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Executive Summary
The Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and the County’s Registrar of Voters had a vision in 2011. As the upcoming presidential election year approached they had the foresight and courage to ask an important question:

What can we do to ensure that as many everyday citizens in our county – no matter their race, socio-economic status, country of origin, or background – participate in the electoral process?

The Board and its staff knew that the year would bring a unique set of challenges for this county’s voters. First, the June election would bring the implementation of the state’s new top-two primary, and many worried that voters would be confused by the system. Second, the success of the upcoming November election would inevitably be measured against the unprecedented turnout levels achieved in 2008, when millions of new young voters and voters of color participated at record levels. There was serious consideration about whether 2012 participation rates would come even close to that historic level of engagement and participation. In the face of these challenges, our County’s Board boldly declared that it had a unique and potentially powerful role to play in ensuring especially that historically disenfranchised communities have access to the ballot box and ultimately exercise their right to vote.

Their willingness to ask and then respond to these challenges led to the creation of the Registrar of Voters’ innovative CBO outreach program. Designed to implement targeted investments in the registration, education, and participation of disenfranchised communities in Santa Clara County, the registrar solicited and awarded four contracts specifically designed to achieve measurable results in voter registration, education, and participation rates.

Working Partnerships USA is proud to have partnered with the County in this historic endeavor and this report is designed to evaluate and measure the effectiveness of the program we ultimately implemented targeting Latino and Vietnamese youth.

We are proud to report some incredible accomplishments from our work:

- Successful registration of over 14,000 voters
- Over 5,100 contacts to targeted populations in the June Primary Election resulting in voters who were 40% more likely to vote than their peers in a low-turnout election.
- Over 9,000 contacts to targeted populations in the November General Election resulting in voters who were 26% more likely to vote than their peers in a high-turnout election.
- Increased participation in all the targeted subgroups – with incredible gains for Latino and Vietnamese voters, who were twice as likely to vote after being contacted by the Lead the Vote team.

It is my hope that this report serves both as evidence of the effectiveness that strategic voter engagement programs can have, but also as a useful look at the best practices and methodology implemented by Working Partnerships USA to achieve these exciting outcomes.

Warmly,

Cindy Chavez, Executive Director
Working Partnerships USA

Voter Registration in Santa Clara County

Background and Methodology
Eligible young people and monolingual Vietnamese and Spanish speakers are registered to vote at lower rates than other populations in Santa Clara County. At the beginning of 2012, 63% of eligible young people aged 18-24 were not registered to vote. Of the 158,000 total youth in Santa Clara County, about 67,000 are Latino or Vietnamese.

Voter registration and education programs are a critical civic engagement priority to ensure that the voting population more accurately reflects a community’s demographics. In order to increase voter participation rates with young Latino and Vietnamese voters in Santa Clara County, Working Partnerships hired a trilingual canvass team (Spanish, Vietnamese, and English) and conducted an aggressive voter registration effort dubbed Lead the Vote which successfully registered more than 14,000 voters in ten months.

Lead the Vote team members were expertly trained to engage citizens in important questions about the voting process and the upcoming election. They fielded inquiries about voter registration deadlines, when absentee ballots were due, how the new top-two primary system would work, polling place information, and questions about registering after changing their place of residence among other issues. The extended, face-to-face interaction by the Lead the Vote team was key to successfully registering thousands of voters.

Canvassers worked five or six days a week throughout two phases of work: Phase 1 - January through June, and Phase 2 – July through October. In each phase voter registration and education efforts emphasized participating in upcoming elections on either the primary election on June 5th, 2012, or the general election on November 6th, 2012. The registration and education program focused on the regional college campuses in the county where many young people of color are enrolled in higher education classes. Additionally, team members conducted outreach at high volume shopping centers in targeted zip codes likely to be frequented by the Latino and Vietnamese community.

During Phase 1 of the Lead the Vote’s registration drive, Working Partnerships’ staff reached out to a variety of community organizations to organize voter registration opportunities to the populations they serve. Working Partnerships distributed 22,480 voter registration cards in Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Tagalog, and Vietnamese to 37 community organizations throughout Santa Clara County. Organizations that received cards include the NAACP local chapter, Asian Americans for Community Involvement, and Californians for Justice. It is worth noting that despite the large numbers of cards distributed to regional community-based-organizations, only a handful of those cards were completed.
and returned to the Registrar’s office. When comparing the results of targeted outreach through Lead the Vote and distribution of voter registration cards through community partners, it is clear that in-person (face-to-face) voter registration efforts resulted in a much better return on investment. See Appendix A for the full list of community organizations which received registration cards.

