Survey of Poll Workers in California – General Election November 7, 2006
Report for Santa Cruz County

Election Administration Research Center, UC Berkeley, May 1, 2007

In the following pages we provide a summary of a survey conducted by the Election Administration Research Center (EARC) at UC Berkeley, and an analysis of data collected from election poll workers (or precinct board members), who worked at polling places throughout California during the General Election on November 7, 2007. This study was funded by the California Secretary of State's office, and conducted in collaboration with the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials (CACEO).

Project Overview
California's 58 counties have roughly 25,000 polling places staffed by approximately 100,000 poll workers. By law, California's polling places have to be staffed by a minimum of 3 poll workers, but some counties, depending on availability, will hire as many as 6 workers to fill special needs, usually to add workers with second language skills. On average, a precinct board consists of 4 members. While there was a great shortage of workers for the June 2006 Primary, and most counties were scrambling to hire workers up until the last few days before the election, there did not seem to be the same widespread need in the 2006 General Election, partly because the counties needed less workers overall. Some counties had purged their voter rolls and cut the number of precincts down considerably.

June survey
During the June Primary of 2006, EARC launched a survey of poll workers in California. The initial plan of the study was to deploy the survey instrument (see Appendix 1) to all poll workers in California counties. All 58 counties were invited to participate but because of a short time frame to launch the survey, many counties were unable to include the surveys in their precinct supplies which had already been packed or sent out to poll workers. In the 3 weeks before the election, EARC delivered over 55,000 surveys to 25 counties[1]. Approximately 43% of those surveys were returned which we considered a phenomenal response rate.

County participation in November
Most of the counties who were contacted directly by EARC and declined participating during the Primary indicated that they would be interested in conducting the survey during the General Election in November. In the months preceding the General Election, we again invited counties to participate in the survey, either for the first time or to repeat and compare results to the Primary Election. Four counties that did not distribute the survey in June, chose to distribute it in

---

[1] 1 The counties that received surveys in June were: Alameda, Colusa, Contra Costa, Fresno, Humboldt, Kern, Lassen, Los Angeles, Mariposa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Solano, Tuolumne and Yolo.

November.[2] Four counties also chose to conduct the survey again[3], resulting in eight counties participating with approximately 8500 poll workers.[4]

Survey instrument
The November survey instrument was tailored to each county. First the June questionnaire was edited to reflect what we learned from the analyzing the June results. We clarified questions, removed less relevant questions and consolidated questions. As requested by a County Clerk, we added a set of questions right at the beginning of the survey about training on new voting equipment. For two counties (Contra Costa and San Luis Obispo) that distributed the survey in June, we left the 'rated' questions (where the respondent circles 0-5) worded the same, because these counties specifically wanted to compared their results between June and November. For the rest of the counties, we reworded these questions to determine if we could better capture the impact of received training on preparation. Generally, this consisted of the sentence "If you received training on ___, how well did it prepare you to _____" so that the respondent only rated their actual training, not lack of training. For three counties (Contra Costa, San Luis Obispo, and San Francisco) we adapted terminology to their unique circumstances, providing 'Election Day job title' choices particular to their county. In general there were two questionnaires, one which had the older version of 'rated' questions (32 questions – see Appendix 2) and one which had the newer version of 'rated' questions and a few extra questions (34 questions – see Appendix 3).

Distribution
Just as in June, the surveys were printed on a double sided 8 ½" x 11" sheet of paper. EARC stapled a self-addressed postage-paid business reply envelope to each survey, coded them by county, and collated them into packs of 4 or 5 depending on requests by counties. Generally the surveys were then packaged into a large envelope that was stamped "For Inspector and Poll Workers," one for each precinct, and delivered to the counties for inclusion into the precinct supplies. In some cases individual surveys were provided to the county to distribute to roving inspectors or other workers during training, and in one case the county printed, stapled envelopes (provided by us), and distributed the surveys on its own. At the request of some counties, we sent more questionnaires than poll workers in the county, so they had extra for distribution in different ways.

Sample sizes and response rates
Again, we found this distribution system to be fairly successful. 9110 surveys were distributed and just over 35.5% of these surveys were returned to us. Because we sent extra surveys to the counties, if we just look at the number of workers who worked that day and could have answered the survey, our response rate is 38%. Across the eight counties, we have received a total of 3239 surveys which have been coded and entered into datasets by two research assistants. For Santa Cruz, we received 350 surveys back, 39% of the number of poll workers that worked that day.

---

[2] These counties were Imperial, Mendocino, Sonoma and San Francisco; although we delivered surveys in San Francisco in June, they were never distributed and therefore we considered San Francisco as new to the survey.
[3] These counties were San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz and Yolo
[4] The participating counties used a variety of voting technology, both in terms of machine types and manufacturers. Some implemented new technology in November and others had the same technology already for several elections. Five counties had scanners in their precincts, two counties used paper ballots that were centrally scanned, and one had a DRE touch screen machine for all voters. To meet the HAVA accessibility requirement, some of the optical scan counties had ballot marking assistance devices and some used DRE machines.

For these reports, we first created separate county level datasets, and then combined these datasets according to survey type. Two counties with the older version had a combined total of 1229 responses. The six surveys with the newer questionnaire had a combined total of 2010 responses. For the 20 identical questions sent to all eight counties, a dataset of all 3239 responses was compiled. The combined data are necessary to be able to analyze the variables using a bigger sample, and to provide a baseline for each county to compare their responses.

Findings
Below are the results for the Santa Cruz responses coded and analyzed as of today, and for the most part they are discussed in the order they appeared on the survey (see Appendix 3). Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point in most cases. Where percentages do not add to 100%, the balance is those who did not answer the question and/or it is due to rounding error. All percentages are the results for Santa Cruz, and the *percentage for the all county[5] sample is listed in parenthesis after each response*.

Training attendance
Santa Cruz does comparatively well training all its poll workers. Of the Santa Cruz poll workers that responded to the survey 90% (77%) reported that they attended a training class for the November Election, and 9% (22%), did not. (See Table 1)

On a methodological note, these numbers are fairly good measures for the *sample* because very few left this question unanswered; in Santa Cruz, one respondent left this question unanswered, and in the all county samples less than 1% left it blank. However, these numbers may not reflect the *actual* percentage of poll workers that were trained, either in the county or state-wide. We suspect that workers who did not attend training did not feel like the survey was designed for them, and thus did not fill it out. Poll workers that were trained are probably over-represented in these results.

Table 1: Attended Training

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	90%	77%	84%	86%
No	9%	22%	16%	13%
No Answer	.3%	.7%	0%	.4%

Please note that the proportion going to training of the workers across all the counties surveyed dropped significantly between June and November. We believe this was because the different mix of counties in the two samples had different training requirements, and because the all county sample in November was a more experienced group than the June sample (76% returning workers as opposed to 68% in June) and the experienced clerks tend to forgo optional training more often. Related to this was the apparent smaller requirement for workers in November than June and thus the ability to use returning workers and less need to recruit new workers.

