

TRANSFORMATIONS THROUGH CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

A National Evaluation of the Impact of the ENACT Course on
Student Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behavior



2023

Kaitie Chakoian, Ph.D. Candidate
Social Policy: Economic & Racial Equity
The Heller School for Social Policy and
Management
Brandeis University

Melissa Stimell, JD
Professor of the Practice
Director ENACT, The Educational Network for
Active Civic Transformation
Brandeis University

Brandeis University

Contents

Contents	1
Overview	2
Key Findings	2
Methods	3
Results	4
Upon Completing an ENACT Course, Students have Political Efficacy	4
Political Efficacy Leads to Political Engagement	5
ENACT Teaches Critical Knowledge and Skills	8
Action Steps for Future Evaluation	9
Conclusion	11
Appendices	12
Appendix A: Sample Schedule of Assignments	12
Appendix B: Disaggregated Data	17
Appendix C: Participating Schools	20
Appendix D: About the Authors	21



“I had had very minimal contact with government institutions. This class was the first real experience I had.... Now I no longer feel alienated and disconnected from my personal representatives and senators.”

Overview

The Educational Network for Active Civic Transformation (ENACT) is a national, non-partisan program based at Brandeis University that engages undergraduates at colleges and universities in state-level legislative change by teaching them to work with legislators, staffers, and community organizations to advance policy. By engaging young people around the country in civic activism built on knowledge, cooperation, justice and integrity, ENACT is becoming a major voice in addressing challenges to American democracy. In ENACT courses, students learn about participating in the legislative and advocacy process at the state level, with a substantial hands-on component in which they engage directly in that process.

In the 2022-2023 academic year, ENACT courses ran at 15 schools in 15 states. In total, since its inception 12 years ago, ENACT has trained Faculty Fellows (a total of 59) teaching in colleges and universities in all 50 states. Approximately 3000 students have participated in ENACT courses to date.

Twelve years after its initial implementation, ENACT participants have demonstrated positive outcomes, as noted by course faculty, in final presentations and mock advocacy sessions, and in feedback from legislators who interact with students. In 2021, a group of seasoned ENACT faculty and administrators collaborated to build an evaluation tool to systematically measure the impact of participating in an ENACT course on students' attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, and skills around civic engagement.


Key Findings

- Students who complete an ENACT course feel competent to participate politically and feel that their participation can have an impact on political outcomes. This political efficacy translates to heightened levels of civic engagement.
- ENACT participants are more civically engaged than a national sample of U.S. residents. When results from this survey are combined with previous pilot research on ENACT alumni, it is clear that ENACT participants vote in national, state, local, and primary elections at very high rates, compared to national samples. They also participate in various other forms of civic engagement such as attending public rallies and demonstrations and donating money to campaigns or causes that are important to them.
- ENACT courses help students develop critical and translatable professional skills including effective communication and the ability to work collaboratively with others.

Methods

Students who enrolled in ENACT courses between January 2022-May 2023 were surveyed immediately following completion of their course (or as a final course activity). The survey asked about students' attitudes, knowledge, and behavior around civic engagement, as well as their perceptions of the impact the ENACT course had on them. During this period, 32 ENACT courses ran with approximately 333 total students enrolled across courses. In total, 143 students (31%) from 16 schools (73%) completed the survey.

The majority of participants (56%) enrolled in the ENACT course in their senior year. Another 21% took the course as juniors and 18% as sophomores. Social science majors (Anthropology, Economics, Ethnic Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, etc) made up 65% of survey participants. Health professions, business, art and humanities majors each respectively accounted for 7% of participants. The remainder were biological and life science majors (5%), math and computer science majors (2%), education majors (<1%), physical science majors (<1%), or selected "other" as their major (5%). Participants self-identify across the political spectrum, but the vast majority (70%) identify as left-leaning.



