



The Elections Performance Index 2012

The State of Election Administration and Prospects for the Future

Overview

In 2013, The Pew Charitable Trusts unveiled the Elections Performance Index, or EPI, the first comprehensive assessment of election administration in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The release introduced the index's 17 indicators of performance and summarized 2008 and 2010 data, giving users a way to evaluate states' elections performance side by side.

Pew's new edition of the index adds analysis of the 2012 election and provides the first opportunity to compare a state's performance across similar elections—the 2008 and 2012 presidential contests—as well as with other states, regions, and the nation as a whole. This expanded analysis reveals key features of state elections and presents a rich picture of the U.S. democratic process that will be enhanced as new data are added each year.

Overall, states did better in 2012 than they did in 2008. Although voters turned out at a lower rate in 2012, fewer of those who did not vote said they were deterred from the polls by illness, disability, or problems with registration or absentee ballots. And more states offered voters the option to register online, which may have contributed to some of this improvement.

The 2012 analysis begins to clarify what it takes to be a leading state, which will help others improve in the coming years. These and other results are discussed in-depth in the pages that follow, but the key findings, briefly, are:

- **Elections performance improved overall.** Nationally, the overall average improved 4.4 percentage points in 2012 compared with 2008 the scores of 21 states and the district improved at a rate greater than the national

average; 19 states' averages improved but by less than the national average increase; and 10 states' averages declined.

- **High-performing states tended to remain high-performing and vice versa.** Most of the highest-performing states in 2012—those in the top 25 percent—were also among the highest performers in 2008 and 2010. The same was true for the lowest-performing states in all three years. In looking at these two groups, a picture begins to emerge of the distinctions between high and low performers.
- **Gains were seen in most indicators.** Of the 17 indicators, overall national performance improved on 12, including a decrease in the average wait times to vote and an increase in the number of states allowing online voter registration. In addition, the index revealed some stark regional differences across indicators. For example, the South had the lowest voter turnout and highest rate of nonvoting due to disability, as well as states with the highest average voting wait time.

These findings also reveal the steps that states can take to improve their scores and make elections more cost effective and efficient, including:

- Ensuring the collection of more and better elections data.
- Implementing online voter registration.
- Upgrading voter registration systems.
- Offering a complete set of online voting information lookup tools.
- Requiring postelection audits.

Nearly all of these steps were also recently recommended by the bipartisan Presidential Commission on Election Administration.¹

What Is the Elections Performance Index?

The Elections Performance Index is intended to help policymakers, election administrators, and other citizens:

- Evaluate elections based on data, not anecdote.
- Compare the performance of elections across states and time.
- Identify potential problem areas that need to be addressed.
- Measure the impact of changes in policy or practice.
- Highlight trends that otherwise might not be identified.
- Use data to demonstrate to state and local policymakers the need for resources.
- Educate voters about election administration by providing context about how the process works.

Pew partnered with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to bring together an advisory group of state and local election officials and academics from the country's top institutions to guide development of the index. The advisory group held a series of meetings beginning in July 2010 to select the best ideas from indices in other public policy areas, identify and validate existing data sources, and determine the most useful ways to group available data.

The EPI tracks 17 distinct indicators of elections performance, selected from more than 40 prospective measures, based on their completeness, consistency, reliability, and validity.² For more information on how the indicators were selected and computed, or additional analysis of their meaning, please see the online interactive report at www.pewstates.org/epi-interactive or the report’s methodology at www.pewstates.org/epi-methodology. The 17 indicators are:

