

Fall 2019 Snapshot Survey Report

Work Climate Committee

Accessible plain-language version

Survey conducted by the Work Climate Committee

Prepared by the WCC Snapshot Sub-Committee

Dr. Julian Smit, Chair

Note: The source report is titled “Fall 2019 Snapshot Survey Report,” while its methodology states that the survey was administered during Spring 2020, with responses collected February 10 through March 6, 2020. The source title is preserved here rather than silently changing it.

Contents

- Executive Summary
- 1. Overview
- 2. Themes and Survey Topics
- 3. Data Collection
- 4. Participants
- 5. Campus Presence
- 6. Major Decisions and Communication
- 7. Campus Safety
- 8. Diversity
- 9. Internal Recognition
- 10. Interactions in the Work Environment
- 11. Communication and Department Meetings
- 12. Recommendations and Potential Future Steps
- 13. Limitations and Data Notes
- 14. Accessibility and Publication Notes

Executive Summary

The Work Climate Committee (WCC) uses two surveys to learn about workplace climate at the College of Southern Nevada (CSN). The PACE survey is a comprehensive survey administered by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) on a three-year cycle. The WCC Snapshot Survey is a shorter, in-house survey administered through CSN’s Office of Institutional Research. The Snapshot Survey follows up on PACE topics and allows the WCC to examine other workplace-climate issues.

This Snapshot Survey included 40 items. Employees were invited to participate, and 703 employees responded to at least some part of the survey. Not every participant answered every question, so the response rate varies by item.

The survey examined Campus Issues, Campus Safety, Diversity, and a special-focus topic: Internal Recognition. It also asked about employees’ interactions with CSN departments and leaders and how employees receive information.

The results describe the employees who responded. They should not automatically be treated as a description of the entire CSN workforce.

1. Overview

The WCC uses two complementary surveys to evaluate workplace climate at CSN.

Survey	Purpose	Typical cycle
PACE	A comprehensive assessment of workplace-climate issues at CSN.	Every three years
WCC Snapshot Survey	A shorter survey used to follow up on PACE topics and explore emerging workplace-climate issues.	About every two years

The Snapshot Survey is designed to be smaller than PACE and can be customized for different topics. It includes both multiple-choice and open-ended questions. The WCC reviews and considers both types of responses.

The Snapshot Survey provides a picture of workplace climate at the time the survey was completed. It is intended to be used with the PACE survey, not as a replacement for it.

Detailed results for specific themes, questions, or demographic groupings are available from the Work Climate Committee. The source report directs readers to the WCC website and wcc@csn.edu for additional information.

2. Themes and Survey Topics

The WCC developed four central themes. Three themes are used in each survey so that results can be compared over time. The fourth is a special focus that can change with each survey.

Theme	Focus
Campus Issues	Major decisions, employee input, communication, and access to executive leadership.
Campus Safety	Employees' perceptions of safety on campus and use and reliability of emergency phones.
Diversity	Relationships, fairness, inclusion, and diversity-related initiatives.
Internal Recognition	Awareness of the Internal Recognition Committee, recognition methods, nominations, and perceptions of the recognition process.

3. Data Collection

Survey Administration

The Snapshot Survey contained 40 items and was administered online through Qualtrics during the Spring 2020 semester. Essentially all CSN employees were invited to participate. CSN's Office of Institutional Research administered the survey.

Survey activity	Date or information
Invitation sent	February 10, 2020
Responses collected	February 10 through March 6, 2020
Survey platform	Qualtrics
Administration	CSN Office of Institutional Research
Total participants	703 employees

Survey Data Limitation

Some demographic questions were incorrectly configured when the survey was created. This forced respondents to select only one characteristic across several demographic categories, including sex and

race. Because of this problem, the results from this survey cannot be broken down reliably by demographic categories.

4. Participants

A total of 703 employees participated. Not every participant answered every question. The response rate shown with each question is the percentage of participants who answered that question.

Note: These results describe the people who responded to the survey, not necessarily the entire CSN workforce. Breakdowns by category may or may not match the actual workforce. The opinions reported are those of respondents and may or may not represent all CSN employees.

Primary Job at CSN

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

Note: Item response rate: 86.9%. Participants were mainly from Academic Affairs.

Primary CSN Personnel Classification

Primary CSN Personnel Classification	Percent
Full-time Academic Faculty	37.8%
Administrative Faculty/Professional Staff	25.1%
Classified Staff	18.1%
Part-time Academic Faculty	12.6%
Wage/Hourly Worker	2.5%
Letter of Appointment	1.4%
Other	1.4%
Student Worker	1.1%

Note: Item response rate: 91.2%. Full-time and part-time Academic Faculty together accounted for slightly more than half of participants.

