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2016 Report Questions

- **Overview:** What were the main goals your campus had for carrying out democratic engagement in 2016 (refer to your campus’ Voter Friendly Campus plan)? Did your campus meet these goals? Why or why not?
- **Coalition:** How did your coalition function throughout the fall semester? Why was your coalition effective or not effective? How will it change for continued Democratic Engagement work; particularly focused on midterm elections
  - What other partners did you work with internally or externally? What was their role?
- **Analysis of your work:** For campus plans, we asked you to cover how you planned on fulfilling the four buckets of work for a well-rounded democratic engagement. Please describe how each of these programs were actualized, if they were successful, and what you learned.
  - Voter registration: How did your campus register students? How many students did you register?
  - Voter education: How did you provide students nonpartisan voting information?
  - Ballot access: How did you make sure students had access to the ballot? What were the advantageous and hurdles to students at your institution having access to the ballot?
  - Voter turnout: How did you encourage your students to vote on or before Election Day?
- **Successes:** What are your institution’s top successes (up to 3) of your democratic engagement efforts in 2016?
- **Barriers:** What are your institution’s barriers (3) faced implementing democratic engagement work in 2016?
- **Beyond 2016:** Local and state elections, legislative issues, and other democratic engagement activities should take place year round. Looking into 2017 and future years, how do you plan on continuing to engage and educate students about the democratic process?
- **NSLVE Data:** When you receive your campuses’ NSLVE report, what plans are in place with your coalition to evaluate this data and to assess future initiatives?
- **Photos and Stories:** Share your favorite photos and stories with us from the election!
Overview: What were the main goals your campus had for carrying out democratic engagement in 2016 (refer to your campus’ Voter Friendly Campus plan)? Did your campus meet these goals? Why or why not?

Analysis of your work: For campus plans, we asked you to cover how you planned on fulfilling the four buckets of work for a well-rounded democratic engagement. Please describe how each of these programs were actualized, if they were successful, and what you learned.

- Voter registration: How did your campus register students? How many students did you register?
- Voter education: How did you provide students nonpartisan voting information?
- Ballot access: How did you make sure students had access to the ballot? What were the advantageous and hurdles to students at your institution having access to the ballot?
- Voter turnout: How did you encourage your students to vote on or before Election Day?

At Washington University in St. Louis (WashU), voter engagement encompasses three major areas: compliance, voter registration, and voter education. According to national best practices, the best way to increase voter turnout is to register people as voters and to educate them not only on the issues that will be on the ballot, but also on the basic logistics of voting. Given these standards, WashU focused our efforts on these two approaches from spring 2016 through the Presidential Debate held on campus and Election Day.

The Gephardt Institute for Civic and Community Engagement’s mission is to cultivate informed and actively engaged citizens, and our office is tasked with overseeing the voter registration, compliance, and engagement processes for students on campus. Compliance is an incredibly important aspect of our voter engagement and registration work. To ensure that voter engagement and education are implemented correctly and in a nonpartisan manner, the Gephardt Institute works collaboratively with the office of Government and Community Relations and the legal department. Washington University and the Gephardt Institute are nonpartisan, not only on principle, but also because we are 501(c)3 organizations, which means our nonpartisanship is written into the tax code and into the University charter with the state of Missouri.

WashU followed all national, state, and local laws relating to voter registration and contracted with TurboVote to complete voter registration through a nonpartisan, web-based platform. This platform enabled us to support students to register as voters in all fifty states, navigate the absentee voting process in their home states, and remain in compliance with their state’s registration deadlines and processes. In the event that a school or department organized a voter registration drive outside of the Gephardt Institute or the WashU Votes committee, the Gephardt Institute supported them to ensure that their partnering agencies were nonpartisan and that they had proper mechanisms in place to remain compliant. For example, the medical school campus partnered with the League of Women Voters to host a lunch time voter registration drive in addition to the tabling and registration efforts held by Voter Registration Squad members on that campus.

To ensure that everyone registering voters at Washington University was prepared to provide accurate information and remain compliant with voter registration processes, all students and staff registering voters on any of
WashU’s campuses were either trained by someone deputized by the county or were supervised by the Voter Engagement Fellow or member of the Voter Registration Squad.

