



PACIFIC VOTES!

Strengthening American Democracy Action Plan – Academic Year 24/25

**McCall Center for Civic
Engagement *and the*
Pacific Votes Workgroup**



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Meet Pacific University.....	3
Executive Summary	4
Leadership	6
Commitment	11
Landscape.....	15
Goals.....	18
Long-Term Goals.....	18
Short-Term Goals.....	19
Strategy	21
Short-Term Guiding Questions	21
NSLVE / Reporting	22
Evaluation.....	23
Appendix A – Workgroup Membership.....	29
Appendix B – Short Term Strategy	31

Meet Pacific University

Founded in 1849, and composed of four campuses and five clinics in Oregon’s Willamette Valley, Pacific University is the No. 1 private research institution in the Pacific Northwest. A diverse learning community offering a unique combination of nationally recognized undergraduate, graduate and professional programs in the arts and sciences, education, business, optometry and the health professions, Pacific melds the personal, nurturing learning environment of a small liberal arts college with the rigorous scholarship of a much larger school. About one in four Pacific students– both undergraduate and graduate – are the first in their families to attend college, and the institution is designated an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI).



Pacific University is committed to strengthening our support of American democracy by enhancing our students’ awareness, motivation, and ability to participate in democratic institutions and processes. The “Pacific Votes” program operates under the leadership of the McCall Center for Civic Engagement, with the support of the cross-institutional Pacific Votes Workgroup. Our participation in the Strengthening American Democracy Action Planning process has transformed our efforts, leading to recent accomplishments such as:

- First institution in the state of Oregon to receive the “Voter Friendly Campus” designation
- Recipient of the ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge 2022 Highly Established Action Plan.
- 2020 election campus-wide voting rate of 67.5% (higher than the national average for institutions of higher education and the general public)
- Significant voting rate increases in 2020 for specific student groups (Asian +29%, American Indian/Alaska Native +24%, Black +29%, 2 or more races +19%)

Executive Summary

1. Which individuals (e.g., name(s), title(s), department(s)) and/or organizations developed this plan?

The students and permanent staff of the McCall Center for Civic Engagement (hereafter MCCE) drafted this plan with informal input from other offices, students, faculty, and staff.

2. Why is your institution invested in creating a plan to map out civic learning and democratic engagement efforts? How does this plan tie to broader institutional norms/values/strategic plans?

Pacific University has participated in the ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge since 2016. Developing an annual action plan has become an integral part of our institution's Pacific Votes work. The guidance provided to assess progress and formulate SMARTIE goals has been invaluable for our work expanding the visibility of the program and reaching across institutional silos.

On March 9, 2024 our institution's Board of Trustees approved a new strategic plan, as well as priorities and objections under the themes of "Empower, Thrive, Advance". This action plan will allow the MCCE to effectively advocate for democratic engagement be integrated into next steps of the campus-wide implementation of the new strategic plan.

As the fifth iteration of our action plan, this document is intended to help the MCCE:

- a) Initiate the event & initiative planning processes for the Fall 2024 semester
- b) Assess the elements of our Pacific Votes program that have proven successful
- c) Identify SMARTIE goals and strategies for further institutionalization of our democratic engagement efforts on campus
- d) Act as a guide for new members of our workgroup & university administration who wish to learn about Pacific Votes
- e) Prove our eligibility for ongoing recognition by national partners including Voter Friendly Campus and the ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge.

3. 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.

Implementation occurs primarily in-person on Pacific University's Forest Grove campus (home to the College of Arts and Sciences and the MCCE). Online and hybrid tools have

allowed increased availability to the institution's other campuses, which are targeted for improved outreach in our long-term goals.

4. 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?

This action plan starts with Summer 2024 and ends in Summer 2025 (with the bulk of identified initiatives targeting the Fall 2024 semester leading up to the November 5 election). These short-term goals and planning efforts are connected to long-term strategic planning through 2034 & it is updated every calendar year as part of our Action Plan process.

5. How will this action plan be implemented? Who's in charge? What unit/office/division will be facilitating the effort?

The Pacific Votes program is lucky enough to be backed by a fully staffed and funded center (the MCCE), with 2 full time staff and an average of 8-12 student employees in a given semester. While challenges to this model persist (e.g. we are only open for 10 months of the year, and are located within and funded by the College of Arts and Sciences rather than the institution as whole) this arrangement has overwhelming benefits, and work-arounds are possible through the participation of the larger Pacific Votes Workgroup, whose cross-institutional members provide significant guidance and support. During the 23/24 academic year, we were selected to receive a National Voter Registration Day Partner Grant, which allowed us to hire our first Pacific Votes Student Ambassadors. With the recent "Dear Colleague" confirmation of FWS applicability to voter engagement efforts, we plan to maintain our current 2 students in this role and may even be able to hire additional students in Fall 2024, giving our action plan implementation processes the additional benefit of direct student oversight and input.

6. What strategies were employed to make sure this plan was equitable and included a diverse audience?

The Pacific Votes Workgroup is composed of a wide array of representatives from units across the university, and includes faculty, staff, and students. Although some participants self-select into the workgroup due to their interest in the work, other representatives are specifically invited for their ability to diversify our outreach (e.g. representatives from Nā Haumāna O Hawai'i , Center for Gender Equity, Student Multicultural Center, students from our "Cultural and Religious" clubs).

The MCCE also has an Internal Equity Workgroup which meets monthly to strategize and review our efforts through an enquiry lens. The Pacific Votes work is included in this process, and is one of the drivers of an effort to create a guide for planning equitable and accessible events on campus. All this being said, this is an area where Pacific Votes still has work to do, and our MCCE staff is working diligently to improve our processes.

Leadership

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?

