

Table II: November 2019 Silver Falls School District survey results by demographic groups

Note: This table is meant as a **guide to voter preferences and key messages only**. Items in the table are grouped by topic. Survey questions related to the same component are listed together under each topic for comparative purposes. Numbers in parentheses refer to the question in the survey. All other numbers are percentages.

The small number of respondents for some sub-groups result in a large reliability variable for these groups. This is especially true for any sub-groups with a very small number of respondents, e.g., voters ages 18-24, ages 25-34 and ages 35-44.

Blue shading highlights the total percentage response to each question and provides the basis for measuring gain or loss of support for each of the survey's facility components or tested arguments. Note that for a number of questions the, "Not Sure" responses are combined with low or negative ratings because Oregon election research for bond measures consistently shows "Not Sure" voters will vote "No", if they vote at all.

Green numbers (generally +10% to include attrition) designate high priority items for particular demographic groups.

Red numbers (generally -5% margin of error) indicate significant loss of support. The district should consider eliminating components with an all red survey rating from consideration and/or inclusion in any potential bond proposal.

Very high and very low responses are in bold type and underlined for emphasis in copies that are not printed in color.

Gray highlighted columns of 45-59 and 60+ age voters, 3/4 and 4/4 election voters are highlighted to emphasize that these voters will determine the outcome of any future bond election and their views should be reflected in the district's discussions regarding facilities improvements.

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 49% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
District Operations and Performance															
Rate SFSD operation & performance (1) Excellent/Pretty Good	<u>67</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>69</u>
Rate SFSD operation & performance (1) Only Fair/Poor	21	22	20	29	12	30	20	20	11	18	35	19	23	19	20
Rate SFSD operation & performance (1) Don't Know	12	13	11	0	17	3	9	16	11	14	4	12	13	11	11

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
Receive good value for property taxes (5) Yes	50	50	50	71	53	44	52	49	67	41	42	55	49	52	49
Receive good value for property taxes (5) No	37	39	36	0	41	39	39	36	22	43	47	32	37	35	39
Receive good value for property taxes (5) Don't Know	13	11	14	29	6	17	9	15	11	16	11	13	14	13	12
Continue high performance by adding space for enhanced programs/ curriculum (22) Agree	75	71	78	100	94	85	81	66	78	72	72	74	76	73	74
Continue high performance by adding space for enhanced programs/ curriculum (22) Disagree	19	22	17	0	6	13	16	25	11	22	21	20	16	23	21
Maintaining Rural Schools															
If you knew, investing in SMS would allow district to maintain all rural schools for foreseeable future would you favor/ oppose replacing SMS (18) Favor	70	66	73	86	88	78	73	63	78	68	75	65	72	65	70

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
If you knew, investing in SMS would allow district to maintain all rural schools for foreseeable future would you favor/ oppose replacing SMS (18) Oppose	25	30	22	14	12	19	23	30	22	24	21	30	20	31	28
If you knew, SFSD has no immediate plans to close any rural K-8 schools, would you favor/oppose replacing SMS (15) Favor	53	45	59	57	71	65	62	43	72	55	59	47	56	51	51
If you knew, SFSD has no immediate plans to close any rural K-8 schools, would you favor/oppose replacing SMS (15) Oppose	33	39	29	43	24	24	30	38	22	28	26	40	26	41	38
As long as SFSD maintains its K-8 schools into the future, I would support proposal that includes replacing SMS (23) Agree	<u>68</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>66</u>

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
As long as SFSD maintains its K-8 schools into the future, I would support proposal that includes replacing SMS (23) Disagree	26	32	22	14	24	11	22	33	11	24	25	31	22	30	29
I would oppose any bond measure if SFSD doesn't close 2 smallest rural schools (21) Disagree	<u>70</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>68</u>
I would oppose any bond measure if SFSD doesn't close 2 smallest rural schools (21) Agree	20	22	18	29	29	13	19	20	22	28	18	16	19	20	21
Facilities															
Rate overall condition of SFSD buildings (2) Excellent/Pretty Good	58	66	51	86	53	48	49	64	44	50	51	66	55	55	65
Rate overall condition of SFSD buildings (2) Only Fair/Poor	35	26	40	14	42	48	43	26	44	44	39	28	38	37	25
How would you rate the physical condition of Silverton Middle School? (3) Excellent/Pretty Good	29	36	23	14	24	21	21	36	22	21	27	33	26	29	34

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
How would you rate the physical condition of Silverton Middle School? (3) Only Fair/Poor	39	35	43	43	47	55	50	28	44	49	47	33	45	44	32
How would you rate the physical condition of Silverton Middle School? (3) Not Sure	<u>32</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>44</u>
If you knew 81 year old section of SMS is abandoned and condemned due serious structural and safety issues such as asbestos and lead, how would you rate the physical condition of this school? (4) Excellent/Pretty Good	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>
If you knew 81 year old section of SMS is abandoned and condemned due serious structural and safety issues such as asbestos and lead, how would you rate the physical condition of this school? (4) Only Fair/Poor	<u>81</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>77</u>

