institutional policies that promote the philosophy of affirmative action.

2. Current administrative practices that respond to affirmative action regulations.

3. The perception of whether institutional policies and practices are adequate in promoting affirmative action.

Accordingly, this study was developed with the intention of evaluating and assessing the perceptions of currently employed full-time community college faculty members and professional student service staff. This was carried out in order to achieve four objectives: to determine the extent of knowledge toward the adoption of institutional policies relating to state-mandated affirmative action, to determine the extent of
knowledge toward the implementation of state-mandated policies relating to affirmative action, to determine if there is a need for policy implementation on the part of community colleges, and to determine if the DE should continue to promote affirmative action policy. Individuals associated with the sample population were asked to provide their perceptions of current affirmative action policies and practices within their area community college.

A total of 70 statements were included in the survey instrument with an additional request for a written statement reflecting the opinion of the respondent towards the issues raised in the survey. After receiving the survey responses, it was decided that the survey would be best utilized to determine if respondents perceived that specific affirmative action related activities were being carried out by their community college. Subsequently, 20 of the 70 survey items were selected that responded to the chosen research purpose.

Descriptive data such as gender, demographic setting, professional position, years of community college experience, and years of formal education were included in the study to determine if there was a relationship between these variables and the perceptions of affirmative action adequacy on the part of the survey respondents.

Surveys were mailed to 240 current community college employees. Of this total, 179 surveys were returned and 176 were usable for statistical analysis.

In terms of descriptive data, responses from the sample population included 86 from faculty members and 90 from professional student support service staff; 90 were male and 86 were female; 63 were from the urban
setting and 113 were from the rural setting. As for years of community college experience, 59 respondents reported to have been employed 0 to 5 years; 29 to have been employed 6 to 10 years; 27 to have been employed 11 to 15 years; 40 to have been employed 16 to 20 years; 21 to have been employed 21 to 25 years; 2 to have been employed 26 to 30 years; and 1 to have been employed 31 to 35 years. For years of formal education, 7 had achieved a maximum education of a high school diploma; 50 had received a maximum of a bachelor of arts degree; 91 had received a maximum of a master of arts degree; 12 had received a maximum of a doctorate degree; and 15 reported to have received maximum education through other classifications.

Four null hypotheses and one research question were developed for this research study. An ANOVA with covariance procedure was used to compare male and female means, urban and rural means, and faculty and professional student service staff means for significant differences. The covariates for this comparison included years of employment and years of formal education.

Null Hypothesis One stated that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of female and male employees that their institutions are in compliance with state affirmative action guidelines when controlling for urban or rural setting of the community college, instructor or professional student service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Male means were greater than female means in 18 of the 20 statements of perception related to affirmative action. In addition, male means
registered agreement with 19 of the 20 statements of perception and female means registered agreement with 18 of the 20 statements of perception. Although male means were predominately larger than female means, significant F values were not obtained at either the .01 or .05 levels for any of the 20 statements. Because there was an absence of significant F values, the first null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Two stated that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who work in an urban or rural setting of the community college when controlling for gender, instructor or professional student support service status of the employee, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Urban means were greater than rural means 19 of the 20 statements of perception related to affirmative action. Urban means indicated a perceived agreement for 19 of the 20 statements of institutional activity, rural means indicated a perceived agreement for 15 of the 20 statements of institutional activity. The margin of mean differences produced 10 occurrences of significant F value difference at the .01 level and 5 instances of significant difference at the .05 level. Because there was a majority of significant F values, the second null hypothesis was rejected.

This finding may be attributed to several factors. First, rural professionals may not be observing positive results in terms of achieving gender balance in their workplace, therefore affecting their perception of affirmative action status within their institution. Second, rural values and culture may affect attitudes and behaviors of college professionals, thereby influencing their perceptions of institutional policies and
procedures. Third, rural female professionals may be inhibited from seeking upward professional mobility due to spouse or family obligations to the area they reside in, thus limiting their professional growth and affecting their perception of institutional affirmative action.

Null Hypothesis Three stated that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of employees who are employed in an instructor or professional student service staff position when controlling for gender, urban or rural setting of the community college, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Faculty group means were larger than professional student service staff means for 15 of the 20 statements related to affirmative action. Faculty means registered agreement to 19 of the 20 statements of institutional activity, and professional student service staff means registered agreement for 18 of the 20 statements of institutional adequacy. The average group mean difference for each statement was small and produced only one occurrence of a significant F value difference at the .05 level. In response to the single occurrence of a significant difference, the third null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Although the third null hypothesis cannot be rejected, it should not be overlooked that faculty and professional student service gender percentages were predominately skewed to one gender or another. Faculty respondents were represented by 69.8% males and 30.2% females, and professional student service staff respondents were represented by 66.7% females and 33.3% males. The representation of faculty gender percentages closely reflects the state employment breakdown (62.1% male and 37.9%
female), as indicated in the 1992 Iowa Department of Education BEDS survey for community college faculty members. However, the representation of professional student service staff gender percentages does not reflect the breakdown as communicated in the 1992 BEDS survey (52.3% male and 47.7% female). Why is it that faculty means were greater than professional student service staff means for 15 of the 20 statements and why did more professional student service females choose to respond? It can be interpreted that the predominant female input of the professional student service staff respondents was influential in producing lower mean scores. Furthermore, female professional student service staff may perceive affirmative action to be less effective in promoting gender balance, due to a lack of tangible results. In turn, this dissatisfaction generated a higher percentage rate of survey representation.

