

Respondent	Policy providing feedback on:	Do the proposed edits make this policy easier to understand and apply?	How clear is the revised policy?	Do you have any concerns about implementing this policy?	Please share any comments, suggestions or concern about the revised policy. We welcome any feedback that can help improve it before it is finalized.
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	I think this makes it easier
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	Thanks for keeping it concise.
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Maybe	Mostly clear	No	It's definitely better than the previous policy. Thumbs up!
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	Policy clearly states what the procedure is and the deadlines.
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	Good revision
District supervisor	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	Division Director can handle this and help SWCC with workload.
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	Maybe	Curious about the shift of responsibilities between the commission/director. I am still learning processes and how this would impact workflow/ democratic representation for the people of north carolina. If it would speed up and maintain unbiased and democratic process I am all for it.
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	Seems like decent changes to me
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	No	N/A
District supervisor	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Mostly clear	Maybe	Wondering why the Commission is abrogating these responsibilities?
District employee	Criteria for Extension of Previous Program Year Contracts	Yes	Very clear	Maybe	Unsure why the Division Director is being given authority on contracts where the Commission had it before. Maybe some background information on why these revisions were discussed and recommended would be helpful. To me, this would be like a District Employee making a contracting decision instead of the District Board.
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Mostly clear	No	I agree with the changes using the current year price as things have been inflating at an unreasonable amount.
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Very clear	No	None.
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Very clear	No	Looks like a good change for repairs.

Respondent	Policy providing feedback on:	Do the proposed edits make this policy easier to understand and apply?	How clear is the revised policy?	Do you have any concerns about implementing this policy?	Please share any comments, suggestions or concern about the revised policy. We welcome any feedback that can help improve it before it is finalized.
District employee	Repairs	Maybe	Mostly clear	No	I would add if the repair contract will cover 75% or 100%.
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Mostly clear	No	Good revision
District supervisor	Repairs	Yes	Very clear	No	Well written and needed in many cases.
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Very clear	No	No issue with the content, but a suggestion on point #5. In the second sentence, would it be clearer to add? ...contract will be canceled (insert) "and returned" to the state account. Thanks to all who had a part in putting these changes out for District input. This is good communication!
District employee	Repairs	Yes	Very clear	No	N/A