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
Would you favor or oppose constructing a new middle school to replace the existing SMS? (13) Favor	54	49	58	71	65	63	65	44	67	51	63	49	63	47	43
Would you favor or oppose constructing a new middle school to replace the existing SMS? (13) Oppose	30	33	27	29	12	22	26	35	17	29	26	35	22	37	36
If you knew construc- ting a new middle school would save district tens of thousands of dollars per year in operating costs that could be redirected into classrooms, would you favor or oppose replacing SMS? (14) Favor	68	62	73	86	82	78	76	59	78	72	70	62	73	65	62
If you knew construc- ting a new middle school would save district tens of thousands of dollars per year in operating costs that could be redirected into classrooms, would you favor or oppose replacing SMS? (14) Oppose	25	31	21	14	12	19	21	30	17	24	24	29	19	29	33

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
If you knew a new middle school would enable SFSD to provide a safe and more secure learning environment for these students, would you favor or oppose replacing SMS? (16) Favor	<u>68</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>64</u>
If you knew a new middle school would enable SFSD to provide a safe and more secure learning environment for these students, would you favor or oppose replacing SMS? (16) Oppose	26	31	22	14	18	15	21	32	17	25	22	30	20	31	30
If you knew replacing SMS would enable SFSD to replace modular classrooms with permanent classroom space, would you favor or oppose proposal? (17) Favor	<u>66</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>62</u>

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
If you knew replacing SMS would enable SFSD to replace modular classrooms with permanent classroom space, would you favor or oppose proposal? (17) Oppose	27	30	25	14	24	19	21	33	22	30	24	28	21	33	30
Part of SMS has been condemned and can no longer be used. We need to ensure students attending SMS have permanent and safe learning environment. I would support replacing this school. (20) Agree	<u>68</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>59</u>
Part of SMS has been condemned and can no longer be used. We need to ensure students attending SMS have permanent and safe learning environment. I would support replacing this school. (20) Disagree	29	34	25	14	18	24	23	35	22	25	28	32	21	35	37

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
I want middle school students district-wide to have access to high-quality courses and options that give them the best chance of finding a living wage job after graduating. I would support a future bond measure that includes a new middle school and additional space in other schools that will enhance vocational and technical opportunities for these students. (24) Agree	<u>69</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>
I want middle school students district-wide to have access to high-quality courses and options that give them the best chance of finding a living wage job after graduating. I would support a future bond measure that includes a new middle school and additional space in other schools that will enhance vocational and technical opportunities for these students. (24) Disagree	28	31	26	0	18	22	24	34	11	28	29	31	23	33	33

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
Additional Space for educational programs															
Additional space for hands-on learning district-wide such as science labs for 6 th -8 th grade students? (11) High priority (3&4)	<u>81</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>73</u>
Additional space for hands-on learning district-wide such as science labs for 6 th -8 th grade students? (11) Low priority (1&2)	16	14	16	0	18	11	13	19	17	11	15	19	14	10	24
Additional classroom space for enhanced vocational programs district-wide for grades 6-8 such as agriculture, woodworking and metals? (6) High priority (3&4)	<u>76</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>72</u>
Additional classroom space for enhanced vocational programs district-wide for grades 6-8 such as agriculture, woodworking and metals? (6) Low priority (1&2)	21	23	21	14	12	11	24	24	22	20	25	23	22	18	25

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
Additional space for enhanced technology and computer science programs district-wide for grades K-8? (10) High priority (3&4)	<u>76</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>
Additional space for enhanced technology and computer science programs district-wide for grades K-8? (10) Low priority (1&2)	22	14	27	14	24	26	18	23	28	16	27	23	17	27	25
Additional classroom space for music district-wide? (8) High priority (3&4)	<u>74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>58</u>
Additional classroom space for music district-wide? (8) Low priority (1&2)	23	23	25	29	53	28	20	22	22	24	19	29	14	27	38
Additional library space where needed throughout SFSD for K-8 students? (9) High priority (3&4)	<u>60</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>54</u>
Additional library space where needed throughout SFSD for K-8 students? (9) Low priority (1&2)	37	31	41	43	30	39	38	37	44	34	38	39	32	40	44

Subject/Question	All	Male 43% of respon- dents	Female 57% of respon- dents	Ages 18-24 ONLY 2% of respon- dents	25-34 ONLY 5% of respon- dents	35-44 ONLY 15% of respon- dents	45-59 28% of respon- dents	60+ 51% of respon- dents	1/4 voters 5% of respon- dents	2/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	3/4 voters 21% of respon- dents	4/4 voters 41% of respon- dents	Silver -ton 48% of reson- dents	East Rural 27% of reson- dents	West Rural 25% of reson- dents
Additional space district-wide where needed, for physical education and athletic programs for K-8 students? (7) High priority (3&4)	58	56	59	57	70	65	57	55	61	50	60	60	58	61	54
Additional space district-wide where needed, for physical education and athletic programs for K-8 students? (7) Low priority (1&2)	39	38	39	43	30	33	41	41	33	47	39	37	38	36	44
Additional classroom space for art programs district-wide? (12) High priority (3&4)	56	59	53	28	64	53	54	58	61	55	57	54	67	52	38
Additional classroom space for art programs district-wide? (12) Low priority (1&2)	42	37	46	71	36	44	44	40	34	45	41	44	31	47	57
Would you favor or oppose constructing a new athletic facility and artificial turf field west of SHS building? (19) Oppose	<u>68</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>67</u>
Would you favor or oppose constructing a new athletic facility and artificial turf field west of SHS building? (19) Favor	<u>24</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>