Null Hypothesis Four stated that there are no significant interactions between males and females, urban or rural setting of the community college, and instructor or professional student service status of the employee when controlling for years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

Interaction of the variable means produced one instance of a significant F value difference at the .05 level. The three-way interaction among the variables of gender, demographic setting, and professional position produced means of limited difference when assembled and compared according to the position of their subgrouping. However, the interaction between gender and professional status did bring attention to their interrelationship.
Gender and professional position generated one significant F value difference at the .01 level and six significant F value differences at the .05 level. Analysis of the interaction of the two variables indicated a noticeable difference between the mean responses of the female faculty and female professional student service staff. This analysis further supports the interpretation of results for the third null hypothesis that female professional student service staff perceive affirmative action to be less effective in promoting gender equity.

Due to the single occurrence of a significant three-way interaction difference, the fourth null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Nevertheless, the number of significant F value differences provides the basis for one to believe that there is an influential variable combination that may affect survey responses to statements of affirmative action perception.

The Research Question asked under what variable conditions would female and male employees hold similar perceptions towards affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college when considering the instructor or professional student service status of the employee, urban or rural setting of the community college, years of professional experience in the community college setting, and years of formal education.

The response to the research question is based on the data reviewed for the four null hypotheses. It was reported that similar perceptions are held by groups of respondents according to the comparison of gender. This is also the case for professional status, even though female professional staff responses influenced lower mean scores between faculty and professional student service staff. Similar perceptions according to
gender and professional position are particularly emphasized when taking into account the findings of the bivariate relationships and the ANOVA with covariance statistical procedure. Through these methods of statistical analysis, the group mean differences in relation to the 20 statements of perception produced insufficient numbers of significant F value differences. As for years of professional experience and years of formal education, the effect of these variables also proved to be insignificant. This belief is attributed to the findings of the correlational matrix and the single occurrence of a significant F value difference as presented in the ANOVA with covariance.

When evaluating the influence of the demographic variable, an alternative viewpoint surfaces. This occurs when assessing the margin of mean differences, as presented in the bivariate relationship and the ANOVA with covariance statistical analysis. It would appear that the demographic setting of the community college influences the perception of the respondent, regardless of the gender. Therefore, the perception of females employed in rural settings would have conflicting ratings of institutional policies and practices toward affirmative action when compared to males employed in the urban setting.

Conclusions based on the findings of this study indicate that the perception of affirmative action policies and practices within Iowa's community colleges, as rated by community college professionals who are currently employed, does not differ according to gender or professional position. This assessment remains constant when factoring into account the variables of years of community college employment and years of formal education.
When taking into consideration the demographic setting of the survey respondent, there is an observed difference in the perception of affirmative action activity within community colleges based on urban and rural setting. The perceptions of urban respondents have higher levels of affirmative action activity than those of rural respondents. This observation is maintained regardless of the years of community college employment and years of formal education.

By assessing the interaction of the variable subgroups, it is determined that association with specific subgroupings does not cause a significant difference of perception. However, there are indications that the two-way interaction of gender and professional position may influence female professional student service staff to have contrasting perceptions with other respondents.

Female and male employees will hold similar perceptions towards affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college. This remains constant even when considering professional status, years of professional experience in a community college, and years of formal education. The perception of female respondents would contrast noticeably with the perception of male respondents if you take into consideration the demographic setting of the respondent. Rural female respondents would have lower perceptions of institutional affirmative action activity when compared to male urban respondents.

Through the collection of data, significant differences of perception prevailed according to the demographic setting of the respondent, but did not occur according to gender and professional position. Despite this conclusion, it was determined that there appears to be general agreement
related to the 20 statements of perception that the surveyed community colleges were perceived to be in compliance with Chapter 19B, Subsection 11 of the Iowa Code. This finding may not be a surprise for it is quite possible that respondents wanted to present their institutions under favorable circumstances and/or respondents turned to institutional policy manuals rather than to their perceptions when recording their ratings on the survey instrument.

Affirmative action in educational employment is a responsibility that must be assumed by the State of Iowa, the DE, and individual community colleges. There is evidence that this responsibility is being actively pursued by these parties. Nevertheless, the documented perceptions of the community college professionals indicate inconsistencies in awareness and knowledge of community college policies and practices. It is also evident that additional actions need to be incorporated to further promote the concept of affirmative action. This statement is based on Iowa community college employment statistics, the perceptions of female professional student service staff, and the rural perceptions of professional employees. All 15 of Iowa's community colleges can meet the expectations placed on them with continued development of appropriate procedures and resources.

Conclusions Based on Findings

As a result of this study, a number of conclusions were drawn. These conclusions are related to Iowa's community colleges. They are as follows.
1. Analysis of survey responses indicate that the surveyed community colleges appear to be in compliance with the Code of Iowa.

2. Responses of the survey participants indicate that there were no statistical differences of perception according to gender of the respondent.

3. Survey responses indicate that there are no statistical differences of perception according to the professional position of the respondent. However, the influence of lower female professional student service mean scores represents possible dissatisfaction with the affirmative action policies and procedures of community colleges in achieving sex equity among professional positions within the community college.

4. Respondent ratings reveal that there are statistical differences of perception according to the demographic setting of the survey participant.

5. There appears to be no relationship between years of professional community college experience and the perception of the respondents based on their gender, demographic setting, and professional position.

6. There appears to be no relationship between years of formal education and the perception of the respondents based on their gender, demographic setting, and professional position.

7. Female and male employees hold similar perceptions toward affirmative action policies and procedures of their community college, even when considering years of professional experience in a community college and years of formal education. To a lesser extent, this remains constant when considering professional status. In contrast with this assertion, the perceptions of female respondents may differ with the perception of male respondents if you take into consideration the demographic setting of the respondent.

8. Although it is recognized that institutions are complying with Code of Iowa regulations, conclusive data is not available which supports the contention that affirmative action is positively influencing gender equity within community colleges.

Recommendations to Policymakers

This section of the research study is devoted to offering recommendations to policymakers with the intention of enhancing the role
of affirmative action within Iowa's community colleges. The recommendations follow.

