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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Document

The purpose of this document is to present Hart InterCivic’s plan for Verity Voting summative usability testing.

The Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG), version 1.0 (2005) require such testing in Volume 1, Section 3.1.1, *Usability Testing*:

> The vendor shall conduct summative usability tests on the voting system using individuals representative of the general population. The vendor shall document the testing performed and report the test results using the Common Industry Format. This documentation shall be included in the Technical Data Package submitted to the EAC for national certification.

Additional sections of the VVSG that require summative usability testing with specific target groups include:

- Sec. 3.2.2.1, *Partial Vision*
- Sec. 3.2.2.2, *Blindness*
- Sec. 3.2.3, *Dexterity*

After this test plan is executed, Hart’s Usability Testing Report will be submitted to the EAC as part of the Technical Data package, in accordance with the terms of Section 3.1.1, above, and Chapter 4 of the *EAC Voting System Testing and Certification Program Manual, Version 1.0*.

1.2 Scope

The scope of this document is limited to the test plan required for voting device usability testing, for purposes of conformance to VVSG 1.0.

More specifically, summative usability tests will be performed for Verity Scan, a paper ballot scanning device, and Verity Touch, a multi-purpose electronic device that can be configured in a variety of ways.
1.2.1 Verity Scan

Verity Scan is a digital paper ballot scanning device. After poll workers open the polls, Verity Scan is ready to receive marked paper ballots. Voters may privately and independently insert their marked ballots into the Verity Scan feed path in order to cast the ballot. Verity Scan also provides "second chance voting," with voter instructions for mismarked ballots, and it includes additional accessibility features, including unique audible sounds and controls within reach for voters who use wheelchairs. Verity Scan is attached to a secure ballot box.

1.2.2 Verity Touch

Verity Touch is a touch-screen electronic device that can be configured as a Direct Record Electronic (DRE) device, or as a ballot marking device (BMD). Both configurations allow voters to activate their ballot session by entering an Access Code. Voters use the electronic interface to privately and independently mark and/or cast the ballot.

Verity Touch is also compatible with Verity Access, an optional ATI component. Verity Access includes tactile buttons, support for audio ballot voting, and compatibility with additional two-switch adaptive devices, such as "jelly switches" and sip-and-puff devices.

2 USABILITY TESTING OVERVIEW

2.1 What does usability mean?

Usability is a measure of the effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction that specified users experience when interacting with certain products.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology describe these terms in greater detail in its publication, *Improving the Usability and Accessibility of Voting Systems and Products*:

> Usability... is a measure of the effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction achieved by a specified set of users performing specified tasks with a given product (ISO 9241-11, 1998). **Effectiveness** is the accuracy and completeness with which specified users can achieve specified goals in particular environments.

> **Efficiency** is defined as the resources expended by the user in relation to the accuracy and completeness of goals achieved.

> **Satisfaction** is defined as the subjective comfort and acceptability of the results to its users and other people affected by the results. These definitions have been formulated to provide the means for explicit measurements for usability. Usability testing is a method by which users of a product are asked to perform certain tasks in an effort to measure the product's usability using the metrics of effectiveness,
efficiency, and satisfaction. In practice, usability testing is part of a larger set of approaches for evaluating usability, some of which involve users directly and other which do not.

2.2 Usability and the voting experience

Verity Voting is designed to achieve high usability for voters in the following ways:

Voter Effectiveness

- Verity voting devices are designed to allow voters to accurately cast a ballot that will be counted as their selections are intended.
- Verity voting devices incorporate best practices for user interface design in order to reduce undervotes and residual votes.

Voter Efficiency

- Verity voting device interfaces are designed to support a voter's ability to get in and out of his or her polling place quickly, confident that his/her ballot will be counted as intended.
- Verity voting devices are designed to minimize the number of keystrokes that are required to complete typical actions during a voting session.

Voter Satisfaction

- Verity voting devices are designed to support a voting process that is easy and intuitive.
- Verity voting device interfaces make it clear to the voter how to begin the voting process.
- Verity voting device interfaces make it unequivocally clear to the voter whether a ballot has been successfully cast or not.
- Verity voting devices do not overload voters with excessive information at any one time.
- Verity voting devices offer voters indicators of the overall progress in the voting session, to make it clear what steps have already been completed, and what steps remain before completion.
- Verity voting devices make it clear when the voter has completed each step or task in the voting process.
- Verity voting devices allow users to easily find the races they wish to vote on.
- Verity voting devices minimize the presentation of extraneous information in the visual or audio interface.
2.3 Why conduct usability testing?

Aside from the fact that summative usability testing is required by the VVSG, Verity Voting is committed to the principles outlined below:

- Verity voting devices aim to improve the quality of interaction between voters and voting systems.
- Verity voting devices aim not to contribute to the commission of voter error within the voting session.
- Verity voting devices are designed in accordance with the principle that voting systems should rely as little as possible upon a voter’s prior experience or familiarity with a particular type of technology or interface.

