

Accessibility Testing Protocol

Accessibility testing report for the [system name]

[date]

[Name
Affiliation]

Name
Affiliation}

This report presents the findings of testing conducted [date], and recommendations for improving the accessible voting experience of the [voting devices tested].

Contents

- Summary..... 3
- About the accessibility testing 5
- Participants 11
- Top positives..... 6
- Top problems 7
- Recommendations for deployment..... 8
- All observations..... 9
- Problems..... 10
- Appendix A: Voting instructions 11
- Appendix B: Personas for poll worker scenarios 25

Summary

This report presents the findings of voting machine accessibility testing conducted [dates], for the [who]. It includes accessible voting experience improvement recommendations for the [voting system tested].

Using a ballot specifically designed for accessibility testing, the examiners conducted an expert review of each system, observed six voters with disabilities as they used the system, and worked with fourteen poll workers in a guided review and discussion.

[additional notes for the summary]

Top issues

Examiners and voters identified the top accessibility issues:

[heading for first issue]

- [details for first issue]

[heading for next issue]

- [details for next issue]

[heading for next issue]

- [details for next issue]

The section “All Observations,” below, contains details of the problems observed during the examination, grouped by aspect of the voting system and by severity rating.

About the accessibility testing

Goals

The examination has four goals:

- Continue to refine a method of testing voting systems for accessibility efficiency. This is the third time this new method has been used as part of state certification.
- Gather insights about how the system can be effectively deployed for poll workers and voters.
- Provide those insights to local election officials so that they may make informed and effective voting machine purchases and deployments.
- Serve voters with disabilities better by making the voting experience independent and private for all voters.

How the testing was conducted

[describe the testing, including the system tested, materials used, and a summary of the expert review, testing with voters, and testing with poll workers.

Summarize the number and characteristics of the participants]

Severity scale

In both the expert review and voters with disabilities observations, we categorized these issues based on their impact on a voter's ability to vote independently and privately.

- **Positives** – things that voters mentioned as meeting or exceeding their expectations
- **Annoyances** – things voters mentioned as problems, but which did not significantly slow their progress in marking their ballot
- **Problem solving** – instances where voters hesitated and had to figure out how to complete an action or task, but were able to do so on their own
- **Needs assistance** - problems that could only be solved with help, such as instructions or assistance from a poll worker
- **Likely to prevent independent voting for voters with some disabilities** - problems that could prevent successful independent and private voting, even with good knowledge about how to use the system and accessibility feature

Top positives

The expert examination, voter experiences, and poll worker sessions recognized several positives of these voting systems.

[title]

[details]

[title]

[details]

[title]

[details]

[title]

[details]

Additional positive observations can be found in the “All Observations” section of this report.

Top problems

The following discusses the problems found during the expert examinations and voter/poll worker observations with the [name] ballot marking system.

Testing identified [#] problems that could reduce the ability of people with disabilities to vote independently and privately.

[Problem name]

What Happened?

[detail]

Why is this a problem?

[detail]

Recommendations

[details]

[Problem name]

What Happened?

[detail]

Why is this a problem?

[detail]

Recommendations

[details]

Recommendations for deployment

The participants – and examiners – saw the systems being tested for the first time during the examination. Many voters will also try using a new system for the first time in the voting booth, so our test was realistic for voters in this state.

The recommendations here are based on observations of how both poll workers and voters used the system and direct suggestions they made.

All observations

Voter comments and reviewer observations about each machine are described below. For each are, the observations are organized by the machine function then by the severity.

Positives

Function	Observation	Severity
General	[observation]	Positive
Display and Navigation	[observation]	Positive
Assistive Technology (AT)	[observation]	Positive
Category	[observation]	Positive
Printed Ballot & Scanner	[observation]	Positive

Problems

Function	Observation	Severity
Setup for Voters	[observation]	[rating]
Orientation and Navigation	[observation]	[rating]
Audio Feedback & Instructions	[observation]	[rating]
Assistive Devices	[observation]	[rating]
Straight Party Voting	[observation]	[rating]
Alerts	[observation]	[rating]
Write-In Process	[observation]	[rating]
	[observation]	[rating]
Printing/Ballot Verification	[observation]	[rating]
Scanner	[observation]	[rating]

Appendix

Include test materials here

Include the personas used for testing with poll workers here