1. The Code of Iowa Subsection (19B.11) that relates to organizational affirmative action practices, should be maintained. This is in response to the imbalanced numbers of male faculty members over female faculty members. To achieve balanced representation, affirmative action measures should be applied to promote equal employment opportunity. This would be accomplished through the adoption of rules that specify actions that community colleges must take; requesting the submission of reports which document the efforts of community colleges in achieving sex equity; and the compilation of annual reports by the DE for distribution to appropriate state entities.

2. State legislative emphasis should continue to be directed towards affirmative action in order to improve gender equity. This would involve the annual examination and evaluation of annual reports and documents that are assembled by the DE and various community colleges. As a result of the annual evaluations, the legislature can make necessary recommendations.

3. The Iowa Department of Education should expand its role of facilitating a diverse educational workforce through its policies and utilization of its resources. Facilitating a diverse educational workforce can take the manner of onsite audits and reviews, carrying out institutional in-services, recommending speakers and organizations that can enhance and promote sensitivity towards affirmative action and gender equity.

4. Community colleges should expand their internal methods of affirmative action dissemination and provide conceptual justification for the various affirmative action policies and procedures. This expansion can take the shape of regularly scheduled general information sessions for all employees and interested public members that cover relevant topics associated with affirmative action and sex equity. In addition, an appointed affirmative action/equal employment opportunity committee should serve as a monitoring and recommendation body on behalf of the institution. This would assist the institution in maintaining proper focus on the needs of affirmative action.

5. Community colleges should take action to educate and sensitize their boards of directors, administrators, and hiring personnel concerning issues related to affirmative action and to promote awareness as to why it is necessary to achieve a gender
balanced workplace. This would include the employment of external facilitators or the training of internal personnel by outside organizations.

6. Community colleges should establish procedures and practices that would identify and recruit qualified females. Examples of this recommendation would involve the establishment of communications with four year higher education institutions as to the availability of appropriately trained professionals available for employment, and determining population centers which would contain professionally experienced females. Recruitment of qualified females could then be focused upon those resource pools.

7. Community colleges should establish procedures that promote mentoring relationships between inexperienced female professionals and experienced professional employees. These relationships would be established as female professionals begin their phase of employment. Not only would this help female professional development, but it would allow women to become institutionally entrenched and would encourage institutional acceptance.

Recommendations for Further Study Based on This Research

This research document has focused attention on a dominant social issue that affects all segments of our society, including education. As our culture continues to diversify, the importance of this social issue will increase. Therefore, recommendations for future study are provided. They include:

1. Duplicate the study presented and include all of Iowa's community colleges. Future results could be compared and analyzed with the results of this study in order to determine if perceived institutional advances in the promotion of affirmative action have been made.

2. Although it appears that community colleges are carrying out state-mandated affirmative action policies and procedures, it can be interpreted that females, particularly rural females, question the degree of institutional commitment due to a lack of significant results in achieving a gender balanced workforce. Future studies should be conducted to determine the degree of commitment that community colleges have toward the role of affirmative action and sex equity.
3. Community college personnel should be surveyed in order to
gauge their perception of whether current affirmative action
activities were meeting institutional responsibilities.

4. A research project that reflects the format of this study
should be carried out in other states that would have differing
cultural, ethnic, and demographic characteristics. Results
could be compared and analyzed with the results of this study.
Through the comparison of results, further justification may be
provided that the state of Iowa, the Iowa Department of
Education, and Iowa community colleges should place increased
emphasis on achieving positive outcomes through affirmative
action measures.

In conclusion, this study has many implications that affect the state
of Iowa, the Iowa Department of Education, Iowa community colleges, and
professional employees of Iowa community colleges. Affirmative action and
sex equity are not issues that are solely reserved for the field of higher
education. If the state of Iowa sincerely wishes for advances to be made
in this social arena, efforts should be made to extend this concept of
importance to all branches of business and government. In turn, the lives
of all Iowans would be enriched because of increased attention and
acceptance of cultural diversity. With increased emphasis towards
affirmative action in all phases of our society, successful results can be
more easily accomplished in specific domains of our society (e.g.,
education).

As a regulatory and coordinating body, it is necessary for the Iowa
Department of Education to promote a sense of commitment on the part of
Iowa community colleges to achieve sex equity through affirmative action.
This belief stems from the interpretation that community colleges are
complying with state-mandated legislation, but are not achieving
noteworthy results. By not achieving noteworthy results, the commitment
of community colleges is called into question.
Iowa community colleges must seize upon their opportunity to be at the forefront of societal advancement. Community colleges pride themselves on contributing to the overall quality of life for significant numbers of Iowans. By promoting gender equity through affirmative action in the workplace, community colleges have a prime opportunity to further their importance in Iowa society. Subsequently, it is necessary for the promotion of gender equity to begin within the community colleges, therefore providing a foundation of role modeling for its students.

Finally, it is important for individual community college professionals to involve themselves in the establishment and implementation of policies and procedures within their institutions. To achieve broadbased sex equity in our society, it necessitates the individual involvement of all concerned parties. To achieve success you must start on the ground floor.
A wage gap...still. (1972). NEA Today, 10, 2.


Affirmative action plans: Recommended procedures for increasing the number of minority persons and women on college and university faculties. (1982). Academe, 68, 15A-20A.
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APPENDIX A. GENDER COMPARISON FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY
Table A. Gender comparison of full-time faculty salary and percent of tenure, 1987-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary of full-time faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All institutions surveyed</td>
<td>$38,295</td>
<td>$30,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All two-year institutions surveyed</td>
<td>$32,007</td>
<td>$28,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of full-time faculty with tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All institutions surveyed</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All two-year institutions surveyed</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B. GENDER COMPARISON OF EMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor &amp; O</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C. STATE OF IOWA CODE, CHAPTER 19B
CHAPTER 19B

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

19B.1 Definitions.

