


POST-ELECTION VOTING SURVEY
OF STATE ELECTION OFFICIALS

**TECHNICAL
REPORT**

2016



FVAP.GOV
FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Analyses | 8 |
| Resources..... | 8 |
| SEO and LEO interaction..... | 20 |
| Proposed SEO Products and Service..... | 29 |
| Registration and Ballot Issues..... | 37 |
| CSG Overseas Voting Initiatives Recommendations..... | 47 |
| Methodology | 55 |
| Survey instrument design..... | 56 |
| Survey Administration..... | 59 |
| Conclusion | 61 |
| References | 64 |
| Appendices | 65 |
| Appendix A: 2016 PEVS SEO Survey Instrument..... | 65 |
| Appendix B: 2016 PEVS SEO Communication Materials..... | 84 |
| Appendix C: 2016 PEVS SEO Frequencies..... | 93 |

Introduction

The Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) seeks to ensure Service members, their eligible family members and overseas citizens are aware of their right to vote and have the tools and resources to successfully do so—from anywhere in the world. To adhere to this purpose and to meet legislative and executive responsibilities, FVAP collects data on individuals covered by the *Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA)* and the network that supports them.

FVAP administered the 2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials (PEVS-SEO) to help SEOs be more effective in their roles and to understand how SEOs use FVAP products and services, interact with local election officials (LEO), and address State ballot and registration issues. The 2016 PEVS-SEO is a new survey, roughly based off the 2014 PEVS-LEO, and is intended to be a customer satisfaction survey adhering to the restrictions of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Fast Track approval process. Previous analysis of the LEO surveys indicated that most LEOs received assistance via their State Election Office, which led to the decision to create the new survey focusing on the individual SEOs from the 50 states, District of Columbia and U.S. territories. This report is focused on two key goals related to the SEO population: (1) answering within-population absentee voting research questions, and (2) describing the full survey methodology of the 2016 PEVS-SEO data collection, including survey design and survey administration.

This report is one of four interrelated documents evaluating the 2016 Post-Election Voting Surveys (PEVS). The 2016 PEVS Integrated Report focuses specifically on FVAP program effectiveness across the voting assistance populations. The 2016 Voting Assistance Officer (VAO) Technical Report and 2016 Active Duty Military (ADM) Technical Report each focus on the within-population research questions and survey methodology for their respective populations.

This introduction discusses FVAP's legislative responsibility for conducting the PEVS, highlights key findings and topics discussed in this report and ends by describing the full outline of this report.

1.1 | FVAP Legislative Responsibility for SEO Data Collection

FVAP is responsible for carrying out the responsibilities of *UOCAVA*, as amended by the *Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act*, and Executive Order 12642, signed in 1988. The various PEVSs help fulfill the required statistical analyses of this legislation. The *Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act* of 1986, Section 101.b (1), 42 USC §1973ff, now 52 U.S.C. 20310 permits members of the Uniformed Services and Merchant Marine to vote in elections for federal offices. FVAP, under the guidance of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness USD (P&R), is charged with implementing *UOCAVA* and evaluating the effectiveness of its programs. As a customer satisfaction survey, the PEVS-SEO evaluates the effectiveness of FVAP assistance for a key stakeholder group to ensure that FVAP is effectively fulfilling its obligations.

The quantitative nature of PEVS-SEO allows for a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of current levels of consultation and service provision to a key voting assistance group, which helps all *UOCAVA* populations. The VAO survey fulfills Section 20308(b) of 52 U.S.C., which requires FVAP to conduct statistical analyses to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in federal election years. The PEVS-SEO fulfills the obligations of *UOCAVA* (20301[b][1]), which directs FVAP to “consult with State and local election officials.”

Further, Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1000.04, Federal Voting Assistance Program, assigns the USD P&R as the Presidential designee; the responsibilities, however, are carried out by the FVAP Director. Under these authorities, FVAP provides voter registration and voting information to those eligible to vote in applicable U.S. elections. FVAP provides assistance directly via resources like the *Voting Assistance Guide* and *FVAP.gov*, but along with VAOs in the Military Services, SEOs are one of the key populations through which FVAP provides voting information for eligible voters.

In October 2009, *UOCAVA* was amended by the *MOVE Act*, Title V, Subtitle H of P.L. 111-84, National Defense Authorization Act Fiscal Year 2010. Among its provisions, the amended *UOCAVA* requires FVAP to evaluate the effectiveness of FVAP activities carried out under section 20305, assess voter registration and participation by absent Uniformed Services voters, describe the communication between States and the Federal Government in carrying out the requirements of *UOCAVA*, and describe the utilization of voter assistance under section 1566a of 10 U.S.C. As a result, FVAP contracted Fors Marsh Group (FMG) and the Department of Defense (DoD) Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) Defense Research, Surveys, and Statistics Center (RSSC) (now Office of People Analytics) to design, administer and analyze the PEVS-SEO. FVAP assists *UOCAVA* voters via a variety of channels and SEOs and LEOs are integral to these efforts. PEVS-SEO is thus necessary for FVAP to assess the status of SEO and LEO assistance to *UOCAVA* voters and effectively carry out the mandates of the *MOVE Act*.

1.2 | SEO Research Topics and Key Findings

This report evaluates the effectiveness of FVAP assistance to State Election Offices and seeks to answer key research questions using the 2016 PEVS-SEO. This is done by focusing on five key topics specific to the SEO population:

- 1) Resources
- 2) SEO and LEO interaction
- 3) Proposed SEO products and services
- 4) Registration and ballot issues
- 5) Council of State Governments' (CSG) Overseas Voting Initiative (OVI) recommendations

Overall, these analysis sections report a number of key findings:

- The vast majority of respondents used SEO-specific FVAP resources.
- SEOs and local officials communicate frequently, mostly via email and telephone, which facilitates the sharing and dissemination of needed information.
- The vast majority of SEOs are pleased with the general and SEO-specific materials and assistance they currently receive from FVAP.
- States show significant variation in how they deal with ballot and registration issues faced by *UOCAVA* voters. In particular, around half of responding States do not allow online registration of *UOCAVA* status, emphasizing the importance of FVAP's online assistant service.
- The vast majority of responding SEOs said their State had already implemented, or planned to implement, policy recommendations of the CSG's OVI Policy Working Group related to voter communication, online registration and the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA).
- More work remains on the fourth areas of recommendations related to engaging with the U.S. military community.

1.3 | Overview of Report Methodology

Unlike the previous surveys of LEOs, the design of the PEVS-SEO is significantly different, which has important implications for the findings of these research questions. Whereas the LEO surveys in 2014 and 2012 were samples of approximately 1,500 officials, PEVS-SEO is a census of all 55 current SEOs.

The new research and survey design came from the belief that FVAP could improve its understanding of how best

to support the election official community by focusing its efforts on SEOs. Doing so would reduce overall survey burden and make the data collection more efficient. Thus, the primary focus of this survey was soliciting customer satisfaction data and feedback on how to improve the delivery of FVAP services.

Because of these changes, the results presented below represent only the valid responses to the survey and have not been adjusted for sample weights. Importantly, this means that the results only speak to the attitudes and answers of those who responded to the survey. One cannot extrapolate the findings as applicable to the broader population of SEOs who did not respond to the survey or to future SEOs. Moreover, although many of the questions are similar to those addressed to LEOs in 2014 and 2012, the results are not comparable across time or populations.

Due to the census nature of the survey and restrictions on releasing personally identifiable information (PII) on individual States or SEOs, the results presented in this report are of a purely descriptive manner and are not broken down by demographics or other identifiable characteristics. These data are descriptive, not inferential statistics, which means they do not allow for correlational analysis using regression or hypothesis testing about the relationship between variables of interest. Descriptive statistics do allow one to visualize the data to identify patterns, both in terms of measures of central tendency, such as mean or median values, as well as the spread or variation in the responses. This information is the foundation for assessing customer satisfaction and most customer satisfaction studies stop at the descriptive statistic stage.¹ The survey provides a broad assessment of current SEO attitudes and experiences and offer lessons for improving the survey design and question choice for the next round of surveys.

1.4 | Outline of Report

This report begins with five analysis sections devoted to answering research questions specific to the SEO population. The first analysis section provides an overview of resource usage by SEOs in 2016 and their level of satisfaction with those resources. Following this section is an assessment of the interaction between SEOs and LEOs, including the frequency of contact, mode of interaction and type of information provided. The third section features a discussion of potential new assistance and training materials that could enhance current FVAP offerings. The final two analyses explore particular problems for UOCAVA voters that SEOs deal with and potential ways of dealing with the challenges. The fourth analysis section examines variation in current policies that States have in place for dealing with UOCAVA registration and ballot issues. The last analysis discusses a number of different suggestions from the CSG OVI and assesses the extent of current and future adoption of these recommendations by the States.

Following these analyses, the report turns to describing the full survey methodology of the 2016 PEVS-SEO data collection. This section begins by describing the design of the PEVS-SEO and how it relates to a pilot study conducted on the newly designed instrument. Next, the survey administration section discusses the

¹ Richard L. Oliver, 2015. *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, (Routledge), p. 29–30.

communication plan and how the survey was programmed, fielded and quality checked. The report concludes with a discussion of what these analyses mean for improving FVAP resources and services for SEOs, recommendations for future research and limitations of these analyses. Appendix A displays the survey instrument that SEOs were asked to respond to and Appendix B contains the communications sent to PEVS-SEO sample members. Finally, Appendix C of the report includes the full descriptive survey results for each question of the 2016 PEVS-SEO.

2.1 | Introduction

FVAP provides a wide variety of voting assistance materials, both in general and specifically for SEOs. As a customer service report, the central focus of the PEVS-SEO was SEO awareness and use of FVAP products and services, satisfaction with those services, and what steps, if any, were needed to improve them. FVAP is committed to providing high-quality customer service to all of its stakeholders and meeting their voting assistance needs. To do so effectively requires good data on current customer behavior and needs as well as taking steps to address any issues that may exist.

Customer satisfaction is a complex idea that can be difficult to measure in a single manner. This section begins with a discussion of customer satisfaction research and highlights some of the challenges with assessing customer satisfaction. The next section presents and analyzes descriptive statistics from three approaches to measuring customer satisfaction. First, it describes SEO use of FVAP resources and self-described satisfaction. Second, it describes SEO use of policy-related materials and self-described usefulness of those materials. Third, it explores whether SEOs agree with a number of different statements related to FVAP services.

Across the multiple questions presented here, the central finding is that among responding SEOs, there is high customer satisfaction with SEO-specific resources provided by FVAP.

2.2 | Research Questions

This section evaluates three related research questions:

- Are SEOs aware of and using FVAP products and services?
- Are they satisfied with the products and services?
- Can FVAP improve the type, quality or provision of the products and services?

2.3 | Customer Satisfaction

As is discussed further in the methodology section below, the PEVS-SEO dealt with this challenge by starting with a pilot survey and cognitive interviews with actual election officials to ensure that the phrases and question design were matching the intended issue. The survey also used multiple concepts of satisfaction, usefulness and agreement with a specific task to triangulate the concept of customer satisfaction.

There are many ways to define “customer satisfaction,” each of which captures a different aspect of the concept. Drawing from the academic literature on market research, a basic definition of “satisfaction” can be stated as “the consumer’s fulfillment response. It is the judgment that a product/service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (or is providing) a *pleasurable* level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under- or overfulfillment.”² Researchers also distinguish at the individual level between satisfaction with a single transaction versus the time-accumulated performance, meaning satisfaction accumulated over time through multiple transactions. For example, an SEO might have a difficult time finding the answer to a specific question from a local official and be dissatisfied with that transaction, but still be satisfied overall based on the ease with which they are able to do common tasks, such as downloading forms. The survey results here attempt to measure both of these aspects.

Satisfaction in this view is a result both of the effective performance of a good or service as well as the psychological filter connecting that performance to satisfaction. In this case, quality provision is not necessary for satisfaction to exist. Instead, the context of expectations also matters. The gap between performance and expectation can lead to higher levels of satisfaction, all else equal, if a good or service exceeds expectations. It can also lead to lower levels of satisfaction with a high level of performance, if that performance only meets, but does not surpass, expectations.

SEOs are a conduit by which FVAP transmits information and training materials to LEOs and the poll workers who interact with individual voters. A relevant example here is the connection between poll worker confidence and worker views of the training they receive.³ Research shows poll workers are more confident when they view their training as informative and relevant. Key to this perception is the gap between expectations and reality. Poll workers are sensitive to discrepancies between the training and the eventual task. Confidence is lower when there are differences between the training they receive and the eventual tasks they perform and they tend to also agree they have more problems completing tasks when this difference exists. FVAP helps SEOs bridge this gap and provide effective training to poll workers and other local officials in a myriad of ways.

²Richard L. Oliver, 2015. *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, (Routledge), p. 8.

³ Hall, Thad, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson. “Poll workers and the vitality of democracy: An early assessment.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40.04 (2007): 647–654.

FVAP provides a wide variety of general and SEO-specific materials, including:

- [Election Official \(EO\) newsletter](#)—The EO newsletter provides brief updates on topics of interest to EOs, including research updates, upcoming important dates and deadlines, and messages from FVAP leadership.
- [FVAP Research](#)—FVAP periodically releases in-depth research reports on topics that may be of interest to SEOs. Recent topics have included a model for estimating the number of U.S. citizens abroad and the voting-related needs of Wounded Warriors.
- [Public Policy Briefs](#)—FVAP monitors and researches relevant policy developments that may impact UOCAVA voters. FVAP produces and distributes these policy briefs to inform SEOs and legislators about the potential impacts.
- [Congressional Reports](#)—FVAP is mandated to produce annual reports to Congress assessing the effectiveness of FVAP in fulfilling its legislative duties and detailing FVAP’s activities and research initiatives of.
- [FVAP State Affairs Specialists](#)—State Affairs Specialists are FVAP staff members with expertise in State- and federal-level voting regulations and provide hands-on assistance to SEOs and LEOs in the form of trainings, briefings and information provision.
- [EO Online Training](#)—Accessible via FVAP.gov, the “Election Official Online Training” provides State- and role-specific training for EOs on relevant issues such as UOCAVA protections.
- [Address Look-Up Service](#)—Upon request, FVAP can look up ADM members’ addresses for EOs. The service does not extend to military members’ eligible family members or overseas citizens.
- [FVAP.gov](#)—FVAP.gov is the central location for accessing FVAP’s vast array of voting assistance information, research and contact information.

2.4 | Methodology

The PEVS-SEO deals with the challenge of measuring and quantifying customer satisfaction by approaching the concept from a number of different angles. The process started with a pilot survey and cognitive interviews with actual EOs to ensure that the design of the phrases and questions was getting at the intended issue. Additionally, the survey used multiple concepts of satisfaction, usefulness and agreement with a specific task to triangulate the concept of customer satisfaction.


As discussed above, customer satisfaction is not driven purely by a single, objective measure of quality. Thus, this section uses data from the PEVS-SEO to define customer satisfaction in multiple ways. It includes data on satisfaction with resources as well as self-reported awareness and usage of resources. Awareness and usage are included, as respondents need to have experience with FVAP’s before they can discuss their level of satisfaction. As a census of SEOs, the section reports descriptive statistics summarizing the distribution of

responses as a percentage, rather than as a count of individual responses. The percentages are based on the number of valid respondents, but may not add up to 100 percent if some individuals chose not to respond to an individual question.

2.5 | Results

Figure 2.1 shows the level of SEO awareness of key FVAP services. The three broadest types of services all surpassed 90 percent awareness among responding SEOs, with FVAP.gov at 100 percent, FVAP Staff Support at 94 percent and State Affairs Specialists at 92 percent. Less-well-known services were the online training and FVAP address look-up service, with 73 percent and 63 percent awareness, respectively.


