Research Goals

Measure opinion toward PCC among likely primary voters including:

- Depth and breadth of support for PCC
- Support for program offerings, current and potential
- Understanding of and support for PCC’s infrastructure needs
- Support for a bond renewal
Methodology
Patinkin Research Strategies conducted interviews August 8-11, 2016

- Survey of 800 likely voters from the Portland Community College district
- Sample was the best possible approximation of an off-cycle primary voter
- Margin of error +/- 3.5% at the 95% level of confidence, margin of error for subgroups is higher
Perceptions of PCC
Do they like us and what we’re doing?
PCC has strong favorability ratings

- 3 out of 4 voters have a favorable opinion
- A third of voters report a very favorable opinion
- Tip: Focus on increasing intensity of support

Favorability: PCC & Community Colleges

- 76% Strongly Favorable
- 33% Favorable
- 13% Neutral
- 12% Unfavorable
- 12% N/A

Focus on increasing intensity
Generally strong support for local schools

- Both PCC and PSU outperform K-12
Voters’ Perceptions

Portland Community College:

- Provides affordable, accessible education for everyone
- Prepares students now and in the future
- Teaches the skills necessary to secure good paying jobs to keep up with the high cost of living

Provides lifelong learning opportunities for all adults

Essential job skills + good paying jobs + keep up with Portland’s high cost of living

Makes higher ed more accessible for all members of our community

Prepares students to transfer to a 4-yr college

Is Oregon’s largest college serving more than 80,000

Total

Well

Q. 22 42% 37% 79%
Q. 14 36% 43% 79%
Q. 11 30% 46% 76%
Q. 19 33% 41% 74%
Q. 10 36% 30% 66%

Very Well    Well
Accountability Frame

- A thin majority feel satisfied (these responders are most likely to support bond renewal).
- Not at a crisis but important to keep a handle on this measure of support.

51% believe PCC is spending taxpayer money wisely

46% are satisfied with PCC’s spending
# Accountability to Taxpayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most likely to be satisfied</th>
<th>Most likely to be unsatisfied</th>
<th>Most likely to be unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 50-59</td>
<td>Age 60-69</td>
<td>No college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC students</td>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>Renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners</td>
<td>PCC families</td>
<td>Younger voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Voters</td>
<td>All Voters</td>
<td>All Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHERE WE START
Measuring Viability

Benchmarks for a winning measure

- Overall support for a proposal must be in the mid-50s or higher
- Intensity of support is a key measure for us to build
- Intensity of opposition should be muted, ideally trails support by a 2-1 margin
Renewal Only, No Increase

“How Bonds to improve classrooms, safety, technology, construct job training space. Shall college repair, construct facilities, job training space; issue $165 million dollars in general obligation bonds estimated to maintain current tax rate?”

If the election were held today would you vote “yes” or “no”?

Total Yes = 64%
- Yes: 35% (Strong: 29%, Not Strong: 6%)
- No: 29% (Strong: 16%, Not Strong: 13%)
- Don't Know: 8%

Total No = 28%
### Support Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propensity to vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>+46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- More voters we turnout the better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>+45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Must keep this from becoming partisan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>+44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>+29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WA Co can be won but the math is in Mult Co

---

**Total Yes = 64%**

- 35%

**Total No = 28%**

- 29%
- 12%
- 16%
- 8% Don’t know

---

- Strong
- Not Strong
Support by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No gender gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>+64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 70</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Support decreases with age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College+</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>+42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- College education = better voter

- 24% of voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCC Student</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC Family</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>+57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PCC students and families are our base

- 33% of voters
Top Priorities for Voters
Top Priorities

- Job training
- Updated technology
- Critical repairs

First Choice

1. Skills taught at PCC match the specific needs of local employers (18%)
2. Updating technology and science labs to provide modern higher education (22%)
3. Addressing critical repairs and maintenance for classrooms and college facilities (12%)
4. Increasing safety for students and staff (20%)
5. Revenue raised by the bond is spent accountably and efficiently (20%)
Outcomes

**What challenges should be addressed with bond funds?**

- **Improved school safety**
- **More trained health professionals**
- **Students to be prepared for good-paying jobs**
- **Modernized higher education**

*(All tests extremely well)*
Our Path Forward

Increasing the intensity of support

- Build PCC’s communication channels to students and families
- Deepen relationships with current supporters

Emphasize PCC’s proven track record

- Providing accessible and affordable education
- Meeting the needs of the community – matching job skills with local employers
- Preparing students now and in the future
Schedule: May 2017 Election

PCC FACILITIES MASTER PLAN - OPTION A
SCHEDULE | PHASE 1

BOND (MAY 2017)
CAPITAL PROJECT CONFIRMATION
Scheduled Maintenance
Public Safety
Information Technology

ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN
Comprehensive Facilities Condition Assessment
Space Utilization
Transportation
Sustainability
ADA

Cost Estimates
Task Force Meetings (weekly)
PCC Work Groups (weekly)
Steering Committee (monthly)
PCC Board Meetings (monthly)
Schedule: November 2017 Election
## Bond Election Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2017 Election</th>
<th>November 2017 Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2016 Review of current Bond polling and update of timeline</td>
<td>November 15, 2016 Review of current Bond polling and update of timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017 polling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2017 – Board only review of projects &amp; costs</td>
<td>January 21, 2017 – Board first review of projects &amp; costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2017 – Board Resolution approved</td>
<td>July 20, 2017 – Board Final review of projects &amp; costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 2017 – Filing deadline</td>
<td>August 17, 2017 – Board Resolution approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2017 - Election</td>
<td>September 7, 2017 – Filing deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 7, 2017 – Election</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bond Renewal Guiding Questions

1. Do you go?
2. How much do you ask?
4. What is the future of PCC bond requests?
5. What are the timelines internally?
6. What are timelines externally around campaign planning?
7. What are next steps moving forward?