

Gallaudet University
Center for Democracy in Deaf America
www.signvote.org
ALL IN Challenge Action Plan 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Per the rubric, the Action Plan must answer the following:

Who developed the plan

The purpose of the plan

Where the plan will be implemented

The goal(s) of the plan

The intended duration of the plan

How the plan will be implemented

Gallaudet University was founded in 1864 by an act of Congress (its charter) that was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. It is the world leader in liberal education and career development for deaf, hard of hearing, and deafblind students. The University enjoys an international reputation for its outstanding undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as for its research on topics related to people who are deaf, including their history, language, and culture.

The Center for Democracy in Deaf America (CDDA) is a Gallaudet-based non-partisan organization championing the development of skills in democratic excellence through debate, civic engagement, and disagreement. CDDA aspires to mold a future where deaf and hard-of-hearing people, and their schools, programs, workplaces, and communities volunteer, vote, serve, and network with individuals and organizations inside and outside the Deaf community to promote the quality of democracy.

SignVote is a program under CDDA to promote voter engagement excellence at Gallaudet University. Please see: <https://signvote.org/>

CDDA, in collaboration with the President's Office, University Communications, Multicultural Student Programs, Gallaudet Athletics, and Student Engagement and Leadership submits this *ALL IN Action Plan* in support of its efforts to increase civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation at Gallaudet. Specifically, the goals of this plan are to

1. increase student voter registration by 40%
2. Increase student voter participation in the 2024 fall elections
3. Increase student awareness about the vote by mail process
4. Increase student engagement and dialogue about voter participation and public policy issues through a series of CDDA-sponsored events.

The plan will be implemented primarily on the Gallaudet University campus. On occasion, we anticipate that the plan will also be implemented in various venues in the Washington, DC area and in cyberspace through the use of video conferencing (such as Zoom) and social media (such as TikTok). The intended duration of this plan is from September to Election Night 2024.

The plan will be implemented in several phases.

- First, CDDA will work with Multicultural Student Programs, Student Engagement and Leadership and Gallaudet Athletics to set up registration booths with laptops, decorations, and offer support in ASL starting on National Voter Registration Day and several times thereafter leading up to Election Night.
- Second, CDDA will work with SEL, MSP, and Athletics to host JocktheVote and OrganizetheVote challenges and videos to maximize student-athlete and student-organizational leaders voter participation.
- Third, CDDA will work with athletic coaches, team captains, and organizational student leaders to educate, engage, and register members of their teams and organizations with the goal of 100 percent voter participation for all teams and organizations on campus.
- Fourth, CDDA will work with athletic coaches to have them (1) sign the ALL IN Voter Engagement Pledge; (2) host meaningful conversations about the upcoming elections; (3) encourage their student-athletes to attend democratic engagement events on campus and online; and (4) participate in the “SignVote” challenge in which key student leaders and teams and organizations with 100% participation of eligible voters will be honored by President Cordano, University Communications, and Gallaudet Athletics at an end of semester celebration.
- Fifth, CDDA, with the support of the University President, University Communications, Provost, and Dean of Faculty, will promote deaf-centric voter education and democratic engagement by hosting several panels, workshops, and events on campus.
- Sixth, CDDA will promote voter turnout by providing transportation, reminders, and/or instructions leading up to deadlines for mail-in ballots and Election Day, and working with student organizations and sports teams to see who can turnout the most students.
- Finally, CDDA and University Communications will promote democratic engagement by hosting a virtual event titled "Election Night in ASL!" which will feature a well-known deaf broadcaster who will host various guests including student organization leaders and

the Gallaudet President to discuss the elections in real time. The winner of the student competitions for registration/turnout will be announced during this event also.

More information about the Executive Summary Section:

This section provides a summary of the campus democratic engagement action plan. It should be clear, concise, and allow the reader to easily understand what the campus is doing and why. It distills the plan into just a few paragraphs or pages so that the reader can rapidly become acquainted with the action plan. Consider sketching out an executive summary as a starting point and then revisiting and finalizing as the final step in your action plan development.