Workgroup members are selected from among a variety of stakeholders, taking into account their willingness to contribute to a permanent and inclusive body based on:

- Interest
- Ability to help develop and implement a plan that takes equity and diversity into account
- Ability to connect with and/or represent students across the university
- Ability to meet and contribute to working group

Our annual outreach (already started for 2024-2025, see Appendix A for a list of invited participants) emphasizes the twin goals of reach and inclusivity, based upon the MCCE's SOFAR framework (Students, Organizations in the Community, Faculty, Administration, Residents of Forest Grove / Washington County). In particular we target members who represent:

- Identity-based communities and constituencies
 - Staff, faculty, and student leaders involved with such groups as the Student Multicultural Center, Hispanic Heritage Student Association, Muslim Student Association, Nā Haumāna O Hawai'i, Rainbow Coalition, Pacific Christian Fellowship, and others for which identity-based political activity may be relevant.
- Political diversity
 - College Democrats/Republicans/other political clubs if applicable
 - Individuals with particular political leanings to be involved if there are not active groups on campus that represent them. For example, as it appears that we may have neither a College Democrats nor College Republicans clubs next year, we will put out a call for individual participation.

At the current time, the Workgroup is staff/faculty heavy – invitations to student groups to participate have not yielded consistent participation, although we do know that many students are pursuing democratic engagement opportunities within their own spheres of influence. In our last action plan we indicted a desire to explore paid opportunities for students to engage with the workgroup. We are happy to confirm that as noted above we have now developed 2 paid roles within the MCCE for “Pacific Votes Student Ambassadors”. We are hopeful that efforts to properly compensate students for their time will yield better representation – and that they will be uniquely able to attract other students to the cause, even in unpaid roles.

- a. What senior administrative leaders (e.g., college president, provost, dean of students) are involved, and what role do they play? What role do you wish senior administrative leaders would play on your campus?**

Multiple Deans and Associate Deans (including the Dean of Student Engagement and Inclusion, Dean of Student Well Being, Associate Dean of Applied and Experiential Learning) are deeply involved in the Pacific Votes Workgroup. The president has signed the Presidential Commitment. We hope to involve more Deans from the academic side of the house, and our goals for the 2024 election include the distribution of individualized NSOLVE guides to each school dean highlighting the available information about how their students vote.

- b. What academic departments and which faculty within academic affairs are involved? (e.g., political science professor(s), fine arts department)**

Invitations to participate and/or nominate representatives have been sent to each of the colleges (Arts & Sciences, Education, Health Professions, Business, Optometry). Specific representation is also solicited from faculty who have long-standing relationships with the program (e.g. political science, whose faculty collaborate on multiple events including Constitution Day and Election Night programming) or whose students' have specific needs around elections (e.g. the school of pharmacy, whose students depart on rotation right before election day).

- c. 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)**

Active student life participants include the Dean of Students and Associate Dean of Students, with occasional participation from the VP of Student Affairs (who is also our Chief Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Officer). Other engaged representatives include the Director of University Center & Student Activities, and the Director of most campus centers (Center for Gender Equity, Student Multicultural Center, Student Counseling Center).

- d. Which students and student organizations are involved? (e.g., student government, issue-based student orgs)**

Student government representatives from both the Undergraduate Student Senate and the Professional Student Senate have seats on the Workgroup, as does a representative from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. As noted above, representation from other student organizations has been minimal, although they are kept abreast of the Workgroup efforts via email. We hope to

encourage further student participation and are actively working to encourage the nascent development of a new political club on campus.

- e. 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?**

The MCCE have a friendly relationship with our local League of Women Voters, who will be receiving an invitation to join the workgroup this year. We have also recently been in contact with APANO, who we invited to campus to discuss efforts to build Asian and Pacific Islander power at the polls, and are pursuing other Portland Metro area organizations for similar work including Imagine Black and Next Up.

- f. 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?**

We have a resurgent partnership with Washington County Elections, who partnered with us for National Voter Registration Day 2023 and have begun advertising elections related positions directly to our students. Multiple members of their team have attended at least one Workgroup session and have expressed interest in returning to campus for additional tabling and outreach events.

- 2. Who is this person(s) and/or office(s) held accountable to, what is their reporting line?**

Leadership succession of the Workgroup chair will follow that of the MCCE Director, as will many spots in the working group itself i.e. when a club president graduates/steps down, an invitation will be extended to the incoming president.

At this time participation in the Work group is designed to be flexible and low-barrier to entry. The Workgroup primarily acts as a brainstorming entity, helping ensure the work (which is carried out by the MCCE in partnership with other campus units) is thorough, equitable, and engaging to all members of the campus community. Expectations are not levied on the Workgroup members such that individual accountability is currently required. However, we are exploring the idea starting a smaller taskforce this year (situated between the Workgroup and the MCCE staff) who will have higher expectations placed upon them. At this point, it will fall upon the MCCE staff to manage their accountability and follow-through.

- a. If student-staff or community members are involved, how are they compensated for their involvement?**

The two new Pacific Votes Student Ambassadors will be paid for their participation in the Workgroup and all related Pacific Votes work! There are currently no other compensation plans for Workgroup participants.

3. What are working group members' unique strengths and, with those in mind, what are their responsibilities?

Each of the workgroup members brings unique knowledge of the needs of certain students in our campus community, as well as the best way to reach them in a meaningful way. Additionally, specific workgroup members have established roles in pre- and post-election planning (esp. Orientation, Student Counseling Center). At this time, the Workgroup is tasked with reviewing MCCE plans, providing feedback, and suggesting new/alternative strategies for outreach. As appropriate, they are asked to join with the MCCE to help with the implementation of the programming, but this is on an as-needed basis, and is not a universal expectation.

4. How will people be brought into the coalition who currently are not there? Why have these individuals/groups been identified to join?

As the MCCE is situated with the College of Arts & Sciences, we continue to strive to improve our connections with the other colleges, and especially with the other campuses. These colleges & campuses have been underrepresented in the past and we have found it a slow-process to institutionalize these relationships – right now we are relying on personal relationships which allow us to approach individuals we think would be amenable to the work.

a. a) Which groups have traditionally been underrepresented within your mobilization efforts and how does your working group work to strategically involve members of those groups?