**Training**

All Lead the Vote team members participated in a rigorous two-hour training prior to engaging in field work. Team members also received daily, on-the-ground training from team leaders, who observed their work on-site and offered real-time feedback. All team members participated in debrief sessions at the end of each work shift to record effective outreach strategies and to resolve challenges and difficulties in the field. Additionally, Working Partnerships staff reviewed the team’s training, dynamics, structure, and leadership on a weekly basis and made adjustments accordingly.

**Results**

Through focused coaching, promotion of highly successful canvassers to help train underperforming colleagues who, and tailored trainings to address relevant challenges, Working Partnerships was able to create a very effective outreach system and improve the performance of its team significantly over time.

Chart 1 demonstrates the upward trend in voter registration cards collected by the Lead the Vote team through 2012. As more the number of completed cards increased, Working Partnerships refined its intake and quality control system, training several more leaders to oversee canvass teams and contact recently registered voters to verify information and ensure the quality of team members’ interactions. By expanding the program and incorporating lessons learned from Phase 1, Working Partnerships ensured continued improvement through Phase 2 in the team’s ability to register a high number of voters.

**Voter Education**

A substantial barrier to voter participation continues to be lack of information or misinformation about the registration and voting process. To that end, the CBO outreach program included an important voter education component designed to provide new registrants and existing voters with critical information on the mechanics of voting and individual troubleshooting on getting registered and turning out to the polls.

**Chart 2: Age Breakdown Information for Voter Registration Cards Collected by LTV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Registrations</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-language interactions were critical to enfranchise and empower traditionally under-participating communities in Santa Clara County. Lead the Vote’s ability to hold in-language interactions increased the opportunity for monolingual speakers to register with our canvassers, so they would be eligible to vote. In numerous feedback sessions with canvassers, registrants stated that their positive and informative registration experience meant they were more likely to vote in the subsequent election and stay engaged in the electoral process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>3602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>3516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,424</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lead the Vote program specifically worked to target eligible voters aged 18-24. Working Partnerships was able to successfully reach this target population as shown in Chart 2, below. In-language interactions resulted in more monolingual Spanish-speaking and monolingual Vietnamese-speaking voters successfully registering with a Lead the Vote team member.
voter participation phases of the election cycle, Lead the Vote team members successfully reached tens of thousands of voters through door-to-door outreach, phone calling, and mail in order to educate them on the immediacy of the upcoming election as well as how and where to vote.

Presentation Content
Working Partnerships staff developed a concise and engaging presentation geared towards high school and college-aged students and designed to convey the most critical aspects of voter education and engender a sense of civic duty regarding participation in the electoral process. The Lead the Vote voter education presentation included:

- Why voting is important for young people
- Voting rights
- How to register to vote
- Information on California’s new Top Two Primary law
- How to vote on June 5th, 2012 (or before June 5th if voting by mail)

As stated above, the Lead the Vote canvass team was trained to conduct informal voter education in the field. When registering a voter, team members also informed registrants about the top-two primary law and reminded them of the date for the upcoming election. They were also prepared to answer questions regarding the registration and voting process.

Results
The responses from students were very positive in classrooms across the County. Many students had not yet registered to vote, and were not aware that they could register if their eighteenth birthday was on or before the next Election Day.

When canvassing in the community, team members often encountered potential voters who were unsure of their eligibility to register or to vote. The Lead the Vote team was able to register citizens who had completed parole, but who had previously believed their criminal record prevented them from registering to vote. Additionally, team members guided registrants with no permanent home address through the registration process.

It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of voter education presentations on voter participation and empowerment without tracking whether a voter who participated in an education event actually turned out to vote in a subsequent election. However, the sense of civic engagement and the belief that peer-to-peer networking extended the reach of the presentations beyond the participants lead the team to believe they are worth the effort in future voter outreach programs.