Figure 2.1: Awareness of FVAP Resources



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Figure 2.1 shows the percentage of respondents who used each resource when limited only to those who were aware of the resource. In comparing Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2, awareness and use follow the same pattern in rank order, but the magnitude of use did not align directly with awareness. One-hundred percent of responding SEOs were aware of FVAP.gov and 96 percent of them used it. Ninety-two percent of respondents were aware of the State Affairs Specialists, but only 73 percent of those had interacted with them. Similarly, 73 percent of respondents were aware of the online training, but only 39 percent of responding SEOs used that training. The biggest gap between awareness and use was with the address look-up service, with 63 percent being aware and 16 percent using the service.


Figure 2.2: FVAP Resource Usage



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents that were aware of each resource. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

In Figure 2.3, which shows the strong customer satisfaction that FVAP has achieved, it is not a lack of satisfaction with online training and the address look-up service that is holding back usage and referrals to LEOs. Responding SEOs were most satisfied with FVAP State Affairs Specialists, with 79 percent being very satisfied and the remainder satisfied. Online training was slightly less successful, with 64 percent being very satisfied, 29 percent satisfied, and 7 percent neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Although the number of SEOs using the address look-up service was small, those who did use it were pleased with their experience, as 60 percent were very satisfied and the other 40 percent were satisfied. The most commonly used resource, FVAP.gov, was also very effective. Six percent of responding SEOs were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, with the remaining responses split between very satisfied (55 percent) and regular satisfied (38 percent).

Figure 2.3: Satisfaction with FVAP Resources




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

a. SEO Policy-Related Products

Satisfaction can be an amorphous term to define, so the survey also included questions that dealt with the usefulness of specific FVAP policy-related products. Figure 2.4 details which policy products the SEOs reported using. The most popular was the EO newsletter, which was used by 80 percent of responding SEOs. The more in-depth policy resources were not as widely used, with 47 percent of responding SEOs saying they used FVAP research materials, 37 percent used public policy research papers, and 29 percent using the Congressional Reports. These lower use numbers may be the result of the more narrow substantive issues addressed in specific research papers, compared to the wide-ranging issues and appeal of the online newsletter, rather than any variation in perceived quality.


Figure 2.4: Usage of FVAP Policy-Related Resources



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Similar to the satisfaction numbers discussed previously on Figure 2.3, Figure 2.5 shows the level of satisfaction with FVAP’s policy-related materials. All of the SEOs answering the questions viewed the different materials as somewhat useful or better. The most useful resource was FVAP research materials, which 52 percent found very useful and an additional 43 percent thought was useful. The various public policy papers were described as useful or very useful by 95 percent of the respondents. Although the EO Online Newsletter was the most commonly used public policy resource, the proportion of SEOs rating the newsletter as very useful or useful was slightly lower at 84 percent, which is still high. The EO online training had a similar total evaluation, but answers were split differently, with 64 percent of all responding SEOs rating the online training as useful, compared to 46 percent for the newsletter.

Figure 2.5: Usefulness of FVAP Policy-Related Resources




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

b. FVAP Portal

The FVAP *Voting Assistance Guide (Guide)* was also seen as an important resource. Eighty percent of those responding said that someone in their office had used the FVAP portal to edit their State information to be used in the *Guide*. As Figure 2.6 shows, a combined 77 percent of the responding SEOs found the portal to be either very useful or useful for editing information to be included in the *Guide*, which is lower than the satisfaction with the general resources discussed above. 13 percent of those responding saw the portal as not useful for updating their State information and 8 percent who thought it was only somewhat useful. This response could be due to a matter of user interface, individual comfort level with technology or some other issue. This question did not have a follow-on, open-ended question asking why, which could be a useful addition for future research or the next iteration of the survey.

Figure 2.6: FVAP.gov Portal Usefulness




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

c. Application of FVAP Information

Finally, SEOs were presented with three key statements about the quality of FVAP recommendations and asked to agree or disagree with each statement related to the information provided by FVAP. Eighty percent of those responding agreed or strongly agreed that FVAP information helped resolve general questions LEOs might have. Nearly exactly the same proportion agreed with the statement that FVAP helped with UOCAVA laws. Finally, 68 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that FVAP helped LEOs be more effective. When SEO respondents were asked about their satisfaction in terms of applying FVAP information to knowledge areas, satisfaction was still high but slightly more respondents expressed dissatisfaction. Unlike the previous questions, this set of questions did have SEOs who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the effectiveness of certain aspects of FVAP information. This was a small fraction, however, that never exceeded 8 percent of responding SEOs.

Figure 2.7: FVAP Information Usefulness



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

2.6 | Discussion and Conclusion

This section began with a discussion of customer satisfaction and some of the challenges with measurement. The results section presented descriptive statistics from three different ways of measuring customer satisfaction. First, it described SEO utilization of FVAP resources and self-described satisfaction. Second, it detailed SEO use of policy-related materials and self-described usefulness of those materials. Third, it explored whether SEOs agreed with a number of different statements related to FVAP services. It showed a number of key findings:

- The vast majority of SEOs are aware of FVAP’s key SEO-specific and policy related resources.
- Among those aware of the resources, fewer SEOs used a resource than were aware of it, outside of broad usage of FVAP.gov
- The gap between awareness and usage of EO online training is large and presents an opportunity to target for increased growth.
- The vast majority of responding SEOs are satisfied with the SEO-specific and policy-related materials from FVAP.

The results of this section provide both good news and questions regarding FVAP’s provision of services and the satisfaction that SEOs have with those services. Fundamentally, SEOs are aware of the big-picture services that

FVAP provides and are consistently satisfied with all the services they use. In terms of one of its core missions, FVAP is successful in providing needed services to the SEOs who responded to the survey.

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 above suggest that FVAP faces both an opportunity and a note of caution. Given the high levels of both awareness and usage of FVAP.gov and the State Affairs Specialists, it is surprising that awareness and usage of online training and the look-up services are so low. With SEOs already using FVAP.gov, it should be possible to direct more of those visitors to use the online training and address look-up service. This pool of SEOs could be targeted with more direct information about those two services to increase awareness and utilization. However, simply increasing awareness is unlikely to be sufficient, if current SEO behavior is a guide. Currently, there is a large drop-off between awareness and use; if such a gap continued in the face of increased levels of awareness, the actual increase in utilization might be relatively small. It is impossible to know what percentage of those responding SEOs who do not know about the online training would have used it if only they were aware of it. If the group of SEOs that is not aware of the online training behaves in the same manner as those SEOs who were aware, informing all of the remaining 27 percent currently unaware of online training would only increase usage by about 14 percentage points if there were 100 percent awareness. Thus, an emphasis on using the services and why SEOs should use them appears equally or more important than simple awareness of the services. FVAP is currently conducting a user experience (UX) audit of FVAP.gov that may help identify ways to close the gap between awareness and use.

Satisfaction is a complex concept; however, individuals' satisfaction with an organization depends on how broadly their experience is defined. Satisfaction can focus on a single interaction with a particular product or encompass the accumulated experience with the organization as a whole. FVAP is particularly successful at the broadest level, both as an organization, but also in terms of FVAP.gov. The topline level of satisfaction is not simply the additive sum of satisfaction with each individual SEO-specific resource. In other words, an SEO may have a frustrating experience with a public policy report, for example, but that is unlikely to define their overall view. This can also help explain how awareness and satisfaction of the umbrella item of FVAP.gov can be so high, whereas smaller subsets of resources on that same page can have substantially lower levels of awareness and usage, which is consistent with the research on satisfaction discussed above.

More puzzling was the disjuncture between the level of satisfaction with FVAP online training resources, which was high, and the level of usage, which was low. In general, the variation in usage by SEOs did not track closely with satisfaction or awareness. This finding suggests that simple marketing activities to increase awareness among SEOs are not sufficient to increase usage of FVAP resources. It could be that simple awareness does not entail complete understanding of what a service provides. There could be a disjuncture between what SEOs actually need and the nuances of what FVAP actually offers.

As the questions went further away from strictly asking about satisfaction there was more variation in response on the bottom end of disappointment with FVAP resources. However, the level of disappointment was never particularly large. Nevertheless, there is always room for improvement and the methodological limitations of the census approach means that FVAP cannot project these results onto the whole population of SEO staff members currently and in the future. Future research could be focused on identifying what the sources of dissatisfaction

are, either through focus groups, adding more open-ended questions to the survey, or changing questions to focus on more concrete uses of FVAP materials as well as potential gaps between SEO expectations of FVAP materials and the actual experiences.

For example, comparing the relative differences between the three questions in Figure 2.7, which are less direct ways of measuring satisfaction, is useful for getting at the potential issues of high expectations impacting satisfaction. The proportion of agreement is basically the same for whether FVAP helps resolve LEO questions and helps with *UOCAVA* issues; there is less support for the statement that FVAP helps LEOs be more effective. The proportion of strongly disagree and disagree are about the same, but the percentage of respondents that were indifferent, neither agreeing nor disagreeing, was about twice as high as the first two questions.

These results could also relate to the gap between the high usage of informational resources, such as FVAP.gov and the EO newsletter, which would help both answer LEO questions as well as explain *UOCAVA* laws, and online training. Online training, which has a more direct connection to helping LEOs be more effective, was relatively underused and could contribute to the higher number of SEOs responding in a neutral fashion. These questions would also be prime candidates for follow-on, open-ended questions to understand the specific complaints of those small numbers of respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statements.

Future research could investigate further the SEO views of what their local officials' needs are. It could be that LEOs have needs that have not been articulated to SEOs because they did not know that FVAP offered that type of assistance or the local officials may have explicitly said they did not have a particular need. Current satisfaction is high with the issues asked about by the survey, but there may be additional needs that are not articulated because SEOs or the survey have not asked.

SEO and LEO Interaction

3.1 | Introduction

SEOs serve as an important conduit of information from FVAP to LEOs. With thousands of local jurisdictions and offices, it is beneficial for FVAP to interact with the 55 SEOs and allow the State-level officials to pass on information relevant to the needs of their local stakeholders. This division of labor requires an effective transfer of information, free of roadblocks or bottlenecks. If SEOs do not pass along the information and assistance they receive from FVAP, then the LEOs and voters will not receive the help they need. FVAP needs to know that SEOs are connecting LEOs to relevant resources. If SEOs are not, then FVAP needs to know why in order to take steps to address those concerns or problems.

This section begins by describing basic structure of the relationship between SEOs and LEOs, the responsibilities of each and why communication between them is important. Second, it describes the numerous modes of communication available to SEOs and the relative frequency with which they use them. It then discusses the different resources that SEOs can refer local officials to and the reasons why they might choose not to share those resources.

The central finding is that SEOs are in constant communication with their LEOs, mostly via email and phone calls. Referral rates vary by the resource in question, with online training having a surprisingly low rate. Referral rates, however, do not track with views on usefulness or awareness. Instead, the biggest factor for non-referral is that the LEOs simply do not have a need for that type of assistance or are able to get the need filled by an alternative source of information.

3.2 | Research Questions

This section deals with three related research questions:

- How are SEOs interacting with LEOs?
- How often and by what mode do SEOs communicate with LEOs?
- Are SEOs sharing and referring FVAP resources with LEOs? If not, why?

3.3 | State and Local Election Officials

Effective campaign administration requires effective communication between State and local officials, as laws at the federal and State level can change leading to new or different responsibilities for officials. Elections are a complex endeavor, especially when considering the needs of absentee and *UOCAVA* voters who can be located large distances from the local official. These responsibilities create a demand for election assistance from FVAP by both SEOs and LEOs.

Within nearly every State, elections are the responsibility of LEOs who actually administer the elections. They hire poll workers, find polling places, transmit absentee ballots, carry out in-person voting on Election Day, collect and count the ballots, and follow through after the election with steps needed to certify the election. The State Election Office is responsible for ensuring local election offices complete these critical activities and conform to applicable laws, regulations and approved practices. SEOs provide guidance to LEOs when questions arise, usually perform some level of training and professional development for their LEOs and oversee confirmation that LEOs are performing their jobs properly.

Beyond management and oversight, SEOs often directly assist voters with various election services. With the adoption of the *Help America Vote Act (HAVA)*, SEOs are responsible for the voter registration database in their State. This includes developing a procedure for processing voter registration applications and a method for keeping the database current. State Election Offices also typically check the ballots used in each jurisdiction to ensure that the actual ballot is accurate; they also provide broad voter education materials on the internet as well as print. After an election, the SEO plays a critical role in collecting the results from each LEO and certifying all State and federal election results.

SEOs are usually a component of a Secretary of State's Office; however some States locate the SEO in a Board of Elections. SEO staff size varies based on what activities the office performs, but often includes information technology staff that manage election data and voter registration, a legal staff and staff to interact with local election offices.

The majority of local election authorities are elected, but approximately 15 percent of localities have election offices that are governed by an appointed individual and 22 percent use an appointed board. Rural areas and less-populated counties and towns are more likely to have elected individual officials, whereas more densely populated urban and suburban jurisdictions are more likely to use an appointed individual. Nearly half of the local jurisdictions in the United States use partisan election authorities.⁴

In most States, the Secretary of State is the chief election official. This person is typically a partisan, elected official. The Secretary typically delegates the management of elections to an appointed Election Director. This


⁴ Kimball, David C., and Martha Kropf. "The Street-Level Bureaucrats of Elections: Selection Methods for Local Election Officials." *Review of Policy Research* 23.6 (2006): 1257–1268.

distribution of responsibility between SEOs and LEOs highlights the need for positive and meaningful interaction to help fulfil all the State and local voting assistance duties. FVAP resources and services are designed to help both SEOs and LEOs and to facilitate efficient interactions between these two populations.

3.4 | Results

In line with the previous results that showed LEOs getting most of their assistance via their own State’s election office, the PEVS-SEO found that responding SEOs are in frequent contact with their local officials and use a variety of methods for communicating with them. Figure 3.1 shows the modes of communication and their frequency of use among the responding SEOs. Email was the dominant form of interaction, with 65 percent using email daily and 92 percent either daily or weekly. Phone or conference calls were the second most popular choice, with more than half of respondents making phone calls daily and 67 percent when combining daily and weekly contact. Ninety-one percent of respondents communicated via phone or conference call at least monthly. Finally, just under half of SEOs used the State website or app to communicate at least weekly. Social media, regular mail, and in-person meetings and conferences were less likely to be used daily or weekly.

Figure 3.1: Methods of Communication



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.


On a monthly basis, phone calls, regular mail, and in-person contact were the most frequent responses, with between a quarter and 30 percent of respondents. And while social media and the State website were used

frequently by a certain portion of the respondents, they were also the two specific choices that SEOs were most likely to never use, with 65 percent never using social media and 37 percent never using the State website or app.

These results suggest both opportunities and challenges for improving communication. The low level of social media use shows potential for growth, depending on what is driving the low level of use. In contrast to answering a phone call or reaching out to an LEO, social media requires a more active investment of time and resources to monitor an account. Social media is also more open to the public, all else equal, which may limit its usefulness in providing certain kinds of information to local officials.

Unsurprisingly, SEOs were more likely to refer FVAP resources that were broad in nature. In their interactions with local officials, SEOs consistently refer LEOs to FVAP.gov, with 90 percent of respondents having done so. FVAP.gov is a multifaceted resource that contains information on a wide variety of issues, which makes it the likely first stop for any voting-related question.


Figure 3.2: Referring FVAP Resources



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

The second most common resources suggested by SEOs were online training and FVAP staff support, each of which were referred by 37 percent. This finding makes sense as these are more specific resources that deal with a more narrow range of issues. Least common, with around one-quarter of the SEOs making referrals, were the FVAP address look-up service and FVAP State Affairs Specialists.


Figure 3.3: FVAP Staff Support Referral



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Figure 3.3 shows that the probability of referral was contingent on the subject matter. Responses loosely fell into two groups, one in which around half of SEOs referred the LEOs to FVAP and a second group in which between 20 percent and 25 percent of SEOs made a referral. Needing voting supplies and receiving training or resources were the most common referral issues, at 50 percent, followed closely by updating contact information at 44 percent, and resolving an LEO problem with 39 percent. Less common, but central to FVAP’s mission to support UOCAVA voters, 22 percent of the SEOs made referrals to obtain clarification on UOCAVA issues. Least common and reinforcing the theme of strong overall satisfaction with FVAP assistance, only 17 percent of respondents referred LEOs to suggest changes to FVAP publications or programs.


