

ROUGH EDITED COPY  
PEPNET-SOUTH  
MARCH 23, 2010

**SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION PRESENTATION**

CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:  
ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC  
PO BOX 278  
LOMBARD, IL 60148

\*\*\*

THIS IS BEING PROVIDED IN A ROUGH-DRAFT FORMAT. COMMUNICATION ACCESS REALTIME TRANSLATION (CART) IS PROVIDED IN ORDER TO FACILITATE COMMUNICATION ACCESSIBILITY AND MAY NOT BE A TOTALLY VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

\*\*\*

>> MARCIA KOLVITZ: HELLO. I'M GLAD YOU'RE ABLE TO JOIN US FOR THE THIRD PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST DAY OF A 2-DAY WEBCAST THAT FOCUSES ON ONLINE LEARNING AND MEDIA.

JUST A REMINDER FOR THOSE OF YOU THAT HAVE BEEN WATCHING SOME OF THE OTHER PRESENTATIONS, WE'RE USING A COLLABORATIVE TOOL TO ENABLE DISCUSSION AND INTERACTION AMONG THE PARTICIPANTS. BECAUSE YOU'RE ALL OUT THERE, YOU DON'T HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK THOSE QUESTIONS AND PROVIDE YOUR EXPERIENCES. SO WE'RE USING A FREE EASY TO USE DISCUSSION TOOL CALLED LEARNCENTRAL. IT'S A SOCIAL LEARNING NETWORK FOR EDUCATION, PLEASE REFER TO THE CONFIRMATION E-MAIL THAT YOU RECEIVED FOR THIS WEBCAST IN ORDER TO SEE HOW YOU WILL LOG ON. WE HOPE YOU'LL DO THAT.

THE THIRD PRESENTATION WILL FOCUS ON THE EVALUATION OF ONLINE LEARNING. THE TWO PRESENTERS ARE MARYLEE STEWART WHO IS THE PROGRAM COORDINATOR FOR LIVE ONLINE WITH THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AND MICHELLE SWANEY THE TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST FOR PEPNET-SOUTH.  
MARY LEE, MICHELLE?

>> MARY LEE STEWART: HI, GOOD AFTERNOON. THANK YOU FOR JOINING US THIS AFTERNOON.

SO OVER THE NEXT FEW MINUTES I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT -- HOLD ON, FOLKS, LET'S CHECK THE MIC. IT'S ON. GREEN BATTERY. I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION TOOL EVALUATION THAT WE DID IN THE FALL 2008.

IN FALL 2008 OIT WAS ASKED TO REVIEW SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION TOOLS TO PROVIDE THE FACILITIES FOR ASYNCHRONOUS LEARNING TASK FORCE WITH A RECOMMENDATION. THIS RECOMMENDATION, THEY NEEDED THAT FOR FUTURE PROJECTS AND ALSO TO HELP GUIDE THE UNIVERSITY IN THE NEEDS FOR THE FUTURE. THE EVALUATION WAS PARTICULARLY RELEVANT GIVEN THAT ITC, WHICH IS A PART OF OIT, HAD JUST COMPLETED A FACULTY SURVEY. AND THE SURVEY REFLECTED CERTAIN TOPICS THAT WE COULD USE TO CONTINUE ON INTO THE EVALUATION PROCESS.

FOR EXAMPLE, FACULTY WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SURVEY SUGGESTED THAT THEY WERE INTERESTED IN TOOLS WHICH WOULD ENABLE STUDENT GROUPS TO WORK TOGETHER AND ALSO BRING GUESTS AND EXPERTS WHO WORK GEOGRAPHICALLY ELSEWHERE INTO THE CLASSROOM. THE TEAM, WHICH WAS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS, SELECTED FOUR PRODUCTS TO LOOK AT. ELLUMINATE LIVE, WHICH HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN A PREVIOUS EVALUATION; WIMBA CLASSROOM WHICH WAS ALSO INCLUDED IN A PREVIOUS EVALUATION; ADOBE ACROBAT CONNECT PRO, WHICH WE HAD KNOWN AT THAT TIME AS A MACROMEDIA BREEZE; AND SABA CENTRA WHICH WAS THE EXISTING TOOL BEING USED ON CAMPUS.

INVITATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION INTO THE EVALUATION PROCESS WENT OUT TO 28 FACULTY MEMBERS AND ALSO A REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE CENTER ON DEAFNESS AND ALSO ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM MEMBERS FROM WITHIN OUR OWN GROUP. THE EVALUATION PROCESS INVOLVED PARTICIPANTS TO MAKE A COMMITMENT OF ABOUT 10 HOURS TO THE PROJECT. THE 10 HOURS INCLUDED PARTICIPATING IN THE 1-HOUR ITC-LED DEMONSTRATION OF EACH TOOL. WE ASKED THE PARTICIPANTS TO CONDUCT IDENTICAL TEACHING SESSIONS USING EACH OF THE TOOLS. AND THEN GIVE US FEEDBACK AND COMPARE THE FEATURES FUNCTIONALITY OF EACH TOOL.

WE LOOKED AT DIFFERENT CATEGORIES AND HOW WE COULD ASSEMBLY THE INFORMATION WE WERE GIVEN. WE DECIDED TO DIVIDE IT INTO TEACHING AND LEARNING FEATURES, ACCESSIBILITY, AND ALSO ADMINISTRATION, WHICH INCLUDED BLACKBOARD INTEGRATION. THE TEACHING AND LEARNING FEATURES THAT WERE SELECTED INCLUDED LEARNING FEATURES THAT WERE CONSIDERED STANDARD COMPONENTS OF SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION TOOLS. MANY OF THESE FEATURES HAD

BEEN REQUESTED EARLIER IN THE FACULTY SURVEY AND THEY WERE -- THE FEATURES THAT WERE MOST OFTEN USED BY FACULTY MEMBERS WHO WERE TEACHING WITH THE SABA CENTRA PRODUCT AT THE TIME. I'LL GO OVER SOME OF THESE FEATURES. WE'LL TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THEM LATER IN THE PRESENTATION.

WE DEFINITELY WANTED TO LOOK AT 2-WAY AUDIO AND TEXT CHAT. DIFFERENT WAYS TO COMMUNICATE IN THE ONLINE CLASSROOM. WE WANTED TO LOOK AT PRESENTATION SLIDES AND WHAT KIND OF CONTENT COULD BE ADDED TO THE CLASSROOM. ENGAGEMENT ITEMS SUCH AS A SHARED WHITE BOARD WHERE BOTH LEADERS AND PARTICIPANTS COULD COMMUNICATE AND DISCUSS ITEMS, TO FEEDBACK AND POLLING WHICH COULD ALSO INCLUDE INSTANT FEEDBACK AND INSTANT POLLING SUCH AS VISUAL CUES WITHIN THE CLASSROOM, PRESENCE INDICATORS THAT WOULD HELP STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTORS SEE WHO WAS ONLINE AT THE TIME. WE ALSO WANTED TO LOOK AT SYNCHRONOUS WEB BROWSING. APPLICATION SHARING, WHICH ARE TWO WAYS TO SHARE CONTENT WITHIN THE CLASSROOM, PRESENTATION MEDIA -- AND WE WANTED SOME ROOM THERE FOR GROWTH AS WELL AS MORE FACULTY MEMBERS WERE USING VIDEO AND AUDIO AND DIFFERENT KINDS OF MEDIA FORMATS WITHIN THE ONLINE CLASSROOM.

BREAKOUT ROOMS WERE IMPORTANT OR SOME WAY TO DIVIDE THE CLASSROOM UP INTO GROUPS AND THEN BRING THOSE GROUPS BACK IN TO A MAIN CLASSROOM. THE WEB CAM AND VIDEO, OF COURSE, IS VERY IMPORTANT. TESTING AND QUIZZING AND IF THAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE ONLINE CLASSROOM OR WAS IT A SEPARATE MODULE? AND ALSO, RECORDING AND PLAYBACK OF THE SESSION.