To support these principles, usability testing is required to measure the extent to which Verity Voting devices have achieved their design and usability goals, and where quality improvements can be made.

2.4 Types of usability testing

Several different types of usability testing can be performed, including formative, summative, and conformance testing. Summative usability testing will be used to assess Verity Voting’s effectiveness, efficiency, and voter satisfaction. Formative usability testing is a natural part of the development process that Verity voting devices have undergone numerous times, typically in a less formal fashion. Conformance testing to specified metrics for usability is an area for future development in the federal voting system guidelines.

**Summative usability testing** is used to evaluate how well the design meets usability requirements. These tests are typically based on the three elements in the definition of usability found in ISO9241-11: effectiveness (completeness and accuracy), efficiency (resources expended), and satisfaction. Summative usability tests typically include larger numbers of participants, allowing for statistical analysis of the performance of the system.

**Formative usability testing** is diagnostic in nature, supporting the development of the design by providing evaluation and feedback on various aspects of the design. This style of testing is typically used at several stages in the design process to help the design team uncover usability problems and make decision about design features. Formative testing is recommended as a best practice for system design in the FEC publications, “Developing a User-Centered Voting System” and “Usability Testing of Voting Systems.”

**Conformance tests** have the goal of detecting aspects of the system that do not meet a standard, not to identify the cause of failure. A usability test for conformance to a usability standard is a specialized type of summative test. For voting systems, such a test requires usability performance benchmarks as part of the standard to test against, a representative set of test ballots and a well-specified test protocol that is explicit about how many and what types of voter populations to test against. Further, the conformance test has to be validated to produce repeatable results.
3 TEST DESIGN

3.1 Test objectives

The objectives of Hart InterCivic’s summative usability testing for Verity voting devices are:

- To assess the effectiveness of Verity Voting devices by measuring the abilities of various user groups to complete cast ballots in a specified manner.
- To assess the efficiency of Verity Voting devices.
- To assess user satisfaction with Verity Voting devices by eliciting subjective and objective feedback.
- To assess the usability of the Verity Voting accessible voting interfaces for different groups of persons with disabilities.
- To elicit user feedback on how the voting devices can be further improved.

3.2 Variables to be measured

Summative usability testing for Verity Voting devices will measure the following variables:

1. Accuracy
2. Efficiency
3. Satisfaction

3.3 Method of measurement

Summative usability tests for Verity Voting devices will measure the variables above in the following manner:

1. **Accuracy** is measured in terms of the total number of errors that a user commits during the performance of various specified tasks. In other words, accuracy is measure of correctness, or completeness. Test participants will be instructed to perform specific operations when voting a ballot, and their ability to select and record the ballot in the manner intended will be the measure of accuracy.

2. **Efficiency** is measured in the total number of minutes required to complete the voting process, from beginning to end. Efficiency is measured with unambiguous start-stop indicators, from the time a voter is issued a ballot or

3. **Satisfaction** is measured with a post-testing questionnaire administered to participants. The purpose of the questionnaire is to elicit information on topics like the following:
   - How easily and successfully do voters mark a ballot?
   - What questions and/or problems do voters have when marking the ballot?
   - What mistakes do voters make in marking the ballot?
     - Were they aware that they had made mistakes?
     - If not, why not?
If so, what did they do to recover?

- What aspects of the voting process are difficult to understand?
- What do users like and dislike about the voting process (e.g., navigation, organization of information, and grouping of content)?

### 3.4 Target populations

For purposes of certification, the VVSG requires that Verity Voting devices undergo usability testing with the following populations:

1. individuals representative of the general population (i.e., the general voting population.)
2. individuals who are partially sighted
3. individuals who are blind.
4. individuals who lack fine motor control

*In addition to* the above required target groups, during the participant recruitment process, Hart InterCivic will make an extra effort to recruit participants from the following populations:

5. individuals with low literacy
6. individuals who are older than age 70
7. individuals who are fluent in Verity Voting-supported languages other than English

### 3.5 Context of use

Participants in summative usability testing will use Verity Scan and Verity Touch in a facility designed to simulate an actual polling place.

Participants will receive instructions on how to mark paper and electronic ballots, and will undergo a simulated voting experience that follows this sequence:

1. Receive paper ballot or access code for electronic ballot.
2. Read or listen to the instructions on the ballot.
3. Vote the ballot selections in the specific manner prescribed from the test administrator’s instructions.