As used in this chapter unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Affirmative action" means action appropriate to overcome the effects of past or present practices, policies, or other barriers to equal employment opportunity.

2. "State agency" means an office, bureau, division, department, board, or commission in the executive branch of state government.

86 Acts, ch 1245, §220

19B.2 Equal opportunity in state employment — affirmative action.

It is the policy of this state to provide equal opportunity in state employment to all persons. An individual shall not be denied equal access to state employment opportunities because of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or physical or mental disability. It also is the policy of this state to apply affirmative action measures to correct deficiencies in the state employment system where those remedies are appropriate. This policy shall be construed broadly to effectuate its purposes.

It is the policy of this state to permit special appointments by bypassing the usual testing procedures for any applicant for whom the division of vocational rehabilitation of the department of education or the department for the blind has certified the applicant's disability and competence to perform the job. The department of personnel, in cooperation with the department for the blind and the division of vocational rehabilitation, shall develop appropriate certification procedures. This paragraph should not be interpreted to bar promotional opportunities for blind and physically or mentally disabled persons. If this paragraph conflicts with any other provisions of this chapter, the provisions of this paragraph govern.

86 Acts, ch 1245, §221

19B.3 Administrative responsibilities of department of personnel and board of regents.

1. The department of personnel is responsible for the administration and promotion of equal opportunity and affirmative action efforts in the recruitment, appointment, assignment, and advancement of personnel by all state agencies except the state board of regents and the institutions under its jurisdiction. In carrying out this responsibility the department shall do all of the following with respect to state agencies other than the state board of regents and its institutions:

   a. Designate a position as the state affirmative action administrator.
   b. Propose affirmative action standards applicable to each state agency based on the population of the community in which the agency functions, the population served by the agency, or the persons that can be reasonably recruited.
   c. Gather data necessary to maintain an ongoing assessment of affirmative action efforts in state agencies.
   d. Monitor accomplishments with respect to affirmative action remedies identified in affirmative action plans of state agencies.
   e. Conduct studies of preemployment and postemployment processes in order to evaluate employment practices and develop improved methods of dealing with all employment issues related to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action.
f. Establish a state recruitment coordinating committee to assist in addressing affirmative action recruitment needs, with members appointed by the director of the department of personnel.

g. Address equal opportunity and affirmative action training needs of all state agencies by:
   (1) Providing appropriate training for managers and supervisors.
   (2) Insuring that all state agencies make training available for all staff members whose duties relate to personnel administration.
   (3) Investigating means for training in the area of career development.

h. Coordinate and develop equal employment opportunity reports, including the initiation of the processes necessary for the completion of the annual EEO-4 report required by the federal equal employment opportunity commission.

i. Address equal opportunity and affirmative action policies with respect to employee benefits and leaves of absence.

j. Adopt equal employment opportunity and affirmative action rules in accordance with chapter 17A.

19B.4 State agency affirmative action plans — programs.
1. Each state agency, including the state board of regents and its institutions, shall annually prepare an affirmative action plan. State agencies other than the state board of regents and its institutions shall submit their plans to the department of personnel. Institutions under the jurisdiction of the state board of regents shall submit their plans to that board. The plans shall be submitted between December 15 and December 31 each year. Each plan shall contain a clear and unambiguous written program containing goals and time specifications related to personnel administration.

2. Each state agency, including the state board of regents and its institutions, shall conduct programs of job orientation and provide organizational structure and training for upward mobility of employees. Emphasis shall be placed upon fair practices in employment.

19B.5 Annual reports.
1. The head of each state agency other than the state board of regents and its institutions is personally responsible for submitting an annual report of the affirmative action accomplishments of that agency to the department of personnel between December 15 and December 31 each year.

2. The department of personnel shall submit a report on the condition of affirmative action programs in state agencies covered by subsection 1 by January 31 of each year to the department of management.

3. The state board of regents shall submit an annual report of the affirmative action accomplishments of the board and its institutions by January 31 of each year to the department of management.

19B.6 Responsibilities of department of management — affirmative action.

The department of management shall oversee the implementation of sections 19B.1 through 19B.5 and shall work with the governor to ensure compliance with those sections, including the attainment of affirmative action goals and timetables, by all state agencies, including the state board of regents and its institutions.

19B.7 State contracts and services — state-assisted programs — responsibilities of department of management — regents.
1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, the department of management is responsible for the administration and promotion of equal opportunity in all state contracts and services and the
prohibition of discriminatory and unfair practices within any program receiving or benefiting from state financial assistance in whole or in part. In carrying out these responsibilities the department of management shall:

a. Establish for all state agencies a contract compliance policy, applicable to state contracts and services and to programs receiving or benefiting from state financial assistance, to assure:

1. The equitable provision of services within state programs.

2. The utilization of minority, women's, and disadvantaged business enterprises as sources of supplies, equipment, construction, and services.

3. Nondiscrimination in employment by state contractors and subcontractors.

d. Adopt administrative rules in accordance with chapter 17A to implement the contract compliance policy.

c. Monitor the actions of state agencies to ensure compliance.

d. Report results under the contract compliance policy to the governor and the general assembly on an annual basis. The report shall detail specific efforts to promote equal opportunity through state contracts and services and efforts to promote, develop, and stimulate the utilization of minority, women's, and disadvantaged business enterprises in programs receiving or benefiting from state financial assistance.

e. Do other acts necessary to carry out the contract compliance policy described in this section.

2. The state board of regents is responsible for administering the provisions of this section for the institutions under its jurisdiction.

Sanctions.
The department of management may impose appropriate sanctions on individual state agencies, including the state board of regents and its institutions, in order to ensure compliance with state programs emphasizing equal opportunity through affirmative action, contract compliance policies, and requirements for procurement set-asides for targeted small businesses.

