

# **AbilityNet Accessibility Kit Pilot Project**

## **External Evaluation**

**Carried out by**

**Jean Alcock**

**JARCS**

**(Jean Alcock Research & Consultancy Services)**

**on behalf of**

**Scottish Enterprise Digital Inclusion Team  
and  
learndirect scotland**

**April 2004**



# **AbilityNet Accessibility Kit Evaluation**

## **Contents Page**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background to Project</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Backgrounds of Partners</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>The AbilityNet Accessibility Kit</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Survey Results</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Centre Profiles</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Availability of Kit Items</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Usage of Kit Items</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Impairment &amp; Unmet Need</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Supporting Users</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Training</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Technical Issues</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Internal Evaluation</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Impact of Kit</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Summary &amp; Recommendations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	
<b>Usage of Kit Items by Centre</b>	
<b>Appendix 2</b>	
<b>Survey Questionnaire</b>	



## **Introduction**

In October 2003 30 learning centres across Scotland were supplied with the basic Accessibility Kit identified by AbilityNet for public Access ICT Points. At least one member of each centre received training from AbilityNet in the use of the kit items and also on the wider picture of assistive technology. An Interim Report<sup>1</sup> evaluating the training was carried out 6 weeks after receipt of the kit. This present evaluation carried out after 6 months of operation is concerned with use of kit items within centres; the impact of the kit on making centres more accessible to disabled users and the suitability of the kit items as part of a generic package.

## **Background to Project**

The project aims to improve access for disabled people to public access ICT facilities.

The range of needs demonstrated by users in centres varies widely, from the need to have a trackball to counter difficulties with manual dexterity, which is particularly useful to older people who are unfamiliar with a computer mouse, to highly specialist software to cater for people with complex needs.

Some disabled people require individual assessment to discover the assistive technology that will enable them to use computers and sometimes this will involve the installation of costly and sophisticated software and hardware. However for many people computer access can be achieved by relatively simple, free or low cost adaptations. AbilityNet Scotland has developed a generic kit of such adaptations, which it believes can cater for 70% of disabled people using centres in which staff members have received training in their use.

Through piloting this kit and training centre staff, the project seeks to include people who would have difficulty accessing a computer through standard methods.

The training offered covered:

- Physical access – using computers with a physically disabling condition.
- Sensory access – using computers with a vision or hearing impairment.
- Cognitive access – using computers with a literacy or learning difficulty.

An additional aspect of staff training was increasing knowledge of the inbuilt accessibility options available on Microsoft Windows system.

---

<sup>1</sup> AbilityNet Scotland Accessibility Kit and Training Pilot for Public Access IT Centres: Interim report, December 2003 (*Laura McKenna, Digital Inclusion Team*)

This pilot study was designed to evaluate both the generic kit and the staff training in 30 public IT centres across Scotland, none of which are specifically aimed at disabled clients.

## **Background of partners**

AbilityNet is a UK national charity offering professional expertise in adapting computers for use by people with all kinds of disability. AbilityNet grew from the combined Foundation for the Communication for the Disabled and the Computability Centre in 1998. In 2001 it set up its first centre in Scotland, based in South Queensferry, one of 10 regional centres throughout the UK.

Training in the use of 'No and Low cost adaptations' has always been an element of AbilityNet's promotion. With the growth in public access IT centres AbilityNet has developed a generic kit and training which aims to support centres in being inclusive to all.

Scottish Enterprise Digital Inclusion Team is funded by the Scottish Executive, working to themes highlighted in the digital inclusion strategy, 'Connecting Scotland's People'.

The team work in Social Inclusion Partnership areas in 8 Scottish Enterprise Local Economic Companies.

The team's task is to ensure a joined-up approach to community ICT projects and provision of a high quality of service in all ICT facilities in SIP areas. The Champions achieve this by engaging and coordinating the activities of a broad range of local partners, including local authorities, community and voluntary organisations, neighbourhood projects and other local service agencies.

learnirect scotland has a network of 438 branded centres across the country, all of which have Internet connected PCs.

learningdirect Scotland was keen to be involved in the pilot as they had begun to further develop their policy on IT accessibility and to advise and assist learning centres on compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) required by October 2004. Findings from this pilot will inform their accessibility policy in the wider context.

## **The AbilityNet Accessibility Kit**

AbilityNet has developed a generic kit and staff training package it believes will cater for 70% of the ICT needs of disabled people. The emphasis is on several low cost items covering a wide range of impairment and catering for relatively straightforward difficulties. For example, Black on Yellow Keyboard stickers providing better contrast and larger letters can help users with visual problems and those with learning difficulties to learn to use the keyboard. The training recommended as part of the package is not only on the use of the kit items but also gives an overview of other assistive technology to catering for users with more complex needs. The aim is that by raising

## *Accessibility Kit Evaluation*

awareness across the broad spectrum of assistive solutions, trained staff will be more able to react positively whatever the needs of disabled users.

### **The AbilityNet kit comprises**

Compact Cherry keyboard with keyguard  
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball  
Kensington Expert Mouse  
Keyboard Stickers (large black on yellow)  
Document Reader software  
Penfriend XP (word prediction software)  
Belkin USB PS/2 adaptor + extension cables  
Support Materials  
including a wall poster to help advertise the equipment,  
Instruction sheets to aid with tuning windows settings,  
And the AbilityNet Scotland Accessibility CD-ROM

## **Evaluation Methodology**

The external evaluation was carried out in March and April 2004 by an independent information specialist with eighteen years experience of disability issues relating to learning, with particular emphasis on access to ICT. The evaluation was carried out six months after the staff had been trained and the centres had received the kit. The aim was to survey all 30 centres taking part in the pilot project by contacting the staff member who had undergone the initial training.

A Questionnaire was devised to be completed by a mixture of face-to-face and telephone interviews. Topics covered in the questionnaire were:

- Centre Profile
- Kit availability in centres
- Use of Individual Kit Items
- Identification of Unmet Need and solutions found
- Cascading Training to other staff members
- Marketing Techniques
- Technical problems
- Impact of Kit on Service

Some of these topics had been covered in the initial evaluation and were included to see if problems identified had been solved.