Voter Participation
While registering to vote provides access to the ballot box, it does not guarantee voter participation. Populations that are registered at lower rates also participate less frequently in elections. Direct one-on-one voter contact is a proven and effective method to increase voter turnout, even among populations that traditionally vote at lower rates. Per Donald Green and Alan Gerber’s book, Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout, effectiveness for various voter contact item are rated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Effectiveness per contact</th>
<th>Is effect statistically reliable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-door canvassing</td>
<td>One voter per 14 contacts (plus effects of spillover)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail, nonpartisan</td>
<td>One vote per 200 recipients</td>
<td>Yes, but borderline significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live calls, with special coaching</td>
<td>One vote per 35 contacts</td>
<td>Yes, based on few studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>No detectable effect</td>
<td>Large numbers of studies show average effect cannot be large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Working Partnerships Lead the Vote team engaged in intensive, direct voter contact by phone and in-person for both the June and the November elections in 2012. In both elections, direct voter contact significantly increased voter turnout in every target population.

The Voter Gap
Not all demographics vote at the same rate. We know, through past elections, that younger voters and minority voters participate at lower rates. Charts 4 and 5 below demonstrate the gap between the 18-24 age group and older voters in the 2008 elections, while charts 6 and 7 demonstrate the gap between Hispanic/Latino, Vietnamese voters and the general population.

The Lead the Vote team used the 2008 Presidential elections as a framework to compare turnout rates because to date, it is one of the highest turnout elections with exceedingly high participation across all demographic groups. The 2008 election is also a more apt comparison to the 2010 election, because more voters participate in presidential elections than gubernatorial elections. We believe that comparing a presidential to a gubernatorial election would unfairly advantage the gains in turnout for the Lead the Vote program would be unproductive in determining their true effect.
Chart 4: Voter Turnout in Santa Clara County by Age

2008 Primary Election Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65&amp;up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
<td>23.15%</td>
<td>32.88%</td>
<td>44.96%</td>
<td>60.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5: Voter Turnout in Santa Clara County by Age

2008 General Election Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65&amp;up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>68.59%</td>
<td>75.22%</td>
<td>82.49%</td>
<td>86.75%</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
<td>88.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 6: Targeted Demographic Turnout in Santa Clara County

2008 Primary Election Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
<td>34.36%</td>
<td>34.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 7: Targeted Demographic Turnout in Santa Clara County

2008 General Election Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>79.33%</td>
<td>70.29%</td>
<td>83.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June Primary Election

The June program focused increasing the participation rates of occasional voters aged 18-35. Occasional voters were defined for the primary election as voters who had voted in at least three but no more than five of nine preceding elections, excluding special elections. Our team was able to contact voters in three languages: English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Working Partnerships staff developed a script to engage young voters in all three languages. Calls were made using an online voter database and predictive dialing software which tracked the contact rates, responses, and other information online. The phone script included information on where to drop ballots off, important dates and deadlines, and where to find a polling place.

Many of the Lead the Vote team members transitioned from voter registration to voter participation. The team continued to be trilingual (Spanish, English, and Vietnamese). All team members went through an additional training on best practices for voter engagement on the phone, which included hands-on role-playing. Team leaders monitored team members’ performance and provided assistance in overcoming difficulties and challenges. Team members tracked the number of calls made, the number of conversations that successfully resulted in the voter committing to vote, and questions that they were unable to answer on the phone. Team leaders were then able to provide tailored coaching to each team members’ needs.

The Lead the Vote staff engaged voters on the phone, providing information on why voting was personally important to them and their families, as well as crucial information on how to return their ballot by mail, where to drop it off, and when their ballot needed to be returned.

June Results

In every target population, voter contact by the Lead the Vote team significantly increased voter turnout. The most striking increase occurred within the County’s youngest voters, where voter contact increased turnout by 18.8 percentage points. Also worth noting is the large voter turnout increase within the Vietnamese population, where voter contact increased turnout by 17.7 percentage points. In the Vietnamese and Latino populations, voter contact by the Lead the Vote team almost doubled the turnout rate for the June primary. Among young Latino and Vietnamese voters between the ages of 18 and 24, Lead the Vote contacts tripled the turnout rate. See the below table and Chart 8 for the effect the Lead the Vote team’s effect on turnout for voters they were able to contact.

Overall, in the June primary election, the Lead the Vote team was able to increase turnout in targeted populations by 8.4 percentage points, with larger gains for Vietnamese and Latino voters.

---

### Turnout Rates for Targeted Populations in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age 18-24</th>
<th>New Registrants</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Occasional Voters</th>
<th>All Targeted Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Pt. Increase</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Occasional voters were defined as voters who voted in at least 3 and no more than 5 of the 9 past elections, excluding special elections*

---

November General Election

Leading up to the November election, Working Partnerships further focused its program to reach the specific target populations. To reach immigrant voters, the Lead the Vote team chose to focus on voters requesting in-language ballots in Vietnamese and Spanish, since monolingual voter participation is often lower. It is with the monolingual, non-English speaking voters where the tri-lingual Lead the Vote team had the most significant gains in voter turnout.

