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SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2012, the Service Providers and Civic Engagement (SPaCE) Project provided civic engagement opportunities to low-income individuals through nonprofit human service provider agencies, including health clinics, food banks, and family assistance centers. Project partners sought to integrate civic engagement tactics into ongoing services, and evaluate whether they are effective in motivating clients to vote. State partners and national staff provided comprehensive training, technical assistance, and support to 58 nonprofit agencies across nine states. Human service nonprofits utilized voter registration and a pledge to vote campaign to engage clients, and built a list of 21,736 individuals.

SPaCE conducted the first randomized controlled experiment measuring the impact of nonprofit service providers on the civic participation of their clients. In partnership with the Analyst Institute, SPaCE sought to answer the question: Is Get Out The Vote (GOTV) communication from one’s own human service nonprofit more effective than GOTV communication from an organization that is unfamiliar to the target?

Post-election turnout rates were compared and no statistically significant difference was found in voting rates between the two groups. This does not necessarily indicate that the contacts were ineffective, but rather that one was not significantly more effective than the other. The experiment serves as a pilot for future testing and evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of civic engagement programs within human service nonprofits. In addition, the Analyst Institute recommends replications of the experiment several times and with a larger universe before reaching firm conclusions.

Notably, the impact of collecting pledges and registrations on the likelihood of the individuals to vote was not measured in this experiment, and the Analyst Institute recommends future testing on this particular element. For more details, please see Appendix C.

Key takeaways from the project include:

- **Engaging underserved populations**: 2012 turnout among SPaCE’s universe was 69 percent. The individuals SPaCE engaged represent diverse populations (52 percent white, 25 percent African-American, and 12 percent Latino). Forty-six percent of individuals live in households earning less than $40,000. In Colorado, of the 4,201 individuals engaged, 73 percent are unique voters who were not engaged by other state table partners.

- **Increased civic engagement activity among human service nonprofits**: Ninety percent of survey respondents reported they plan to continue providing civic participation activities for their clients in the future. Through surveys and case studies, participating human service nonprofits reported increased skill and capacity in the areas of client engagement, community relationships, Board capacity and interest in advocacy, and organizational advocacy readiness and sophistication.

- **Emerging best practices**: The most successful tactics, identified by participating human service nonprofits, were integration of civic engagement activities with intake, community outreach programs, case management, and larger client and community events. Participating agencies also cited the importance of accessing a cohort of other nonprofits and a state coordinator to help troubleshoot challenges.
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SECTION II: BACKGROUND

The coming decade will offer perhaps the greatest aggregation of challenges to poor and vulnerable members of our country in modern history. Gaps in income equality, life-long earnings, primary and secondary education, family net worth and assets have widened substantially\(^1\). If these challenges were not enough, programs that provide the safety net of community services which ordinarily support our society’s most vulnerable members are on the chopping block due to deficits and budget cuts. As a result of the 2013 federal government sequestration, nonprofits are expected to lose nine percent of their federal funding, while simultaneously experiencing dramatic increases in the demand for their services\(^2\). These compounding problems speak to the urgent need to strengthen the civic voice of affected communities.

Civic Participation in Low-Income Communities

Despite the real needs of poor communities, their voices are often unheard by policymakers\(^3\). Due to a variety of factors, including unequal access and inadequate information about the political system, individuals from low-income communities engage with the political system less frequently than high-income earners\(^4\).

![2008 Voting Turnout by Household Income](chart)

Source: U.S. Census

Poor and marginalized individuals continue to live in communities plagued by poor performing schools, low-paying jobs, and inadequate health care. Many of these individuals understand the important role the social safety net plays in keeping families out of poverty.

Differential participation rates that favor the wealthy ensure the enactment of policy priorities that support high-income individuals. As money, time, and effort are expended on these policies, the needs of poor and low-income families are overlooked, contributing to increased levels of poverty

---


among society's most vulnerable members. When low-income and marginalized populations are not at the decision-making table, their immediate needs are not recognized and they risk losing a future voice. In addition, recent efforts to restrict voting access have come in the form of voter identification laws, purges to voter registration rolls and limiting periods for early voting.

Without the political force to change current policies, the vicious and intertwined cycles of poverty and political exclusion continue. Policies that ignore the needs of low-income and marginalized populations exacerbate poverty, making the poor poorer. Income inequalities have been correlated with poor health, lower educational attainment, higher rates of mental illness, housing insecurity, and greater levels of family conflict and turmoil among poor populations. As low-income communities sink further into poverty, the very resources needed to help pull them out continue to be cut.

Engaging New Voices in Political Debates
The decision to become civically engaged is indicative of an individual's belief in their ability to influence and change their surrounding circumstances. This outlook has a number of benefits, both for the individual and their community.

Civic participation is correlated with lower levels of depression, better outcomes with chronic health conditions, and a greater propensity to follow issues and volunteer. Civic engagement is tied to an increase in critical thinking, written, verbal and leadership skills, and the ability to successfully complete college.

Communities with higher voter registration rates demonstrate decreased levels of unemployment and are better able to withstand the impact of recessions. These communities also have higher levels of social capital and more responsive government officials who represent the needs of the community at large.


The Nonprofit Service Provider Model
Community-based organizations, such as food banks and local health centers, play a key role in the civic engagement landscape, working to end the unequal participation rates noted above. Integrated voter engagement strategies have been found to be effective and vital to the health of our democracy14. While candidates and political campaigns often target more active participants in elections, community-based organizations can implement programs aimed at less active voters.

The Service Providers and Civic Engagement (SPaCE) Project complements engagement efforts by community organizing, advocacy, and public policy organizations. SPaCE’s model integrated voter engagement into service delivery including intake and enrollment, programs, and classes. SPaCE helped make integrated engagement more manageable for social service organizations by providing training, ongoing coaching, and a network to collaborate with peers. Within the context of attacks nationwide on the right to vote, ensuring low-income communities receive proactive information about voting is strategic and timely.

SPaCE was a strictly nonpartisan program. In complying with federal laws pertaining to 501(c)(3) organizations, the program does not advocate for or against candidates or parties.