The named person in each of the 30 centres involved in the project was emailed and told to expect a questionnaire that was posted out the following week. The researcher then telephoned each person to arrange a time to visit or complete the questionnaire over the phone. This initial contact identified that four people had left post since the start of the project. In all cases an alternative person was identified but this had an impact on the detail of information available and indeed on the level of commitment to use of the kit.

It also emerged that some people would feel more comfortable completing and returning the questionnaire independently and, in view of the time constraints, this was agreed with the proviso that the researcher would contact the respondent with any queries that arose when the questionnaire was returned. There were a few problems in reaching the named person within the time scale due to annual leave and pressing work problems.

## **Survey results**

However, despite these problems, some contact was made with a competent person in all but one of the 30 centres and 27 questionnaires were returned. Information from a 28th centre was obtained during a visit but the questionnaire was not completed. However the general information from this centre is included in the report.

- 3 of the 27 questionnaires were completed during centre visits.
- 4 were completed during telephone interviews; 2 of these are incomplete because the named person was not available.

## *Accessibility Kit Evaluation*

- 20 questionnaires were completed and returned by post or email.
- 5 of these centres were subsequently contacted for clarification about information given.

The detail given by centres varies considerably mainly because some centres were unaware that they would be asked for this type of information and do not normally keep usage statistics.

### **Section 1 Centre Profiles**

Of the 30 centres taking part in the pilot project

- 20 were funded and selected by the Scottish Enterprise Digital Inclusion Team. These centres are based within geographic Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) areas.
- 10 are branded learndirect Scotland Centres. These were funded by the Scottish Executive and selected by learndirect scotland regional managers,

None of the centres is specifically for disabled users. However in one centre the kit had been installed within a project aimed at disabled users and another centre has a long track record of delivering inclusive services. Both these centres are learndirect scotland branded centres.

### **Sector**

Of the respondents:

- 12 centres are in the voluntary sector
- 9 centres are statutory bodies, such as libraries
- 5 centres are other public bodies such as Colleges
- 1 centre is in the private sector

Of the non-returns:

- 3 are community learning centres (General Information from one of these is included but no questionnaire returned)

### **History and Funding**

Of the Respondents

- 6 centres (2 voluntary & 4 public) were established before 1990. None of these is on time-limited project funding.
- 12 centres (4 Public; 7 Voluntary & 1 Private) were established between 1990 and 1999. Of these 4 are on time-limited funding for this particular aspect of their service with 1 due to run out in 2004, 2 in 2005 & 1 in 2006.

## Accessibility Kit Evaluation

- 9 centres have been established since 2000. Of these 7 are time-limited projects. Funding has or is due to run out in 2004 for 2 centres, in 2005 for 3 centres & 2006 for 3 centres
- 14 centres are core funded, either wholly or in part.

There are general implications for time-limited projects that might be very successful in building up good access for disabled users only for that access to disappear when the project closes. One centre closed during the evaluation period. However from the returns in this survey no particular conclusions could be drawn relating sector, history and funding to the level of use of kit items.

### ICT Services offered

Most centres offered more than one way to access ICT

Type of Service	No. of centres
Public Access point allowing unplanned use of computers by individuals	18
Public Access point requiring pre-booking by individuals to use computers	11
Learning Centre offering individual users access to open learning material	18
Learning Centre offering taught classes for registered users	19
Other, Please Describe. Literacies ICT ECDL test centre Taster ICT Extended Learning Support	4

Table 1.1

- 2 centres only offer unplanned use of computers by individuals
- 4 centres only offer taught classes for registered users
- 1 centre only offer access to open learning materials
- 18 centres offered a mixture of unplanned & planned use.

The type of service has obvious effects on the ability of centre staff to identify users with access issues.

Where a centre only offers drop-in facilities it will always be difficult to identify disabled users and advise them about assistive technology. Although disabled people might use the centre facilities, if there is only minimal staff input any difficulties they have in using standard equipment might go unnoticed. It is more likely that such users will just not return, especially if they are new to ICT and are unaware of the often simple ways in which they could be helped. Many people are unwilling to draw attention to themselves if they are having difficulties with ICT. These assertions are borne out in the survey.

- None of the kit items were used in the 2 centres offering only drop-in facilities.

## *Accessibility Kit Evaluation*

- A respondent from a centre offering extended learning support in a college stated that the kit items had improved retention rates of disabled users
- 3 respondents identified the reluctance of disabled people to draw attention to themselves, often preferring to cope with the difficulties of using standard kit than be seen to be different.

Where only taught classes are offered it will obviously be easier to identify and support disabled users. The survey has identified some examples of best practice resulting from a robust induction policy which are highlighted in Section 8 Marketing.

## General Usage

Respondents were asked to give the total number of people using their ICT facilities over the six months of the project. Real or approximate figures were given by 21 respondents.

Total Number of Users	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Not given	7	7	7	7	7	7
Under 50*	6	6	6	6	6	6
50 – 99	3	3	3	3	3	3
100 - 199	3	3	3	3	3	3
200 – 499	2	2	2	4	2	2
500 – 999	3	3	3	1	3	3
1000 +**	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Number of Centres					

Table 1.2

\* 1 centre only has disabled users

\*\* 1 centre has between 2000 & 3000 users while the other has an average of 17,500 per month; this large figure from a further education college drops to 10,000 and 5,000 in July and August respectively.

Respondents were also asked to give the number of disabled users over the same period. These disabled people do not necessarily use items from the Accessibility Kit. Real or approximate figures, including no users, were given by 18 respondents

Number of Disabled Users	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Not given	9	9	9	9	9	9
None	2	1	2	2	1	2
Under 5	5	6	5	8	7	7
5-10	5	8	7	6	5	6
11 - 20	3		2		1	1
20 – 50**	2	2	2	2	2	2
40 - 100***	1	1	1	1	1	1
100+	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Number of Centres					

Table 1.3

\*\* One of these centres offers a Specific Disability Service

\*\*\* Figures are based on research carried out by centre. Results are available for consultation.

## **Section 2 Availability of Kit Items**

Respondents were asked whether the kit was installed ready for use on one or more machines or if it was available for use on one or more machines.

12 centres have not installed the kit on any of their machines but make them available when required. In one centre items were kept at the counter and users had to ask for them. This allows them the flexibility of installing the hardware or software on a machine of choice. It also means, as happens in 2 centres, the equipment can be spread over several sites or taken away for home use. The downside of using this method is:

- the time it might take to install some of the items although this should be minimal with the hardware which is plug & play. In a taught class this could affect the whole class.
- user embarrassment that they are causing disruption and do not want to make a nuisance of themselves.
- staff members might need to remind themselves about how to install the kit item.