Reasons to miss training class
When Santa Cruz poll workers that did not attend training were asked 'why not', the largest group 52% (28%) said they had a conflict with the scheduled training times, which included having to work and being out of town. (See Table 2) This was the second most common reason 27% (32%) in Santa Cruz's June survey. The second most common reason in November, at 32% (11%), was that

---

[5] The 'all county' sample is the combined data of eight counties for the 20 common questions, and 6 counties for the other questions.

4

a worker signed up too late to attend training; this was the primary reason in June, at 36% (30%). The third most frequently mentioned reason, at 10% (10%), was that no training was available; however, this reason was not given at all in June. One respondent, 3% (41%), claimed that training was not necessary, and one, 3% (2%) said they forgot, two reasons that were more prevalent in June for Santa Cruz. The fact that more respondents said that training was unnecessary in June as compared to November might be explained by the slightly greater experience level of the sample in June. Of the Santa Cruz poll workers surveyed in November, 77% (76%) had worked before and only 19% (22%) were new, as opposed to 80% (68%) of respondents in June that had worked in previous elections, and 19% (31%) that had not worked before. (See Table 11)

Table 2: Reasons to not attend training class

| | Nov06 | | June 06 | |
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Schedule Conflict	52%	28%	27%	32%
Signed up too late	32%	11%	36%	30%
No training available	10%	10%	0%	14%
Training unnecessary	3%	41%	13%	15%
Forgot	3%	2%	14%	2%
Ill/unable to get there	0%	8%	8%	14%

Training content and equipment
The November questionnaire then went on to ask specific questions about the kind of training available if the respondent did attend training for the November Election. This was not asked in June. The first question was whether the respondent was trained on voting procedures and the rest of the questions pertained to voting equipment. The same percentage of workers who reported attending training, 90%, also reported being trained specifically on procedures. (See Table 3) The drop in those who answered no to this question is made up for by the rise in those who did not answer. Many less respondents were trained on the equipment than reported attending training class. 72% (68%) reported being trained on how to set up and dismantle voting equipment and 61% (53%) reported being trained in how to troubleshoot the equipment. (See Tables 4 and 5) Please note that many counties have a division of labor where not all workers must handle the equipment, so these percentages probably reflect that. However those who were trained on equipment were most likely to be fully trained, as 55% (50%) of all respondents reported being trained on both setting up and dismantling and troubleshooting the equipment. 13% (15%) of all respondents were trained on setting up the equipment but not on troubleshooting. And a very small percentage 4% (3%) was trained on troubleshooting equipment but not setting up and taking down the equipment. (See Table 6) It follows reason that setting up and dismantling equipment is the first level of training, and learning how to troubleshoot equipment would then be the next level of training.

Table 3: Trained on Procedures

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	90%	80%
No	2%	3%
No Answer	7%	17%

Table 4: Trained on Setting Up and Dismantling Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	72%	68%
No	19%	14%
No Answer	9%	18%

Table 5: Trained on Troubleshooting Equipment Problems

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	61%	53%
No	27%	26%
No Answer	11%	21%

Table 6: Type of Training on Equipment

	Troubleshooting	
Santa Cruz County	Yes	No
Set up and Dismantle Yes	55%	13%
No	4%	14%

We also asked 'Did you receive reference materials on the new voting equipment?' 47% (58%) of Santa Cruz poll workers received reference materials specifically on the new voting equipment, much less than the number who were trained on the equipment. (See Table 7) Mostly those that received reference materials were also trained on the equipment, but in 2.5% of cases they were not, so the reference materials in those cases were a substitute to training.

Table 7: Received Reference Materials on Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	47%	58%
No	41%	21%
No Answer	12%	21%

We also asked the poll workers whether this was the first time they were trained on the voting equipment used in the November 06 election. This varied by county, as some counties implemented new equipment for November 06 and others had been using the equipment for several elections and others were somewhere in-between. In Santa Cruz, there was a much higher percentage of trainees learning the equipment for the first time 73% (39%) than those who had been trained on the equipment already 11% (39%). (See Table 8) While over 70% of respondents had worker before or were trained before (Tables 10 & 11) and only 19% were new workers, the equipment was basically new to the county. The implementation of the full set of new equipment in Santa Cruz's November election is reflected in these numbers. The 11% who had been trained on equipment previously were probably the subset of workers trained on the touch screen in June.

Table 8: Trained For First Time on Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	73%	39%
No	11%	39%
No Answer	14%	21%

Understanding Necessity of Equipment and Previous Training
We then asked the poll workers if they understood from the training why the voting equipment is necessary. Considering that most poll workers were trained on the equipment for the first time, it is reassuring that 72% (71%) of the respondents did answer yes to this question and only 12% (7%) answered no. (See Table 9)

Table 9: Understood Why Equipment Necessary

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	72%	71%
No	12%	7%
No Answer	15%	21%

While the equipment was new to most, Santa Cruz poll worker respondents were highly trained in general. Not only did 90% of respondents receive training for November 2006, but also 74% (70%) of respondents attended training for past elections. Only 24% (27%) did not receive training in past elections. (See Table 10) Of those who attended past trainings 60% (49%) attended more than 4 trainings each.

Table 10: Attended Past Trainings

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	74%	70%	73%	63%
No	24%	27%	26%	35%
No Answer	2%	3%	1%	2%

Poll Worker Experience
Santa Cruz's respondents in the November Election were as experienced as all eight counties combined, almost as experienced as Santa Cruz's June sample, and much more experienced than the other 23 counties in June. 77% (76%) of respondents of respondents reported that they had worked in previous elections. Only 19% (22%) of the November poll workers reported that they had not worked before. (See Table 11) Of those who had worked previous to November, 56% (51%) had worked in more than 4 past elections.

Table 11: Poll Worker in Previous Elections

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	77%	76%	80%	68%
No	19%	22%	19%	31%
No Answer	3%	2%	1%	1%

Reference Materials to Review Before Election Day.
In June we asked the counties about receiving reference materials at training and reviewing these materials prior to Election Day. In November, we broadened the question to receiving materials in any way before Election Day, not just at the training, and across the counties this number dropped. (See Table 12) In our Santa Cruz sample, a large 77% (67%) reported receiving materials before Election Day, greater than the all county percentage in November, but not as high as Santa Cruz's June respondents or the all county sample in June. Of those that did receive materials, a substantial 84% (83%) reported reviewing those materials, which is equivalent to the all county percent in November and to the Santa Cruz percent in June. (See Table 13) We continue to recommend that

the importance of reviewing the materials prior to Election Day is emphasized when they are handed out or mailed to the poll workers.

Table 12: Received Reference Materials Before Election Day

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	77%	67%	83%	85%
No	14%	22%	4%	6%
No Answer	6%	7%	7%	5%

Table 13: Reviewed Reference Materials Before Election Day

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties
Yes	84%	83%	84%	91%
No	7%	8%	13%	7%
No Answer	9%	9%	2%	3%

Reference Materials on Election Day
Later in the survey we asked the six county group if they had sufficient reference materials available to them on Election Day (as opposed to before Election Day) and 86% (87%) checked yes and only 3% (4%) checked no. (See Table 14) 10% (8%) did not respond to this question. Although most respondents find the materials sufficient, the results of this survey and other data we have collected point to the need of making materials available to all poll workers on Election Day regardless of their position, job duty, experience or training status.