Figure 3.4: FVAP.gov Non-Referral



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

As part of the customer-satisfaction focus on the study, it is important for FVAP to understand the reasoning behind why SEOs did not refer specific resources to LEOs. Figures 3.4 through 3.6 show that responding SEOs chose not to refer FVAP because their local officials did not need assistance on a particular issue. For FVAP.gov, 80 percent of those responding said this was the reason they did not make a referral. For FVAP staff support, that number was 48 percent, with 17 percent getting comparable help from another resource that served as a substitute for staff support. Seventy-two percent of respondents did not refer officials to the address look-up service because it was not needed and 6 percent because they received similar help elsewhere.


Figure 3.5: Not Referring FVAP Staff Support



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

These three questions indicate that referral decisions are more related to the perceived need by LEOs rather than perceptions of quality or usefulness of the service. SEOs and LEOs have a bidirectional relationship that is not solely top-down or bottom-up in nature. The frequency and content of their communication emerges from the interaction of the demand from local officials and the supply of resources from FVAP. This communication serves both to keep SEOs informed of the needs of their stakeholders, but also for SEOs to inform LEOs about the services and information available from FVAP. For those issues in which SEOs perceive a demand from LEOs, they are more likely to supply that assistance and refer FVAP resources.

Figure 3.6: Address Look-Up Service Non-Referral



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

3.5 | Discussion and Conclusion

The analysis described the frequency, mode, and motivation for interactions between SEOs and LEOs. Significant variation exists across all three of these dimensions. It showed a number of key findings:

- Email was the most common form of communication, with more than 90 percent of SEOs using email to communicate with LEOs on a daily or weekly basis. Telephone or conference calls were the second most common form, with around two-thirds communicating on a daily or weekly basis.
- Social media was the least common form of communication, with nearly two-thirds never using it to communicate with LEOs.
- Referral of FVAP materials was driven more by perceived need or demand from LEOs rather than issues with quality or usefulness of FVAP products.

SEOs play a significant role in providing information and training to LEOs and feedback from those stakeholders to FVAP. Communication and information transfer remains a central mission of FVAP and SEOs alike. This

section summarized the level and mode of communication between SEOs and LEOs. Although not every mode of communication is used every day, State and local officials are in daily or weekly contact via email or phone. Less common forms of interaction include social media and in-person visits. Future research could investigate the reasons behind the relatively low level of engagement with social media. This low level could be due to a generational gap that will erode over time as Millennials move up in the workforce and election administration world. In addition, there could be job-specific reasons why social media does not lend itself to meeting the needs of State and local officials.

In their communications with local officials, SEOs are consistent in their referral of FVAP.gov as the main source of FVAP assistance. They are less consistent referring the specific subsets of FVAP materials and resources. This finding is potentially confusing, given that many of those same resources are accessible via FVAP.gov. This disconnect could be due to the structure of the survey questions, how the respondents interpreted the questions or how local officials approach SEOs for help. In asking about both FVAP.gov and the specific aspects of FVAP assistance, the 90 percent referral rate for FVAP.gov could be capturing referrals to specific resources, but the SEO may simply tell a LEO to go to FVAP.gov in response to a specific question related to training. There is a high level of communication with multiple modes, but FVAP may want to explore suggesting best practices for what resources to refer to LEOs.

Proposed SEO Products and Services

4.1 | Introduction

FVAP is not merely interested in ensuring SEOs have access to and are satisfied with current SEO-specific voting assistance resources, but also want to ensure that these SEOs have input in future resources. The previous sections established that SEOs are very satisfied with the current FVAP services that they consume. This section turns to the level of satisfaction with the breadth of FVAP offerings. Election administration is not a static environment and election officials may have changing needs that require new resources or different kinds of assistance. To be proactive, FVAP included a number of questions in the survey that focused on potential additions or new approaches to assess the reaction of SEOs.

This section begins by summarizing some of the potential new resources that FVAP could provide to election officials. Second, it focuses on one specific potential offering: an address-matching service for *UOCAVA* voters. It explores both past experience with similar products and likelihood of using a service if offered. The section concludes with a discussion of how SEOs view these potential training topics, materials, and formats and how useful they would be in meeting current or future needs.

4.2 | Research Questions

- Would SEOs use a *UOCAVA* military database-matching service if FVAP offered one?
- How useful do SEOs view potential resources, such as future training topics, fact sheets and policy-related projects?

4.3 | Current and Potential Resources

FVAP currently provides a wide range of services to election officials at the State and local level. Via the FVAP.gov website, FVAP provides information on implementing *UOCAVA*. It provides outreach materials,

including a “communications toolkit” designed for election officials, infographics, fact sheets,⁵ and Service-specific advertisements for local media, posters, and videos. The fact sheets are one- or two-page, full-color handouts that address topics such as “Absentee Voting: Myths and Realities” and how to use the FPCA. FVAP also provides policy briefs and other research materials that provide analysis of policy topics relevant to election officials and *UOCAVA* voters.⁶ Election officials can also take State-specific online training via FVAP.gov.

Beyond these currently offered SEO-specific services, FVAP sought SEOs feedback in the PEVS-SEO for a new database matching service. Database matching was presented as a service to potentially increase accuracy in contacting voters. The service would allow SEOs to compare their entire State database of *UOCAVA* military voters to a secondary database of address information. This service would permit the identification of active duty personnel and potential changes in addresses in order to issue address confirmation notices.

In addition to the address matching service, FVAP is also considering expanding the scope of its fact sheets, training topics, and modes of training. Potential fact-sheet topics include state post-election data, state demographics of *UOCAVA* voters, information on different modes of transmission for absentee ballots, jurisdiction maps, and state voting deadlines. New training topics included common reasons why FPCAs and FWABs are rejected, demographics of military *UOCAVA* voters, and state legislative activities related to voting.


4.4 | Results

Despite a strong baseline of satisfaction with FVAP services, there is always room for improvement and change to address new or unaddressed issues that are salient to SEOs or LEOs. To be proactive along this dimension, FVAP included a number of questions in the PEVS-SEO about the desirability or usefulness of potential new services that FVAP could provide.

⁵ See https://www.fvap.gov/uploads/FVAP/Outreach-Materials/FVAP_ElectionOfficials_20150827.pdf

⁶ See https://www.fvap.gov/uploads/FVAP/EO/FVAPNeverResidedPolicyBrief_20170222_FINAL.pdf


Figure 4.1: Previous Experience with Database-Matching Service



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 display how responding SEOs viewed the suggested database-matching service for *UOCAVA* voters. Only 10 percent of respondents had any previous experience with a similar address-matching database. Nevertheless, nearly 60 percent said they were very likely or likely to use such a service, were FVAP to provide it. Only six percent said they were not at all likely to use such a service. Given the low level of actual experience with an address-matching service, it is unclear what the responses about using an FVAP-provided service actually indicate.

Figure 4.2: Potential Use of FVAP Database-Matching Service




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

a. Potential Training Topics, Fact Sheets and Policy-Related Projects

As discussed in the previous section, SEOs consistently find current FVAP offerings to be useful. When contemplating future offerings, respondents showed more variation in opinion. The survey solicited opinions on three types of potential offerings: (1) fact sheets, (2) training topics, and (3) policy-related topics.

FVAP is considering developing State-specific fact sheets on *UOCAVA*-relevant election statistics that would be intended for SEOs and LEOs. Overall, Figure 4.3 shows that the responding SEOs were very much in favor of these fact sheets, with at least 60 percent saying that each option would be useful or very useful. Only two of the choices, information on modes of transmission and State voting deadlines, had more than 5 percent responding that the fact sheet would not be useful. Of these two, the weakest support was for State voting deadlines, in which 22 percent of respondents said it would not be useful, and an additional 16 percent responding that it would be somewhat useful. These findings suggest that State deadlines would not be a desirable future State-specific fact sheet for SEOs.

Figure 4.3: Usefulness of Potential FVAP Resources




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

FVAP provides numerous training opportunities, both in person and online, and the survey asked SEOs which new training topics would be most useful for the LEOs in their State. Figure 4.4 displays these results. Overall, every potential topic was seen as useful or very useful by at least two-thirds of those who responded to each question. What did vary, however, was the balance between useful and very useful. The most popular item—which 94 percent of respondents said would be useful (31 percent) or very useful (63 percent)—was common voter problems. Mailing and emailing materials was a close second with 29 percent responding useful and 63 percent very useful. Next were FPCA and Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot (FWAB) rejection (86 percent combined useful and very useful) and UOCAVA laws (78 percent combined), with 49 percent and 39 percent respectively rating them as very useful. The remaining topics all had approximately 30 percent of respondents viewing the choice as very useful, except for State legislative activities, which was rated very useful by only 16 percent of those responding.

Thus, although all the potential topics were seen as being useful to some degree, the broader the subject and the potential audience were, the more useful the potential topic would be rated. For prioritizing which training topics to address first, FVAP may want to focus its energy on those general issues before addressing topics with a narrower focus.

Figure 4.4: Usefulness of Potential Training Topics




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

In providing training on these different topics, FVAP may want to offer training in multiple formats to best suit the training format preferences of SEOs. Figure 4.5 shows the responses of SEOs rating four concrete examples—State conferences, online training modules, webinars and in-person training. Although all four examples were rated around 90 percent somewhat useful or above, there was a rank order preference in terms of the most-useful scores. With 51 percent of respondents rating it as very useful, the State conference was the most popular choice, followed by online training modules at 39 percent. Webinars and in-person training were next, with 29 percent and 24 percent rating them as very useful. Least useful, and not presented in the graph, was the other training format option, which 36 percent said was not useful and 39 percent said would only be somewhat useful.

In the results presented here, there is no clear aversion to online training modules, as this training format is the choice that has the smallest percentage of respondents describing it as not useful. This finding is somewhat surprising, given that Figures 2.1 and 2.2 show awareness (73 percent) and usage (39 percent) of FVAP online training being relatively low.

Figure 4.5: Usefulness of Potential Training Formats



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

The main point here is that SEOs see most forms of training as being useful for their LEOs, but beyond that, it is hard to draw a clear conclusion. It is unclear what the perceived differences are between a webinar and online training modules or what that would mean for online versus in-person training. Without a clear preference for training type, FVAP may want to continue to provide options and allow SEOs to choose the method that works best for them. The vast majority of those SEOs responding said that online training modules would be useful, yet their revealed and self-reported actions do not line up.

4.5 | Discussion and Conclusion

The analysis summarized potential new resources that FVAP could provide to election officials. In particular, it focused on an address-matching service for UOCAVA voters. It then discussed a number of additional potential offerings and how SEOs viewed the usefulness of these training topics, materials, and formats in meeting current or future needs.

It showed a number of key findings:

- SEOs were very enthusiastic about a potential address-matching database

- New resources covering post-election data and demographic information on *UOCAVA* voters were seen as the most useful
- Broader training topics that had general applications were seen as more desirable than narrowly-focused issues, such as state legislative activities
- SEOs showed no clear preference for in-person versus online forms of training, although state conferences had the highest level of support.

In contemplating adjustments to the services offered, FVAP starts from a position of strength, in that SEOs are already highly satisfied with the services they are receiving. Given this strong baseline and broad current offerings, the unmet needs of SEOs appear relatively low. However, given the broad support for potential new resources, it could be that existing needs are being met, but that SEOs are hungry for additional resources that can help them.

Indeed, providing an address-matching service could be the sort of example that is potentially useful, despite limited previous experience among the SEOs. For *UOCAVA* voters, receiving their absentee ballots in a timely manner and in the correct location is often a challenge, especially if they change addresses frequently. With the decentralized nature of the American voting system, these challenges are even greater. A centralized address-matching system could provide significant assistance to election officials serving *UOCAVA* voters by helping ensure that voters receive their ballots on time while increasing efficiency for election officials who would waste fewer resources sending ballots to incorrect or out-of-date addresses.

Responding SEOs showed substantial enthusiasm for such a service. However, this enthusiasm is not guaranteed to necessarily translate into actual use of a service, were FVAP to provide it. If this resource is implemented, it would be important to address the lack of prior SEO experience. Around 90 percent of responding SEOs have had no experience with a resource and would need to be guided in materials on how to use it and why. It is one thing to express support for something hypothetically, as individuals can project their own views of what such a service would entail. With the other possible additions, SEOs have experience with similar items, such as fact sheets and policy briefings, even if the exact topic would be new. As discussed above, customer satisfaction is driven by the interaction of expectations with performance as much as by an objective level of service performance. SEO expectations may be such that an initial use of the service could leave them disappointed or merely indifferent to the service, even if the service fulfilled 100 percent of its intended function.

A similar caveat could be made for any of the potential resources for which SEOs lack significant previous experience. It could be that the expressed level of support for potential services would be even higher if more SEOs knew how such a service would be helpful. It could be a more honest answer, if they have not been primed or biased in one way or the other based on a previous interaction. Or, it could be an indication that there is a sharp need for such a service and FVAP would be well positioned to fill that void. Or they may not actually have any use for it, but it sounds like something they would use. Future qualitative research would be better suited to understand why or why not SEOs want or need these suggested resources.

SEOs serve in a unique situation, in that they are both consumers of services from FVAP and a service provider to their own LEOs. This dual position likely impacts their views of the potential usefulness of new products and services. The results in this section reveal a general preference for broadly focused and more open-ended services over narrowly focused topics. Narrow topics are more likely to serve a smaller, niche role in the day-to-day operations of an SEO, whereas broad topics and resources are likely to be used frequently.

Finally, given the general equality of preference for the different training formats, future iterations of the survey may need to ask more fine-grained questions about the training preferences, similar to questions asked in the PEVS-VAO survey. These questions asked about preferred training methods and reasons for those preferences, such as preferring hands-on learning.

A background image of a financial chart with a blue grid, a yellow line, and red and blue bars, set against a dark blue background.

Registration/Ballot Issues

5.1 | Introduction

Assisting *UOCAVA* voters is FVAP's core mission; but one of the myriad problems that *UOCAVA* voters face is ensuring that they achieve the full protections they are allowed as *UOCAVA* voters. Despite protections being defined at the federal level, States deviate in key dimensions of how they establish a voter's *UOCAVA* status and implement the protections. Thus, it is important for FVAP to understand what States are doing so that training and assistance materials can accurately reflect the regulatory environment and, in turn, ensure that aforementioned proper training and assistance.

This section focuses on the registration and ballot issues that LEOs and *UOCAVA* voters deal with. Due to the decentralized nature of the American voting system, there is the potential for significant variation in how States implement different federal regulations related to voting and protections for *UOCAVA* voters. This section begins with a discussion of the statutory responsibilities that SEOs have in implementing *UOCAVA*. It then details the different policies that States apply in carrying out these obligations. The section then concludes with a discussion of the potential costs and benefits of the variation in State approaches to dealing with the various registration and ballot issues.

Overall, the responses discussed in this section show a fair amount of flexibility for *UOCAVA* voters compared to other absentee voters when it comes to meeting absentee ballot requests. This flexibility is helpful for individual cases, especially in States where regular absentee ballot regulations are particularly strict. More “flexible” State registration and ballot policies may allow *UOCAVA* voters to either better avoid a rejected ballot or more easily request and return their ballot. However, such flexibility makes for large variability and thus uncertainty for voters. It also means that the level of *UOCAVA* protection is not uniformly applied, both across jurisdictions, but potentially within them as well.

5.2 | Research Questions

- How do States handle specific registration and ballot request issues for *UOCAVA* voters?

5.3 | SEOs and UOCAVA Voters

In fulfilling the obligations of the amended *UOCAVA*, States vary on how they deal with registration and ballot request issues for *UOCAVA* voters. *UOCAVA* states that although States are required to implement *UOCAVA*, SEOs may delegate administrative responsibilities associated with *UOCAVA* voting to local election offices. Specifically, the legislation states:

“Nothing in the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.) may be construed to prohibit a State from delegating its responsibilities in carrying out the requirements of such Act, including any requirements imposed as a result of the provisions of and amendments made by this Act.”

