DICE

Digital Inclusion Champions in Europe

Stakeholder goals and support requirements in Ireland

WP number	WP2
WP title	Stakeholder recruitment and user requirements gathering
Status	Final
Dissemination	Public
Publication Date	28/04/2014
Author	NCBI

For further information related to the DICE project please visit:

the project website (www.dice-project.eu);

Facebook page (facebook.com/digichampion);

Twitter page (twitter.com/dice_project).

The DICE (Digital Inclusion Champions in Europe – 2013-1-IE1-LEO05-06094) project has been partially funded under the Lifelong Learning program. This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

1 Research methodologies

The user requirements for the DigiPlace4All online peer support community for Ireland are documented in this report. The requirement gathering work of the DICE project involved an in-depth inquiry to find out what information and skills are needed by technology users with disabilities, VET trainers, mainstream educators and employers, how they find and share this information and how peer support relationships develop and work in practice.

As the questions this work seeks to address are open in nature a qualitative approach to data gathering was adopted. Instruments used were structured questionnaires and interviews, one-to-one semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

Four separate questionnaires were developed, one for VET students and other technology users with disabilities, one for VET trainers and mainstream educators, one for Employers and one for NGOs working with people with disabilities. Each questionnaire was made available in English, Dutch, Polish and Bulgarian, in the form of online surveys for those who could fill them in. For those who could not, the questions were presented within structured interviews.

In Ireland a total of 104 people participated in the requirement gathering exercises. A total of 34 respondents completed the questionnaires or structured interviews, including 10 technology users with disabilities (visual, hearing, speech, mobility, learning and mental health), 12 VET centres or mainstream educators (universities and colleges), 11 NGOs and 1 employer.

Focus groups were used to gather more in-depth and nuanced information about the needs of the target groups, how they share information and support each other. A total of 33 individuals took part in focus groups, including 19 students and technology users with disabilities, 6 VET centres or training organisations, 8 IT trainers.

Semi-structured one-to-one interviews were used to expand on areas of particular interest and relevance to the individual, without the constraints of group discussion. A total of 37 individuals took part in depth semi-structured interviews, including 8 students and technology users with disabilities, 11 mainstream educators (which included higher educator disability officers, inclusive education and assistive technology university staff), 3 VET centres or training organisations (including IT trainers) 3 employers, 7 NGOs (including 2 community resource workers, assistive technology management, vocational educational management and specific disability group management) and 6 policy advisors or other relevant agencies.

1.1 Research topics

The requirements gathering exercises aimed to collect information from all stakeholder groups in the following ten areas:

- Information needs (topics)

- Needs for assistance and support
- Sources of information they use now
- Sources of assistance available to them now
- Values and deficiencies of these sources of information and assistance (This information captured in qualitative data)
- How information and assistance could be improved
- Peer support networks and relationships that exist
- Motivations for learning digital skills (goals)
- What digital technologies they use what digital services they use and how proficient they are at these
- Their social needs

This report presents the analysis of both the quantitative (on-line questionnaires) and qualitative (focus groups and semi-structured interviews) findings with each group. Appendix A-D presents the on-line questionnaires for each group, Appendix E-H presents the interview topic guide for each group.

Firstly the report will present the quantitative findings for each group following the areas outlined above. As only two employers completed the on-line questionnaires data cannot be indicative of general employer population so will not be included here. Both employers who completed questionnaire expressed interest in learning about accessibility issues, financial supports, best practice examples. Qualitative data with a further three employers who participated confirmed this feedback; these views will be presented in the subsequent section.

As the overall goal in collecting this information from stakeholder groups was to identify what can be learnt from each group's experiences to inform the development of the DigiPlace4all on-line peer support community the qualitative data will be presented from each group perspective in terms of "lessons learnt".

2 Information needs

2.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Online questionnaire responses indicated that over 80% of technology users with disabilities use laptops, tablets, websites, social media and alternative keyboard. Over 50% use PCs, smartphones, A/V products, printers/photocopiers, canes, relay services, text to speech software, screen magnification software, voice alternatives, mouse alternatives and voice output communication aids. Up to 50% use simple mobile phones, multimedia players, navigation devices, digital magnifiers, magnifying glasses and computer games. The only listed technologies not regularly used by at least 20% of were alarm clocks, hearing aids, symbol supported communication, braille displays/printers, DAISY player, voice recognition, writing aids and wheelchairs.

In education, 75% of students use a variety of software not listed in the question, including learning management systems (Moodle). At least 50% use library or

online video services.