Test ballots will include:

1. Federal and state offices
2. Partisan and non-partisan offices
3. Propositions

Specific tasks will also test the following ballot features:

1. Changing selections
2. Write-in voting
3. Contests that include more than one valid choice
4. Straight party voting, including cross-over votes.
3.6 Personnel/roles needed

Summative usability testing for Verity Voting will require different individuals to perform the following roles:

1. Moderator – someone not involved in designing the ballot
2. Helper/note-taker
3. Observers

3.7 Method of procedure - Overview

1. Summative usability testing for Verity voting devices will be performed as a series of 15 minute voting sessions, with one voter per session. It is critical that the moderator not provide assistance to participants in performing the requested tasks. (In the event that participants request assistance, the moderator shall instruct the voter to simply “do the best you can” in performing the requested task, without explaining how to do so.)

2. Each participant uses copies of the same ballot, with the same instructions for marking the selections. In each session, the moderator will greet the participant, obtain his/her signature on a consent form, provide a demographic questionnaire, and provide instructions on the process.

3. To ensure consistency across all voting sessions, the moderator will use a standard script to greet the participant and to provide instructions. (See Appendix A for the Moderator's Guide.)

4. After the voter has received a paper ballot or an Access Code for an electronic ballot, the participant may begin the voting process.

5. The moderator and note taker will remain in the room to collect data and comments for later analysis.

6. At the conclusion of the voting session, the moderator administers the post-voting questionnaire and is available to answer any additional questions that the participant may have. (Participants often enjoy sharing additional impressions and understanding where they might have made mistakes, if any.)

7. After all participant voting sessions are complete, the post-testing analysis phase follows.

8. Testing staff will gather data to support the following metrics:
   a. Number of ballots successfully cast or completed.
   b. Percent of tasks completed without any errors.
   c. Total number of assists requested from participants
   d. Time to complete the voting session.
3.8 Session Outline

Below is a description of what will happen in each 15-minute voting session:

1. **Moderator** - Introduce the session (2 minutes)
   a. Make the participant comfortable
   b. Go over what will happen in the session
   c. Make sure the participant understands the consent form. (Participant signs form.)
   d. Ask participant to complete the demographic questionnaire
   e. Introduce the ballot.

2. **Participant** - The participant votes the ballot. (Up to 10 minutes.)
   a. Participants follow prescribed instructions to mark voter selections in a specific way.
   b. The moderator intervenes only to act as a poll worker would, without teaching the voter how to vote.
   c. The note-taker uses a prepared note-taking form to record data on the participant's reading and voting behavior.

3. **Moderator and Participant** (Jointly) - Satisfaction questionnaire (2 minutes)
   a. The moderator gives the participant the very short questionnaire on satisfaction and confidence and then wraps up the session by thanking the participant.

4 TEST PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Preparation

4.1.1 Supplies needed

The following supplies will be required to conduct summative usability testing:

**Fixtures and voting device hardware**

1. Minimum room size approximately 15’ x 15’
2. Power cords
3. Power strips/surge protectors
4. Folding table to serve as “check in” table, to simulate polling place check in.
5. Verity Scan paper scanning device
6. Verity Scan ballot box
7. Verity Touch with Access
8. Verity Touch Writer with Access
9. Printer for Verity Touch Writer
10. Verity Link flash memory devices, with pre-programmed election definition (note: voting devices will be pre-defined with the appropriate polling place ID that matches the Test Ballots)
11. Test Ballots
12. Ballot marking pens
13. Jelly switches
14. Sip-n-puff device
15. Headphones
16. Comfortable chair and table top surface for participants to mark paper ballots.

Usability testing materials
1. Moderator’s Guide
2. Participant consent forms
3. Demographic questionnaire
4. Script for moderator
5. Voter instruction sheets
6. Post-study questionnaires
7. Notepads & pens
8. Stopwatch

4.1.2 Election Definition/Ballot Design
Each participant will vote paper or electronic versions of the same ballot, with the same instructions for marking the paper or electronic version, respectively. Accordingly, only a single precinct style (ballot style) is required.

Ballots shall obey the design conventions listed below. For details on the Test Ballot Specification, see Appendix E.
1. Simple, commonplace language (not technical or political)
2. General Election
3. Include:
   a. Write ins
   b. Straight party
   c. Multiple selection contests
   d. Propositions (summary form, full text)

4.1.3 Recruit participants
Hart InterCivic will run advertisements and perform outreach to local advocacy groups to recruit participants for summative usability testing. It is Hart’s goal to recruit approximately 12 to 15 people who reflect various demographics, including special-needs audiences. (See Section 3.4, above.)
In selecting participants, Hart InterCivic shall support the following objectives:

1. It is more important to have a sample of voters that includes representatives of many types of local voters than it is to have a randomly drawn sample.

2. **It is important to ensure that the people at most risk of failure in using a voting system are included in the test.** (This includes people with a variety of disabilities, socio-economic backgrounds, language skills and ages.) The solution is to recruit more participants from higher-risk profiles, rather than an even number from each group.

