

COM Employee Survey Fall 2025

Methodology and Response Rate

In November/December 2025, a confidential online survey was administered to all current COM employees. The purpose of the survey was to assess patterns of commuting to COM, use of public transportation, use and impact of artificial intelligence for work, and experiences with COM technology.

Data collection took place between November 25 and December 22, 2025. The survey link was sent via COM email to 656 COM employees. A total of 262 employees completed the survey, for a response rate of 39.9%.

See Appendix A for response rates and representation by subgroups.

Section 1: Commute Patterns and Experiences

Q1. For each day of the week, please select the COM campus where you typically commute to work.

Employees most commonly reported commuting to campus Monday through Thursday, with the Kentfield campus serving as the primary work location across all employee groups. Approximately 62–67% of employees reported working at Kentfield on weekdays, while about 20–21% reported working at the Indian Valley Campus (IVC). Around 15–17% of employees reported not commuting Monday through Thursday. Friday commuting patterns differed, with 44% of employees reporting they do not typically commute on Fridays. Faculty were more likely than classified staff to report not commuting on certain weekdays, particularly Monday (21% vs. 13%) and Thursday (31% vs. 6%), while MSC employees were the most likely to work on campus throughout the week.

Q2. How do you typically commute to COM?

Driving alone was overwhelmingly the dominant commute mode, reported by 94% of employees overall. All other modes were used by relatively small shares, including carpooling (6%), active transportation (6%), and public transportation (4%). Faculty reported the highest rate of solo driving (97%), while classified staff were slightly more likely to use alternative modes such as carpooling (9%) or public transportation (7%), though these differences were modest.

Q3–Q5. Public Transportation Use and Transfers

Public transportation use among employees was very limited. Among those who used transit, Marin Transit buses were the most commonly used system (80%), followed by

SMART train (20%). Most transit users reported making one transfer (60%) or no transfers (30%) for a one-way trip.

Q6. On average, how long is your one-way commute to COM?

Commute times varied widely, though most employees driving alone (87%) reported commute times of 60 minutes or less. Public transportation users were more likely to report longer commute times, including 45% who reported trips exceeding 60 minutes. Faculty were somewhat more likely to report mid-range commute times of 31–45 minutes (31%), while MSC employees were more likely to report longer commutes of 46–60 minutes (34%).

Q7. What time do you typically arrive at COM on the days you commute?

Employees most commonly reported arriving in the early morning (8:00–10:00 a.m.), with approximately 75–80% selecting this time across weekdays. Late morning arrivals (10:00 a.m.–noon) were reported by about 10–12%, while afternoon and evening arrivals were relatively uncommon. Classified staff and MSC employees were especially likely to arrive early in the morning, often exceeding 90% on certain days, while faculty showed more variation in arrival times, with higher proportions arriving later in the morning or afternoon.

Q8. Overall, how would you rate your current commute?

Employee perceptions of their commute were mixed, with 50% rating their commute as excellent or good, 27% as fair, and 23% as poor. MSC employees were more likely to report negative perceptions, with 43% rating their commute as poor, compared to 27% among classified staff and 14% of faculty. Faculty were most likely to report positive commute experiences overall.

Q9. Compared to last academic year, is your typical commute to COM now:

Of employees who commuted to Marin last year, most (62%) reported their commute is about the same, while 31% said it's worse, and 7% reported improvement. MSC employees were the most likely to report a worsening commute (46%), while faculty were the most likely to report no change (71%).

Q10. This academic year, which options have you used to reduce the impact of your commute?

More than half of employees (54%) reported using none of the listed strategies to reduce commute impacts. Among those who did, 25% adjusted work hours, 16% used remote work, and 6% tried a different commute method. Faculty were most likely to report using no strategies (63%), while classified staff were more likely to report using remote work (24%), and MSC employees were somewhat more likely to report adjusting their work hours by driving earlier.

Q11. Are you enrolled in commuter benefits programs?

Participation in commuter benefits programs was extremely low, with 94% of employees reporting they are not enrolled in any program, 7% in Marin Commutes Rewards, and 3% in pre-tax transit and parking benefits. Enrollment was minimal across all employee classifications.

Q12. Likelihood of leaving position due to commute

Most employees (73%) reported they are not likely to leave their position due to commute conditions, while 20% reported being somewhat likely and 7% very likely. MSC employees were the most likely to say they'd leave due to commute (14% very likely, 26% somewhat likely).

Q13. Biggest challenges with driving/carpooling

The most commonly reported challenge was traffic (34%), followed by travel time (17%) and costs (14%), while 27% reported no challenges. MSC employees were more likely to cite traffic as a primary challenge (46%), while faculty were somewhat more likely to cite costs (18%).

Q14. How would you rate the public transportation options currently available between your home and COM?