Current Research and Gaps in Knowledge
In developing programs, SPaCE applied to the service provider model what we know from complementary, field-based outreach efforts. Direct voter contact is the most effective strategy for increasing voter turnout. Direct voter contact strategies include face-to-face, phone, and mail communications. Face-to-face conversations are the single most effective tactic, increasing an individual’s likelihood to vote by a notable 9 percent15. SPaCE partners apply this learning and assist partners engage clients and residents as they visit social service agencies in person.

However, the civic engagement field and nonprofit sector lacks enough empirical research that demonstrates civic engagement programs within social service agencies are effective, sustainable, and cost-effective. SPaCE began to explore these questions through qualitative and quantitative evaluation strategies, measuring the value of service providers as trusted messengers, tracking best practices and effective tactics, and assessing cost and return-on-investment figures for the program. SPaCE will continue evaluating its capacity building curriculum, and assessing the impact of partners’ civic engagement programs.

A Growing Field
SPaCE partners envision building a pipeline through which nonprofit human service providers can increase their knowledge, skill set, and capacity for continued civic engagement efforts. With increased numbers of organizations entering the civic engagement landscape, and with limited resources and funding for programs, our field benefits from further partnership and exploration of the service provider model of civic engagement as a meaningful method of motivating and supporting low-income individuals to participate civically. SPaCE partners with pioneers in this field, including Nonprofit VOTE.

---


SECTION III: SPACE PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Overview and Goals
The SPaCE Project provided civic engagement opportunities to low-income individuals through nonprofit human service agencies, including health clinics, food banks, and family assistance centers. The project worked to increase the capacity of social service providers to integrate civic engagement tactics into ongoing services. SPaCE’s 2012 programs represented a partnership between State Voices tables in six states, Nonprofit VOTE, the National Association of Community Health Centers, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and local human service nonprofit agencies. The project was fiscally sponsored by State Voices nationally.

In 2012, nonprofit leaders with a shared commitment to engaging low-income communities came together to better evaluate service provider civic engagement programs. A lack of empirical data exists demonstrating these programs are effective, and SPaCE sought to address this gap.

SPaCE’s 2012 goals were to:

- Engage a team of direct service providers across nine states to register and engage 20,000 low-income clients;
- Evaluate the impact of service providers as trusted messengers to increase voter turnout among their clients;
- Assess best practices for service providers to engage clients in voter registration, nonpartisan education, and get-out-the-vote programs; and
- Help create a ‘civic engagement pipeline’ to increase the long-term capacity of nonprofit service providers to effectively sustain this work for the long-term.

Measuring Civic Engagement
Electoral Impact: Quantitative Evaluation Methodology
To evaluate organizations’ civic engagement programs and impact, randomized controlled testing represents the ‘gold standard’ of quantitative evaluation. In partnership with the Analyst Institute, SPaCE developed and conducted the first randomized controlled experiment measuring the impact of nonprofit service providers as trusted messengers for civic participation activities.
From April through October 2012, nonprofit human service agencies developed methods to ask clients to register to vote as part of their normal service delivery. If clients were already registered, they were asked to pledge to vote with a written postcard.

In the weeks preceding the election, each client received four reminders to vote, including two mailers, one personal phone call helping voters make a plan to vote on Election Day, and one pre-recorded phone call.

The experiment examined the name recognition and influence nonprofit human service agencies have among clients to inspire them to vote. Clients who registered or pledged to vote were randomly divided into one of two treatment groups. Clients in treatment Group A received GOTV messages on behalf of the nonprofit provider with whom they registered or pledged to vote. Clients in treatment Group B received the same messages on behalf of the SPaCE Project itself, an entity that was unfamiliar to them. The Analyst Institute conducted statistical analysis to determine whether the two groups demonstrated a difference in rates of voter turnout.

Results can be found in Section IV, and the full Analyst Institute memo is included as Appendix C.

Capacity Building: Qualitative Evaluation Methodology
SPaCE also examined whether participating organizations increased their capacity to integrate civic engagement activities into their ongoing programs and services. While SPaCE partners recognize creating culture shifts within nonprofit organizations is a long-term process, increased capacity among participating organizations was assessed utilizing qualitative surveys and interviews. In December 2012, SPaCE conducted a qualitative survey among participating service provider organizations. Staff, Board members, and volunteers were asked for their input on SPaCE’s training, programs, and approach to civic engagement work. The survey was completed by 26 organizations (45 percent of participating agencies). SPaCE also conducted qualitative interviews to determine how participating in 2012 activities increased the organization’s capacity.

Interviewed agencies were chosen to reflect the variety of organizations that participated in the program. Geographic location, staff size, budget and staff time spent on the project were among the factors considered when selecting agencies to interview.

Project Structure
Nonprofit Human Service Organizations
Participating nonprofit social service providers in SPaCE primarily serve low-income populations, but demonstrate significant variation in size, service provision, and location. Participating organizations deliver a wide range of services, with many specializing in multiple programs. Common areas of focus include mental health counseling, literacy, self-sufficiency, and education. Almost half the participating organizations report advocacy as a consistent service they provide to their clients and communities. A complete list of participating agencies can be found in Appendix A.

Notably, eight Planned Parenthood affiliates across five states and fifteen National Association of Community Health Centers affiliates in six states participated in the effort to engage clients in a health center and clinic setting. In addition, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, National Association of Community Health Centers, and Nonprofit VOTE provided outreach support, strategic planning and leadership, and staff resources to the project.

More than 65 percent of responding nonprofits had participated previously in some form of client or community voter engagement. These percentages indicate a high level of organizational commitment to ongoing civic engagement among SPaCE’s network.
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SPaCE engaged agencies across organizational budget sizes. Budgets of participating agencies ranged from less than $100,000 to over $10 million, with the majority between $1 and $10 million. This range indicates a broad interest in civic engagement work, regardless of organizational size.

**State Infrastructure and Support**
State coordinating partners were vital to the success of the project. State coordinating organizations and staff directed programs and ensured partners met goals and benchmarks. These state leads also worked to identify participating nonprofit agencies, provided ongoing training and technical assistance to agencies, and provided expertise and leadership to the development and vision of the national effort.