To ensure that WashU successfully met our goals for carrying out democratic engagement in 2016, we established voter engagement goals around the following concepts:

- It is important for students to learn the PROCESS of democracy  
  - This is not about voting, it’s about learning

- Politics 365  
  - Political engagement and voting are year-round practices and part of a person’s identity.  
  - Want to establish a culture of civic dialogue and learning to dialogue across difference

- Nonpartisan  
  - We can talk about political engagement AND be inclusive

In 2016, the Gephardt Institute established and met ambitious goals for both voter registration and voter turn-out. Those goals included:

- Increase our total eligible student voter registration rate from 72.24% to 80%
- 60% of all new voter registrations are completed through TurboVote
- Maintain the 2012 voting rate of 95% for those living on the Northside and voting in Missouri
- Increase voting rate from 84% to 90% for those living on the South 40 and voting in Missouri
- Increase our total registered student voting rate from 58.61% to 65%

**Voter Registration and Engagement Successes**

In total, through coordinated efforts across the Gephardt Institute, WashU Votes, and the Voter Registration Squad, WashU registered 3,608 students on TurboVote between July 15, 2016 and October 12, 2016 (the Missouri registration deadline). The Voter Registration Squad achieved this record number of registrations by tabling at 25 different events including National Voter Registration Day, Constitution Day, an Absentee Voter Party, Ezra Klein’s talk on campus, and many more. By linking TurboVote to many campus-wide communications – including a campus-wide email from the chancellor, newsletter stories, targeted emails through mail services, and the campus-wide administrative website Webstac; as well as offering in-person registration at the Gephardt Institute office located in the student center - we were able to reach the entire campus multiple times throughout the election season.

While we have not yet received our NSLVE or voter turnout data from the St. Louis County Board of Elections, the Gephardt Institute can report the following successes to date:

Voter Registration Numbers for 2016:
• Total number of students registered by the Gephardt Institute using TurboVote = 3,608
• % of the student body with new or updated registrations: 24.86%
  (Assumes total enrollment # of 14,514 students)
• Number of students registered in Missouri: 2,513
• Number of student requesting an absentee ballot or registering out of state: 926
• 169 students not disclosing their state of registration

Compared with the last Presidential Election in 2012, when WashU also hosted a Presidential Debate, the Gephardt Institute has made tremendous improvement in our overall voter registration efforts.

• In 2012, the total number of students registered by the Gephardt Institute: 1,072
  o % of student body registered by the Gephardt: 7.86%
  o Number of students registered in Missouri: 897
  o Number of students requesting an absentee ballot or registering out of state: 175

According to our NSLVE data from the 2012 election, WashU as a campus registered:

• Total number of students registered: **7,924**
• % of the eligible student body registered: **72.24%**
• Total number of students who voted: 4,644
• % of the eligible student body that voted: **42.43%**
• Rate of registered voters who voted: **58.61%**
• Number of students voting on campus: 1278
• % of students eligible to vote on campus (living on the South 40 and registered with their university address) who voted: **84%**

Between 2012 and 2016, the Gephardt Institute made major changes to our strategy and approach to registering students as voters. In the last Presidential election, registration drives were done using paper registration forms, with out-of-state and absentee voter information only provided at one of eight voter registration drive locations. This is a significantly lower number of voter registration events or opportunities provided compared to the 25 events the Gephardt Institute and the Voter Registration Squad tabled at in the fall of 2016.

This year, WashU was able to work with the St. Louis County Board of Elections to move an on-campus polling place from the dorms to the newly renovated Athletic Complex, which was also the location for the Presidential Debate. The new location was equidistant from the two on-campus housing areas which house almost 100% of the first and second year students, a large percent of upper-classmen, and Greek housing. We anticipate that on-campus voting rates will be higher this election as a result of the new polling place location, visibility on campus, and frequent communications with students leading up to election day about their options and rights as voters on campus.

**Politics 365: Ramping Up and Maintaining Engagement**

There were a number of factors that made the 2016 general election cycle unique. Hosting the second presidential debate on campus had a major impact on not only student interest and knowledge of the election, but also on what
structures were created to support student political engagement. The WashU Votes committee, Student Engagement Sub-Committee, and Voter Engagement Fellow position existed in part due to the debate, as did several other joint campus initiatives and funding opportunities.

Given the widespread media coverage of the Presidential Debate, there was a high level of engagement for the student body on campus, with over 10,000 students registered for the debate ticket lottery, and thousands of students coming to campus on the day of the debate to check out the WashU Votes-led Debate Fair and media tents, and to attend one of five campus-based Presidential Debate watch events.