Reserved.

School districts, area education agencies, and merged area schools — duties of director of department of education.

1. It is the policy of this state to provide equal opportunity in school district, area education agency, and merged area school employment to all persons. An individual shall not be denied equal access to school district, area education agency, or merged area school employment opportunities because of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or physical or mental disability. It also is the policy of this state to apply affirmative action measures to correct deficiencies in school district, area education agency, and merged area school employment systems where those remedies are appropriate. This policy shall be construed broadly to effectuate its purposes.

2. The director of the department of education shall actively promote fair employment practices for all school district, area education agency, and merged area school employees and the state board of education shall adopt rules requiring specific steps by school districts, area education agencies, and merged area schools to accomplish the goals of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in the recruitment, appointment, assignment, and advancement of personnel. Each school district, area education agency, and merged area school shall be required to develop affirmative action standards which are based on the population of the community in which it functions, the student population served, or the persons who can be reasonably recruited. The director of education shall consult with the department of personnel in the performance of duties under this section.

3. Each school district, area education agency, and merged area school in the state shall submit to the director of the department of education an annual report of the accomplishments and programs of the district, agency, or merged area school in carrying out its duties under this section. The report shall be submitted between December 15 and December 31 each year. The director shall prescribe the form and content of the report.

4. The director of the department of education shall prepare a compilation of the reports required by subsection 3 and shall submit this compilation, together with a report of the director's accomplishments and programs pursuant to this section, to the department of management by January 31 of each year.

Reserved.
APPENDIX D. IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONS
APPENDIX E. CHAPTER 95 ADMINISTRATIVE CODE -

SCHOOL RULES OF IOWA
Chapter 95 Administrative Code - School Rules of Iowa

Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Standards

281–95.1 (256) Purpose. It is the purpose of this chapter to implement Iowa Code section 19B.11 by requiring specific steps by school districts, area education agencies, and merged area schools to accomplish the goals of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in the recruitment, appointment, assignment and advancement of personnel.

281–95.2 (256) Definitions. The following definitions shall be applied to the rules in this chapter:

"Affirmative action" means action appropriate to overcome the effects of past or present practices, policies, or other barriers to equal employment opportunity.

"Agency" means a local school district, an area education agency or a merged area school.

"Availability" means the extent to which members of a racial/ethnic group, women, men or persons with disabilities are present within the relevant labor market.

"Director of Education" means the director of the Iowa Department of Education.

"Equal employment opportunity" means equal access to employment, training and advancement, or employment benefits regardless of race, creed, color, religion, sex, age, national origin and disability.

"Person with a disability" means any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities, has a record of such impairment or is regarded as having such an impairment, as defined by civil rights commission subrule 161-8.26(1).

"Racial/ethnic minority person" means any person who is African-American, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native.

"Relevant labor market" means the geographic area in which an agency can reasonably be expected to recruit for a particular job category.

"Metropolitan statistic area. A large population nucleus (50,000 +) and nearby communities which have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. Each area consists of one or more entire counties."

"Underrepresentation" means having fewer members of a racial/ethnic group, women, men or persons with disabilities in a particular job category than would be reasonably expected based on their availability in the relevant labor market.
"Workforce" means an agency's full-time and part-time employees.

281-95.3 (256) Equal employment opportunity standards. Employment policies and practices shall provide equal employment opportunity to all persons. No person shall be denied equal access to agency employment opportunities because of his or her race, creed, color, religion, national origin, gender, age or disability.

281-95.3(1) (256) Affirmative action programs. A work force analysis shall be performed and affirmative measures will be developed and implemented for any major job categories in which a racial/ethnic group, women, men or persons with disabilities are underrepresented.

281-95.4 (256) Duties of boards of directors. Each board of directors shall adopt policy statements and develop plans for implementation of equal employment opportunity standards and affirmative action programs.

281-95.4(1) (256) Policy statements. Each board of directors shall adopt policy statements outlining its commitment to the principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. These policy statements shall prescribe procedures for employees and applicants for employment to redress complaints of discrimination.

281-95.4(2) (256) Written plans. Each board of directors shall prepare and implement written equal employment opportunity and affirmative action plans by July 1, 1990. The plans shall be evaluated and updated on a biennial basis.

281-95.4(3) (256) Assignment of responsibility. Each board of directors shall assign to an employee the responsibility for coordinating the development and ongoing implementation of the plans. This employee may be the same employee who has been assigned to coordinate the agency's efforts to comply with federal laws requiring non-discrimination in educational programs and employment.

281-95.4(4) (256) Input. Each board of directors shall obtain systematic input from diverse racial/ethnic groups, women, men and persons with disabilities into the development and implementation of the plans. School districts may use existing advisory committees or public hearing procedures developed to receive similar input regarding the development and implementation of multicultural, nonsexist education plans.

281-95.4(5) (256) Staff development. Each board of directors shall provide periodic training for all staff who hire or supervise personnel on the principles of equal employment opportunity and the implementation of its affirmative action plan.

281-95.4(6) (256) Record keeping. Each board of directors shall keep the necessary records to document its affirmative action progress. Employment data shall be reported to the department of education by racial/ethnic category, gender and disability. This report shall be part of the Department of Education's basic educational data collection system.
Plan components. In addition to the board policy statement, each equal employment opportunity and affirmative action plan shall include but not be limited to the following components:

Identification of coordinator. The name, job title, address and phone number of the employee responsible for coordinating the development and implementation of the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action plans.

Administrative statement. An administrative statement on how the agency's equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies and plans are to be implemented, including the internal system for auditing and reporting progress. The administrative statement shall be signed and dated by the chief executive officer of the agency.

