



# A Report on a Community Survey

Prepared for

**Glen Ellyn School  
District 41**

Wednesday  
December 14, 2005



## Survey Basics

In this report, we present you with our observations and conclusions based on the results of 401 telephone interviews with registered voters in Glen Ellyn School District 41. All interviews were completed between November 15 and November 20, 2005. The margin of error for common questions in this study is +/- 4.5 % with a 95% confidence level. The demographic characteristics of the population of individuals interviewed reflect the characteristics of the population of all voters with one exception. The population interviewed is more likely to vote in any election held in the district than the total population of registered voters. This bias was intentional.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The base of support for placing a school bond on the ballot next year is weak.

- Before information about the need for and benefits of a school bond were presented only 40.6% of respondents stated they would favor such a proposal with 42.9% opposed and 16.5% undecided.
- Information does not significantly change the level of support for a bond next year. After information about the need for a bond was presented, support only increased to 43.1% with 40.1% opposed and 16.7% undecided.
- Even a focused presentation of the reason the district needs bond funds increases the level of support to only 46.6%.
- Of the tax rates presented to voters, only the lowest, \$98 per year for the average homeowner, is acceptable. This tax rate makes 56.6% of

respondents state they would favor a proposal with such a cost. This is consistent with the final tax question in the survey. This question presented a cost of \$175 after a short statement about the district's need for a bond. In response, only 40.6% said they would favor such a proposal. This response indicates that an acceptable tax rate is at or just below \$100.

Our conclusions are based on the following analysis of the interviews completed for this study.

## The Uninformed Base of Support

The uninformed base of support for a bond is weak. Before information about the construction and renovation needs faced by the district were presented, each person was asked: *“Glen Ellyn School District 41 may place a bond measure on the ballot next year that would increase property taxes in order to raise the funds needed to build one new school and additional classrooms at existing schools in order to avoid over crowding. In addition, bond funds would be used to continue the renovation and modernization of the local schools. Would you favor or oppose placing such a bond proposal on the ballot next year?”* In response, only 40.6% of respondents said they favored such a proposal with 42.9% opposed and 16.5% undecided.

To more fully understand this response, we need to explore two key cross tabulations of the data. We need to divide all of the responses to this question according to the individual’s status as a parent or non-parent and by each individual’s level of voting activity.

During the interview, a series of questions was used to determine if the individual being interviewed currently had a child in public school or had a grown child who had gone to school in the district in the past. The responses to all of these questions are used to divide the interviews conducted as part of this study into three groups: current K-8 parents, parents of grown children who went to a public school in the past (to be called “alumni parents”), and non-parents. Divided in this way, we can see the uninformed base of support is more uniform than different. Support is slightly higher among parents and slightly lower among alumni parents. It is more important, however, that they are similar and that the level of support is not highest among parents. Among parents, the uninformed base of support is 44.8% with 42.5% opposed and 12.7% undecided. Among alumni parents, 36.5% favor a bond with 42.3% opposed and 21.2%

How many people were interviewed in each category?

- K-8 parents: 134
- Alumni parents: 137
- Non-parents: 130

undecided. Among non-parents, 40.8% said they favored such a proposal with 43.8% opposed and 15.4% undecided. This pattern of support is of concern because in all school finance elections the parents should be found to be significantly more supportive than all of the other voters in the district when the uninformed benchmark question is presented. Before moving to the ballot, Glen Ellyn School District 41 needs to build a better understanding of the need for a bond among its parents (and the parents of current high school students). All of the responses to the uninformed benchmark are presented in the following table.

	<b>K-8 Parents</b>	<b>Alumni Parents</b>	<b>Non- Parents</b>
Favor	44.8%	36.5%	40.8%
Oppose	42.5%	42.3%	43.8%
Undecided	12.7%	21.2%	15.4%

How many people were interviewed in each category?