GUIDING QUESTIONS (The following questions should be addressed in the Executive Summary

1. Which individuals (e.g., name(s), title(s), department(s)) and/or organizations developed this plan?
2. What is this action plan for and what does it seek to accomplish?
3. Where will this action plan be implemented? Where will this action plan be implemented? E.g., name of the institution, the number of campuses the work will take place at, campus locations (city and state), in-person, online, hybrid.
4. Why was this action plan developed? How does this plan tie to broader institutional norms/values/strategic plans?
5. When does this action plan start and end? Is this an action plan focused on the short-term and long-term goals? When will it be updated?
6. How will this action plan be implemented? Who's in charge? What unit/office/division will be facilitating the effort?
7. What strategies were employed to make sure this plan was equitable and included a diverse audience?

II. LEADERSHIP

Per the rubric, this section should include

1. Descriptions, including names and titles of the leadership coalition responsible for improving democratic engagement.
2. Several categories of participation are encouraged (1) students (2) faculty (3) student affairs (4) community/national organizations (5) local elections office coordination.

SignVote under the Center for Democracy in Deaf America (CDDA) is the primary coordination point for voter engagement efforts at Gallaudet University. CDDA is a non-partisan organization

committed to developing healthy democratic skills and habits of deaf individuals by fostering disagreement, debate and civic engagement through American Sign Language and English. CDDA seeks to foster a civic-minded Deaf community where deaf people and their schools, programs, workplaces, and communities volunteer, vote, serve, and network with insiders and outsiders to promote the quality of democracy. Dr. Brendan Stern, an assistant professor of American politics at Gallaudet University, is the CDDA's founder and executive director.

Primary Contact: Brendan Stern, CDDA Executive Director

CDDA acknowledges that its success depends on sustained collaboration with students, faculty, and key members of university administration across our campus. The following partners will meet at least once a month with CDDA to discuss and review strategy and goals to increase democratic engagement at Gallaudet and ensure that traditionally underrepresented groups are not marginalized.

CDDA partners include

- Roberta Cordano, President
- Dr. Khadijat Rashid, Provost
- Brandon Williams, Director of Multicultural Student Programs
- Michelle Gerson-Wagner, Director of Student Engagement and Leadership
- Brandi Rarus, Director of University Communications
- Warren Keller, Athletic Director

[More on the Leadership section:](#)

The leadership section of a campus action plan describes the team that is responsible and accountable for the institution's efforts to increase civic learning and democratic engagement among its students. Designating a leader(s) and establishing a working group that includes a variety of stakeholders increases the likelihood of success, long-term sustainability, and the institutionalization of civic learning and democratic engagement efforts on campus. Including representatives from on-campus departments and student groups, as well as off-campus organizations, ensures efforts are collaborative and coordinated, and that a variety of perspectives are taken into consideration. The working group should reflect your campus and community, with intentional and equitable inclusion of diverse voices. Campus coalitions can grow and evolve over time to best meet the civic learning and democratic engagement needs of your institution. The group should strive to build a leadership team over time that is reflective of your campus community including diverse partners. Beyond the recruitment of diverse working group members, it's important to consider and describe how exactly members will be involved in order to leverage their strengths and promote inclusivity as central to your success. Keep continuity year to year. It's always hard to start a program from scratch. When you are building your voter engagement efforts, consider ways to keep it going strong year-to-year. Importantly, if your coalition includes student leaders, be aware when there will be turnover because of graduations. Succession planning can be a key feature to ensure that the work continues especially when transitions occur

Guiding Questions:

1. Who are the working group members and how are involved? How is the working group ensuring there is diversity within the campus' voting coalition?
 - What academic departments and which faculty within academic affairs are involved? (e.g., political science professor(s), fine arts department)
 - What units within student affairs are involved and which administrators are involved? (e.g., office of new student involvement, director of student life, office of diversity and inclusion)
 - Which students and student organizations are involved? (e.g., student government, issue-based student orgs)
 - What community and/or national (private, nonprofit, government) organizations are involved? (e.g., League of Women Voters, ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge) How do national and local partners support your institution's efforts?
 - Is the working group coordinating with the local election office? If so, with whom and how? If not, what is your plan to get the local election office involved?