Workforce analysis. A work force analysis that shall show the numerical and percentage breakdown of the agency's full-time and part-time employees within each major job category by racial/ethnic group, gender, and disability. Major job categories shall be consistent with the E.E.O. 5 and E.E.O. 6 occupational categories reported to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. For the purpose of confidentiality, disability data may be based on total agency figures, rather than those of major job categories.

Quantitative analysis. A quantitative analysis that shall compare work force analysis figures with the availability of qualified or qualifiable members of racial/ethnic groups, women, men and persons with disabilities within the relevant labor market.

Qualitative analysis. When underrepresentation is identified in one or more major job category, a qualitative analysis shall be implemented and included in the agency's affirmative action plan. The qualitative analysis is a review of employment policies and practices to determine if and where those policies and practices tend to exclude, disadvantage, restrict or result in adverse impact on the basis of racial/ethnic origin, gender, or disability. The analysis may include, but is not limited to the review of:

a. Recruitment practices and policies;

b. A demographic study of the applicant pool and flow;

c. The rate and composition of turnover in major job categories;

d. Trends in enrollment which will effect the size of the work force;

e. Application and application screening policies and practices;

f. Interview, selection, and placement policies and practices;

g. Transfer and promotion policies and practices;

h. Discipline, demotion, termination and reduction in force policies and practices;
i. Employee assistance, training selection and mentoring policies and practices;

j. The impact of the collective bargaining agreement on equal employment opportunity and the affirmative action process;

k. Law, policies or practices external to the agency that may hinder success in equal employment opportunity and affirmative action.

281-95.5(6) (256) Goals. Numerical goals and timetables for reduction of underrepresentation in each major job category where it has been identified shall be developed. These goals shall not be treated as rigid and inflexible quotas that must be met, but as reasonable aspirations toward correcting imbalance in the agency's workforce. The goal shall not cause any group of applicants to be excluded from the hiring process. When setting numerical goals agencies shall take into consideration the following:

   a. The numbers and percentages from the workforce analysis conducted pursuant to (95.5 (3));

   b. The number of short and long term projected vacancies in the job category, considering turnover, layoffs, lateral transfers, new job openings, and retirements;

   c. The availability of qualified or qualifiable persons from underrepresented racial/ethnic, gender and disability categories within the relevant labor market.

   d. The makeup of the student population served by racial/ethnic origin, gender and disability;

   e. The makeup of the population served by racial/ethnic origin, gender and disability;

   f. The makeup of the population of the metropolitan statistic area, when applicable, by racial/ethnic origin, gender, and disability;

281-95.5(7) (256) Absence of minority base. Agencies with no minority students enrolled or no minority employees shall develop goals and timetables for recruiting and hiring persons of minority racial/ethnic origin when those persons are available within the relevant labor market.

281-95.5(8) (256) Consolidation. An agency may consolidate racial/ethnic minorities and job categories into broader groupings in conducting its analysis under subrules 95.5(3), 95.5(4) and 95.5(6) when its size or number of employees makes more specific categories impractical.

281-95.5(6) (256) Qualitative goals. Qualitative goals, activities and timetables which specify the appropriate actions and time frames in which problem areas identified during the qualitative analysis are targeted and remedied. In setting qualitative goals and planning actions the agency may consider, but need not be limited to the following:
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a. Broadening or targeting recruitment efforts;

b. Evaluation and validating criteria and instruments used in selecting applicants for interviews, employment, and promotion;

c. Providing equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and intergroup relations training for employees of the agency;

d. Developing a system of accountability for implementing the agency's plan;

e. Developing and implementing an employee assistance and mentoring program;

f. Establishing a work climate which is sensitive to diverse racial/ethnic groups, both women and men and persons with disabilities;

g. Negotiating the revision of collective bargaining agreements to facilitate equal employment opportunity and affirmative action;

h. Considering a person's racial/ethnic origin, gender, or disability as a relevant factor when selecting applicants for interview, employment and promotion in job categories where underrepresentation exists.

281--95.6 (256) Dissemination. Each agency shall have an internal and external system for disseminating its equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies and plans.

281--95.6(1) (256) Plan distribution. The policies and plans shall be annually distributed to agency employees involved in the hiring or management of personnel and shall be made available to other agency employees, the public and the Director of Education upon request.

281--95.6(2) (256) Policy statement distribution. The policy statement shall be distributed to all applicants for employment and shall be disseminated annually to employees, students, parents and recruitment sources.

281--95.7 (256) Reports. Each education agency shall submit an annual progress report on equal employment opportunity and affirmative action to its local board of directors. An annual progress report shall be submitted to the Department of Education by December 31 of each year. The report shall be part of the basic educational data collection system administered by the Department of Education.

These rules are intended to implement Iowa Code section 19B.11.

DATE
APPENDIX F. SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND COVER LETTER
Dear Community College Employee:

As you may be aware, the topic of affirmative action/equal employment opportunity has received increased attention by the state of Iowa and the Iowa Department of Education (DOE). Subsequently, I have chosen this issue as a dissertation topic through my studies at Iowa State University College of Education.

Enclosed you will find a survey which relates to my dissertation research. This study is designed to identify the perceptions of higher education professionals within Iowa's community college system, and determine whether community colleges are following mandated affirmative action/equal employment opportunity within the gender classifications.

With the assistance of the DOE, the names of forty employees within your institution have been chosen as survey participants (twenty males and twenty females). Through your responses, and the responses of professionals from five other Iowa community colleges, the role of affirmative action/equal employment opportunity may be more adequately gauged.

I need your help in completing this study. Attached you will find a survey that questions your perceptions concerning the issue of affirmative action/equal employment opportunity within your institution of employment. In the next two weeks, please take thirty minutes and share your perceptions and beliefs by answering the questions of the enclosed survey. When completed, please return the survey in the attached envelop to the individual who forwarded it to you. The results of this study are scheduled to be compiled and compared within and among institutions by Fall of 1991.