Perceptions of public transportation availability were mostly negative. Of those who had an opinion, 75% rated options as poor, 16% as fair, and only 9% as good or excellent. Classified staff (16%) were most likely to rate their available options as good or excellent.

Q15. Have you ever looked at the schedules and/or routes for public transportation near you?

Most employees (70%) reported having looked at public transportation routes or schedules near them, despite relatively low usage of public transportation. This pattern was consistent across employee classifications.

Q16. If you were to use public transportation to get to COM, how much additional time would you be willing to spend?

Employees reported varying willingness to spend additional time commuting via public transportation. Overall, 24% were not willing to add any time, while 38% were willing to add up to 20 minutes and about 20% were willing to add 45–60 minutes. Faculty were the most willing to add time to their commute.

Q17. Which factors would make you more likely to use public transportation?

The most commonly selected factors were related to convenience, including direct routes to campus (55%), shorter travel time (36%), and more frequent service (35%).

Approximately 27% of employees reported that nothing would increase their likelihood of using public transportation. MSC employees were more likely to emphasize shorter travel

time and proximity of stops, while classified staff were more likely to indicate no interest in using public transportation.

Q18. What is the maximum amount you would be willing to pay per one-way trip for public transportation to COM?

Employees showed moderate cost sensitivity. Approximately 27% reported willingness to pay \$1–\$3 per trip, 24% \$3–\$5, and 13% would only use public transportation if it were free. About 6% reported they would not use public transportation regardless of cost. Faculty were somewhat more willing to pay higher amounts, while classified staff were more likely to prefer lower-cost options.

Section 2: Classified Professional Learning (Classified Staff Only)

Q19. How interested are you in professional learning/training in the following areas?

Classified staff reported strong interest in professional learning across all areas. A majority reported being very interested in technology and applications (51%) and career advancement strategies (51%), while 44% reported being very interested in artificial intelligence. Overall, interest levels indicate a strong demand for continued professional development opportunities.

Q20. Which types of professional learning opportunities fit best with your work schedule?

Professional Learning Days were the most preferred format, selected by 69% of respondents, followed by self-paced ProLearning videos (61%) and FLEX week sessions (48%). These results suggest a preference for both structured, dedicated learning time and flexible, asynchronous options.

Q21. Which professional learning formats do you find most effective?

Employees reported a strong preference for in-person and hands-on learning formats. In-person workshops were selected by 78% of respondents, followed by hands-on or experiential learning (60%) and self-paced online courses (53%). Smaller proportions preferred virtual or hybrid formats.

Q22. What barriers limit your participation in professional learning opportunities?

The most commonly reported barriers were scheduling conflicts (60%), lack of time (55%), and competing work responsibilities (43%). Fewer respondents cited lack of awareness or access to resources, indicating that structural and time-related barriers are the primary constraints.

Q23: Have you ever used ProLearning to do any of the following?

Most classified staff (98%) reported using ProLearning, particularly for completing video training (94%), signing up for workshops (76%), and searching for training opportunities (74%).

Q24. What are your current professional goals?

Employees most commonly reported goals related to developing skills for their current job (68%) and advancing in their current career (57%).

Q25: Other than pay or promotion, how would you prefer to be recognized for your professional development achievements?

Most employees (85%) would like to be recognized in some manner, the most preferred forms of recognition being supervisor recognition (54%) and certificates or certifications (52%).

Section 3: Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Q26. Which best describes your experience with generative AI tools?

Most employees reported some level of experience with generative AI tools. Overall, 31% reported regularly using one main tool, 22% reported using multiple tools, and 29% reported having tried AI once or twice, while 16% reported never having used AI. MSC employees were more likely to report regular use of multiple tools (34%), while classified staff were more likely to report limited or occasional use (38%).

Q27. Do you have a paid subscription to a generative AI tool?

Most employees (74%) reported not having a paid subscription to an AI tool. However, adoption was higher among faculty (34%) and MSC employees (39%) compared to classified staff.

Q28. Have you used generative AI tools for professional tasks?

Employees reported using AI for a range of professional tasks, most commonly for asking questions or support (59%), brainstorming ideas (48%), improving writing (44%), and drafting communications (43%). Faculty were substantially more likely to use AI for creating instructional materials (30%), while MSC employees were most likely to use AI for writing-related tasks and communications.

Q29. In which ways do you use AI tools to support your work?

Two-thirds of employees who use AI said they use it to accommodate the way they work, most commonly for language translation (47%), simplifying complex instructions (47%), and organizing tasks (45%). Use for time management and accessibility-related functions was less common but still notable.

Q30. How confident are you in evaluating AI-generated information?

Confidence in evaluating AI-generated information was moderate, with 48% reporting being somewhat confident and 23% very confident, while 29% reported low confidence. MSC employees were more likely to report higher confidence levels compared to classified staff and faculty.