A wide variety of faculty are engaging with politics and democracy in their classrooms, but struggle to find time to engage with the Pacific Votes Workgroup. To facilitate deeper engagement from the faculty, we are looking at the College of Arts & Sciences "EDI Fellow" model. The MCCE leadership team is exploring the possibility of developing a "Democracy Fellow" using a similar model. As stated in our goals below, we will be reviewing this model during the 24/25 academic year, with the possible goal of proposing a "Democracy Fellow" for the 25-26 academic year.

5. How is the working group inclusive of different campus and community stakeholders?

The Workgroup uses the SOFAR method to ensure a wide-range of participants, as well as the criteria listed above for extending specific invitations.

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?

The Pacific Votes program and the democratic engagement work of the MCCE has implicit support of upper administrators as well as occasional explicit support (e.g. our president signed the Presidential Commitment and has named civic engagement as fundamental to the Pacific experience). At this time, however, as the Workgroup is still relatively new so it does not have the same visibility among the administration as does the MCCE.

7. What other offices on campus need to be involved? (e.g., website or portal management, registrar, university relations)

We are developing relationships with Marketing and Communications, and hope to have their participation in the Workgroup this year. We have been waiting for a strategic time to speak with the Registrar's office about adding a "Register to Vote" button somewhere close to the "Register for Classes" links & believe we may be approaching an appropriate opportunity to do so.

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).

The Workgroup has already started having sporadic meetings during the Spring 2024 semester. Regular meetings will begin in August 2024, and are currently scheduled for the second Thursday of each month through election day. The MCCE Program Coordinator will manage logistics related to communications, Zoom links, follow-up emails, etc.

9. How are you keeping working group members engaged over time and addressing stakeholder turnover?

As the current expectations placed upon the Workgroup are limited in scope, a widespread acknowledgement on campus of the importance of preparing for elections, and the recent success of the Pacific Votes programs, we have found our participants to be deeply engaged and creative. We remain diligent in inviting the new representatives as staff turnover occurs, and encouraging their participation through early outreach (E.g. in March 2024 we hosted a "Pacific Votes Preview" for newly hired Working Group members, as well as past-participants who wished to have a refresh, to learn about the program and their possible role.)

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?

As the MCCE is a fully funded and staffed entity with final control of the Pacific Votes implementation, the Workgroup can welcome members who have limitations on their time and participation and/or need to step away, without a loss in program effectiveness.

11. What is your leadership succession plan? Is leading this work part of someone's job description? How will this work continue if key leaders change roles or leave the institution?

At this time the Workgroup is primarily managed by the MCCE's Program Manager of Applied and Experiential Learning. Ultimate responsibility for the work rests with the MCCE's director, the Associate Dean of Applied and Experiential Learning. As this leadership is an identified component of the Program Manager's position, they will be responsible for handing off appropriately in the case of a role change or institution departure.

Commitment

1. How does the mission and vision of your campus align with your work to increase student voter engagement in our democracy?

Pacific University's mission is to be "A diverse and sustainable community dedicated to discovery and excellence in teaching, scholarship and practice, Pacific University inspires students to think, create, care and pursue justice in our world." Our new strategic plan emphasizes three pillars:

- The Pacific University community will be **empowered** by a robust and diverse student body, world-class faculty and staff, and effective leadership. Collectively, these individuals will be dedicated to discovery and excellence in teaching, scholarship, and practice.
- Pacific University will be an environment where all can **thrive**. Teaching, learning, living, and personal growth will take place in a diverse community, served by the built and natural environment, and sustained by sound operations and policies.
- Pacific University will harness resources to achieve aspirational goals that **advance** fiscal health, academic achievement, scholarship and research, and far-reaching impact. Revenue sources will be diverse, stable, and robust.

We feel confident that civic engagement broadly, and democratic engagement to a lesser degree, will be embedded in the implementation of these new strategic pillars and feel the MCCE and the Pacific Votes Workgroup are well positioned to contribute to this process.

2. 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?

The institution and leadership currently demonstrate commitment to improving civic learning and democratic engagement through support of the MCCE, a mission statement in line with these principles (see below), and academic integration of civic learning (especially at the undergraduate level—see below). During the 2020 election the MCCE saw increased explicit support for political participation at the level of upper administration, and expects this level support over the next couple of years at a minimum, perhaps more as the intuitional-level strategic plan and College of Arts & Sciences visioning process proceeds..

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

In 2020, the commitment became more visible as the president connected with the university community with some frequency about the forthcoming election, their singing of the Presidential Commitment, and the work being done within the institution to support full democratic participation.

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

The Marketing and Communications office works with the MCCE to broadcast exciting Pacific Votes news, using channels which are available to the public. IN addition, the MCCE works with external stakeholders via it's Advisory Council. At this time, we do not have a strong process for communicating with general community partners, but have identified it as an area of growth. Using our community partner network we hope to be more intentional about connecting with partners about topics specific to their interests or that build partnership with our institution. Our strategies for the 2024 election also include multiple programming opportunities which may be possible to open to the public.

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

Yes.

d. 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.

Yes, both our past and current presidents have signed the commitment.

3. 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?

Educating for civic learning is pervasive in the College of Arts & Sciences, as indicated by its position as a Core Requirement for graduation. Although there are indications of it being part of the university's culture in other colleges, it is less clearly systemic and verifiable. There is still work to be done to embed *democratic engagement* more fully in the culture across all colleges.

4. 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?

The institution's commitment is implied but not explicit in existing communications:

- *Mission statement*: "A diverse and sustainable community dedicated to discovery and excellence in teaching, scholarship and practice, Pacific University inspires students to think, create, care and pursue justice in our world."
- *Core values*: "Serving the Global Community"
- *Accreditation objective*: "Prepare students for engaged, responsible citizenship and community service"

Educating for civic learning is a significant, if not pervasive, part of the undergraduate institutional culture, but is not yet consistent and systematic across the entire institution. The MCCE primarily serves and supports the undergraduate experience at Pacific, but there is no counterpart unit for each of the graduate colleges or other campuses.