AS WE WENT THROUGH THE ACCESSIBILITY PART OF THE EVALUATION, WE FOUND SOME COMMON FEATURES AMONG THE FOUR TOOLS. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WAS SOME FORM OF SUPPORT FOR CLOSED CAPTIONING OR A PLUG-IN THAT COULD BE PURCHASED LIKE A SEPARATE MODULE AND INCLUDED INTO THE ONLINE CLASSROOM. ALL OF THE TOOLS HAD AUDIO ALERTS AND UTILIZED SOME FORM OF KEYBOARD SHORTCUTS IN SOME MANNER TO HELP WITH THE ONLINE CLASSROOM. AND EACH PRODUCT ALSO ALLOWED FOR THE SESSIONS TO BE RECORDED, STORED, AND THEN ACCESSED AT A LATER DATE.

WE ALSO FOUND SOME DIFFERENCES. FOR EXAMPLE, VIDEO SUPPORT, WHICH WAS A KEY ITEM THAT WE WERE LOOKING AT. SOME OF THE PRODUCTS ALLOWED FOR MULTIPLE VIDEOS ON SCREEN. AND AGAIN, THIS IS IN FALL OF 2008. SO SOME ALLOWED FOR THAT AND SOME DID NOT. SOME OF THE PRODUCTS ALLOWED FOR SUPPORT FOR PHONE BRIDGE WHERE PARTICIPANTS OR EVEN THE LEADER COULD USE THE PHONE TO

DIAL IN TO THE ONLINE CLASSROOM AND SPEAK AND BE HEARD.

THE CAPTIONER COULD BE PROMOTED FROM WITHIN THE CLASSROOM. SOME ALLOWED THAT FREEDOM AND OTHERS DID NOT. OTHERS DESIGNATED THAT THE CAPTIONER HAD TO BE DESIGNATED BEFORE THE CLASS BEGAN. WE ALSO FOUND THAT THE TEXT CHAT WAS INCLUDED IN SOME OF THE CLASSROOM RECORDINGS AND IN OTHERS NOT QUITE. IT MAY HAVE BEEN A SEPARATE MODULE THAT COULD BE DOWNLOADED AND SAVED AT ANOTHER TIME BUT IT WASN'T INCLUDED IN THE RECORDING ITSELF. WE ALSO FIND DIFFERENCES WITH THE ADJUSTABLE SCREEN, WINDOW AND/OR BACKGROUND COLOR OF THE FOUR PRODUCTS. OH, AND NOW I'M GOING TO HAND IT OVER TO MICHELLE.

>> MICHELLE SWANEY: WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT SPECIFICALLY HOW WE REVIEWED EACH OF THESE PRODUCTS. AS MARYLEE MENTIONED, THIS EVALUATION WAS DONE IN FALL OF 2008. IT'S VERY LIKELY THAT EACH OF THESE TECHNOLOGIES HAVE CHANGED IN THAT AMOUNT OF TIME. TECHNOLOGY IS CHANGING QUICKLY WE WOULD DEFINITELY RECOMMEND THAT BEFORE YOU GO INTO AN EVALUATION PROCESS THAT YOU LOOK AT ALL THE PRODUCTS AND WHERE THEY ARE AT AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

AS PART OF THIS EVALUATION AND MY RESPONSIBILITY AS REPRESENTATIVE ON CENTER ON DEAFNESS, I LOOKED AT VIDEO COMPONENTS IN EACH PROGRAM. DID THEY ALLOW FOR ONLY A SINGLE VIDEO COMPONENT WINDOW OR DID THEY ALLOW FOR MULTIPLE VIDEOS ON SCREEN SIMULTANEOUSLY? COULD THOSE VIDEOS BE ADJUSTED IN SIZE FOR VIEWING? AS YOU ALL KNOW, IF YOU'RE TRYING TO VIEW AN INTERPRETER OR A DEAF INDIVIDUAL IN A VERY SMALL THUMBNAIL PICTURE, THAT'S JUST NOT ACCEPTABLE. WE WANTED TO LOOK AT THE QUALITY OF VIDEO FOR SIGNING AND WHAT'S IT VERY IMPORTANT ESPECIALLY AS RELATED TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING.

WE LOOKED AT THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT IN EACH PROGRAM. WAS ANY OF THE PROGRAMS WERE THEY ABLE TO UTILIZE MULTIPLE DIFFERENT TYPES OF APPROACHES SUCH AS CART, TYPEWELL, C-PRINT? OR WERE THEY LOCKED DOWN SPECIFICALLY TO ONE VENUE? DID THE END USER, THE PARTICIPANT HAVE THE ABILITY TO CONTROL THE COLOR, THE FONT, AND THE SIZE OF THE CAPTIONING? PARTICULARLY AS IT RELATES FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE LOW VISION.

