



“Transforming Election Administration, Voting System
Accessibility, and the Certification Process”

EAC Roundtable Discussion

May 9, 2013

EAC Offices
Suite 150
1225 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC

Participate

Live webcast at www.eac.gov

Twitter: @EACgov #FOV13

Submit questions & comments via Twitter and webcast

Agenda

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 12:00pm – 2:30pm | Session I: Results of EAC Accessibility Grants Funding |
| 2:30pm – 2:45pm | Afternoon Break |
| 2:45pm – 5:30pm | Session II: Streamlining the EAC Testing and Certification Program |

Participants

Moderator: Merle King, Executive Director, Georgia's Center for Election Systems, Kennesaw State University

Session I: Results of EAC Accessibility Grants Funding

- Dana E. Chisnell, Usability and User Research Consultant, UsabilityWorks
- Kathryn Summers, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Division of Science, Information Arts, and Technologies, University of Baltimore
- Daniel Castro, Senior Analyst, Information Technology & Innovation Foundation
- Dan Gillette, Consultant, Vote Your Mind at CITRIS, UC Berkeley
- W. Bradley Fain, Ph.D., Principal Research Scientist, Georgia Tech Research Institute
- Douglas L. Kruse, Ph.D., Director, Ph.D. Program in Industrial Relations and Human Resources, Rutgers University
- Lisa A. Schur, Ph.D., J.D., Associate Professor, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University
- Juan E. Gilbert, Ph.D., IDEaS Professor & Chair, Clemson University

Session II: Streamlining the EAC Testing & Certification Program

- Brian Hancock, Director, EAC Voting System Testing and Certification
- Traci Mapps, Senior Director of Compliance Operations, SLI Global Solutions
- Brad King, Co-Director, Indiana Election Division
- McDermot Coutts, Director of Research & Development, Unisyn Voting Solutions
- Mark W. Skall, Technical Reviewer, EAC
- Steve Pearson, Vice President of Voting Systems, ES&S
- Juan E. Gilbert, Ph.D., IDEaS Professor & Chair, Clemson University

Discussion Questions

These are questions (divided by panel segment) the moderator is likely to pose to the designated panel. Depending on the direction of the discussion and time limitations, all questions may not be asked. These questions are provided to give the panelists the opportunity to further prepare for the discussion and to inform the public, including election officials, about likely topics.

Session I: Results of EAC Accessibility Grants Funding

1. How would you assess the current state of the art/practice of voting systems and election administration in regards to accessibility issues?
2. What are the follow-on steps for the research you presented? Did your research identify new potential areas to enhance accessibility in elections?
3. How might your research be incorporated into voting system design or election administration practices? Could you describe an appropriate pilot project to refine and test the implementation of your research?
4. In regard to the next generation of voting systems, can you prioritize accessibility concerns that need to be addressed? Can you identify resources for vendors to access to assist in this?
5. Some EAC grantees have piloted their AVT projects in different types of elections. How can we get your R&D and research findings into the hands of elections officials for use on the frontline of elections? Can you share existing success stories?
6. In regard to election administration, can you prioritize accessibility concerns and needed procedural changes? Can you recommend resources available to state election officials to assist them in analyzing their accessibility needs and designing mitigations? Local officials?

Session II: Streamlining the EAC Testing & Certification Program

As the EAC Voting System Testing program has matured, time to complete testing and overall program costs have decreased. The EAC believes that more significant progress can be made by making significant modifications to the current program in order to further decrease program costs, decrease the time to complete testing, and to enhance and encourage innovations. After EAC staff describes proposed programmatic changes, panelists will be asked to react to the proposed changes from their varied perspectives:

1. How would these proposed changes impact your company/State/Test Laboratory?
2. Do you believe that the proposed changes (if implemented correctly) would achieve the desired results of more efficient and timely testing and certification of voting systems?
3. What other related recommendations would you propose to the EAC?
4. How long is “too long” for a voting system test campaign? Please differentiate certified system modifications from new system testing.