

Fall 2019 Snapshot Survey Report

Prepared by: WCC Snapshot Sub-Committee, Dr. Julian Smit – Chair

Survey conducted by the Work Climate Committee

College of Southern Nevada

For more information, contact the Work Climate Committee at wcc@csn.edu.

Executive Summary

Overview

The Work Climate Committee (WCC) uses two surveys to assess workplace climate at the College of Southern Nevada (CSN).

The Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey is administered by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) on a three-year cycle. The in-house Snapshot survey is administered more frequently through CSN's Office of Institutional Research. The Snapshot follows up on topics addressed in PACE and examines other workplace-climate issues that may emerge.

The Snapshot is shorter than PACE and can be customized for different topics. It includes both multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions. The results provide a picture of workplace climate among CSN employees who responded at the time of the survey.

The Snapshot is not intended to replace the PACE survey. The two surveys are intended to be used together to assess, evaluate, and report on workplace climate at CSN.

Detailed results for individual questions, themes, or demographic groups are available from the WCC. Previous reports and additional information are available on the WCC website.

Survey Themes

The WCC developed four themes for this Snapshot survey. Three themes are used regularly so results can be compared over time:

Theme	Description
Campus Issues	Questions about major decisions, communication, and employee input.
Campus Safety	Questions about employees' perceptions of safety at CSN.
Diversity	Questions about fairness, inclusion, and diversity at CSN.
Internal Recognition	A special focus on recognition processes, award preferences, and related issues.

The Internal Recognition theme was selected because it had appeared in a previous Snapshot survey and was considered timely for follow-up.

Data Collection

Survey Administration

The Snapshot Survey contained 40 items and was administered online through Qualtrics during the Spring 2020 semester. The survey was administered by CSN's Office of Institutional Research.

CSN employees were invited by official CSN email to participate anonymously. Invitations were sent February 10, 2020, and responses were collected through March 6, 2020. Each employee received a one-time-use link to access the survey. The CSN President also encouraged employees to participate.

After the survey closed, the Office of Institutional Research compiled the responses and provided anonymous data to the WCC for analysis.

Some demographic questions were incorrectly configured. Respondents were required to select only one characteristic across several demographic categories, including sex and race. As a result, the WCC could not reliably break down these survey results by demographic category.

Participants

A total of 703 employees participated. Not every participant answered every question, so the response rate varies by item.

The results represent the employees who responded to the survey, not the entire CSN workforce. Participant characteristics may not match the characteristics of the full workforce. Likewise, the opinions reported here may not represent the views of all CSN employees.

Participant Profile

Primary job at CSN	Percent	Item response rate
Academic Affairs	52.4%	86.9%
Student Affairs	15.9%	86.9%
Executive	14.7%	86.9%
Workforce & Economic Development	5.7%	86.9%
Finance	5.4%	86.9%
Henderson/Facilities	3.3%	86.9%
Other	2.6%	86.9%

Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Executive employees make up more than three-quarters of participants.

Primary CSN personnel classification	Percent	Item response rate
Full-time Academic Faculty	37.8%	91.2%
Administrative Faculty/Professional Staff	25.1%	91.2%
Classified Staff	18.1%	91.2%
Part-time Academic Faculty	12.6%	91.2%
Wage/Hourly Worker	2.5%	91.2%

Primary CSN personnel classification	Percent	Item response rate
Letter of Appointment	1.4%	91.2%
Other	1.4%	91.2%
Student Worker	1.1%	91.2%

Full-time and part-time academic faculty together make up slightly more than half of participants. Administrative Faculty/Professional Staff make up about one-quarter.

Primary campus	Percent	Item response rate
West Charleston	45.1%	90.8%
North Las Vegas	30.3%	90.8%
Henderson	12.1%	90.8%
Other Sites and Centers	9.7%	90.8%
Online	2.8%	90.8%

West Charleston has the largest share of participants. West Charleston and North Las Vegas together account for about three-quarters of participants.

Employment category	Percent	Item response rate
Full-time	81.5%	90.8%
Part-time	18.5%	90.8%

Most participants are full-time employees.

Length of employment at CSN	Percent	Item response rate
0–5 years	36.7%	90.8%
6–10 years	19.7%	90.8%
11–15 years	15.8%	90.8%
16–20 years	15.5%	90.8%
More than 20 years	12.2%	90.8%

About one-third of participants have worked at CSN for five years or less. About 44% have worked at CSN for more than 10 years.