Although individual responses to the survey include the use of identifying codes, this investigator will be the only individual having access to identifying code indicators and all individual information will be kept confidential. In addition, the code indicators will be destroyed by September 30, 1991. Should you respond accordingly to the survey and wish to withdraw your input, please notify me and your participation will be discontinued.

Please note that participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and is absent of any institutional expectation to comply with this request. However, it is anticipated that the results of this study will provide useful information in order for the DOE to enhance their consulting role in community college personnel management matters. If you so choose, the end results of the survey can be forwarded to you.
Your involvement in this concern is appreciated. Should you have questions or concerns, feel free to contact me by phone or in writing. My phone number is 515-295-3170 (weekends and evenings) and 712-852-3554 (weekdays). The mailing address is 424 North Jones Street, Algona, Iowa 50511.

Please remember that your responses to the questionnaire are based solely on your perceptions and familiarity with institutional policies, practices, and procedures. Please do not refer to an institutional policies handbook.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this survey.

Sincerely,

Carl R. Heilman
Doctorate of Philosophy Candidate

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel C. Robinson
Major Professor
Before completing this questionnaire, please note the following definitions:
1. Affirmative Action - appropriate action to overcome the effects of past or present practices, policies, or other barriers to equal employment opportunity.
2. Equal Employment Opportunity - equal access to employment, training and advancement, or employment benefits regardless of gender.
3. Workforce Analysis - indicates the numerical and percentage breakdown of the institution's full-time and part-time employees within each major job category by gender.
4. Qualitative Analysis - determines if and where such policies and practices tend to exclude, disadvantage, restrict, or result in adverse impact on the basis of gender.
5. Hiring Goals - reasonable aspirations toward correcting a possible imbalance in the institution workforce.

Check one/Fill in the blank

Age

Black___ Asian or Pacific Islander___ American Indian or Alaskan native___ Hispanic___ White, not of Hispanic origin___

Physically Handicapped___ yes ___ no

Male___ Female___

Highest degree attained: High School Diploma___ Bachelor of Arts___ Master of Arts___ Doctorate Degree___ Other (please specify)________________________

Years of community college employment experience: 0-5___ 6-10___ 11-15___ 16-20___ 21-25___ 26-30___ 31-35___ more than 35___

Please respond to the following statements/questions by circling whether you agree (a) or disagree (d) and the degree to which you feel your perception of the stated situation is true (1-not sure, 2-possibly sure, 3-sure, 4-very sure, and 5-positively sure)

1. Your college has an identified board policy statement that outlines the intentions of equal employment opportunity on behalf of the governing Board of Directors and the college.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D
2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

4. Your college performs a yearly workforce analysis of institutional job categories that are broken down by gender.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

6. A self-evaluative analysis that assesses the personnel employment policies and practices of your institution, as related to equal employment and affirmative action, is assembled each year.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D
8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

9. An affirmative action plan is made available to all employees who seek this information at your college.
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

10. All news releases and institutional documents and advertisements identify the institution as a "Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer" at your college.
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

12. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question eleven, should your institution have such a policy?
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

13. Your college holds staff development in-services that relay goals, policies, and procedures of equal opportunity employment.
A  1 2 3 4 5
D

14. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question thirteen, should your institution have such a policy?
A  1 2 3 4 5
D
15. Your college informally communicates to external organizations its willingness to accept and serve protected class individuals.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

16. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question fifteen, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

17. An affirmative action committee, comprised of college employees, is established at your institution in order to carry out and review the outcomes of equal opportunity and affirmative action elements.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

18. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question seventeen, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

19. An affirmative action committee meets on a regularly scheduled time basis during the calendar year at your college.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

20. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question nineteen, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

21. An affirmative action committee at your college is equally represented by employees of both genders at your institution.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D
22. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question twenty-one, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

23. When your college seeks job applicants for professional staff positions, your college must recruit from a specified geographic job range in order to attain the most qualified job applicant available.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

24. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question twenty-three, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

25. When filling vacant positions, your college compares the percentages of employee gender within the institution and those members who are present in the relevant geographic labor market.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

26. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question twenty-five, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

27. When job vacancy notices are posted, all professional staff members within your institution will have equal amount of days to forward intent of interest.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D
28. All professional staff candidates who are interested in seeking employment at your college are required to fill-out identical employment forms.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

29. All professional staff candidates who are interested in seeking employment at your college are required to fill-out institutional equal employment data information sheets.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

30. A job screening interview committee, that includes college employees of both genders, is established to review all position applications at your institution.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

31. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question thirty, should your institution carry out this practice?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

32. Job applicants who are selected for an interview at your college meet with an employment screening interview committee.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

33. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question thirty-three, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D
34. A job screening interview committee forwards the names of the top job applicants to the hiring office of your college.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

35. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question thirty-four, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

36. All job applicants who are not selected for a job position with your college are notified by the institution of the decision.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

37. The rationale for hiring job applicants is made available to college employees.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

38. All matters involving personnel advertisement, issuance of applications, establishment of job descriptions, response to inquiries, and acceptance of applications, is the responsibility of the hiring office of your college.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

39. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question thirty-eight, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5

D
40. In regard to selection, appointment, and placement decisions, your college pre-determines the necessary education and experience based on fairness, equitability, and realism.

1 2 3 4 5

41. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job descriptions, and necessary experience.

1 2 3 4 5

42. An internal review mechanism is in place to determine the comparable value of a job position.

1 2 3 4 5

43. An external review mechanism is in place to determine the comparable value of a job position.

1 2 3 4 5

44. There is a minimum of one yearly job review of each employee's effectiveness in performing job assignments at your college.

1 2 3 4 5

45. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question forty-four, should your institution have a policy that stipulates bi-yearly reviews of employee effectiveness in performing job assignments?