WE ALSO LOOKED AT AUDIO SWITCHING WAS THE VIDEO DEPENDENT UPON AUDIO SWITCHING, WAS IT AUTOMATIC OR CONTROLLED? COULD THE HOST CONTROL THAT? IN SOME PROGRAMS THE PROGRAM WAS LOCKED DOWN SO THAT IF ANOTHER SITE SPOKE, THEN THEIR VIDEO AUTOMATICALLY POPPED UP. AND THAT CREATES A PROBLEM. YOU WANT TO BE ABLE TO CONTROL

THOSE VIDEOS.

NOW, THIS IS A BEGINNING SLIDE TO THE NEXT FOUR WHICH WILL SHOW A CHART FOR EACH OF THE PROGRAMS THAT WE REVIEWED AND THE ANALYSIS THAT I PROVIDED FOR THAT. I ASKED PEPNET-SOUTH STAFF MEMBERS TO PARTICIPATE IN EVALUATION OF EACH OF THESE FOUR PROGRAMS. THIS INCLUDED USERS WHO WERE DEAF, HARD OF HEARING, AND HEARING, AND I ASKED FOR THEIR FEEDBACK AS WELL AS THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REQUESTED THEIR FEEDBACK THROUGH A SURVEY TO WHERE THEY PROVIDED INFORMATION ABOUT EACH OF THESE PROGRAMS. IT WAS CONSISTENT WITH WHAT INDIVIDUALS ON CAMPUS WERE ANSWERING. AND I GAVE THOSE RATINGS, PROS AND CON, FROM ONE BEING EXCELLENT ALL THE WAY TO FIVE BEING POOR ON EACH OF THESE AREAS. AND AGAIN, I DO WANT TO EMPHASIZE THIS WAS IN FALL OF 2008. SO A LOT OF THIS INFORMATION MAY NO LONGER BE RELEVANT.

WIMBA AT THAT TIME WAS NOT A PRODUCT THAT WE RECOMMENDED FOR UT BASED UPON WHAT WE HAD FOUND. SOME OF THE REASONS WERE THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR THE WRITER AND THE CAPTIONER TO ACCESS. THEY WERE HAVING TO MANUALLY ENTER EVERY TIME THEY CAME TO AN END OF A LINE. AND, OF COURSE, THAT CREATED PROBLEMS FOR THEM. THE COMPONENT WAS NOT INTUITIVE. SO THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT AND THE VIDEO WAS NOT ABOVE THE CURRENT PRODUCT THAT WE HAD AT THE TIME AND STILL DO HAVE WHICH IS SABA CENTRA.

SOME OF THE PROS OF WIMBA WERE PORTS WERE NOT NEEDED TO BE OPENED SO THAT PARTICIPANTS COULD BE INVOLVED. SO, IF THEY WERE PARTICIPATING FROM A SITE, AN AGENCY OR INSTITUTION THAT HAD A FIREWALL SET UP, THEY DIDN'T TYPICALLY HAVE PROBLEMS RECEIVING THAT VIDEO. SO THAT RECEIVED A 1. IT WAS EXCELLENT.

PARTICIPANTS DID HAVE THE ABILITY TO CHANGE THE QUALITY OF THE VIDEO THEY WERE RECEIVING. FOR EXAMPLE IF THEY HAD A LOWER BANDWIDTH CONNECTION, THEY COULD REDUCE THE QUALITY OF THEIR VIDEO AND IT WOULD STILL BE GOOD QUALITY VIDEO. THAT WAS A 1 AS WELL. USERS, END USERS HAD THE ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE VIA A LONG DISTANCE CALL. SO, IF THEY WERE IN A RURAL AREA AND HAD DIFFICULTY ACCESSING THE INTERNET IF THEY NEEDED THEY COULD CALL IN AND STILL HEAR THE AUDIO AND RECEIVE THE INFORMATION. THAT WAS A 1 AS WELL.

THE RECORDING CAPABILITY OF THE FULL PROGRAM, WHICH WAS AUDIO, VIDEO AND APPLICATION SHARING CREATED A FULLY ACCESSIBLE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING PARTICIPANTS WOULD ATTEND A RECORDED SESSION. SO THAT WAS A 1 AS WELL.