- 2a) Who is this person(s) and/or office(s) held accountable to, what is their reporting line? 2b) If student-staff or community members are involved, how are they compensated for their involvement?
3. What are working group members' unique strengths and, with those in mind, what are their responsibilities?
4. How will people be brought into the coalition who currently are not there? Why have these individuals/groups been identified to join? 4a) Which groups have traditionally been underrepresented within your mobilization efforts and how does your working group work to strategically involve members of those groups?
5. How is the working group inclusive of different campus and community stakeholders?
6. Does the working group have the support of upper administrators (e.g., president, provost, chancellor, VPSA) who can help advocate on behalf of the working group?
7. What other offices on campus need to be involved? (e.g., website or portal management, registrar, university relations)
8. How often will the working group meet and communicate? Identify who is responsible for communicating amongst the group and how the group will meet (e.g., in-person, virtually, over email).
9. How are you keeping working group members engaged over time and addressing stakeholder turnover? `
10. If someone in the working group stops showing up and doing the work or needs to step away, what steps will be taken to ensure the efforts continue?

III. COMMITMENT

Per the rubric, this section should provide a “description of institutional commitment to improving democratic engagement.”

Mission Statement

Gallaudet University, federally chartered in 1864, is a bilingual, diverse, multicultural institution of higher education that ensures the intellectual and professional advancement of deaf and hard of hearing individuals through American Sign Language (ASL) and English. Gallaudet maintains a proud tradition of research and scholarly activity and prepares its graduates for career opportunities in a highly competitive, technological, and rapidly changing world.

Vision

Our vision is to become the university of choice for the most qualified, diverse group of deaf and hard of hearing students in the world and hearing students pursuing careers related to deaf and hard of hearing people. We will empower our graduates with the knowledge and practical skills vital to achieving personal and professional success in the changing local and global communities in which they live and work.

The Gallaudet campus community includes students, faculty, teachers, and staff, all of whom share certain common goals and values that we all believe enrich our academic environment. The community’s primary goal is to prepare students to be informed, literate, productive, and responsible and active citizens.

We believe that every person should be treated with civility and that our community is strengthened by the broad diversity of its members. Therefore, we promote and applaud behaviors that support the dignity of individuals and groups and are respectful of others’ opinions. We will especially discourage behaviors and attitudes that disrespect the diversity of individuals and groups for any reason, including religion, race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, hearing status, or language and communication preference.

Gallaudet University and its communities are in a continual state of “becoming” or transforming. Through this transformation, the University positively impacts local communities, the nation, and the world for deaf people across the spectrum of identities. To fully become, Gallaudet must understand and reckon with its history, recognize the current context within which it exists, and envision a future where the world recognizes and values the contributions of deaf, hard of hearing, deaf-disabled, and deafblind people of all backgrounds and identities.

Description of Commitment

CDDA and its partners including university administrators and university communication recognizes that Gallaudet's voting rate in the 2018 midterm, according to NSLVE, was 20% below average and agrees that this is intolerable. The Gallaudet President has signed the ALL IN president pledge to full student participation and along with the Provost and Dean of Faculty, with the support of CDDA, are explicitly committed to raising democratic engagement this year by adhering to the strategy outlined in this plan. In addition to our short-term goals, we will also promote democratic engagement inside and outside the classroom by adding civic-based courses in the general education curriculum and disseminating civic knowledge in ASL on Gallaudet's social media channels.

More on the Commitment section:

This section describes how the institution demonstrates its commitment to increasing civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation. A public institutional commitment is critical for improvement across campus; it signals to all stakeholders that these efforts are significant and long-term. Before action planning begins, the working group should first explore the process's underlying context, motivations, and commitment. This process also evaluates if voter registration information is featured in campus-wide materials, if the campus supports placing a polling location on campus and is willing to make a building available, and examines how voter registration is embedded in the campus culture by being included in processes that all new students go through every year, even in non-general or midterm election years.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How does the institution and its leadership demonstrate commitment to improving civic learning and democratic engagement? Is there an explicit, visible commitment on the part of the governing board, president/chancellor, and senior leadership?