1 2 3 4 5
46. Yearly evaluations are used in assessing potential for transfer, promotion, and training for other positions within your institution.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

47. All professional staff members are notified and encouraged to seek job vacancies within your college, if they are qualified.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

48. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question forty-seven, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

49. All professional staff members are encouraged to expand their professional competence at your college.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

50. All professional staff members are asked to participate in college sponsored staff development activities at your institution.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

51. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question fifty, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5

D
52. Recommendations for demotion or termination are forwarded to a review committee at your college that is equally represented by the employees of both genders.

53. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question fifty-two, should your institution have such a policy?

54. A complaint procedure is in place for all college employees, other than what is stated in a master contract, who are affected by demotion or termination.

55. There is equality in employment areas such as pay, pay raises, fringe benefits, leave policies, educational activities, and use of college resources.

56. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.

57. There is a designated committee in charge of investigating claims of sexual harassment.

58. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question fifty-seven, should your institution have such a policy?
59. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

60. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information sheets that document gender percentages of those hired; gender percentages of current employees; reasons for demotions and terminations according to gender; and changes in job classification based on gender.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

61. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

62. Whether you agreed or disagreed with question sixty-one, should your institution have such a policy?

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

63. Your college has made significant gains in the employment of gender class citizens, due to institutional policies.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D

Please specify your interpretation of significant

64. Your college has the necessary policies and procedures in place to effectively promote affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.

A 1 2 3 4 5
D
65. Further state legislation would impede the effectiveness of your institution in increasing the numbers of protected class citizens.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

66. The governing board of directors of your institution genuinely advocate the concept of affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

67. Institutional administrators at your college genuinely promote the various policies and procedures related to affirmative action/equal opportunity employment.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

68. The majority of non-administrative male employees at your college feel professionally threatened due to affirmative action/equal employment opportunity policies and procedures.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

69. The governing board of directors at your institution have adopted the necessary guidelines in order to promote affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D

70. The governing board of directors at your institution have adopted policy guidelines that exceed the minimum state laws that mandate affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.

A 1 2 3 4 5

D
71. Please share any thoughts that you believe are relevant to the topics addressed in this questionnaire.
APPENDIX G. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL AND DE LETTER
November 26, 1990

Carl R. Heilman
Iowa Lakes Community
3200 College Drive
Emmetsburg, Iowa 50536

Dear Carl,

I have enjoyed the opportunities I have had to discuss your proposed study related to affirmative action in Iowa's Community Colleges. As I understand it your study would involve a survey of community college employees to determine their perceptions toward affirmative action and the degree of its implementation in community colleges.

I think that your study may provide useful information and could be valuable to the Department of Education as we continue to implement affirmative action programs in Iowa schools and community colleges. The perceptions of educational employees toward affirmative action is a factor in the success or failure of affirmative action plans and a greater awareness of those perceptions may have implications for implementation strategies.

I wish you success with your study and I would be quite interested in reviewing the results with you in the not so distant future.

Cordially,

Thomas A. Andersen, Ed. D.
School Administration and Accreditation
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. **X** Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly: See Attachment III
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. □ Consent form (if applicable) N/A

14. **X** Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. **X** Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

   First Contact
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-31-91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Last Contact
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-30-91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

   9-30-91
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Day / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-30-91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Departmental Executive Officer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Elliott</td>
<td>12/7/91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approved</th>
<th>Project Not Approved</th>
<th>No Action Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee Chairperson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia M. Keith</td>
<td>12/20/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Committee Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM Keith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H. CORRELATIONAL MATRIX TABLE
Table H. Correlations among 20 statements and with years of employment and formal education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your college has an identified board policy statement that outlines the intentions of equal employment opportunity on behalf of the governing board of directors and the college.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within your institution, there is an identified employee who is responsible for coordinating and monitoring affirmative action policy.</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is an administrative directive at your college that details the implementation of agency policies and plans, and the methods of auditing and reporting equal employment opportunity progress.</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your college performs a yearly workforce analysis of institutional job categories that are broken down by gender.</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A numerical analysis comparing the workforce and the availability of qualified individuals in the labor market, according to gender, is filled out each year by your college.</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A self-evaluative analysis that assesses the personnel employment policies and practices of your institution, as related to equal employment and affirmative action, is assembled each year.</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your college establishes goals that identify timelines for hiring members of class gender in underrepresented job categories.</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant correlation at the .05 level.

**Significant correlation at the .01 level.
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Your college establishes hiring goals that provide a timeline for correcting employment weaknesses that impede achievement of equal employment and affirmative action.</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An affirmative action plan is made available to all employees who seek this information at your college.</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All news releases and institutional documents and advertisements identify the institution as a &quot;Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer&quot; at your college.</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Copies of affirmative action policy statements are maintained on staff bulletin boards, employee lounges, and in administrative offices at your college.</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Your college holds staff development in-services that relay goals, policies, and procedures of equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Your college formally communicates to external organizations its willingness to accept and serve protected class individuals.</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A procedural method for investigating charges of sexual harassment is available.</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guidelines are in place that outline the procedures employees are entitled to take when wishing to resolve unfair discrimination claims.</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 1.00

.** .35** 1.00

.** .26** .59** 1.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The institution compiles annual equal employment data information sheets that document gender percentages of those hired, gender percentages of current employees, reasons for demotions and terminations according to gender, and changes in job classification based on gender.</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Annual equal employment data information reports are circulated to all institutional departments.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Your college has the necessary policies and procedures in place to effectively promote affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The governing board of directors at your institution has adopted policy guidelines that exceed the minimum state laws that mandate affirmative action/equal employment opportunity.</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees of your college who are responsible for the implementation of affirmative action policies, carry out a yearly systematic assessment and review of job qualifications, job descriptions, and necessary experience.</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>