All voters who committed to voting during the first round of contact and had not yet voted were called again during the Get Out the Vote (GOTV) phase in order to remind them again to vote. Similarly, voters who had confirmed their intention to vote during the GOTV phase were called again on Election Day if their ballot had not yet been received by elections officials.
The Lead the Vote team conducted multiple and various types of contacts based on the philosophy that voters who do not consistently participate in elections need additional work to turn them out. The Lead the Vote civic engagement model included two types of contact (by phone and by mail) and two phases of re-contact in order to increase turnout among target populations. This method was overwhelmingly successful.

**November Results**

The Lead the Vote team had a significant and dramatic impact on turnout results in each targeted population. Chart 9 and the table below illustrates the gains that were made in targeted populations. The impact of Lead the Vote contacts was even greater in the November election than in June; overall, the Lead the Vote team increased voter turnout by 15.7 percentage points in the entire targeted population in just twelve days of direct voter contact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age 18-24</th>
<th>New Registrants</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Occasional Voters</th>
<th>All Targeted Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Pt. Increase</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant increase occurred in the Vietnamese speaking population, where contact by Lead the Vote increased voter turnout by 25 percentage points. A Vietnamese speaking voter contacted by the Lead the Vote team was thus 44% more likely to vote than a Vietnamese speaking voter who had not been contacted. The turnout rate among Vietnamese speaking voters contacted by Lead the Vote exceeded even the overall turnout rate for the County (82.3% compared to 79.9%).

**June and November Results – Statistical Analysis**

For both the June and November elections, statistical analysis was conducted to determine the impact of the Lead the Vote team on voter turnout. The statistical test used to compare Lead the Vote targeted voters and non-targeted voters is a two-proportion z-test. This type of test is applied to delineate whether differences in turnout rates between the contacted and the uncontacted groups are statistically significant or merely due to random chance.

**A note on Z-Tests:**

A two-sample z-test is used to compare two groups and determine if the observed differences are statistically valid or result from random chance. For our purposes, we want to study whether Lead the Vote’s efforts to conduct voter contact during the June and November elections increased the rate (proportion) that certain categories of voters cast ballots.

The first step in conducting a Z-Test is to create a set of conflicting hypotheses. The null hypothesis purports that any difference between the contacted and uncontacted voters is due to random chance. The alternative hypothesis is the opposite of the null hypothesis, and proposes that any difference between the groups is significant. By this we mean that the difference between the two groups is so great that it exceeds the range of values we would expect due to random chance, and therefore the difference must be the result of some other factor. In this case, we would hypothesize that the difference is due to the voter contact conducted by the Lead the Vote team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀: P₁ = P₂</td>
<td>The rate of turnout for contacted voters is the same as the rate of turnout for uncontacted voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hₐ: P₁ ≠ P₂</td>
<td>The rate of turnout for contacted voters is different than uncontacted voters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step is to create an alpha level; the bar at which you need to reach to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. In this analysis the alpha level is set at 5%. A 5% alpha level is common in social science research.

| Alpha Level α | The probability level at or below which the difference between the two sample proportions is not attributable to random chance. |
After setting the alpha level, you will need to calculate the test statistic (Z-score) to determine the probability (P-Value) of observing a sample statistic as extreme as the test statistics.

The Z-Score is computed using the following formula:

\[
z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2})}}
\]

- \(\hat{p}_1\): Sample proportion from Population 1
- \(\hat{p}_2\): Sample proportion from Population 2
- \(n_1\): The size of the sample from Population 1
- \(n_2\): The size of the sample from Population 2
- \(\hat{p}\): The pooled sample proportion, calculated as the total number of successes in both samples.

When the Z-score is calculated, the score represents a position on the normal distribution curve, with a value of zero being placed directly at the center of the curve (see below). Each Z-score corresponds to a P-Value, which represents the probability that any variance between the sample proportions is due to random chance. The smaller the P-Value, the less likely the variance is due to random chance.

After calculating the test-statistic, you can use the P-Value to determine whether to accept the null hypothesis or reject the null hypothesis. The Z-Score falls within the middle, then you fall within the acceptance region and you would accept the null hypothesis.