-Is the commitment communicated within the institution? To whom, specifically, and how?

-Is the commitment communicated outside the institution (i.e., to external stakeholders and the general public)? To whom, specifically, and how?

-Does the institution's commitment to civic learning and democratic engagement consider diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice tenets?

-Has the institution's senior leadership (e.g., president, provost, chancellor) made an outward commitment to democratic engagement? For instance, signing the ALL IN Presidents' Commitment to Full Student Voter Participation.

2. Is educating for civic learning and democratic engagement a pervasive part of institutional culture? Is it ongoing, consistent, systematic, and sustainable across programs, departments, and the entire institution? How do you know?

3. How is the institution's commitment reflected in existing statements and documents (e.g., mission statement, vision, core values, strategic plan)? Has the institution created and implemented an action plan in previous years?
4. What are the institution's overall civic, democratic, and/or political learning outcomes? Is there a process in place to ensure that outcomes are measured and met?
5. How is educating for civic learning and democratic engagement included in the general education curriculum?
6. How is educating for civic learning and democratic engagement included in the co-curriculum?

IV. LANDSCAPE

Per the rubric, the Landscape section should provide:

1. Analysis of student data
2. Campus climate
3. Current institutional efforts for improving democratic engagement results

The Gallaudet NSLVE Campus Report indicates a steady increase in the percentage of registered students from 60% in 2014 to 80% in 2020. The voting rate of registered students has also increased from 12% in 2014 to 71% in 2020. Although promising, over this time period Gallaudet's rates in key categories: (1) registration rate, (2) voting rate of registered students, and (3) voting rate, have consistently been lower than the national average. Gallaudet's voting rate also appears to lag behind the NSLVE institutional average. In 2018, the voting rate for all institutions was 39.1%; Gallaudet's voting rate was 19.1%. In sum, Gallaudet's voting engagement shows encouraging signs of improvement, but there is still work to be done.

Gallaudet's commitment to democratic engagement finds concrete expression, inter alia, in the design of our newly revised general education curriculum, in which our students participate primarily during their freshman and sophomore years. The general education curriculum exposes students to a broad range of courses across four major areas of inquiry. Two of these focal areas, Ethics & Civics, and Identities & Cultures, are closely related to, and directly support, democratic engagement.

More on the Landscape Section:

This section describes the current campus landscape, including climate, programming, and student engagement. A self-assessment of current work and data (e.g., established learning outcomes, assessment data, curricular and co-curricular activities, resources) provides the institution with a comprehensive understanding of current efforts and student engagement with those efforts. It also provides the opportunity for the institution to evaluate those efforts

and determine areas of strength and those needing improvement. Campus voting coalitions are encouraged to reach out to department heads, faculty, student government, student group leaders, student affairs staff, local election officials, and community partners (local and national) that engage with the campus when doing their landscape analysis. It's unlikely, especially at large campuses, that even a diverse task force or working group will know about all of the civic engagement activities on a campus so reaching out to as many stakeholders as possible to best understand the campus' reach and engagement is important.

Guiding Questions

1. Are civic learning and democratic engagement overall campus learning outcomes? If so, what are the learning outcomes and how are they measured?
2. Do you have access to assessment data for your campus? If so what does assessment data show about the political climate and democratic engagement on campus? How does this data compare to that of peer institutions?
3. How is civic learning and democratic engagement present in the curriculum?
 - In which courses is it taught?
 - In which courses is it listed as a learning outcome?
 - Are courses connected to civic learning and democratic engagement available to all students or a particular group of students (e.g., only incoming first-years, political science majors)?
4. How is civic learning and democratic engagement present in the co-curriculum?
 - In which departments is this included?
 - What initiatives, programs, and activities focus on this?
 - What student groups and clubs are engaged?
5. What internal barriers (e.g., limited funding, staff resistance, lack of leadership) prevent the institution from being successful
6. What external barriers (e.g., election laws, voter ID laws, lack of proximity to polling location) prevent the institution from being successful?
7. What is the demographic makeup of the institution's student body? How is this information considered when mapping out civic learning and democratic engagement efforts?
8. What resources are available to help the institution be successful? Specifically, what internal and external factors lead to successes (e.g., president's support, in a fully vote-by-mail state)?
9. What additional resources are needed to help the institution be successful?