SOME OF THE CONS AT THAT TIME OF WIMBA AS I ALREADY MENTIONED, THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT, THE SIZE, FONT, AND COLOR, BACKGROUND AND FOREGROUND COULD NOT BE CHANGED OR INCREASED AND IT WAS TOO SMALL. IT WAS DIFFICULT FOR THE READING OF THE EYES. THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT WAS NOT INTUITIVE AND DIFFICULT FOR THE WRITERS. VERBATIM WRITERS UTILIZING A STENO MACHINE COULD NOT KEEP THEIR HAND ON A REGULAR KEYBOARD AND ON THEIR STENO MACHINES.

THE VIDEO COMPONENT DID NOT A LAW FOR MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS VIDEOS, IT ONLY ALLOWED FOR ONE SINGLE VIDEO AT A TIME AND IF YOU WANT TO BE IN A SITUATION WHERE YOU WANT TO PROVIDE THE VIDEO OF AN INTERPRETER AND A DEAF STUDENT SO THAT THEY CAN SEE EACH OTHER AND THE STUDENT CAN RAISE HIS HAND AND THE INSTRUCTOR KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON IN CLASS, MULTIPLE VIDEOS, OF COURSE, WOULD BE NEEDED. THE VIDEO WAS BASED ON AUDIO SWITCHING. AND MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS COULD NOT SHARE THE VIDEO. AND THAT, AGAIN, WOULD CREATE A PROBLEM WHEN YOU WANTED TO SHOW BOTH A VIDEO OF THE INTERPRETER AND/OR INSTRUCTOR PRESENTER. AND WE ALSO HAD SEVERAL PARTICIPANTS THAT HAD MULTIPLE PROBLEMS WITH AUDIOS AND MICS.

THE NEXT PRODUCT, ELLUMINATE LIVE, IT AND SABA CENTRA TIED AT FIRST AND SECOND IN THIS PORTION OF THE EVALUATION RELATED TO ACCESSIBILITY FOR DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING INDIVIDUALS.

SOME OF THE PROS: THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT WAS EASILY ACCESSED ONCE THE CAPTIONS AND WRITER WAS PROMOTED TO THE COPRESENTER STATUS. THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT, THE FONT SIZE COULD BE RESIZED BY THE INDIVIDUAL USERS. IT DID HAVE THE ABILITY OF UP TO SIX MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS VIDEOS. VIDEO QUALITY WAS GOOD ESPECIALLY FOR THE USE OF SIGN LANGUAGE. PARTICIPANTS COULD DIAL IN VIA LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALL.

AS I MENTIONED, THAT IS GREAT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE IN RURAL AREAS. THE RECORDING CAPABILITY OF ELLUMINATE LIVE ALLOWED FOR THE RECORDING OF FULL PROGRAM. AUDIO, VIDEO AND APPLICATION SHARING AND ONCE AGAIN CREATED THAT ACCESSIBLE ENVIRONMENT FOR DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING USERS TO BE ABLE TO ATTEND A RECORDED SESSION. IT ALSO HAD THE ABILITY FOR MULTIPLE CAPTIONISTS OR WRITERS TO BE IN A SESSION INSTEAD OF IT JUST BEING ONE CAPTIONIST AND WRITER AND IT WAS AN EASY SWITCH FOR THEM.

SOME OF THE CONS TO ELLUMINATE LIVE AT THAT TIME WERE THAT THE MULTIPLE VIDEO INPUTS ONLY ONE WAS ANY SIZE IT COULD BE

UNDERSTOOD. THE OTHER FIVE WERE THUMBNAILED AND IT WASN'T COMPREHENSIBLE FOR SIGN LANGUAGE. THE PRESENTER WOULD TAKE THE LARGEST QUADRANT AND THAT COULD BE A DIFFICULTY BUT IT WOULD TAKE SOME WORK AROUND AND CREATIVITY TO GET BEYOND THAT. AT THAT TIME ONE OF THE CONS ALSO WAS THAT THE CAPTIONING BACKGROUND, FONT AND COLOR COULD NOT BE CHANGED BY INDIVIDUAL USERS AND PARTICIPANTS.