State Lead Organizations include:
- Colorado - Colorado Participation Project and Colorado Civic Engagement Roundtable
- Michigan - ACCESS
- Minnesota - Minnesota Participation Project/Minnesota Council of Nonprofits
- Montana - Montana Organizing Project
- New York - Long Island Civic Engagement Table
- Oregon - Oregon Voice
- Pennsylvania - Pennsylvania Voice
- Washington - Win/Win Network
- Wisconsin - Wisconsin Voices

**Project Structure and Staff**
SPaCE project staff directed fundraising efforts, developed tools and materials, facilitated collaboration, led strategic planning efforts, and managed the data and evaluation experiment. Staffing included a Project Director, an Evaluation Manager, and a Data Coordinator. Data support was provided by the Colorado Civic Engagement Roundtable.

**Program Overview**

**Capacity Building Curriculum**
National staff and state leads provided comprehensive training, technical assistance, and support to participating nonprofit agencies. Capacity building support included:

- Stipends to offset the cost of service provider staff.
- Assistance developing a client engagement plan.
- Ongoing support and coaching to ensure goals and benchmarks were reached.
- On-site and remote trainings.
- In-person site visits to troubleshoot challenges and meet additional training requirements.
- Client engagement materials and supplies.
- A cohort of participating nonprofits for knowledge sharing.
- On-site voter registration staff in the months before the election.

While many organizations had engaged in civic and advocacy activity previously, most individual agency staff and volunteers were new to civic engagement programs, and expressed they had little or no experience around voter registration. Comprehensive training was a key component for individual agency and collective success. Training included skills building for agency staff to identify and overcome client objections to voting in a culturally competent manner. Training also helped to create organization-wide support for the project.
Ongoing technical assistance and coaching was also essential for ensuring organizations met benchmarks and remained enthusiastic throughout the campaign. Collaboration between participating agencies also featured prominently as a successful component of the technical assistance provided. Collaboration was facilitated in a variety of ways, including group check-ins, the establishment of local “cohorts” of participating nonprofits in each state, e-newsletters and email updates, and brainstorming sessions.

SECTION IV: ANALYST INSTITUTE QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Experiment Results
In partnership with the Analyst Institute, SPaCE sought to answer the questions: Is GOTV communication from one’s own human service nonprofit more effective than GOTV communication from an organization that is unfamiliar to the target?

In order to protect confidentiality rules and laws, existing client lists and information were not accessible for the project. Each individual was engaged personally and directly by staff. Collecting voter registrations and pledges in this manner proved more difficult than anticipated.

“Turnout in the group receiving GOTV contact from an unfamiliar organization was 69.7% compared to 68.8% in the group receiving outreach from a “trusted messenger.” This difference of 0.9 percentage points is not statistically significant (p=0.23) and suggests that GOTV contact from a “trusted messenger” was no more or less effective than contact from an unfamiliar organization” (Analyst Institute, 2013). Unfortunately, partners are unsure if social service agencies were more effective as trusted voices than the unfamiliar messenger. Full results are included in Appendix C.

SECTION V: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Five central themes emerged from SPaCE’s survey work and interviews: 1) positive staff and client response; 2) the utilization of a variety of techniques and personnel, 3) ease of engagement when voting was connected to outcomes, 4) training and technical assistance from state leads; and 5) the importance of financial resources.

Positive Organizational Response
Over 96 percent of survey respondents said they considered their involvement in the SPaCE Project a success. Participating agencies stated through participation they:

• Increased their organization's capacity to register clients.
• Increased awareness among clients.
• Built relationships with partners around civic participation.
• Enjoyed the client engagement and conversation that accompanied the efforts.

Organizations also expressed consistent interest in continuing advocacy and engagement activities in the future. More than 92 percent of survey respondents said their involvement with SPaCE encouraged them to continue or become further involved in civic engagement work including client mobilization, voter education, and lobbying.
Techniques and Personnel
The following graph demonstrates the range of agency staff leading civic engagement programs:

Staff Members Involved in Civic Engagement Activities

Tactics organizations used to implement this project point to the versatility of voter engagement work and its ability to fit within different nonprofit structures. Participating agencies found unique ways to integrate voter engagement into ongoing programs. For example, Denver Urban Ministries in Denver, Colorado engaged front desk staff and caseworkers. Clients also received voter information in orientation packets, and computer work stations at the agency accessed by clients had a voter registration website as the homepage.

Peak Vista Community Health Center in Colorado Springs, Colorado and Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties in St. Paul, Minnesota regularly present at community functions such as health and school fairs. These two agencies effectively utilized these regular organizational activities to ask clients to register or pledge to vote.

The most effective staff leaders identified by participating organizations were volunteers, in-take staff, front desk staff, temporary civic engagement staff, and case managers.

Training and Support
All participants were offered training about the political activities nonprofits can and cannot engage in, eligibility requirements to register to vote, and how to effective engage a client face-to-face. Survey respondents found the following aspects of training beneficial:

- Assisting with specific language around the ask.
- Provision of answers to standard questions.
- Discussion on nonpartisan laws and regulations.
- Simplifying the process and using actual voter registration cards as examples.
- Help with overcoming client objections and the provision of data about why people do/do not register/vote.
- Voter ID laws, details on the registration form, and resources for individuals in difficult situations.
Supplemental Staff
Many organizations received additional staff support to supplement voter engagement efforts. These individuals provided a range of support, including direct engagement with clients, training and coaching for volunteers, and strategic planning assistance. Of the survey respondents, agencies that engaged supplemental field staff found their presence beneficial. These field staff:

- “Provided staff support so activities did not take staff away from job duties.”
- “Greatly increased voter registration capacity.”
- “Helped volunteers and interns with hands on training.”
- “Interacted well with clients and made participation in the project doable.”
- “Increased numbers and raised the profile of the work with direct service staff.”

Financial Resources
A number of agencies received funding ranging from $2,000 to $4,000 to supplement their participation in the SPaCE project. Organizations designated the use of these funds according to individual need and discretion, often hiring additional field staff, paying for the travel cost of volunteers, or offsetting the cost of direct service staff time.

Organizational Impact: Capacity Building Indicators
Through a post-participation survey and six in-depth interviews, respondents identified four aspects of improved capacity in the following areas: 1) client engagement, 2) community relationships, 3) board capacity and interest in advocacy, and 4) organizational advocacy readiness and sophistication.