Participants came from a variety of backgrounds and identities. Nearly two-thirds (61%) identified as White, 12% as Hispanic, Latino or Spanish, 10% as Asian, 8% as Black or African American, 5% as Middle Eastern or North African, and 2% as either American Indian/Alaska Native or Other, respectively. Over two-thirds (67%) identified as women, 27% as men, and 5% as nonbinary.¹ Just over one-quarter (27%) of participants were first generation college students. When asked to


¹ One student participant noted that these gender categories were too limited and the question should instead be open-ended so that participants could enter the identities that best suit them. See "Action Steps for Future Evaluation" for further consideration of this feedback.

consider their family’s access to money and resources as they grew up², 22% indicated that they had less than enough, 49% had enough, and 29% had more than enough. Similarly, when asked about how much of a problem drugs, violence, gangs, and crime were in the neighborhood where they grew up, 32% said they were somewhat or a big problem, 31% said they were not much of a problem, and 37% said they were no problem at all.

Results

Upon Completing an ENACT Course, Students have Political Efficacy

Political efficacy is a necessary condition for civic engagement.³ When people feel competent to participate politically and feel that their participation can have an impact on political outcomes, they are more likely to be civically engaged. ENACT alumni are confident in their own political efficacy. Respondents indicated that they think they are better informed about politics and government than most people (84%), and feel they could do as good a job in public office as most other people (75%). The majority are interested in politics (86%) and consider themselves to be politically active (72%). Finally, over three-quarters (77%) believe that they personally can influence politics or policy in their communities and states.



² These final two questions were taken from the Black Youth Project Survey. Cathy J. Cohen. 2005. "Black Youth Culture Survey." Chicago, IL: *Black Youth Project*. <http://www.blackyouthproject.com>.

³ Almond, G. A., and Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton University Press.

In 2022, this research team surveyed ENACT alumni from Brandeis University who had taken the course between 2011 and 2020.⁴ The results above echo what was found even in students who enrolled in ENACT courses up to a decade ago. They feel empowered to engage with local and state politics and these feelings of efficacy translate to actual political engagement.

Possibly contributing to the efficacy reported by participants, students are confident in their own skills related to navigating the political and policy-making process. Of all respondents, 94% reported that they know the steps a bill goes through between being proposed and being passed into law. Respectively, 92% know who to contact if they are dissatisfied with a policy and feel that they know enough to participate in politics. Finally, 89% indicated that they have a good understanding of the important political issues facing their state.

"I'd say out of the limited experiences I have had personally with the government that there are many good things being done but very many mistakes being made as well... one of the main reasons I want to work in government and politics is to change the ways things are operated."

Political Efficacy Leads to Political Engagement


Students who complete an ENACT course are engaged in social, civic, and political activity. Within the past 12 months, 79% have attended meetings related to politics and 71% have signed a petition. Though a smaller percentage, over 50% had posted about politics on online social networks (58% before the semester began, and 53% during the semester they took the ENACT course⁵), 36% wrote a letter to a newspaper editor, 26% of students had volunteered for a political campaign and 23% contributed money to a political organization or candidate. Looking beyond just one year, 68% have attended a political rally or speech (41% in the past year) and/or demonstrated or protested for a cause they care about (35% in the past year).

This level of engagement is above average, based on other national surveys. In 2018, the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI) and The Atlantic conducted a survey with a random sample of over 1000 adults living in the U.S. about their civic engagement. The PRRI/The Atlantic Civic Engagement Survey found that a minority of participants had attended a rally or demonstration (8%), volunteered with a group or cause (14%), attended a community meeting (12%), donated

⁴ Chakoian, K., Powley, C., & Stimell, M. (2022). Transforming the civic engagement of future generations: A pilot evaluation of the impact of the ENACT course on alumni civic engagement and career trajectories. <https://enact-resources.s3.amazonaws.com/ENACT%20Pilot%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20February%202022.pdf>

⁵ Posting on online social networks is not part of the required course assignments for the ENACT class.

money to a campaign or cause (19%), posted on social media about an issue that matters to them (23%), or signed an online petition (28%), in the past 12 months.⁶



ENACT students also indicated a high rate of political engagement through voting. Nearly all (95%) students are registered to vote. Three students indicated that they are not eligible to vote (likely due to citizenship status) and only three students out of 143 are eligible but not registered. Over 80% voted in the 2020 election, and 67% voted in the 2020 primary. Just under one-third of students voted in the most recent midterm (30%), state (31%), and local (26%) elections. The majority (89%) intend to vote in the next state and local elections.