3. Special efforts will be made to recruit individuals whose backgrounds vary by the following characteristics:
   a. prior voting experience,
      i. avid voter
      ii. civic voter
      iii. issue voter
      iv. excluded vote
      v. apathetic voter
   b. age
   c. rural/urban environment
   d. computer usage levels
   e. information about or interest in politics
   f. education (including low literacy)
   g. income
   h. race and ethnicity
   i. native language
   j. gender

4. Hart will also make efforts to include voters that identify with a major party, as independents, and perhaps even minor-party identifiers or apolitical voters.

4.1.4 **Internal pre-testing training and pilot**

Prior to inviting participants to attend usability testing, Hart will conduct internal training for the moderator, note-taker, and observers. In addition, Hart will conduct a “dry run” to assess the overall test plan implementation, and to make modifications to the test design if necessary.

It is anticipated that the training and dry run will be a true “dress rehearsal,” using internal Hart personnel to act as participant voters. In addition, the internal pre-testing training and pilot will take place in the actual testing facility, with all required voting machines, fixtures, and testing materials, such as paperwork and required forms.

4.2 **Conduct the test**

4.2.1 **Pre-Evaluation**

During testing, the moderator will perform the following **pre-evaluation tasks**:

1. Welcome participants
2. Introduce the test
3. Obtain signed consent forms
4. Obtain demographic questionnaire
5. Read script
6. Provide voters instructions, with prescribed selection patterns
4.2.2 Evaluation

During testing, the moderator will perform the following evaluation tasks:

1. Observe voting sessions
2. Intervene only to act as a poll worker would, without teaching the voter how to vote.

During testing, the note-taker and observer will perform the following evaluation tasks:

1. Use a prepared note-taking form to record data on the participant's reading and voting behavior.

4.2.2.1 Tasks

During testing, voting participants will perform the following:

**Core Tasks**

1. Vote for a candidate running in a single-member contest with only one candidate.
2. Vote for the first candidate in a winner-take-all contest with two candidates.
3. Vote for the second candidate in a winner-take-all contest with two candidates.
4. Vote for one candidate in a winner-take-all contest where the number of candidates is greater than two but the list is "short."
5. Vote for the last candidate on a medium length list of names (e.g., seven candidates).
6. Vote for the candidate in a position near the end of a "long" list of candidates (e.g., 12 or more).
7. Vote for a "short" proposition.
8. Vote for (or against) a "very long" proposition.
9. Skip a contest.
10. Vote for a complete slate of candidates in a multi-member contest by name selection.
11. Vote for a complete set of candidates in a multi-member contest by a combination of name selection and write-in.
12. Vote for a partial slate of candidates in a multi-member contest by name selection.
13. Vote for a partial slate candidates in a multi-member contest by a combination of name selection and write-in.

**Secondary Tasks**

1. Detecting and correcting overvotes.
2. Initially skipping a contest but then entering a vote in this contest before casting the ballot.
3. Entering a vote and changing it before casting the ballot (electronic ballot only)
4. Voting in a contest and then clearing the vote before casting the ballot (electronic ballot only).
5. Returning to a contest in which the participant has already voted and changing a vote prior to casting the ballot (electronic ballot only).
6. Return to a contest or proposition to a change the vote (electronic ballot only).
7. Enter a write-in candidate name; then change to a listed candidate (electronic ballot only).
8. Select a candidate; then change it to a write-in candidate (electronic ballot only).
9. Vote a straight party contest as the only mark on the ballot (without exception).
10. Vote a straight party contest with an exception for a specific contest (either skip a contest or vote for a different party)

4.2.2.2 Additional tasks for participants with disabilities

In addition to the tasks described above, voting sessions for persons with disabilities shall include tests for the following features of the accessible voting stations:

1. Variations in visual display fonts, contrast, color, and dual visual and audio output for users with partial visual disabilities
2. Audio output combined with tactile controls for users who are blind
3. Tactile controls for users with mobility and dexterity disabilities

4.2.3 Post-Evaluation

After each voting session is complete, the moderator will perform the following post-evaluation tasks:

1. Give each participant the short questionnaire on satisfaction and confidence.
2. Answer any additional participant questions about the voting experience.
3. Use a prepared note-taking form to gather additional subjective data about the voting experience.
4. Wrap up the session by thanking the participant.

4.3 Post-test analysis & issuance of final report

After all participant voting sessions are complete, the moderator, note-taker, and observer will collaborate to report upon the data gathered. After all data has been analyzed, Hart InterCivic will issue a Usability Testing Report.