Participant age group	Percent	Item response rate
Over 60	6.1%	68.7%
60s	20.8%	68.7%
50s	25.3%	68.7%
40s	25.3%	68.7%
30s	16.7%	68.7%
20s	5.2%	68.7%
Teens	0.6%	68.7%

This question had one of the lowest response rates; 31.2% of participants left it blank. Among respondents, fewer than one-quarter are under age 40, and more than half are over age 50. About half are in their 40s or 50s.

Time likely to be on campus	Percent
6:00 AM–9:00 AM	45.1%
9:00 AM–Noon	71.3%
Noon–3:00 PM	66.6%
3:00 PM–6:00 PM	54.5%
6:00 PM–8:00 PM	21.6%
After 8:00 PM	6.7%

Participants could select more than one time period. More than two-thirds are likely to be on campus between 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM. More than half are likely to be on campus between 3:00 PM and 6:00 PM, and 45.1% are likely to be on campus before 9:00 AM.

Campus Issues

This section reports employee perceptions about major decisions, communication, and opportunities to provide input about work conditions and the work environment.

I am included in major decisions regarding the conditions of my work climate at CSN.

Response	Percent
Agree	11.8%
Somewhat Agree	26.6%
Somewhat Disagree	26.0%
Disagree	35.5%

Item response rate: 98.4.

My input is sought regarding major decisions at CSN that directly affect my work environment.

Response	Percent
Agree	11.7%
Somewhat Agree	23.0%
Somewhat Disagree	25.0%
Disagree	40.2%

Item response rate: 98.3.

My input is included regarding major decisions at CSN that affect my work environment.

Response	Percent
Agree	10.5%
Somewhat Agree	22.4%
Somewhat Disagree	28.5%
Disagree	38.7%

Item response rate: 97.9.

Major changes at CSN are communicated to me in a timely fashion.

Response	Percent
Agree	18.6%
Somewhat Agree	33.3%
Somewhat Disagree	22.3%
Disagree	25.8%

Item response rate: 98.2.

CSN Executive Team members are accessible to me if I need them.

Response	Percent
Agree	22.8%
Somewhat Agree	35.9%
Somewhat Disagree	20.3%
Disagree	21.0%

Item response rate: 97.4.

Campus Safety

Most respondents report feeling safe at CSN. Perceptions differ between daytime and nighttime, but a majority report feeling very safe or generally safe at both times. About 20% report feeling unsafe or sometimes unsafe in parking lots or on campus walkways at night.

More than three-quarters of respondents believe employee safety is a high priority at CSN. About 15% do not agree that employee safety is a high priority.

Safety of Employees as a Priority

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	
Agree	
Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	

The source report states that the vast majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that employee safety is a high priority, while 15% do not. The individual percentages are not provided in the source text available for this report.

Likelihood of Being a Crime Victim

Response	Interpretation from source report
Not at all likely / Not very likely	Almost 80% of respondents selected one of these responses.
Somewhat likely / Very likely	About 20% of respondents selected one of these responses.

The source report states that almost 80% of respondents do not believe they are likely to be the victim of a crime at CSN during the next 12 months, while about 20% believe it is somewhat or very likely.

Use of Emergency Phones

Response	Percent	Item response rate
Yes	5.9%	96.3%
No	94.1%	96.3%

Most respondents had not used a red emergency phone in a classroom or a blue emergency box outside.

Perceived Reliability of Emergency Phones

Response	Percent	Item response rate
Always Reliable	31.9%	97.2%
Sometimes Reliable	31.8%	97.2%
Never Reliable	1.8%	97.2%
I'm Not Sure	34.5%	97.2%

Diversity

CSN is working to promote relationships, enhance understanding, and open channels of communication between individuals from different backgrounds, identities, and cultures.

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	28.3%
Agree	49.7%
Disagree	12.9%
Strongly Disagree	9.2%

Item response rate: 88.5.

CSN recognizes the contributions of all employees who excel at their jobs, regardless of their backgrounds and identities.

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	21.2%
Agree	39.5%
Disagree	20.4%
Strongly Disagree	18.8%

Item response rate: 89.5.