1. **Data completeness.** How many jurisdictions reported statistics on the 18 core survey items in the U.S. Election Assistance Commission’s Election Administration and Voting Survey?
2. **Disability- or illness-related voting problems.** What percentage of voters did not cast a ballot due to an “illness or disability (own or family’s)”?
3. **Mail ballots rejected.** What percentage of mail ballots were not counted out of all ballots cast?
4. **Mail ballots unreturned.** What percentage of mail ballots sent out by the state were not returned?
5. **Military and overseas ballots rejected.** What percentage of military and overseas ballots returned by voters were not counted?
6. **Military and overseas ballots unreturned.** What percentage of military and overseas ballots sent out by the state were not returned?
7. **Online registration availability.** Were voters allowed to submit new registration applications online?
8. **Postelection audit required.** Was a voting equipment performance check required after each election?
9. **Provisional ballots cast.** What percentage of all voters had to cast a provisional ballot on Election Day?
10. **Provisional ballots rejected.** What percentage of provisional ballots were not counted out of all ballots cast?
11. **Registration or absentee ballot problems.** How many people reported not casting a ballot because of “registration problems,” including not receiving an absentee ballot or not being registered in the appropriate location?
12. **Registrations rejected.** What proportion of submitted registration applications were rejected for any reason?
13. **Residual vote rate.** What percentage of the ballots cast contained an undervote (i.e., no vote) or an overvote (i.e., more than one candidate marked in a single-winner race)—indicating either voting machine malfunction or voter confusion?
14. **Turnout.** What percentage of the voting-eligible population cast ballots?
15. **Voter registration rate.** What percentage of the voting-eligible population was registered to vote?
16. **Voting information lookup tools.** Did the state offer basic, easy-to-find, online tools so voters could look up their registration status, find their polling place, get specific ballot information, track absentee ballots, and check the status of provisional ballots?
17. **Voting wait time.** How long, on average, did voters wait to cast their ballots?

Overall elections performance improved

The addition of 2012 data to the Elections Performance Index makes it possible for the first time to compare a state's performance over time and against other states. In general, state election administration improved between 2008 and 2012. This was true for the performance of individual states compared with prior years and nationwide on many indicators.

Nationally, states' overall scores, which are calculated as an average of all 17 indicators, increased 4.4 percentage points on average in 2012, compared with 2008.

States

Forty states and the District of Columbia improved their overall scores, compared with 2008:

- 21 states and the district raised their performance more than the national average increase.
- 19 improved but less than the average increase nationally.

The 21 states and the district that improved more than the national average vary widely in size and region; they cover the political spectrum from deep blue to battleground to solid red.

The district's overall score improved the most—by 20 points—from 2008 to 2012. Although the city's EPI average is still below the national average, the district made major strides across multiple indicators. The district and Alabama were the only jurisdictions to improve more than 9 points above the mean increase since 2008. Both were in the bottom 25 percent in 2008 and remained among the lowest performers in 2012.

While the national trend was clearly upward, not all the news was good. Ten states' overall scores declined.

Georgia had the sharpest decrease, dropping 7 points from 2008 to 2012. The state's voter turnout fell by more than the national decrease, and it had one of the largest increases in nonvoting due to disability or illness. The state's rate of nonvoting due to registration and absentee ballot problems also increased, and Georgia did not add online voter registration or postelection audits, which many other states have implemented since 2008. The state did pass online voter registration legislation, but it has not been implemented. Lastly, it was one of only 10 to report less data to the federal Election Assistance Commission as measured by the index in 2012 than in 2008.

After Georgia, the states with the largest decreases in overall average since 2008 were Hawaii and Vermont.

High-performing states stay strong; low performers remain near the bottom

One of the most important facts emerging from the index is that certain states consistently perform at a high level on elections, and others are chronic underperformers. Over time, better data and a clearer understanding of the characteristics of these two groups will help all states identify the problems that most commonly hinder improvement and recognize truly effective election administration.

High performers continue to lead the way

At the state level, the highest-performing states in 2012—those in the top 25 percent—were Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin. Seven of these—Colorado, Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin—were also high performers in 2008 and 2010, and six states—Colorado,

Connecticut, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, and North Carolina—saw their overall scores rise more than the national average increase from 2008 to 2012.

North Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin had the highest rankings for both presidential election years. This consistently strong performance could be due, in part, to their voter registration policies. Minnesota and Wisconsin allow Election Day registration, and North Dakota doesn't require voters to register. Previous research shows these policies can correlate with higher turnout, and in most cases it eliminates the need for provisional ballots.³ Turnout was highest in Minnesota and Wisconsin in 2012; both exceeded 70 percent of the eligible population.⁴

Registration Policies Improve Elections Performance

States that offer more convenient and efficient ways for voters to register and update their registrations can avoid many common issues, such as registrations rejected, use of provisional ballots, and nonvoting due to registrations problems.