2 centres had installed the kit items onto a dedicated machine. This may be useful in that the equipment is readily available in an identifiable machine but it has certain distinct disadvantages.

- The different items are designed to cater for a wide range of need and putting it all on the one machine means that only the needs of one person can be catered for at any one time.
- It can draw attention to a person's impairment if they are only able to use one particular machine which is then seen as that "funny" machine. In one centre the "funny" machine is always the last to be booked out & then if it is needed by a disabled person the non-disabled user has to move and wait for another machine to become available. This centre is very busy but to date has not had many disabled users so that the problem has not yet arisen.

11 centres used a mixture of methods depending on the kit item. Generally:

- The cherry keyboard, the trackball & the Expert Mouse are available for use on any machine as the need arises.
- The Keyboard Stickers, Reader Software & Penfriend were all installed on different machines. Some centres had purchased further sets of keyboard stickers as they had proved so popular with older users. 2 centres would uninstall Penfriend from one machine & install it in another if required to keep in line with licence regulations.

In the Interim Evaluation it was reported that 3 centres had been unable to access the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options because they sat inside a secure control panel only available to IT staff. This was identified as an on-going problem in the largest centre involved in the project.

Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options Policy at 1 Centre
--

## *Accessibility Kit Evaluation*

Machines can be customised for users but only by a member of the IT support team coming to the centre in person to change the settings and returning at the end of the session to reset the machine. While the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options are the most commonly used item of kit across all the centres the figures estimated for this otherwise high usage centre are low, reflecting the difficulties involved in accessing the system. Requests to management to provide a more user friendly and flexible system have been unsuccessful.

It is unlikely that this would be classed as discrimination under SENDA as the options are made available; it is just that the present policy discourages users and staff from using them.

This centre is atypical of the other centres in the project because it has ready and immediate access to much more sophisticated assistive technology than is available from kit items. This includes a National Access Centre where users can receive individual assessment for assistive technology. Nonetheless it is unfortunate that this inflexibility could lead to "high tech" solutions being used where "low tech" ones might do.

### **Section 3 Usage of Kit Items**

Respondents were asked to give usage figures for each of the kit items, identifying new users in each month and those that continued to use the items for more than one month. This was possible in centres recording very low usage and the figures in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 are fairly accurate.

However, in larger usage centres it proved impossible to separate new and continuing use. This was mainly because of the different ways in which respondents had interpreted the question.

- Some respondents estimated average usage in each month
- Some interpreted continuing users as meaning people who had previously used the centre and were now using a kit item.
- Some counted everyone as a new user when they started using a kit item and a continuer if they used it for more than one month.
- Some centres counted demonstrating a kit item to users as usage even if the disabled person did not then go on to use it regularly. In one case 150 people were shown the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options over each of the six months but only around 50 continued to use them.

Therefore, in table 3.3 the figures given represent the estimated number of times each kit item was used each month of the project

The figures given in Table 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 represent responses from 21 centres. Of the remaining 6 centres:

- 1 respondent did not know what use had been made of the kit.
- 5 Respondents (2 Voluntary, 2 Public, and 1 Private) reported that no use had been made of any of the Kit items.
  - 1 centre was a public library with drop-in access and no requests had been made to use the equipment.
  - 1 centre had not used the equipment up to now but was envisaging that use would be made in the future as more contact was made with local groups. This centre had a mixture of drop-in access & taught classes.
  - In 1 centre much of the learning activity takes place in the local college that already has well established support systems, including the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit.
  - 1 centre has not been able to promote the kit because of lack of resources & infrastructure.
  - The private centre had not had any requests and was unable to promote the kit as the person doing the training was now on maternity leave. The centre had had disabled users in the past but at present the only disabled user had greater needs than was available from the kit. The centre had catered for this need by downloading a demonstration copy of Supanova. However in the end the user cancelled.

## Low Usage Centres

9 Respondents (2 public, 7 Voluntary) reported minimal use (less than 5 users in total per centre) had been made of at least 1 kit item including Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options.

### Number of Individuals starting to use a kit item over the period

Item	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Total
Compact Cherry keyboard	2						2
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball	5				1		6
Kensington Expert Mouse	1						1
Keyboard Stickers	1						1
Document Reader software			1				1
Penfriend XP			3				3
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options	3		4		2		9
<b>Total New Users in 9 centres</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>23</b>

Table 3.1

### Estimate of the continuing use of kit items by individual users

Item	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Compact Cherry keyboard	2	2	2	2	2
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball	5	3	2	2	2
Kensington Expert Mouse	1	1	1	1	1
Keyboard Stickers	1	1	1		
Document Reader software					
Penfriend XP			3		
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options	3	3	6	5	5
<b>Total Continuing Users in 9 centres</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 3.2

7 of the centres acknowledged the low use made of the kit up till now

**"Although we have not used the kit extensively within the centre to date, there is no doubt in my mind that without it, learners may have given up, either feeling that they were a burden to staff or physically would have been unable to continue because of difficulties." Michelle Brown, Langlees & Bainsford CLC**

and all indicated that they had plans to market it more fully in the future. (See Section 8 Marketing).

1 centre allowed users to sign items out for trying out at home and this usage is not included in these figures.

1 centre closed down during the reporting period.

## Higher Usage Centres

Kit items have been used more extensively (more than 5 users per centre) in 11 centres (9 public, 2 voluntary). The total number of users in the centres varied from around 20 to over 17,500.

### Numbers of people using kit items over the period

Item	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Total
Compact Cherry keyboard	59	48	53	43	48	62	<b>313</b>
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball	34	9	11	9	13	8	<b>84</b>
Kensington Expert Mouse	31	10	10	7	7	8	<b>73</b>
Keyboard Stickers	84	51	52	35	38	37	<b>297</b>
Document Reader software	21	11	13	10	10	13	<b>78</b>
Penfriend XP	15	10	9	11	12	9	<b>66</b>
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options	119	67	73	65	66	76	<b>466</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>1383</b>

Table 3.3

- 3 centres used all 7 kit items
- 1 had only used the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options.
- 7 had used between 3 and 6 items.
- 4 centres had introduced kit items to users at the beginning of the period and their use had continued throughout. However, these centres did not appear to have introduced any new users in following months.
- at least 1 centre encourages users to use the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options independently and 2 others plan to introduce these options to users during induction.

