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Begin Voting

This ballot design is brought to you by Oxide Design Co., CivicDesigning.org, and University of Baltimore with funding from ITIF through the Election Assistance Commission’s Accessible Voting Technology Initiative.
- Digital front end
- Can be used with any system
- Creative Commons license
- Pattern library
- Test bed for academic and other test projects
Wanted: Continuous improvement

Governor

Vote for 1.

- Frederick Sharp: Orange
- Alex Wallace: Yellow
- Barbara Williams: Tan
- Althea Sharp: Gold
- Ann Windbeck: Independent
- Touch here to write in another name
We’re not done

- more accessibility
- compelling summary screen
- state election laws
### City Council

**Vote for up to 4.** You can choose 1 more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara Shry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carole Barker</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donald Rupp</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Feister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Touch here to write in another name*

**Touch here to see more names**
Our AVTI project did not include a pilot
Interest

- states
- OSDV
- VSAP
- Hart is implementing
Review what you’re voting for

This screen shows everything you voted for. Review it carefully. If you are ready to cast your ballot, touch Cast your vote.

Touch to see more

- Carole Barker [ ] Yellow
- Donald Rupp [ ] Yellow

You voted for 3 people. You can vote for 1 more.
If you want to vote for more, touch here.

Water Commissioners

You did not vote for anyone.
If you want to vote, touch here.

Court of Appeals Judge

- Kenneth Mitchell [ ]

Touch to see more

Cast your vote
- No one knows how to do this
- Implementation obstacles
  - timing within cycles
  - budget for IT implementation
  - who does this work - staff or vendor?
  - procurement
  - political will and risk
  - legislation may need changes
Usability testing versus piloting
What we did

- Formative testing
- Rapid iterations
- Lab setting
- Interacting with voters
- Paper prototype
- Digital prototype
- 33 individual sessions
Usability testing is

- controlled, direct observation
- tool for exposing frustrations
- method for gathering evidence for informed design decisions
- Piloting
  - gives context, putting a design in the wild
  - uses real data, contests, and legislation
  - interacts with broader range of people
Research is important.
Piloting is, too.
Research v. Piloting

- **Research:**
  - baseline
  - experimentation

- **Pilots:**
  - access to non-commercial solutions
  - access to early versions that you can affect
  - let requirements be known outside RFPs
  - shows needed changes in ops & training
Piloting: where and when
Checking feasibility, in the field

- Plan a roll-back option
- Keep the scale small at first
- Minimize the variables
- Don’t forget to assess usability
Political will and feasibility

- Anywhere Ballot: ballot marking
- Continuous improvement with partners in the field
- Implementation obstacles
- Usability testing and piloting are important
Field Guides To Ensuring Voter Intent

civicdesigning.org(fieldguides)

---

No. 10
Show what’s most important.

Use layout and text size to help voters know what to pay attention to.

The ballot title should be the most prominent.

A contest header should be more prominent than the candidates’ names.

A candidate’s name should be bolder than his/her party affiliation. Candidates’ names and options should be presented with equal importance.
dana@centerforcivicdesign.org
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