- *MCCE mission*: "The Tom McCall Center for Civic Engagement at Pacific University fosters an engaged campus that connects students, faculty, and staff with community partners to serve the common good, revitalize our community, and facilitate learning within a community context. The Center promotes the value of life-long active citizenship, building a sense of empowerment to effect meaningful social and political participation, while cultivating the development of critical thinking skills and the capacity to reflect on one's own set of values."
- *Operating definition of civic engagement* (included in multiple marketing materials): "Civic engagement addresses a significant social, political, or environmental issue in the community through actions that can make a difference on those issues, including service, advocacy, awareness-raising, activism, action-oriented research, electoral participation, and political involvement."

This is the fifth iteration of our action plan.

5. 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?

The institution does not have overall civic, democratic, or political learning outcomes, but does have objectives related to the core theme of Serving the Global Community and accreditation progress.

- Percentage of graduates who, as part of their degree program, participated in civic engagement, service learning, and other community-based learning, as measured in our Alumni Survey.
- Degree to which students embrace a pluralistic orientation, as measured by the Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey.
- Percentage of recent graduates reporting participation in civic activities at least once in the previous year, as measured by Pacific Survey of Recent Graduates.

The College of Arts and Sciences (where the MCCE is housed) does have learning outcomes for the civic engagement component of the core curriculum. These outcomes state that through completion of the civic engagement (“CE”) requirement, students will be able to:

- Apply disciplinary knowledge (facts, theories, experiences, etc.) to one’s own participation in civic life, politics, and government;
- Effectively communicate (e.g., express, listen, and adapt to others) in a civil manner (i.e., courteous and respectful regardless of differences);
- Demonstrate attitudes of social responsibility (i.e., individual and collective obligation to act for the greater good).

6. How is educating for civic learning and democratic engagement included in the general education curriculum?

The general education core for the College of Arts and Sciences (which serves most undergraduates at the university) includes a civic engagement requirement, most typically met through a CE-designated course of 2 credits or more. CAS requires assessment for the civic engagement core requirement. The college assessment plan hinges on a rotational cycle of planning, collecting data, analyzing evidence, and revising accordingly. As part of this cycle, civic engagement began data collection in Spring 2020 for the first round of formal assessment since the creation of the requirement. Since then we have been in a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement. Fall 2024 is another Civic Engagement assessment cycle, with aligns nicely with our desire to learn about faculty attempts to engage directly with democracy in the classroom.

Graduate programs at Pacific meet national accreditation standards for specific professions, and often include service-learning or community-based learning as part of their programs. While many of these field experiences (such as social work or education practicum placements or clinical training in health professions) serve community needs, they are not typically grounded in specifically *civic* learning outcomes.

7. How is educating for civic learning and democratic engagement included in the co-curriculum?

Co-curricular civic learning is promoted through the MCCE's programming, such as GIVE projects (Get Involved Via Engagement), and includes Pacific Votes events and opportunities. As in curricular learning, much of this work is siloed between colleges and schools and well as between undergraduate / professional programs, and between the various campuses. We have significant work to do promoting civic and democratic learning across these silos, as well as through other organization on campus such as through clubs. The Workgroup's ability to assist with cooperation, collaboration, and communication across these silos is proving a key element of success, and will be further emphasized moving forward.

As there are no college- or institution-wide goals for co-curricular programming, meaning the working group will have significant room to explore a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programming to meet the goals of Pacific Votes. A co-curricular SLO process has begun on our campus, as part of our accreditation requirements. As these become more formalized, the MCCE and our Pacific Votes Workgroup are well positioned to broaden the goals identified here.

Landscape

1. Are civic learning and democratic engagement overall campus learning outcomes? If so, what are the learning outcomes and how are they measured?

Although civic learning and democratic engagement are not overall campus learning outcomes, they are taught with specific learning outcomes in the 50+ courses designated to meet the CE requirement for undergraduates, and complemented with co-curricular activities from the MCCE (see Section III.3, above, for details of both). As of this writing, it is not clear whether or how civic learning is taught at the graduate level – a result of the MCCE's placement within the College of Arts and Sciences and the siloing discussed above.

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? See following page for examples.

Our institution uses the NSSE Survey, however our center does not have immediate access to the data.

3. How is civic learning and democratic engagement present in the curriculum?

Civic engagement is a core requirement for undergraduates in the College of Arts and Sciences. A full detailing of this core requirement and related courses can be found at: <https://www.pacificu.edu/academics/academic-resources/core-requirements/civic-engagement>.

4. How is civic learning and democratic engagement present in the co-curriculum?

The MCCE has both curricular and co-curricular elements so provide significant leadership for this on the co-curricular side and ensure that it is integrated into related curricular programming. In recent years, we have redoubled our efforts to connect with student groups (e.g. the in-development political club on campus) to support their democratic engagement work in addition to running our own. The number of events we manage number 3+ every month of the school year so are too numerous and varied to list here.

5. What internal barriers (e.g., limited funding, staff resistance, lack of leadership) prevent the institution from being successful?

Internal barriers exist which impact our activities. Namely:

- Civic learning and democratic engagement are championed from the MCCE, and supported by administrators, but not led by administrators
- The institution does not have a pervasive *political* culture, i.e., not a strongly activist student body, meager or non-existent Democrat/Republican clubs, etc.
- The university has several colleges and campuses that operate relatively autonomously (39% of students attend classes outside Forest Grove, where the MCCE is located) and are not centralized with respect to civic or community engagement. Coordination of our efforts are difficult across university entities, and institution-wide initiatives are particularly challenging

6. What external barriers (e.g., election laws, voter ID laws, lack of proximity to polling location) prevent the institution from being successful?