Client Engagement
In 2012, SPaCE sought to engage low-income individuals who utilize the direct services of nonprofit community agencies in voter participation activities. Qualitative results show SPaCE’s success in achieving this goal. Key findings include:

- Organizations reported that clients experienced both increased knowledge of and a greater interest in becoming civically engaged as a result of the agency’s participation in SPaCE.
- More than 80 percent of organizations reported receiving positive feedback from clients and stakeholders regarding involvement in the project.

Organizations also noted that because of the project, clients were better able to make connections between civic participation and public policy decisions. For example:

- Face-to-face conversations with clients at Peak Vista Community Health Centers in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and Just Harvest in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, were influential in helping individuals connect the availability of services provided by their nonprofit with the role of decision-makers.
- Four regional Planned Parenthood organizations in Pennsylvania found that a number of clients were interested in volunteering and signing up for the organization’s advocacy updates and action alerts after registering to vote.

Community Relationships
Participating organizations credited new and strengthened relationships to their involvement with SPaCE. Specifically, nonprofits found this project improved their ties with community-based organizations and elected officials.
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Several interviewees noted stronger relationships developed with other community organizations as a result of SPaCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Welfare Council of Long Island</th>
<th>Just Harvest</th>
<th>Community Action Partnership of Washington and Ramsey Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships established through SPaCE aided in disaster response and recovery efforts. SPaCE, &quot;opened up relationships to us so that when [Hurricane] Sandy hit, we already had an established relationship.”</td>
<td>After discussing their involvement in the SPaCE project at a coalition meeting, the organization was connected with four new community volunteers.</td>
<td>As a result of the project’s voter registration, a local law firm offering immigration classes engaged the organization for ongoing support. The firm “wanted us to come to their graduation so one of the first things [new citizens] could do was register to vote....We will continue this process.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to improved collaboration between nonprofits, participants also benefited from strengthened connections with elected officials. For example, the Clerk and Recorder of the City and County of Denver, Colorado volunteered with the Harm Reduction Action Center to register and engage clients with agency staff and volunteers on National Voter Registration Day. The Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties shared a similar story involving Minnesota’s Secretary of State. The organization brought so many registration forms to the election office that, “our Secretary of State actually stopped us on a number of occasions to say, ‘you’re down here all the time, I appreciate what you all are doing, is there anything else I can do to help you?’”

Advocacy Readiness
Nonprofits noted that SPaCE representatives provided education, skills training, and a space for agency self-reflection that increased organizational advocacy readiness. One survey respondent noted that SPaCE, “helped the Board get more comfortable with advocacy.”

A number of organizations, such as Peak Vista Community Health Centers and Denver Urban Ministries, reported their Board of Directors became more engaged with their advocacy work as the agency showed success in working towards their numeric goals. For example, a member of Just Harvest’s Board volunteered to phone bank clients, asking them to pledge or register to vote.

This interest was also evident in organizational supporters. For example, Denver Urban Ministries sent out regular updates about the effort to their stakeholders. At the end of the project, staff sent out a survey to these individuals to find out what topics they would like to explore in further depth. The survey showed an increased interest in advocacy work, which staff attribute to their participation in the SPaCE project.

Participating organizations were offered training on voter registration and education skills, and how to stay nonpartisan. The Health and Welfare Council of Long Island, New York noted that the training received included “what we were permitted and not permitted to do as 501(c)(3)’s. It was helpful not just for this work, but in general.”
Peak Vista Community Health Centers also found that the SPaCE project helped the entire staff become more comfortable asking clients to become civically engaged. As their project coordinator noted, this is a skill that will benefit their future advocacy efforts. Additionally, Planned Parenthood clinic representatives from Pennsylvania stated that through the support and skills built through SPaCE, they were better able to understand where and how to approach clients. Planned Parenthood clinics across Central, Western, Southeast, and Northeast Pennsylvania are utilizing skills learned from the project on a current advocacy venture.

SECTION VI: RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES

For Human Service Nonprofits
Several important recommendations were developed to help service agencies continue to integrate civic engagement work into program service and delivery. Recommendations include making civic participation a part of organizational culture, and remaining flexible throughout implementation.

Building Civic Participation Culture
Nonprofits that incorporate civic engagement and advocacy into their organizational mission found greater levels of success in the SPaCE project. For example, Just Harvest strongly identifies as an advocacy organization. Conversations with clients either begin or end with information about the agency’s public policy goals, which helps clients, “realize we’re not just fighting for them to get food stamps, we’re fighting to protect the program as a whole.” As a result, clients saw “that by voting, they are also supporting us.”

Client engagement is incorporated into regular activities at the Community Action Program of Ramsey and Washington Counties. The organization’s community engagement coordinator noted, “Our success had everything to do with continuing efforts over the years. [Civic engagement] is part of the culture and fabric of our organization.” As a result, the organization is known in the community as a group that does voter education work every year.

Flexibility
Participation in the SPaCE voter engagement project was a learning process for many organizations and success was often not immediate. Instead, successful agencies recognized when efforts were not working, and worked with state leads to adjust their tactics. For example:

- By the end of the project, Planned Parenthoods of Central, Western, Northeast, and Southeast Pennsylvania were operating the SPaCE project in 17 health centers across the state. The organization remained flexible with individuals and volunteers between health centers as they learned which sites were most effective.

- Both the Health and Welfare Council of Long Island and Peak Vista Community Health Centers initially focused on engaging clients during the enrollment process. When this technique demonstrated limited results, they switched to the more effective method of incorporating client engagement into other community outreach efforts.

- The Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties developed specialized Hmong pledge to vote cards, to better engage Hmong-speaking residents.
Civic Engagement Coordinating Agencies
SPaCE’s state and national coordinating agencies played a central role in the project. These groups provided resources, training, and support to participating nonprofits. As these groups continue their work in the future, SPaCE recommends continued training and support for service providers, cohort building, and developing collaborative relationships among participating nonprofits.

Continued Training and Technical Assistance
Organizations noted on countless occasions the important role training from state and national staff played in their ability to successfully complete the project. Peak Vista Community Health Centers staff noted that, “without the training, we would have been totally lost.” Similarly, Denver Urban Ministries’ representatives said they needed the training, which helped ensure they did the work effectively and accurately. Organizations also noted that trainings delivered to direct service staff were most helpful and effective. 53 percent of survey respondents said engaging uninterested clients was a challenge. Future trainings should further address difficult topics such as these.