During the analysis phase, special attention shall be paid to the following:

- Success and failure (i.e. accuracy/effectiveness)
  - Overall rate of residual votes
  - Unintentional undervotes
  - Accidentally voting for the wrong candidate
  - Straight party voting
  - Write-in lines
  - Voting for more than one candidate in a race
  - Making corrections before casting a ballot
  - Failure to cast ballot; abandonment
  - Errors on ballot, compared to desired selections
- Time to complete a ballot, beginning to end (i.e. efficiency)
- Requests for assistance (i.e. satisfaction)
• Spoken comments, subjective feedback
  1. What was confusing?
  2. What was not clear, and why?
  3. What might need additional instructions, or different labels/headings?
• Any voter adaptation or behavior that is adaptive (such as taking out reading glasses or moving in closer to the machine)
• Assessments of voter emotion (confusion, frustration, anger, disgust; delight, satisfaction)
• Distractions (glare, noise, movement)
• Whether certain types of voters need more help in using the machines (e.g., those with little computer experience, senior citizens, lower income and non-English language voters).

During the analysis phase, Hart InterCivic will determine appropriate action to take for system improvements, based upon the results.

4.3.1 Report format
The ANSI/INCITS 354-2001 defines a format to be used so that the results of the usability testing is reported in a standard and interchangeable way.

This standard defines objective usability measures, focuses on reporting usability metrics, and provides a description of the test to allow it to be repeated.

5 APPENDICES

This Summative Usability Testing Plan includes the following documents as Appendices:
A. Moderator’s Guide
B. Consent form
C. Demographic questionnaire
D. Post-study questionnaire
E. Test ballot specification
5.1 APPENDIX A – Moderator’s Guide

5.1.1 Pre Evaluation Administration

In the pre evaluation administration phase, the moderator will be responsible for:

- Greeting each participant at the “voter check-in” table
- Administering the consent and release form (if necessary, read it to the participant)
- Administering the demographic questionnaire (if necessary, read it to the participant)
- Presenting the test introduction to the participant and ensuring that he/she understands the procedures.

The following introductory material will be given to the participant.

5.1.2 Test Introduction – Moderator Script

The test moderator will present the following information to participants. It is essential that all test participants receive the same instructions, so please follow the script exactly.

Welcome, and thank you for helping us today. You are here to be part of an evaluation of some voting machines. We are conducting this evaluation to see if typical voters can accomplish specific kinds of voting tasks, similar to tasks that voters might attempt in a real election. This is not evaluation of you. We are evaluating the equipment. Any problems you encounter represent a design issue in these machines.

We have made up a ballot for use in this evaluation. The names on the ballot are not real. And all political party names are referred to by colors. These colors have no relationship to the political parties you may know. They were also made up for this test.

We will be giving you specific written instructions for what we want you to do. It is important you follow our instructions so that we have can properly test the machines. So, if the directions say to vote for a specific person, please try to vote for that person even if you prefer another name or party. If you cannot do it exactly as the instructions tell you, do the best you can. If you cannot complete a task, try to remember what happened so we can talk to you about it after the evaluation. We’ll be taking notes and listening carefully while you vote.

When you have finished voting, I’ll ask you to fill out a brief questionnaire. Then I’ll ask you some questions about what you thought of the ballot and what the experience of using it was like. The whole session should take about 15 minutes.

Once the evaluation begins, we will not be able to provide you with any help.

Please remember that you are not being tested in any way. Do you have any questions?

After the moderator ensures that the participant understands what is expected, the participant instructions will be given to them and they will be shown to the machine.
5.1.3 Voting

For the Verity Scan scanning device, the moderator will be required to provide a paper ballot for each participant.

For the Verity Touch or Verity Touch Writer, the moderator will be required to use the poll worker interface to generate an Access Code for each participant. Once the Access Code has been printed, the Access Code “ticket” should be left on the device for the voter to use in order to activate the electronic ballot.

- Have the participant sit/stand at the voting station. Make adjustments as necessary for persons with disabilities.
- Say, “Okay, let’s get started. Are you ready to vote? From this point on, you should treat me like a poll worker. If you have questions or problems with the ballot, ask me, the poll worker, and I’ll note your question.”
- While the participant is voting, observe without disturbing them. Don’t teach them how to use the ballot.

What to look for

- What problems did the participant have marking the ballot?
- What comments did they have about the voting session?
- What questions did the participant ask about while using the ballot? After using the ballot?
- Did the participant find the instructions?
- Did the participant read the instructions?
- If the participant did read the instructions, how helpful were they? What questions and problems did the participant have understanding the instructions?

Once the participant has completed the voting session or moved away from the voting machine, the moderator will record the event time—the time on task will be from the start point as described above to the time the participant moves away from the voting machine.

5.1.4 Post Evaluation Interview

In the post test questioning phase, the moderator will administer the satisfaction questionnaire. Once the participant completes the questionnaire, the moderator will interview the participants to determine:

- If the participant followed the voting instructions
- If there were situations where the participant could not follow the instructions and what was done in those situations.