Seven of the 10 states with the lowest rates of registration or absentee ballot problems in 2012—Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Wisconsin—allowed Election Day registration or did not require voter registration. Maine, Minnesota, and Wisconsin had the lowest rates of these problems, 1 percent.

Additionally, states that adopt online voter registration can increase the accuracy of their rolls while also reducing costs to election officials and taxpayers.⁵ States using the latest technology to conduct data matching of voter registration lists, such as those participating in the Electronic Registration Information Center, or ERIC, have reduced the number of provisional ballots cast and rejected, as well as the proportion of the population that fails to vote due to a registration problem.⁶ The Presidential Commission on Election Administration recommends both online voter registration and participation in ERIC. For more information, visit ericstates.org.

Low performers still face challenges

Eleven states—Alabama, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia—and the District of Columbia were in the lowest 25 percent of the index in 2012. Six of these—Alabama, California, Mississippi, New York, Oklahoma, and West Virginia—were also ranked at the bottom in 2008 and 2010. Mississippi was the lowest performer in all three years. Of those at the bottom in 2012, only the overall averages of Hawaii, Oklahoma, and Texas decreased since 2008.

Importantly, because overall averages are calculated based on the performance of other states, sometimes even dramatic improvement or decline within a state will not be reflected in its ranking relative to other states. As noted earlier, this is evident in the case of the District of Columbia. The district improved the most in 2012 compared with its performance in 2008, but it still fell into the group of low performers because widespread improvement elsewhere also raised the national average significantly. This highlights the value of considering multiple points of comparison, made possible by the index: evaluating states against the national average; state against state; and a single state with itself year over year. The district gets high marks for improving on multiple indicators as compared with its 2008 performance; relative to the rest of the nation, however, it still has much room for improvement.

Whether a high performer, low performer, or somewhere in between, all states have the opportunity to do better in coming years. Learning more about those states that consistently outperform, and those that consistently struggle, can help all states improve.

Indicators

Individual indicators reveal critical information about what is driving better overall state performance, as well as what consistently holds states back.

The nationwide view

Nationally, 12 of the 17 indicators improved, with notable gains in six areas:

- **Wait times** decreased about 18 percent, or by about 3 minutes, on average, from 2008 to 2012.
- 13 states had **online voter registration** in 2012, compared with just two in 2008.
- 18 states and the district reported 100 percent **complete data** to the Election Assistance Commission in 2012, compared with only seven in 2008.
- Rates of **nonvoting due to disability or illness** declined nationally by nearly 0.5 percent; rates declined in 27 states and the district.
- Rates of **nonvoting due to registration or absentee ballot problems** decreased nationally by nearly 0.4 percent; rates declined in 28 states and the district.
- 30 states and the district required **postelection audits** in 2012, compared with 23 in 2008; audits allow states to ensure that voting equipment is functioning properly and delivering an accurate result.

Five indicators declined from 2008 to 2012. Of these, the most significant was voter turnout, which dropped by 3.4 percentage points. This was not surprising because voters in the 2012 election expressed less enthusiasm than in the 2008 presidential contest, which recorded the highest turnout since 1968.⁷

Additionally, the number of provisional ballots issued increased 25 percent in 2012, and the number of provisional ballots rejected increased 7 percent.

Performance varied by region

At least three indicators varied substantially by region:⁸

Nonvoting due to disability- or illness-related problems

The average rate for this indicator across both 2008 and 2012 in the Northeast was 17.7 percent and in the South was 19.0 percent, both significantly higher than rates in the Midwest, 14.4 percent, and the West, 12.4 percent.⁹ Of the 10 jurisdictions with the highest rates in 2012, six—Alabama, the district, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia—were in the South, and three—Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Rhode Island—were in the Northeast.