- Very Active Voters: 166
- Active Voters: 164
- Less Active or New: 71

To look for differences of opinion based on a voter's propensity to vote, each individual's history of voting activity was used to define voter types. Five recent elections in the district<sup>1</sup> were used as the basis for classifying voters as Very Active Voters (who have voted in at least four or five of the last five elections), Active Voters (who have voted in two or three of the last five elections), and Less Active or Newly Registered Voters (who have voted once or registered within the last 12 months but have not yet voted). The uninformed base of support for a bond is weakest among the district's most active voters and strongest among those least likely to vote in any election held in the district. This pattern of support means that a bond proposal from the district will have a better chance if placed on the November ballot next year as opposed to the primary ballot in the spring<sup>2</sup>. All responses are presented in the following table.

---

<sup>1</sup> The elections used for this study were the November general elections held in 2002 and 2004, the primary elections held in 2004 and 2002, and the April 2005 consolidated election.

	<b>Very Active Voters</b>	<b>Active Voters</b>	<b>Less Active &amp; New Voters</b>
Favor	35.5%	40.2%	53.5%
Oppose	50.6%	39.6%	32.4%
Undecided	13.9%	20.1%	14.1%

---

<sup>2</sup> The uninformed level of support is more than 10% higher among those with no history of voting in a primary election than among those voters who do participate in primary election.

## The Impact of Information

Information about the need for bond funds increases the level of support for placing such a proposal on the ballot by only 2.5%. This increase is too small to be significant given the margin of error for this study. A total of 18 statements were included in the survey questionnaire. These statements described the need for bond funds or the ways in which bond funds would be used. Unfortunately, only one of the statements presented during the survey made more than 50% more likely to support a bond proposal from the district. This response came in reaction to a statement that reminded voters that enrollment had been increasing steadily since the early 1990s. This information made 50.6% more likely to support placing a bond on the ballot. Fortunately, only one of the statements produced a stronger negative than positive reaction. Most of the statements presented simply had no impact on whether the individual being interviewed would support a bond. The one exception is a statement that told voters the task force has recommended the reconfiguration of the local schools. This statement made 37.2% less likely to support placing a bond on the ballot and only 33.7% more likely to do so.

As each statement was presented, the individual being interviewed was asked if the information presented made them more likely or less likely to support placing a bond on the ballot. The language that introduced this series of questions read as follows: *“I am going to read some statements about the bond being considered by Glen Ellyn School District 41. Please tell me whether the information would make you more likely or less likely to support the placement of a bond proposal on the ballot next year which, if adopted, would raise property taxes.”*

All of these results are presented in the following table where the percentage made more likely is used to rank each statement.

<b>Pct. More Likely</b>	<b>Statement</b>
<b>50.6%</b>	10. Enrollment in the district has increased steadily since the early 1990s, creating a need for additional classroom space.
<b>49.9%</b>	13. Due to a lack of classroom space, many student services, including math and reading programs designed to help those struggling with these basic skills, are being taught in closets and hallways.
<b>49.6%</b>	22. The task force recommended that bond funds be used to continue the renovation of existing schools so that student programs and services can be provided in appropriate classrooms instead of closets and hallways.
<b>46.9%</b>	15. The district is running out of space for additional portable classrooms at its existing schools.
<b>45.4%</b>	14. Portable classrooms are very inefficient to operate. It can cost as much to heat and light the portable classrooms at a school site as it does to heat and light all of the permanent buildings at the same school.
<b>44.1%</b>	18. Unlike permanent classrooms, each portable classroom opens directly to the outdoors. Therefore, the district cannot control the access school visitors have to students as well as it can in permanent school buildings.
<b>43.9%</b>	21. The task force recommended that bond funds be used to replace portables with new, permanent classrooms at existing school sites.
<b>43.6%</b>	25. The new school will be built on land the district owns near Hadley Junior High School.
<b>43.6%</b>	16. Portables do not provide the additional library, restroom, cafeteria, or gym space needed at each of the district's schools to accommodate current levels of enrollment.
<b>43.4%</b>	12. In order to create additional classroom space, the district has placed 26 portable classrooms at its existing school sites.
<b>43.1%</b>	11. A study of the district by the Northern Illinois University Center for Governmental Studies concluded that enrollment would increase by an additional 7% over the next seven years.
<b>41.6%</b>	20. The task force recommended that bond funds be used to build a new school.
<b>41.5%</b>	17B. Using portables at existing school sites has significantly reduced the space available for playing fields and parking. There is very little green space left at most of the district's schools.