Next we asked about which topics they would have liked more information. While most respondents found the materials 'sufficient,' 20% (26%) of respondents still answered this question. We received a total of 87 separate responses from 69 respondents. (See Table 15) This question gave as prompts five topics for which respondents might want more information: equipment, opening, closing, special situations, and troubleshooting. While these were there to stimulate ideas, they also garnered many of the responses. (See grey rows in Table 15) In some cases the respondent just circled the topic rather than wrote it out, or wrote 'all of the above.' The only prompted topic that tended to get fewer responses was 'opening' procedures. In some cases more detail was provided about the particular topic. For example, while information about 'equipment' in general was requested 10 times, additional requests were for troubleshooting information about the machines, better organized, more clear, and more visual information on the machines, and a video about the scanner. Others asked for more training on the machine rather than more written information, and one specifically asked for hands-on training. All kinds of other responses were entered in this question, such as those suggesting a review before the day starts, and asking for more supplies to help the voters such as maps and sample ballots.

Table 14: Sufficient Reference Materials Available on Election Day

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties		24 Counties
Yes	86%	87%	91%	90%
No	3%	4%	3%	3%
No Answer	10%	8%	3%	4%

Table 15: Materials or Information Needed

Santa Cruz County	frequency	% of 87 responses
Nothing/No- Sufficient Materials/Materials Good	3	3%
Not sure	2	2%
More written info/clearer written info/better organized/streamline	4	5%
Equipment in general	10	11%
Troubleshooting machines	2	2%
Touch screen/computer info(more, clarify, explain security, pictures)	6	7%
Video about scanner	1	1%
Need training on equip (rather than written material)	5	6%
Opening	6	7%
Closing	14	16%
Special Situations	14	16%
Trouble Shooting	11	13%
All of the above (equipment, opening, closing, special situations, trouble-shooting)	1	1%
Step by step procedures/terminology	2	2%
Did not need reference materials/relied on other workers	3	3%
Review provisional and absentee procedures before starting day	1	1%
Voter info (Sample Ballots, Maps of Other polling places)	2	2%

Election Day Titles

The Santa Cruz sample contained 16% (21%) inspectors, and 81% (72%) clerks. (See Table 16) Six respondents, just under 2%, reported being some kind of technology or voting machine specialist. One respondent wrote that he/she was a student worker, however later in the survey 17 respondents stated that they were high school students, so these most likely simply circled 'clerk' for their Election Day title. (See Table 28) The breakdown of inspectors and clerks is an expected and reasonable breakdown because there is usually one inspector per polling place accompanied by 3 or more clerks, and it is almost exactly the same ratio that Santa Cruz had in its June survey sample. Santa Cruz has a higher ratio of clerks to inspectors than the all county samples both in June and November, which may be explained by larger precinct boards and by the fact that some of the other counties used the term 'judge' rather than 'clerk.'

About 18% (24%) of the returning poll workers in the Santa Cruz sample reported having worked as an inspector at some point in the past, and about 62% (69%) had been clerks. (See Table 16) Eleven or 3% of experienced workers had been some kind of technology specialist in a previous election, presumably the June 2006 election when touch screen machines were introduced.

Table 16: Election Day Titles of Sample

	Nov06				June 06			
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County - past titles	All Counties - past titles	Santa Cruz County	All Counties	Santa Cruz County - past titles	All Counties - past titles
Inspector	16%	21%	18%	24%	15%	21%	16%	26%
Clerk	81%	72%	62%	69%	84%	64%	86%	70%

The next set of questions were scored on a 1 – 5 Likert scale, one being poor and 5 being excellent. 3 or 'good' was in the middle, indicating 'could be better, could be worse.' 0 was the option for Not Applicable. Please note that the following percentages will not add to 100 because not all poll workers answered them.

General preparation for Election Day:
The November survey asked the following questions about training preparation differently than in June, and therefore there is no comparison given of figures from June. There is comparison, however, to the combined sample of the six counties who were asked the question in this format. The first question asked "if you received training, how well did it prepare you for Election Day?" Upon being asked this question, 17% of Santa Cruz respondents said 'good' or a 3 on the 1 – 5 scale. 67% felt very well prepared, rating training preparation at 3.5 or above. 5% felt poorly or less than well prepared for Election Day. (See Table 17) Santa Cruz poll workers showed high levels of confidence, and slightly more than all six counties put together.

Table 17: Preparation for Election Day

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	67%	63%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	17%	15%
Not well prepared	5%	4%
Not Applicable	4%	4%
No Answer	7%	13%

Handling voter situations:
Poll workers were then asked a more specific question about training preparation: "If you received training, how well did the training prepare you to manage different voter situations and questions on Election Day?" In November, 19% of Santa Cruz poll workers rated the training preparations as 'good' in terms of handling voter situation, 64% rated the training preparation as better than

good, and 5% rated the preparation as less than good. (See Table 18) Again Santa Cruz showed high levels of confidence, especially compared to all six counties. The confidence in this specific area was approximately the same as general confidence about Election Day.

Table 18: Preparation to Handle Different Voter Situations

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	64%	59%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	19%	18%
Not well prepared	5%	6%
Not Applicable	4%	4%
No Answer	7%	13%

Working with Voting Equipment:
The next set of questions asked poll workers about their preparation to handling the voting equipment on Election Day. Six counties received the question "If you received training on voting equipment, how well did it prepare you to operate that equipment?" 17% of Santa Cruz poll workers said their preparation for operating the voting equipment was good, 43% rated their preparation above 3 on the 1 to 5 scale, and 11% felt poorly or less than well prepared to deal with voting equipment. (See Table 19)   Here we see the confidence of Santa Cruz respondents dropping compared to the first two questions, but still about the same as the six county sample. However we can explain the drop in confidence with respect to equipment as resulting from less training on equipment. With this question we see the number who checked 'N/A' or who didn't answer closely track the number who reported earlier in the survey that they were not trained on equipment. Since less respondents found this question relevant to them, the percentages who actually rated their level of participation have to be lower.

Table 19: Preparation to Operate Voting Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	43%	47%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	17%	17%
Not well prepared	11%	9%
Not Applicable	17%	13%
No Answer	12%	15%

Respondents were then asked whether training had prepared them to demonstrate how to operate the equipment to voters. For this purpose, 18% rated the training as 'good' or 3, 40% as 3.5 and above, and 10% rated it below 3. (See Table 20) This confidence level is essentially the same as the confidence level for operating the equipment, and just a little less than all six counties combined.

Table 20: Preparation to Demonstrate Voting Equipment to Voters

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	40%	46%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	18%	17%
Not well prepared	10%	8%
Not Applicable	19%	14%
No Answer	12%	15%

When asked directly "If you received training on equipment for voters with disabilities, how prepared were you to assist voters with disabilities to use that equipment?" 16% of the respondents said 'good, ' 39% said better than 'good' and 11% said less than 'good' and 22% checked N/A. (See Table 21) Santa Cruz respondents were about as well-prepared on the accessible equipment as they were on the equipment in general and as all the counties together.