V. GOALS

Per the rubric, this section should describe the institution's

1. short-term goals (e.g. by next election) and
2. Long-term goals (e.g. in the next decade, or in two election cycles, etc.)

The following goals are designed to foster a civic-minded Deaf community where students volunteer, vote, serve, and network to promote the quality of democratic discourse.

Long-term goals:

1. Earn designation as a “Voter Ready Campus” through the through the #CCPVotes program.

Short-term goals:

1. Increase overall residential student voter registration by 20%.
2. Increase student voter participation in the 2024 fall elections by 20% (compared to 2020)
3. Increase student awareness about the vote by mail process.
4. Increase student engagement and dialogue about voter participation and public policy issues through a series of CDDA-sponsored events.

More on Goals:

This section describes what the institution hopes to achieve. By setting goals, the institution can plan activities to achieve results and assess impact. It is suggested that prior to setting goals, there should be a clear vision of what the institution wants to accomplish and what it wants students to learn. With a clear vision, goals can be set to achieve the desired outcomes. Long-term goals help the institution achieve its vision – what impact does the institution seek to have? Long-term goals should be tied to the institution’s mission and learning outcomes. Short-term goals break long-term goals into manageable parts. Goals should be S.M.A.R.T.I.E. – specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-bound, inclusive, and equitable. Goals should reflect the number of people involved and the resources available

LONG-TERM GOALS

1. What is the long-term vision the institution hopes to achieve?
2. What knowledge, skills, and capacities (learning outcomes) does the institution want students to achieve and graduate with in order to be active and informed?
3. What are the outcomes the institution wants to accomplish over the next 10 years?
4. Are the goals S.M.A.R.T.I.E. (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, time-bound, inclusive, and equitable)?
5. Do the goals contribute to expanding access to voting for a diverse set of students?
6. Are these goals informed by principles of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice?
7. Are these goals informed by data and research?

SHORT-TERM GOALS

1. What outcomes does the institution need to reach during the next three years to stay on track to reach its longer-term vision? How do the goals of the campus voting coalition contribute to the institution's overall equity and inclusion goals? How do the goals support the institution's strategic plan?
2. What resources does the institution need to ensure its longer-term vision is within reach?
3. Who does the institution need to involve in order to reach its longer-term vision?
4. Does your campus voting coalition have the capacity and/or support to achieve this goal?
5. Is the goal SMARTIE (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, time-bound, inclusive, and equitable)?
6. Does the goal solve an immediate issue student voters face?
7. Is the goal informed by data and research?
8. What does your institution need to do to best mobilize voters for the next election (whether local, state, federal primaries or general elections)?

VI. STRATEGY

Per the rubric, this section should provide a “description of institutional efforts to reach desired democratic engagement results.” The rubric places a particular emphasis on including both “short-term tactics” and “long-term strategies.”

CDDA's plan will be implemented in several phases.

- First, CDDA will work with Multicultural Student Programs, Student Engagement and Leadership and Gallaudet Athletics to set up registration booths with laptops and offer support in ASL starting on National Voter Registration Day and several times thereafter leading up to Election Night.
- Second, CDDA will work with athletic coaches, team captains, and organizational student leaders to educate, engage, and register members of their teams and organizations with the goal of 100 percent voter participation for all teams and organizations on campus.
- Third, CDDA will work with athletic coaches to have them (1) sign the ALL IN Voter Engagement Pledge; (2) host meaningful conversations about the upcoming elections; (3) encourage their student-athletes to attend democratic engagement events on campus and online; and (4) participate in the “SignVote” challenge in which key student leaders and teams and organizations with 100% participation of eligible voters will be honored by President Cordano, University Communications, and Gallaudet Athletics at an end of semester celebration.