Ask participants follow-up questions if necessary. Try to keep questions open-ended. For example, if the participant missed a race or did not vote according to the instructions, go to that place in the ballot and
say, “Tell me more about what you did on the ballot here and why.” Or, “I see you said that you strongly disagree that you feel confident using this ballot. Tell me about that.”

When you’re done with the review of their ballot and the questionnaire, if there is time, ask these questions:

- How did using this ballot compare with the last time you voted?
- What help do you think that other people might need in using this ballot?

### 5.1.5 Conclusion

The moderator should be sure to thank each participant for his/her time.
5.2 APPENDIX B – Consent Form

Consent Form

Hart InterCivic is conducting research to evaluate the usability of voting machines. We will use the results of these sessions to help improve the usability of the machines.

If you agree to participate, you will use the voting machines in the presence of a moderator and share your thoughts on the voting experience. You will be given instructions on specific tasks to perform while you vote the ballot. The names and parties on the ballot are not real, and the ballot is for evaluation purposes only.

In this short session, you will
- Respond to a brief questionnaire about you and your voting experience
- Vote using the ballot
- Be interviewed by the moderator about using the ballot
- Complete a brief questionnaire and interview about your overall experience.

Your participation will take approximately 15 minutes. There is no risk to you if you participate in this study. We will use the information that you provide, along with information from other people, to improve the design of the voting machine.

Any information you share will be kept strictly confidential; your name will not be associated with the data we collect from your session. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate at all, may refuse to participate in certain procedures or answer certain questions, or may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate will not affect your relationship with any local, state, or Federal organizations, or the person who identified you as a potential participant. Agreeing to participate and signing this form does not waive any of your legal rights.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact:

VP, Engineering  [email address]
Hart InterCivic  [phone number]
15500 Wells Port Drive
Austin, Texas 78728

If you voluntarily agree to participate in this research, and have had all your questions answered, please sign below.

____________________________  _______________
Participant’s Signature         Date

____________________________  _______________
Moderator’s Signature          Date

If you have any questions, please contact:
5.3 APPENDIX C – Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below as best you can. Any information you share will be kept strictly confidential; your name will not be associated with the data we collect from your session.

Thank you for your assistance today.

Participant number: _____________________

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your zip code? _______

3. Which of these best describes your race or ethnicity:
   - White
   - Black or African-American
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - Some other race or ethnicity

4. Are you:
   - Female
   - Male

5. Do you have any of the following physical limitations? (Please indicate Yes or No)
   - Blindness, deafness, or a severe vision or hearing impairment
   - A condition that substantially limits one or more physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying?

6. Do you have difficulty doing any of the following? (Please indicate Yes or No)
   - Learning, remembering, or concentrating?
   - Dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home?
   - Going outside the home alone to shop or visit a doctor’s office?
   - Working at a job or business?

7. Have you voted before? ___ yes ___ no
8. Are you registered to vote right now? ___ yes ___ no ___don’t know
9. What was the last election you voted in? ________
10. The last time you voted, what did you use to vote?
    - Punch card
    - Touch screen
    - Optical scan (filling in a bubble or joining the ends of an arrow)
    - Lever machine
    - Absentee / Mail-in
    - I don’t remember
5.4 APPENDIX D – Post-Testing Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below as best you can. Any information you share will be kept strictly confidential; your name will not be associated with the data we collect from your session.

Thank you for your assistance today.

Circle the words that most closely describe your reaction to each statement.

1. **I thought the voting process was easy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **The voting process was difficult to understand.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **It was easy to mark my choices.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **I would imagine that most people would be able to use this machine without problems.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **I found this machine awkward to use.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **I felt very confident casting my vote using this ballot and this machine.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **I would need help to use this ballot.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5.5  **APPENDIX E – Test Ballot Specification**

Notes:

- This document is adapted from the NIST publication, *Improving the Usability and Accessibility of Voting Systems and Products*.
- In this document, the format for partisan candidates is: "name / party". Colors are used as party names.

5.5.1  **Information applicable to whole ballot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>11-6-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sample County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Party Voting</td>
<td>Enabled for partisan races</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2  **Information applicable to every race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-term or partial-term election</th>
<th>Full-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Method</td>
<td>Simple vote for N candidate(s) - (i.e. no ranked voting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3  **Race #0:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Contest</th>
<th>Straight Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Option #1.1: Blue
- Option #1.2: Yellow
- Option #1.3: Purple
- Option #1.4: Orange
- Option #1.5: Pink
- Option #1.6: Gold
- Option #1.7: Gray
- Option #1.8: Aqua
- Option #1.9: Brown
5.5.4 Race #1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>President and Vice-President of the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate #1.1**: Joseph Barchi and Joseph Hallaren / Blue
- **Candidate #1.2**: Adam Cramer and Greg Vuocolo / Yellow
- **Candidate #1.3**: Daniel Court and Amy Blumhardt / Purple
- **Candidate #1.4**: Alvin Boone and James Lian / Orange
- **Candidate #1.5**: Austin Hildebrand-MacDougall and James Garritty / Pink
- **Candidate #1.6**: Martin Patterson and Clay Lariviere / Gold
- **Candidate #1.7**: Elizabeth Harp and Antoine Jefferson / Gray
- **Candidate #1.8**: Charles Layne and Andrew Kowalski / Aqua
- **Candidate #1.9**: Marzena Pazgier and Welton Phelps / Brown