SEOs have several important responsibilities, including:


- Designating a single State office to provide information on registration and absentee ballot procedures for all voters in the State;
- Reporting data within 90 days of each federal election on *UOCAVA* voting in the State;
- Notifying *UOCAVA* voters with a reason should their absentee ballot request be rejected; and
- Establishing procedures for the electronic transmission of blank ballots to *UOCAVA* voters.

In fulfilling these obligations, however, States vary on how they deal with registration and ballot request issues for *UOCAVA* voters. *UOCAVA* voters have multiple ways to register to vote and request an absentee ballot, including the local State forms or the FPCA. Variation in how States treat the FPCA means that *UOCAVA* voters face potential confusion over how they register and receive ballots, as well as potential rejection of registration or ballot requests if they do not follow their State’s particular guidelines.

5.4 | Results

The most basic rule governing FPCAs is when voters can submit an FPCA for an upcoming election. This rule is important for *UOCAVA* voters, as they may think to re-register to vote or establish an absentee ballot request as part of the process of moving to a new location outside of their voting jurisdiction. For the November 2016 General Election, the vast majority of States did not begin accepting FPCAs to register voters until after the 1st of January. As shown in Figure 5.1, only 20 percent of responders said their State accepted FPCAs before January 1, 2016. In these States, an FPCA submitted in December would not carry over into the election year and would need to be resubmitted in January.


Figure 5.1: FPCAs Acceptance Before January 1, 2016



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Figure 5.2 shows that states were more flexible in letting *UOCAVA* voters register to vote online, with just over half of responding SEOs saying they allowed online registration for *UOCAVA*. Online registration is likely to be of extra importance to *UOCAVA* voters, especially those who are overseas where regular mail access may be ineffective or slow, or where they are so highly mobile that maintaining a valid, stable regular mailing address may be difficult.


Figure 5.2: Online UOCAVA Voter Registration System



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Of all the State registration policies asked about, States varied the most in how they treated the FPCA as a permanent registration form. As Figure 5.3 shows, If UOCAVA voters used the FPCA to register, then the State would consider that voter to be permanently registered in 82 percent of States that responded.

Figure 5.3: FPCA Permanent Registration




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Many States were also accommodating when dealing with registration and ballot request deadlines. Figure 5.4 shows how States treated an FPCA from a previously unregistered voter that was received after the voter registration deadline but before the absentee ballot request deadline. Nearly one-third of respondents said their State rejected the FPCA for registration as well as ballot request. Ten percent accepted the FPCA for only the current election. The remaining 57 percent responded “other,” which allowed open-ended responses for elaboration. Within the “other” category, there were a wide variety of answers.⁷ For example, respondents noted their States allow same-day registration, which meant FPCAs were accepted up to Election Day. Other States had special waivers for *UOCAVA* or military voters or followed up with voters if sufficient contact information had been provided.

⁷ To maintain non-identifiability of responders, the open-ended responses are only discussed generally here.


Figure 5.4: FPCA Application Deadlines



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Thus, it is important that voters are able to identify themselves as *UOCAVA* voters. The easiest way to do this is with the FPCA, which is explicitly for *UOCAVA* voters. If a voter does not use the FPCA, he or she can still obtain *UOCAVA* protections, depending on the form he or she uses to register. As displayed in Figure 5.5, 69 percent of SEOs responded that their State allowed voters to use a State form with *UOCAVA* status selected on the form. Even if the voter failed to select that option, 65 percent of respondents would still provide *UOCAVA* status if something else in the application indicated the voter was *UOCAVA*, such as an overseas address. And 57 percent of responding SEOs said their State accepted any other form that indicated the voter had *UOCAVA* status. Even though many States were flexible, these results underline the importance of FVAP emphasizing the FPCA to *UOCAVA* voters to ensure they have all the protections entitled to them.


Figure 5.5: Ballot Request Forms for UOCAVA Protection



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Most States were also very flexible when it came to requiring ballot secrecy envelopes for ballots submitted via regular mail. Seventy-three percent of SEOs responding to the question said their State would accept and process ballots that lacked a security envelope. Ten percent, however, would reject that ballot and the remaining 8 percent would reject it unless it was a FWAB.


Figure 5.6: Submission Without Ballot Secrecy Envelope



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

Given the long distances and uncertainty of the absentee ballot process, *UOCAVA* voters may be especially concerned about the status of their submitted ballots. SEOs provide several options for voters to check on their ballot status, which are presented in Figure 5.7. Eighty-six percent said their State provided a website or online system to confirm ballot reception, whereas 51 percent of respondents said they used email, 22 percent included phone access and 20 percent said they used regular mail.

Figure 5.7: UOCAVA Ballot Receipt Confirmation Methods



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

5.5 | Discussion and Conclusion

The analysis focused on the registration and ballot issues that LEOs and *UOCAVA* voters face. The section began by discussing statutory guidelines for SEOs implementing *UOCAVA*. It then discussed the different policies States have adopted to carry out these obligations. It then concluded with a discussion of the potential costs and benefits of the variation in State approaches to dealing with the various registration and ballot issues.

It showed a number of key findings:

- States show a fair amount of variation in how they implement *UOCAVA* obligations
- The FPCA remains the key method by which voters can establish their *UOCAVA* status and ensure that they receive the protections afforded to them by that status
- Of particular concern for FVAP, only about half of responding SEOs said that their State allowed online registration for *UOCAVA* voters, which emphasizes the important role that the FVAP online assistant plays

On the one hand, the flexibility that many States afford *UOCAVA* voters is encouraging given the other challenges that this population faces when voting. The downside to flexibility is uncertainty and lack of uniformity. Voters may have relied on their State ballot form in the past and are unfamiliar with the FPCA, or their State form may not have a clear way to establish *UOCAVA* status. LEOs may have discretion when deciding if there is sufficient additional information to establish someone as *UOCAVA*, but this means that a voter's status may be dependent on who happens to process his or her ballot request.

The results also underline the importance of the FPCA as a consistent method to register to vote. Although other methods may work, the FPCA remains the most direct way to establish *UOCAVA* status. Online options, both in terms of registering to vote as well as checking on the status of a ballot, are increasingly available to voters, but additional expansion of these options can still be made. Indeed, the results shown in Figure 5.2—that half of responding SEOs said their States did not have an online registration system for *UOCAVA* voters—emphasize the importance of FVAP's online assistance for *UOCAVA* voters. If a voter lives in one of the States that does not have a similar State-sponsored resource, the FVAP alternative is even more crucial.

Regulatory consistency across jurisdictions, especially if States converge on those solutions that make it easier for *UOCAVA* voters to vote, will assist election officials in providing effective assistance. The next section addresses one avenue by which such consistency might be achieved.

CSG Overseas Voting Initiative Recommendations

6.1 | Introduction

As discussed in the previous section as it relates to ballot and registration issues, UOCAVA voters face many barriers to exercising their right to vote. Since 2013, FVAP has been working with the CSG via its cooperative agreement to develop policy recommendations to assist UOCAVA voters as part of the CSG's OVI Policy Working Group. In 2016, the Policy Working Group released its report, *Overseas Voting: Strategies for Engaging Every Voter*, which included a number of policy recommendations, most of which States could implement unilaterally.⁸ The survey asked SEOs about their awareness of the OVI recommendations and the status of each policy in their respective State.

This section begins by assessing the level of awareness among SEOs about the details of the OVI recommendations. Next, it discusses the extent of implementation of the four policy recommendations areas. For three of the four areas, the large majority of responding SEOs said their State had either already adopted the suggested reform or had plans to do so in the near future. This section concludes with a discussion of what remains to be accomplished and what the remaining challenges could be to further completion.

6.2 | Research Questions

- Have States implemented or do they plan to implement the CSG OVI recommendations?

6.2 | CSG Overseas Voter Initiative

The OVI has three advisory working groups that draw from experienced professionals and election officials. The goal, and intended audience of the working groups, was to “provide State policymakers and State and local election officials with best practice guides to ensure the men and women of the U.S. military and Americans living

⁸ <http://www.csg.org/ovi/SpecialReport2016.aspx>

overseas are able to enjoy the same right to vote as citizens living in the United States.”⁹ The CSG Policy Working Group examined military and overseas voting recommendations from the Presidential Commission on Election Administration, as well as other successful programs and practices across the country. The CSG Technology Working Group explored issues such as performance metrics and data standardization for incorporation into State and local elections administration policies and practices for overseas ballots. The CSG Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS) Section B Working Group worked with FVAP and the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to improve the collection of administrative data associated with *UOCAVA* voting.

The recommendations fall into four general areas:

1) Voter communication

- Use plain language
- Make effective use of election websites and social media.
- Create more user-friendly electronic ballot return envelopes.
- Communicate to voters when the ballot application is accepted.
- Provide information to voters about what is on the ballot

2) The FPCA

- Treat the FPCA as a permanent request for voter registration.
- Establish a default validity period for the FPCA mail ballot request.

3) Online voter registration

- States that provide online voter registration should incorporate online registration for overseas and military voters.

4) Engaging the U.S. military community

- Establish partnerships between state and local election officials and local military installations.


6.3 | Results

Overall, SEOs were highly aware of all the different policy recommendations. Figure 6.1 shows that 71 percent of SEOs responding were aware of the recommendations related to voter communication and 69 percent were

⁹ <http://www.csg.org/ovi/>

aware of the FPCA. Slightly lower, 65 percent were aware of the online voter registration recommendations and 61 percent were aware of recommendations to improve engagement with the military community.

Figure 6.1: CSG OVI Awareness



Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.


More important than awareness was the actual progress that had been made toward implementation. Overall, progress on planned adoption and already adopted tracks with awareness of the recommendations, as the most success has been in the voter communication and FPCA-related areas and the least progress made in engaging the military community.

a. OVI Recommendations: Voter Communication

Figure 6.2 breaks down the 10 recommendations on voter communication by the percentage of SEOs responding that their State had already implemented, planned to implement and did not plan to implement. For all but one of the recommendations, a majority of SEOs responded that their State had already adopted the recommendation. The one recommendation that States were reticent to adopt was redesigning the State web site to target young *UOCAVA* voters. This same pattern held once planned implementation was included in the

analysis as well, with only between two and 15 having no plans to adopt the policy recommendations, except for young *UOCAVA*, for which the percentage saying no plans was 27 percent.

Figure 6.2: OVI Recommendations—Voter Communication




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

b. OVI Recommendations: FPCA

Figure 6.3 shows a similar pattern for progress on the two FPCA-related OVI recommendations, although with no middle ground of planned implementation. Eighty-four percent of responding SEOs said their States had already made FPCA registrations permanent and 14 percent reported not planning to make that change. Sixty-nine percent of responding SEOs said they had already made the FPCA ballot request valid for one election cycle.

Figure 6.3: OVI Recommendations—FPCA




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

c. OVI Recommendations: Online Voter Registration

Figure 6.4 displays the results for how respondents planned to implement the two OVI recommendations on online voter registration. Again, similar to the awareness numbers, 65 percent of responding SEOs said they planned to or had already implemented the recommendations related to online voter registration. Sixty-one percent already allowed *UOCAVA* voters to request a ballot online with the FPCA or State form and 4 percent were planning on implementing it. Only 47 percent said they already allowed *UOCAVA* voters to register online, but an additional 18 percent were planning to do so.

Figure 6.4: OVI Recommendations—Online Voter Registration




Note: Percentages based on valid respondents. Numbers may not total to zero because of refusals.

d. OVI Recommendations: Military Community Engagement

The most room for improvement remains on the recommendations related to engaging the U.S. military community. Figure 6.4 shows that although 39 percent of respondents said their State already contacted installation staff, only 16 percent already shared FVAP content and 10 percent had recruited spouses for election offices. Future progress looks better, as an additional 29 percent plan to contact installation staff and 43 percent will be sharing FVAP content. Even with future plans, 49 percent of SEOs that responded said they did not plan to recruit spouses for election offices. Given the strong impact that spouses can have on voting behavior, this remains an important recommendation to pursue.

Figure 6.5: OVI Recommendations—Military Community Engagement



6.4 | Discussion and Conclusion

This analysis began by discussing the level of awareness among SEOs on the specifics of the OVI recommendations. Next, it discussed the progress in implementing the four policy recommendation areas. It concluded with a discussion of remaining goals and potential challenges to further progress.

It showed a number of key findings:

- For three of the four areas, the large majority of responding SEOs said their State had either already adopted the suggested reform or had plans to do so in the near future.
- The most progress remains on the goals related to engaging the military community.

Significant progress has already been made in implementing the recommendations of the CSG OVI among the responding SEOs. Progress is not consistent across all the recommendations, which suggests that States are making changes on an issue-by-issue basis rather than adopting the CSG proposals across the board. Somewhat surprisingly, the awareness of each of the general areas of recommendation was relatively low at around 70 percent. Not every State has a representative in every working group, but with the CSG as a partner, one might expect higher levels of awareness. It could be, of course, that SEOs may be aware of the specific aspects of the four general recommendation areas without being explicitly aware where those policies came from.

Another interpretation, however, is that States have started with low-hanging fruit and already adopted the

easiest changes or in those States where reform was easiest. Many of the already adopted recommendations were relatively straightforward issues of communication or regulations on how long an FPCA registration was valid. However, once one gets into setting up an online voter registration system one must invest a significant amount of resources to establish a safe, secure, and trusted system. Some States that have a low number of absentee and *UOCAVA* voters might not see the net benefit of investing such resources for a small number of voters. If this issue is the main roadblock, then further progress may be more difficult to achieve, at least via marketing and outreach.

2016 PEVS-SEO Methodology



Survey Design

7.1 | Introduction

The main purpose of the 2016 PEVS-SEO was to collect data from SEOs to help them be more effective in their roles by understanding how to improve FVAP services offered to SEOs, LEOs and UOCAVA voters. To do this, FVAP designed a customer satisfaction survey focused on three central purposes: (1) Understanding SEO engagement with FVAP resources and how resource can be improved, (2) understanding how SEOs interact with LEOs, and (3) understanding how States handle specific registration and ballot request issues for UOCAVA voters. The following section explains how the newly designed 2016 PEVS-SEO was based on a pilot study and how the survey was designed to meet specific goals.

7.2 | PEVS-SEO Pilot Study

To test the newly designed PEVS-SEO, a pilot study was conducted involving cognitive interview methodology. Cognitive interviewing allows participants the opportunity to provide feedback on the survey itself. This method is used to assess whether participants interpret and interact with the survey in the way that researchers intended. The goal of the pilot was to identify any problematic survey items and test comprehension of the survey and communication materials from an election official's perspective.

7.3 | Cognitive Interview Procedure

Interviews were conducted with six highly experienced LEOs who had been actively involved with FVAP projects in the past.¹⁰ The cognitive interview participants were recruited through FVAP contacts via email invitations as a convenience sample and did not receive compensation. They varied by gender—three male and three female—and came from six separate States, primarily in the West and South. Their titles were Director of Elections, Supervisor of Elections, or Administrator of Elections of their county jurisdiction, and most had worked as election officials for the majority of their careers.

¹⁰ Since the PEVS-SEO is designed as a census of SEOs, the pilot test used LEOs because it would have been detrimental to the survey design to pilot test the survey instrument on current SEOs.