- 39.5%** 24B. Building a new school for fifth and sixth grade students will allow the district to offer additional foreign language and technology classes to fifth and sixth graders.
- 39.3%** 24A. Building a new school for fifth and sixth grade students will allow the district to offer additional classes in art, music, and the performing arts to fifth and sixth graders.
- 37.4%** 19. A task force of community members and district staff has reviewed all of the district's facilities needs and recommended the district ask voters to approve a bond to address the problems created by overcrowding.
- 33.7%** 23. The task force recommended that the grade levels served at each school be reconfigured. Instead of elementary schools that serve kindergarten through fifth grade and a middle school for sixth through eighth grades, the task force recommended elementary schools that would serve kindergarten through fourth grade, a junior high for seventh and eighth graders, and a new intermediate school for the district's fifth and sixth graders.
- 32.3%** 17A. Using portables at existing school sites has significantly reduced the space available for playing fields and parking.

Before leaving this section of the report, we want to look at some of these statements again and separate the responses of parents from those of non-parents. Doing so emphasizes the fact that this information does not have the type of reaction we need to see when a district is planning a school finance proposal. Parents should always have a significantly stronger reaction to information about the need for bond funds than the reaction of non-parents<sup>3</sup>. In most cases, the district's K-8 parents do not have a reaction that is much stronger than voters who do not currently have children in the schools. To illustrate this point, the following table presents the responses to the seven statements that had the strongest overall positive reaction. In this table, the responses to each statement have been separated according to parent status.

---

<sup>3</sup> We would expect a number of these statements to make 60% to 70% of the parents more likely to support a bond.

<b>K-8 Parents</b>	<b>Alumni Parents</b>	<b>Non- Parents</b>	<b>Statement</b>
53.7%	51.8%	46.2%	10. Enrollment in the district has increased steadily since the early 1990s, creating a need for additional classroom space.
48.5%	48.9%	52.3%	13. Due to a lack of classroom space, many student services, including math and reading programs designed to help those struggling with these basic skills, are being taught in closets and hallways.
48.5%	50.4%	50.0%	22. The task force recommended that bond funds be used to continue the renovation of existing schools so that student programs and services can be provided in appropriate classrooms instead of closets and hallways.
53.7%	40.9%	46.2%	15. The district is running out of space for additional portable classrooms at its existing schools.
47.8%	40.1%	48.5%	14. Portable classrooms are very inefficient to operate. It can cost as much to heat and light the portable classrooms at a school site as it does to heat and light all of the permanent buildings at the same school.
43.3%	44.5%	44.6%	18. Unlike permanent classrooms, each portable classroom opens directly to the outdoors. Therefore, the district cannot control the access school visitors have to students as well as it can in permanent school buildings.
46.3%	40.9%	44.6%	21. The task force recommended that bond funds be used to replace portables with new, permanent classrooms at existing school sites.

Before placing a proposal on the ballot, we believe the district should begin an effort to more fully inform parents of the need for a bond. Stronger, positive reactions from parents are essential to the success of a ballot measure for two reasons. First, the parent community must be ready to provide a school bond with overwhelming support at the ballot box. Second, parents must have a strong, positive reaction to the need for and benefits of a bond because they will form the core of the volunteer effort that must be launched in support of any tax proposal. Currently, parents are not in a position to provide either to a school bond proposal.

## An Informed Response

Information about the need for a bond increases the level of support available for placing such a proposal on the ballot by only 2.5%. After voters were informed of the need for and benefits of a bond, each person was asked: *“Now that you have heard some information about the bond being considered by Glen Ellyn School District 41, I want to see if this information has changed your opinion. Would you favor or oppose the placement of a bond measure on the ballot next year that would increase local property taxes to raise the funds needed to build one new school, additional classrooms at existing schools, and to continue the renovation and modernization of the local schools?”* In response, 43.1% said they favored such a proposal with 40.1% opposed and 16.7% undecided.

The information presented in this section of the survey has a slightly greater impact on the level of support among parents than non-parents. But the increase in each group is too small to be significant. In addition, even among parents, information about the need for a bond fails to bring support above 50%. All of the responses to the informed benchmark divided by parent status are presented in the following table.