5.5.5 Race #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>US Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate #2.1**: Dennis Weiford / Blue
- **Candidate #2.2**: Lloyd Garriss / Yellow
- **Candidate #2.3**: Sylvia Wentworth-Farthington / Purple
- **Candidate #2.4**: John Hewetson / Orange
- **Candidate #2.5**: Victor Martinez / Pink
- **Candidate #2.6**: Heather Portier / Gold
- **Candidate #2.7**: David Platt / Gray
5.5.6 Race #3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>US Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>6th Congressional District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Candidate #3.1: Brad Plunkard / Blue
- Candidate #3.2: Bruce Reeder / Yellow
- Candidate #3.3: Brad Schott / Purple
- Candidate #3.4: Glen Tawney / Orange
- Candidate #3.5: Carroll Forrest / Pink

5.5.7 Race #4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Candidate #4.1: Charlene Franz / Blue
- Candidate #4.2: Gerard Harris / Yellow
- Candidate #4.3: Linda Bargmann / Purple
- Candidate #4.4: Barbara Adcock / Orange
- Candidate #4.5: Carrie Steel-Loy / Pink
- Candidate #4.6: Frederick Sharp / Gold
- Candidate #4.7: Alex Wallace / Gray
- Candidate #4.8: Barbara Williams / Aqua
- Candidate #4.9: Althea Sharp / Brown
- Candidate #4.10: Douglas Alpern / Independent
- Candidate #4.11: Ann Windbeck / Independent
- Candidate #4.12: Mike Greher / Independent
- Candidate #4.13: Patricia Alexander / Independent
- Candidate #4.14: Kenneth Mitchell / Independent
- Candidate #4.15: Stan Lee / Independent
- Candidate #4.16: Henry Ash / Independent
- Candidate #4.17: Karen Kennedy / Independent
- Candidate #4.18: Van Jackson / Independent
- Candidate #4.19: Debbie Brown / Independent
- Candidate #4.20: Joseph Teller / Independent
- Candidate #4.21: Greg Ward / Independent
- Candidate #4.22: Lou Murphy / Independent
- Candidate #4.23: Jane Newman / Independent
- Candidate #4.24: Jack Callannann / Independent
- Candidate #4.25: Esther York / Independent
- Candidate #4.26: Glen Chandler / Independent
- Candidate #4.27: Marcia Colgate / Independent
- Candidate #4.28: Leslie Porter / Independent
- Candidate #4.29: Molly Dalton / Independent
- Candidate #4.30: David Davis / Independent
- Candidate #4.31: May Peterson / Independent
- Candidate #4.32: Patricia Dawkins / Independent
- Candidate #4.33: Suzanne Adams / Independent
- Candidate #4.34: Mary Miller / Independent
- Candidate #4.35: Rosalind Leigh / Independent
- Candidate #4.36: Elaine Henry / Independent
- Candidate #4.37: Gail Moses / Independent
- Candidate #4.38: Daniel Jones / Independent
- Candidate #4.39: Don Maybee / Independent
- Candidate #4.40: Lillian Cohen / Independent
- Candidate #4.41: Richard Mitchell / Independent
- Candidate #4.42: Pat York / Independent
- Candidate #4.43: Linda Rappaport / Independent
- Candidate #4.44: Mike Porter / Independent
- Candidate #4.45: Margaret Sharp / Independent
- Candidate #4.46: Cathy Steele / Independent
- Candidate #4.47: Lawrence Smith / Independent
- Candidate #4.48: Bill Kendrick / Independent
- Candidate #4.49: Fred Stein / Independent
- Candidate #4.50: Jerry Cole / Independent
5.5.8 Race #5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>Lieutenant-Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate #5.1**: Chris Norberg / Blue
- **Candidate #5.2**: Anthony Parks / Yellow
- **Candidate #5.3**: Luis Garcia / Purple
- **Candidate #5.4**: Charles Qualey / Orange
- **Candidate #5.5**: George Hovis / Pink
- **Candidate #5.6**: Burt Zirkle / Gold

5.5.9 Race #6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>County Clerk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate #6.1**: Laila Shamsi / Yellow