External barriers are limited but must be carefully navigated:

- The university is situated in a small town on the outskirts of the Portland metropolitan area, so is not the heart of local or regional political activity
- Oregon votes by mail, so understanding that process and implications for students is a barrier (although vote by mail itself is relatively easy and generally facilitates participation)
- Election processes are in a state of flux nationwide and event in Oregon (as of Spring 2020 postage is no longer required, as of January 2022 ballots must be postmarked by election day instead of received), which can be confusing for new voters
- Less than 50% of students attending Pacific come from Oregon, the remainder come from other states/countries and require assistance deciding whether to change their registration to Oregon and/or navigating the absentee ballot process in their home state

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?

Pacific University is an AANAPISI institution, with a high percentage of both POC and first-generation students. It also straddles the urban-rural divide and has a high percentage of students who attend from out of state. There is a physical and cultural divide between undergraduate students, who can be found on our Forest Grove campus, and graduate students who are located across all four campuses, as well as in many other practicum placements around the country. Pacific has thriving international office, so we have many international students on-campus who are interested in learning more about American elections, as well as a number of American citizens living abroad during each election.

Each of these diverse student groups offers an opportunity for the Pacific Votes program to create targeted outreach and support for democratic engagement. For example:

- Our Pacific Votes pledges greatly increased our ability to provide curated support for students who hail from an increasing geographically diverse home states, where many of them still cast ballots.
- We are aware of the number of students who are unable to participate in the election and work to keep them involved through other means.
- As most of our students are of traditional college-going age, we know that many of them are voting for the first time and therefore take steps to support them in that process.
- We partner with identity-based units and clubs on campus to ensure we have a broad and culturally-sensitive reach.

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)?

The resources we have available for the Pacific Votes are significant due to its placement within the MCCE:

- The MCCE is staffed, funded, and committed to this effort
- Oregon has a strong vote-by-mail system and helpful elections offices
- The university has excellent political expertise within the Politics & Government faculty

9. What additional resources are needed to help the institution be successful?

Long term financial resources required to ensure success will need to emerge over time; we have the resources we need to proceed at this time. Less tangible resources include a strong relationship with the incoming president, senior administration support for

improved internal communications, and de-siloing of operations – all valuable and only marginally within the MCCE’s sphere of influence.

Goals

Pacific Votes’ short-term goals are focused exclusively on the 2024 election. Long-term goals take a broader look at the ways in which the program operates - goal setting both for individual election cycles and the systemic challenge of enculturating democratic engagement on campus. This broad view is complicated by the positioning of the MCCE within the College of Art and Sciences, such that institution-wide goals may not be advisable or achievable.

Long-Term Goals

1. What is the long-term vision the institution hopes to achieve?

In the long-term, the MCCE hopes to articulate concrete democratic engagement goals, institutionalize democratic engagement by expanding our efforts beyond individual student contact, and foster a culture conducive to political engagement.

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?

Our new institutional learning outcomes:

ILO #1: In summative performance assessments near the point of degree completion, students meet program-defined benchmarks for critical thinking, communication, and application of degree knowledge and skills.

ILO #2 In designated performance assessments identified by each degree program, students meet program-defined benchmarks for Social Responsibility and Diverse and Intercultural Perspectives.

3. What are the outcomes the institution wants to accomplish over the next 10 years?

- a. By 2025, the MCCE will explore the potential for a new “Democracy Fellow” and if deemed appropriate, will propose such a role be made available to both undergraduate and graduate level faculty.
- a. By 2026, the MCCE will bring parity to resources targeting primary elections, midterm elections, and presidential elections.
- b. By 2030, the MCCE will increase the number of tenured faculty teaching civic engagement classes in all university majors in the College of Arts and Sciences; ensure that CE-class approval process includes democratic engagement as a core tenant.
- c. By 2032, the MCCE will increase student voting rates in presidential elections by 10 percentage points over the 2016 turnout levels.

- d. By 2032, the MCCE will increase student voting rates in midterm elections by 10 percentage points over the 2018 turnout levels.
- e. By 2032, the MCCE will bring parity to voter turnout rates based on race/ethnicity as well as program of study.

4. Are the goals S.M.A.R.T.I.E. (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, time-bound, inclusive, and equitable)?

Yes, each of these goals meets SMARTIE criteria.

5. Do the goals contribute to expanding access to voting for a diverse set of students?

Yes, these 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?

Yes, although we believe the truly key emphasis on diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice must come in the implementation stage.

7. Are these goals informed by data and research?

The goals are informed by: sources of data that the MCCE has readily available, best-practices gathered through our professional development work as staff members, and our deep knowledge of our campus and its current needs.

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?

Note: these goals and the related discussions are specifically for the 2024 midterm election. We do not yet have goals identified for the next three years, as we use the experiences of each election to refine our processes and target specific campus needs.

- a. In 2024, the MCCE will increase the percentage of the student body signing the Pacific Votes Pledge by 10% over 2020.
- b. In 2024, the MCCE will increase the percentage of the student body who vote by 10% over 2020.
- c. In 2024, the MCCE will invite 100% of cultural clubs to engage with the Pacific Votes Workgroup, and engage directly with 70% of Cultural Clubs through a meeting visit from an MCCE Civic Action Team Specialist.
- d. In 2024, the MCCE will provide a minimum of 3 accessible opportunities for faculty across the institution to learn about democratic engagement topics relevant in their classrooms.

- e. In 2024, The MCCE will clarify its position around the relationship between civic engagement and democratic engagement, and communicate this out via a syllabus guide for CE faculty.
- f. In 2024, the MCCE will create a template for communicating NSLVE data out to the dean of each college, and obtain feedback on the template for revision in future elections.
- g. In 2024, the MCCE will host 5 Pacific Votes Workgroup meetings, at which student participants will be equitably compensated for their time.
- h. In 2024, the Pacific Votes Workgroup will launch our “Just One Thing” campaign, where all campus units are asked to pick one way to engage with the election (e.g. communication campaign, event, etc.).