	<b>K-8 Parents</b>	<b>Alumni Parents</b>	<b>Non- Parents</b>
Favor	47.8%	39.4%	42.3%
Oppose	41.0%	38.7%	40.8%
Undecided	11.2%	21.9%	16.9%

The presentation of information about the bond has its greatest impact on Active Voters but this change of opinion is too small to be significant. Among the district’s Active Voters, information increases support by 3.7%. Among Very Active Voters, the same information increases the level of support by 2.5%.

There is no change in the level of support available among the district's least active voters. All of these responses are presented in the following table.

	<b>Very Active Voters</b>	<b>Active Voters</b>	<b>Less Active &amp; New Voters</b>
Favor	38.0%	43.9%	53.5%
Oppose	45.2%	39.6%	29.6%
Undecided	16.9%	16.5%	16.9%

## A More Focused Presentation

At the end of each interview, a short statement was read to each individual. The purpose of this test is to see if a more focused presentation of the need for a bond increases the level of support available for such a proposal. The statement read as follows: *“Enrollment in the Glen Ellyn School District 41 has increased steadily since the early 1990s. To make room for these students, the district has placed 26 portable classrooms at its existing schools sites. In addition, many student programs have been forced to use hallways and closets instead of classrooms. A study of the district by Northern Illinois University concluded that enrollment in the district will continue to increase over the next five years. A full review of the district’s facilities needs by a community taskforce concluded that the district should build one new school, replace portables with new, permanent classrooms, and continue the renovation of each existing school in order to address the problems created by overcrowding. To raise the funds to provide students with adequate classroom space, the district may ask voters to approve a school bond next year which, if adopted, would raise property taxes.”* Asked again if they would favor or oppose placing a bond on the ballot, 46.6% were in favor with 40.9% opposed and 12.2% undecided.

The presentation of the information in this statement has its greatest impact on the level of support among parents and alumni parents. After the statement was read to them, support among parents increased by 5.9% and among alumni parents by 5.1%. Among non-parents, support decreases by 0.8%. Among parents, support finally rises above the 50% required for passage. Unfortunately, among all other voters, support is well below the majority level. All of the responses to this question are presented in the following table.

	<b>K-8 Parents</b>	<b>Alumni Parents</b>	<b>Non- Parents</b>
Favor	53.7%	44.5%	41.5%
Oppose	38.8%	40.1%	43.8%
Undecided	7.5%	15.3%	13.8%

The statement causes support to increase by 9.9% in the district's least active voters but has no significant impact on the level of support available from more active voters. Unfortunately, among the district's most active voters, support does not even reach 40%. All of these responses are presented in the following table.

	<b>Very Active Voters</b>	<b>Active Voters</b>	<b>Less Active &amp; New Voters</b>
Favor	39.8%	46.3%	63.4%
Oppose	47.0%	40.9%	26.8%
Undecided	12.7%	12.8%	9.9%
Refused	0.6%		

## A Reaction to Cost

Immediately after the focused statement was presented, each voter interviewed was asked: *“I want to add one additional fact. If you knew that the bond will cost the average homeowner in the district \$175 per year, would you favor or oppose the placement of a bond proposal on the ballot next year?”* In response, support for placing a bond on the ballot drops to 40.6% with 48.9% opposed and 10.2% undecided. This cost is clearly too high to achieve majority support.

In order to define an acceptable tax rate, we need to look at the responses to five other questions that presented costs ranging from \$98 to \$217. This section of the survey was introduced to voters with the following language: *“I am going to ask you five questions about the cost of the property tax increase being considered. Each question presents you with an annual cost. These costs will be read to you in a random order. For each, tell me if knowing the cost of the bond would make you favor or oppose the placement of a bond measure on the ballot next year.”* Only the \$98 tax rate wins support from more than 50% of those interviewed. This cost to the average homeowner in the district caused 56.6% to say they would favor such a proposal with 32.9% opposed and 9.2% undecided. Because information alone never produces majority support, we believe the tax rate by itself must do so. Therefore, we do not recommend a rate higher than \$98 per year for the average homeowner.