Table 21: Preparation to Assist Voters with Disabilities to Use Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	39%	40%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	16%	17%
Not well prepared	11%	11%
Not Applicable	22%	17%
No Answer	12%	15%

Serving with voters with impairments or limited English proficiency:
In June, the poll workers who responded to our survey felt least prepared on the next two issues. First we asked them generally about serving voters with disabilities: "If you received training on how to serve voters with disabilities (other than use of equipment), how effective was the training in preparing you to serve those voters?" For Santa Cruz, 17% of poll workers said that their training preparation for assisting voters with disabilities was 'good,' and 43% rated their preparedness at better than good. 9% did not feel well prepared, and 19% indicated N/A. (See Table 22) The confidence with respect to serving voters with disabilities in general was slightly better than assisting these voters with equipment, and again, was equivalent to the confidence across all 6 counties on this question.

Table 22: Preparation to Serve Voters with Disabilities

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	43%	43%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	17%	17%
Not well prepared	9%	8%
Not Applicable	19%	17%
No Answer	12%	15%

In June, the level of preparation for dealing with voters with limited English proficiency was considerably lower than the other types of preparation. In November, six counties were asked a newly worded question "If you received training on how to serve voters with limited English proficiency, how effective was the training in preparing you to serve these voters?" and again confidence dropped. Confidence among Santa Cruz respondents was also the lowest in this area of training preparation and was lower than the six counties combined, as 17% of poll workers said that it was 'good,' only 21% rated it above 'good,' and 12% rated this part of the training as less than good or 'poor.' (See Table 23)

Table 23: Preparation to Serve Voters with Limited English Proficiency

| | Nov06 | |
	Santa Cruz County	6 Counties
Well prepared	21%	30%
Preparation 'good' or 'ok'	17%	15%
Not well prepared	12%	10%
Not Applicable	37%	29%
No Answer	13%	15%

Note that in Santa Cruz, the number who checked 'not applicable' on this question was higher than those who found the other questions non-applicable. We suspect that this is a result of the training not covering language issues to any substantial extent, or because some poll workers do not believe language minorities exist in their area. This is an area for concern in all counties. Of these six counties two are covered under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.[6] Some counties that are not covered by Section 203 may not provide training on this issue, and those that are covered may or may not provide training on this subject. Training is obviously a difficult and complex process, and most trainers only include what they believe to be absolutely necessary. However, even if a county is not independently covered under Sec. 203, the entire State of California is covered under Sec. 203 for the Hispanic language group. In addition, the Department of Justice has sued various jurisdictions (for example the City of Boston in 2005[7]) under Section 2 of the VRA for abridging the right to vote of limited English proficient members of language minority groups, even when that minority group was not covered under Section 203. For all counties it would be wise to incorporate into training a component that educates poll workers about what to do when a voter with limited English skills enters their polling place, and how to accommodate voters that do not speak English (regardless of their native language).

Training, processes, and use of equipment ON Election Day:
The last three questions in this series were applicable to all respondents, whether or not they attended training. These questions were the same for all eight counties.

---

[6] The VRA coverage for the eight counties in the survey is as follows: Contra Costa: yes Hispanic; Imperial: yes Hispanic and American Indian; Mendocino: no; San Francisco: yes Hispanic, Chinese; San Luis Obispo: no; Santa Cruz: no; Sonoma: no; Yolo: no
[7] For complaint, see: http:www.usdoj.gov/crt/voting/litigation/recent_sec2.htm#boston

Poll workers were asked how helpful their colleagues were training them on Election Day. This is particularly important for poll workers that did not attend training or are inexperienced. 13% indicated that the training on Election Day was 'good' and 76% rated it better than 'good.' 4% were less impressed with it, checking a number below 3, and 5% answered N/A. (See Table 24) On-the-job training was rated in Santa Cruz higher than across all 8 counties, and somewhat higher than in Santa Cruz's June sample.

Table 24: Instruction on Election Day

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 24 counties
Very Helpful	76%	63%	65%	50%
Instruction 'good' or 'ok'	13%	18%	21%	26%
Instruction poor	4%	6%	4%	8%
Not Applicable	5%	7%	7%	8%
No Answer	3%	6%	4%	4%

When asked how well Election Day processes went at the respondent's polling place, we generally saw the ratings rise compared to other questions. This was true in Santa Cruz as well, where 6% answered 'good,' a large 88% indicated that it went better than good, and only 2% felt less than 'good' about election processes in their polling place. (See Table 25) Across the counties, the distribution of ratings shifted into the higher categories in November, indicating a better feeling about the operation of the polling places than in June, and in Santa Cruz positive perceptions of Election Day were even higher.

Table 25: Election Day Processes

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 24 counties
Day went very well	88%	78%	79%	65%
Day processes 'good' or 'ok'	6%	14%	14%	25%
Day went poorly	2%	4%	2%	6%
Not Applicable	.3%	1%	.5%	1%
No Answer	3%	4%	5%	4%

We added a final Likert scale question that we did not ask in June, going back to the topic of voting equipment and asking poll workers "How smooth was the use of voting equipment in your polling place?" 12% of Santa Cruz respondents rated the smoothness of equipment use as 'good,' 75% rated the use of equipment as better than 'good,' and 6% rated it as less than 'good.' (See Table 26) This was a relatively highly rated subject in Santa Cruz. Poll workers did not feel quite as good

about the use of the equipment as the general Election Day processes, but this is understandable considering that equipment use is a very new part of the Election Day context.

Table 26: Use of Voting Equipment

	Nov06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties
Very smooth	75%	53%
'good' or 'ok'	12%	18%
Not smooth	6%	11%
Not Applicable	2%	12%
No Answer	5%	7%

Motivations and Occupations

Two open-ended questions in the next section asked respondents why they chose to become poll workers (motivations) and what they do when they are not working at the polls (i.e. occupation or occupational status). Please note that we coded respondents' 2 primary reasons or job titles, i.e. answers might be: "It's my civic duty and the money helps," this would be coded as 'civic duty' and 'money.' Or, "I am retired and volunteer at the senior center and the food bank." This would be coded as 'retired' and 'volunteer.' We gave weight to the order the respondents listed their reasons and occupations, paying most attention to what they stated first.

On the motivations to become a poll worker, the top reason given at 23% (23%) was 'community service/volunteering in the community,' followed by 'civic duty' at 18% (12%), and then 'wanting to participate in, learn about, or ensure the integrity of the election system/process,' with 17% (20%). (See Table 27) These top three categories are consistent with the all county samples, and with Santa Cruz's June sample. Other reasons in order of frequency include 7% (6%) 'asked by friend or relative,' 5% (6%) think its fun or thought it might be fun, 5% (5%) for the stipend, 3% (3%) said that they liked working with and meeting people or enjoyed seeing their neighbors, 3% (3%) were 'retired so have time,' and 3% (3%) heard about the need for poll workers. The other reasons for working at the polls were 2% or less approximately the same prevalence as in the whole sample.

In June, being recruited by a friend or relative was a prominent reason across all counties. The higher prevalence of being 'asked by a friend or relative' in June as compared to November makes sense because with the extreme shortage of workers, many were recruited directly by other workers to help fill their boards.