It is clear that the initial upsurge of use following receipt of the Kit and the training in September was not maintained throughout the project.

A detailed breakdown of usage per centre is given in Appendix 1

## User Profiles

The questionnaire did not include a question about user profiles but nevertheless some generalities did emerge.

- Elderly people with age-related mobility and visual impairments. By far the greatest use of kit items was by this group who do not necessarily see themselves as disabled.
- People with learning disabilities. Some centres are used by people with learning difficulties who come either singly or in groups with support workers who often bring their own hardware, for example tracker balls and learning materials specifically designed for their users.
- One centre was presently working closely with people with mental health issues and felt that this resulted in lower use of the kit than might be at other times.

## *Accessibility Kit Evaluation*

- Three respondents mentioned resistance on the part of individual users to use something different.

## **Sections 4 and 6 Impairment and Unmet Need**

Respondents were asked if the kit items used catered for the needs of their users.

Of the 19 respondents who gave usage statistics:

- 4 were unsure about whether all the needs were catered for. One reason given was that the user was accompanied by a support worker
- 10 said that the items used fully catered for the needs of their users.
- 5 centres had sought solutions to assist their users.
  - a young man had been referred to AbilityNet for a taster session in voice recognition software.
  - a copy of Zoomtext had been obtained from a charitable organisation.
  - an ergonomic mouse & screen visor had been purchased and learning material adapted to suit the needs of users.
  - a portable induction loop and an adjustable desk had been purchased.
  - an adjustable desk had been constructed by a local joiner.

In many cases these solutions came as a direct result of attempting to use the kit items. For example, in one centre the Cherry Keyboard seemed to be the ideal solution for one user but she was unable to reach it at a standard work station. In this case a local joiner was asked to provide the solution.

In 5 centres the kit items were an add on to existing, often more sophisticated access technology so that it is likely that users' needs were already being met.

## **Section 5 Supporting Users**

Respondents were asked how independent users could become after being shown the use of the items. 14 respondents gave figures in response to this question.

As might be expected users of the hardware items achieved greater independence than software users. All the hardware is simple to install & relatively simple to learn although one centre mentioned that it did not have a manual for the Cherry Keyboard and this had reduced usage independence to 50%. However users might not always have the manual dexterity to plug in the hardware and therefore would require this initial installation to be carried out by a member of staff.

Independence in the use of the software items including the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options was fairly high, ranging from 75 – 100%, in 7 centres while others recorded that 50 – 100% of users were dependent on centre support to use these kit items. In some cases these figures reflect the centre policy as regards computer usage rather than the ability of the user.

- In 1 centre computers were set up with user profiles and in this way the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options could be set as default for each

## Accessibility Kit Evaluation

profile. This was seen as being useful for staff but did not encourage users to find out how to do it for themselves or to change things if required.

- In 1 centre the use of the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options had been devolved down to users. This meant that the centre had no record of how often these options were being offered.
- In 1 centre all the kit items had to be set up by staff as users were not allowed to tinker with the machine
- In 1 centre the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options could only be accessed by IT support staff (See section 2)

Respondents were then asked what percentage of staff would be able to provide this support.

No Support System	10% of Staff	11- 30%	31-50%	51 -80%	81 – 100%
3	1	2	4	4	12

Table 5.1

- 9 centres used trained volunteers all or part of the time.
- 8 centres would or did approach specialist agencies for provision of support.

The support needed to allow use of kit items has obvious resource implications for centres, especially those that record a low percentage of staff and/or volunteers with expertise to provide this support and those that do not.

**"Training has not been demonstrated to staff yet or to volunteer tutors, sessional staff etc. Time needed to do this and money for payment of sessional staff are issues" (Dalmuir Centre)**

2 centres mention making extensive use of volunteers as 'IT Buddies' to support individuals or small groups.

## Section 7 Training

The initial training raised awareness about more than the use of the kit items and it was clear from respondents that this had had a good effect in that they were able to respond more positively if a user needed more than the basic kit.

4 people who responded to the questionnaire had not been involved in the initial training provision because the original person had left post. 1 of these had since undergone training. 100% of the respondents who had attended were satisfied with the training.

**"The initial training still sticks in my mind as one of the best training sessions I have ever taken part in, both for content & enjoy ability" Paul Davies, Instep Communities**

- 12 centres had since made use of the AbilityNet CD Rom or Website
- 4 have made direct contact with AbilityNet.
- 19 had cascaded training down to other staff and where relevant volunteers.
- In 8 centres 100% of staff had received training in use of kit items.

## Section 8 Marketing

Respondents were asked to indicate how they had advertised the Accessibility Kit both internally and externally.

- 1 respondent did not know of any marketing activity around the kit.
- 4 centres had not carried out any marketing of the kit either internally or externally. These centres had recorded no or very low usage (1 user in each of 2 centres). Of these:
  - 1 centre had capacity issues.  
**"There is an unreality that simply providing some infrastructure and training will result in such projects being able to be progressed or cascaded. Digital Inclusion is a priority but it is only part of what we do. We have great issues around having core funds just to deliver our core business. The enterprise network needs to recognise that resources are needed to deliver such projects and stable core incomes is needed to ensure a stable platform from which to deliver"**  
***Bruce Henderson, Dove Centre***
  - 1 centre was planning to work more closely with local groups. It was already used by groups who brought their own equipment, track balls etc.
  - 1 centre was planning to produce its own poster showing pictures of the different items
  - 1 centre was planning to highlight the possibilities of the kit at a forthcoming staff development day.  
**"Kit hasn't been marketed within college but will be at a forthcoming Staff Development Day to promote Learning Service under the Brites Initiative"** ***Gavin Boyd, West Lothian College***
- 2 Centres had not used the AbilityNet Poster to advertise but had advertised in some other way.
  - 1 centre had contacted local disability organisations. This centre had reasonably high and constant use of the equipment and reported new users through marketing activity.
  - 1 centre has produced its own publicity material and had advertised on its web page. This centre reported no usage of the equipment and therefore no new users.
- 21 centres, including the centre visited that had not completed a questionnaire, had used the poster in-house to advertise the kit. Of these:

## Accessibility Kit Evaluation

- 6 had not undertaken any other marketing activity. Of these 3 had none or very low usage (1 person per centre) but the other 2, a community learning centre and a public library, had higher usage.
- 15 centres had at the very least contacted local disability organisations, while some had also advertised in the press produced their own publicity materials. 11 of these centres reported that their marketing activities had (8) or had possibly (3) brought in new disabled users to the centre. In 1 case this was reported as the use of the centre by another service provider.