At work, all use office software and employer's software and systems.

All or nearly all students rated their level of knowledge as at least sufficient for

everything except social media. More than 50% of students wanted more information about navigation devices, text to speech software, keyboard alternatives, mouse alternatives, voice recognition, writing aids and self motivation. More than one wanted more information about digital magnifiers, DAISY, peer communities, sharing opportunities (forums/blogs), blogging, social activities, job searching, independent travel, financial support and AT.

Qualitative interview data indicated a need for up to date information on mainstream digital technologies (smart phones, tablets, social media, education learning tools) and AT (for specific disability groups e.g. screen magnification, Writing aid software, Voice recognition).

From the perspective of DigiPlace4All website there was a strong request from students and other technology users for the inclusion of user reviews of the above technologies to support specific education courses, jobs, setting up on-line business. Another key area highlighted in qualitative interviews was the accessibility of DigiPlace4All for IT beginners by including "How to get started' beginner guides to IT. From the more advanced student perspective a need for clear information on Irish employers who currently hire people with disabilities was identified.

2.2 VET trainers/mainstream educators

Over 80% of educators/VET trainers reported that students with disabilities use websites in their education. Over 50% cited PCs, laptops, tablets, smartphones, social media, learning management systems, printers/photocopiers and interactive

electronic whiteboards. Up to 50% cited simple mobile phones, computer games, library & online video services. 78.6% said they needed additional information to increase their knowledge of using these technologies with students.

78.6% of educators said they use assistive technologies at least sometimes in teaching or training and that they increase effectiveness. Every one of the assistive technologies listed was reported as being used by at least one educator or trainer. Those used by at least 25% (4 of the 16 respondents) were wheelchair or scooter, hearing aid, digital magnifier, screen magnification software, text to speech software, Braille display or printer, mouse alternative, keyboard alternative and voice recognition.

From the qualitative data all educator groups indicated a need for more information on the most useful technologies for working with specific disability groups. There was also a need for more information and support on how to support most vulnerable least connected groups in the community. A need for resource like DigiPlace4All which would compliment in person training was identified.

2.3 NGOs/ relevant agencies

80% of NGOs said they think people with disabilities are interested in learning about social activities and understanding their rights. Over 50% said peer communities, opportunities for sharing information, job searching and independent living. More than one said social media profiles, financial support for assistive technologies, events, e-games and etiquette for colleagues.

All NGOs reported that the people with disabilities they serve use laptops, websites, simple mobile phones and audiovisual products. The only mainstream or daily living technologies for which usage was reported by less than 50% of NGOs were tablets and alarm clocks.

In education, 71% reported that disabled students use electronic interactive whiteboards and 43% library or online video services. Learning management systems and beamers were cited by only one respondent.

At work, 75% of NGOs reported employees with disabilities using office software and 50% employer's software and systems.

3 Needs for assistance and support

3.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Over 80% of students reported navigation problems. Over 50% reported difficult keyboard orientation. More than one student reported problems due to lack of clear instructions, difficulty installing, and ergonomic problems.

3.2 VET/mainstream educators

Of the 65% of respondents who said they encounter problems when using assistive technologies with students with disabilities, 75% cited a lack of clear instructions as one of the problems, 62% cited difficulty installing and 25% cited bugs and difficulty troubleshooting. This suggests a clear need for assistance with using assistive technologies.

82% said they would be interested in participating in information and training activities related to using mainstream and assistive technologies with students with disabilities.

3.3 NGOs/ relevant agencies

Two thirds of respondents who answered the question said they would be interested in information and training activities related to using mainstream and assistive technologies. The main aspects influencing participation are content (80%), Duration and interactivity (60%) and format (20%). All said that increasing their knowledge and competence regarding mainstream and assistive technologies will give opportunities for the advancement of the careers of people with disabilities.

4 Sources of information they use now

4.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Over 50% of students learn from friends, colleagues or by themselves. More than one learn from a supervisor, family members or relatives, trainers or tutors. None reported learning from salespersons, guardian or social workers.

4.2 VET/mainstream educators

Over 75% of educators or trainers learn from colleagues or by themselves. More than 20% learn from mangers, salespersons or organisations representing people with disabilities. More than one learn from friends and public authorities. 29% cited other sources, including peers, email lists and their IT training department.

All but one respondents said they share information about assistive technologies with other people. Face to face contact and staff meetings were cited by over 50% and workshops, seminars or conferences by 46%. Twitter was used by only 15%, Facebook not at all and other social networks by 8%.