Table 27: Motivation to become a poll worker

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 24 counties
Community service	23%	23%	20%	19%
Civic duty	18%	12%	15%	13%
Interest in/safeguard election process	17%	20%	21%	16%
Asked by friend/relative	7%	6%	11%	13%
Fun/interesting	5%	6%	5%	7%
Money	5%	5%	2%	5%
Like working with/meeting people	3%	3%	4%	5%
Retired so have time	3%	3%	4%	3%
Heard about need for workers	3%	3%		
Recruited by county	2%	1%	3%	4%
Patriotism	2%	3%	2%	2%
As volunteer for charity	2%	3%	2%	.4%
Regular routine/family tradition	1%	2%	1%	1%
Have free time	1%	2%	2%	1%
School credit/resume	1%	1%	.2%	1%
Unemployed so have time	1%	.3%	.5%	.4%

We then asked poll workers what they do when they are not working at the polling place. We categorized their occupations slightly differently with the November survey, so comparisons with June are more difficult, but most of these categories are comparable. (An 'x' marks a category with no comparison.) We list the top 13 categories for Santa Cruz, which are approximately the same as in Santa Cruz's June sample, and as the all county samples in November and June. 43% (42%) reported first and foremost that they are retired. (See Table 28) The next biggest groups are 10% (7%) were non-professional government employees, 7% (5%) professionals of some type (teachers, lawyers, accountants, etc.), and 5% (8%) who are high school students. 3% or less of the sample is in each of the following categories: those that do volunteer work as their primary occupation, semi-professional occupations, students in higher education, those in service jobs, self-employed folks, sales or clerical workers, managers, and stay-at-home moms/dads/spouses. The equal distribution of respondents across so many occupations in Santa Cruz is fairly representative of the all county sample in November.

Table 28: Poll Worker Occupation or Occupation Status

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 24 counties
Retired	43%	42%	45%	45%
Government Employee	10%	7%	9%	12%
Professional	7%	5%	11%	10%
High School Student	5%	8%	.2%	3%
Volunteer work	3%	5%	2%	6%
Semi-professional	3%	3%	x	x
Student in Higher Education	3%	4%	4%	6%
Service Occupations	3%	3%	3%	3%
Self-employed	3%	3%	2%	1%
Sales or Office Occupations	3%	3%	2%	2%
Management	3%	2%	1%	1%
Homemaker	3%	3%	5%	5%
Arts/Entertainment	2%	2%	1%	1%

Willingness to Return

In terms of being able to retain poll workers, Santa Cruz is in fairly good shape, although a little less so than the eight counties combined. 77% (83%) said that they are definitely willing to work again, and only 10 respondents, 3% (2%), said that they definitely would not. (See Table 29) In the November survey we added two explicit alternatives to 'yes' and 'no,' 'maybe/not sure' and 'cannot.' In Santa Cruz, 19% (14%) of responding poll workers checked the "maybe/not sure" option, indicating that they might be willing depending on certain circumstances. The five percent more in this category than the whole sample explains most of the six percent less who said an unequivocal 'yes' about returning. We added the option in November that respondents could check "cannot" work again, to indicate that, regardless of their preference, they are unable to work again because, for example, they are moving away or would be changing jobs or traveling. This option was only chosen by only 1 or .3% (.3%) of the respondents.

Table 29: Willingness to Return to Work As Poll Worker

	Nov06		June 06	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties		All Counties – across all 24 counties
Yes	77%	83%	94%	89%
No	3%	2%	2%	5%
Maybe	19%	14%	3%	4%
Cannot	.3%	.3%	x	x
No Answer	.6%	1 %	1%	2%

We examined the reasons given by the ten respondents who said that they would not work again. Only one of these did not provide an answer. Four of these said they just were not interested in the job anymore, two of these said they were simply too old or frail to work again, one said they were frustrated with the election system, one complained about the small stipend and the long day, and one cited both the long day and too much responsibility as the reasons for not working again. (See Table 30) Other than a higher percentage just not interested anymore, these percentages were very much like those in the all county sample. There were no respondents who said that they would not return because they would be moving, working, or traveling, which was a common answer in June in Santa Cruz. Also in June there were many in Santa Cruz stating a contingency to returning; however these June respondents did not have an explicit option to check 'maybe/not sure' and therefore checked 'no' but then provided their contingency.

When given the option of 'maybe/not sure' the reasons were different in that a potential scheduling conflict became the primary reason. (See Table 31) The other two prevalent reasons for being unsure about returning were similar to the reasons for not returning, that is the day being too long and being too old or in poor physical shape.

Table 30: Why will not return

	November 2006		June 2006	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – 'state-wide'	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – 'state-wide'
Don't want to/not interested anymore	40%	7%	0%	7%
Too old, physical limitations	20%	19%	0%	16%
Day too long	20%	23%	29%	28%
Too much responsibility	10%	9%	0%	6%
Not enough money	10%	2%	0%	6%
System does not work, don't want to be part of it	10%	16%	14%	9%
Conflict in schedule	0%	5%	29%	19%
Only if you change something	0%	2%	14%	3%

Table 31: Why might not return

	November 2006	
	Santa Cruz County	All Counties – across all 8 counties
Conflict in schedule	21%	16%
Day too long	16%	16%
Too old, physical limitations	12%	10%
Only if you change something	3%	4%
Don't want to/not interested anymore	3%	2%
System does not work, don't want to be part of it	3%	4%
Too much responsibility	3%	1%
Not enough money	1%	2%

Poll Workers' Handwritten Comments

This final section is specific to your county. As described earlier, the survey consisted of a variety of question formats. The following is a summary of the answers to the open-ended question:

> "Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improving your county's poll worker program (especially about recruitment, assignment, training, reference materials, and supplies)?"

We received a mix of comments, from praise and complaints, to specific suggestions. Some comments were outside of the realm of the survey, and are summarized in the general/miscellaneous section. You will notice that some comments are simply either not implementable or are not within the county's jurisdiction, however, they may illustrate a need for further explanations during training to avoid problems at the polling place. One example of this is; "There should not be materials other than in English because everyone has to speak English because this is an English-speaking country".

In Santa Cruz County, 211 respondents provided open-ended comments which we categorized and within each category ordered by their frequency, so that the most popular comment is at the top and the single comments are at the end. The number in parentheses after each comment is the frequency and the comments with no number were mentioned only once.

The first category is about the poll worker program, management, or Election Day experience. As usual the most common comment was to somehow reduce the length of shifts, and another common comment was about the lack of pay. There were an equal number of positive comments about the poll worker program, including praise for the co-workers, the program, the county clerk, the process and the experience. In the area of recruitment, there were several comments about the benefits of high school students and having younger workers, or at least a variety of ages. Finally, the comments about assignment and conduct were very mixed, from praise to complaints about individual workers and a few suggestions for better management of the precinct boards.