Although these figures are not overwhelming they do indicate that a robust external marketing policy is needed in order to raise awareness about the kit and its potential for enabling disabled people to access ICT. The kit in itself is not enough.

The survey also brought out some interesting methods of encouraging usage of the kit items.

### **Best Practice**

One centre offering taught courses takes each learner through an induction process, part of which is to customise the machines to suit individual need. Each user gets the opportunity to try out the various options to come up with a machine that suits them. As many of the users are elderly with age-related impairments, this proactive method ensures that the user is not made to feel different by being singled out only once a problem has been identified.

One centre "now includes accessibility issues as part of the introduction to any courses ... and gives clients the option to try trackballs, alternative keyboards, change screen size etc."

This type of approach which in effect is mainstreaming assistive technology was taken by 4 centres in the study and appears to be an effective way of letting people who can only use the standard equipment with difficulty find easier ways to use computers without being embarrassed.

Three centres mentioned resistance to use of any of the kit items because of embarrassment or a feeling of being a nuisance. It seemed that many people who can use standard equipment albeit very slowly and ineffectively are at present unwilling to try a more effective method if this is being sold as a "disability item". As by far the greatest use of the kit was by elderly people with age-related impairments it is perhaps time to remove the disability label and starting to make all users aware of these options.

These examples are identified as best practice and they could point the way for more effective marketing in the future.

This level of embarrassment is not so likely to be an issue for disabled people with more complex needs who definitely cannot use standard input/output devices. In those cases where the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit

items are inadequate to meet their needs other "higher tech" solutions are available. The AbilityNet training undergone by respondents has gone a long way to raise awareness about possible solutions and there was evidence that this was already being put into practice.

## **Section 9 Technical Issues**

None of the respondents reported any technical issues with the equipment. However one centre reported that the magnifier option within the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options did not work on the CDROMS they used.

## **Section 10 Internal Evaluation**

7 centres had carried out informal internal evaluation of the kit as part of their normal monitoring systems. 2 centres were willing to make this information available on site to an external agency. This offer was not taken up because of time constraints.

## **Section 11 Impact of Kit**

The majority of respondents were pleased to take part in the pilot project and thought that the kit was a useful addition to their service. They were asked to rate

- the usefulness of the kit in catering for the needs of disabled users
- the added value of the kit to their service.

on a scale of 1 (No Value) to 5 (Invaluable)

77% of respondents scored 3 or above on the usefulness of the kit; with 18% scoring 5

81% of respondents scored 3 or above on the added value of the kit; with 18% scoring 5

The scores were influenced by

- some centres already having assistive solutions in place so that the kit was an add-on to these.
- some low or no use centres scored low not because of the kit but because of their lack of use of it.

## Respondents Comments

"The majority of users have a learning disability rather than a physical or visual disability. Therefore some of the kit has been more beneficial than others. *Dalmuir Centre*

"Although I have scored these low that is only because we have other systems in place that ensure that disabled users are not excluded. These arrangements have meant that the college has tackled the exclusion problem on our behalf and we also have two outreach workers who deal with disability issues and numeracy/literacy problems." *East End Connected*

"Will continue to market to appropriate groups. Have shown to Essential Skills Co-ordinators and Tutors who are interested in using with their learners." *Elgin Library*

"Although to date we have not actively targeted potential user groups because of continuing programmes of study and space within the centre, it enables us to include this in our development plan for the learning centre.

In addition to having the kit for centre use, it has very much proven its worth in providing information and examples of what is available in way of support and help To this extent, the training & kit has been invaluable for awareness raising & sharing good practice." *Langlees & Bainsford Community Learning Centre*

"The Kit is excellent – I used some of the items myself as a non-disabled user just to get experience with them, and was almost converted into a trackball user full time! The main reason for low scores is the small amount of use that the kit has seen. This may change in the future as one of the local disability projects funding ends in a few months and we may see an upturn in disabled users." *In Step Communities*

"In conjunction with helping people understand their computer specification we also try to make them aware of aids in making computing easier whether disabled or not." *Johnstone Castle Learning Centre*

"The training came along at a perfect time for me as we were organising a "Computing for the Terrified" course for the local Visually Impaired group. We customised the PCs using a combination of accessibility options, trackballs, big keys keyboards and supernova.

Several of our clients have gone out to buy their own equipment after having used it in our centre.

I now include accessibility issues as part of the introduction to any courses I am doing and give clients the option to try trackballs, alternative keyboards, change screen size etc." *SCOOP*

## Summary and Recommendations

This survey was undertaken to evaluate the use and value of the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit for Public Access ICT Points in 30 learning centres across Scotland. Each centre was given one kit and at least one member of staff received a day's training in its use. The evaluation survey was carried out after 6 months.

### Centre Profiles

The centres chosen for the pilot range from small community learning centres to public libraries and colleges. Their one similarity was that they provide ICT facilities; their sector, history, funding and type of service offered were much more diverse. Within the scope of this survey sector, history and funding did not appear to be significant when looking at the kit usage, although the issue of time limited funding could become an issue over time. What was much more significant in terms of usage is the type of access to computers that is provided by each of the centres.

The 2 centres that offer only drop-in computer facilities recorded no usage of the kit. There is plenty of evidence from this survey that people who have difficulty in using standard input kit are reluctant to draw attention to themselves even when they are given the opportunity to try out alternative methods. It is very unlikely therefore that they will be pro-active in approaching staff in a centre that is offering no or minimal support to any of its users. While usage rates varied in the centres offering taught courses or a mixture of taught and drop-in facilities there is no doubt that these centres will be more likely to identify and cater for user support needs.