4.3 NGOs/ relevant agencies

As sources of information and support for NGOs about using mainstream or assistive technologies with people with disabilities, all of the following were cited by at least 50% of NGOs: Experts or consultants, other similar organisations, people with disabilities, self learning and salespersons.

5 Sources of assistance available to them now/they use now

5.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Over 50% of students learn from friends, colleagues or by themselves. More than one learn from a supervisor, family members or relatives, trainers or tutors. None reported learning from salespersons, guardian or social workers.

5.2 VET/mainstream educators

Over 75% of educators or trainers learn from colleagues or by themselves. More than 20% learn from mangers, salespersons or organisations representing people with disabilities. More than one learn from friends and public authorities. 29% cited other sources, including peers, email lists and

their IT training department.

All but one respondent said they share information about assistive technologies with other people. Face to face contact and staff meetings were cited by over 50% and workshops, seminars or conferences by 46%. Twitter was used by only 15%, Facebook not at all and other social networks by 8%.

5.3 NGOs/ relevant agencies

This topic was not addressed by these groups in the on-line questionnaires.

6 How information and assistance could be improved

6.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Over 50% of students cited electronic tutorials, individual training and leaning by doing among the 3 best ways for them to receive information and training in this area. Up to 50% cited educational videos, group learning or eLearning. Audio clips and observing others were cited by only one. None cited paper manuals.

6.2 VET/mainstream educators

A number of respondents made comments concerning the difficulty of keeping up to date with changing technology.

6.3 NGOs/relevant agencies

The best ways cited by NGOs for them to receive training on technology and disability were eLearning, individual training, group working, learning by doing and educative videos.

7 Peer support networks and relationships that exist

7.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Almost all students share information about mainstream technologies with others. Fewer, but still the majority (62.5%), share information about assistive technologies. Taking mainstream and assistive technologies together, almost all students who share information use face-to-face contact. 50% use mobile apps. Other methods used by significant numbers of students are Facebook or Twitter (42%), and Skype or other social networks (33%). One student reported that they create YouTube tutorials. None of the participants in the on-line questionnaire have their own blogs or websites.

7.2 VET/mainstream educators

When asked does anyone provide them with support in using assistive technology, over 50% said they rely on themselves or on information from the internet. More than 30% cited peers, friends or family members, managers, and their organisation's AT support centre. Only 15% rely on customer service representatives.

7.3 NGOs/ relevant agencies

Most NGOs share information with others. 71% shard information about mainstream technologies and 83% about assistive technologies. The main channel is direct contact, cited by 83% (mainstream) and 80% (assistive). More than one NGO also cited using a blog/website and email.

8 Motivations for learning digital skills (goals)

8.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Of the aspects that can influence participation in information and training activities, accessibility of materials, opportunity for communication and collaboration with peers and format were cited by more than 50% of students. Up to 50% cited training context, interactivity, flexibility, support during and after activities and attractiveness of materials. Duration was only a consideration for one person.

8.2 VET/mainstream educators

The core motivations for learning digital skills related to personal career goals, being informed to teach subject, to be equipped with skills to pass on to their students, keep up to speed with innovative ways of teaching and learning for all student/trainee groups.

8.3 NGOs/relevant agencies

This topic was not addressed in the on-line questionnaire by these groups.

9 What digital technologies and services they use and how proficient they are at these

9.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

Over 80% of technology users with disabilities use laptops, tablets, websites, social media and alternative keyboard. Over 50% use PCs, smartphones, A/V products, printers/photocopiers, canes, relay services, text to speech software, screen magnification software, voice alternatives, mouse alternatives and voice output communication aids. Up to 50% use simple mobile phones, multimedia players, navigation devices, digital magnifiers, magnifying glasses and computer games. The only listed technologies not regularly used by at least 20% of were alarm clocks, hearing aids, symbol supported communication, braille displays/printers, DAISY player, voice recognition, writing aids and wheelchairs.

In general, students rated their skill level as at least sufficient for all technologies. The only ones for which a significant proportion (>20%) of students rated themselves as poor were computer games, library or online video services, voice recognition software and other educational and workplace technologies or software.