The following table presents the overall responses to each of tax rate questions.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Pct. in Favor</b>
27. Property taxes for the average homeowner would be increased by \$98 per year.	<b>56.6%</b>
28. Property taxes for the average homeowner would be increased by \$147 per year.	<b>43.9%</b>

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 29. Property taxes for the average homeowner would be increased by \$176 per year. | <b>37.7%</b> |
| 30. Property taxes for the average homeowner would be increased by \$198 per year. | <b>34.9%</b> |
| 31. Property taxes for the average homeowner would be increased by \$217 per year. | <b>27.4%</b> |

## Evaluating the School District

A number of questions were included in the survey to explore voter opinion concerning the job the school district is doing. The first presents a question derived from the Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup *Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools*. The response shows that voters have a good reaction to the district (or feel that they are unable to evaluate the district). When asked: *"Students are often given the grades of A, B, C, D, and F to denote the quality of their work. Suppose the public schools in your community were graded in the same way. What grade would you give the schools in Glen Ellyn School District 41?"* 60.4% give the district an A or a B. This response is more positive than the PDK numbers for 2003 or 2004. These results are presented in the following table.

	<b>Glen Ellyn</b>	<b>PDK 2003</b>	<b>PDK 2004</b>
<b>A</b>	20.0%	11.0%	13.0%
<b>B</b>	40.4%	37.0%	34.0%
<b>C</b>	10.2%	31.0%	33.0%
<b>D</b>	2.7%	10.0%	10.0%
<b>F</b>	0.2%	5.0%	4.0%
<b>DK</b>	26.4%	6.0%	6.0%

Local voters give the district's facilities similar high marks when asked: *"What grade would you give to the quality of the elementary and middle school facilities in Glen Ellyn School District 41?"* 56.2% give the district an A or a B. Only 3.0% responded by giving the district a D or an F. These results are presented in the following table.

<b>A</b>	18.5%
<b>B</b>	37.7%
<b>C</b>	16.0%
<b>D</b>	2.5%
<b>F</b>	0.5%
<b>DK</b>	24.9%

Voters were also asked to “consider the financial management of the elementary school district. What grade would you give to the financial management of Glen Ellyn School District 41?” In response, 22.7% gave the district an A or a B. Approximately the same percentage, 24.4%, gave the district a D or an F. The low marks given to the district are strongest in the K-8 parent population. This perception of the district will need to be addressed before a bond is placed on the ballot. All of the responses to this question are presented in the following table.

	Overall	Parent	Alumni parents	Non- parents
<b>A</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	6.0%	2.9%	3.8%
<b>B</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	23.1%	17.5%	14.6%
<b>C</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	21.6%	24.8%	20.8%
<b>D</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	17.9%	13.9%	13.8%
<b>F</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	14.2%	7.3%	6.2%
<b>DK</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	16.4%	33.6%	40.8%

A related question produces a very similar result. When asked to rate the job the district does “spending tax dollars wisely,” 18.7% believe the district is doing an excellent or above average job while 31.0% give the district below average or poor marks. Again, parents are more likely to give the district low marks than are alumni parents or non-parents. All of the responses to this question are presented in the following table.

	Overall	Parent	Alumni parents	Non- parents
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	3.0%	3.6%	3.8%
<b>Above average</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	17.9%	17.5%	10.0%
<b>Average</b>	<b>34.9%</b>	35.1%	36.5%	33.1%
<b>Below average</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	15.7%	14.6%	11.5%
<b>Poor</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	22.4%	13.1%	15.4%
<b>Unable to evaluate</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	6.0%	14.6%	26.2%

Opinion is evenly divided when voters were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: “Glen Ellyn School District 41 can be trusted to properly manage local tax

*revenue.*” 42.7% agree or strongly agree with this statement while 44.9% disagree or strongly disagree. All of the responses to this question are presented in the following table.

<b>Strongly agree</b>	11.0%
<b>Agree</b>	31.7%
<b>Disagree</b>	27.4%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	17.5%
<b>Don't know</b>	12.5%

## The 2001 Referendum

Two questions were included in the survey to explore what voters remember about the district’s 2001 referendum. The first simply asked: *“In 2001, the Glen Ellyn School District 41 asked local voters to approve a local tax increase to raise the funds needed to lower class sizes and to strengthen many classroom programs. When that proposal was on the ballot, did you support it or oppose it?”* In response, 41.9% said they supported the 2001 proposal with 32.4% opposed. 3.0% said they did not vote and 12.0% said they did not live in the district in 2001.

