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Outline

- Conceptual framework
- Data sources
- Elections Performance Index (17 measures)
  - Where Missouri ranks
- One measure of success
  - Impact of new voting equipment
## Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions/Value</th>
<th>Registering Voters</th>
<th>Casting Ballots</th>
<th>Counting Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources

- Surveys of voters
  - Survey of the Performance of American Elections (SPAE)
  - Census Voting and Registration Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS)
- Administrative data from election offices
  - Election Administration and Voting Surveys (EAVS)
- Surveys of election officials
Voting Wait Time in 2008

Missouri (25.9 min.)
Voting Wait Time in 2012

Missouri (13 min.)
Absentee Non-Return Rate in 2008

Absentees not returned
- Less than 3%
- Between 3% and 6.2%
- Over 6.2%
Absentee Rejection Rate in 2008

Missouri (0.2%)
UOCAVA Non-Return Rate in 2010

Missouri (61%)
Military/Overseas Ballots Not Returned in 2010
UOCAVA Rejection Rate in 2010

Missouri (7.7%)
Registration or Absentee Problems in 2008

Missouri (9.9%)
Provisional Ballots Cast in 2008

Missouri (0.2%)
Provisional Ballots Cast in 2008
Measurement Success:
Voting Technology Accuracy

- Residual vote rate
  - Difference between total ballots cast and valid votes cast for president (as % of ballots cast)
- Benchmark in presidential elections (below 1%)
- Residual vote rate in 2000 (before new equipment): 1.8%
- Residual vote rate after new equipment
  - 2004: 1.1%
  - 2008: 1.0%
- Most of the decline due to new voting equipment
Voter Turnout in 2012

Missouri (62.5%)
Summary

- Overall, Missouri ranks highly on many measures.
- State rankings mask a lot of local variation.
- Most challenges/problems are concentrated in heavily populated jurisdictions.
- Some measures lack clear benchmarks, identical definitions.
- Election performance measures are not going away.
The End

• Questions?
• dkimball@umsl.edu
• Thank you!