9.2 VET/mainstream educators

Over 80% of educators/VET trainers reported that students with disabilities use websites in their education. Over 50% cited PCs, laptops, tablets, smartphones, social media, learning management systems, printers/photocopiers and interactive electronic whiteboards. Up to 50% cited simple mobile phones, computer games. library & online video services

78.6% of educators said they use assistive technologies at least sometimes in teaching or training and that they increase effectiveness. Note: The question “Do you use assistive technologies in teaching or training?” and subsequent follow-up questions about effectiveness were understood differently by different respondents. Some clearly answered “yes” because their students use them, even though they don’t use them themselves. Some clearly answered “no” for the same reason.

Every one of the assistive technologies listed was reported as being used by at least one educator or trainer. Those used by at least 25% (4 of the 16 respondents) were wheelchair or scooter, hearing aid, digital magnifier, screen magnification software, text to speech software, Braille display or printer, mouse alternative, keyboard alternative and voice recognition.

At least one respondent but at most two rated their level of knowledge as ‘poor’ for every single mainstream technology listed. 78.6% said they needed additional information to increase their knowledge of using these

Technologies with students.

For assistive technologies, there was also significant lack of knowledge. The only ones for which at least 20% educators or trainers reported their skill level as being sufficient were digital magnifiers, screen magnifications software, screen reader software, mouse alternatives, keyboard alternatives,

voice recognition and special input devices.

Educators and trainers also cited a lack of proficiency among their students with disabilities. Only 21% said that students have enough knowledge and skills to use assistive technologies. 36% said they don't and 43% didn't know.

9.3 NGOs/relevant agencies

All NGOs reported that the people with disabilities they serve use laptops, websites, simple mobile phones and audiovisual products. The only mainstream or daily living technologies for which usage was reported by less than 50% of NGOs were tablets and alarm clocks. Reported use of assistive technologies among people with disabilities ranged from 90% never using it to 80% using it every day. It is difficult to know what conclusions to draw from these numbers. Types of assistive technology widely used for mobility are wheelchairs/scooters and canes. For communication, hearing aids are widely used (75% of the 4 respondents who answered that question) but symbol supported communication and voice output communication were reported by only one respondent and relay service by none. For vision, all respondents reported use of screen magnification ad screen reading software, 50% digital magnifiers/CCTVs and 25% Braille displays or printers. None reported use of DAISY players or software. For computer input, mouse alternatives, keyboard alternatives and voice recognition were reported to be in use by over 50% of respondents, writing aids by 33% and special input devices by only one respondent.

In education, 71% reported that disabled students use electronic interactive whiteboards and 43% library or online video services. Learning management systems and beamers were cited by only one respondent.

At work, 75% of NGOs reported employees with disabilities using office software and 50% employer's software and systems.

At least 20% of NGOs rated the level of knowledge among people with disabilities as poor for all listed mainstream and daily living technologies except PCs, simple mobile phones, alarm clocks and audiovisual products.

In contrast, over 20% of NGOs rated level of assistive technology knowledge as at least sufficient for all except mouse alternatives and Braille displays/printers.

In education and work, knowledge of interactive whiteboards, office software and other workplace technologies was similarly rated.

10 Social needs

10.1 Students and other technology users

Over 50% of students said they would be interested in learning about self-motivation guidance. Over 20% would be interested in job searching, sharing with others through forums & blogs, peer communities, social activities, blogging, independent travel, financial support for AT and using AT. None stated an interest in labour legislation or understanding their rights.

10.2 VET/Educators and NGOs/relevant agencies

These groups did not address this topic in the on-line questionnaire however the qualitative data indicates social inclusion as a dominant topic which will be presented in the subsequent section of the report.

11 Lessons Learnt for DigiPlace4All community

This section of the report focuses on combining the quantitative findings with the in depth qualitative feedback gathered from focus groups and semi-structured one-to-one interviews to identify the key lessons learnt from requirements gathering with all stakeholders (including employers, policy advisors and relevant agencies).

11.1 What did we learn about peer support?

From the student/other technology user with disability the main channel of support for digital skills learning was identified as home and training centre environment. These environments are especially significant for the beginner and intermediate students from all disability groups and the deaf community. In the case of the beginner learner, this perspective was also supported by IT trainers/ mainstream educators and NGOs/relevant agencies.

Support from other students/technology users with disabilities who can explain how technology supports them so essentially one-to-one peer support was identified as particularly beneficial for beginners from all disability groups and the deaf community. Retention of information learnt at training centre was expressed as an issue for all beginner groups from focus groups with deaf students and their tutors, visually impaired students and their IT tutor and trainers and students with intellectual disabilities and their tutors. The potential for DigiPlace4All to act as a compliment to the work of the training centre environment to enable trainees access support during non contact hours was recognized by all groups.