Q31. Overall, what impact has AI had on the following areas of your work?

Employees generally reported neutral to positive impacts of AI. A majority (57%) reported a positive impact on productivity, while 31% reported a positive impact on workload and 21% on work-life balance. MSC employees were the most likely to report positive impacts of AI on their productivity, skills/abilities, collaboration with colleagues, and workload.

Q32. How concerned are you about the following aspects of AI?

Employees reported high levels of concern regarding AI, particularly related to academic integrity (51% very concerned), accuracy and reliability (51% very concerned), and privacy and data security (63% very concerned). Concerns were consistently high across employee classifications, with faculty showing particularly high concern about academic integrity.

Q33. How important is it for COM to integrate AI tools into the following functional areas to improve efficiency, service, or learning?

Overall, employees reported moderate support for integrating AI tools across functional areas, with most responses falling between “somewhat important” and “very important,” depending on the use case. For academic tutoring, 44% reported it as somewhat important and 23% as very important, indicating moderate support overall. For administrative tasks, about half of employees (49%) reported this as somewhat important and 24% as very important, suggesting general openness to AI for operational efficiency. Interest was lower for student advising applications, where nearly half (49%) reported AI integration as not important.

Support was stronger for applications related to accessibility and workforce development. For accessibility and accommodation tools, 45% reported this as very important and 41% as somewhat important, indicating broad support across employee groups, with MSC employees especially likely to rate this as very important (63%). Similarly, career services and workforce applications were viewed favorably, with 51% reporting somewhat important and 23% very important.

In contrast, interest in AI for instructional content creation was more mixed, with 40% reporting somewhat important, 40% not important, and only 19% very important, with faculty more likely than other groups to rate this area as not important.

Q34. How interested are you in professional development/training in the following AI-related topics?

Overall, results indicate strong interest in foundational and ethical AI training, with more variation in interest for instructional and role-specific applications.

Employees reported generally strong interest in AI-related professional development, particularly in areas related to ethics and applied use. Nearly half of employees (47%) reported being very interested in training on ethical use of AI and academic integrity, with an additional 34% somewhat interested. Interest in integrating AI for learning and studying was also relatively high, with 37% very interested and 34% somewhat interested.

Interest in integrating AI into course design and assignments was more mixed, with 43% not interested, 28% very interested, and 28% somewhat interested, reflecting variation in perceived relevance across roles. Faculty were more likely than classified staff to express higher interest in this area.

Training related to using AI for productivity and administrative tasks also showed moderate interest overall, with responses distributed across levels of interest, though MSC employees were more likely to report high interest in these applications.

Section 4: COM Technology

Q37. Which of the following challenges have you experienced when using the COM website or the MyCOM portal?

A majority of employees reported experiencing at least one challenge when using the COM website or MyCOM portal. The most frequently reported issue was difficulty finding needed information (56%), followed by content being incorrect or outdated (43%) and poorly organized content (43%). Additional challenges included broken links (30%) and issues with mobile display (13%). About 23% reported no challenges.

Some variation by classification was observed. Faculty and MSC employees were more likely than classified staff to report difficulty finding information (60–62% vs. 48%), while MSC employees were more likely to report issues with incorrect or outdated content (68%) and broken links (50%). Classified staff were more likely than other groups to report no challenges.

Q38. How often do you use the following applications/online systems in your current position?

Use of institutional systems varied widely depending on the platform and employee role. Microsoft Teams was one of the most frequently used systems overall, with 54% of employees reporting daily or weekly use. However, usage differed substantially by classification, with nearly all MSC employees reporting frequent use (94%), compared to

lower usage among classified staff (76%) and especially faculty (21%), indicating variation in how communication and collaboration tools are used across roles.

Q39. How effective are the applications/online systems you use regularly?

Overall, employees report that most commonly used applications and systems are effective, with strong majorities rating them as “very effective,” particularly for core communication and instructional tools. However, there are notable differences across systems and employee classifications.

Communication and collaboration tools received the highest effectiveness ratings. Zoom was rated very effective by 88% of employees overall, with consistently high ratings across all groups (89% Classified, 88% Faculty, 86% MSC). Outlook also received very strong ratings, with 77% of employees reporting it as very effective, including particularly high ratings from Classified staff (86%) and MSC employees (85%), compared to somewhat lower—but still positive—ratings from Faculty (66%). Teams was also viewed favorably, with 68% rating it very effective, though Faculty were less likely to do so (42%) compared to Classified (73%) and MSC employees (85%).

Administrative and workflow tools showed more variation. Adobe Sign (68% very effective) and COM phone/voicemail (60%) were generally viewed positively across groups. SharePoint received more mixed feedback, with 52% rating it very effective, but a sizable share (37%) indicating it is only somewhat effective, particularly among MSC employees (53% somewhat effective).