Turnout

Average turnout across both years was highest in the Midwest, 65.6 percent, and the Northeast, 64.5 percent, both significantly higher than the South's rate of 59.4 percent.¹⁰ Two Midwestern states—Minnesota and

Wisconsin—had the highest turnout in both 2008 and 2012; but of the five states with the lowest turnout in 2012, four—Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia—were in the South.

Average voting wait times

Long lines at the polls in several states in 2012 made headlines, and as a result, wait times were understood by many voters to be a major problem nationwide. Data from the Survey of the Performance of American Elections, however, show that wait times actually decreased by about three minutes, on average, from 2008 to 2012.

Where longer wait times were recorded in both years, they generally were concentrated regionally. Of the 10 jurisdictions with the longest average waits to vote in 2012, eight were in the South—the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia. And six of those also had some of the longest wait times in 2008, including:

- Florida, which had the longest wait in 2012 and one of the largest increases—16.1 minutes—from 2008 to 2012.
- South Carolina and Georgia had the two longest wait times in 2008. They also had the two largest decreases in wait times from 2008 to 2012—from 61.5 minutes to 25.2 minutes in South Carolina and from 37.6 to 17.8 minutes in Georgia. Both, however, still remained among the longest wait times in 2012.

Directions for future research

Evidence from the Elections Performance Index indicates that state policies on mail voting and provisional ballots may have cascading effects—affecting scores on other indicators of election administration. Unlike other election policies, such as those to upgrade voter registration practices where the benefits of reform have been documented, policies for mail voting and provisional ballots deserve more research and attention from policymakers as future elections provide additional years of data for analysis.

Mail ballots

Mail voting has been one of the most substantive policy shifts in elections over the past few decades. The index recognizes four classifications of mail-voting policies in states:

- **Limited.** Registered voters must provide a specific reason, often from a pre-established list (e.g., illness, disability, travel, etc.), when requesting an absentee ballot.
- **No excuse.** Any registered voter may request an absentee ballot without providing a reason.
- **Permanent.** No-excuse mail voting is permitted, and registered voters have the option of automatically receiving absentee ballots by mail for all future elections.
- **Full vote-by-mail.** Elections are conducted entirely by mail.

Research shows that voters like the convenience of casting their ballot by mail. This is especially true in states with fewer limitations on the use of mail ballots.¹¹ With respect to the index, only six states allowed individuals to cast a domestic ballot by mail without an excuse in 1988. By 2012, that number had grown to 27 states and the District of Columbia.¹² Mail-voting policies are related to performance on a number of indicators:

- On average, states with limited mail voting had higher rates of nonvoting due to disability or illness—18.6 percent in 2008 and 2012, compared with states offering no-excuse and permanent mail voting—14.3 percent and 14.7 percent, respectively.¹³ This is reaffirmed in preliminary research, which suggests that, even though

disability is a valid reason for requesting a mail ballot in limited mail-voting states, more permissive regimes are associated with higher turnout among the disabled.¹⁴

- On average, mail ballot rejection rates in permanent mail-voting states were nearly double those of states with no-excuse mail voting and more than three times those of states with limited mail voting.¹⁵
- Permanent mail-voting states had much higher rates of mail ballots not being returned, on average: 14.3 percent in 2012, compared with 6.5 percent in limited states and 9.0 percent in no-excuse states.
- Permanent mail-voting states typically had higher rates of nonvoting due to registration or absentee ballot problems: 7.9 percent, compared with 5.9 percent in no-excuse and 5.8 percent in limited states.¹⁶

As there are apparent trade-offs with different types of mail-ballot regimes, additional research is needed to better understand the effects of mail-voting policies, particularly the high rates of unreturned and rejected absentee ballots in permanent and full vote-by-mail states, as well as the lower rates of nonvoting due to disability or illness in these states.

Provisional ballots

Provisional ballots are most often cast when there is a discrepancy between a voter's registration record and the information he or she presents at the polls. If the voter is deemed eligible in a later review, the ballot is counted. The EPI rewards states for low rates of provisional ballots cast and high rates of provisional ballots counted. This means that states that issue provisional ballots more frequently are penalized in the index, even if most are ultimately counted.

