

Accessible Voting Systems Vendor Fair Survey Results

On April 4th, 2005, citizens with disabilities from all over the state tested voting systems and completed surveys documenting their reactions to each system. A total of 496 surveys were completed.

The survey results on the following page will be one of several factors used to help the Oregon Secretary of State decide which voting system or systems to purchase to give citizens with disabilities the opportunity to vote privately and independently.

Brief descriptions of each voting system are provided in italics next to the voting system names to aid those who attended the Fair, but may not be familiar with the names.

The final weighted score listed on the Survey Results Chart was reached using the scale below.

The scores are presented on the Survey Results Chart as **weighted score**/number of surveys completed.

Question	Possible Score	Possible Weighted Score
I would like to use this voting system in an election.	5	10
There were too many steps in using this voting system.	5	5
I thought this voting system was easy to use.	5	10
The instructions for this voting system were difficult to understand.	5	5
The buttons or touch screen were easy to use.	5	5
It was hard to move around the ballot with this system.	5	5
I think that most people could learn to use this voting system very quickly.	5	10
I found this voting system awkward or difficult to use.	5	10
I felt very confident that my vote was cast correctly with this voting system.	5	15
I would need help each time I used this voting system.	5	15
The ballot text was easy to read or hear.	5	5
Casting my vote was easy.	5	5
	60	100

Accessible Voting Systems Vendor Fair Survey Results Chart

The scores are presented as **weighted score**/number of surveys completed.

weighted score	mobility	vision	manual dexterity	hearing	cognitive/ mental health	none	other	multiple
Advanced Voting Solutions Vote by Phone			<i>the phone system that used voice recognition</i>					
68.38 /50	65.83 /6	69.86 /29	71.00 /2	n/a	85.50 /4	50.50 /4	68.33 /3	53.50 /2
Advanced Voting Solutions WINVote			<i>the system that used the touch screen for navigation</i>					
69.81 /64	81.29 /7	65.38 /29	76.50 /2	n/a	71.69 /13	70.50 /6	65.50 /2	72.80 /5
Avante DRE Voting System			<i>the system that used a modified computer keyboard</i>					
73.49 /49	78.00 /5	72.78 /23	82.00 /3	n/a	71.80 /5	75.25 /4	76.67 /3	66.83 /6
Avante Optical Voting System			<i>the system that used a modified computer keyboard and an optical scan paper printout</i>					
71.39 /31	93.33 /3	65.31 /13	n/a	76.00 /1	71.38 /8	66.33 /3	78.00 /1	80.00 /2
ES&S Automark			<i>the system that used an optical scan ballot</i>					
77.25 /61	85.25 /8	75.13 /30	82.00 /1	76.00 /1	75.90 /10	85.00 /2	81.00 /3	74.33 /6
Hart InterCivic eSlate			<i>the system that used a dial for scrolling through choices</i>					
71.31 /78	71.00 /9	70.50 /40	72.00 /2	60.00 /1	75.58 /12	80.20 /5	67.33 /3	64.83 /6
IVS LLC Inspire			<i>the system that used a phone keypad for navigation</i>					
71.46 /26	79.75 /4	80.08 /12	36.00 /1	n/a	69.00 /4	n/a	61.00 /1	51.25 /4
IVS LLC Vote by Phone			<i>the phone system that was activated when the vendor entered a ballot id</i>					
72.20 /35	50.00 /4	80.96 /23	n/a	n/a	55.00 /4	n/a	60.00 /2	62.50 /2
PhonElect Vote by Phone			<i>the phone system with a full-length ballot demo</i>					
62.75 /44	60.78 /9	65.25 /24	86.00 /1	n/a	60.40 /5	n/a	44.00 /2	57.33 /3
Sequoia AVC Edge			<i>the system that used four differently shaped, color-coded buttons for navigation</i>					
73.55 /55	76.86 /7	70.27 /26	72.00 /1	n/a	78.83 /12	79.00 /3	70.67 /3	71.00 /3
VoteHere Sentinel			<i>the voter verification system; the survey for this system had a possible total of 90 points</i>					
71.33 /3	76.00 /1	n/a	n/a	n/a	72.00 /1	n/a	n/a	66.00 /1