Each respondent was asked the following background questions:

**What is your primary role at your institution?**

- Executive Administrator: 6%
- Part-Time Faculty: 13%
- Trustee: 0.5%
- Director/Coordinator: 12%
- Dean: 5%
- Classified Staff: 21%
- Full-Time Faculty: 37%
- Other: 6%

**What is your primary area of work?**

- Instruction: 45%
- Student Services: 31%
- Research & Planning: 3%
- Information Technology: 4%
- Business or Administration Services: 5%
- Other: 13%

For each of the following questions, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on the scale provided. The scale ranged as follows:

- Strongly Disagree
- Mostly Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Somewhat Agree
- Mostly Agree
- Strongly Agree

Open-ended follow-up questions were asked if respondents noted any level of disagreement with the statement(s) provided. The top answers to these follow-up questions are outlined in the “Major Themes” sections throughout the survey results.
Question 1
Statewide Chancellor’s Office policy changes implemented over the past five years are having a positive impact on student outcomes at your college.

**AGREE** 74.8%
**DISAGREE** 25.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td>12.45%</td>
<td>35.54%</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)**

- Specific policies are not helpful or have negative results (e.g., SLOs, non-repeatability, too much data collection, BOG loss rules).
- Problems with the CCCCO processes (e.g., curriculum process too long, no directives/guidelines/clear policies, too many independent initiatives, staff not sufficient/not well trained).
- Transfer has been prioritized over everything else (e.g., CTE, lifelong learning).
- Lack of support for and input from adjunct faculty and classified staff.

Question 2
Community colleges are helping improve social mobility of low-income and disadvantaged students in our state.

**AGREE** 86.6%
**DISAGREE** 13.4%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>21.79%</td>
<td>35.19%</td>
<td>29.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)**

- Need to provide more resources for students (e.g., student services, support services, counseling, mental health).
- Eliminate tuition and provide access to financial aid and funding beyond tuition (e.g., books, transportation, living expenses, parking, childcare).
- Remember that there are many students that the CCCs must serve, not just transfer (e.g., community members, lifelong learners, CTE students, part-time students).
- Work with K-12 to increase intersegmental coordination and the college readiness of incoming students.
- Faculty should reflect the diversity of CCC students.
The level of regulatory oversight of colleges by the state Chancellor’s Office is reasonable given its responsibility to account to the legislature, governor and taxpayers.

**Question 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)**

- Regulation is not unreasonable, but it is dysfunctional (e.g., falls on faculty, short deadlines, long wait times, too top-down, one-size-fits-all, uncoordinated, inconsistent, not transparent).
- Existing regulations are not enforced. There is not enough accountability (e.g., need site visit, audits, oversight).
- CCCCO needs to provide more on-time guidance/clarification on policies and procedures.
- CCCCO staff is insufficient for requirements (e.g., backlog of curriculum approval and oversight is insufficient).
- Colleges need fewer regulations and more flexibility to allow for innovation and creativity.

The level of alignment that the community colleges system has with K-12 is adequate at this time.

**Question 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)**

- More communication, outreach, and alignment between the systems.
- Streamline the transition from K-12 to CCCs (e.g., better data and data sharing, align requirements, dual enrollment, basic skills in K-12 not CCCs).
- Earlier support and more counseling in K-12. Provide more information so students and parents know their options between CC, CSU, UC and private.
- Communicate value of CCC (including CTE) to K-12 parents/educators.
Question 5

The level of alignment that the community colleges system has with UC and CSU with regard to transfer is adequate at this time.

| AGREE | 69.0% |
| DISAGREE | 31.0% |

Strongly Disagree | Mostly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Mostly Agree | Strongly Agree
4.96% | 7.77% | 18.25% | 31.94% | 31.06% | 6.02%

Major Themes (among respondents who disagreed):

- Better outreach, dialogue and communication between the segments.
- More alignment between systems, coordinate articulation agreements for ease of transfer and make transfer requirements simpler and clearer (e.g., common course numbering system and improve upon ASSIST).
- UC alignment is particularly weak and needs more work/attention.
- Better student support (e.g., communication with students, more counselors/counselor training).
- K-12 through 4-year database so students are seen holistically.

Question 6

Improving staffing and resources at the state Chancellor’s Office can lead to better support for colleges.

| AGREE | 81.0% |
| DISAGREE | 19.0% |

Strongly Disagree | Mostly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Mostly Agree | Strongly Agree
3.89% | 4.82% | 10.26% | 27.38% | 23.49% | 30.16%

Major Themes (among respondents who disagreed):

- Spend money on staff/resources at the local colleges not at the CCCCO (e.g., teaching, FT faculty).
- Allow for more local control and flexibility. Provide more advocacy and less regulation.
- Better communication to the field from CCCCO (e.g., related to vision, goals, focus and the role of the CCCCO).
- Improve upon and document CCCCO policies and procedures. More training for CCCCO staff.
- Have CCCCO staff and administration learn more about the colleges, perhaps through site visits, employee exchange programs or by hiring former CCC employees at the Chancellor’s Office.
MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)

- More coordination, communication and planning with the colleges. Working with colleges rather than a top-down approach. More communication at all levels.
- Deal with all issues relating to part time/adjunct faculty (e.g., pay, benefits, 67% rule, hire FT faculty from PT ranks).
- Advertise the mission of the CCC to ALL communities (e.g., local and state population, lifelong learners, legislators).
- Streamline curriculum approval processes to meet student needs and those of rapidly changing industries.
- Less paperwork and bureaucracy. More carefully planned initiatives and deadlines.
- Treat colleges individually as they are all different. Solutions should not be one-size-fits-all.
All voices within the community colleges system are heard and respected with the goal of improving opportunities and success for students of diverse backgrounds.

**MAJOR THEMES (among respondents who disagreed)**

- Empower specific groups to participate by providing protections (for adjunct faculty), paid release time for participation (for classified staff). Specifically, adjuncts, CTE faculty, classified staff and students should be included in all discussions.

- Figure out how to attract and retain diverse people at all levels of the system. Provide diversity training for those who are already in the system.

- Provide more outlets for students and others in the field to express their opinions (e.g., surveys, focus groups, public forums, website).

- Reduce/increase the voice of faculty. (Respondents were split on whether faculty were too powerful or not powerful enough.)

- Greater professional/leadership development opportunities for staff and faculty.

- Act on input and communicate when action has been taken.