This judgment is based on recent research. Compared with standard ballots, provisional ballots are more costly, inefficient, and administratively burdensome. Large numbers of provisional ballots have also been cited as contributing to long lines at polling places. Testimony before the Presidential Commission on Election Administration indicated that laws resulting in large numbers of provisional ballots tended to slow the voting process at the polls.¹⁷ These burdens can exacerbate controversy in close races, when provisional ballots often become the focal point for any challenged election or recount.¹⁸ Consequently, provisional ballots—designed as a fail-safe to allow a voter, otherwise disenfranchised, to cast a ballot that could be counted after eligibility was confirmed—have been compared to canaries in the coal mine, because in large numbers they can indicate that an election system is not working efficiently.¹⁹

The use of provisional ballots varies dramatically. Future research should include systematic evaluation of state laws regarding the use and counting of provisional ballots. Policy choices by states can inform our understanding of provisional ballot use, and research on the cost and administrative burden of provisional ballots will help states weigh their options.

Recommendations

From 2008 to 2012, states' elections performance improved overall. For all states, but especially those with low scores or that were near the bottom in both years, strategies are available to spur improvement. These recommendations are not Pew's alone. Most were also included in the Presidential Commission on Election Administration's 2014 report.

- **Ensure that more and better elections data are collected.** Data completeness, specifically as reported to the federal Election Assistance Commission, is an indicator that offers a clear path toward improvement. Some

states have systems designed to effectively and accurately collect source data from local election jurisdictions, but many do not. Not only will the best use of technology improve data collection by and from local election jurisdictions, it will also lead to higher completeness rates and help provide necessary tools to states to more finely assess how well elections are run and how to improve the voting experience. As the Presidential Commission on Election Administration notes, “If the experience of individual voters is to improve, the availability and use of data by local jurisdictions must increase substantially.”²⁰

- **Implement online voter registration.** Offering voters the opportunity to register and update their information online provides measurable benefits to states and helps improve overall election administration. In particular, online voter registration saves taxpayer dollars, increases the accuracy of voter rolls, and provides convenience to voters.²¹ And by giving voters a simple way to keep their records up-to-date after a move or name change, online registration may reduce voter registration problems and the need for provisional ballots.
- **Upgrade voter registration.** There are several ways to do this, including online voter registration. Additionally, eight states and the District of Columbia have joined the Electronic Registration Information Center, a data-sharing partnership that helps participating states to keep better track of voters who have moved or died and to encourage those who are eligible to vote but have not yet registered. This keeps voter information more up-to-date while helping eliminate some of the registration problems that may result in provisional ballots on Election Day.²²
- **Offer a complete set of online voting information lookup tools.** More states offered a wider range of online voter information tools in 2012 than in 2008. In 2008, 11 states had none of these tools. In 2012, only two states, California and Vermont, did not furnish any of these tools. The more states provide such tools, the more access voters will have to election information where they look for it most—online—and the more problems, such as being at the wrong polling place and thus voting by provisional ballot, can be avoided.²³
- **Require postelection audits.** Mandating a postelection audit allows states to ensure that voting equipment is functioning properly, correct procedures are being followed, and problems are identified quickly.

Conclusion

The Elections Performance Index provides the first opportunity for policymakers, election administrators, and the public to see how states performed in 2012 and to evaluate changes since the 2008 presidential election. Future iterations of the index will offer still more opportunities to compare similar elections—such as the 2010 and 2014 midterms—and to see the state of elections over a much longer time frame, from 2008 to 2016 and beyond.

As data improve, there will be additional uses for the index. When states change policy or administration, the index will be able to track the effect of those actions. Additionally, as we learn more about how elections run and how best to measure them, we expect to refine the index by adding, changing, or subtracting indicators to better reflect the characteristics of effective, efficient election administration.



Future iterations of the index will offer still more opportunities to compare similar elections—such as the 2010 and 2014 midterms—and to see the state of elections over a much longer time frame, from 2008 to 2016 and beyond.”