Poll Worker Program/Management/Experience
- 5 hours shift, need shorter shifts in general, day too long (17)
- great time, enjoy the time (8)
- Great group of people to work with (7)
- Need better pay (6)
- good job (6)
- Gail and her staff did a great job organizing this election and all the new equipment (6)
- smooth process (3)
- too much paper work for closing poll, need to be improved (3)
- I am proud of the election process in Santa Cruz county (2)

- you make it harder/more complex each election (2)
- Closing was very disorganized and very confused. Please try to improve this process (2)
- Have local county/city help with poll closing procedure
- not enough front end organization
- things were a little hectic in the early morning but smooth out after we got our feet wet
- The election was less confusing than others, it was very well organized
- whole process was nice and educational
- It was interesting to see the different procedures during the votes
- Good leadership, good cross checking, good facility
- appreciate the raise that Santa Cruz county instituted this year
- have the "rover" show up during the 2-4pm period and not when things are busy and tense due to the volumes of people

Characteristics, Recruitment
- impressed with High School Students, they were great (3)
- recruit more young people since they are very helpful (2)
- Election day is too important to be supervised by exhausted old people (2)
- outreach to UCSC for poll workers
- recruitment: make sure broad spectrum of ages, backgrounds
- more outreach to people who have time or energy to serve. May be radio advertisements or public service announcements on public radio stations
- advertise in newspaper and TV and challenge citizen to give their time in this important aspect of our democracy that people voice their opinions
- recruit at mobile home park for seniors
- Post pay scale and a letter letting people know they can work 1/2 shift
- some older worker have vision problems

Assignment and Conduct
- Have enough staff (4)
- the inspectors here are just wonderful (3)
- Gwyn Larson was an excellent and knowledgeable inspector (2)
- more volunteers, the more help the better
- My group at Oak Tree Villa was fun. The inspector was outstanding, full of energy.
- My inspector Melanie in Scotts Valley CA was fantastic
- Tracy + Kyoko are great to work with
- Laurie was wonderful + real pleasure to work with
- would like to work with Linda's group again at Simpkin Swim center
- I thought our team at precinct #s 1061 & 1041 were very good, good clerks and a really good supervisor
- my roving inspector was great
- the rover was not nice at precinct 2048

- The inspector was coarse and abusive verbally to me. I have reported this to Santa Cruz
- not good team work between precinct, too many chiefs and not enough Indians, at closing: no chief and lots of Indians
- too much micro-management
- trouble coordinate with other partners
- The clerk from the other precinct kept coming to our precinct and disturbed us, however the inspector didn't do anything about it
- New volunteer was overwhelmed and scared after the first training session. She didn't want to deal with too much of legal stuff at the polling place because it's just too much responsibilities
- One inspector cannot cover 2 precincts adequately. We were 2 people short. We need the inspector to work at our table but having to cover 2 precincts frequently left us with only 3 people to do everything
- one handicapped workers picked his nose and ate it, and drove every one crazy with this talking and not paying attention to what he was suppose to be doing
- I will not work again because I found my co-workers frustrating
- would like to have workers from where I live in Pajaro Village, not friend of the inspector
- be more efficient by assigning poll workers to work closer from their home
- let everyone have a precinct so they can vote in person on election day, or make everyone vote by mail
- try to give more support to one and only inspector
- assignment: keep # of poll workers up even with automation
- they should make age balances. For example I am 20 years and was working with 3 70+ yr old women. That meant I was on my feet with no breaks the whole day. Last time I was on a very balanced board and it was a lot better for me. Need to ask people ages and make sure its balanced
- too many clerks-some of them have nothing to do---should have good rules because some clerks dressed too sloppy and didn't do anything
- have few rules for the poll workers to make it fair for everyone. I was working and some one kept talking and the other one went to lunch
- should rotate the jobs
- poll workers should wash hand frequently
- the use of cell phones during voting process should be curtailed

The next category is about the training classes for poll workers, which include suggestions primarily for content, but also format, scheduling, and materials. The recommendations for training content varied considerably, including more training on equipment, troubleshooting, special situations, closing, absentee and provisional voting, voters with disabilities, basic duties, and what to expect on Election Day.

Training
- more hand-on experience with machines (16)
- good training (11)

- clearer direction for closing (8)
- more training on equipment (8)
- confusing instructions (8)
- more training (6)
- like the role play (5)
- have a training course closer to the date of the election date so poll workers don't forget most of the things (4)
- need smaller classes, more one on one training (3)
- clearer direction for opening (3)
- separate workshop for inspectors for more detail training (3)
- procedure step-by-step for electronics, need clearer directions (3)
- training went way too fast (2)
- more training on trouble shooting (2)
- video and more photos on training materials (2)
- training on how to reconcile at the end of the day (2)
- make workshop mandatory to all workers (2)
- were not trained for codes and counts (2)
- love training classes
- new equipment was introduced at the polls during this election and both the inspector and another poll worker were extensively trained on the use of the new equipment and we experienced very few difficulties
- It is crucial that the inspector is well-trained on the equipment and procedures
- more info to poll workers on how to set up the voting stations, electric equipment
- Include in the training information that voting on the touch screen takes longer than the paper ballots. Many voters were surprised that touch screen takes longer time
- We did not understand we would have to count separate the ballots for individual precincts. Thought machines were doing that
- weak special trainer on equipment
- In a multi-precinct environment, the instructor need to include all machines used or assign machines to certain precinct
- More training on dealing with people who claimed registered but not listed, more material to go over before election day, such as absentee voters who insists on not voting AV. More on void ballots.
- review provisional and absentee process prior to polls opening-quick review before the rush
- address how to answer voter's Qs appropriately
- training: assurance that voting is safe
- specials situations should be more focus during training sessions
- better or more complete training for handling disabled voters, maybe a separate module
- I had no idea what I was expected to do prior to election day. No one made my job as a student clerk clear to me
- some procedure were too hard to understand

- too much info
- Have concise and well-organized training materials or training events. The 3 hours training could have taken 1 hour if the materials and instructor were organized
- Suggestion: would have 2 training days for clerks. One on procedure and one on problem that may occur
- separate training session for first time worker
- I would like to get contacted earlier next time so I can go through the trainings. It would have given me a better understanding of the process
- breaks in between training session
- The class is degrading, we are not children-talk to us without the phony humor

Another major category is suggestions for improving the raw materials of Election Day, including the polling site, reference materials, voting equipment and supplies. These comments were extremely varied as well, ranging from satisfaction with supplies, equipment, and materials to requests for more and different supplies, equipment and materials. The touch screen machine got mixed reviews, as did reference materials. There were several suggestions for how to change, improve, or augment the reference materials and to make the return of ballots and supplies at the end of the day easier. A subcategory is "Voter Services and Communication" which details suggestions to improve the experience of voters and ease the voting process. As is very common in these surveys, many of these suggestions were for more adequate signage and directions to the appropriate polling place. Another suggestion that came up a few times was to promote the touch screen machine to voters, especially by allowing them to access and learn about the machines before Election Day.