Looking at the voting behavior of ENACT alumni who completed the course a year or more before being surveyed, participation rates are even higher. Every single respondent to the alumni survey indicated that they are currently registered to vote and voted in the 2020 election. The majority of survey respondents who were eligible voted in the most recent state (95%), local (85%), and primary (87%) elections, while 93% plan to vote in the next general election (2022, at the time the survey was administered) and 96% plan to vote in the next Presidential election (2024).

⁶ Jones, R., Cox, D., Griffin, R., Najile, M., Fisch-Friedman, M., and Vandermaas-Peeler, A. (2018). *American democracy in crisis: Civic engagement, young adult activism, and the 2018 midterm elections*. <https://www.prii.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Civic-Engagement-NovB.pdf>

Note: this survey has not been conducted since 2018

Both students who recently completed the course and alumni with more distance from the program exhibit much higher voting rates than state and national averages. Only 74% of citizens, ages 18-24, voted in the 2020 election.⁷ According to the Massachusetts Secretary of the Commonwealth, only 51% of voters turned out for the last non-Presidential state election (2022) and only 37% for the 2020 primary election.⁸ Local election engagement is markedly lower, on average. Cities with high local turnout (such as Boulder, CO and Columbus, OH) see average rates of 20-40%, while cities with low local turnout (Las Vegas, NV, and Ft. Worth, TX) are as low as 6-9%.⁹ In comparison to these more typical numbers, ENACT graduates have an excellent voting record, particularly in presidential elections.

	ENACT Alumni	ENACT Participants	Comparison Groups
Voted in 2020	100%	82%	National average, ages 18-24: 74%
Voted in 2020 primary	87%	67%	Massachusetts voters: 37%
Voted in last state election	95%	31%	Massachusetts voters: 60%
Voted in last local election	85%	26%	High and low turnout cities: 6-40%

Qualitatively, participants described a variety of degrees of engagement with government. They described day-to-day interactions like driving on public roads and having their garbage picked up. Some talked about their own personal experience (outside of the course) lobbying, running non-profits, and sitting on Governor’s councils. Many brought up their voting habits (or lack thereof) as how they engaged with government. A full 30 respondents noted that, prior to this course, their interactions with government had been minimal. A few extrapolated on that point talking about ways that their racial identity, immigration status, or socioeconomic class had limited those interactions. Others who noted having positive experiences explicitly pointed to their own privilege as a factor in that positivity. A repeated theme, particularly among respondents who had limited interactions with government, was the various ways that engaging in the ENACT course helped them to realize they had more access to government officials than they had previously thought.

“I’m 18 years old and so my interactions with government up until this point have been very limited. Before this class I didn’t realize that a normal person like me could just go and meet with political representatives. Now that I understand how to engage, I think I will [do] more in the future.”


⁷ According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s record, “Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2020”: <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/voting-and-registration/p20-585.html>

⁸ <https://www.sec.state.ma.us/e/elevoterturnoutstats/voterturnoutstats.htm>


⁹ According to “Who Votes for Mayor”, a project of Portland State University: <http://whovotesformayor.org/>

ENACT Teaches Critical Knowledge and Skills

Students completing ENACT courses credit the class with building skills that hold value in their professional careers. Over 83% believe that the ENACT program contributed to their skill in working with others. This outcome makes sense as the course is typically structured so that students work in pairs or in small teams to learn about and advocate for policy proposals at the state level.¹⁰ Similarly, 79% indicated that the ENACT course helped develop their writing skills and 76% believe it helped develop their ability to speak clearly and effectively. These skills are honed through the variety of assignments that build to the final Legal Advocacy Project, including writing a Legislative Research Report, OpEd, a visual Storybook, elevator pitch and letter to legislators, as well as through the many opportunities (and obligations) students have to interact with policymakers, community coalition leaders, and university personnel throughout the course. (For a sample schedule of assignments for an ENACT course, see Appendix A). Other skills that students note as a result of completing the ENACT course are an ability to see the world from others' perspectives (91% see this as a strength of theirs) and the ability to discuss controversial issues (90% feel this is at least somewhat of a strength).



