Appendix E:

Round II, Survey B Results

If you attended the audioconference with Gail Bingham (audioconference with online question submission that took place 6/3), please fill out the following three questions:

1. How valuable did you find the presentation?
(1=not valuable, 6=very valuable)

Elaine Hallmark	6
John Helie	1
John Tatum	5
Laura Kaplan	4
Michael Eng	5
Robin Roberts	5
Tim Hicks	1
Tom Taylor	0
Xantha Bruso	4

AVERAGE   3.4

2. What did you like most about the presentation?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
I liked Gail's description of various issues, pointing out the things that might be different from what people expected and the critical elements. I also liked the way the questions were handled in general, and the specific references GAil made to the background paper.

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
Gail's discussion of the use of the assesssment and the dispute dynamics that drive assessments.

Laura Kaplan - 2003-06-18
Re: the content of the assessment dialog, I enjoyed the application to a real case,

with all its messy real complexities. Re: format / tools, i liked that we all (including gail) were able to see the group's questions as they were posted.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Hearing Gail provide her insights from her many years of experience.

Robin Roberts - 2003-06-17
The moderation of the call was done very well.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Wasn't able to participate but the survey wouldn't let me submit my responses to Harty chat room without responding to this question.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
I enjoyed Gail's converstional style and logical summarization of events. She touched on issues both in the assessment as well as behind the scenes decisions that she had to make that aren't obvious in the assessment document.

3. What would you improve?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
I think we need some practice in how to organize the questions, and perhaps to have the speaker wait to respond to questions until the moderator puts them in some order. Spontaneous response is, of course, good when the question is right on point and does not distract the speaker from the line of thinking. Perhaps the time could have been more segregated between presentation and questions. I also would have gotten the notice out earlier and urged people to read the material in advance. An explanation of how it was going to work ahead of time would have been helpful in preparing for the session.

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
Provide an ability for the moderator to group questions into threads and show them that way. Perhaps a second moderator to do that. It would have been usefull to have a set of slides to structure the discussion as well.

Laura Kaplan - 2003-06-18
I'm curious as to why you had the call in broadcast only mode. Why assemble a group real-time around the phones when only two can speak? There was a small amount of interactivity with questions submitted online during the presentation; however I could have gained almost as much value (much more quickly) if I had simply read the transcript of the interview on my own time. Also, it would have been

interesting if the moderator had refered back to the content of our online dialog and asked Gail to comment on the themes and how they did or did not jibe with her experience. perhaps you did some of that and I'm not remembering.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Probably too much time spent on the details of the specific case and not enough time about assessments in general, as well as questions from the listeners.

Robin Roberts - 2003-06-17
I think the moderator-guest discussion could be considerably enlivened by taking questions from the audience.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Wasn't able to participate but the survey wouldn't let me submit my responses to Harty chat room without responding to this question.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
I think the technology worked well for the purpose of this call, and that the interviewee/interviewer interactions were good.

4. How could you envision using a communication platform like this, and for what applications?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
I think it was great for this. It is similar to a workshop at a conference where there is someone presenting and people asking questions. Not as good as in person, but certainly practical for disseminating information. I think it could be used for some aspects of information sharing and developing a common information base in a collaborative or consensus process.

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
Primarilly an information delivery platform. Teaching, present a report.

Laura Kaplan - 2003-06-18
I'm not sure. I'm iffy about the use of broadcast mode. perhaps it would work well for group education / formal presentation for shared content knowledge, where interaction is not as important. using this tool, audio learners could tune in, while visual learners could just read the transcript. thinking more, this tool has obvious potential for public participation...members of the public would not have to travel to a meeting, but could listen in and submit comments from wherever they needed to

be. This would allow for a greater volume of comments to be collected than is possible in brief public comment periods. The written format may also be more comfortable for some members of the interested public than speechifying at a microphone. i'd be interested to see how the tool could be used for a multiparty interactive "conference call" with an online component. this would be especially interesting if there were a way to do real-time transcription. how about if the audio feed could go through the computer rather than the phone? and how about trying to merge voice and typed communication into one conversation!