Supplies/Reference Materials/Equipment/Polling Site
- more touch screen machines (6)
- adequate supplies and reference materials (5)
- too much redundant material-loose forms, binders, etc (3)
- not so much paper--separate sheet available for opening and closing (apart from manual) (3)
- provide telephones so we don't have to use our own (3)
- providing some lunch or dinner in addition would be good (2)
- color code everything (2)
- more booth for voting, more handicapped (2)
- More better supplies (2)
- too many supplies (2)
- separate from general stuff (2)
- I like the yellow check off list-very helpful (2)
- ballot on touch screen did not match sample ballot (2)
- there were not enough of the "security/privacy shelves" or envelops (2)
- If a ballot is to be cast provisional there need to be a machine to prevent it being scanned (2)
- satisfied with new equipment

- touch screen machine were very popular
- touch screen voting too slow
- get rid of touch screen machine
- Great distrust of computer voting
- our touch screen machine ran out of paper after 4 voters used it
- More reference materials
- condense reading material
- there was duplication of materials, making it hard to find the correct paper
- to hard to find important information such as "when a person arrives, ask their name, address, ask them to sign in, etc." also a CLEAR closing procedure would help
- It would be helpful to have a list of every place where signatures of poll workers are required so no documents are missed.
- the new materials for closing need to be reviewed to get rid of old-ambiguous instructions, none of the machine tallies were accurate, all seemed to off by one or two
- organize important tally forms and put them in an easy to get envelope
- Need to check materials in box before giving to the inspectors
- supplies: keep all important poll opening, closing, sealing labels, signature sheets
- Suggestion: pins for election workers should be MADE IN AMERICA
- manual ballots contain "spam" and contradictions
- need different color pens for help with rosters
- the red pencils need to be longer
- I would like to see electronic pencil sharpener
- At my polling place we have to move furniture around to provide space for booths, machines, and tables. It would be so much easier and save time if the cleared space were included when negotiating with the site owners
- Suggestion: request a diagram for table tops showing where to place ballots, required signs, index and other supplies that have to be in place before first voter enters
- it would be great if a schematic were drawn of the floor plan after your rover has come by and rearranged the set-up
- The precinct 5406 has 6 booths and 1 handicap booth while the physical space only accommodate 3 regular booths
- we have to set up 2 spaces in the handicapped parking since the parking space is on the other end of the polling place for the disabled
- It would be great to have the sign "VOTE" out on the street bigger
- There are way too many signs
- for paper ballots- bend 3-4 ballots at stapled area, rip off carefully, then bend both way at stub and rip apart almost all the way to make it easier for removal before depositing in scanner
- Provisional counts did not show up as provisional on computers
- the provisional sign in was confusing with 2 different places
- Too many provisional ballots

- Need extra ballot boxes for drop off and mail in, need better means to attach signs on doors
- really like new ballot box system
- returning the ballots and equipment at end of day was extremely time consuming
- too much new equipment for poll workers to transport back to county office
- some boxes were too heavy for workers
- Suggestion: returning ballots and materials to court house after poll close. Should all be handled from driver staying in car and election officials at court house. They should not have to wait.
- have competent people at the pick-up station
- more help at election center
- Our precinct, B-40 Fire Station, had trouble the first 2 hours with the new ballot box. Had to wait for parts replacement
- Suggestion: I think some smooth jazz music would be great

Voter Services/Communication
- big signs to notify changes made, or to direct voters to polling place (5)
- have a traffic plan for each site to prevent complaints from voters and to help them find the place easily (4)
- print precinct number larger on sample ballot (3)
- precinct number should be big and easy to read (3)
- We need map of precincts for voters and for us to direct voters (2)
- big signs show where the absentee ballots box (2)
- Promote the touch screen voting to ease voters (2)
- Could we have public appointments to access the electronic ballot machine to become more familiar with it? I feel they don't have enough time on election day to be won over
- When voters are assigned a different polling place sample ballot should make note of it. We had at least 30 people who had to go to a different place or vote provisional.
- display precinct maps and street outside multiple precincts
- do not have more than 1 precinct in exact location
- we need more English voter info booklets

The final group of miscellaneous comments included preferences and suggestions for changing the election system and a few specific complaints of poll workers about some aspect of their experience.

General/Miscellaneous
- Suggestion: back to paper ballots (2)
- wondering if we should vote from home through computer
- why not go total absentee ballots for every elections-seems to me this would save the country money

- Students of CA came to the polls with their absentee ballots from other counties. As in the state of Washington, could the deadline for an absentee ballot be a postmark of the Election Day?
- I am concerned about this election and about the next primary election. There are at least 10 parties, how will it be electronically voted?
- I couldn't take off work to work at polling place and have to use vacation for it.
- we were required to hang a flag even though our location has a permanent one in front of the building
- I am color blind and could not tell the difference between the white and red card used
- call for more comments: Isha Visrael: 831-462-4046

Appendix 1: June 6, 2006 Poll Worker Survey

Dear Poll Worker: Please complete this confidential questionnaire to assist a University of California study on poll worker training in California, and then return it in the postage paid envelope. As a poll worker, your expertise is essential to our research and your participation is much appreciated. We hope our research helps to improve the poll worker experience and election process for everyone. (Please complete both sides of this page.) **THANK YOU! THANK YOU!**

ABOUT YOUR TRAINING BEFORE ELECTION DAY

1. Did you attend a training class for the June 6, 2006 Election? Yes_____ No_____
   If No, why not? _____

2. Have you attended trainings in the past for other Elections? Yes _____ (If Yes, how many)? _____ No_____

	(for questions below please circle the number that applies)					
3. How convenient was the training location?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
4. How convenient was the training time?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)

5. Did you receive any reference materials (manuals, checklists, etc.) at training to take home? Yes ___ No___ N/A___
   If Yes, did you review any of the materials before reporting to your polling site on Election Day? Yes___ No___
   If you did NOT review materials received, why not? _____

   _____

6. Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improvement of **poll worker training**?

   _____

   _____

ABOUT YOUR ELECTION DAY EXPERIENCE

1. Have you worked as a poll worker in previous elections? Yes_____ No_____

   (If Yes, in **how many elections** have you worked as a poll worker?)_____

2. Please circle your job title on Election Day June 6, 2006:

   Inspector   Judge   Clerk   Other_____

   What were your job titles in past elections? _____

	(for questions below please circle the number that applies)					
3. How well did the training prepare you for Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
4. How well did the training prepare you to operate any voting equipment (such as ballot marking devices, ballot scanners, electronic machines) on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
5. How well did the training prepare you to demonstrate to voters how to operate any voting equipment (such as ballot marking devices, ballot scanners, electronic machines)?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
6. How well did the training prepare you to manage different voter situations and questions on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
7. How effective was the training in preparing you to serve voters with disabilities?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
8. How effective was the training in preparing you to serve voters with limited English proficiency?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
9. How helpful was the training/instruction you received <u>on Election Day</u> from other poll workers or election staff?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
10. How adequate were the available reference materials for guiding you through Election Day processes and procedures?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
11. In your opinion, how well did Election Day processes go at your polling place?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)

ABOUT YOUR ELECTION DAY EXPERIENCE (continued)

12. Do you think class training is valuable for working at the polls?   Yes _____   No_____   Not Sure/Don't Know_____

13. Did you have adequate reference materials available to you on Election Day? Yes__ No__   Not Sure/Don't Know_____

    What materials were most useful on Election Day? _____

    _____

14. Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improving **written poll worker reference materials**?

    _____

    _____

ABOUT BEING A POLL WORKER IN GENERAL

1. Why did you become a poll worker?

    _____

    _____

2. When you are not serving as a poll worker, what do you do?
(for example: high school student, college student, retired, county employee, state employee, teacher, in business, etc…)

    _____

3. Are you willing to work in future elections?   Yes_____   No_____   (why not?) _____

    _____

4. Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improving **your county's poll worker program**?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

Co # 19

Appendix 2: November 7, 2006 Alternative Version of Survey

Dear Poll Worker: Please complete this confidential questionnaire to assist a University of California study on poll worker training in California, and then return it in the postage paid envelope. It is most helpful if you complete this after Election Day, and you may take it home and send it back at any time. As a poll worker, your expertise is essential to our research and your participation is much appreciated. We hope our research helps to improve the poll worker experience and election process for everyone.