NOW, FOR CENTRA. CENTRA, AGAIN, TIED WITH ELLUMINATE LIVE IN ITS RATINGS AND EVALUATION PROCESS. SOME OF THE PROS, THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT, THE FONT SIZE AND COLOR COULD BE CHANGED BY INDIVIDUAL USERS. THE SCREEN COULD ALSO BE MANIPULATED AND RESIZED AND THAT WAS GREAT. IF THEY WANTED TO MAKE THE FONT 18 OR 24 POINT, WHATEVER THEY WANTED TO MAKE THAT, THEY COULD CHANGE THEIR SCREEN AROUND AND THEY COULD MOVE THE COMPONENTS AROUND ON SABA CENTRA. IF THEY WANTED THEIR VIDEO UP IN THE RIGHT-HAND CORNER, THEN THEY COULD DO THAT. IF THEY WANTED THE CAPTIONING IN THE LOWER LEFT HAND, THEY COULD DO THAT. WHEREVER THEY WANTED TO PLACE THOSE COMPONENTS. THE FONT AND BACKGROUND COLOR COULD ALSO BE CHANGED. SABA CENTRA ALSO ALLOWED FOR FOUR GOOD SIZED VIDEO INPUTS. AND THAT'S ESPECIALLY HELPFUL WHEN YOU WANTED TO HAVE INTERPRETER, THE PRESENTER, AND THE DEAF STUDENT UP ON SCREEN OR EVEN JUST THE DEAF STUDENT AND THE INTERPRETER.

ONE CAUTION HERE THOUGH IS TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE THE BANDWIDTH IN YOUR NETWORK CONNECTION AND ON YOUR COMPUTER TO BE ABLE TO HANDLE THE VIDEO SCREEN. THAT'S ONE THING WE DID NOTICE WITH SABA CENTRA IS THAT THE MORE VIDEO YOU ADD, THE MORE IT PULLS ON YOUR SYSTEM. THAT IS A CAUTION WE'D LIKE TO RECOMMEND.

SOME OF THE CONS: FIRST OF ALL, WITH PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE AT INSTITUTIONS OR AGENCIES WHO WERE ON A FIREWALL, THEIR TECH SUPPORT WOULD HAVE TO OPEN PORTS FOR THEM TO BE ABLE TO ACCESS THE VIDEO FOR CLARITY. AND THAT WAS DIFFICULT, ESPECIALLY IF YOU DIDN'T HAVE THAT TECH SUPPORT PERSON RIGHT AT YOUR FINGERTIPS. AT THAT TIME AND AS I MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS PRESENTATION -- THIS HAS CHANGED -- BUT AT THAT TIME THE RECORDING HERE ON CAMPUS AT UT COULD NOT BE DONE TO INCLUDE AUDIO, VIDEO AND THE APPLICATION SHARING. THAT HAS NOW CHANGED. AND THAT WAS BASED ON WHAT WE HAD AVAILABLE HERE AT UT, NOT ON THE CENTRA SIDE.

WE DID FIND THAT VIDEO WAS NOT AS CLEAR IN CENTRA AS IN OTHER PRODUCTS SO THAT WAS RATED ABOUT A 3. AND AT THAT TIME, THE CAPTIONING BOX WOULD STOP SCROLLING WHILE IN SESSION. AGAIN, I WANT TO REEMPHASIZE THOSE ARE ALL ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED AND

HAVE BEEN TAKEN CARE OF.

AND LAST ONE WE LOOKED AT WAS ADOBE CONNECT PRO. YOU'LL SEE THE COMMENT WAS IT WAS DIFFICULT TO RATE THIS PROGRAM FAIRLY BECAUSE THE EVALUATION OF THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT WE COULD NOT DO THAT AT THAT TIME. SO IT WAS DIFFICULT TO REALLY GIVE IT A FAIR RATING. IT DID HAVE ADOBE CONNECT PRO, DID HAVE MULTIPLE VIDEO CAPABILITY. AND IT DID HAVE GOOD QUALITY VIDEO AND IT DID SEEM TO BE AN EASY PROGRAM TO USE. THE BIGGEST CON THAT WE SAW WAS THAT THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT WAS SEPARATE AND IT WAS NOT INTEGRATED INTO THE PRODUCT. SO YOU HAD TO MAKE A SEPARATE PURCHASE TO HAVE THE CAPTIONING COMPONENT.