One of the key motivations for participating at training centre was to have the opportunity to meet with peers. However, as one VET student acknowledges “one-to-one is brilliant but naturally not always available”. Given that one-to-one to support from peers and the designated IT trainer is limited to training centre timetables the need for a peer to peer on-line resource was recognized and welcomed by all groups.

Information sharing from the VET/mainstream educator perspective takes place on an ad hoc personal one-to-one basis. This experience was related by all groups working with people with different disabilities. Step-by-step video tutorials such as those uploaded on YouTube were considered very useful for learning about assistive and mainstream technologies to support their students, trainees and service users in the community. The benefit of virtual support to reach students when face to face not possible was recognized by all groups though caution was recommended for how to support beginner users access this support safely. A view from one community resource worker is representative of the majority of NGOs:

“Sometimes I’d like to be sitting with a person to show them something but I can’t… it would be nice to be able to ask someone can you give this person an hour”.

This indicates a need for DigiPlace4All to compliment the existing extremely important one-to-one support.

Social media was considered very valuable for peer support but not part of structured work practices. Several participants from these groups queried whether DigiPlace4All could host a live Q&A on selected topics once a week/month. This suggestion has been taken on board for consideration on whether this could be facilitated once the website is fully functioning.

Listening to NGO/relevant agencies views it was felt that peer support can work well however great care needed to be taken in selecting the most suitable to give peer support. There was a strong expression for people who would be selected to be peer supporters would demonstrate both strong digital and social skills. Criteria to select peer supporters would be critical to choosing appropriate individuals.

All groups recognized the importance in emphasizing the benefits of peer support for both individuals (peer supporter and supported). Peer support to help service users access and use social media safely was suggested as an area for DigiPlace4All to address. From their own daily working practices, several participants identified the benefits of being part of an on-line community to connect with other workers who could share expertise with similar cases.

The case of trainees and service users who need access to supported employment opportunities and peer support in this domain were highlighted for inclusion in DigiPlace4All community. Several participants discussed the lack of a structured transition programme for trainees exiting training centres. This led to a query about whether DigiPlace4All could develop a transition programme through a peer pathway plan which profiled students experiences.

From the employer perspective user generated content and live contact with all stakeholders was identified. In particular contact with other employers who hire people with disabilities for information and peer support was rated highly. Specific information and peer support in the following three key areas are sought:

1) equipment funding for AT supports

2) reasonable accommodations

3) Creating a digitally and socially inclusive work environment.

11.2 How can DigiPlace4All manage peer support relationships?

This question was discussed with all groups in relation to how they already access peer support. The following are some suggestions that are being considered.

DigiPlace4All could offer varying degrees of peer support depending on:

1) Stakeholder group

2) Student skills and goals. E.g. All beginner students respond best to one-to-one teaching for early stage learning in digital skills. Heavy reliance on one-to-one naturally recedes as the student progresses.

11.2.1 Set a peer support timeframe

- Assign a peer supporter for a set time e.g. a week, a month, 3 months? E.g. Help people through the initial stages and avoid creating dependencies.
- Set peer support goals e.g. 1) improve digital skills to take an ECDL exam; 2) perhaps to become a peer supporter or Champion in the future?

11.2.2 How to select peer supporter?

- Self and peer nomination
- Consult with training centre, educator, employer
- Specific skills level? Personality factor?
- Active social media user, writing blogs, tweets etc
- Employer track record hiring and sustaining staff with disabilities

11.3 Link to the social (real) world

All groups in particular all student/other technology users with disabilities queried whether DigiPlace4All would be solely on-line or would there be opportunities to meet face-to-face. All groups talked about meeting people through the DigiPlace4All on-line community as way to increase participation in society in general. 80% of NGOs said they think people with disabilities are interested in learning about social activities. There was caution expressed by several NGO representatives around the potential for on-line learning to heighten social isolation and facilitating opportunities for people to meet face to face were strongly recommended. This feedback suggests that DigiPlace4All should present opportunities for organising and advertising meet-ups and other physical events. A possibility is that this could be connected with Meetup or similar social media initiatives. This idea is in development.

Existing links and support networks from all disability groups were acknowledged and their support highly valued. In particular from the perspective of visually impaired and blind trainees and their IT trainers the support provided by the vipstudents email discussion list moderated by Paul Traynor and from the Irish deaf society the social club based in Galway was also cited as a great support for service users.