- Fifth, CDDA will promote voter turnout by providing transportation, reminders, and/or instructions leading up to deadlines for mail-in ballots and Election Day, and working with student organizations and sports teams to see who can turnout the most students.
- Sixth, CDDA and SL will promote democratic engagement by hosting a virtual event titled "Election Night in ASL!" which will feature a well-known deaf broadcaster who will host various guests including student organization leaders and the Gallaudet President to discuss the election in real time. The winner of the student competitions for registration/turnout will be announced during this event also.
- Finally, CDDA is committed to evaluating the democratic engagement drive by using anecdotal and NSLVE data to improve the success of our democratic engagement work in the future.

The strategy section of a campus action plan summarizes how the institution intends to build institutional culture and infrastructure that supports civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation. Put simply, it outlines a strategic plan for this work. A campus's strategy should include a plan for achieving short-term and long-term goals and should consider means of achieving what is laid out in the other segments of your action plan. Developing a strategy should consider various institutional departments, programmatic efforts, and, ultimately, the infusion of a broad civic ethos into the mission of the institution. Strategy can be infused into the institution's culture and infrastructure through a variety of methods; there is no one methodology for all campuses to follow. For instance, while many campuses are able to quickly articulate a variety of programmatic approaches, (e.g., listing tabling days for voter registration or campus debate watch parties), it is just as important for campuses to be exploring long-term strategy. What resources are needed for the institution to create a cultural shift in which democratic learning and participation become a part of everyday engagement?

In summary, this strategy section should describe shorter-term tactics for improving student voter registration, education, and turnout around elections (e.g., by including election deadlines and dates in a campus calendar of events). You can find numerous examples of successful campus strategies for student voter registration, education, and turnout in the bi-annual Voter Friendly Campus Report. Equally important is to consider and describe long-term strategies for further developing a campus ethos and set of experiences that help students develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for full participation in our democracy. Such strategies might consider staffing, curricular offerings, cross-campus collaborations, and ways in which civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation are woven into campus communications and campus-wide events from orientation to convocation and graduation. There should be strategies aligned with all of your short- and long-term goals described in the previous section.

SHORT-TERM GUIDING QUESTIONS

What is the work?

a) What are the planned activities and initiatives related to voter registration, voter education, voter turnout and mobilization, and voter access?

b) What would it take to Ask Every Student on campus about participating in our democracy? For resources and tools to do so visit: www.studentvoting.org.

c) Where will each activity occur (e.g., in a public campus space, in the classroom, virtually)?

Who is responsible for implementing each planned strategy and tactic? Who is the audience for each strategy and tactic?

a) What methods will be used to make strategies and tactics accessible to diverse populations?

b) Are you including tactics that focus on reaching all students, especially traditionally underrepresented students? Where will each activity occur on and off campus? When will the work happen and what preparations are required beforehand to make it happen? Are individuals consistently (i.e. quarterly, semesterly or yearly) trained to ensure conversations remain nonpartisan, culturally sensitive, accurate, and that the voter registration processes result in zero errors? Why is each strategy and tactic being implemented and what is the goal for each activity?

LONG-TERM GUIDING QUESTIONS

How would you describe a campus committed to educating for civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation? What would it look like and how would you know this commitment existed?

How might your institution deepen capacity and competence related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in tandem with civic learning, political engagement, and voter participation?

What will it take to build toward this vision of sustained commitment beyond a single election cycle (e.g., resources, curricular offerings, staffing)?

Where does work need to happen in order to institutionalize this vision (e.g., faculty senate, student government, division of student affairs)?

a) Who is responsible within your working group for catalyzing or leading each effort? One step further, how would you know that this commitment has been institutionalized?

b) Does your coalition have a succession plan that continually involves and builds up new student leaders, as well as provides for staffing transitions?

On what timeline will efforts to enact this vision occur? (Think in terms of years; e.g., in year one your institution will accomplish what? In year two your institution will accomplish what? And so on...).

