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Housekeeping

- Use chat to communicate
- Update your screen name
- Mute your audio if you aren’t speaking
What we will cover in these webinars

An introduction to the VVSG 2.0 draft requirements to improve the accessibility and usability of voting systems.

Part 1: Introducing the human factors requirements and the process used to create them

Part 2: Updates to best practices and new technologies for voting systems with examples of why and how the requirements were updated
About the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG)

The Help America Vote Act directs the Election Assistance Commission to create voting system guidelines and defines the process.
HAVA includes basic requirements for accessibility

HAVA includes requirements that voting systems:

- Are accessible for individuals with disabilities with same opportunity for participation (including privacy and independence) as other voters.

- Provide voters an opportunity to verify their choices, and change the ballot or correct any error before the ballot is cast and counted, in a private and independent manner.

- Provide alternative language accessibility pursuant to Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.

Section 301 (3) and (4)
VVSG 2.0 Principles for accessibility and usability

1: High quality design
2: High quality implementation
3: Transparent
4: Interoperable
5: Equivalent and consistent voter access
6: Voter privacy
7: Marked, verified, and cast as intended
8: Robust, safe, usable, and accessible
9: Auditable
10: Ballot secrecy
11: Access control
12: Physical security
13: Data protection
14: System integrity
15: Detection and monitoring
Goals for the accessibility and usability updates

- Address issues that voters still encounter with accessible voting systems
- Catch up to current best practices in election systems
- Catch up to best practices in user interface design and usability
- Cover new technologies now in common use
- Match updated laws and standards
- Write clear, testable requirements
What we will cover in the this webinar

Part 2: Examples of updates to best practices and new technologies for voting systems

1. Addressing Federal accessibility regulations
2. Text size and contrast
3. Plain language requirements
4. Gestures and scrolling
5. Ballot selections review
6. Voter control of ballot selection
Examples of updated requirements
1. Addressing federal accessibility regulations

Goals for the update

• Match updated laws and standards
• Cover new technologies now in common use
Why the requirements needed updating

Federal accessibility guidelines in “Section 508” have changed since VVSG 1.1

- New rules accommodate larger motorized wheelchairs
- Rules for web and other documents incorporate the international Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.1)

Voting systems often include functions beyond a polling place marking device

- Web pages to check if a ballot was counted
- Remote accessible voting systems
- Pre-marking systems
Updating guidelines for voters using wheelchairs

Federal regulations cover:
• Floor space needed for physical access
• Room for a personal attendant
• Distance a voter can reach to touch a control on the voting system

Updated requirements:
• Reference the federal standards
• Link to U. S. Access Board guidance
• Add guidance notes on use in voting systems
Updating the VVSG to include federal accessibility laws

Federal regulations cover:
• Any information or computer technology (ICT)
• Section 508 was “refreshed” in 2008

Updated requirements:
• Added tags to identify requirements based on a source in Section 508/WCAG
• Added specific references where needed
• Added a requirement to explicitly include the full Section 508 for the entire voting system
2. **Text size and contrast**

Goals for the update

- Address issues reported by voters and research evidence
- Make ballots and other materials easier for voters to read
Why the requirements needed updating

There was strong evidence that the text sizes available in current voting systems were not large enough in either the default or large size ranges.

Evidence included:

- Anecdotal evidence from voter feedback
- Research at the University of Baltimore with voters with low literacy
- Research from an EAC Accessible Voting Technology Initiative grant showing that voting systems were not including the largest text sizes in the VVSG 1.1 ranges
- Usability testing from other voting system research
Making the text presentation more helpful to all voters

Updated requirements for text size:
• Increase the default text size to 4.8mm
• Added for discrete text sizes
• Allowed continuous text scaling as an option
• Allowed horizontal scrolling or panning at text sizes over 200% (7.1mm)

Updated requirements for text color and contrast:
• Specified the options more precisely
• Added colors for those who need low contrast
Comparing the text sizes in 1.1 and 2.0

The two sizes in 1.1 left a gap in the middle that included the most useful text sizes for many voters.

1.0 and 1.1 have 2 text size ranges:
- 3.0-4.5 mm - default
- 6.3-9.0mm

2.0 has 4 text size ranges:
- 3.5-4.2 mm
- 4.5-5.6 mm – default
- 6.4-7.1 mm
- 8.5-9.0 mm
Sample color contrast settings

Contrast samples included in guidance notes to show combinations that meet the requirements

Grey scale samples at 3:1 to 21:1

High contrast examples at 16.1:1 to 21:1

Low contrast examples at 4.8:1 to 7.86:1
3. Plain language requirements

Goal for the update
• Write clear, testable requirements
Why the requirements needed updating

The core requirement remains the same, but we changed the approach to how it was written to:

- Make it more testable, even with requirements that are hard to measure
- Give manufacturers and testers better tools to meet the requirement
- Make it easier to apply to all requirements for instructions, notices, messages and general usability for voters