Endnotes

- 1 Presidential Commission on Election Administration, *The American Voting Experience: Report and Recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration* (January 2014), <https://www.supportthevoter.gov/files/2014/01/Amer-Voting-Exper-final-draft-01-09-14-508.pdf>.
- 2 A state's overall EPI average is calculated from its performance on all 17 indicators, relative to all states. A state with an average of 100 percent would have the best value of any state on every indicator across both 2008 and 2012, and a state with an average of zero would have the worst value on every indicator across both years. Because these averages are based on the performance of all states in those years, even a state with a 100 percent average has room for improvement in future elections.
- 3 Stephen Knack, "Election Day Registration: The Second Wave" (1998), http://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25011/1/MPRA_paper_25011.pdf.
- 4 Although these Election Day registration states do well on the indicators we measure, high performance is not a universal feature of states with this policy. Idaho and Montana have Election Day registration and do not have higher overall averages in any of the years. Further, as discussed in the methodology (www.pewstates.org/epi-methodology), the index is not able to capture certain empirical evidence of the performance or implementation of Election Day registration that occurs in the polling place. Some have questioned how to measure the quality or integrity of the implementation of an Election Day-registration system, but the lack of comprehensively good data means that scores for this indicator may be inflated.
- 5 The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Understanding Online Voter Registration" (January 2014), http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2013/Understanding_Online_Voter_Registration.pdf.
- 6 Gary Bland and Barry C. Burden, "Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC): Stage 1 Evaluation," report to The Pew Charitable Trusts by RTI International (Dec. 10, 2013), http://www.rti.org/pubs/eric_stage1report_pewfinal_12-3-13.pdf.
- 7 The drop in interest and enthusiasm among adults nationally was demonstrated in a number of polls before and after the 2012 election. Gallup found that the proportion of adults who were "more enthusiastic than usual about voting" decreased from 62 percent in 2008 to 47 percent in 2012. See <http://www.gallup.com/poll/153038/gop-slightly-ahead-voting-enthusiasm.aspx>.
- 8 The index uses the U.S. Census Bureau regional designations of Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. The Northeast includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The Midwest is made up of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The South includes Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. The West is composed of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.
- 9 In nonvoting due to disability or illness, the difference between the South and the Northeast, compared with the Midwest and the West, is statistically significant, $p < 0.01$.
- 10 The difference in turnout between the Midwest and the Northeast, compared with the South, is statistically significant, $p < 0.05$.
- 11 John Fortier, *Absentee and Early Voting: Trends, Promises, and Perils* (Washington: AEI Press, October 2006). The proportion of voters casting ballots by mail in 2012 almost tripled, to 20 percent, compared with 1980.
- 12 "Absentee and Early Voting," the National Conference of State Legislatures, <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/absentee-and-early-voting.aspx>.
- 13 The difference between the average rate of nonvoting due to disability or illness for permanent states and for limited states and the difference between the average rate of nonvoting due to disability or illness for limited states and for no-excuse states is statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.
- 14 Lisa Schur and Douglas Kruse, "Disability and Election Policies and Practices," in *The Measure of American Elections*, eds. Barry C. Burden and Charles Stewart III, forthcoming.
- 15 The difference between the average rejection rate for permanent states and for limited states and the difference between the average rejection rate for permanent states and for no-excuse states is statistically significant, $p < 0.01$. It is unclear whether there is a difference between the rejection rates for limited and no-excuse states.
- 16 The difference between the average rate of nonvoting due to registration or absentee ballot problems for permanent states and for limited states and the difference between the average rate of nonvoting due to registration or absentee ballot problems for permanent states and for no-excuse states is statistically significant, $p < 0.01$.



Election Day, Nov. 5, 2013, Tuckahoe Elementary School, Arlington, VA.