¹⁰ This is not true in all iterations of ENACT courses. See "Action Steps for Future Evaluation" for further consideration of the impact of different course components on outcomes.



Action Steps for Future Evaluation

Upon completion of data collection for this report, preliminary results were shared at the ENACT Institute, held in June 2023 at Brandeis University. Faculty Fellows shared initial impressions and a sub-group of experienced Faculty Fellows (all joined the program prior to 2019) who had initially helped to design this evaluation tool provided feedback and dialogue around the results and future steps for this project. Finally, anecdotal responses from student survey participants were captured at the time of survey administration about how to continue to develop the tool. Below are action steps that emerged.

1. **Future re-designs of this evaluation process should include student representation:** Student survey participants provided insightful feedback on the content of the survey, as well as the format of some of the questions. It is in alignment with the mission of the ENACT program to provide students with access to committees that are designing this evaluation so that those students may use their voices to advocate for their needs, while also learning from the collaborative academic process.
2. **More data is needed to enable disaggregation by subgroups and analysis of group differences:** The results of these first 18 months of the national evaluation are promising and show positive impacts of the ENACT program. In order to better understand the nuances of what components of the program have which impacts, it is necessary to be able to disaggregate groups. For instance, it would be beneficial to compare private schools, public schools, and community colleges, or courses taught by faculty trained in person or online, or courses whose schedule of assignments includes 5-10 elements of the ENACT curriculum with those that contain only 3-5. A preliminary attempt at this disaggregation was made (tables of these comparisons can be found in Appendix B). While the number of

143 respondents is respectable for an evaluation of this scale, it loses its statistical power as it's divided into subgroups. Additionally, these subgroup divisions are not symmetrical. For instance, when looking at courses that provided syllabi and total enrollment numbers, only four schools had at least five components of the ENACT schedule of assignments. These schools made up 56 total participants, 49 of which were from the same institution over the course of two semesters. More data is needed in order to take these important next analytical steps. There may be strategies for optimizing participation to explore, including incentivizing student and/or faculty engagement.

3. **Methodology needs to be revised in order to ensure there is continued access to control group data:** The original design of this survey ensured that data could be compared against a national sample by utilizing questions from already existing surveys. All of the data points in this report that include comparison data refer to questions asked in the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI)/The Atlantic Civic Engagement survey, last conducted in 2018. Unfortunately, this survey is no longer regularly administered. This means that data in this project can be compared against data up through 2018, but cannot keep pace moving forward. Given the broad-reaching impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and the changing political climate, comparison to 2018 data and trends is insufficient. Either revising the questions to mirror those from other, ongoing surveys, or creating a different control group (such as students in more traditional political science classes) is necessary moving forward.
4. **Explanatory results would benefit from the inclusion of more qualitative, open-ended questions in the survey:** Results from the first 18 months of this evaluation project are illuminative. At the same time, there is much that quantitative data cannot capture. This evaluation team saw great success from including open-ended qualitative questions in the 2022 ENACT Alumni pilot evaluation.¹¹ The addition of similar questions in this survey tool would add to the depth of information participants are able to provide. Additional qualitative data collection tools (e.g., end-of-semester focus groups of students and faculty) could also be beneficial.
5. **The current tool carefully evaluates individual outcomes, but future iterations should expand to explore impacts on collective efficacy:** The existing survey questions focus on individual students' attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. This is aligned with the country's historic and predominant allegiance to individual liberalism – where individuals have the ability to learn skills, work hard, influence their government, and change their own material circumstances. An alternate political theory is one in which not only the attitudes, behavior, and knowledge of individuals are of import, but also those of communities. Incorporating measures into this evaluation tool that examine how students share what they learn in the course with others in their life and how it impacts the efficacy of communities would allow for greater exploration of alternative theories of political power-building.