5.5.10 Race #7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>State Senator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>31st District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minimum Votes Allowed: 0
Maximum Votes Allowed: 1
Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed: 1

- Candidate #7.1: Edward Shiplett / Blue
- Candidate #7.2: Marty Talarico / Yellow

5.5.11 Race #8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>54th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Candidate #8.1: Andrea Solis / Blue
- Candidate #8.2: Amos Keller / Yellow

5.5.12 Race #9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>County Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Candidate #9.1: Camille Argent / Blue
- Candidate #9.2: Chloe Witherspoon / Blue
- Candidate #9.3: Clayton Bainbridge / Blue
- Candidate #9.4: Amanda Marracini / Yellow
• Candidate #9.5: Charlene Hennessey / Yellow
• Candidate #9.6: Eric Savoy / Yellow
• Candidate #9.7: Sheila Moskowitz / Purple
• Candidate #9.8: Mary Tawa / Purple
• Candidate #9.9: Damian Rangel / Purple
• Candidate #9.10: Valarie Altman / Orange
• Candidate #9.11: Helen Moore / Orange
• Candidate #9.12: John White / Orange
• Candidate #9.13: Joe Lee / Pink
• Candidate #9.14: Joe Barry / Pink
• Candidate #9.15: Martin Schreiner / Gray

5.5.13 Race #10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>Jude, Court of Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>Statewide, 4th seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Non-partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Candidate #10.1: Michael Marchesani

5.5.14 Race #11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>Water Commissioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>City of Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Candidate #11.1: Orville White / Blue
• Candidate #11.2: Gregory Seldon / Yellow
5.5.15 Race #12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Office</th>
<th>City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Office</td>
<td>City of Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Votes Allowed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Write-in Votes Allowed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Candidate #12.1: Harvey Eagle / Blue
- Candidate #12.2: Randall Rupp / Blue
- Candidate #12.3: Carroll Shry / Blue
- Candidate #12.4: Beverly Barker / Yellow
- Candidate #12.5: Donald Davis / Yellow
- Candidate #12.6: Hugh Smith / Yellow
- Candidate #12.7: Reid Feister / Yellow

5.5.16 Retention Question #1:

| Wording of Question | Shall Robert Demergue be retained in office as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? |

- Yes
- No

5.5.17 Retention Question #2:

| Wording of Question | Shall Elmer Hull be retained in office as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court? |

- Yes
- No

5.5.18 Proposition #1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of proposition</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wording of proposition</td>
<td>Shall there be amendments to the State constitution intended to have the collective effect of ensuring the separation of governmental power among the three branches of state government: the legislative branch, the executive branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the judicial branch?

a. Article III, Section 6 of the Constitution shall be amended to read as follows:

Section 6. Holding of offices under other governments. - Senators and representatives not to hold other appointed offices under state government. --No person holding any office under the government of the United States, or of any other state or country, shall act as a general officer or as a member of the general assembly, unless at the time of taking such engagement that person shall have resigned the office under such government; and if any general officer, senator, representative, or judge shall, after election and engagement, accept any appointment under any other government, the office under this shall be immediately vacated; but this restriction shall not apply to any person appointed to take deposition or acknowledgement of deeds, or other legal instruments, by the authority of any other state or country.

No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he or she was elected, be appointed to any state office, board, commission or other state or quasi-public entity exercising executive power under the laws of this state, and no person holding any executive office or serving as a member of any board, commission or other state or quasi-public entity exercising executive power under the laws of this state shall be a member of the senate or the house of representatives during his or her continuance in such office.

b. Article V of the Constitution shall be amended to read as follows: The powers of the government shall be distributed into three (3) separate and distinct departments: the legislative, the executive and the judicial.

c. Article VI, Section 10 of the Constitution shall be deleted in its entirety.

d. Article IX, Section 5 of the Constitution shall be amended to read as follows:

Section 5. Powers of appointment.- The governor shall, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, appoint all officers of the state whose appointment is not herein otherwise provided for and all members of any board, commission or other state or quasi-public entity which exercises executive power under the laws of this state; but the general assembly may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they deem proper, in the governor, or within their respective departments in the other general officers, the judiciary or in the heads of departments.

5.5.19 Proposition #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of proposition</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wording of proposition</td>
<td>Shall there be an amendment to the State constitution concerning recovery of damages relating to construction of real property improvements, and, in connection therewith, prohibiting laws that limit or impair a property owner’s right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you agree that the negligent landlord was responsible for your injuries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to recover damages caused by a failure to construct an improvement in a good and workmanlike manner; defining "good and workmanlike manner" to include construction that is suitable for its intended purposes; and permitting exceptions for laws that limit punitive damages, afford governmental immunity, or impose time limits of specified minimum lengths on filing lawsuits?