Primary Campus

Primary Campus	Percent
West Charleston	45.1%

Primary Campus	Percent
North Las Vegas	30.3%
Henderson	12.1%
Other Sites and Centers	9.7%
Online	2.8%

Note: Item response rate: 90.8%. West Charleston and North Las Vegas together represented about three-quarters of participants.

Employment Status

Employment Status	Percent
Full-time	81.5%
Part-time	18.5%

Note: Item response rate: 90.8%.

Length of Employment at CSN

Length of Employment at CSN	Percent
0–5 years	36.7%
6–10 years	19.7%
11–15 years	15.8%
16–20 years	15.5%
More than 20 years	12.2%

Note: Item response rate: 90.8%. About 44% of respondents had worked at CSN for more than 10 years.

Year of Birth / Age

Year of birth	Age category used in source	Percent
Before 1949	Over 60	6.1%
1950–1959	60s	20.8%
1960–1969	50s	25.3%
1970–1979	40s	25.3%
1980–1989	30s	16.7%
1990–1999	20s	5.2%
2000–2009	Teens	0.6%

Note: Item response rate: 68.7%. The source states that 31.2% of participants left this item blank.

5. Campus Presence

Times Employees Are Likely to Be on Campus

Time of day	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%

Note: Response rate was not determined in the source report. Participants could select more than one time period. More than two-thirds reported being likely to be on campus from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

6. Major Decisions and Communication

This section asked whether employees felt included in major decisions, whether their input was sought and included, whether major changes were communicated in a timely way, and whether members of the CSN Executive Team were accessible.

Employees are included in major decisions about the conditions of their work climate at CSN

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

Note: Item response rate: 98.4%

Employee input is sought regarding major decisions at CSN that directly affect the employee's work environment

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

Note: Item response rate: 98.3%

Employee input is included regarding major decisions at CSN that affect the employee's work environment

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

Note: Item response rate: 97.9%

Major changes at CSN are communicated to employees in a timely way

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

Note: Item response rate: 98.2%

CSN Executive Team members are accessible when employees need them

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

Note: Item response rate: 97.4%

7. Campus Safety

The source report states that most respondents felt safe at CSN and that perceptions of safety differed between daytime and nighttime. It states that about 20% reported feeling unsafe or sometimes unsafe in parking lots or on campus walkways at night, and that more than three-quarters believed employee safety was a high priority.

Note: The source contains charts for several safety questions but does not provide the underlying percentages for every category in the extracted text. This rewrite preserves the source report's written summary rather than inventing missing numbers.

Safety of Employees Is a High Priority at CSN

The source report states that the large majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that employee safety is a high priority. It also states that 15% did not agree.

Likelihood of Being the Victim of a Crime at CSN in the Next 12 Months

The source report states that almost 80% of respondents did not believe they were likely to be a victim of a crime at CSN during the next 12 months. About 20% believed this was somewhat or very likely.

Have you ever used a red emergency phone in a classroom or a blue emergency box outside?

Response	Percent
Yes	5.9%
No	94.1%

Note: Item response rate: 96.3%

How reliable do you believe the emergency phones are?

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

Note: Item response rate: 97.2%

8. Diversity

CSN is working to promote relationships, improve understanding, and open communication between people from different backgrounds, identities, and cultures

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

Note: Item response rate: 88.5%

CSN recognizes the contributions of 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%

Note: Item response rate: 89.5%

Personal characteristics do not influence performance decisions at CSN

Response	Percent
Strongly Agree	16.4%
Agree	32.6%
Disagree	27.6%
Strongly Disagree	23.4%

Note: 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%

Note: Item response rate: 78.8%

Fair Treatment of Most Employees

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%

Fair Treatment of the Individual 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%

Characteristic	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response rate
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%

If you have not been treated with respect, did you report it or make the College aware of the situation?

Response	Percent
Yes	36.7%
No	63.3%

Note: Item response rate: 32.1%

Diversity Interventions

Respondents ranked possible diversity interventions. The source reports a mean ranking and states that a lower ranking means the intervention was more valued.

Proposed intervention	Mean ranking
Develop initiatives that promote persistence, retention, and graduation of diverse students	2.64
Hire and retain faculty and staff who reflect the population CSN serves	2.84
Recruit faculty and staff who reflect the population CSN serves	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

Note: Item response rate: 77.7%. The source uses the phrase “Mean Lower ranking more valued.”