Continued Cohort and Collaborative Partnership Building
A striking benefit to participating organizations was new and strengthened relationships with fellow nonprofit agencies. Cohort- and team-building activities, which included group phone calls, in-person meetings, and e-mails, helped facilitate these connections. As the Health and Welfare Council of Long Island coordinator noted, being part of a cohort helps organizations learn from each other and feel they are “part of something significant.”
APPENDIX A: PARTICIPATING HUMAN SERVICE NONPROFITS

Colorado

Denver Urban Ministries
Emergency Family Assistance Association
The GLBT Community Center of Colorado
Harm Reduction Action Center
Peak Vista Community Health Centers
Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains
Project WISE
Salud Family Health Centers

Michigan

ACCESS

Minnesota

ARC Greater Twin Cities
Community Action Duluth
Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties
Keystone Community Services
Lifetrack Resources
Minnesota AIDS Project
NorthPoint Health & Wellness Center
Planned Parenthood Minnesota
West Side Community Health Services

Montana

Partnership Health Center

New York (Long Island)

ABBA
Clubhouse of Suffolk
Family and Children's Association
Family Service League
Gateway Youth Outreach, Inc.
Hands Across Long Island
Health and Welfare Council of Long Island
Island Harvest
Planned Parenthood Hudson Peconic
Pronto of Long Island
STRONG Youth
The Five Towns

Oregon

Central City Concern
Community Health Center
La Clinica
Multnomah County Health Department
Neighborhood Partnerships
OHSU Family Medicine at Richmond
Outside In

Pennsylvania

Planned Parenthood of Southeast Pennsylvania
Planned Parenthood Central Pennsylvania
Planned Parenthood of Western Pennsylvania
Planned Parenthood of North East Pennsylvania
Just Harvest
Auberle
Community Human Services
Vote for Homes
Primary Community Health Services Pittsburgh

Washington

Planned Parenthood Greater Washington
Washington Low Income Housing Alliance
International Community Health Service
Ready by Five
SeaMar Community Health Center
Consejo Counseling and Referral
HealthPoint

Wisconsin

Bray Center
Hmong American Friendship Association
Goodman Community Center
Clean Slate
APPENDIX B: CASE STUDIES

Case Study: Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties
St. Paul, Minnesota

About
Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties (Community Action) was recruited by the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits/Minnesota Participation Project to participate in the SPaCE project. Founded in 1964, Community Action provides a variety of services, including energy and weatherization assistance, early childhood education, and training and capacity building for individuals. The organization serves low-income residents in the area, with a mission of reducing poverty and its impacts on people in Ramsey and Washington counties.

Community Action perceived a natural fit for participation in SPaCE because civic engagement already plays a central role in their organizational identity. As their Community Engagement Coordinator noted, civic engagement “is a part of our culture and the fabric of the organization. It is one of the many things that make our organization what it is.”

Implementation
Voter engagement was integrated into Community Action’s regular service delivery. Efforts were led by staff and members of Community Action’s client leadership program, the You Be The Change Council. Community Action engaged over 1,100 individuals in voter education activities. While attending community events, such as local health and resource fairs, hip hop festivals, client events, and community competitions, volunteers spoke with clients about the services Community Action provides and information about registering to vote.

By the end of the election cycle, Community Action was recognized throughout the area as an organization that offers civic engagement opportunities to their clients. Their Community Engagement Coordinator said, “We had lots of people come into our office, tell us they wanted to register to vote, or drop off their voter registration form.”

Best Practices in Action: Integration into Service Delivery
A significant part of Community Action’s success derived from the partnership between staff and the You Be The Change Council. Council member travel costs were subsidized by the stipend received through SPaCE, making members the primary face of Community Action’s outreach efforts. Their presence was immensely beneficial because “they know the community and they are not a foreign face.”

Community Action intends to continue this work. According to their Community Engagement Coordinator, encouraging long-term, systemic change that empowers individual clients and the community is, “why we were created.” Participation in voter registration activities, “gives us a sense of belonging....It helps sustain and uphold why we were created, and continues to pass the torch about why community action is needed and why it is important.”
Case Study: The Health and Welfare Council of Long Island  
Long Island, New York

About
The Health and Welfare Council of Long Island (HWCLI) is a multi-faceted organization dedicated to advocating for the health and economic security of Long Island's most at-risk families and individuals. Their services range from assisting with enrollment in college financial aid and federal nutrition assistance programs, to coordinating regional efforts between health and human service agencies, and conducting advocacy work for the sector.

The HWCLI became involved with the SPaCE project upon a funder’s suggestion. Eager to make the connection between their advocacy and direct service provision, the HWCLI saw participation in SPaCE’s voter engagement drive as a natural avenue to “empower individuals to become more self-sufficient and have a greater quality of life.”

Implementation
Self-analysis and flexibility proved essential to the HWCLI’s success at engaging more than 200 clients. Initially integrating voter engagement work into their intake process, staff found clients “weren’t really in the mindset to be thinking about voter registration at that point in time.” The agency switched tactics after finding clients showed more interest and were more engaged when approached at community fairs and presentations. This became the centerpiece of the organization’s outreach efforts.

Best Practices in Action: Building Long-term Relationships
The HWCLI’s interest in civic engagement work extends beyond SPaCE’s 2012 voter engagement drive. As noted by the Chief Operations Officer, “This is not just about voter registration. It is also about being a network for the people we are all trying to empower.” The HWCLI values the development of long-term relationships that facilitate future work. Through their partnership in SPaCE, the organization built a number of substantial partnerships. These relationships have already proved beneficial. When Hurricane Sandy hit, the HWCLI was able to improve community recovery and relief efforts by utilizing relationships developed through SPaCE.

A similarly strong relationship was formed between the HWCLI and Long Island’s coordinating partner, the Long Island Civic Engagement Table (LICET). As a collaborative relationship, the HWCLI and LICET worked closely together to develop tools, techniques, and trainings. A “two-sided partnership” between the organizations was formed, where both agencies now call on each other’s networks for assistance.