<b>Recommendation 1</b> All ICT Public Access Points should aim towards providing more than just drop-in facilities for computer use.
---

### Usage

It proved difficult to collect accurate statistics about general computer usage in centres and about usage by disabled people as numbers were not always recorded and where figures were given they were often estimated. Around 30% of centres claimed to be unaware that any statistics would be required for the pilot. As for the kit items, these were used in so many different ways that it was only possible to estimate usage, especially in centres with higher usage.

It was disappointing that 50% of centres either recorded no or minimal usage.

No Usage	Minimal Usage	Higher Usage
20%	30%	50%

Reasons for low start-up and usage rates were lack of time and capacity, change of staff; kit was an add-on to existing facilities; disabled users were always referred to a specialist service. Some centres indicated that they were planning to start marketing the kit into in the near future. This would

indicate that for some it is just too early to gauge the impact of the kit on services.

In the higher usage centres there was downturn in usage after the initial receipt of the kit and training (See Section 3 Table 3.3) with only the Cherry Keyboard having more users in February than in September. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the reason for this. It could be that after the initial enthusiasm apathy set in; on the other hand it could be that many users who were shown the kit items decided not to use them. This was certainly something that came up during interviews when it was mentioned that some disabled users were reluctant to use a piece of kit that marked them out as disabled.

Usage of individual items varied with the Cherry keyboard, keyboard stickers and Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options being the most commonly used items. This is perhaps unsurprising as the majority of users were older people with age-related impairments such as poor dexterity due to arthritis and loss of vision. However usage of the other items was high enough overall to justify their inclusion in the generic kit. However, one respondent suggested that a more flexible approach to a generic kit.

**"Has been a valuable addition to our existing provision and learners and staff have been very positive about the equipment. [However,] if this is to be rolled out to other centres I suggest that the range of equipment is made more flexible i.e. Centres could choose the resources they require from a menu up to a value. This is because many centres will have a range of facilities already and will not need all of the prescribed equipment but may benefit from an alternative."**  
**Elmwood College**

This is an idea that could be looked at in more detail.

**Recommendation 2** While the 6 month period is a reasonable time period for this initial evaluation, there is a need for on-going monitoring and evaluation to find out if the kit becomes embedded in service delivery across all the centres. Indeed it would be hoped that this present survey will encourage centres to adopt some of the good practice that has emerged from it.

The assumption in some centres that disabled people were always referred on to specialist services is worrying. While it might be a preferred option for some people it is certainly not in the spirit of social inclusion.

**Recommendation 3** There is a need to provide on-going disability awareness training to ensure that staff members start to naturally include disabled people as users of their service and that assistive technology becomes part of the package rather than an add-on. There was an indication in some centres that this was happening and to some extent this approach appeared to solve the problem of users unwilling to use the kit items because they did not want to be seen as different. (see p18).

**Unmet Need**

## Accessibility Kit Evaluation

Over 50% of the centres who responded to the question about Unmet Need felt that the needs of users were adequately met by kit items. It is likely that this could change if the kit is marketed more effectively. There was unmet need in 25% of responding centres and they had all been proactive in finding solutions. In many cases it was the initial AbilityNet training that had raised awareness about the options available.

**Recommendation 4** Centres should be kept up to date about assistive technology to allow them to respond positively accurately to the needs of users.

### Support & Training

It is good practice to encourage disabled people to be as independent as possible and there was good evidence of centres doing this by, for example allowing users to customise machines with the Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options. However, there will always be a need to ensure that support is available for those that need it. This should be as much a part of the digital inclusion agenda as the provision of computers. This could be physical support, for example plugging in a piece of kit. 44% of respondents said that over 80% of staff members were able to provide this sort of support. Other disabled people will have more complex needs and will always need help to use a computer. Many of the smaller learning centres have good on-going support mechanisms embedded in their service, often through the use of trained volunteers as buddies and by employing sessional staff. Where this is not an option some centres work closely with specialist agencies to provide support.

**Recommendation 5** Centres should be encouraged to share good practice in ways of forging partnership links with specialist agencies and setting up robust support mechanisms.

The ability to provide such support rests partly on training and 70% of centres had already cascaded the AbilityNet training down to other members of staff and volunteers while others were planning to do this in the future. 30% of centres said that all their staff had been now received training.

**Recommendation 6** Centres should be encouraged to continue cascading the training about access issues for disabled people throughout their organisations.

However training is only one of the resources needed to enable centres to provide on-going support for disabled users. Where support systems are not already in place, time and money are both required to set up and maintain such systems.

**Recommendation 7** Centre Managers and their funding bodies should look at ways of ensuring that users with additional needs receive appropriate support by providing the necessary resources within centres to allow this to happen.

### **Marketing**

Having an accessibility kit or any other assistive technology available in a learning centre is not going to have a great impact on the number of disabled users without good external marketing. In the survey 73% of centres that had marketed the kit externally, over and above the use of the AbilityNet Poster, reported an increase in the number of disabled people using the centre. Use of the AbilityNet poster on its own did not seem to have much impact on usage. If demand is going to increase it will be necessary for centres to market the availability of the kit and any other assistive technology more effectively. Several centres had plans to take a more proactive approach in the future.

**Recommendation 8** Resources are needed to ensure that the availability of the kit is advertised more widely and effectively to outside organisations and the general public.

Pro-active Internal marketing is equally important. Merely putting up a poster did not have much impact. However, in centres where users were introduced to the kit items at induction there was evidence that they were more likely to continue to use them. This is particularly useful with older users with age-related impairment who do not think of themselves as disabled. Over 50% of centres stated that the majority of their users were elderly.

**Recommendation 9** Centres should be encouraged to market the availability of the kit internally.

## **Conclusion**

There is no doubt that that the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit is an important first step in enabling people with support needs to use ICT in public access centres. It provides a range of no and low cost adaptations that can adequately meet the needs of a wide range of users. It is not clear from this survey if the Kit meets the needs of 70% of disabled people as claimed by AbilityNet but this is mainly because there has been a poor start-up rate in some centres. Combined with AbilityNet's excellent training programme, it has no doubt helped raise awareness about the needs of disabled users and the wide range of ICT solutions available in the participating centres.

However, the kit is only a part of the equation. Staff time, training, robust support systems and an on-going marketing strategy are also needed to ensure that disabled people will be attracted into non-specialist provision and will continue as users because their support needs are being met. The survey has highlighted the danger that without all elements of the equation in place there is still a danger that centres will "end up with a collection of interesting looking equipment gathering dust in a cupboard<sup>2</sup>"

It is important for both the social and digital agenda that this is not allowed to happen.