(Please complete both sides of this page.)   **THANK YOU!   THANK YOU!**

ABOUT YOUR TRAINING BEFORE ELECTION DAY

1. Did you attend a training class for the November 7, 2006 Election?   Yes_____   No_____

If No, why not? _____

If Yes,

- Were you trained on voting procedures? Yes_____   No_____
- Were you trained on how to set up and dismantle voting equipment? Yes_____   No_____
- Were you trained on how to troubleshoot various situations with the voting equipment? Yes_____ No_____
- Was this the first time you were trained on this particular voting equipment?   Yes_____   No_____
- Did you understand from the training why the equipment is necessary?   Yes_____   No_____
- Did you receive any reference materials on the new voting equipment? Yes_____ No_____

2. Have you attended trainings in the past for other Elections?   Yes _____ No _____

(If Yes, how many)? every training for _____ Elections   OR   training for every Election for _____years   OR _____

ABOUT YOUR ELECTION DAY EXPERIENCE

1. Have you worked as a poll worker in previous elections?   Yes_____   No_____

   (If Yes, in **how many elections before November 7** have you worked as a poll worker?)   _____ elections OR

    Less than 10 yrs_____(please enter number)   10-20yrs_____   20yrs or more _____

2. Please circle your job title on Election Day November 7, 2006:

       Inspector   Clerk   Other_____

    Did you work for an "adopt-a-poll" on November 7?   Yes_____   No_____

    What were your job titles in past elections? _____

	(for questions below please circle the number that applies)					
3. How well did the training prepare you for Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
4. How well did the training prepare you to operate any voting equipment (such as ballot marking devices, ballot scanners, electronic machines) on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
5. How well did the training prepare you to demonstrate to voters how to operate any voting equipment (such as ballot marking devices, ballot scanners, electronic machines)?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
6. How prepared were you to assist voters with disabilities to use the equipment that is provided for them?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
7. How well did the training prepare you to manage different voter situations and questions on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
8. How effective was the training in preparing you to serve voters with disabilities?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
9. How effective was the training in preparing you to serve voters with limited English proficiency?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
10. How helpful was the training/instruction you received on Election Day from other poll workers or election staff?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
11. How adequate were the available reference materials for guiding you through Election Day processes and procedures?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
12. In your opinion, how well did Election Day processes go at your polling place?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)
13. How smooth was the use of voting equipment in your polling place?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(good)	4	5(excellent)

ABOUT BEING A POLL WORKER IN GENERAL

1. Why did you become a poll worker?

_____

_____

2. When you are not serving as a poll worker, what do you do?
(for example: high school student, college student, retired, volunteer work, county employee, state employee, teacher, in business, etc…)

_____

3. Are you willing to work in future elections?   Yes_____   No_____   Maybe/Not Sure_____   Cannot_____

(why?) _____

4. Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improving **your county's poll worker program** (especially about recruitment, assignment, training, reference materials, and supplies)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Co # 7

Appendix 3: November 7, 2006 Survey for Santa Cruz

Dear Poll Worker: Please complete this confidential questionnaire to assist a University of California study on poll worker training in California, and then return it in the postage paid envelope. As a poll worker, your expertise is essential to our research and your participation is much appreciated. We hope our research helps to improve the poll worker experience and election process for everyone. It is most helpful if you <u>complete this after Election Day</u>, and you may take it home and send it back at any time.
    (Please complete both sides of this page.)   **THANK YOU!   THANK YOU!**

ABOUT YOUR TRAINING BEFORE ELECTION DAY

1. Did you attend a training class for the November 7, 2006 Election?   Yes_____   No_____

If No, why not? _____

If Yes,

- Were you trained on voting procedures? Yes_____   No_____
- Were you trained on how to set up and dismantle voting equipment? Yes_____   No_____
- Were you trained on how to troubleshoot various situations with the voting equipment? Yes_____ No_____
- Was this the first time you were trained on this particular voting equipment?   Yes_____   No_____
- Did you understand from the training why the equipment is necessary?   Yes_____   No_____
- Did you receive a manual on the new voting equipment? Yes_____ No_____

2. Have you attended trainings in the past for other elections? Yes ____ No ____
(If Yes, how many)? every training for _____ elections   OR   training for every election for _____years   OR _____

3. Have you worked as a poll worker in previous elections? Yes_____   No_____
If Yes, in **how many elections before November 7** have you worked as a poll worker?
      Please estimate: _____ elections OR _____ years

4. Did you receive any reference or learning materials prior to election day??   Yes ___   No___   N/A___
    If Yes, did you review any of the materials before reporting to your polling site on Election Day?   Yes___   No___   N/A__

ABOUT YOUR ELECTION DAY EXPERIENCE

1. Please circle your job title on Election Day November 7, 2006:

      Inspector   Judge   Clerk   Other_____

    What were your job titles in past elections? _____

2. Did you have sufficient reference materials available to you on Election Day? Yes ___   No___   N/A___
What would you have liked more written information on: (equipment, opening, closing, special situations, trouble-shooting, etc or I was not given access to reference materials, did not need reference materials, etc)
_____

Questions 2-8 are for those who received training.	(for questions below please circle the number that applies)					
3. If you received training, how well did it prepare you for Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
4. If you received training, how well did the training prepare you to manage different voter situations and questions on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
5. If you received training on voting equipment (such as ballot marking devices, ballot scanners, electronic machines), how well did it prepare you to operate that equipment on Election Day?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
6. If you received training on voting equipment, how well did it prepare you to demonstrate to voters how to operate that equipment?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
7. If you received training on equipment for voters with disabilities, how prepared were you to assist voters with disabilities to use that equipment?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
8. If you received training on how to serve voters with disabilities (other than use of equipment), how effective was the training in preparing you to serve those voters?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
9. If you received training on how to serve voters with limited English proficiency, how effective was the training in preparing you to serve those voters?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)

Questions 9-12 are for ALL survey takers	(for questions below please circle the number that applies)					
10. How helpful was the training/instruction you received <u>on Election Day</u> from other poll workers or election staff?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
11. In your opinion, how well did Election Day processes go at your polling place?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)
12. How smooth was the use of new voting equipment in your polling place?	0(N/A)	1(poor)	2	3(neutral)	4	5(excellent)

ABOUT BEING A POLL WORKER IN GENERAL

1. Why did you become a poll worker?

_____

_____

2. When you are not serving as a poll worker, what do you do?   Please indicate your occupational status and occupation past, present, or future.

(for example: high school student, college student, retired, volunteer work, county employee, state employee, teacher, in business, etc…)

_____

3. Are you willing to work in future elections?   Yes_____   No_____   Maybe/Not Sure_____   Cannot_____

(why?) _____

4. Do you have additional comments about and/or suggestions for improving **your county's poll worker program** (especially about recruitment, assignment, training, reference materials, and supplies)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____