The HWCLI will continue civic engagement work, already an integral part of their organizational mission. Drawing from their experience with SPaCE’s 2012 voter engagement drive, the HWCLI plans to apply lessons learned from this project into their future activities. Through their future work, the HWCLI intends to contribute to “the conversation among health and human service providers” about the importance of advocacy work.
Case Study: Peak Vista Community Health Centers
Colorado Springs, Colorado

About
Peak Vista Community Health Centers (Peak Vista) is dedicated to providing exceptional health care for people facing access barriers. Located in southeastern Colorado, the organization offers a combination of primary medical, dental, and behavioral health care services to low-income and under-insured individuals.

Civic engagement work is a value at Peak Vista. The health clinic previously conducted campaigns to alert their members to legislative issues relevant to Peak Vista. The SPaCE Project offered a new way for health centers to engage clients specifically in civic participation activities.

Implementation
Peak Vista Community Health Centers surpassed their goal of engaging 1,000 clients, instead reaching 1,400 individuals. Much of this work was done by the organization’s outreach staff, through interaction with families and individuals at local community events.

Peak Vista was especially successful in engaging young voters. Staff attended school events and targeted seniors who were turning 18. Staff noticed that, “this was a big thing to them. They were the ones who were most excited about it.”

Best Practices in Action: The Importance of Flexibility
Flexibility was vital to Peak Vista’s success. When first implemented, voter engagement activities were coordinated by the enrollment team. This method experienced some success but was limited as clients engaged at that point of service were often in “crisis mode.” Internal evaluation prompted Peak Vista to alter the project’s implementation, moving it under the outreach staff’s purview.

The outreach staff found quick success in their new role. Well-known within the community, this team had, “trust already built with a lot of families.” This move also played to staff strengths. At Peak Vista, the outreach staff is, “very into engaging patients and thinking outside of the box in thinking of creative ways to engage clients on special issues.” This team is also, “accustomed to getting outside the building to where people live.”

The voter engagement drive was thoroughly integrated into the outreach team’s daily activities. Contests were developed to reward high-performing members, progress was continually updated on a prominent white board, and the project was a regular agenda item at staff meetings. As the outreach coordinator noted, “I think all the staff in Peak Vista knew about the work.”

Peak Vista continues to see benefits from the lessons learned through SPaCE. The organization’s success created “high morale and confidence” so the next time they participate in “patient engagement of any kind, we are going to do it with confidence.”
Case Study: Planned Parenthood Association of Pennsylvania Statewide

About
Operating 42 clinics throughout the state, Planned Parenthood Association of Pennsylvania (PPPA) provides a variety of health care services to low-income men and women, including family planning, birth control, sexually transmitted infection testing and treatment, abortion care, pregnancy testing, and gynecological and breast exams. An estimated 1 in 5 women will utilize services from a Planned Parenthood clinic once in her life. Planned Parenthood Association of Pennsylvania serves 120,000 men and women each year.

Serving primarily un- and under-insured populations, Planned Parenthoods in Central, Western, Northeastern, and Southeastern Pennsylvania became involved with SPaCE “to give patients and the people that visit Planned Parenthood Health Centers the opportunity to become civically engaged in their community.”

Implementation
Planned Parenthood agencies across Pennsylvania managed SPaCE’s voter engagement drive through the Public Affairs department, which oversaw project interns and volunteers. Initially offered at 11 clinics, voter engagement efforts eventually expanded to 17 of the organization’s health centers across the state.

PPPA took the time to learn how to best conduct their voter engagement efforts. As one of their grassroots organizers noted, each of the health centers is “laid out differently, so figuring out how and where to logistically set people up” was difficult at first. “It took a couple of weeks to get over this learning curve,” staff noted. By the end of the project, Planned Parenthood was successful in engaging 1,300 clients.

Best Practices in Action: Increased Organizational Capacity
The ability to evaluate how best to engage clients supported PPPA’s overall efforts and brought long-term benefits. Centers plan to continue using interns and volunteers in future endeavors and they now know, “what centers and what times work best” for engaging clients. This knowledge is already proving useful. In planning a client advocacy and education project to be conducted at health centers, these lessons are being applied and implemented.

Planned Parenthood of Pennsylvania was also able to, “bring people into [their] supporter network” as a result of participation in SPaCE. Throughout the project, a number of clients became interested in Planned Parenthood’s advocacy work and, “wanted to know how they could get involved...Some have asked if they can become volunteers.”
APPENDIX C: ANALYST INSTITUTE EXPERIMENT RESULTS MEMO

Subject: Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project (SPaCE) 2012 Trusted Messenger Experiment
To: Lindsey Hodel, SPaCE
From: Lauren Keane and Josh Kalla, Analyst Institute
Date: October 9, 2013

Executive Summary
During the 2012 election cycle, the Service Providers and Civic Engagement (SPaCE) Project, in conjunction with 58 human service nonprofits and with support from ISSI staff, conducted an experiment to test whether human service nonprofits are particularly effective GOTV messengers. Clients of nonprofits were first asked by a staff member to register or pledge to vote. Staff members included permanent employees as well as temporary employees hired for the project. This universe was then randomly assigned to receive GOTV contact (i.e., a postcard, letter, live GOTV call, and robo-call reminder) from the human service nonprofit or from an organization unfamiliar to targets (Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project).

After the election, turnout rates were compared across both conditions and we found no statistically significant difference in voting rates between the two groups. This does not necessarily mean that the treatments were ineffective, but rather that one was not significantly more effective than the other. Because we were unable to include an uncontacted control group (due to the small size of the universe), we cannot tell what the impact of either treatment (or the two treatments considered together) was compared to no contact. It is also important to note that this finding only speaks to the question of what advantage human service nonprofits have with respect to GOTV communication. The value of collecting pledges and registrations during the first stage of the project could not be measured in this test, and future research should attempt to address this limitation.