2. How do the goals of the campus voting coalition contribute to the institution’s overall equity and inclusion goals?

Our strategies, short-term goals, and long-term goals all take direction from our institution’s commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion, and are proactively designed to contribute to a more equitable campus experience for our student body.

3. How do the goals support the institution's strategic plan?

Our activities feed into the institutional learning outcomes articulated in above. As the institution embarks on a new strategic planning process there will be opportunities to further aligning and influence.

4. What resources does the institution need to ensure its longer-term vision is within reach?

The MCCE is sufficiently resources and feel confident in our ability to continue progressing toward our long-term vision, unless overall budget changes impact our ability to properly implement the Pacific Votes program.

5. Who does the institution need to involve in order to reach its longer-term vision?

Greater viability and more buy-in, for which we are actively seeking involvement across the campus in our Workgroup.

6. Does your campus voting coalition have the capacity and/or support to achieve this goal?

Yes.

7. Is the goal SMARTIE (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, time-bound, inclusive, and equitable)?

Yes, each of the short-term goals meet the SMARTIE criteria.

8. Does the goal solve an immediate issue student voters face?

Our goals target not only students but faculty, staff, administration and our Workgroup participants. While some goals work to solve an immediate issues students face, most target the enculturation of civic and democratic engagement on our campus.

9. Is the goal informed by data and research?

The goals are informed by: sources of data that the MCCE has readily available, best-practices gathered through our professional development work as staff members, and our deep knowledge of our campus and its current needs.

10. What does your institution need to do to best mobilize voters for the next election (whether local, state, federal primaries or general elections)?

We lay this out in our strategies and goal-setting.

Strategy

Pacific Votes strategies for engagement are based on our four-pronged effort to support voter registration, education, turnout, and debrief/reflection. Established short-term strategies are outlined below, along with Fall 2024 events for which planning is already underway.

Short-Term Guiding Questions

1. What is the work?

See Appendix B, which identifies initiative, audience, location, timing, and goals for each of the planned Fall 2024 actions, as well as the general strategic category it falls into.

2. 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.

At this point, the scale of Ask Every Student seems like more than we are able to commit to. To successful “Ask Every Student” we would need additional data on the program’s effectiveness, increased budget for implementation, and high-level leadership for coordination across units.

3. Who is responsible for implementing each planned strategy and tactic?

The MCCE is responsible for implementing each planned strategy and tactic.

4. What methods will be used to make strategies and tactics accessible to diverse populations?

We have specific targets embedded in our short-term goals for interacting with cultural clubs on campus, as well as long-standing relationships with campus units like Nā Haumāna O Hawai'i. We regularly obtain voter registration forms and guides in Spanish from our local elections office and have begun working with student leaders in the MCCE to improve our Spanish language translation of our internal / outreach materials. We have fully embraced hybrid programming to make them more accessible to all students.

5. Are you including tactics that focus on reaching all students, especially traditionally underrepresented students?

Yes, we center outreach that focuses on reaching all students including those who would not traditionally have felt invited into this space (e.g. 2020 programming included work with the Student Multicultural Center to create guides for DACA students on campus). This is an area where work remains, however, and is one of the reasons we are diligently working toward higher student participation in the Workgroup.

6. 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?

Some of the work has already begun, particularly that targeting faculty and the administration. The majority of programming targeting students, faculty, and staff will take place during the Fall 2024 semester. Many of these strategies have a long history on our campus, so benefit from established planning processes and clear task delineation. The MCC has benefited from low turnover (our director has been with the center for 10+ years), and we strive to source regular professional development for all staff which emphasize nonpartisan and culturally sensitive programming. We have a well-developed volunteer training guide which is reviewed for accuracy every year before being distributed to students at NVRD, etc.

NSLVE / Reporting

1. 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.

The [Pacific Votes website](#) makes both the Action Plan and NSLVE reports publicly available. This page is linked to regularly in communications to students, faculty & staff.

- 2. 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.**

See above.

- 3. 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.**

In addition to sharing the report as a whole on our website, we share select data points in all-staff/all-faculty meetings, in Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion annual reports, the MCCE annual report, directly to the Workgroup and the MCCE Advisory Council, and in reporting produced by Marketing and Communication for distribution in our weekly e-news and on the website.

- 4. 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.**

For the first time this year we plan to produce program-specific guides to the NSLVE data, which will be distributed to each Dean to encourage their participation in the Workgroup and their own internal communications to students about the importance of democratic engagement. If resources allow, this method could also be replicated for other units of academic affairs and student affairs with more general campus-wide data.

Evaluation

- 1. What is the purpose of the evaluation?**

Evaluation of the Pacific Votes program currently occurs as a function of MCCE end-of-year operations.

- 2. What does the institution want to know and be able to do with the information gathered?**

The purpose of this evaluation is to improve our understanding of what we do and could do better so that we have a basis for sound decision-making and planning. The process of writing these action plans has already born fruit in this arena as we are just now reaching a point where we feel confident committing to SMARTIE goals.

- 3. Who is the audience for the evaluation?**

The audience is primarily internal, including program administrators (e.g., MCCE staff), university administrators, students, and staff/faculty. Elements are made publicly available on the Pacific Votes website and in our Annual Report (hard copies of which are made available to all interested parties when the Center tables at events).

The Workgroup will also receive an evaluation assessment at the start of the fall 2024 semester, to help orient their work based on the results of the 2020 election. If the 2022 NSLVE reports are released by then, we will also be able to include those details, however at this point we do not have any indication that this will happen.

4. 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?

The evaluation is carried out by the staff of the MCCE. We have approached the Institutional Research Office about furthering our relationship with the goal of improving targeted communications with other campus units.

5. When will the evaluation be carried out and completed?

The evaluation will be carried out as part of the MCCE's spring semester wrap-up. The goal is to have the evaluation completed no later than June 16, 2025.

6. What impact is already being measured for other related initiatives, like the Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement?