The Gephardt Institute developed a Voter Engagement Team of over 80 campus faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students to keep the campus informed of voter engagement efforts, and to build a large supportive base of involved constituents. The Voter Engagement Team had a sub-committee of 25 committed and passionate students and staff interested in Voter Registration. This team met twice a month with staff from the Gephardt Institute to review plans, brainstorm ideas and strategies for voter education and engagement on Constitution Day, Voter Registration Day, and during the Debate Fair, and led voter registration and tabling at over 25 events on campus. Members of the Voter Registration Squad volunteered to set up the on-campus polling place for Election Day and then tabled outside of the polling place on Election Day to engage voters and celebrate their participation in the democratic process.

In a large part because of the Presidential Debate, the Gephardt Institute was also able to offer an Election Year Faculty grant that supported faculty across schools and departments to implement activities, events, or projects related to the election and debate through Inauguration Day. To date, Gephardt has distributed $3,558 in grants for six projects.

Election Year Faculty funded projects include:

- The art school offered stations for students to design and produce their own posters (pictured to the right) to get out the vote- including at the Debate Fair on Oct 8th, 2016.
An art class developed a “Vote Dammit” campaign using social media, print media, and large campus displays that engaged thousands through appealing student-designed visuals.
(https://www.facebook.com/votedammit/)

The international office created an election day polling place simulation for international students to educate them on ballot issues and to discuss the democratic process in the U.S.

A psychology professor is organizing an inter-disciplinary symposium on the “Rise of Trump and ‘Trumpism’ in Politics”

Debate watch parties and discussions to engage students in deeper conversations about the candidate’s platforms and what was at stake during the election.

Additionally, the WashU Votes Programming and Funding Committees provided the structure and resources to engage a large percent of the student population in events leading up to the debate and the election.

The Programming Committee planned several major events where the Voter Registration Squad also volunteered to provide registration through TurboVote. The WashU Votes events included a “Light Up Brookings” event (see photo to right) to announce the countdown to the debate on campus with a pop up tent including food, a photo booth, music, and activities provided by WashU Public Affairs.

The WashU Votes Programming Committee coordinated several on-campus debate watch parties with food, pre and post-debate media coverage, voter registration, and games.

On the weekend of the Debate (October 8th, 2016), the WashU Votes Programming Committee hosted an on-campus “Debate Fair” with student groups, departments across campus, and organizations tabling for thousands of students who stopped by (see photo to left).

The WashU Votes Funding Committee also created a student group grant-making process for both graduate and undergraduate students to have access to funds for student-led efforts around the debate and election. Given that Student Union and the Graduate Professional Council groups do not have to meet the same nonpartisan criteria, they were able to plan and implement a wide range of projects.

In total the Funding Committee considered 59 applications for funding, and approved 53 of these requests-granting $45,274.54 to student groups for election and debate related events, programs, and activities. Student funded projects included a wide range of topics such as the following:

- African American Leader Panel on Election Access
- Debate 2016: Energy and Environment
- Presidential Election Manga Series of illustrated graphics
- Plate of the Union: Debating the Future of Food and Farming
- Spotlight on Immigration Speaker Series
- The Economics of Foreign Policy
Feminist Analysis of the Debate

WashU’s voter engagement, registration, and education strategy was concentrated between August and the Election in November 2016; however, the Gephardt Institute’s work engaging students in the political process continued through the inauguration and will continue into upcoming local elections this spring. We will continue to share communications about voter registration deadlines and processes to participate in elections, co-sponsor and promote events that engage and inform voters, and spark opportunities for dialogue about issues important to student voters.

Goals for Voter Engagement and Civic Dialogue

This year, the Gephardt Institute piloted a series of post-debate Civic Dialogues with goals to:

- Engage 80 campus community members in dialogue through our post-debate dialogue program
- Elicit 200 responses about which issues are important to our students before College Debate 16
- Spark at least 150 posts through social media with #WashUVotes hashtag

In September 2016, the Gephardt Institute trained a cohort of 8 graduate students to lead nonpartisan dialogues for both undergraduate and graduate students to have a safe, respectful space to talk through the elections. Gephardt provided voter engagement brochures to all facilitators and participants as an additional way to engage in the election.

The Civic Dialogues, however, had very low turnout with fewer than 10 total participants. Most students either sought social spaces to watch and process the debates, or watched independent of the university. The Gephardt Institute is reconsidering our approach to civic dialogue, and will adapt engagement opportunities to better meet students’ interests and ways they prefer discussing politics. The Gephardt Institute is also offering dialogue resources and toolkits for faculty and student groups interested in facilitating their own discussions, with resources available online and in our office.