Replication of this test, with the inclusion of a control group, would need to be conducted, and at a greater scale, before we conclude with any certainty that human service nonprofits are no better GOTV messengers than organizations that are unfamiliar to targets. Future tests may show a benefit to this type of “trusted messenger.” If they do not, the core learning might be that collaborative GOTV efforts (i.e., GOTV contact undertaken through an umbrella organization rather than with each organization operating on its own) are more cost-effective. That is, there may not be enough benefit to “trusted messenger” GOTV outreach to outweigh the efficiencies gained through economies of scale (i.e., bulk rate postage, reduced printing costs, etc.).
Background

Political campaigns, and especially advocacy-based organizations, often reach out to politically disenfranchised communities, but the participation gap between those with higher and lower socioeconomic statuses still looms, and public policy often appears to reflect this disparity, skewing toward the interests of the better off. A notable feature of some campaigns and organizations that reach out to politically disenfranchised communities is that they do not have strong relationships with them. While they are at times able to activate disadvantaged citizens during elections or advocacy campaigns, arguably they could be more effective if they established and cultivated relationships with them. Unfortunately, if these relationships do not exist naturally, they are difficult and costly to build. Community-based organizations work to build these relationships, and human service nonprofits naturally have and cultivate relationships with the clients they serve.

The mission of the SPaCE Project is to engage and activate disadvantaged communities through the human service nonprofits that serve them. The belief that these citizens trust health clinics, food banks, and other human service agencies and thus will be responsive to registration, GOTV, and advocacy communication from them was central to the founding of the SPaCE Project. Finding empirical evidence to support this belief is critical to the continued growth of the project and execution of its mission.

Research Question

Is GOTV communication from one’s own human service nonprofit more effective than GOTV communication from an organization that is unfamiliar to the target?

Experimental Design

Experimental Universe

Clients of 58 human service nonprofits were included in the experiment. Unlike many other programs, which rely on existing voter file data, SPaCE and its partners built the contact list through face-to-face engagement with clients, who either registered to vote with the assistance of the human service nonprofit or pledged to vote when asked by a staff member. These individuals tended to be middle-aged (mean age of 41), racially diverse (around 52% Caucasian, 25% African American, and 12% Latino), and female (60%). 36.5% voted in the 2008 presidential election and 23% voted in the 2010 midterm elections. The experiment was conducted with human service nonprofits in Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, North Carolina, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Experimental Conditions

Targets were randomly assigned to:

1. A group that received a postcard, letter, live GOTV call, and robo-call reminder from the human service nonprofit that serves each (i.e., a “trusted messenger”) (N=10,808; 8,696 matched to voter file).1
2. A group that received a postcard, letter, live GOTV call, and robo-call reminder from the Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project (i.e., an unfamiliar organization) (N=10,928; 8,845
matched to voter file).²

Experimental Process
The human service nonprofits with which the SPaCE Project partnered collected registrations and pledges to vote from clients during the several months leading up to the election. GOTV phone calls to voters were sandwiched between the letter and postcard. These calls, made between October 25th and November 2nd, were optimized using experimentally-informed best practices. (Copies of the mail pieces and phone scripts can be viewed in the Materials Appendix.) Voters also received a robo-call reminder to vote the day before the election.

We knew that reaching this population of voters on landlines would be very difficult and federal law makes it prohibitively expensive to call cell phones.³ Thus, the treatment included both mail and phone such that every target would receive at least some treatment.

Experimental Power
Collecting registrations and pledges proved to be very difficult, and the universe was reduced somewhat due to illegible handwriting and low-quality data-entry. Given an experimental universe of 21,736 targets and a voter file match rate of 80.7%, we could likely detect differences in turnout between the two groups as small as 1.9 percentage points. Note that the experiment did not include an uncontacted control group, which means that we cannot measure the impact of receiving the GOTV contact, only whether contact from one messenger was more effective than contact from the other.⁴

Results
After the election, updated voter file data was collected from the VAN to examine the effects of the treatments on voter turnout. As mentioned above, not every record could be matched to the VAN because of messy or incomplete data at the time of registration or pledging through SPaCE. Turnout rates from the 2012 general election for voters in both treatment conditions are displayed in Figure 1, with the blue bars indicating the percent voting and the ranges in red indicating the 90% confidence intervals.⁵ Turnout in the group receiving GOTV contact from SPaCE was 69.7% compared to 68.8% in the group receiving outreach from his or her human service nonprofit. This difference of 0.9 percentage points is not statistically significant (p=0.23) and suggests that GOTV contact from the human service nonprofit was no more or less effective than contact from an unfamiliar organization.⁶
Discussion

This experiment did not show any statistically significant differences in voter turnout between the group receiving GOTV contact from one’s own human service nonprofit and the group receiving GOTV contact from an unfamiliar organization. However, the results speak only to the impact of the messenger among an experimental universe that pledged to vote or registered with his or her human service nonprofit. We cannot tell what the impact would have been on clients of human service nonprofits who did not receive this initial outreach.  

Since this is the first experiment of its kind and it does not include an uncontacted control group, we recommend additional testing before concluding that human service nonprofits are no more effective at voter mobilization than unfamiliar messengers. These future tests, no matter the results, will be informative. If the results of this study are replicated in future tests, they would suggest that collaborative GOTV outreach should be undertaken, since programmatic efficiency is gained through economies of scale. If the results run counter to those of this study, they would suggest that human service nonprofits are “trusted messengers”, which should undertake their own GOTV campaigns despite the higher costs.

Finally, it is important to note that while we had hoped to find that human service nonprofits as “trusted messengers” are more effective GOTV messengers, this was by no means the only measure of success. SPaCE partners solicited registrations and pledges to vote from over 20,000 clients, which is itself a great step toward empowering the politically disenfranchised. Future research should find ways to measure
the impact of these voter registration and voter pledge programs on voter turnout and other types of civic engagement.

**Technical Appendix:**

1. Collecting registrations and pledges proved to be more difficult than initially anticipated, and as a result, we did not have a large enough universe to include an uncontacted control group.

2. The targets that could not be matched are randomly distributed across the experimental conditions (p=0.37) and covariate balance on gender, age, race, and past vote history remains when the universe is limited to just those targets who could be matched to the voter file.

3. Only about 22% of targets actually heard the GOTV phone message.

4. We chose to test the two messengers against one another rather than testing the human service nonprofit condition against an untreated control group so that we could identify the unique impact of the messenger above and beyond the impact of receiving GOTV contact. Had we chosen the latter and detected an effect, we would not have been able to tell what part was attributable to receiving GOTV contact and what part was attributable to contact having been made by one’s human service nonprofit.

5. Confidence intervals are a way of representing our level of certainty around the estimate. The true effect will be contained in the 90% confidence interval 90% of the time. If the 90% confidence interval of one condition overlaps the turnout rate in the other condition, the difference is not statistically significant.