¹¹ Ibid

Conclusion

ENACT courses are designed to teach undergraduate students to engage in state-level legislative change through hands on engagement with the political process. Through the administration of a survey to 143 ENACT participants between January 2022-May 2023, this report finds that upon completing the course, students report high levels of political efficacy. Students feel well-qualified and equipped to engage with the political process. This political efficacy translates to higher-than-average levels of political activity – through both individual actions (attending meetings, rallies, demonstrations, contributing money and volunteering) and voting behavior. For many students, the ENACT course opened the door to political activity by showing them the access they already had to the political process and providing critical knowledge and skills to build their confidence to engage with it. Finally, there are many new directions to take future evaluation of the ENACT program to better understand the impact of individual components and the program’s potential for future students and their communities.



I feel a little more empowered as a citizen because I now know that I have a voice and I can use it.”

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample Schedule of Assignments

A. The Legislative Research Report

Team Assignment

The report is a **10-page document** in support of your bill. It should contain detailed arguments and counterarguments with facts, figures, analyses, and relevant studies explaining the rationale and consequences of the bill. It might be helpful to examine similar legislation in other states. Students in other states working on similar bills might be helpful via ENACT. The report should clearly cite relevant research and contain a bibliography. This report is especially helpful to the staff or few legislators who wish to become experts on this bill; or as a training document for coalition staff and grassroots leaders.

Your report will be graded on the following criteria:

analysis of legislation,
arguments and research in support of legislation,
response to counterarguments,
quality and breath of works cited, and
quality of writing.

B. Storybook

Team Assignment

For elected and appointed policymakers a book of good stories about a critical mass of constituents with a fixable policy problem, the campaign storybook, is an invitation to be a hero. We all like a good story. There is something about real stories of real people with real problems that makes us want to help-especially when we are in a place with the expertise and the power to fix the problem. In this assignment, you and your team will create a campaign storybook consisting of, at a minimum, two separate stories. These stories must originate from real people through personal interviews, testimony at hearings that you attended, or informal meetings. The final product should include: a distilled version of the full interview, stating the compelling essence of the story presented in a visually pleasing manner. The storybook also should include the bill's title and number, its essence in layperson's language, the problem it seeks to fix, and your contact info for people who want to get more information. It will be important to ask the participant's name, contact information, the participant's willingness to talk to policymakers, and the participant's willingness to talk to the media. **It also will be important to give yourself adequate time to identify people to include in your storybook, to obtain the story, and to present it in an effective manner.**

Your storybook will be graded on the following criteria:
relevance of interview, hearing, or meeting;
quality of substance presented, and
quality of visual presentation.

C. Elevator Speech, Letter to Legislator, and Monologue to Chair of House Ways and Means Committee

Team Assignment

1. Script for the Elevator Speech

All workers on your bill campaign need to handle short telephone or face-to face conversations about the bill. This 30-second rap, known as the elevator speech, is important in quickly getting the essence of the campaign out to potential recruits, staff, and legislators you “bump into on the elevator.” Write the script for your bill campaign's elevator speech. This script should not be longer than **one page**. **Be prepared to make your elevator speech to the class and to answer brief questions.**

Your elevator speech will be graded on the following criteria:
engaged the legislator/staffer, with a common value,
succinctly described the problem,
illustrated the solution, and
made a call to action.

2. Letter to the Legislator

A **one-page** personal letter communicating a genuine response to a problem is very effective with policymakers. Write the letter in support of your campaign issue to your State Representative or State Senator. Type in your address at www.wheredoivotema.com to determine your elected officials, those that represent your current place of residence. Use a standard business letter format.

Your letter will be graded on the following criteria:
engaged this legislator with a common value and a specific connection,
succinctly described the problem,
illustrated the solution,
addressed counterarguments to the bill, and
made a specific call to action.

