

Community Feedback on the 2025 Bond Election

Executive Summary and Actionable Considerations

Purpose

This outline summarizes key themes from the post-election community feedback survey following the 2025 bond election. The intent is to inform future facility planning and community engagement by identifying areas of shared understanding, points of concern, and practical considerations moving forward.

Participation Context

- Nearly 2,000 individuals participated in the bond election.
- 261 individuals completed the post-election feedback survey.
- Survey responses represent qualitative insight and should not be interpreted as a statistically representative sample of all voters.
- The value of the survey lies in identifying recurring themes, concerns, and expectations.

Shared Understanding Across Responses

- Broad acknowledgment that Snyder ISD facilities require continued investment, particularly at Snyder High School.
- General understanding that major construction projects cannot be funded through the Maintenance and Operations budget.
- Appreciation for community engagement efforts, including meetings, tours, and informational resources.

These responses indicate alignment on the existence of facility needs, even when opinions differ on approach.

Primary Reasons for Support

- Emphasis on safety and infrastructure improvements.
- Support for long-term planning that benefits students and staff.
Concern about rising costs if major repairs are delayed.
- Confidence in the district's identification of facility needs.

These responses suggest a foundational base of support for facility investment when the purpose and necessity are clearly communicated.

Primary Reasons for Opposition

- Concerns about overall cost and perceived tax impact.
- The scope of the proposal felt too large or too broad.
- Preference for phased or prioritized projects.
- Requests for greater project-level detail and clarity.
- Broader concerns related to trust, maintenance history, or financial oversight.

Opposition was more often tied to scale, structure, and confidence than to rejection of facility improvements.

Emphasis on Focus and Phasing

- Strong interest in prioritizing essential needs first.

- Preference for phased or smaller proposals that allow the community to see progress over time.
- Desire for clear separation between critical infrastructure and enhancements.

This feedback suggests future proposals may benefit from a sequenced, priority-driven approach.

Perception of Project Mix

- Certain components became symbolic of “wants versus needs” in public discussion.
 - These perceptions influenced overall support, even when those components were not the primary cost drivers.
- Some supportive respondents noted that broader project packaging made consensus more difficult.

How projects are grouped and framed influenced public understanding and confidence.

Communication and Clarity

- Information was widely shared through multiple communication channels.
- Many respondents engaged with tours, materials, and discussions.
- Some voters still reported uncertainty related to financial impact, scope, or specific outcomes.

This suggests a gap between access to information and confidence in decision-making.

Trust and Systemic Considerations

- Some feedback connected bond decisions to perceptions of maintenance responsiveness, operational consistency, and long-term accountability.

Actionable Considerations for Future Planning

Project Structure

- Explore phased or prioritized facility plans.
- Clearly distinguish essential infrastructure needs from enhancements.

Cost and Detail

- Provide clearer project-level estimates and renderings where feasible.
- Explain cost drivers, trade-offs, and alternatives in plain language.

Oversight and Accountability

- Clearly define guardrails for the use of bond funds.
- Communicate how progress and expenditures would be monitored and reported.

Community Engagement

- Continue engagement beyond election cycles.
- Involve a broader range of perspectives, including those who expressed concerns or skepticism.

Strategic Outlook

Survey feedback suggests the community remains open to continued dialogue when proposals feel manageable, priorities are clearly defined, accountability is visible, and engagement is ongoing. This input can inform future facility planning and engagement strategies regardless of the timing of any future bond proposal.