6. This estimate accounts for household clustering and randomization strata. As a robustness check, we ran the analysis only among the targets whose phone numbers and/or addresses exactly matched the voter file. Within this universe (N=14,071), we find consistent results (i.e., turnout was 0.5 percentage points higher among those contacted by the Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project, but the difference was statistically insignificant, p=0.28).

7. HIPPA privacy laws make this type of experiment impossible, as human service nonprofits cannot release their client lists for matching to the voter file. For this experiment, the registrations and pledges provided the information needed to match.
Materials Appendix:

Phone Script

Groupcode 01 – Unfamiliar Organization
Groupcode 02 – Trusted Messenger

VAR1 – SP
VAR2 – City

Hi, could I speak to [name1] or [name2]? (please enter id number of target reached)

Groupcode 01:

This is [CALLER NAME] calling from the Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project. I want to remind you that Election Day is coming up on Tuesday, Nov 6th. Can we count on you to vote?

Groupcode 02:

This is [CALLER NAME] calling from [VAR 1], the organization that provides services and support to you and your family.

Recently, you registered or pledged to vote with [VAR 1], and I’m calling to say thank you. I also want to remind you that Election Day is coming up on Tuesday, Nov 6th. Can we count on you to vote?

01 Yes: GO TO Q2
02 No:

Groupcode 01:

Sorry to hear that. Many of your neighbors are planning to vote and I hope you will reconsider and join them on Tuesday, November 6th. Have a good day.

Groupcode 02:

Sorry to hear that. Many of your neighbors are planning to vote because they know their vote can preserve

[if VAR 3=PPFA]
community services, jobs, and education.

[if VAR3=other]
community services like [VAR 1] provides.

I hope you will reconsider and join them on Tuesday, November 6th. Have a good day.

03 Uncertain: GO TO Q1
20 Refused: Thanks for your time. Goodbye
21 Do not call: Thanks for your time. Goodbye.
22 Not voting: Thanks for your time. Goodbye.
23 Already Voted: Thanks for your time. Goodbye.

FDISPS 30-86 ARE FINALIZED RECORDS BUT DON'T COUNT AS CONTACTS

30 Early Hangup [enter ID1 into ID field]
31 Language Barrier [enter ID1 into ID field]
32 Target Deceased [enter ID1 into ID field]
35 Privacy Manager [enter ID1 into ID field]
80 Wrong Number [enter ID1 into ID field]
81 Disconnected Number [enter ID1 into ID field]
82 Fax/Modem [enter ID1 into ID field]
83 Fast Busy [enter ID1 into ID field]
84 Telephony Error/Circuits Busy [enter ID1 into ID field]
85 Changed Number [enter ID1 into ID field]
86 Tri-tone/No longer in service (catch all) [enter ID1 into ID field]

Q1 Groupcode 01:

Many of your neighbors are planning to vote. Can we count on you to join them and make your community stronger by voting this year?

Groupcode 02:

Many of your neighbors in [VAR 2] are planning to vote because they know their vote can preserve

[if VAR 3=PPFA]
community services, jobs, and education.

[if VAR3=other]
community services like [VAR 1] provides.

01 Yes Great! GO TO Q3
02 NO Have a good day.

Q2 Groupcode 01:

Great! We are calling people in [VAR2] and it looks like a lot of people in your neighborhood will be voting this year. GO TO Q3

Groupcode 02:

Great! We are calling people in [VAR 2] and it looks like a lot of people in your neighborhood will be voting this year. They know their vote can preserve

[if VAR 3=PPFA]
community services, jobs, and education.
[if VAR3=other] community services like [VAR 1] provides.

GO TO Q3

Q3 So, do you think you’ll head to the polls from your home, work, or somewhere else? (pause for response)

Is that close enough to walk or will you drive or take the bus? (pause for response)

I have information about your polling place. Do you have a pen? (pause for response)

To find your polling place, you can call (866) OUR-VOTE. That’s 1-866-687-8683. You can also text WhereDoIVote, all run together, to 69866. Do you need me to repeat these numbers? (repeat if necessary)

Great, thanks for committing to vote this year, goodbye. (pause for response)
Letter

Dear ,

We at the Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project want to remind you that Election Day is Tuesday, November 6th. It looks like a lot of people in Saint Paul will be voting this year. Thank you for being a good citizen who cares about our community and votes to protect it. We hope to be able to thank you for voting after the election!

We know that you are busy, and voting takes a little time and planning. Please take a minute and picture yourself on Election Day. What time will you head to the polls? How will you get there? Will you go alone or with a neighbor or family member?

Plan ahead, and be sure to vote on Tuesday, November 6th.

Sincerely,

The Service Providers and Civic Engagement Project

Questions about the election, call (888) OUR-VOTE or (866) VE-Y-VOTA or text “WhereDoIVote” or “DondeVoto” to 69866.
Dear 

We at Hmong American Friendship Association want to thank you for registering or pledging to vote with us. We also want to remind you that Election Day is Tuesday, November 6th. It looks like a lot of people in Milwaukee will be voting this year. Thank you for being a good citizen who cares about our community and votes to protect community services, jobs, and education. We hope to be able to thank you for voting after the election!

We know that you are busy, and voting takes a little time and planning. Please take a minute and picture yourself on Election Day. What time will you head to the polls? How will you get there? Will you go alone or with a neighbor or family member?

Plan ahead, and be sure to vote on Tuesday, November 6th.

Sincerely,

Hmong American Friendship Association

Questions about the election, call (888) OUR-VOTE
or (866) VE-Y-VOTA
or text “WhereDoIVote” or “DondeVoto” to 69866.
Hello

We at Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains want to thank you for registering or pledging to vote with us. We also want to remind you that Election Day is Tuesday, November 6th. Voting helps to protect community services, jobs, and education.

We know that you are the kind of person who votes and cares about your community. Join with your neighbors and family and vote on Tuesday, November 6th. Make your voice heard!

Sincerely,

Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains

1110 Vermont Avenue, Suite 300
Washington DC, 20005

Reminder to vote on Election Day, Tuesday, November 6th

For more information or to find your polling place, call (888) OUR-VOTE or (866) VOTE-VOTA, or text "WhereDoIVote" or "DonateVote" to 09866.