Would even one use of passive voice fail a system?
What we learned in the gap analysis

- There is better appreciation of plain language as important for voting systems.
- NIST research still useful for voting systems.
- There are tools that can help guide writing.
- It’s important for cognitive disabilities and low literacy or English proficiency

Updated requirements:
- Single broad requirement
- Specifically includes administrative interfaces
- Specific elements listed in discussion notes

7.3-P
Information and instructions for voters and election workers must be written clearly, following the best practices for plain language.
We reviewed plain language evaluation tools

We reviewed tools that can evaluate short texts against plain language practices such as:

- Sentence and word length
- Passive verbs and hidden verbs
- Words easily misused
- Complex phrases or jargon
- Duplicate or unnecessary words

We found several free or low-cost programs that are useful for both writing and evaluation

Sample review results from 3 tools
Plain language of the requirements

One of our long-time goals has been plain language of the requirements. Practicing what we preach, we also worked on making the requirements themselves clear.

The new requirements (for all principles) include

• “Must” (not “shall”) following guidance in Federal Register
• Active voice that establishes what aspects of a voting system are responsible
4 Gestures and scrolling

Goal for the update

• Cover new technologies in common use
Why the requirements needed updating

VVSG 1.1 did not allow scrolling within a contest because of concerns about the digital divide and accessibility of conventional scroll bars.

- A contest may not fit on a single screen because:
  - The list of candidates or ballot question text is long
  - The voting system or marking device has a small screen
  - The voter has increased the text size
- Using separate pages adds navigational complexity and reliance on voters understanding the boundaries of the contest.
- Voting system logic had problems handling the interaction accurately.
There are alternatives to scroll bars

Scroll bars are just one way to move within a list, so other designs can be allowed as an alternative.

Updated requirements:
- Allow pagination or scrolling with
- Fixed header/footer for orientation
- Cues that there are more items
- Option to sync audio and visual
- Works in all interaction modes

Single-touch buttons can be used to move within a long list or text.
Allowing simple gesture meets voter expectations

What’s a simple, common gesture?
• Tap
• Pinch or spread fingers to zoom
• Swipe to scroll
• Press and hold to drag

Voters often expect to be able to swipe to scroll

Updated requirements allow common gestures as an optional alternative that:
• Does not allow navigation off the current contest
• Does not create accidental activation
• Work consistently across the entire voting session
• Do not require sequential, timed, or simultaneous actions

- analysis of style guides for commercial platforms
5. Ballot selections review

Goals for the update

• Catch up to best practices in election systems
• Address issues that voters still encounter with accessible voting systems
• Cover new technologies now in common use
Why the requirements needed updating

HAVA requires an opportunity to:

- Review selections before printing or casting
- Be notified of overvotes
- Make changes

All current voting systems include a review screen

- Bring current practice and common features into the VVSG as a baseline
- Leave room for innovation and design
There are a lot of small variations in design

- We don’t have a lot of evidence about what works better
- The interactions between design elements is complex
6. Voter control of ballot selections

Goals for the update

- Catch up to best practices in election systems
- Address issues that voters still encounter with accessible voting systems
Why the requirements needed updating

The voting system should not take control of selections away from voters.

- When a contest does not fit on one screen, system actions may not be visible on the screen.
- Clear feedback helps voters understand the rules for each contest.

Voter control is especially important for accessibility.

- Feedback in the audio format helps voters understand the current status, and what will happen as a result of their answer.
- Large text modes are more likely to have some candidates out of sight.
The draft requirement puts the voter in control

An electronic ballot interface must give voters direct control over making or changing vote selections within a contest.

It allows

- Vote-for-one: An immediate change from one choice to another
- Vote-for-multiple: No automatic deselections, notification to voter of their options if they attempt to select more than allowed
- Re-ordering candidates in preferential voting only when requested
- Clear feedback for group selections, such as straight-party voting
Updating to modern technology conventions

Technology has changed a lot since 2004-2009, when the current voting system standards were written.

Guidance papers with the research evidence and rationale for the changes will help everyone understand how to design and implement voting systems using the new requirements.
The goal

Voting systems that meet the principles in the VVSG and are designed, implemented, and evaluated using best practices for user-centered design, usability, and accessibility.
Group discussion questions

What resonated with you today?

What did we cover that you have questions about?

Is there some thing we didn’t discuss today that you’re curious about?
Resources

Human Factors Public Working Group
https://collaborate.nist.gov/voting/bin/view/Voting/HumanFactors

VVSG 2.0 Draft Requirements
https://collaborate.nist.gov/voting/bin/view/Voting/VVSG20DraftRequirements

NIST and the Help America Vote Act
https://vote.nist.gov

A Roadmap for Usability and Accessibility of Elections
https://civicdesign.org/projects/roadmap/
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