In order to have a more rigorous analysis, the Lead the Vote team used a two-tailed test, meaning the rejection regions (results that result in rejecting the null hypothesis) fall at both the left and right ‘tails’ of the normal distribution curve. Although we believe Lead the Vote efforts increase turnout, meaning the rejection region could be single-tailed on the right side, using a two-tailed test is standard practice for statistical analysis in social science and requires a smaller P-Value (\(\alpha/2\), Value or 0.025) to reject the null hypothesis.

In order to apply the two-proportion Z-test, the following assumptions were made: nominal level data, random selection of the treatment, and sufficiently large sample size. We also assume that, except for the Lead the Vote intervention, the voters in the two samples (Contacted and Uncontacted) have the same characteristics and environmental factors that influence their voting rates. Although it’s impossible to control real-world populations, we do not believe there are external influences (other campaigns, community groups, etc.) or variables (polling place locations, neighborhood voting rates, etc.) that would account for the results that we found through our analysis.

### Results:

The results of the analysis show the increases in voter turnout due to the Lead the Vote team in every population tested are statistically significant at a high confidence level (greater than 99%). This is because each of the computed p-values.

#### Results of Two-Sample Z-test on June Election Population Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Two-tailed p-value</th>
<th>Z-score*</th>
<th>Contacted Voters</th>
<th>Uncontacted Voters</th>
<th>Contacted Proportion</th>
<th>Uncontacted Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Targeted Voters</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>67,763</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>25,062</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New registrants</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>4527</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>4527</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High Z-scores correspond to negligible P-scores, which are estimated as zero.

#### Results of Two-Sample Z-test on November Election Population Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Two-tailed p-value</th>
<th>Z-score*</th>
<th>Contacted Voters</th>
<th>Uncontacted Voters</th>
<th>Contacted Proportion</th>
<th>Uncontacted Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Targeted Voters</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>4608</td>
<td>56,210</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>13,233</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New registrants</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>36,074</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>37,983</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High Z-scores correspond to negligible P-scores, which are estimated as zero.
Each of the As demonstrated by the charts above, the probability that the increase in voter turnout was a result of Lead the Vote contact and not due to random variation is 99.9%.

The Effect of Multiple Contacts on Voter Turnout

Lead the Vote’s civic engagement model was built on the idea that multiple contacts increase the likelihood of voter turnout. For this reason, the Lead the Vote team attempted to re-contact all voters who had indicated an intention to vote but who had not yet cast their ballots during “Get Out the Vote” weekend, the weekend immediately preceding an election. Additionally, voters reached during the GOTV phase were contacted again on Election Day. This method proved effective in amplifying the impact of the Lead the Vote team on voter turnout.

As evidenced by the chart above, the most effective program contacts voters at least twice at key points before an election occurs. One contact has a marginal effect on voter turnout; the real increase in voter turnout occurs when a voter has been contacted at least twice. In the overall population, two contacts increased voter turnout by more than 20 percentage points. Three contacts was most effective in the Latino population, where the third contact increased voter turnout to 84.1%.

Overall

For the November election, voters contacted at least once by the Lead the Vote team were 26.2% more likely to vote than voters in the same population who had not been contacted. It is also worth noting that among voters requesting a ballot in Vietnamese, voters contacted at least once by the Lead the Vote team exceeded their counterparts in voter turnout by 25 percentage points, achieving a turnout rate above the County’s (82.3% compared to 79.9%). The full impact results will be discussed below.

Conclusion

In putting forth a Community-Based Organization program, the Board and the County Registrar of Voters set forth a vision of active inclusion: bringing in the communities within the County that historically and presently face barriers to democratic participation. Working Partnerships crafted its Lead the Vote program with this same vision, and created a state-of-the-art civic engagement model that significantly increased voter registration and participation by marginalized communities during both the June and November elections of 2012.

Through ten months of rigorous and high-quality work, the Lead the Vote team has found that:

- Investing in voter registration increases voter turnout
- Investing in voter mobilization increases voter turnout, even among hard to reach constituencies
- In-language programs are highly effective at mobilizing monolingual communities
- Employing the proven method of direct voter contact, coupled with rigorous training and quality control, can significantly impact voter turnout

Communities continue to face barriers to voter registration and participation. As the population continues to grow and change, new challenges will no doubt arise. Given the success of its 2012 program in enfranchising and mobilizing, Working Partnerships hopes to explore a consistent voter outreach program that continues to engage hard-to-reach populations such as young people and language minorities.