Those who lived in the district at the time of the 2001 election were then asked an open-ended question: *“Is there one thing that you remember about the 2001 Glen Ellyn School District 41 referendum?”* 178 voters responded to this question. All of the responses were assigned to one of four broad categories (or could not be assigned and were left in an Other/Miscellaneous category). 28.7% offered a comment that related to the credibility of the district. All of the responses to this question are presented in the following table. The actual responses are presented in Appendix A at the end of this report.

Category	Count	Percentage
Trust in the district/District credibility	51	28.7%
Other/Miscellaneous	51	28.7%
Ways in which tax funds were to be used	34	19.1%
The cost was too high/It was a tax increase	31	17.4%
A lack of information	11	6.2%

## Appendix A

*“Is there one thing that you remember about the 2001 Glen Ellyn School District 41 referendum?”*

### ***Trust in the district/District credibility***

- A lot of promises were made and the funds didn't go where they were promised to go. I am willing to support the schools because I support good education but I want them to use the funds as promised.
- According to a study conducted by the Daily Herald, money projections per household are never publicized accurately, thus producing a surplus collection of funding and/or taxes. The misrepresentation of the figures causes me to be unable to support such referendums.
- After the fact, it ended up that the cost was much more significant than they thought.
- All the information was not given to the voters. The superintendent and the school board think that their opinions supersede those of the members of the community.
- As soon as we voted for it, they would have tripled taxes.
- At that time, they said they would not ask to raise taxes again and they did a study to make sure that we did not have to raise it again.
- At that time, they were doing a better job with school management and so I supported that measure. Now, they are wasting money and still asking for a tax increase instead of managing the money better.
- At the end, they realized that they would have more money than they needed.
- Credibility is lost from this election.
- Had hidden agenda
- Have tough time understanding; not explained properly to justify increased taxes
- I basically felt that the school district has been very wasteful with our money.
- I couldn't believe what they claimed.
- I didn't think they tried to raise the money prior to going to the taxpayers.
- I felt like they didn't do what the money was for. I don't believe that the district would ever do what the money was used for. I totally distrust them.

- I felt that the money they had raised for the referendum was not used correctly; it should have been used for adding more teachers and not adding specialists.
- I guess my biggest question was: are they (school district) effectively using the school funds?
- I just felt that I was being conned.
- I just remember that I voted for it and that they should have had the foresight to know that the population would increase and they should not have closed down any schools.
- I just think that they didn't look at the alternatives and the teachers' salaries were out of touch with the business world.
- I opposed this bond issue because the money gets eaten up by the school board putting it into raises for the school board but it doesn't go to help the kids. They destroyed a perfectly good school to rebuild a new one on the same spot. They should work on getting a new school board. I think that taking 10 homes from families to build a parking lot is horrible.
- I trusted that they would spend the money wisely but they didn't.
- I was not in support of District 41 building a new school with the 2001 bond because they had torn down the whole school. They said they didn't need the school due to lack of enrollment and now they want more money for a new school. They are using very poor judgment and planning with our property tax dollars.
- It was a grass roots campaign and it was more expensive than we were told.
- It was a lot more than what it was supposed to be and it was defeated.
- Misrepresentation of the finances
- People felt that there was a lot of politics going and that they were putting a guilt trip on the populace. There were too many half truths and not enough factual information on the true costs and no accountability of use of and need for funds. A big contention was what is the amount of the overhead?
- The appropriate homework was not done. I don't think we need the entire school.
- The deliberate misleading of the taxpayers as to the total cost of the bond
- The district cannot manage its money properly.
- The school board and the school administration are not trustworthy. They said that the price was going to be lower than it was but the information was based on what they were going to do only in the first year. What they were doing was not right and that's why people voted the wrong way. That didn't explain how it worked. They didn't explain phase-in.
- There was a lot of hard work put into it and nothing came out of it. They didn't do exactly what they were supposed to do and lost a classroom at Churchill but, oh boy, we sure did get a big new gym. (P.S. That belongs

to the Park District.) District 41 has been fiscally irresponsible and I think that they're pushing the lower to middle income out of here.