We are active participants in our institution's accreditation processes and partner with our institutional research office on surveys such as NSSE.

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

Traditionally, our primary data collection has been from the NSLVE report, and this is where much of our data targets will continue to pull from. Additional qualitative data is gathered by the MCCE staff in a continuous manner to ensure responsive programming.

Now that we have established new SMARTIE goals as part of this year's action planning process, the new data to collect for short term goals includes:

- Number of signatories of the Pacific Votes pledge
- Successful outreach and engagement with Culture Clubs, counting both (a) outreach, and (b) invitations to attend meetings
- Workgroup attendance

For long-term goals it includes:

- Number of tenured faculty teaching CE classes in every major in the College of Arts and Sciences.

As each short- and long-term goals have been constructed in a SMARTIE manner, the indicators of success are built into the goal.

8. 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?

While qualitative data is helpful to ensure responsive programming, our short- and long-term goals have been strategically written to use accessible quantitative data which can be analyzed with some ease using simple excel formulas. The results of the evaluation will be shared in spring updates about the MCCE operations, as well as in fall outreach to the Workgroup and college deans.

DEI effort evaluations currently include the NSLVE race/ethnicity data, and engagement with the campus “Culture Clubs”. We would love to hear additional ideas ALL IN has for expanding these efforts with other data points.

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

For the time being, evaluation efforts are housed within the MCCE.

10. 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.

This action plan outlines our second iteration of SMARTIE goals – in previous iterations our nascent goal-setting relied heavily on generalized goals not grounded in baseline data. However, because our most recent previous action plan presumed that we would have access to the 2022 NSLVE report (which has still not been released), we have not yet been able to determine if the majority of those goals were met. As a result, we made the decision to update the 2024 goals to the same metrics we hoped for in 2022. Hopefully the 2024 NSLVE report will be released with more alacrity and we will be able to assess out success using this.

Our Pacific Votes programming benefits from established strategies (e.g. familiar programming on NVRD which our student body knows to look for), as well as exciting new developments in 2020 (launch of our Pacific Votes Workgroup, launch of a Pacific Votes Pledge, use of Zoom to enhance our reach to faculty through targeted videos

created by our staff). Additionally, our 2020 programming benefited from strong relationships with both Athletics and Marketing & Communications. We continue to lean into all of these developments, as they seem to have made a noticeable impact on the scope and scale of our reach.

One major change we continue to see on our campus are significant numbers of elections related events and initiatives occurring on campus that are initiated by units other than the Pacific Votes. This was observed in our most recent Action Plan and has formed the basis of our “Just One Thing” campaign which we are launching for 2024. IN this campaign, we will be asking every unit on campus to plan “Just One Thing” related to the election. We hope in this way to facilitate the growing culture of engagement, and position the Pacific Votes Workgroup as the entity able to help guide and inform these efforts with best-practices to ensure accessible, equitable, and correct information is being disseminated. As this is a new initiative, we do not have historic metrics for success, but will instead be using this as a baseline year to built future metrics upon.

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

As the 2022 NSLVE report has not yet been released for our institution, it is not possible to comment on progress made on the majority of our goals, which relied on that data. Progress on all non-NSLVE grounded goals are as follows:

- One long-term goal accomplished: By 2024, the MCCE will bring equity to Workgroup membership (based on SOFAR and positionality) and work directly with 100% of new Workgroup members to ensure they are prepared to act as liaisons to their colleges/schools/peer groups.
- Additional long-term goals are in progress and remain listed on this action plan.
- Three short-term goals accomplished (however, they remain relevant and have stayed on this action plan as goals to accomplish again in 2024).
- Two short-term goals not accomplished, and have been placed on the Pacific Votes Student Ambassador priority list (and remain in this iteration of our action plan) for accomplishment in Fall 2024.

12. 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?

These steps were taken as part of our commitment to the work, but not as an outcome of committing to the Ask Every Student framework.

13. Were efforts advanced regarding diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice priorities on campus?

Yes, Pacific University, led by the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, is deeply entrenched in the vital, ongoing process of advancing EDI efforts on campus. This effort is reflected in the MCCE and Pacific Votes efforts, as well as the breakdown of voter engagement data by race/ethnicity highlighted in the Introduction.

**14. 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?**

Pacific University's increased electoral participation was part of a national trend during the 2020 election. We believe the additional increased evidenced on our campus were the result of: the inaugural launch of the Pacific Votes Pledge, the inaugural launch of the Pacific Votes Workgroup, and a gently increasing cultural of democratic engagement on campus (as evidenced by the wide-variety of voter engagement initiatives launched independent of our Workgroup).

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

Our key performance indicators met and exceeded our expectations:

1. 2020 voting rate of 67.5% (+16.9 change from 2016)
2. 2020 increases for specific student groups: Asian +29%, American Indian/Alaska Native +24%, Black +29%, 2 or more races +19%
3. Increases in voting rate for both first and second year students (+19% and +24% respectively)
4. Increases in multiple fields of study which have traditionally seen low participation (business +33%, physical sciences +38%)

16. 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?

They were supportive and have signed the commitment.

17. How can student research projects support evaluation measures?

We partner with the Dean's office of the College of Arts and Science to obtain a list of senior capstone projects related to civic engagement. These projects are driven by students and faculty, but when related to civic engagement the MCCE is often invited as an early stakeholder to facilitate the research. If an individual student were interested in using Pacific Votes data in their work, we would welcome the opportunity to partner with them but are not currently soliciting such at this time.

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

Only those already confirmed in the MCCE budget.

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

We are waiting in anticipation for the 2022 NSLVE report to be released, however will be primarily focusing on the 2020 election details (which provides better parity for this presidential election regardless). One of our goals which was not accomplished in 2022 was to prepare a template which can be used to disseminate information to each one of the school Deans regarding elements of the NSLVE data which is relevant for their schools – hopefully encouraging them to plan their own communications through department emails as well as encourage participation in the workgroup / outreach to the MCCE for support. This is a priority for our information dissemination this year. If/when 2022 NSVLE or 2024 NSVLE reports are released we will be in a better place to conduct continued evaluation processes!