For each interview, the participant connected remotely through a screen-sharing application, while the moderator and research team observed remotely. At the start of the interview, the moderator discussed the purpose of the interview and provided detailed instructions to the participant. Each interview was recorded and the research team took notes during the session. After consenting to the recording, participants either began sharing their screen or viewed the moderator's shared screen of the survey materials. Participants first viewed the invitation email, which involved reading a mock invitation email, and were then asked about their impressions of receiving an email like this at their election office—followed by more detailed probes. Next, the participants were instructed to complete the programmed pilot web survey on their own computer as they would normally, while noting any questions they found confusing or wanted to comment on. When respondents asked questions during the survey, they were instructed to answer the survey as if the moderator were not there. Due to skip logic, respondents did not see every question in the survey and were not interviewed about skipped questions. After the survey, each participant was asked about his or her overall impression of the survey instrument. The moderator then reviewed the items the participant flagged as confusing and finished the interview by following up on 12 specific questions the research team had previously identified as needing feedback. The majority of the moderator questions focused on comprehension of specific phrases in questions, comprehension of subitems and response items, and exploring what criteria a respondent used to answer each question.

7.4 | Cognitive Interview Results and Changes

Results of the cognitive interviews were informative for both the survey instrument and invitation email. Participants easily interpreted how they would access the survey from the invitation email; however, they expressed it was not clear enough why the survey was important for them and how it differed from the EAC's EAVS. Participants felt that the survey instrument was straightforward, shorter than expected and on topic. They struggled to define a number of terms in both the questions and response options. For example, election officials were familiar with acronyms they use frequently such as FVAP, FPCA and FWAB; however, they appeared to be less familiar with the Electronic Transmission Service (ETS). Participants could recall generally referring FVAP resources, but had difficulty remembering specific times they had referred a resource or the context of that referral. This difficulty was related to the fact that participants defined "Refer to local election officials" in multiple ways. It typically involved talking to an SEO by phone, email, or in person at a conference, but did not include States publicly posting FVAP information on websites or social media. When asked to define "FVAP staff," some said they thought FVAP staff had multiple meanings, such as in-person contacts they had with FVAP directors or FVAP State affairs liaisons. They also did not always consider interacting with those FVAP staff members as formally contacting "FVAP staff support." The cognitive interviews also helped to identify in many questions specific phrases and response options that were confusing to participants or overly primed them with positive or negative reactions.

Based on these cognitive interview results, the pilot PEVS-SEO materials were modified to resolve these comprehension issues. The invitation was modified to emphasize the importance of the survey for SEOs and how the survey differed from the EAC EAVS survey. Questions about ETS were removed from the survey. For staff support, the questionnaire was updated with separate questions about State affairs liaisons and FVAP staff

support, and the web survey programming added hover text that allowed respondents to review these resource definitions during the survey. Referring resources to LEOs was more specifically defined in the final instrument. Finally, phrases and response options were changed to reflect preferred SEO terms that were suggested during the cognitive interviews.

7.5 | PEVS-SEO Final Instrument

Overall, the survey asked SEOs about their experience with (1) FVAP resources and services, (2) FVAP policy research, (3) interaction with LEOs, (4) registration and ballot request issues, and (5) implementation of the CSG's OVI recommendations. Where applicable, attempts were made to align the survey instrument with the 2016 PEVS-VAO and the 2016 PEVS-ADM. The questionnaire was a 15-minute web survey that contained 35 questions.

The survey went through multiple rounds of design and approval by the research team and FVAP. The research team initially met with FVAP to discuss findings and lessons learned from the 2014 PEVS-LEO qualitative survey and the goals for redesigning the survey regarding the SEO population. After drafting an initial pilot survey, FVAP decided to conduct the thorough pilot study described above. Following the pilot study, FVAP and the research team reviewed the cognitive interview results and implemented the recommended changes. The instrument was then reviewed by experts at DMDC, staff at FVAP and ultimately approved by the FVAP Director. Following FVAP approval, the survey instrument was submitted for OMB fast track approval.

Survey Administration

8.1 | Introduction

The survey was administered from January 6, 2017, to February 6, 2017, for a fielding period of 31 days. As described in detail in this section, before administrating the survey, researchers programmed it and conducted quality control checks on the materials. During the survey, researchers administered email communications, answered email helpdesks and monitored survey response rates.

The survey was programmed as a web survey hosted on a .mil domain. FMG created the annotated questionnaire template and programmed the survey with its operations team via Verint's Enterprise Feedback Management (EFM) online survey software. Before fielding, researchers tested the web instrument with sample cases and adjusted for errors in programming, wording and incorrectly captured data. Immediately following the first week of fielding, researchers analyzed initial cases to ensure data was being correctly captured. Respondents who had navigated to the survey URL were greeted with a welcome screen and instructed to enter their personalized ticket number that they received on their survey communications. Additionally, they had the option to view FAQs and security information about the survey before viewing a privacy advisory.

Sample members received a notification email and up to seven additional emails communications inviting them to take the 2016 PEVS-SEO. The email communications included the respondents' first and last name and were sent to the email address identified by FVAP State affairs liaisons as the head of the State Election Office or the person most familiar with UOCAVA. The email announcement was sent on January 6, followed by seven email reminders on January 11, January 13, January 17, January 20, January 23, January 26 and February 1. The emails were purposefully varied both by day of the week and by time of day sent. All email reminders were addressed from "FVAP SEO Survey" using info@postelectionsurvey.com and were signed by the FVAP State affairs liaison associated with that SEO's State to leverage FVAP connections. Based on positive feedback from the cognitive interviews, the emails emphasized language about "personally inviting" the respondent. Additionally, in late January, State affairs liaisons encouraged nonresponding State Election Offices to complete the survey to ensure maximum participation. All sample members had access to an email survey helpdesk monitored by FMG. Sample members were instructed to direct survey access problems to the helpdesk and

could unsubscribe from future email reminders; however, there were no “unsubscribes” from the sample population. All sample members who had not yet completed the survey received all communications.

9.1 | Summary of Results

The PEVS-SEO fulfills the obligations of *UOCAVA* (52 U.S.C., Section 20301[b][1]), which directs FVAP to “consult with State and local election officials.” It focuses on research questions specific to the SEO population and that assess the current state of customer satisfaction with FVAP materials.

In 2012 and 2014, FVAP conducted both the qualitative and quantitative post-election voting surveys of LEOs. Drawing upon those experiences, this survey was intended to focus on SEOs as the main source of training and assistance for the thousands of LEOs. In doing so, it helped improve efficiency of data collection and reduce the burden on public officials by drastically reducing the number of responders.

This report addressed five key research questions related to FVAP’s interactions with State Election Offices. It also reported the full methodology of the PEVS-SEO, detailed the full survey instrument and reported the full breakdown of responses along with the total number of respondents to each question.

Resources: Overall, SEOs are aware, using and satisfied with FVAP products and services. There is room for improvement, but this has more to do with adding new subjects and areas of interest than with fundamentally revamping current efforts.

SEO and LEO Interaction: SEOs interact consistently with LEOs, usually via email and phone calls. SEOs are aware of FVAP resources and refer their LEOs to the appropriate materials when needed and if the local officials do not receive assistance elsewhere.

Proposed SEO Products and Services: As part of these potential new offerings, States would be likely to use a *UOCAVA* military database-matching service if FVAP were to offer one, although most SEOs do not have experience with such a system. SEOs also view potential resources, such as future training topics, fact sheets, and policy-related projects as useful for their interactions with local officials. The more broadly focused the topic and target audience, the more positively the SEOs responded.

Registration/Ballot Issues: States handle specific registration and ballot request issues for *UOCAVA* voters in ways that make confusion and inconsistent application of *UOCAVA* protections more likely. Approximately half of responding States allow online registration for *UOCAVA* voters.

CSG OVI Recommendations: The vast majority of respondents to the survey had implemented or planned to implement three of the four OVI recommendations; specifically, those related to voter communication, online registration and the FPCA.

9.2 | Limitations

The findings presented here, however, must be kept in their proper context. As a survey of customer satisfaction and evaluation, the PEVS-SEO is best viewed as a snapshot of FVAP's current performance in 2016. As a census of all 55 SEOs and not a random, representative sample, these survey results are not generalizable to nonrespondents or a broader potential population of SEOs. Similarly, FVAP helped identify the individual serving as the *UOCAVA* contact at each State office and had that person provide the answers for the whole office. This is useful for identifying the person most familiar with *UOCAVA* issues, but there may be unknown biases in contacting one staff member based on prior FVAP relationships. Nevertheless, it does provide a number of important data points to help improve interactions with a key FVAP stakeholder.

In the context of the CSG OVI recommendations, the central question that this report cannot address is what the barriers are to the remaining States adopting the remainder of the policy proposals. Given the level of initial awareness, it could be lack of awareness. Even if SEOs are aware of the specific policy proposals, they may be more likely to support or implement them moving forward if they are aware of the context in which the proposals were developed. In this case, increased outreach and interaction should help facilitate further adoption. Future iterations of this survey, or related future research, could explore the barriers to greater progress. However, there may be resource limitations or political roadblocks that preclude changes in some States.

9.3 | Future Research and Policy Recommendations

As the first iteration of a survey, the 2016 PEVS-SEO presents new opportunities to refine and improve the survey. Care may also be needed when revising questions if there is a desire to trend the data over time. Future versions may include more open-ended questions to follow up on what distinguishes useful from very useful.

As an assessment of the current level of customer satisfaction two main policy recommendations emerge from this analysis:

- Emphasize online-training, both in terms of awareness and usage. Those SEOs that used the online training were very satisfied with it, but it remains underutilized. This presents significant growth in usage with little new costs in developing additional materials.
- Focus materials on broad-based topics and applications. SEOs were most interested in training materials and issues that appealed to a large number of stakeholders. Narrow topics should not be avoided, but efficiency gains may be achieved by prioritizing mass appeal.

Future research areas may include:

- Investigate SEO views on what their local officials' needs are. Referral rates of FVAP materials are related to SEO perceptions of need by their LEOs. If LEOs have needs that have not been articulated to

SEOs because they did not know that FVAP offered that type of assistance or the local officials may have explicitly said they did not have a particular need.

- Investigate the reasons behind the relatively low level of engagement with social media. The low level could be due to factors unique to the SEO job description, a poor match between the needs of LEOs and the strengths of social media, or a generational gap that will erode over time. Given the wide application of digital marketing in other aspects of FVAP's marketing and communications strategies, this could be an important growth area.
- Explore more why States are not implementing the last OVI recommendation on reaching out to military services. There may be particular roadblocks that differ from the other three policy areas and identifying those barriers is the first step in facilitating further progress.
- Establish a list of best practices to facilitate SEO and LEO communication. This could build upon the social media research or be independent. The current findings focused only on the quantity and frequency of interactions, but not the quality of communication provided by the different modes of communication.
- Explore how SEOs use different type of training modes. This research could support the policy recommendation above to increase use of the online training materials. It could be that some SEOs simply prefer in-person or hands-on learning and would not choose online training, even if they were made more aware of it.

References

- Hall, Thad, J. Quin Monson, and Kelly D. Patterson. "Poll workers and the vitality of democracy: An early assessment." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40.04 (2007): 647–654.
- Kimball, David C., and Brady Baybeck. "Are All Jurisdictions Equal? Size Disparity in Election Administration." *Election Law Journal* 12.2 (2013): 130–145.
- Kimball, David C., and Martha Kropf. "The Street-Level Bureaucrats of Elections: Selection Methods for Local Election Officials." *Review of Policy Research* 23.6 (2006): 1257–1268.
- Kimball, David C., Martha Kropf, and Lindsay Battles. "Helping America vote? Election administration, partisanship, and provisional voting in the 2004 election." *Election Law Journal* 5.4 (2006): 447–461.
- Moynihan, Donald P., and Carol L. Silva. "The administrators of democracy: A research note on local election officials." *Public Administration Review* 68.5 (2008): 816–827.
- Oliver, Richard L., 2014. *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, Routledge

Appendix A: 2016 PEVS-SEO Instrument

FVAP Products and Services

// Include running section header “FVAP Products and Services” //

// Display all resources descriptions together on one page. Format each resource inside a separate box with a light blue background //

The first section of this survey will ask about your experience using five different Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) products and services in 2016.

On the next page, please **read the following descriptions** of these FVAP products and services carefully. You can reference these descriptions during the survey by using the links at the bottom of your screen.

FVAP.gov

Provides customized, voting-related information and resources for all *Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA)* voters and election officials. FVAP.gov supplies State-specific election information, including dates, deadlines and contact information that voters can rely on to adhere to their State’s absentee voting process. Other products and services, such as the election official online training module, are available at FVAP.gov.

Staff Support

FVAP staff are available to provide support to election officials, including voting information, voter outreach materials and State-specific updates that can be communicated with voters. FVAP staff can be reached by email at vote@fvap.gov or by using a toll-free telephone service.

State Affairs Specialists

These specialists work closely with election officials and States on legislation and regulations related to UOCAVA voters. Their goal is to strengthen the relationship between States and FVAP. They are the primary FVAP point of contact for State election officials (SEO) and local election officials (LEO). These specialists provide UOCAVA training and conference briefs. They are also available to answer questions on UOCAVA policy, election official best practices and UOCAVA-related problems.

Address Look-Up Service

Election officials can contact FVAP when a ballot sent to a military Service member is returned and

FVAP will attempt to find the member's current address information.

Election Official (EO) Online Training

A short, interactive course created for election officials. It provides information on UOCAVA-related laws, clarifies the absentee voting process, and includes an overview of FVAP's role in assisting your office with UOCAVA voters.

// Page Break //

// At the bottom of Q1, display link to pop up descriptions of FVAP.gov, Staff support, State affairs specialists, address look-up service, and EO online training with above descriptions //

Item #: Q1

Question Type: Grid

QAW. In 2016, was your office aware of the following FVAP products or services? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|
| QAWWEB | FVAP.gov | Q1a: FVAP.gov awareness |
| QAWSTF | FVAP staff support | Q1b: FVAP staff support awareness |
| QAWSAS | FVAP State affairs specialists | Q1c: FVAP State affairs specialist awareness |
| QAWADD | FVAP address look-up service | Q1d: FVAP address look-up service awareness |
| QAWTRN | FVAP EO online training | Q1e: FVAP EO online training |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

// At the bottom of Q2-Q3sp, display link to pop up descriptions of FVAP.gov, State affairs specialists, address look-up service, and EO online training with above descriptions //

Item #: Q2

Question Type: Grid

// For each subitem, ask if matching (QAWWEB=2 OR QAWSAS=2 OR QAWADD=2 OR QAWTRN = 2). If all QAW subitems except QAWSTF ≠ 2, skip to QREF //

QUSE. In 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP products or services? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|
| QUSEWEB | FVAP.gov | Q2a: FVAP.gov use |
| QUSESAS | FVAP State affairs specialists | Q2b: FVAP State affairs specialist use |
| QUSEADD | FVAP address look-up service | Q2c: FVAP address look-up service use |
| QUSETRN | FVAP EO online training | Q2d: FVAP EO online training use |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q3

Question Type: Grid

// For each subitem, ask if matching QUSE=2. If all QUSE subitems ≠ 2, skip to QREF //

QSAT. How satisfied was your office with the following FVAP products or services?

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--------------------------------|---|
| QSATWEB | FVAP.gov | Q3a: FVAP.gov satisfaction |
| QSATSAS | FVAP State affairs specialists | Q3b: FVAP State affairs specialist satisfaction |
| QSATADD | FVAP address look-up service | Q3c: FVAP address look-up service satisfaction |
| QSATTRN | FVAP EO online training | Q3d: FVAP EO online training satisfaction |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|------------------------------------|
| 5 | Very satisfied |
| 4 | Satisfied |
| 3 | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied |
| 2 | Dissatisfied |
| 1 | Very dissatisfied |

Item #: Q3sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QSATWEB = 1|2 OR QSATSAS= 1|2 OR QSATETS = 1|2 OR QSATADD = 1|2 OR QSATTRN = 1|2, else skip to QREF //

QSATSP: Please explain why you were not satisfied with the following products or services from FVAP:

[INSERT "FVAP.gov" if QSATWEB= 1|2, INSERT "FVAP State affairs specialist" if QSATSAS = 1|2, INSERT "FVAP address look-up service" if QSATADD = 1|2, INSERT "FVAP EO online training" if QSATTRN = 1|2]. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q3sp: FVAP products dissatisfied reason

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

// At the bottom of Q4, display link to pop up descriptions of FVAP.gov, Staff support, State affairs specialists, address look-up service, and EO online training //

Item #: Q4

Question Type: Grid

QREF. In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products or services? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--------------------------------|---|
| QREFWEB | FVAP.gov | Q4a: FVAP.gov referred LEO |
| QREFSTF | FVAP staff support | Q4b: FVAP staff support referred LEO |
| QREFSAS | FVAP State affairs specialists | Q4c: FVAP State affairs specialist referred LEO |
| QREFADD | FVAP address look-up service | Q4d: FVAP ALUS referred LEO |
| QREFTRN | FVAP EO online training | Q4e: FVAP EO online training referred LEO |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

FVAP.gov

// Include running section header "FVAP.gov" //
// At the bottom of Q5-Q5sp, display link to pop up description of FVAP.gov //

Item #: Q5

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QAWWEB =2 AND QREFWEB =1 //

QWEBNOT: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not share information about [FVAP.gov](#) with local election officials (LEO)?