11.4 Importance of the DigiPlace4All design

From all student/other technology users with disabilities there was a strong request for high quality design – cool, use videos and images, not too much text, plain English, symbols. The user experience and aesthetics were emphasised as extremely important to attracting and sustaining appeal for students/other technology user with disabilities.

This is representative of this VET trainee's perspective: "Sometimes sources of info for people with disabilities scream out that they're for people with disabilities and look kind of second rate why can't they be designed in a cool way using more videos and images too?"

11.5 User generated content

All participants emphasized the benefit of user generated content to share information within the community about digital technologies and services for daily practices in education and work environments.

User reviews of technologies, services and experiences in education and work were highly valued means of assessment and also as a channel to share their individual "trials and tribulations" with technology.

User generated content also allowed all groups hear about other people who use/support people with same assistive and mainstream technologies. For beginners it was considered significant to connect directly with peers who could explain how a device helps them in education. All groups indicated that user generated content facilitated access to up to date information.

11.5.1 How can DigiPlace4All facilitate user generated content?

Several means to ensure content generated by users functions were explored such as avoiding static content that is not time-stamped by encouraging blog-style resources and wiki-style resources as both can be updated. Management overhead involved in creating new blog entries and keeping wikis up to date has been a challenge identified. Crowd sourcing by using content generated and updated by all users is one approach being explored.

During the requirement gathering phase individuals who already author and share information on-line especially students and other technology users with disabilities have been identified as part of community building drive.

12 Key topics of interest for DigiPlace4All

12.1 Students and other technology users with disabilities

In focus groups and semi-structured interviews with all groups specific topics emerged as particularly dominant. For students and other technology users with disabilities the following information topics were most strongly requested for inclusion on DigiPlace4All:

- Mainstream and assistive technologies
- Social media and communications services.
- More knowledge of social media, Skype, navigation devices, various assistive technologies, form filling.
- To learn about self-motivation guidance
- No interest in legislation or rights, but most NGOs said students would be interested in rights
- Employment assistance- need to develop early links with mainstream education and employers, peer support for example when to disclose disability in application at interview?
- Access to note takers and interpreters available but often not at private colleges and if they are available they may not have knowledge of the subject. Recommendation for access to list of note-takers/scribes

12.2 VET/mainstream educators

- Information on subject choices that require specific technical support
- Resources provided in alternative formats to text and audio (Deaf tutors)
- Include parents (NGOs also reported this)
- Challenge reaching most vulnerable groups
- Information on private colleges that provide AT support

12.3 NGOs/relevant agencies

- Social inclusion could DigiPlace4All incorporate section on social skills and pursuits?
- Fear of cyberbullying- guidelines on safe use of internet and social media. Clear codes of community conduct were strongly recommended.

12.4 Employers

- Information on reasonable accommodations

- Equipment funding
- "How to" guide to writing inclusive job ad
- Guidance on creating digitally and socially inclusive work environment
- Nominating champions issue of disability disclosure?

12.5 "Don't forget the beginners and older adults!"

This caution from a community resource is representative of NGO/relevant agencies, VET and IT trainers. In focus group and semi-structured discussions with these groups the case of the beginner student/technology user with disability was stressed. Some recommendations for DigiPlace4All included:

- Beginners' guides or a separate section for beginners. (Students, educators, NGOs all suggested this method)
- 'Next Steps' programme for adults with recent sight loss.
- First need the skills to access online supports and safely participate in an online community.
- Cyberbullying (students with ID and educators). Need for guidance in using social media safely suggested by students and their educators.
- Guidelines on safe use of the internet and social media and codes of conduct within the community (All NGO, employer and policy advisor groups)
- Parents should be included for 18+ students who are dependants.
- Challenge: How can we encourage beginners?
- Separate section for beginners that would cover safety and other topics?
- Help beginners find content aimed at them within the general content (e.g. 'introduction to' articles)?
- Tagging content with the tag 'beginners' or 'introductory' allow beginner users to filter the information?

Need to make DigiPlace4Al as simple and safe as possible.

NGO/relevant agencies strongly advocated for the consideration of older adult needs in the DigiPlace4All community in particular emphasizing the benefits of improving their digital skills through connecting with peers for their social inclusion in general.

13 Conclusion

This report from the requirement gathering exercises conducted in Ireland have given an overview of findings from 104 participants to ensure that all stakeholder perspectives are well considered in the development of the DigiPlace4All on-line peer support community website. The Irish project team would like to sincerely thank and acknowledge the participation of all groups involved in the process, in particular students/trainees/other technology users with disabilities and deaf students.