3. Script for in-depth meeting with House Ways and Means Legislative Staff

The Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee and his legislative staff have put you on his meeting schedule. As always, the Chair is concerned about **finances**. You have **5 minutes** to get your points across and to convince the Chair of Ways and Means to vote the way you wish. Write the script for that speech. The script should not be longer than **three pages**. For simplicity, imagine that you have already done the introductions. The script essentially can be written as a

monologue of what you and/or your teammates would say during the inform-and-persuade portion of the meeting. **Please be prepared to give your 5-minute speech and to answer brief questions.**

Your script for your meeting with the Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee and his staff will be graded on the following criteria:

engaged this specific legislator with a common value and a specific connection,
succinctly described the problem,
illustrated the solution, addressing the Chair's financial concerns,
made a specific request of the Chair,
addressed counterarguments to the bill, addressing financial concerns.

D. Media Advocacy

Create a media advocacy campaign consisting of two media activities.

1. The OpEd for Bill

Individual Assignment

OpEd (literally, opposite the editorial page) represents the views of individual writers. This page is designed to present a broad array of views from members of Greater Boston. The Boston Globe is interested in featuring your perspective in an OpEd piece. The written piece should contain no more than **750 words**. Below are some suggestions:

Focus tightly on one issue or idea in your first paragraph. Be brief.
Express your opinion, then base it on factual, researched, or first-hand information.
Be timely, controversial, but not outrageous. Be the voice of reason.
Be personal and conversational; it can help you make your point.
Be humorous, provided that your topic lends itself to humor.
Have a clear editorial viewpoint - come down hard on one side of the issue. Don't equivocate.
Provide insight, understanding: educate your reader without being preachy.
Near the end, clearly re-state your position and issue a call to action. Do not philosophize.
Have verve, and "fire in the gut" indignation to accompany your logical analysis.
Do not ramble or let your oped unfold slowly, as in an essay.
Use clear, powerful, direct language.
Emphasize active verbs; forget the adjectives and adverbs, which may weaken this writing.
Avoid clichés and jargon.
Appeal to the average reader. Clarity is paramount.
Include a brief bio along with your email address at the end.

Your OpEd will be graded on the following criteria:
Focused tightly on one issue/idea in first paragraph,
Clearly stated viewpoint,
Supported viewpoint,

Used powerful direct language,
Used conversational tone,
Made a call to action, and
Demonstrated quality writing.

Extra credit for OpEds emailed to relevant sites for publishing between date graded OpEd is returned to student and amended and due date of final written portfolio.

2. The Video for Bill

Team Assignment or Individual Assignment

Create a brief infomercial on your bill. You might film yourself explaining your bill. You may use tik-tok.

Video is a forum for instant political commentary through such sites as Facebook and YouTube. Such videos can be created through original film or a combination of original film and a remixing of existing video clips into mash-ups-with-messages. They might borrow from the most popular videos on YouTube, marrying serious substance with lighthearted style. While serious in purpose, video activism can draw on the approach pioneered by entertainment-oriented videos. Create your voice in video. Short and powerful can be the best approach.

Your video will be evaluated on its ability to
engage the audience,
present the problem,
illustrate a solution;
call the audience to action,
create emotional impact, and
originality.

If necessary, remember to identify relevant speakers and cite the source of existing video clips.

Extra credit for Videos emailed to relevant legislators/coalitions between date graded Video is returned to student and amended and due date of final written portfolio.

E. Campaign Advocacy Journal

Individual Assignment

Attend and reflect on **four** substantive advocacy meetings on your bill. These meetings cannot include the initial meeting with your bill's sponsor scheduled by the professor. These meetings can include additional meetings with legislators or staffers, coalition members, and legislative hearings that you attended.

In an additional paragraph, please describe any problems you have experienced in your group project, how you are dealing with those challenges, and what you would like to see happen.

Use your communications with your bill's sponsor, coalition organizations and your class supervisor to identify meeting and event opportunities. Each "journal entry" should describe the location of the meeting, the people present, the reason for the meeting, a synopsis of the substance

of the meeting, the connections made or lack thereof, and your perceptions of what went well and what might have worked even better. If you attend more than the above meetings or events, please include a comprehensive list at the end of the journal. Any additional meetings will be viewed as extra credit towards the grade of the campaign advocacy journal. **The majority of the journal should be reflective.** Your campaign advocacy journal should **not be more than five pages.**

Your campaign journal will be graded on the following criteria:
relevance of the meeting,
your advocacy efforts, and
lessons learned.