Personal characteristics do not influence performance decisions at CSN.

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	16.4%

Response	Percent
Agree	32.6%
Disagree	27.6%
Strongly Disagree	23.4%

Item response rate: 80.8.

Personal characteristics do not influence pay decisions at CSN.

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	19.9%
Agree	37.2%
Disagree	23.6%
Strongly Disagree	19.3%

Item response rate: 78.8.

Perceived Fairness for Employees at CSN

Characteristic	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response rate
Gender	25.3%	57.1%	12.5%	5.2%	82.2%
Age	25.7%	57.4%	12.1%	4.8%	79.8%
National Origin	28.1%	54.9%	10.9%	6.2%	78.5%
Sexual Orientation	31.0%	58.6%	7.0%	3.4%	75.2%
Disability	28.3%	58.2%	9.2%	4.2%	73.8%
Religion	31.7%	58.5%	5.9%	3.9%	65.4%
Gender Identity or Expression	30.6%	58.1%	8.2%	3.0%	70.7%
Veteran Status	32.8%	58.4%	5.7%	3.2%	67.3%

Perceived Fairness for the Respondent

Characteristic	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response rate
Gender	32.6%	50.7%	11.4%	5.3%	83.4%
Age	31.9%	52.4%	9.1%	6.7%	81.2%
National Origin	35.5%	49.8%	9.0%	5.7%	77.4%
Sexual Orientation	38.0%	56.3%	2.7%	3.1%	74.5%
Disability	38.2%	54.2%	3.8%	3.8%	63.7%
Religion	37.3%	54.1%	4.0%	4.7%	64.2%
Gender Identity or Expression	39.6%	54.5%	3.2%	2.7%	67.6%
Veteran Status	38.7%	53.2%	4.3%	3.8%	55.9%

Reporting Lack of Respect

Response	Percent	Item response rate
----------	---------	--------------------

Response	Percent	Item response rate
Yes	36.7%	32.1%
No	63.3%	32.1%

Among the small group who answered this question, 36.7% said they reported or made the College aware of a situation in which they were not treated with respect.

Diversity Interventions

Respondents ranked possible diversity interventions. A lower mean indicates that respondents valued the intervention more highly.

Diversity intervention	Mean
Develop initiatives that promote persistence, retention, and graduation of diverse students	2.64
Hire and retain faculty and staff who reflect the population we serve	2.84
Recruit faculty and staff who reflect the population we serve	2.88
Recruit students from diverse backgrounds	3.49
Offer cultural sensitivity opportunities that encourage better interactions with people from diverse backgrounds	4.32
Offer programs and events that celebrate culture and diversity	4.84

Item response rate: 77.7%.

Internal Recognition

Internal Recognition was the special-focus theme for this Snapshot. Questions addressed awareness of the Internal Recognition Committee, how employees learn about it, perceived impact, preferred forms of recognition, and participation in the nomination process.

Awareness of the Internal Recognition Committee

Response	Percent
To a great extent	21.4%
Somewhat	35.7%
Very little	24.4%
Not at all	18.5%

Item response rate: 93.7.

How Respondents Learned About the Committee

Source	Percent
Email	37.7%
Word-of-mouth	12.9%
Other means	6.8%

Source	Percent
CAPE session	5.5%
Flyer	3.6%
Committee's website	2.0%

Respondents could select all that apply. The results show the percentage who reported each source; they do not identify a single primary source. Item response rate: undetermined.

Has the Internal Recognition Committee made positive strides in acknowledging CSN employees' contributions?

Response	Percent
Yes	18.9%
Somewhat	29.1%
No	12.8%
I'm not sure	39.3%

Item response rate: 93.7.

Preferred Forms of Recognition

Recognition method	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Response rate
Awards luncheon	30.8%	40.7%	20.1%	8.4%	91.5%
Monetary award	69.2%	22.7%	4.2%	3.9%	92.0%
Physical award (trophy or plaque)	29.8%	40.7%	20.1%	9.4%	92.2%
Publication in a CSN newsletter or website	39.3%	41.0%	14.3%	5.4%	92.3%
Reserved parking place	32.8%	27.9%	23.4%	15.9%	91.9%
Department-level recognition	52.3%	35.3%	7.6%	4.8%	91.9%
CSN swag	23.0%	33.6%	25.7%	17.7%	90.9%
Time off	46.4%	23.1%	16.3%	14.2%	91.9%
Other methods	25.9%	15.7%	2.8%	55.6%	15.4%

Participation in the Nomination Process

Response	Percent	Item response rate
Yes	40.2%	93.2%
No	52.8%	93.2%

The source report does not provide a percentage for the remaining respondents.