Variable Label: Q5: Reason not shared FVAP.gov

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---|
| 1 | Did not believe FVAP.gov offered the assistance LEOs needed |
| 2 | Did not believe FVAP.gov offered accurate information |
| 3 | LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource |
| 4 | LEOs did not need assistance or information available on FVAP.gov |
| 5 | Some other reason |

Item #: Q5sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QWEBNOT = 1|2, else skip to QSTFRE //

QWEBNOTSP: Please specify how we can improve [FVAP.gov](#). Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q5sp: How to improve FVAP.gov

FVAP Staff Support

// Include running section header "FVAP Staff Support" //
// At the bottom of Q6-Q7sp, display link to pop up description of Staff support //

Item #: Q6

Question Type: Grid

// Ask if QAWSTF=2 AND QREFSTF=2, else skip to QSTFNOT //

// Randomize order of subitems a-f //

QSTFRE. In 2016, did your office refer [FVAP staff support](#) to local election officials for any of the following reasons? Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|------------------------------------|
| QSTFREA | To request FVAP voting supplies or outreach materials | Q6a: Request voting supplies |
| QSTFREB | To receive information about training and/or other FVAP resources | Q6b: Receive training or resources |

| | | |
|---------|---|----------------------------------|
| QSTFREC | To resolve a problem for a local election official | Q6c: Resolve LEO problem |
| QSTFRED | To suggest changes to FVAP publications or programs | Q6d: Suggest FVAP changes |
| QSTFREE | To update contact information for a local election office | Q6e: Update LEO contact info |
| QSTFREF | To obtain clarification about UOCAVA laws | Q6f: Obtain UOCAVA clarification |
| QSTFREG | Some other reason | Q6g: Some other reason |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q6sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QSTFREG = 2, else skip to QSTFNOT //

QSTFRESP: Please specify the other reason(s) your office referred FVAP staff support to LEOS in 2016. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q6sp: Other contacted FVAP staff

Item #: Q7

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QAWSTF = 2 AND QREFSTF = 1 //

QSTFNOT: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not refer local election officials (LEO) to FVAP staff support for assistance?

Variable Label: Q7: Reason not referred staff support

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|--|
| 1 | Did not believe FVAP staff offered the assistance LEOs needed. |
| 2 | Did not believe FVAP staff offered accurate information. |
| 3 | Did not believe FVAP staff provided timely responses. |
| 4 | LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource. |
| 5 | LEOs did not need assistance or information from FVAP staff. |
| 6 | Some other reason |

Item #: Q7sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QSTFNOT = 1|2|3, else skip to QSASRE //

QSTFNOTSP: Please specify how we can improve the assistance provided by FVAP staff support. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q7sp: How to improve FVAP staff

FVAP Policy and Research

// Include running section header “FVAP Policy and Research” //
 // At the bottom of Q8-Q8sp, display link to pop up description of State affairs specialists //

Item #: Q8

Question type: Grid

// Ask if QUESAS = 2, else skip to QADDNOT //

//Randomize order of subitems A-E //

QSASCON: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons? Mark “Yes” or “No” for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|--|
| QSASCONA | To coordinate in-person FVAP training or a conference presentation | Q8a: Coordinate in-person training or presentation |
| QSASCONB | To coordinate changes to your State’s voting procedure information listed on FVAP.gov | Q8b: Change FVAP.gov State info |
| QSASCONC | To resolve a problem for a local election official | Q8c: Resolve problem for LEO |
| QSASCOND | To discuss State UOCAVA-related legislative or regulatory changes | Q8d: Discuss legislative changes |
| QSASCONE | To obtain clarification about UOCAVA laws | Q8e: Obtain UOCAVA clarification |
| QSASCONF | Some other reason | Q8f: Some other reason |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q8sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QSASCONF=2, else skip to QSASP //

QSASCONSP: Please specify the other reason(s) your office contacted FVAP State affairs specialists in 2016. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q8sp: Other contacted FVAP State affairs specialists

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Item #: Q9

Question type: Grid

QSASP: During 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP policy-related products? Mark “Yes” or “No” for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| QSASPA | Public policy papers | Q9a: Public policy papers |
| QSASPB | FVAP research (e.g., Post-Election | Q9b: FVAP research |

| | | |
|--------|--|----------------------------|
| | Survey or comparisons of military and civilian voting rates) | |
| QSASPC | FVAP congressional reports | Q9c: Congressional reports |
| QSASPD | Monthly EO newsletter | Q9d: EO newsletter |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q10

Question type: Grid

// Ask if matching subitems (QSASPA=2, QSASPB=2, QSASPC=2, QSASPD=2). If all QSASP subitems ≠ 2, skip to QADDNOT //

QSASPUSF: How useful were the following FVAP policy-related products? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|------------------------------------|
| QSASPUSFA | Public policy papers | Q10a: Public policy papers useful |
| QSASPUSFB | FVAP research (e.g., Post-Election Survey or comparisons of military and civilian voting rates) | Q10b: FVAP research useful |
| QSASPUSFC | FVAP congressional reports | Q10c: Congressional reports useful |
| QSASPUSFD | Monthly EO newsletter | Q10d: EO newsletter useful |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-----------------|
| 4 | Very useful |
| 3 | Useful |
| 2 | Somewhat useful |
| 1 | Not useful |

Item #: Q11

Question type: Grid

// Randomize order of all subitems //

QFAQUSF: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|
| QFAQUSFA | State-specific UOCAVA voter demographics | Q11a: State UOCAVA demographics |
| QFAQUSFB | State-specific post-election survey data | Q11b: State post-election data |
| QFAQUSFC | State voting dates and deadlines | Q11c: State voting deadlines |
| QFAQUSFD | Accepted modes of transmission for ballots, FPCAs and FWABs | Q11d: Modes of transmission |
| QFAQUSFE | State maps with voter jurisdiction statistics | Q11e: Jurisdiction map |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-----------------|
| 4 | Very useful |
| 3 | Useful |
| 2 | Somewhat useful |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 1 | Not useful |
|---|------------|

Item #: Q12

Question type: Single punch

QVAG: FVAP publishes the Voting Assistance Guide (VAG) every election cycle. In 2015, did someone in your office use the FVAP.gov portal to log in and suggest edits to your State’s election voting procedure information?

Variable Label: Q12: Voting Assistance Guide

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q13

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QVAG=2 //

QVAGUSF: How useful was the FVAP.gov portal for updating your State’s Voting Assistance Guide (VAG)-related information?

Variable Label: Q13: Voting Assistance Guide useful

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-----------------|
| 4 | Very useful |
| 3 | Useful |
| 2 | Somewhat useful |
| 1 | Not useful |

Item #: Q14

Question type: Open end essay

QRESTOP: FVAP conducts periodic research on important election topics. On what policy topic(s) would you most want FVAP to disseminate new research? *Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).*

Variable Label: Q14: Research topics

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

FVAP Address Look-Up Service

// Include running section header “FVAP Address Look-Up Service” //

// At the bottom of Q15-Q15sp, display link to pop up description of address look-up service //

Item #: Q15

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QAWADD = 2 AND QREFADD =1, else skip to QTRNNOT //

QADDNOT: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not refer local election officials (LEO) to the FVAP address look-up service for assistance?

Variable Label: Q15: Reason not referred ALUS

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service offered the assistance LEOs needed. |
| 2 | Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service offered accurate information. |
| 3 | Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service provided timely responses. |
| 4 | LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource. |
| 5 | LEOs did not need assistance or information from the FVAP address look-up service. |
| 6 | Some other reason |

Item #: Q15sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QADDNOT = 1|2|3, else skip to QTRNNOT //

QADDNOTSP: Please specify how we can improve the FVAP address look-up service. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q15sp: How to improve FVAP ALUS

FVAP Election Official (EO) Online Training

// Include running section header "FVAP Election Official (EO) Online Training" //

// At the bottom of Q16-Q16sp, display link to pop up descriptions of EO online training //

Item #: Q16

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QAWTRN = 2 AND QREFTRN = 1, else skip to QTRNTOP //

QTRNNOT: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not refer the FVAP EO online training to local election officials (LEO)?

Variable Label: Q16sp: Reason not referred FVAP EO online training

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---|
| 1 | Did not believe FVAP offered training on the information LEOs needed. |
| 2 | Did not believe the training included accurate information. |
| 3 | LEOs received comparable training from another resource. |
| 4 | LEOs did not need any training. |
| 5 | Some other reason |

Item #: Q16sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QTRNNOT = 1|2, else skip to QTRNTOP//

QTRNNOTSP: Please specify how we can improve the FVAP EO online training. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q16sp: How to improve FVAP EO online training

// Display the description text above QTRNTUSF on the same page. Format text inside a box with a light blue background //

The following questions ask for your opinion on current and new training topics that FVAP may offer for local election officials.

Item #: Q17

Question Type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems //

QTRNTUSF. How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| QTRNTUSFA | Common problems <i>UOCAVA</i> voters may experience when trying to vote | Q17a: Common voter problems |
| QTRNTUSFB | Responsibilities of military voting assistance officers (VAO) | Q17b: VAO responsibilities |
| QTRNTUSFC | Common reasons FPCAs and FWABs are rejected | Q17c: FPCA and FWAB rejection |
| QTRNTUSFD | Best practices for mailing and emailing election materials to <i>UOCAVA</i> voters | Q17d: Mailing and emailing materials |
| QTRNTUSFE | State legislative activities and trends | Q17e: State legislative activities |
| QTRNTUSFF | FVAP's products and services | Q17f: FVAP products and services |
| QTRNTUSFG | Overview of <i>UOCAVA</i> laws and regulations | Q17g: <i>UOCAVA</i> laws |
| QTRNTUSFH | FVAP's Voting Assistance Guide (VAG) | Q17h: FVAP VAG |
| QTRNTUSFI | Overview of the military <i>UOCAVA</i> population and demographics | Q17i: Military <i>UOCAVA</i> pop |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-----------------|
| 4 | Very useful |
| 3 | Useful |
| 2 | Somewhat useful |
| 1 | Not useful |

Item #: Q18

Question Type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems A-D //

QTRNTYPE. FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------|
| QTRNTYPEA | Online training modules | Q18a: Online training modules |
| QTRNTYPEB | In-person training | Q18b: In-person training |
| QTRNTYPEC | Presentation at your State's conference | Q18c: State conference |

| | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| QTRNTYPED | Webinar | Q18d: Webinar |
| QTRNTYPEE | Some other training format | Q18e: Other training format |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-----------------|
| 4 | Very useful |
| 3 | Useful |
| 2 | Somewhat useful |
| 1 | Not useful |

Item #: Q18sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QTRNTYPEE = 1|2 //

QTRNTYPESP: Please describe the other training format(s) that would be valuable to your office. Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable Label: Q18sp: Other training formats

Improvement of Services

// Include running section header "Improvement of Services" //

// Display the description text above QHELPS on one page. Format description below inside a separate box with a light blue background //

The following questions ask about how FVAP can improve communication with your office and improve FVAP products and services.

Item #: Q19

Question Type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems //

QHELPS. Across all FVAP's products and services, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the information provided by FVAP? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|------------------------------------|
| QHELPSA | It helps my office increase our understanding of UOCAVA laws. | Q19a: Helps with UOCAVA laws |
| QHELPSB | It helps resolve questions my office receives from local election officials. | Q19b: Helps resolves LEO questions |
| QHELPSC | It helps my State's local election officials be more effective at their jobs. | Q19c: Helps LEOs be more effective |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|----------------------------|
| 5 | Strongly agree |
| 4 | Agree |
| 3 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| 2 | Disagree |

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1 | Strongly disagree |
|---|-------------------|

Item #: Q20

Question Type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems a-f //

QCONLEO. On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--|--|
| QCONLEOA | Email | Q20a: Email |
| QCONLEOB | Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) | Q20b: Social media |
| QCONLEOC | Mail | Q20c: Mail |
| QCONLEOD | State website, instant messenger, or application | Q20d: State site or app |
| QCONLEOE | In-person meetings or conferences | Q20e: In-person meeting or conferences |
| QCONLEOF | Phone or conference call | Q20f: Phone or conference call |
| QCONLEOG | Other | Q20g: Other |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---------------|
| 1 | Daily |
| 2 | Weekly |
| 3 | Monthly |
| 4 | Semi-annually |
| 5 | Yearly |
| 6 | Never |

Item #: Q20sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QCONLEOG = 1|2|3|4|5, else skip to QDBUSE //

QCONSP: Please specify the other method(s) of communication your office uses to contact local election officials in your State. *Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).*

Variable Label: Q20sp: Other LEO communication

// Display description text above QDBUSE on one page. Format description inside a separate box with a light blue background //

FVAP database matching: As a way to potentially increase accuracy in contacting voters, FVAP is considering offering a service that would allow you to compare your entire State database of UOCAVA military voters to a secondary database of address information. This service would permit the identification of active duty personnel and potential changes in addresses in order to issue address confirmation notices.

Item #: Q21

Question type: Single punch

QDBUSF: Given the above information, how likely is your office to use an FVAP database-matching service in future elections?

Variable Label: Q21: Use FVAP database-matching

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------------|
| 4 | Very likely |
| 3 | Likely |
| 2 | Somewhat likely |
| 1 | Not at all likely |

Item #: Q22

Question type: Single punch

QDBMIL: Has your office ever had previous experience using any database-matching service for your UOCAVA military voter addresses?

Variable Label: Q22: FVAP database-matching UOCAVA addresses

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q22sp

Question type: Open end essay

// Ask if QDBMIL=2 //

QDBMILSP: Based on your previous experience using a database-matching service for your UOCAVA military voter addresses, what specific issues do you think need to be improved in a future database-matching service? Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

Variable label: Q22sp: Issues with military UOCAVA database matching

Registration and Ballot Requests

// Include running section header “Registration and Ballot Requests” //

// Display below description and the two definitions on one separate page. Format all inside a separate box with a light blue background //

The following questions will help us better understand your State’s standard procedures for processing registration and ballot requests during the 2016 General Election. Most of these questions ask about UOCAVA citizens and the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA), described below:

UOCAVA Citizens: U.S. citizens who are active members of the Uniformed Services, their eligible family members or U.S. citizens residing outside of the United States.

FPCA: The FPCA is a single form that can be used to register to vote and/or request an absentee ballot for federal elections.

Item #: Q23

Question type: Single punch

QFPCADATE: States have varying dates for when they begin accepting FPCAs before the current federal election year. Did your State accept FPCAs for the 2016 General Election before January 1, 2016?

Variable Label: Q23: Date State began accepting FPCAs

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|--|
| 2 | Yes, my State began accepting FPCAs before January 1, 2016. |
| 1 | No, my State only accepted FPCAs received after January 1, 2016. |

Item #: 24

Question type: Single punch

QONREG: In 2016, did your State allow voters to register to vote as *UOCAVA* voters through an online voter registration system?