Instructional and academic systems revealed clearer differences by classification. Canvas was rated very effective by 74% overall, driven largely by Faculty (81%), compared to lower ratings among Classified staff (58%) and MSC employees (69%). Elumen, however, was among the lowest-rated systems, with only 28% of employees rating it very effective and 59% reporting it as only somewhat effective, suggesting widespread usability or functionality concerns across all groups.

Enterprise systems and specialized tools also showed uneven perceptions. Banner was rated very effective by 43% overall, but this varied significantly by role: 60% of Classified staff rated it very effective, compared to just 34% of Faculty and 16% of MSC employees, indicating potential differences in familiarity or usability. Similarly, Argos was rated very effective by 52% overall, with much higher ratings among Classified staff (64%) than Faculty (29%) or MSC employees (35%).

Finally, systems such as School Dude and Facilitron received more moderate ratings, with fewer than half of employees rating them as very effective (46% and 47%, respectively),

and substantial shares indicating they are only somewhat effective—especially among MSC employees.

Q40. Have you submitted a ticket to the COM IT Help Desk in the past 6 months?

Most employees (75%) reported submitting at least one IT Help Desk ticket in the past six months, indicating broad reliance on IT support across the college. Usage was particularly high among Classified staff (88%) and Managers/Supervisors/Confidential (MSC) employees (88%), compared to a lower rate among Faculty (61%), suggesting that operational and administrative roles may require more frequent technical support.

Q41. For IT Help Desk tickets you submitted in the past six months, please answer the following:

Timeliness of response:

Overall, employees reported very positive experiences with IT Help Desk response times, with 74% strongly agreeing that their tickets were answered in a timely manner and an additional 24% somewhat agreeing. MSC employees reported the highest satisfaction, with 90% strongly agreeing, compared to 74% of Faculty and 67% of Classified staff. Very few employees expressed dissatisfaction (just 3% somewhat or strongly disagreeing).

Effectiveness in resolving issues:

Satisfaction was similarly high regarding issue resolution, with 76% of employees strongly agreeing that their issue was effectively resolved and 21% somewhat agreeing. Again, MSC employees reported the most positive experiences (90% strongly agree), while Faculty (72%) and Classified staff (74%) were slightly lower but still overwhelmingly positive. Only a small share of employees (3%) expressed any level of disagreement.

Q42. Which of the following technology improvements are most important for COM to prioritize? Please rank them from 1 (highest priority) to 8 (lowest priority).

When asked to rank technology priorities, faster, more reliable Wi-Fi emerged as the top priority overall, with 31% ranking it as their number one priority. This priority was consistent across all employee groups, though Classified staff were most likely to rank it first (36%).

More tech training and support also ranked highly), particularly among MSC employees (28% ranking it first), suggesting a strong need for ongoing employee development alongside infrastructure improvements.

Other priorities fell into a middle tier, including Upgrading existing technology, Expanded laptop/hotspot lending, and Better Canvas/learning system features), which Faculty ranked higher than other groups.

Lower priorities overall included: Better accessibility tools, Stronger cybersecurity (though MSC employees ranked this higher than others), and Better AI tools, which ranked lowest , with 34% of employees ranking it last—particularly among Classified staff (44%), indicating that foundational technology needs outweigh interest in emerging tools.

Q43. Where should COM focus its technology resources over the next 5 years? Please rank the following priorities from 1 (most important) to 4 (least important).

When asked to prioritize broader technology investments, upgrading existing technology emerged as the top priority overall, with 29% of employees ranking it as their highest priority. This was especially important among MSC employees (38% ranking it first).

Keeping current systems reliable was a close second, with relatively even importance across employee groups, though Classified staff were slightly more likely to rank it as a top priority.

Expanding access and equity and investing in new or emerging technology were somewhat lower priorities overall. Notably, MSC employees placed greater emphasis on investing in new technology (31% ranking it first), while Classified staff were less likely to prioritize this area (14%), reflecting differences in role-based needs and perspectives.

Appendix A.

Response Rates by Subgroup

| Employee Classification | N Employees | N Completed Survey | Response Rate |
|---|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Classified | 186 | 99 | 53% |
| Faculty | 428 | 129 | 30% |
| MSC | 42 | 34 | 81% |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| Asian | 43 | 17 | 40% |
| Black or African American | 31 | 8 | 26% |
| Hispanic | 113 | 50 | 44% |
| Multi-Racial | 25 | 14 | 56% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| White | 363 | 144 | 40% |
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 380 | 161 | 42% |
| Male | 261 | 95 | 36% |
| Other or decline to state | 13 | 6 | 46% |
| Age Group | | | |
| 18-24 | 3 | 2 | 67% |
| 25-45 | 153 | 80 | 52% |
| Over 45 | 500 | 180 | 36% |

Representation in Survey Sample by Subgroup