Participation in social media campaigns using the #WashUVotes hashtag and the College Debate 16 online survey were much more successful, however.

According to campus-wide publication The Source, “The excitement surrounding the Oct. 9 debate at WashU was shared with the world via social media, resulting in an unprecedented level of audience engagement for the university. From behind-the-scenes photos of Spin Alley to student activities to observations about the debate itself, Twitter and Instagram users made full use of the #WashUdebate2016 hashtag. Debate hashtag posts numbered more than 11,000 and can be viewed online at debate.wustl.edu” (Oct 2016).

Similarly, the #WashUVotes hashtag was used on Facebook and Twitter throughout the 2016 election season with hundreds of posts and tags on their page and 306 page likes. WashU Votes had 37 online submissions for their College Debate online survey asking for student input on priority issues in the election. This was lower than our original goal, but the quality of responses helped inform the representative’s participation in the College Debate 16. Students took and posted several hundred photos taken in the photo booth outside of the polling place on Election Day showing positive engagement and messages about participating in the democratic process.
Use of social media including the WashU Votes website, Facebook, and Twitter account, along with the Gephardt Institute website, Facebook, and twitter account helped us to surpass our goals. The Gephardt Institute and WashU Votes committee plan to continue using social media platforms and online engagement as a regular means of politically engaging, educating, and informing student voters since digital communication has proven to be a highly successful means of communicating.

**Campus-Wide Communications**

In order to reach 100% of the university community and ensure that students had access to important voter registration and education information, the Gephardt Institute developed a comprehensive communications plan from August-November 2016.

Our original goals were:

- WashU will send two all-student emails with voter registration information (1st in September and 2nd in October)
- All University and Institute communications will be nonpartisan

We met and far exceeded our communication goals by sending a campus-wide email from the Chancellor about the debate and election season with information about how to register as a voter- linking to TurboVote. The Gephardt Institute reached the entire campus through a second communication sent through Deans of each of the academic schools.

Additionally, the Voter Engagement Fellow partnered with campus mail services to send targeted emails and communication to students living on and off campus about how to update their voter registration if they had moved recently.

In September, the Gephardt Institute shared voter registration efforts through the Source, a campus wide newsletter: [https://source.wustl.edu/2016/09/registered-ready-washington-university-students-engaged-voters/](https://source.wustl.edu/2016/09/registered-ready-washington-university-students-engaged-voters/).

In October, prior to the Missouri Voter Registration deadline, the Gephardt Institute communicated voter registration deadline info through newsletter articles, email blasts, and posts on social media, and by asking Deans and Department heads to share communications with students, faculty, and staff.

To share information about voter registration deadlines, TurboVote as a tool for online registration, and locations of the on and off-campus polling places, the Gephardt Institute placed ads in the Student Life newspaper three times between July and November 8th, 2016.

Beyond campus communications, the Gephardt Institute staff and representatives appeared several times on local news sources to discuss voter registration and engagement at WashU including on Sirius XM, STL Today, St Louis Post Dispatch, and Fox News. (See links on the last page)
Campus signage designed by a class in the Sam Fox Arts School under the “Vote Dammit” campaign name helped to promote a positive and humorous message for students and served as a visual reminder for key voter registration deadlines and Election Day.

The WashU Votes Committee and Gephardt Institute went above and beyond to ensure that everyone on the WashU campus received accurate and timely information about how to engage in the political process.

**Coalition**: How did your coalition function throughout the fall semester? Why was your coalition effective or not effective? How will it change for continued Democratic Engagement work; particularly focused on mid-term elections. What other partners did you work with internally or externally? What was their role?

Overall, Washington University established a multi-tiered committee structure to support voter engagement, education, and registration. The Gephardt Institute for Civic and Community Engagement’s mission is to cultivate informed and actively engaged citizens, and is responsible for leading WashU’s voter registration efforts and coordinating the on-campus polling place. The Gephardt Institute is also responsible for Constitution Day and Voter Registration Day activities. This year a full-time Voter Engagement Fellow was hired through Gephardt to coordinate WashU’s voter engagement and registration efforts between March and December 2016. As that position has ended, the Assistant Director for Student Engagement and Service will continue evaluation, reporting, and ongoing voter engagement to ensure we continue to register students as voters and engage them in political education.