F. Present and Defend Legislative Advocacy Project Team Assignment

1. Final Oral Present and Defend

Each team will have **20 minutes** to convince the audience to support its legislation. The audience will role-play as staff to policymakers and interested citizens. Please be prepared for questions. There are multiple possible approaches to the oral presentation. You might use your elevator speech, pieces of your monologue to the Ways and Means Committee, your storybook, parts of your video clip, or something else. As in the final written Legislative Advocacy Project, the presentation should contain a section on next steps. In other words, if you continued to work on the issue, what would be your focus.

Your oral presentation will be graded on the following criteria:
level of preparedness;
evidence of maturation of understanding of legislative process;
level of understanding of issue;
ability to handle questions and comments;
quality of materials presented;
quality of communication skills;
teamwork/collaborative effort.

2. Final Written Legislative Advocacy Project

Your final written legislative advocacy project should consist of amended copies of the prior listed assignments, A-E, based on constructive comments and a new-found knowledge of the issues and the process. Include all members' campaign journals. Do not include the reflection on your group dynamics. **Please add a detailed section on next steps.** Depending on where your bill is in the legislative process, you might discuss potential implementation issues, future advocacy collaborations, potential lobbying problems, substantive problems with the bill itself, and others. **The next-steps section should not be more than three pages.** Please include a table of contents.

Appendix B: Disaggregated Data

None of the data below was found to be statistically significantly different by subgroup, but these are the kinds of disaggregation that could be done with a larger sample size.

Attitudes

Percentage of respondents that indicated they “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree”* with the following statements.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
I am interested in politics	85.72%	85.22%	91.43%	80.71%	88.68%
I could do as good a job in public office as most other people	75%	73.04%	80%	75.44%	79.25%
I am better informed about politics and government than most people	83.57%	81.74%	91.42%	77.2%	88.68%
I am politically active	72.14%	69.56%	77.14%	63.15%	75.47%
Under our form of government, the people have the final say about how the country is run, no matter who is in office	23.36%	21.24%	29.41%	12.28%	26.92%
I can influence politics or policy in my community/state	76.81%	74.34%	80%	64.91%	83.02%
In general, government officials understand people in communities like mine	7.25%	7.96%	5.71%	0%	100%
Government is primarily concerned with giving citizens services *Strongly agree only	2.22%	2.7%	0%	0%	5.77%
Government is primarily concerned with keeping people in line	50%	50%	55.88%	64.92%	34.62%
I know enough to participate in politics	91.43	92.17	88.57	87.72	96.22
I have a good understanding of the important political issues facing this state	89.28	87.83	91.42	84.21	90.57
I know who to contact if I'm dissatisfied with a policy or piece of legislation in this state	91.42	91.31	91.43	85.96	96.22
I know the steps a bill goes through between being proposed and being passed into law at the state level	93.57	95.65	88.57	91.23	98.12

Percentage of respondents that indicated the following were “essential” or “very important”.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
Helping to promote racial understanding	93.08	94.45	90.63	94.44	90.38
Becoming a community leader	70.31	69.81	78.13	65.38	71.15
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values ethics	94.53	96.26	90.32	94.45	100

Working for social change in your career path after college	84.62	83.33	90.63	83.33	78.85
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Behavior

Percentage of respondents that did the following over the past 12 months in support of a group, cause, or campaign they care about.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
Attended a meeting related to politics	78.95	80	75.76	69.64	83.02
Attended a political rally or speech	41.35	39.64	56.25	35.71	35.85
Demonstrated/protected for a cause	35.07	34.23	42.42	32.14	32.08
Written a letter to a newspaper editor	36.36	41.28	18.18	33.33	39.62
Circulated a petition for a candidate or issue, online or on paper	45.86	48.18	36.36	41.82	45.28
Signed a petition, online or on paper	70.68	73.64	63.64	69.09	69.81
Volunteered for a political campaign (unpaid)	25.56	22.73	33.33	21.82	26.42
Worked for a campaign (paid)	12.12	12.84	9.09	9.09	9.62
Contributed money to a political organization or candidate	23.48	22.94	30.3	27.78	20.75