- They did a poor job of planning in the past and they are just trying to put a Band-Aid on it now. They are really unqualified to address this issue and they just want to placate some of the people in the district.
- They did not do their homework well enough.
- They did not have all of their facts correct.
- They didn't follow through with their promises.
- They didn't know how to spend the money they got. They are not good managers.
- They fixed a lot of problems but there was such a misuse of monies in doing these things. I am disgusted with the school board. I found these questions in this survey to not be too accurate. For example, I know for a fact that the portables have locked doors and passkeys, so the question about the safety of the kids is inaccurate.
- They gave a quote for the increase and then they increased the rate increase of the tax.
- They lied to us about the amount that it would be.
- They misled the voters about the money.
- They said they needed the money and now I don't believe them.
- They should have, at that time, looked at the expansion and the need for more funds. I don't believe that they've managed the funds well since that vote.
- They were short-sighted.
- They were supposed to hire somebody to do something and they didn't.
- They were supposed to take care of the problems and they did not.
- They were trying to put it down our own throats. They were playing "hide the pea". They were hiding the money in other funds and making it look like there was not enough money for their education, for the kids.
- They weren't honest with the people.
- Used unwisely
- We felt deceived because the money was to be used for one thing and then we found out it was to be used for something else.
- We were told that our taxes would increase a certain amount but it keeps going up. The district can't be trusted.

### ***Other/Miscellaneous***

- A few people told me to vote against it.
- A lot of people were involved in the bond measure and they did a lot of door knocking to get everyone involved in it.
- Could we buy back the Main Street Park District building that was a school at one time?
- I don't think it went through.

- I get confused with the different bonds for this school district and the high school.
- I have a problem with the teachers' pay and the administrative salaries.
- I have children attending schools.
- I know that the older people did not support it.
- I only remember that it was a close race.
- I remember that a lot of people opposed this.
- I remember that it didn't pass.
- I remember the dollar value and what it was for. My only question is why are we doing it again? Apparently it did not achieve its prior goal.
- I remember the way it was packaged; they made sure that everybody saw the leaks and the conditions of the schools.
- I supported it and I would support this one only if District 87 passes their referendum first. The high school has not been improved in many, many years.
- I think taxes went up \$500 per household. I think the state should match the funds and what the heck happened to the lottery funds?
- I usually voted for referendums but I do not for the district anymore.
- I voted for it.
- I voted for it.
- I voted for it.
- I wasn't aware of the high salaries of the administration.
- I went door to door giving pamphlets out.
- I would support this bond measure if: 1) It was under \$100, 2) if it was used for the upkeep of the existing schools and 3) no new schools. Renovate what you have.
- If they need more space in the classrooms, take the kids from the Glendale Heights school back to Glendale Heights because they don't pay Glen Ellyn taxes; therefore, you would have the room and the space for the Glenn Ellyn school children whose parents pay all of the taxes. Your problem would be solved instead of raising our taxes - again.
- If they really wanted to, they could find the money elsewhere.
- If we had passed it, we wouldn't be in this position. Class sizes would be small and no more money would be needed.
- I'm on a fixed income.
- It didn't work because there was work to be done.
- It failed but I supported it.
- It failed.
- It passed.
- It was impacting the older people of the city who had already paid their dues.
- It was turned down.
- My neighbor was adamantly against it because he sent his kids to private school.

- Pay for play
- Poorly run in making it better known about the needs
- Same issues as this measure - officials want money
- Someone in my neighborhood came to my house with a flyer to talk to me about it and asked for my vote of support.
- Teachers and staff are paid too much.
- Terrible administration people got what they wanted and left the kids out in left field - never again.
- The administrators make way too much money.
- The different districts in one city
- The new site
- The results were close.
- There was too much controversy about it.
- There were more people who would support this than the Glenbard High School bond.
- They couldn't convince me.
- Too many minorities
- Two schools in our district have worked very well.
- We had the exact same referendum three years or so before and I supported it then but not now.
- We need more information on how it will be spent.
- We need to support our kids with better facilities and leadership.