Additionally, WashU established a joint campus initiative called WashU Votes that was administered by the student engagement sub-committee of the Presidential Debate Steering Committee which met weekly from spring 2016 until December. This committee was conceptualized as a unified brand for all election and debate related programming for the 2016 election. Representatives from the offices of Campus Life, Student Union, the Gephardt Institute, Public Affairs, and the Graduate Professional Council were most active within the WashU Votes initiative.

WashU Votes was further broken into four teams charged with developing processes and engagement activities to ensure that students were educated about key issues related to the Presidential Debate and election; that students were able to identify the types of programming most interesting to them and access funding to implement their ideas; that there was coordinated branding and communication shared campus-wide; and that WashU Votes had an infrastructure to register students as voters. Those four sub-committees were the Programming Team, The Funding team, The Marketing and Communications Team, and the Voter Engagement Team.

The Voter Engagement Team was led by Gephardt’s Voter Engagement Fellow and was comprised of 80+ campus faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students. This team received regular communication updates and was further broken into three sub-committees to coordinate efforts. The Brain Trust provided input into Constitution Day, Voter Registration Day, and Voter registration drive event plans; the Community Champions promoted voter registration and engagement within other campus communities - such as Greek Life or the young Democrats or young Republicans. The Voter Registration Squad participated in training and was tasked with leading ongoing voter registration drives. All programing and information relating to the election carried the WashU Votes Logo. WashUVotes.wustl.edu and the WashU Votes Facebook page were centralized portals for voter registration, events, programing grants, etc.
Successes: What are your institution's top successes (up to 3) of your democratic engagement efforts in 2016?

1. We launched our democratic engagement efforts last spring by hiring a full time Voter Engagement Fellow, who was a recent graduate of the university. Her first responsibility was to conduct thorough research into the best practices for voter engagement and education, and we built our communications and outreach plans based on those findings.

The research pointed us to avoid programming around specific issues. Rather, our job was to provide student groups and faculty with the resources and guidance they needed to incorporate voter information effectively into their issue-focused programming. We also combatted typical stereotypes about voting and millennials through our communications strategy. Students often find the actual voter registration process difficult. This difficulty in part arises from all the different rules within each state and in part arises because students have a tendency to over think it. There are many misconceptions about voter registration and voting, and Gephardt tried to correct those misconceptions and frame participating in the democratic process as an identity-based activity. Rather than register to vote, we communicated register as a voter, to demonstrate this is ongoing and part of who people are. We also frequently shared our voter registration numbers and voter engagement successes along the way through campus newspapers, articles, and social media posts to dispel the stereotype that millennials do not vote or engage in the political process. Following these best practices helped us to achieve higher engagement than ever before on campus.
2. In terms of structure, creating processes for cross-campus collaboration and campus-wide championing of voter engagement efforts truly helped voter engagement feel like a Washington University cause and that it belonged to everyone rather than a single office. Information and branding was unified and comprehensive. However, it was incredibly important for the Gephardt Institute to hold the role of voter registration in order to ensure compliance and accurate information was disseminated. We could work very closely with residential life, mail services, and the St. Louis County Board of Elections to monitor students’ on-campus registrations to ensure they had updated their address accurately so they could vote successfully on Election Day.

3. Using TurboVote as a platform to register voters led to a record number of new voter registrations during the fall. The Gephardt Institute worked with the university administration to embed the link into Webstac, a campus-wide website used by all students, and the link was shared with all members of the university through the email from the Chancellor.

**Barriers: What are your institution's barriers (3) faced in implementing democratic engagement work in 2016?**

Throughout this year’s democratic engagement work, we learned so many important lessons about what works to engage students who mostly identify as part of the millennial generation and what does not. We also learned major lessons about coordinating campus-wide efforts in an incredibly decentralized institution.

1. Within the WashU Votes Student Engagement Steering Committee, we received feedback from students and staff alike that the structure was confusing, and many did not know how the different committees or sub-committees were connected. The WashU Votes structure also required a tremendous amount of time and commitment from key staff in Campus Life, the Gephardt Institute, and volunteer student leaders from Student Union and the Graduate Professional Council. We will identify ways to better leverage existing student groups and leaders on campus to mobilize them around the voter engagement, and may move away from creating an additional infrastructure that we asked groups and students to join in the future.