NOW, AT THAT TIME AFTER WORKING WITH THE PEPNET-SOUTH STAFF AND HAVING THAT REVIEW AND EVALUATION BY INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING AND HEARING USERS REVIEW THE ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENTS, ESPECIALLY AS IT RELATES TO DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING USERS, I WENT BACK AND I REALIZED THAT ON THE CAMPUS OF UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, TYPEWELL IS THE PROGRAM THAT IS UTILIZED TO PROVIDE TRANSCRIBING. AND SINCE THIS WAS BEING UTILIZED FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, WE REALLY NEEDED TO LOOK AT HOW TYPEWELL WOULD INCORPORATE WITH THESE FOUR PROGRAMS. SO I REQUESTED FROM THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TO INCLUDE THE OFFICE OF DISABILITY SERVICES INTO THIS EVALUATION AND WE DID SEPARATE TESTS WITH THEM SPECIFICALLY ON EACH OF THESE FOUR PROGRAMS. AND LOOKED AT TYPEWELL WITH EACH ONE OF THEM TO SEE HOW THIS WOULD WORK. BY AND LARGE, THE INFORMATION THAT YOU SEE ON THIS CHART INCLUDES THE RESPONSES ABOUT HOW TYPEWELL WORKED. THEY, TOO, HAD DIFFICULTY WITH WIMBA. CENTRA WORKED WELL. AND SO DID ELLUMINATE LIVE. SO WE WERE ABLE TO MAKE THAT WORK.

AND AT THIS TIME YOU, I WILL TURN IT BACK TO MARY LEE FOR HER TO FINISH OUT THIS PART OF THE PRESENTATION ABOUT THE EVALUATION PROCESS OF SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION TOOLS HERE AT UT IN THE FALL OF 2008.

>> MARY LESS STEWART: BEFORE I GO ON WITH THE NEXT SLIDE, I'D LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT JUST TO TALK ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION TOOL. AT THE TIME WE WERE LOOKING AT A TOOL APPLICATION THAT WOULD ALLOW STUDENTS AND FACULTY AND STAFF EVEN TO COLLABORATE, MEANING SHARE CONTENT, SHARE IDEAS AT THE SAME TIME IN A VIRTUAL SPACE. SO WHEN WE SAY SYNCHRONOUS COLLABORATION, I GUESS THE BEST WAY TO PUT IT IS TRY TO THINK OF A TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM BUT IN A VIRTUAL AREA. LET'S GO ON NOW TO TALK ABOUT SOME OF THE TOPICS WE LOOKED AT

WITH THE EVALUATION PROCESS.

FROM AN ADMINISTRATIVE SIDE, WE WANTED TO LOOK AT PRICING, TYPE OF LICENSING ENVIRONMENT, BLACKBOARD INTEGRATION, WHICH IS OUR LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM HERE ON CAMPUS, AND ALSO THE AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT. THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION, YOU CAN VIEW THOSE IF YOU LIKE AT THE WEB SITE LISTED ON THE SCREEN. I'LL GO AHEAD AND SAY THAT OUT.  
[HTTP://ITC.UTK.EDU/SYNCOLLAB/](http://ITC.UTK.EDU/SYNCOLLAB/).

SO OUR PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO RANK EACH OF THE FOUR PRODUCTS 1 TO 4 WITH ONE BEING THE MOST PREFERRED TOOL AND FOUR BEING THEIR LEAST PREFERRED TOOL.  
SO DRUM ROLL, THE RANKINGS REVEAL THAT THE CURRENT TOOL SABA CENTRA WAS RANKED NUMBER 1 WITH AN AVERAGE RANKING OF 1.7. ELLUMINATE LIVE CAME IN SECOND, VERY CLOSE WITH AN AVERAGE RANKING OF 2.3. ADOBE ACROBAT CONNECT PRO HAD AN AVERAGE RANKING OF 2.7 AND THEN HORIZON WIMBA LIVE CLASSROOM AVERAGE RANKING OF THREE AND THAT CAME IN FOURTH IN OUR EVALUATION.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.