Percentage of respondents who responded "yes" to the following questions about voting behavior.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
Are you currently registered to vote?	95.31	94.29	100	96.08	98.08
Did you vote in the 2020 presidential election?	82.44	82.41	84.38	83.02	83.02
Did you vote in the 2018 national election (midterm)?	29.92	32.08	33.33	30.77	28
Did you vote in the 2018 state election?	31.25	32.08	33.33	28.85	29.41
Did you vote in the 2018 local election?	25.98	26.42	33.33	26.92	22
Did you vote in the 2020 primary election or participate in a caucus for the presidential nomination?	66.94	69.31	62.07	65.96	70.59
Do you intend to vote in the 2024 presidential election?	92.97	92.38	93.75	96.08	92.45
Do you intend to vote in the next state election?	88.89	88.35	90.63	89.8	90.57
Do you intend to vote in the next local election?	88.8	88.24	90.63	89.8	90.38

Skills/Knowledge

Percentage of respondents that rate their own abilities (listed below) as either “a major strength” or “somewhat strong”.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
Ability to see the world from someone else’s perspective	90.84	89.91	92.76	92.46	92.45
Ability to discuss controversial issues	90.08	90.74	90.91	90.74	94.23

Percentage of respondents who indicated that the ENACT course contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas “very much” or “quite a bit”.

	Total Respondents	Faculty Fellows from Cohorts 1&2 (Trained pre-pandemic)	Faculty Fellows from Cohort 3 (Trained during pandemic)	Responded that government officials generally DO NOT understand people in communities like mine	Responded that government officials generally DO understand people in communities like mine.
Speaking clearly and effectively	75.57	75	81.81	72.22	80.87
Writing clearly and effectively	79.39	77.78	90.91	74.08	86.53
Working effectively with others	83.2	86.12	75.75	79.63	84.62

Appendix C: Participating Schools

A full list of schools and faculty fellows who participate in the ENACT program can be found on the [Brandeis University ENACT webpage](#). Below is a list of schools that participated in this evaluation.

Augustana University, SD
Brandeis University, MA
Delaware State University, DE
Emory University, GA
Hendrix College, AR
Metropolitan State University, MN
Middle Tennessee State University, TN
Nebraska Wesleyan University, NE
Phoenix College, AZ
Randolph-Macon College, VA
St. Norbert College, WI
University of Hartford, CT
University of Maine, ME
University of Maryland, MD
University of Nevada, NV
University of New Hampshire, NH

Appendix D: About the Authors

Kaitie Chakoian, PhD Candidate

Kaitie Chakoian is a current doctoral candidate in Social Policy at the Heller School at Brandeis University. Kaitie has been a Teaching Fellow in the ENACT class at Brandeis (“Advocacy for Policy Change”) for five years. Additionally, she has been conducting ENACT evaluation activities since 2021. She also teaches courses to undergraduate and graduate students in gender-based violence, social policy, and qualitative research methods. Outside of academia, Kaitie is the Campus Policy Manager for “End Rape On Campus”, a national organization working end college sexual violence and consults as a report author for the Massachusetts Commission on the Status of Women.

Melissa Stimell, JD

Melissa Stimell is a Professor of the Practice in the Legal Studies Program at Brandeis University. She is the chair of the Program in Social Justice and Social Policy. She is the Director of ENACT, The Educational Network for Active Civic Transformation. She currently teaches Advocacy for Policy Change, Conflict Analysis and Intervention, and Global Justice and Societies in Transition. She also has led Brandeis Summer in The Hague and the seminars accompanying the internship programs. She received her undergraduate degree from Cornell University and her law degree from Boston University School of Law. She has been a public interest attorney for over 30 years, focusing on the representation of vulnerable populations in such areas as criminal law, discrimination of individuals with disabilities, and child welfare.