9. Internal Recognition

To what extent are you aware of the CSN Internal Recognition Committee?

Response	Percent
To a great extent	21.4%

Response	Percent
Somewhat	35.7%
Very little	24.4%
Not at all	18.5%

Note: Item response rate: 93.7%

How Employees Heard About the Committee

How respondents heard about the Committee	Percent
Email	37.7%
Word-of-mouth	12.9%
Other means	6.8%
CAPE session	5.5%
Flyer	3.6%
Committee's website	2.0%

Note: Response rate was undetermined. Respondents could select all that apply, so the percentages show the share who selected each method. They do not identify one primary source of information.

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

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

Note: Item response rate: 93.7%

Types 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 CSN newsletter or website	39.3%	41.0%	14.3%	5.4%	92.3%

Recognition method	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Response rate
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%

Nominating Someone for an Award

Have you ever nominated someone for an award?

Response	Percent
Yes	40.2%
No	52.8%

Note: Item response rate: 93.2%

Type of Award Nominated For

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%

Note: Response rate was undetermined. Respondents could select all that apply, so the percentages do not identify one 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%

Reason	Percent
I don't want someone to lose because my nomination is not good enough	2.3%

Note: Response rate was undetermined. Respondents could select all that apply, so the percentages show reasons selected by respondents and do not identify one 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%

Note: Item response rate: 93.2%

10. Interactions in the Work Environment

Workplace interaction	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Response rate
Facilities Management	42.1%	36.4%	15.7%	5.8%	85.9%
OTS	40.8%	39.8%	13.2%	6.2%	89.6%
Human Resources	32.1%	38.0%	17.7%	12.2%	86.1%
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

Overall experience	Percent
Excellent	27.3%
Good	45.2%
Fair	18.1%
Poor	9.4%

Note: Item response rate: 90.6%.

11. 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%

Note: 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%
Read it on an internal tool	1.4%
Some other means	1.2%

Note: Item response rate: 91.9%.

Regular Department Meetings

Does your department hold regular department meetings?

Response	Percent
Yes	78.1%
No	21.9%

Note: Item response rate: 90.9%

Topics Discussed at Department Meetings

Topic	Percent
-------	---------

Topic	Percent
Policy and procedural changes	74.1%
Sharing information about things employees have 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%

Note: Response rate was undetermined. Respondents could select all that apply. The source report states that these percentages indicate how often each topic is included in department meetings in general.

12. Recommendations and Potential Future Steps

The source report includes headings for “Recommendations” and “Potential Future Steps,” but the provided report text does not contain a separate set of recommendations or future-step statements under those headings.

Note: No recommendations or future steps have been added because the source document does not provide enough text to support them.

13. Limitations and Data Notes

- The survey included 703 participants, but not every participant answered every item.
- The results represent survey respondents and may not represent the entire CSN workforce.
- Some demographic questions were incorrectly configured, so the survey results cannot be reliably broken down by demographic categories.
- Several questions allowed respondents to select more than one answer. For those questions, percentages should not be interpreted as a single-choice distribution.
- Some source charts did not provide complete numerical data in the report text. This rewrite does not create missing percentages.
- The source report contains a date inconsistency: its title says “Fall 2019,” while the methodology states that the survey was administered in Spring 2020 and responses were collected February 10–March 6, 2020.

14. Accessibility and Publication Notes

This version is structured so that important information is represented as text, headings, and tables rather than as information-bearing charts. The goal is to make the report easier to navigate with a screen reader and easier to convert to an accessible tagged PDF.

Document Structure

- The report title uses the Word Title style.
- Major report sections use Heading 1.
- Subsections use Heading 2.
- Individual survey questions use Heading 3 where appropriate.
- Tables use a header row and simple row-and-column structure.
- The tables do not depend on color to communicate meaning.
- Information-bearing charts from the source have been replaced by tables when the chart contained the report's data.
- Important information is not placed in text boxes or decorative graphics.

Recommended PDF Export

- In Microsoft Word, run Check Accessibility before exporting.
- Open the Navigation Pane and confirm that the heading structure is logical.
- Save or export the document as PDF using Word's PDF option rather than Print to PDF.
- When the PDF export options are available, select the option to create document structure tags for accessibility.
- Open the resulting PDF in Adobe Acrobat and run the Accessibility Check.
- Review the PDF Tags panel and Reading Order if Acrobat identifies any issues.
- If possible, perform a short screen-reader test of the title, headings, tables, and links.

Source basis: This accessible rewrite is based on the uploaded "Feb26 snapshot.docx." Survey wording, percentages, response rates, and limitations have been retained from the source where available.