Variable Label: Q24: State online voter registration

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---|
| 1 | Yes |
| 2 | No |
| 3 | It varies by jurisdiction within my State |

Item #: Q25

Question type: Single punch

// Ask if QONREG = 1|3

QONAUTO: In 2016, when a *UOCAVA* voter registered through your State's online registration system, were they automatically sent an absentee ballot without a separate ballot request form?

Variable Label: Q25: Auto sent ballot without separate request

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q26

Question type: Single punch

QFPCAPERM: In some States, if a voter registers using the FPCA, they are considered permanently registered under the National Voter Registration Act (i.e., the voter will be placed on your State's voter registration roll). In other States, voters must submit a separate registration form to be permanently registered.

In 2016, did your State consider a voter to be permanently registered if they registered using an FPCA?

Variable Label: Q26: Permanently registered if using FPCA

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q27

Question type: Single punch

QFPCAPROC: In 2016, if an FPCA from a previously unregistered voter was received after the voter registration deadline but before the absentee ballot request deadline, how was the FPCA processed in your State?

Variable Label: Q27: FPCA after registration before ballot request deadline

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---|
| 1 | The FPCA was rejected or not processed for both registration and as a ballot application. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 | The FPCA was accepted only as a ballot application for the current election; the voter received a ballot for <i>federal and non-federal offices</i> . |
| 3 | The FPCA was accepted only as a ballot application for the current election; the voter received a ballot for <i>federal offices only</i> . |
| 4 | Other |

Item #: Q27sp

Question type: Open End Essay

// Ask if QFPCAPROC = 4 //

QFPCAPROCSP: Please specify how your State would process the FPCA in this situation. *Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII)*.

Variable Label: Q27sp: Other method processing FPCA

Item #: Q28

Question type: Single punch

QPROTECT: Military members and U.S. citizens residing overseas may request absentee ballots using different forms, including FPCAs and State forms. We are interested in whether these types of voters receive the same *UOCAVA* protections if they use non-FPCA forms.

From the list below, mark all types of absentee ballot request forms that would allow a military member or U.S. citizen residing overseas *UOCAVA* protections in your State.

Variable Label: Q28: Ballot request forms for *UOCAVA* protection

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|--|
| 1 | FPCA |
| 2 | State form with a <i>UOCAVA</i> classification selected |
| 3 | State form without a <i>UOCAVA</i> classification selected, but otherwise indicates the voter is covered under <i>UOCAVA</i> (e.g., voter has an overseas mailing address) |
| 4 | Any other form that indicates the voter is covered under <i>UOCAVA</i> |

Item #: Q29

Question type: Multi punch

// Randomize order of response options //

QBALCONF: In 2016, which methods did local election officials in your State use to provide confirmation to the *UOCAVA* voter when a ballot was received? *Mark all that apply*.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| QBALCONFA | Email | Q29a: Email |
| QBALCONFB | Mail | Q29b: Mail |
| QBALCONFC | Website or online system | Q29c: Website or online system |
| QBALCONFD | Phone | Q29d: Phone |

Item #: Q30

Question type: Single punch

QBALSEC: In 2016, if a voter returned a voted ballot without enclosing it in a ballot secrecy envelope,

how did your State process the ballot?

Variable Label: Q30: Processed without ballot secrecy envelope

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---|
| 1 | The ballot was accepted |
| 2 | The ballot was rejected |
| 3 | The ballot was rejected, unless it was a FWAB |

CSG Overseas Voting Initiative

// Include running section header “CSG Overseas Voting Initiative” //

// Display description on a separate page. Format inside a separate box with a light blue background
//

The last section of this survey will ask about your State’s awareness and implementation in 2016 of several key recommendations from the Council of State Governments (CSG).

On the next page, please read the following descriptions of these recommendations.

// Display description and the four definitions all on a separate page. Format all inside a separate box with a light blue background //

In December 2015, the Council of State Governments (CSG) Overseas Voting Initiative Policy Working Group released recommended State policy improvements for *UOCAVA* voters, beyond *UOCAVA* and Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act requirements, in four key areas:

- 1. Voter Communication**—Recommend States use plain language to avoid technical election terms, effectively use websites and social media for a *UOCAVA* audience, create more user-friendly ballot return envelopes and promote these methods, and improve communication to voters about their ballot acceptance and rejection.
- 2. Federal Post Card Application (FPCA)**—Recommend States treat the FPCA as a permanent request for voter registration and establish a one-election-cycle validity period for the FPCA ballot request.
- 3. Online Voter Registration**—Recommend that States that provide online registration extend online registration to overseas and military voters.
- 4. Improved Engagement with U.S. Military Community**—Recommend that States establish partnerships between election officials and members of local military installations.

Item #: Q31

Question type: Grid

QCSGAW: Was your office aware of the CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations for the following areas? Mark “Yes” or “No” for each item.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--|--|
| QCSGAWA | Voter communication | Q31a: Voter communication aware |
| QCSGAWB | FPCA | Q31b: Federal Post Card Application aware |
| QCSGAWC | Online voter registration | Q31c: Online Voter Registration aware |
| QCSGAWD | Improved engagement with U.S. military community | Q31d: Improved Engagement with U.S. Military Community aware |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|-------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |

Item #: Q32

Question type: Grid

// Randomize order of response options //

QCSGCOM: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|--|
| QCSGCOMA | Revise voter communication language to avoid technical election terms | Q32a: Revise language |
| QCSGCOMB | Provide a step-by-step checklist for how to vote and return a ballot | Q32b: Voting checklist |
| QCSGCOMC | Devote a section of your election office website to <i>UOCAVA</i> content | Q32c: UOCAVA website section |
| QCSGCOMD | Make your State website accessible via mobile devices | Q32d: State mobile site |
| QCSGCOME | Redesign State website or social media to cater to a younger <i>UOCAVA</i> audience | Q32e: State web design for young UOCAVA |
| QCSGCOMF | Implement an electronic ballot delivery system | Q32f: Electronic ballot delivery system |
| QCSGCOMG | Publicize the availability of electronic ballot delivery methods | Q32g: Publicize electronic ballot delivery |
| QCSGCOMH | Inform <i>UOCAVA</i> voters about the length of the validity of their ballot request | Q32h: Length of UOCAVA ballot request validity |
| QCSGCOMI | Use online communication to inform voters about election dates and deadlines | Q32i: Online communication of deadlines |
| QCSGCOMJ | Inform <i>UOCAVA</i> voters why their ballot was rejected and how to correct it in the future | Q32j: Ballot rejection and correction |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---------------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |
| 3 | Already implemented |

Item #: Q33

Question type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems //

QCSGFPCA: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA)? *Mark one answer for each statement.*

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| QCSGFPCA | Treat the FPCA as a permanent | Q33a: FPCA permanent voter |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | request for voter registration | registration |
| QCSGFPCAB | Establish a one election cycle validity period for the FPCA ballot request | Q33b: FPCA valid one election cycle |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---------------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |
| 3 | Already implemented |

Item #: Q34

Question type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems //

QCSGOVR: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to online voter registration? Mark one answer for each statement.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|---|---|
| QCSGOVRA | Allow a UOCAVA voter to register online | Q34a: UOCAVA online voter registration |
| QCSGOVRB | Allow a UOCAVA voter to request an absentee ballot online using an FPCA or State form | Q34b: UOCAVA online FPCA ballot request |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---------------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |
| 3 | Already implemented |

Item #: Q35

Question type: Grid

// Randomize order of subitems //

QCSGMIL: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to improving engagement with the U.S. military community? Mark one answer for each statement.

| Variable Name | Variable Text | Variable Label |
|---------------|--|--|
| QCSGMILA | Recruit spouses to work or volunteer in election offices | Q35a: Recruit spouses for election offices |
| QCSGMILB | Share FVAP written and video content on election administration websites | Q35b: Share FVAP content |
| QCSGMILC | Contact staff of local military installations | Q35c: Contact installation staff |

| Value | Value Label |
|-------|---------------------|
| 2 | Yes |
| 1 | No |
| 3 | Already implemented |

Suggested Improvements

// Include running section header "Suggested Improvements" //

Item #: Q36

Question type: Open ended essay

QCHANGE: FVAP strives to provide excellent products and services to State election officials. What changes could FVAP make to improve our products and services to better assist your office and the local election officials you serve? *Do not provide any Personally Identifiable Information (PII).*

Variable Label: Q36: Changes to improve FVAP products and services

// FRAME VARIABLES //

| Variable Name | Variable Label | Response Options |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| FULLNAME | Respondent full name | Text |
| NAMELAST | Respondent last name | Text |
| EMAIL | Respondent email | Text |
| STATE | State | Text |
| JOBTITLE | Job title of respondent | Text |
| FVAP_ANALYST | FVAP Analyst assigned to State | Text |

Appendix B: 2016 PEVS-SEO Communications

Email Communications

a. First Email: Invitation

Email Subject: New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

To help State election officials (SEOs) be more effective in their roles, the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) wants to know how SEOs use FVAP products and services, interact with local election officials, and address State ballot and registration issues. FVAP, a Department of Defense organization, is conducting a **new survey** of State election officials in order to improve the services we offer your office, local election officials and UOCAVA voters. This survey is different from the EAC survey *and focuses on your experience with FVAP, absentee voters and voting assistance resources*. You have been selected to participate in this survey because your office is listed as the State election office of %State%. *As your State Affairs Specialist at FVAP, I personally invite you to participate in a short, 15-minute survey*. Your participation is voluntary, however we want to hear from all State election officials, regardless of your familiarity with FVAP.

The 2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials is available at:

<http://www.INSERT SURVEY LINK.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website. If this does not work, "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you have questions regarding how to complete this survey or need assistance, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil.

Your response is crucial to improving the absentee voting process for our Uniformed Service members and overseas citizens. On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey!

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

b. Second Email

Email Subject: First Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

In an effort to improve the services we offer your office, local election officials and UOCAVA voters, the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) wants to learn more about your experiences leading up to the 2016 election. The **new 2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials** focuses on how you use FVAP services, interact with LEOs, and address State ballot and registration issues. This survey is different from the EAC survey. Most people take 15 minutes to complete the survey. Your participation is voluntary, but it is important that we receive input from each SEO because it will provide FVAP and Department of Defense with valuable information to refine services that allow SEOs to be more effective in their roles.

The 2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials is available at:

<http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website. If this does not work, "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil.

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey!

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

c. Third Email

Email Subject: Second Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

To better assist you and other State Election Officials in your responsibilities, the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) is interested in hearing about your experiences as a SEO leading up to the 2016 election. If you have completed the *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*, thank you. If not, please try to do so today. This is a **new survey** administered by FVAP and the Department of Defense, different from the EAC survey that many SEOs are familiar with. Most people take 15 minutes to complete the survey. The survey will help inform FVAP of how we can improve our products and resources to better serve SEOs, local election officials and *UOCAVA* voters. Your participation is voluntary; however we want to hear from all State election officials, regardless of your experience using FVAP resources.

The survey is available at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website. If this does not work, "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil. If you do not wish to participate or to receive additional reminders about this survey, you may remove yourself from the mailing list by replying to this message. Be sure to include your Ticket Number and the words, "Please remove me from this survey's mailing list."

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

d. Fourth Email

Email Subject: Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

In an effort to improve the services we offer your office, local election officials and UOCAVA voters, the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) wants to learn more about your experiences leading up to the 2016 election. The **new 2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials** focuses on how you use FVAP services, interact with LEOs, and address State ballot and registration issues. If you have already completed the survey, thank you. If not, please take the time today. This survey is different from the EAC survey that many SEOs are familiar with. Most people take only 15 minutes to complete the survey. While your participation is voluntary, this is your opportunity to inform policy officials of your opinions on programs and services that assist your office, local election officials and UOCAVA voters.

The survey is available at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website, or "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil. If you do not wish to participate or to receive additional reminders about this survey, you may remove yourself from the mailing list by replying to this message. Be sure to include your Ticket Number and the words, "Please remove me from this survey's mailing list."

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019Fourth Email Reminder

e. Fifth Email

Email Subject: Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

To help refine the products and services we provide to State Election Officials (SEOs), the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) needs your feedback on your experiences leading up to the 2016 election. If you have completed the *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, **please take the time to do so before the website closes on [DATE]**. Your participation is voluntary, but will provide the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) and Department of Defense with valuable information to improve programs and services that assist your office, local election officials and UOCAVA voters.

The survey is available at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website, or "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil. If you do not wish to participate or to receive additional reminders about this survey, you may remove yourself from the mailing list by replying to this message. Be sure to include your Ticket Number and the words, "Please remove me from this survey's mailing list."

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

f. Sixth Email

Email Subject: Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

If you have completed the *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, **please take the time to do so before the website closes on [DATE]**. While participation is voluntary, your responses will help FVAP improve the resources that assist you, your office and other election officials.

The survey is available at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website, or "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If you have partially completed the survey, but have not clicked the "Submit" button, please log onto the website, complete as many items as you can and submit the survey. After [DATE], we will consider whatever items you have completed at that point to be your intended response.

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil. If you do not wish to participate or to receive additional reminders about this survey, you may remove yourself from the mailing list by replying to this message, and including your Ticket Number and the words, "Please remove me from this survey's mailing list."

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

g. Seventh Email

Email Subject: Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

If you have completed the *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*, thank you. If you have not had a chance to complete the survey, **please take the time to do so before the website closes on [DATE]**. Your participation is voluntary, but we need to hear from all SEOs in order to best assist you in your duties.

The survey is available at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click on this link to go directly to the survey website, or "copy and paste" this address into the web address box of your Internet browser. Once you have accessed the website, **enter your personal Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If you have partially completed the survey, but have not clicked the "Submit" button, please log onto the website, complete as many items as you can and submit the survey. After [DATE], we will consider whatever items you have completed at that point to be your intended response.

If this survey was sent to a general email account, please determine the best person to complete the survey, such as the head of your office or the staff member most familiar with UOCAVA.

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil.

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

h. Eighth Email

Email Subject: Final Reminder – New SEO Survey: *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*

Your Ticket Number: %key_1%

Dear %FullName

This is your final reminder to complete the *2016 Post-Election Voting Survey of State Election Officials*. If you have not completed the survey, **please do so before the website closes on [DATE]**. Your participation is voluntary but will provide valuable insight into how FVAP can best assist you and other SEOs.

Take the survey at: <http://www.INSERT LINK HERE.com/>

Click this address to go to the website or “copy and paste” this address into the web address box of your internet browser. Once at the website, **enter your Ticket Number: %key_1%**

If you cannot access the website or experience other technical issues, please email Seo-survey@mail.mil.

On behalf of FVAP, thank you for participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

%FVAP_Analyst
State Legislative Affairs Specialist
Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)

OMB Control 0704-055, expiration date 04/30/2019

Appendix C: 2016 PEVS-SEO Results

Q1a: In 2016, was your office aware of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP.gov]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 0.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q1b: In 2016, was your office aware of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP staff support]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 6.12% | 93.88% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q1c: In 2016, was your office aware of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP State affairs specialists] [FVAP State affairs specialists]

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 91.84% | 0% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q1d: In 2016, was your office aware of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP address look-up service]

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 36.73% | 63.27% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q2a: In 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP.gov]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 95.92% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q2b: In 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP State affairs specialists]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 45) | 26.67% | 73.33% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q2c: In 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP address look-up service]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 31) | 80.65% | 16.13% | 3.23% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q2d: In 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP EO online training]

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 36) | 61.11% | 38.89% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q3a: How satisfied was your office with the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP.gov]

(1) Very dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4) Satisfied (5) Very satisfied (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 47) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.38% | 38.30% | 55.32% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2a="yes."

Q3b: How satisfied was your office with the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP State affairs specialists]

(1) Very dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4) Satisfied (5) Very satisfied (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 21.21% | 78.79% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

Q3c: How satisfied was your office with the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP address look-up service]

(1) Very dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4) Satisfied (5) Very satisfied (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 5) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 40.00% | 60.00% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2c="yes."

Q3d: How satisfied was your office with the following FVAP products or services? [FVAP EO online training]

(1) Very dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4) Satisfied (5) Very satisfied (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 14) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 7.14% | 28.57% | 64.29% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2d="yes."