---

<sup>2</sup> Making ICT services accessible to disabled users within public access centres, a report by Andy Clarke of AbilityNet Scotland, March 2003, p 8, training



*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Cherry Keyboard</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Totals</b>	
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities	8	12	16	20	24	28	
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre							
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	3	1	2	1			
Centre 005	Get in Step							
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project	4						
Centre 008	City Connect	8	5	6	3	5	5	
Centre 009	Elgin Library	1						
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion							
Centre 011	ACE Cornton							
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC							
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	1						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre	3	3	2	2	2	2	
Centre 018	Student Development Centre	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	4						
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre							
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre							
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre							
Centre 024	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 025	Aberdeen College	25	25	25	15	15	25	
Centre 026	Dundee Central Library							
Centre 027	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 028	The Workplace Initiative - Nil return							
Centre 029	West Johnstone Digital inclusion -Nil Return							
Centre 030								
<b>Totals</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>313</b>

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Trackball</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities							
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre	4				3		
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	2	1	1				
Centre 005	Get in Step	1	1	1				
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project	6						
Centre 008	City Connect	4	5	5	6	5	4	
Centre 009	Elgin Library	2						
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion	3						
Centre 011	ACE Cornton -					1		
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC -							
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	4						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre	4	2	4	3	4	4	
Centre 018	Student Development Centre							
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	4						
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre							
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises							
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre							
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment							
Centre 024	Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre							
Centre 025	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 026	Aberdeen College							
Centre 027	Dundee Central Library							
Centre 028	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 029	The Workplace Initiative Nil return							
Centre 030	West Johnstone Digital Inclusion Nil Return							
<b>Totals</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>84</b>

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Kensington Mouse</b>		<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities							
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre		2					
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	3	1	2	1			
Centre 005	Get in Step							
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project							
Centre 008	City Connect	3	2	4	3	2	3	
Centre 009	Elgin Library							
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion	1						
Centre 011	ACE Cornton							
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC							
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	12						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre	4	4	3	2	4	4	
Centre 018	Student Development Centre							
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	3						
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre							
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre	2	2					
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre							
Centre 024	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 025	Aberdeen College	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Centre 026	Dundee Central Library							
Centre 027	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 028	The Workplace Initiative - Nil return							
Centre 029	West Johnstone Digital inclusion -Nil Return							
Centre 030								
<b>Totals</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>73</b>

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Keyboard Stickers</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>		
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities							
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre	2				1	1	
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre							
Centre 005	Get in Step							
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project	1						
Centre 008	City Connect	4	5	4	4	6	4	
Centre 009	Elgin Library	15						
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion	3						
Centre 011	ACE Cornton							
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC							
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	3						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre	1		1	1			
Centre 018	Student Development Centre							
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	8						
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre							
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises							
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre							
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre	1	1	1	1			
Centre 024	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 025	Aberdeen College	40	40	40	25	25	25	
Centre 026	Dundee Central Library	6	5	6	4	6	7	
Centre 027	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 028	The Workplace Initiative - Nil return							
Centre 029	West Johnstone Digital inclusion -Nil Return							
Centre 030								
<b>Totals</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>297</b>

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Document reader</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>		
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities				1			
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre	1						
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	1						
Centre 005	Get in Step			1				
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project							
Centre 008	City Connect	6	5	6	2	3	6	
Centre 009	Elgin Library	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion	1			1			
Centre 011	ACE Cornton							
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC							
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	6						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre					1	1	
Centre 018	Student Development Centre							
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre							
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre							
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises							
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre							
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre							
Centre 024	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 025	Aberdeen College	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Centre 026	Dundee Central Library	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Centre 027	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 028	The Workplace Initiative - Nil return							
Centre 029	West Johnstone Digital inclusion -Nil Return							
Centre 030								
<b>Totals</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>78</b>

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Penfriend</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>
Centre 001	User Friendly – No Usage					
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities					1
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre	1	1	1	1	2
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	1				
Centre 005	Get in Step					
Centre 006	Dove Centre – No Usage					
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project	1				
Centre 008	City Connect	6	7	7	8	8
Centre 009	Elgin Library		2	1	2	1
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion					
Centre 011	ACE Cornton					
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC					
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage					
Centre 014	Govan Initiative – No Usage					
Centre 015	East End Connected – No Usage					
Centre 016	Scoop	4				
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre					1
Centre 018	Student Development Centre					1
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	2				
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre			3	3	
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises					
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre					
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre					
Centre 024	Badaguish – Usage not Known					
Centre 025	Aberdeen College					
Centre 026	Dundee Central Library					
Centre 027	Bits & PCs – Visit/Nil Return					
Centre 028	The Workplace Initiative – Nil return					
Centre 029	West Johnstone Digital inclusion –Nil Return					
Centre 030						

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Totals</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>72</b>
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------

*Appendix 1: Usage of Kit items by Centre*

<b>Windows Accessibility</b>		<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	
Centre 001	User Friendly - No Usage							
Centre 002	Drumchapel Opportunities	12		4	4	4	4	
Centre 003	Dalmuir Community Centre					1	4	
Centre 004	Ewart Library Cybercentre	4	3	2	3			
Centre 005	Get in Step	1	1	2	1	1	1	
Centre 006	Dove Centre - No Usage							
Centre 007	Nisus Flexit Project	6						
Centre 008	City Connect	20	20	20	20	20	20	
Centre 009	Elgin Library	25	25	25	25	25	25	
Centre 010	Eastbank Health Promotion	18						
Centre 011	ACE Cornton							
Centre 012	Langlees & Bainsford CLC	2	2	2	2	4	4	
Centre 013	Airyhall Library Aberdeen - No Usage							
Centre 014	Govan Initiative - No Usage							
Centre 015	East End Connected - No Usage							
Centre 016	Scoop	6						
Centre 017	St Andrew Learning centre	3	3	1		2	2	
Centre 018	Student Development Centre							
Centre 019	Park Street Learning Centre	8						
Centre 020	Johnstone Castle Learning Centre			3	3			
Centre 021	Brag Enterprises							
Centre 022	Kirkshaw Neighbourhood Centre							
Centre 023	Prospects for Employment							1
Centre 024	Clackmannanshire Women's Tech Centre							
Centre 025	Badaguish - Usage not Known							
Centre 026	Aberdeen College	10	10	10	5	5	10	
Centre 027	Dundee Central Library	4	3	4	2	4	5	
Centre 028	Bits & PCs - Visit/Nil Return							
Centre 029	The Workplace Initiative - Nil return							
Centre 030	West Johnstone Digital inclusion –Nil Return							
<b>Totals</b>		<b>119</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>466</b>
<b>Grand totals</b>		<b>363</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>1383</b>