2. The Gephardt Institute launched a pilot civic dialogue program following the debates based on research indicating that an important aspect of Voter Education is dialogue. The research has shown that one of the only things that can actually statistically increase voter turnout is people engaging in respectful conversation with people who hold different opinions. This empowers people and allows peers to educate peers. However, the reality of this campaign cycle and tenor of the presidential election did not lead to student interest in the civic dialogues. Students opted to discuss politics and the election with their own peer group or found other online channels to communicate their views rather than engage with strangers through the civic dialogue program. We will rethink the type of programming and how we incorporate dialogue into future political engagement events so that it is a component of an event or speaker series, rather than a stand-alone program. We will also offer training and support for student groups or faculty interested in integrating dialogue and reflection into the groups or classes they are already part of rather than offering dialogues through the Gephardt Institute.
3. This election also posed many challenges for us to ensure that the activities, events, and communications were truly nonpartisan in nature—especially given the divisiveness of the candidates in this election season. We scrutinized our work internally, and had many conversations about what type of activity or communication was nonpartisan, and would recommend other institutions to work closely with the university’s legal department to review plans and drafts in advance.

**Beyond 2016:** Local and state elections, legislative issues, and other democratic engagement activities should take place year round. Looking into 2017 and future years, how do you plan on continuing to engage and education students about the democratic process?

To truly create a campus that models the Politics 365 approach, the Gephardt Institute strives to champion ongoing voter engagement and education with the understanding that students need to have clarity about what it means to be a citizen of WashU and St. Louis; an understanding of the issues, challenges and policies impacting the region; and knowledge of how to engage in the political process. As the excitement of the presidential election and debate subsides, the cross-campus collaborations including the Student Engagement Sub-Committee and WashU Votes committees have ended, and the charge for ongoing democratic engagement will continue to fall squarely within the Gephardt Institute charge.

The Gephardt Institute will continue to communicate democratic engagement information each academic semester. Given that WashU students vote in all fifty states, and there are local elections occurring basically every spring and fall, the Gephardt Institute has developed a year-round strategy for communication and voter registration, education, and engagement efforts.

For example, during the spring of 2017, the city of St. Louis has a primary and a general election to elect a new mayor for the first time in sixteen years and an election for school board members as the St. Louis Public School district returns to local control after re-gaining accreditation by the state. The Gephardt Institute has developed a communication strategy to distribute information and links to students for nonpartisan voter registration and education sites including wustl.turbovote.org and Vote411.org. We are communicating important voter registration deadlines, events, and information on our website, Facebook page, newsletter, and by distributing printed flyers. Our staff also tabled during the spring semester activities fair and inauguration viewing event to distribute information about ongoing voter engagement opportunities. The Gephardt Institute will continue to be responsible university-wide for ensuring students have access to voter registration and accurate democratic engagement information.

Additionally, the Gephardt Institute will continue to collaborate with other campus groups where there are opportunities including with other campus departments or institutes, student groups, and local organizations. For example, in February, the Clark Fox Policy Institute is sponsoring a Mayoral Forum, and the Gephardt Institute will work with them to promote the event and coordinate transportation for students to attend. We will also co-sponsor an on-campus panel event with expert speakers to discuss “What’s at Stake in the St. Louis City Election.”

The Gephardt Institute mission is to to cultivate informed and actively engaged citizens, and we will continue to offer educational programs, events, and activities to ensure students are educated about the democratic process and their rights, and that they have access to accurate nonpartisan information to understand key political issues.
NSLVE Data: When you receive your campuses’ NSLVE report, what plans are in place with your coalition to evaluate this data and to assess future initiatives?

Throughout our process of goal setting, planning, and evolving our voter engagement approach, the Gephardt Institute relied heavily on data to inform practice. We learned that it is okay to experiment and try new approaches based on what we have discovered in the research and that we can learn from these successes or failures.

As soon as it is available, the Gephardt Institute will share out the actual voter registration data, as well as the voter turnout information with the full the Student Engagement Sub-Committee and WashU Votes committee to celebrate our successes and reflect on challenges. We will continue to use the NSLVE, TurboVote, and election results data to drive our planning for the future, and integrate the feedback from students, staff, faculty, and campus partners into plans.

It is important to communicate across campus the overall voter engagement and turnout in the fall election. To maximize reach, the Gephardt Institute will include a story on the results in our newsletter, on the website, and will encourage The Source to publish a follow up story as well.

Photos and Stories: Share your favorite photos and stories with us from the election!
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