How are you ensuring that your short-term tactics are embedded into the campus culture and can outlast the individuals leading that effort? (accounting for turnover)

VII. REPORTING

Per the rubric, this section should provide a description of plans to make the following items public:

1. Plans
2. Data
3. Reports

This Action Plan will be shared with the public and our partner institutions. A summary of Gallaudet's NSLVE data will be made publicly available on our website.

More on Reporting:

As part of the reporting process, it is encouraged for campuses to be as detailed as possible and continually retool their democratic engagement action plan to ensure the short- and long-term goals set forth in the plan are being met. If the goals change, these updates should be reflected in the plan in real time

GUIDING QUESTIONS

How will the plan be shared, internally and externally? Please state where the plan will be shared. Keeping in mind to share the report with multiple stakeholders. This could take place by sharing during departmental meetings, student organization gatherings, and with community partners.

Will the plan be made public? If so, how? This could take place by posting the report on your institution's website, social media, etc.

Will the data, such as your institution's NSLVE report, used to inform the plan be made public? If so, how? This could take place by posting the report on your institution's website, social media, with stakeholders, etc.

How will this plan be used to execute student voting coalition work on campuses? This will ensure all campus organizations and groups have access to data and reporting to be able to plan and strategize programming

VIII. EVALUATION

CDDA will evaluate the plan every year to determine if goals are being met or progression towards the goals are being accomplished. Upon evaluation, adjustments will be made accordingly to ensure

the continued development of a working and sustainable democratic engagement model. In addition to internal evaluation, the primary sources of evaluation will be anecdotal data from partners on campus and the NSLVE report that tracks voter demographics, voter registration and voter engagement in the election. Students, coaches, and partners will be surveyed and new evaluation methods will be determined as goals are reached. When available, the results will be shared with the Gallaudet community through university communications.

This section describes how the democratic action plan and its impact will be evaluated, how the institution will know if it is making progress, and when its goals have been reached. Included in this section should be what information (data) will be collected, as well as how it will be collected, analyzed, and used for improvement. Evaluating the work should be a continual process, so the action plan can be adjusted to reach the institution's goals. Evaluation should not be limited to using data from the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement, though it is a vital resource in measuring student voter behavior for the campus.

What is the purpose of the evaluation?

What does the institution want to know and be able to do with the information gathered?

Who is the audience for the evaluation?

Who will carry out the evaluation? Is there an Institutional Research office representative involved?

Faculty who are already studying related research questions? Student Affairs educators carrying out programmatic and long-term learning assessments?

When will the evaluation be carried out and completed? What impact is already being measured for other related initiatives, like the Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement?

What information (data, evidence) must be collected and how will it be collected? What are the performance measures and indicators of success?

How will information (data, evidence) be analyzed? a)

How will the results of the evaluation be shared? b)

How will the success of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts within the plan be evaluated, beyond NSLVE

race/ethnicity breakdown information?

Will efforts to evaluate be limited to one person/one area of your campus or be part of a larger campus effort?

What are your institution's metrics for success? Share what worked, what didn't, why, and how things will be altered for future action plans.

What progress has been made toward each short- and long-term goal?

Were efforts utilized to advance or implement the Ask Every Student framework? a) Integrating voter

registration or GOTV (mail-in ballots, early voting, voter ID asks) into existing processes b)

Executing

individualized voter registration and democratic engagement tactics c) Institutionalizing tactics to be a

sustainable part of campus culture? Were efforts advanced regarding diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice priorities on campus?

Which efforts were most successful to contributing to shifts in NSLVE and other data? a) What could be done to improve upon data metrics? For instance, if there was a big voter registration push, but voter registration data in NSLVE didn't change much, how can we improve on that?

What are your key performance indicators, and did you satisfy expectations?

Was campus administration supportive of civic learning and democratic engagement efforts? What can be done to get university officials to sign the ALL IN IN Presidents' Commitment to Full Student Voter Participation?

How can student research projects support evaluation measures?

What resources do we need next year to advance civic engagement and reach long-term goals?

What are next steps for how evaluation information will be shared?