### ***Ways in which tax funds were to be used***

- A lot of special services were cut.
- Decrease class sizes
- Expanded all the buildings
- Facilities needed funds.
- I am a teacher and I think it was about renovation on the junior high at that time.
- I remember that they would be able to accommodate the students after we pay the taxes.
- I think I voted for that one because they were going to make more classroom space and improve student activities.
- I voted for it to retain the teachers.
- Improve the quality of education
- In general, support of education
- It did improve the schools but it did also cause us to immediately put out trailers because the space was not adequate enough.
- It focused on the lower end of the spectrum.

- It was for extracurricular activities like sports and not for core classroom programs.
- It was going to reduce class sizes.
- It was just about less overcrowding.
- It was supposed to bring music and art classes back and reduce class sizes.
- It was supposed to reduce class sizes but it did not.
- It was supposed to stop overcrowding.
- It was supposed to update the things that needed to be done.
- New classroom and building and that was approved
- Overcrowding issues
- Recommended the cutting of administration costs
- The purpose was to offer fine arts and music.
- There were some questions about cutting some programs because they had not enough money for them.
- They added enough rooms to the school.
- They hadn't received a tax increase in the last 12 years.
- They needed this money for more school space.
- They needed to upgrade handicapped facilities.
- They wanted class sizes to be smaller, the student-to-teacher ratio smaller.
- They were also going to fix the schools so that they weren't so dirty.
- Want to keep class sizes down
- We needed more space because we used portable classrooms.
- We were asked to support a property tax hike to support new school facilities and that's all.
- We were going to lose sports teams and other activities, so I voted yes.

### ***The cost was too high/It was a tax increase***

- All I know is if they passed it, it would have raised the taxes.
- Amount that they wanted to increase taxes
- How high the taxes were
- I did the math and taxes would be too high. Future increases would be too high also.
- I have no children in school and I'm on a fixed income and I don't want to pay more in taxes.
- I think they were going to raise property taxes.
- I voted no because my property taxes are too high already and I don't agree with the way the district spends the money and I don't agree with the things that they teach.
- If it's the one I'm thinking about, it raised my property taxes more than they said it would.

- It increased our taxes.
- It increased taxes.
- It meant higher taxes.
- It raised taxes.
- It was going to increase my property taxes. I pay too much already and enough is enough. There are so many children who are going to the schools in District 41 and their parents don't own property, so they don't have to pay for their child's education.
- It was going to increase my taxes horribly.
- It was going to increase my taxes.
- It was going to raise my taxes.
- It was going to raise taxes about \$1,000 and the administration was using funds poorly.
- It would benefit the kids and it was too costly, if I remember correctly.
- It would increase property taxes.
- More taxes
- My biggest thing was I did not want any more new taxes. The whole public school system has major problems. What is it with calling Christmas break "the winter break"?
- No one voted for it because they didn't want to raise their taxes.
- Property taxes became too high and friend kept job
- Taxes keep going up anyway.
- The increase in my property tax
- The problem is that we told them not to close and sell off all of the schools because this would happen and now that it is happening. We don't want the taxes raised.
- The tax increase was going to cost me.
- The taxes just keep getting higher and higher. I don't want taxes raised for the schools right now.
- The taxes were going to go up.
- They asked for too much money.
- They would raise our taxes.

### ***A lack of information***

- I didn't have much information about it and that is why I voted against it.
- I worked on it. It was advertised but I don't know if it was publicized enough to make people informed enough to seriously consider it.
- It became a great public affairs issue where the kids would suffer. They never told us what the new class sizes would be.
- It was not well-publicized.
- Lack of information as to why the money was needed
- There wasn't enough information on it.

- They did not do a good job of supporting the measure.
- They did not explain the phase-in effect and extra costs to the taxpayers.
- They didn't do a good job of providing details of the proposal. At the end of day, I think that District 41 suffers from a comparison with the high school's finances; therefore, it is essential to provide as much information as possible about the upcoming ballot proposal.
- We definitely need more information about it. Cut all of the gobble-de-gook and just give us the straight answers. They need to blanket the town with information or this proposal will definitely lose.
- We didn't know enough about it ahead of time. It was put to us pretty fast and it was supposed to have taken care of all of the schools' problems to prevent just this increase - again.