- 17 States that rely on provisional ballots as a mechanism for updating voter registration rolls may be less likely to seek out more cost-effective and efficient solutions to their administrative procedures. See Daron Shaw and Vincent Hutchings, "Report on Provisional Ballots and American Elections," submitted to the Presidential Commission on Election Administration (June 21, 2013), <https://www.supportthevoter.gov/files/2013/08/Daron-Shaw-Provisional-Ballots-Shaw-and-Hutchings.pdf>; Presidential Commission on Election Administration, *The American Voting Experience*; "Provisional Ballots General 2012," Maricopa County, AZ, Elections Department (Jan. 30, 2013), <http://recorder.maricopa.gov/voteroutreach/pdf/english/1-2013%20General%202012%20Provisionals.pdf>; Gregory J. Diaz, "Voting and Registering to Vote: The 2013 Report of the Nevada County Elections Office" (March 28, 2013), <http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/elections/docs/The%202013%20Report%20of%20the%20Nevada%20County%20Elections%20Office.pdf>; and "After-Action Report on the November 6, 2012, General and Special Elections," District of Columbia Board of Elections (Feb. 4, 2013), http://www.dcboee.org/popup.asp?url=/pdf_files/nr_1108.pdf.
- 18 States that issue large numbers of provisional ballots risk having an election outcome hinge on these ballots. See David C. Kimball and Edward B. Foley, "Unsuccessful Provisional Voting in the 2008 General Election" (http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2009/ProvBallots_Kimball_Foley_essay%281%29.pdf), in Martha Kropf and David C. Kimball, *Helping America Vote: The Limits of Election Reform* (New York, London: Routledge, 2012).
- 19 Heather Gerken and J. Skelly Wright, "Provisional Ballots: The Miner's Canary for Election Administration," research for The Pew Charitable Trusts (July 2009), [http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2009/ProvBallots_Gerken_essay\(1\).pdf](http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2009/ProvBallots_Gerken_essay(1).pdf).
- 20 Presidential Commission on Election Administration, *The American Voting Experience*.
- 21 Matt Barreto, Bonnie Glaser, and Karin MacDonald, "Online Voter Registration (OLVR) Systems in Arizona and Washington: Evaluating Public Usage, Public Confidence, and Implementation Processes," a report for The Pew Charitable Trusts' center on the states (2010), http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2010/online_voter_reg.pdf; and Christopher Ponoroff, "Voter Registration in a Digital Age," Brennan Center for Justice (2010), http://brennan.3cdn.net/806ab5ea23fde7c261_n1m6b1s4z.pdf.
- 22 Bland and Burden, "Electronic Registration Information Center."
- 23 A September 2013 survey by Public Opinion Strategies and the Mellman Group on behalf of The Pew Charitable Trusts found that 58 percent of registered voters look for election information online. <http://www.pewstates.org/research/analysis/polling-summary-updating-voter-registration-85899538627>.

The Pew Charitable Trusts

Susan K. Urahn, executive vice president

Alexis Schuler, senior director

Election initiatives team

David Becker

Zachary Markovits

Heather Creek

Sean Greene

Maria Ho

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank our advisory board of more than 20 election officials and academics who provided invaluable insight and feedback in developing the Elections Performance Index. Charles Stewart III, the Kenan Sahin distinguished professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and his research assistant, Stephen Pettigrew, contributed unmatched guidance and research support for the project. Additional thanks go to Jennifer Carlson, Joshua Hart, Emily Lando, Melissa Maynard, Benjamin Navarro, Mary Tanner Noel, Kao Phetchareun, and Jacintha Wadlington for their review of this report and the online interactive. Throughout the editorial process, Jennifer V. Doctors provided critical advice and feedback. The team at Pitch Interactive Inc. designed the online interactive for this report, while printable graphics and design for this research were created by Kristin Centrella with assistance from Dan Benderly and Jennifer Peltak. Frederick Schecker and Natalia Pelayo contributed Web support. Stephanie Bosh and Tammie Smith provided strategic advice and production and media assistance on this product.

External reviewers

The project also benefited from the feedback and guidance offered by external reviewers David T. Canon, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and David W. Nickerson, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame. Although they provided constructive suggestions on the content, neither they nor their organizations necessarily endorse Pew's findings or conclusions.

Contact: Stephanie Bosh, officer, communications **Email:** sbosh@pewtrusts.org **Project website:** pewtrusts.org/elections

The Pew Charitable Trusts is driven by the power of knowledge to solve today's most challenging problems. Pew applies a rigorous, analytical approach to improve public policy, inform the public, and stimulate civic life.