## 1. Centre Details

<b>Centre Name:</b>		
<b>Contact Name:</b>		
<b>Address:</b>		
<b>Tel:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	<b>Email:</b>

<b>What year your centre opened?</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

### a. Which Sector does it belong to?

Voluntary	Public (statutory) e.g. public library	Public (non-statutory) e.g. college	Private
-----------	---	--	---------

### b. How is your centre funded?

Core	Project	Other
If your funding is time-limited when does it run out?		

### c. ICT Services Offered (Tick as many as apply)

Public Access point allowing unplanned use of computers by individuals	
Public Access point requiring pre-booking by individuals to use computers	
Learning Centre offering individual users access to open learning material	
Learning Centre offering taught classes for registered users	
Other, Please Describe.	

### d. Usage

Please state how many people used your centre for each month of the Accessibility Kit Project – this figure should include all users, not just disabled people.

	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Number of people using ICT facilities						
Number of disabled people using ICT facilities						

Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

**2. AbilityNet Accessibility Kit & Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options**

a. Please complete the grid below for each Kit Item

Are the individual kit items permanently installed & immediately available?

Are the individual kit items installed on one machine or on different machines?

Item	Installed	Available	Single	Different
Compact Cherry keyboard & keyguard				
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball				
Kensington Expert Mouse				
Keyboard Stickers				
Document Reader software				
Penfriend XP				
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options				

b. If kit items are not immediately available please describe the processes by which you make them available when needed.

c. If the kit is installed on one machine please describe the process by which you make individual items available to more than one user.

d. If the Windows Accessibility Options are not available please explain the reasons.

e.	Yes	No
Have you had to refuse users access to your computers because of rules within your service regarding use of the Windows Accessibility Options?		
If yes, have you discussed this with your line manager & found a solution? Please give details		

## Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

### 3. Usage

Please chart user rates over the 6 months of the project. If you have not kept accurate figures please estimate numbers.

#### a. New Users

Item	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Compact Cherry keyboard with keyguard						
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball						
Kensington Expert Mouse						
Keyboard Stickers						
Document Reader software						
Penfriend XP						
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options						

#### b. Continuing Users

Item	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Compact Cherry keyboard with keyguard						
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball						
Kensington Expert Mouse						
Keyboard Stickers						
Document Reader software						
Penfriend XP						
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options						

### 4. Disabilities

The different items of the Kit are designed to cater for the needs of disabled people with different categories of impairments. Under each category how many people use the individual items? You can tick more than one category for each item. Do the items cater for all the ICT needs of these users?

Item	Physical	Visual	Learning	% Catered	
				yes	no
Compact Cherry keyboard with keyguard					
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball					
Kensington Expert Mouse					
Keyboard Stickers					
Document Reader software					
Penfriend XP					
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options					

## Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

### 5. Supporting Users

a. After initial training, what percentage of individual users are able to start (where applicable) & use kit items independently?

Item	Start	Use
Compact Cherry keyboard with keyguard		
Inclusive Kid-Track trackball		
Kensington Expert Mouse		
Keyboard Stickers		
Document Reader software		
Penfriend XP		
Windows Inbuilt Accessibility Options		

b. What systems do you have in place to provide user support?

Centre Staff support users as & when required	
What percentage of your staff are proficient in giving this support	
Trained volunteers support individual users	
Arrangement with Specialist Agency to provide support	
Other, please describe	
No system in place	

Please give details of support systems you have in place, how well they work, & the resource issues for your centre.

c.	Yes	No
If you are in a centre normally offering ad hoc access to computers would disabled users need to pre-arrange their visit to the centre to take advantage of your support system?		

### 6. Unmet Need

a.	Yes	No
Has the Kit proved insufficient to met the needs of any disabled users?		
If yes, how many times has this happened?		
Give this as percentage of the total number of disabled users?		

If yes, how have you tackled this situation?

b.	Yes	No
Purchased additional software/hardware		
Made links with specialist organisations to provide "people help"?		
Identified alternative provision, e.g. a specialist service, another public access point.		
Other		
Been unable to find solution		

Please give details.

### 7. Training

## Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

		Yes	No
Have you made use of the AbilityNet CDROM to reinforce your training?			
Have you contacted AbilityNet to ask for further advice on using the Kit?			
Were you satisfied with the initial training you received on the kit items?			
Have you taken further training in use of kit items?			
Have you cascaded training down to other members of staff/volunteers?			
Is so, how many	Staff		Volunteers
What percentage does this represent of total staff/volunteer complement?	Staff		Volunteers

### 8. Marketing

	Yes	No
Did you use the Poster accompanying the Kit to advertise within your centre?		
Did you send copies of the Poster out to external agencies?		
Did you produce any alternative publicity material?		
Did you advertise in relevant newsletters & publications?		
Did you contact disability organisations in your catchment area?		
Other, please describe		
Were these activities undertaken at the beginning of the project?		
Did they continue throughout the life of the project?		
Has this marketing brought in new users?		

### 9. Technical Issues

	Yes	No
Have you encountered any technical problems in using individual kits items?		
How have these been solved?		
Input from IT Staff		
Using AbilityNet CDROM		
Contacting AbilityNet		
Other, please describe		
Have any technical problems remained unresolved?		
If yes, please give details		

### 10. Internal Evaluation

	Yes	No

*Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire*

Have you obtained feedback from users about their satisfaction with the Accessibility Kit?		
If yes, can this information be made available to the external evaluator?		

**11. And Finally**

**Please score on a scale of 1 (poor) - 5 (excellent)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, how successful has the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit been in helping you to include disabled people in your service provision?					
To what extent has the AbilityNet Accessibility Kit added value to your service?					
Comments					

Any other Comments:

Thank you taking time to complete this questionnaire. A summary report will be sent to you in due course.