Awards for Which Respondents Have Nominated Someone

Award	Percent
Classified Employee of the Month	22.6%
An Excellence Award	18.5%
A Distinguished Award	11.5%
Administrative Faculty of the Month	9.2%
Regents' Award	6.7%
Another award	1.8%

Respondents could select all that apply. The source report describes these as percentages of respondents selecting each option; it does not identify a single primary award.

Reasons for Not Nominating Someone

Reason	Percent
I did not know I could	11.5%
Some other reason	10.2%
I didn't know how to	9.8%
I'm too busy to nominate someone	8.8%
There is too much time/work involved in nominating someone	7.7%
I don't trust the process or the selection committee	6.0%
I don't know about award deadlines	5.1%
I don't want someone to lose because my nomination is not good enough	2.3%

Respondents could select all that apply. The results show reasons selected by respondents; they do not identify a single primary reason.

Do you think the process for selecting award recipients is equitably applied?

Response	Percent
Yes	22.3%
No	21.4%
I'm not sure	56.3%

Item response rate: 93.2.

Interactions in the Work Environment

Respondents rated their interactions with several groups and offices at CSN.

Group	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Response rate
Facilities Management	42.1%	36.4%	15.7%	5.8%	85.9%
Office of Technology Services (OTS)	40.8%	39.8%	13.2%	6.2%	89.6%
Human Resources	32.1%	38.0%	17.7%	12.2%	86.1%

Group	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Response rate
Police/Security Personnel	49.0%	39.2%	9.3%	2.5%	85.6%
People in my School/Department	46.1%	33.6%	14.6%	5.7%	89.8%
My Supervisor	56.3%	24.8%	9.0%	10.0%	88.5%
People I Supervise	52.7%	40.0%	5.8%	1.5%	56.2%
Mid-Management (director, AVP, dean)	33.7%	32.5%	18.9%	14.9%	82.2%
Executive Leadership (VPs and above)	23.1%	28.8%	24.6%	23.5%	75.1%

Overall experience as an employee at CSN

Response	Percent
Excellent	27.3%
Good	45.2%
Fair	18.1%
Poor	9.4%

Item response rate: 90.6.

Communication and Department Meetings

How Employees Receive Department Information

Method	Percent
CSN email	52.8%
Department meetings	27.1%
Manager, chair, or department head	13.2%
Informal word-of-mouth	3.9%
Some other means	1.5%
Internal communication tool	0.8%
CAPE session	0.5%
Social media	0.3%

Item response rate: 91.9%.

How Employees Receive Information That Directly Affects Them or Their Department

Method	Percent
CSN email	49.2%
Directly from supervisor	41.6%
Informal word-of-mouth	6.5%
Internal communication tool	1.4%
Some other means	1.2%

Item response rate: 91.9%.

Department Meetings

Response	Percent	Item response rate
Yes	78.1%	90.9%
No	21.9%	90.9%

Most respondents reported that their department holds regular department meetings.

Topics Discussed at Department Meetings

Topic	Percent
Policy and procedural changes	74.1%
Sharing information about things each other has learned or experienced	56.2%
Training needs	47.7%
“Students First”	46.8%
Addressing service needs	46.5%
Professional development	38.1%
Paths to advancement	16.2%
Other topics	9.4%

Item response rate: undetermined. Respondents could select all that apply. The percentages indicate how often each topic was selected among respondents who reported having department meetings.

Accessibility Notes for the Published Report

This version replaces the original charts with structured text and tables. This is intentional: the survey findings remain available to readers who use screen readers or other assistive technology without requiring information to be interpreted from a graphic.

The document uses Word heading styles for section headings and table header rows for data tables. When exporting to PDF, use an accessibility-preserving PDF export option and then run the PDF through CSN’s required accessibility checker.

Before publishing, verify that the exported PDF has a logical tag structure, correct reading order, accessible tables with header cells, meaningful document language, and no untagged decorative or informational objects.