Appendix A – Workgroup Membership

Workgroup meetings have already begun for the 2024 election. Invitations to participate were extended to the following:

Students
President, Undergraduate Student Senate
Representative: Professional Student Senate
Representative: PUGS Exec Board
President, First Gen Student Success Association (FGSSA)
President, College Democrats
President, College Republicans
Representative: Civic Action Team Specialist (CATS)
Representative(s): Service, Politics, and Advocacy Clubs
University Centers
Director, Center for Gender Equity
Director, Student Counseling Center
Coordinator, Student Multicultural Center
Director, Center for Peace and Spirituality
Director, Center for a Sustainable Society
Director, Student Health Center
Director, McCall Center for Civic Engagement
Program Coordinator, McCall Center for Civic Engagement
Director of Political Outreach, McCall Center for Civic Engagement
Colleges and Schools
College of Arts and Sciences
School of Social Sciences
School of Natural Sciences
School of Arts and Humanities
College of Business
College of Education
School of Communication Sciences & Disorders
School of Learning & Teaching
College of Health Professions
School of Audiology
School of Dental Hygiene Studies
School of Graduate Psychology
School of Healthcare Administration & Leadership
School of Occupational Therapy
School of Pharmacy
School of Physical Therapy & Athletic Training
School of Physician Assistant Studies

College of Optometry
University Administration
CIO
Dean of Students / Res Life
AVP / Interim Registrar
Associate Vice President for Student Affairs / Chief Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Officer
University Programs
Director, Orientation
Associate Director, Athletics
Director, Hawaii Outreach and Programming
Director, Academic & Career Advising / FGSSA Advisor
Director, Student Activities & Multicultural Interests
Community Members / Organizations
Washington County Elections
League of Women Voters

Appendix B – Short Term Strategy

Fall 2024 planning to date:

Initiative	Audience	Location	Timing	Goal
Voter Registration				
“Welcome Week” Voter Registration Tabling	Students	On campus	August 30 & September 1	Help first year students register
NVRD	Primary: Students Secondary: Faculty, staff	On campus (in UC and mobile teams)	Sept 17	Ensure in-person and online resources are available and distributed to all campuses.
Meet our Pacific Votes Student Ambassadors!	Students	Hybrid	TBD	Networking with politically inclined students
Other events as guided by Workgroup	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Sept 1-Sept 30	TBD
Voter Education				
Constitution Day	Students	On campus	Sept 17	Find appealing topic, partner with UGSS to encourage attendance.
Oregon ballot measures panel	Students, Faculty, Staff	On campus	TBD	Partner with interested faculty, market broadly esp. to staff/faculty.
“How to bring the election into your classroom”	Faculty	TBD	Pre-semester planning week	Connect with pre-semester planning week organizers to hold a session
Other events as guided by Workgroup	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Oct 1-31	TBD
Voter Turnout				

"I Voted" Sticker Competition	Students	On campus	<i>Competition:</i> October 1 <i>Distribution:</i> Nov 1-5	Increase election day visibility with sticker competition, distribute stickers to students who cast their ballot
Ballot Box Walk	Primary: Students Secondary: Faculty, staff	On campus	Nov 1-5	Improve ballot box walk signage to clarify purpose
Athletics / Housing Competition	Students	Hybrid	Nov 1-5	Partner with athletics and/or housing to build on competitive spirit of '20/'22
#PacificVotes Game & Prize Drawing	Students	Online	Nov 1-5	Source fun prizes and allow CATS to run a peer-driven social media campaign
Other events as guided by Workgroup	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Nov 1 - 5	TBD
Voter Debrief/Reflection				
Election Night Watch Party	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Nov 5	Ensure hybrid options and find new POLS faculty to partner with
What Just Happened? With Dr. Jim Moore	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Nov 8	Debrief major election results
Other events as guided by Workgroup	Students, Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Nov 6-14	TBD
All Stages				
Pacific Votes Pledge	Primary: Students Secondary: Faculty, staff	Online	Sept 1- Nov 5	Increase Pacific Votes pledge participation as outlines in short-term goals

"Just One Thing" Campaign	Faculty, Staff	Hybrid	Sept 1 – Nov 5	Encourage all campus units to plan one event or initiative to engage with the election
Social Media and E-news	Students, Faculty, Staff	Online	Sept 1- Nov 5	Collaborate with MARCOM on strategy and themes for midterm election campaign
Syllabus Guide	Civic Engagement faculty	Online	June 16	Further embed democratic engagement in CE class syllabi
Pacific Votes Guide for incoming president	University President	Online	June 16	Welcome president and work to gain her support of this work
NSLVE Guide for Deans	All Deans	Online	Sept 1	Help Deans feel connected to this work through targeted distribution of information

the 1990s, the number of people with a mental health problem has increased in the UK, and the number of people with a mental health problem who are in contact with mental health services has also increased (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2017, 2020).

The 1990s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 1983 (MHA) (Mental Health Act 1983, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2017, 2020), which was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2003 (MHA 2003) (Mental Health Act 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2017, 2020). The MHA 2003 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2017 (MHA 2017) (Mental Health Act 2017, 2020).

The 2000s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2003 (MHA 2003) (Mental Health Act 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2017, 2020), which was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2017 (MHA 2017) (Mental Health Act 2017, 2020). The MHA 2017 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2010s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2017 (MHA 2017) (Mental Health Act 2017, 2020). The MHA 2017 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2020s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020). The MHA 2020 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2020s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020). The MHA 2020 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2020s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020). The MHA 2020 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2020s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020). The MHA 2020 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).

The 2020s saw the introduction of the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020). The MHA 2020 was replaced by the Mental Health Act 2020 (MHA 2020) (Mental Health Act 2020, 2020).