Q4a: In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products? [FVAP.gov]

(1) Very dissatisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4) Satisfied (5) Very satisfied (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 10.20% | 89.80% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q4b: In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products? [FVAP staff support]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 63.27% | 36.73% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q4c: In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products? [FVAP State affairs specialists]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 75.51% | 24.49% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q4d: In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products?
[FVAP address look-up service]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 73.47% | 26.53% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q4e: In 2016, did your office refer any local election officials (LEO) to the following FVAP products?
[FVAP EO online training]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 63.27% | 36.73% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q5: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not share information about FVAP.gov with local election officials (LEO)?

(1) Did not believe FVAP.gov offered the assistance LEOs needed (2) Did not believe FVAP.gov offered accurate information (3) LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource (4) LEOs did not need assistance or information available on FVAP.gov (5) Some other reason (99) Refused.

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 5) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2c="yes."

Q6a: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To request FVAP voting supplies or outreach materials]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 44.44% | 50.00% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6b: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To receive information about training and/or other FVAP resources]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6c: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To resolve a problem for a local election official]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 55.56% | 38.89% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6d: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To suggest changes to FVAP publications or programs]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 72.22% | 16.67% | 11.11% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6e: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To update contact information for a local election office]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 50.00% | 44.44% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6f: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [To obtain clarification about UOCAVA laws]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 72.22% | 22.22% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q6g: In 2016, did your office refer FVAP staff support to local election officials for any of the following reasons? [Some other reason]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 72.22% | 22.22% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1b="yes" AND Q4b="yes."

Q7: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not refer local election officials (LEO) to FVAP staff support for assistance?

(1) Did not believe FVAP staff offered the assistance LEOs needed (2) Did not believe FVAP staff offered accurate information (3) Did not believe FVAP staff provided timely responses (4) LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource (5) LEOs did not need assistance or information from FVAP staff (6) Some other reason
(99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 29) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 17.24% | 48.28% | 34.48% | 0.00% |

**Q8a: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons?
[To coordinate in-person FVAP training or a conference presentation]**

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 36.36% | 60.61% | 3.03% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

**Q8b: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons?
[To coordinate changes to your State's voting procedure information listed on FVAP.gov]**

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 69.70% | 27.27% | 3.03% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

Q8c: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons? [To resolve a problem for a local election official]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 57.58% | 39.39% | 3.03% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

Q8d: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons? [To discuss State UOCAVA-related legislative or regulatory changes]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 33.33% | 66.67% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

Q8e: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons? [To obtain clarification about UOCAVA laws]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 51.52% | 48.48% | 0.00% |

Q8f: In 2016, did your office contact FVAP State affairs specialists for any of the following reasons? [Some other reason]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 33) | 24.24% | 69.70% | 6.06% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q2b="yes."

Q9a: During 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP policy-related products? [Public policy papers]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 61.22% | 36.73% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q9b: During 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP policy-related products? [FVAP research (e.g., Post-Election Survey or comparisons of military and civilian voting rates)]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 51.02% | 46.94% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q9c: During 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP policy-related products? [FVAP congressional reports]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 69.39% | 28.57% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q9d: During 2016, did your office use any of the following FVAP policy-related products? [Monthly EO newsletter]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 20.41% | 79.59% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q10a: How useful were the following FVAP policy-related products? [Public policy papers]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 30) | 0.00% | 5.56% | 55.56% | 38.89% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q10b: How useful were the following FVAP policy-related products? [FVAP research (e.g., Post-Election Survey or comparisons of military and civilian voting rates)]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 23) | 0.00% | 4.35% | 43.48% | 52.17% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q9b="yes."

Q10c: How useful were the following FVAP policy-related products? [FVAP congressional reports]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 14) | 0.00% | 14.29% | 64.29% | 21.43% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q9c="yes."

Q10d: How useful were the following FVAP policy-related products? [Monthly EO newsletter]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 39) | 0.00% | 15.38% | 46.15% | 38.46% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q9d="yes."

Q11a: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office? [State-specific UOCAVA voter demographics]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 20.41% | 32.65% | 42.86% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q11b: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office? [State-specific post-election survey data]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 14.29% | 36.73% | 44.90% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q11c: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office? [State voting dates and deadlines]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 16.33% | 26.53% | 34.69% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q11d: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office? [Accepted modes of transmission for ballots, FPCAs and FWABs]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 16.33% | 6.12% | 36.73% | 40.82% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q11e: FVAP may distribute a State-specific UOCAVA fact sheet of voting statistics intended for State and local election officials. How useful would each of the following items be for your office?

[State maps with voter jurisdiction statistics]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 24.49% | 34.69% | 36.73% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q12: FVAP publishes the Voting Assistance Guide (VAG) every election cycle. In 2015, did someone in your office use the FVAP.gov portal to log in and suggest edits to your State's election voting procedure information?

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 20.41% | 79.59% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q13: How useful was the FVAP.gov portal for updating your State's Voting Assistance Guide (VAG)-related information?

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 39) | 12.82% | 7.69% | 58.97% | 17.95% | 2.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q12="yes."

Q15: In 2016, what was the main reason your office did not refer local election officials (LEO) to the FVAP address look-up service for assistance?

(1) Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service offered the assistance LEOs needed (2) Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service offered accurate information (3) Did not believe the FVAP address look-up service provided timely responses (4) LEOs received comparable assistance from another resource (5) LEOs did not need assistance or information from the FVAP address look-up service (6) Some other reason (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 18) | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 5.56% | 72.22% | 16.67% | 5.56% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q1d ="yes" AND Q4d ="no."

Q17a: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Common problems UOCAVA voters may experience when trying to vote]¹¹

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 0.00% | 30.61% | 63.27% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17b: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Responsibilities of military voting assistance officers (VAO)]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 20.41% | 42.86% | 26.53% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17c: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Common reasons FPCAs and FWABs are rejected]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 8.16% | 36.73% | 48.98% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17d: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Best practices for mailing and emailing election materials to UOCAVA voters]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 2.04% | 28.57% | 63.27% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

¹¹ Due to an error in the survey skip logic, Question 16 was not shown to survey participants.

Q17e: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State?

[State legislative activities and trends]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 14.29% | 16.33% | 51.02% | 16.33% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17f: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State?

[FVAP's products and services]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 26.53% | 40.82% | 26.53% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17g: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Overview of UOCAVA laws and regulations]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 16.33% | 38.78% | 38.78% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17h: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [FVAP's Voting Assistance Guide (VAG)]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 12.24% | 16.33% | 40.82% | 28.57% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q17i: How useful would the following training topics be to local election officials in your State? [Overview of the military UOCAVA population and demographics]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 8.16% | 14.29% | 48.98% | 26.53% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q18a: FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? [Online training modules]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 22.45% | 34.69% | 38.78% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q18b: FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? [In-person training]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 20.41% | 46.94% | 24.49% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q18c: FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? [Presentation at your State's conference]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 14.29% | 22.45% | 51.02% | 4.08% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q18d: FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? [Webinar]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 22.45% | 40.82% | 28.57% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q18e: FVAP provides training to election officials in various formats. How useful would each of the following types of training formats be for local election officials in your State? [Some other training format]

(1) Not useful (2) Somewhat useful (3) Useful (4) Very Useful (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 26.53% | 28.57% | 16.33% | 2.04% | 26.53% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q19a: Across all FVAP's products and services, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the information provided by FVAP? [It helps my office increase our understanding of UOCAVA laws]

(1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Agree (5) Strongly agree (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 0.00% | 2.04% | 16.33% | 44.90% | 34.69% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q19b: Across all FVAP's products and services, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the information provided by FVAP? [It helps resolve questions my office receives from local election officials]

(1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Agree (5) Strongly agree (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 4.08% | 14.29% | 42.86% | 36.73% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q19c: Across all FVAP's products and services, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the information provided by FVAP? [It helps my State's local election officials be more effective at their jobs.]

(1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neither agree nor disagree (4) Agree (5) Strongly agree (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 4.08% | 26.53% | 36.73% | 30.61% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20a: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [Email]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 65.31% | 26.53% | 6.12% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.04% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20b: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 6.12% | 12.24% | 6.12% | 4.08% | 2.04% | 65.31% | 4.08% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20c: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [Mail]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 16.33% | 24.49% | 22.45% | 8.16% | 18.37% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20d: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [State website, instant messenger, or application]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 24.49% | 10.20% | 0.00% | 2.04% | 36.73% | 4.08% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20e: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [In-person meetings or conferences]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 2.04% | 28.57% | 55.10% | 12.24% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20f: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [Phone or conference call]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 53.06% | 14.29% | 24.49% | 6.12% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q20g: On average, how often do you contact local election officials in your State using the following methods of communication? [Other]

(1) Daily (2) Weekly (3) Monthly (4) Semi-annually (5) Yearly (6) Never (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 0.00% | 2.04% | 2.04% | 4.08% | 0.00% | 40.82% | 51.02% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q21: Given the above information, how likely is your office to use an FVAP database-matching service in future elections?

(1) Not at all likely (2) Somewhat likely (3) Likely (4) Very likely (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 6.12% | 34.69% | 20.41% | 38.78% | 0% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q22: Has your office ever had previous experience using any database-matching service for your UOCAVA military voter addresses?

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 87.76% | 10.20% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q23: States have varying dates for when they begin accepting FPCAs before the current federal election year. Did your State accept FPCAs for the 2016 General Election before January 1, 2016?

(1) No, my State only accepted FPCAs received after January 1, 2016. (2) Yes, my State began accepting FPCAs before January 1, 2016 (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 73.47% | 20.41% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q24: In 2016, did your State allow voters to register to vote as UOCAVA voters through an online voter registration system?

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 48.98% | 51.02% | 0% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q25: In 2016, when a UOCAVA voter registered through your State’s online registration system, were they automatically sent an absentee ballot without a separate ballot request form?

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 26) | 46.15% | 50% | 3.85% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents answering Q24="yes" or "It varies by jurisdiction within my State."

Q26: In some States, if a voter registers using the FPCA, they are considered permanently registered under the National Voter Registration Act (i.e., the voter will be placed on your State’s voter registration roll). In other States, voters must submit a separate registration form to be permanently registered.

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 18.37% | 81.63% | 0% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q27: In 2016, if an FPCA from a previously unregistered voter was received after the voter registration deadline but before the absentee ballot request deadline, how was the FPCA processed in your State?

(1) The FPCA was rejected or not processed for both registration and as a ballot (2) The FPCA was accepted only as a ballot application for the current election (3) The FPCA was accepted only as a ballot application for the current election; the voter received a ballot for federal offices only (4) Other

| | Percentages | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 30.61% | 10.20% | 0.00% | 57.14% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q28a: From the list below, mark all types of absentee ballot request forms that would allow a military member or U.S. citizen residing overseas UOCAVA protections in your State.

(1) FPCA (99) Rejected

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 95.92% | 4.08% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q28b: From the list below, mark all types of absentee ballot request forms that would allow a military member or U.S. citizen residing overseas UOCAVA protections in your State.

(1) FPCA (99) Rejected

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 69.39% | 30.61% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q28c: From the list below, mark all types of absentee ballot request forms that would allow a military member or U.S. citizen residing overseas UOCAVA protections in your State.

(3) State form without a UOCAVA classification selected, but otherwise indicates the voter is covered under UOCAVA (e.g., voter has an overseas mailing address) (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 65.31% | 34.69% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q28d: From the list below, mark all types of absentee ballot request forms that would allow a military member or U.S. citizen residing overseas UOCAVA protections in your State.

(4) Any other form that indicates the voter is covered under UOCAVA (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 4 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 57.14% | 42.86% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q29a: In 2016, which methods did local election officials in your State use to provide confirmation to the UOCAVA voter when a ballot was received? [Email]

(1) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 1 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 51.02% | 48.98% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q29b: In 2016, which methods did local election officials in your State use to provide confirmation to the UOCAVA voter when a ballot was received? [Mail]

(1) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 1 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 20.41% | 79.59% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q29c: In 2016, which methods did local election officials in your State use to provide confirmation to the UOCAVA voter when a ballot was received? [Website or online system]

(1) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 1 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 85.71% | 14.29% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q29d: In 2016, which methods did local election officials in your State use to provide confirmation to the UOCAVA voter when a ballot was received? [Phone]

(1) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | 1 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 77.55% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q30: In 2016, if a voter returned a voted ballot without enclosing it in a ballot secrecy envelope, how did your State process the ballot?

(1) The ballot was accepted (2) The ballot was rejected (3) The ballot was rejected, unless it was a FWAB (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 73.47% | 10.20% | 8.16% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q31a: Was your office aware of the CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations for the following areas? [Voter communication]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 71.43% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q31b: Was your office aware of the CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations for the following areas? [FPCA]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 69.39% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q31c: Was your office aware of the CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations for the following areas? [Online voter registration]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 28.57% | 65.31% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q31d: Was your office aware of the CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations for the following areas? [Improved engagement with U.S. military community]

(1) No (2) Yes (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 61.22% | 32.65% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q31e: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Revise voter communication language to avoid technical election terms]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 34.69% | 48.98% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32a: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Revise voter communication language to avoid technical election terms]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 8.16% | 34.69% | 48.98% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32b: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Provide a step-by-step checklist for how to vote and return a ballot]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 0.00% | 20.41% | 73.47% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32c: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Devote a section of your election office website to UOCAVA content]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 0.00% | 6.12% | 85.71% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32d: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Make your State website accessible via mobile devices]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 4.08% | 24.49% | 61.22% | 10.20% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32e: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Redesign State website or social media to cater to a younger UOCAVA audience]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 26.53% | 34.69% | 24.49% | 14.29% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32f: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Implement an electronic ballot delivery system]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 10.20% | 4.08% | 77.55% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32g: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Publicize the availability of electronic ballot delivery methods]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 12.24% | 10.20% | 71.43% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32h: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Inform UOCAVA voters about the length of the validity of their ballot request]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 10.20% | 20.41% | 59.18% | 10.20% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32i: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Use online communication to inform voters about election dates and deadlines]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 2.04% | 14.29% | 75.51% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q32j: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to voter communication? [Inform UOCAVA voters why their ballot was rejected and how to correct it in the future]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 14.29% | 24.49% | 55.10% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q33a: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA)? [Treat the FPCA as a permanent request for voter registration]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 14.29% | 0.00% | 83.67% | 2.04% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q33b: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA)? [Establish a one election cycle validity period for the FPCA ballot request]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 22.45% | 0.00% | 69.39% | 8.16% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q34a: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to online voter registration? [Allow a UOCAVA voter to register online]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 30.61% | 18.37% | 46.94% | 4.08% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q34b: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to online voter registration? [Allow a UOCAVA voter to request an absentee ballot online using an FPCA or State form]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 28.57% | 4.08% | 61.22% | 6.12% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q35a: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to improving engagement with the U.S. military community? [Recruit spouses to work or volunteer in election offices]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 48.98% | 20.41% | 10.20% | 20.41% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q35b: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to improving engagement with the U.S. military community? [Share FVAP written and video content on election administration websites]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 30.61% | 42.86% | 16.33% | 10.20% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.

Q35c: By the November 2018 election, does your State plan to implement any of the following CSG Overseas Voting Initiative recommendations related to improving engagement with the U.S. military community? [Contact staff of local military installations]

(1) No (2) Yes (3) Already Implemented (99) Refused

| | Percentages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 99 |
| All Respondents (N = 49) | 20.41% | 28.57% | 38.78% | 12.24% |

Percentage responding is all SEO-eligible respondents.



FVAP.GOV
FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM



FORS | MARSH
GROUP

ABOUT US

Fors Marsh Group, LLC, is an applied research company specializing in the business of measuring, understanding, and influencing the way people think and make decisions. We take pride in delivering a combination that is rare in the industry: proven expertise in research methodology matched with highly educated employees who deeply understand motivational and human decision-making processes.