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Continuing education and professional development in lieu of in-person lectures. Providing initial orientation for a project involving geographically dispersed participants.

Robin Roberts - 2003-06-17
This platform would be most useful where technical issues need clarification. I don't see using this platform for contentious, social issues.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Wasn't able to participate but the survey wouldn't let me submit my responses to Harty chat room without responding to this question.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
This could be a good way for stakeholders to query a panel of experts, one way to hold a small public meeting about a very specific and well-defined issue, or a way for people to "meet" and vote on an issue that has already been extensively deliberated.

If you participated in the text chat with Mike Harty (online typing, with no audio component, happened 6/10), please fill out the following three questions:

5. How valuable did you find the presentation?
(1=not valuable, 6=very valuable)

Elaine Hallmark	3
Johnon Helie	2
John Tatum	3
Michael Eng	1

Robin Roberts	6
Tim Hicks	1
Tom Taylor	4
Xantha Bruso	3

AVERAGE   2.875

6. What did you like most about the presentation?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
I liked the case, the response to questions and the information that came out. I liked Mike's pointing out the challenges and the differences in approach. Having a "non-mediated" model was good, as well as having info about the resulting policy. Again, having the case write-up was helpful.

John Helie - 2003-06-17
It was tried!! For what it was, it was done well. Everyone deserves credit for presenting the medium and the message

---

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
The assessment was interesting and well done.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
The fact that it was taking place at all.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Can't think of anything that was worthwhile or that I liked.

Tom Taylor - 2003-06-19
I liked having a hard copy of an assessment to look over, react to and see others reactions.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
I liked that the chat took place in real time and that you could choose a color to represent yourself.

7. What would you improve?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
This tool is much more limited. I felt the questions interrupted the flow a great deal. If there were a way to have the questions come in separately and to be organized by the moderator, that would help. Or if people were asked not to submit questions until a certain point and then just turn it over to answering the questions. If it is possible for the presenter to have some things written out ahead of time and then just "upload" them, it would help to get it started with the background and initial presentation. Having the case write-up earlier with more time to read it in advance would be helpful.

John Helie - 2003-06-17
I did not find the Room very inviting or user friendly.

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
Poor vehicle for discussion of complex topic.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Very slow. Too many interruptions in the flow of attempted conversation between the interviewer and teh interviewee. Responses were very brief and lacked much depth. Perhaps it would have helped to have a way to "queu" up questions from the audience. I imagine this was very challenging for teh person being interviewed.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Some of the problems for me were: 1. scattered conversation 2. No depth of discussion 3. number of characters permitted per question too short 4. cumbersome format if everyone who was participating actually submitted quesions and comments. I'm not sure that there are ways to improve the format sufficiently to make it worthwhile. Pre-submitted questions might be useful, with the interviewee answering each question with an opportunity between each question for the person asking the question to pose a follow-up question or comment and then for the other participants to contribute comments on that question/answer subject, before moving on to the next previously submitted question. In this structure, it would be helpful for everyone to be able to see a list of the pre-submitted questions beforehand. Another potential improvement might be to cycle through the participants giving each an opportunity to comment/question or pass, using the alpha listing of participants for the order. But with very many participants, this would probably be pretty cumbersome as well.

Tom Taylor - 2003-06-19
It may have helped to have some initual questions to consider in looking over the assessment. The biggest thing that would have helped was to have spent more time reviewing the materials before the call; this is clearly my responsibility, not yours.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
It would be better if there were less lag time between statements, and if the screen didn't jump around when the page reloaded. Also, it might have been better if Mike had a more structured presentation.

8. How could you envision using a communication tool like this, and for what applications?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
My impression is that it would best be used as a follow up to some other kind of presentation, or to the written review of a document or set of information. It seems harder to organize and/or moderate.

John Helie - 2003-06-17
CHAT is good for "Banter", thoughtful dialogue is not well suited to this medium. I would not use CHAT.

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
Ill suited for discussion.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Interactive chat for just a few participants.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Don't think I would.

Tom Taylor - 2003-06-19
It might be good for leaders and possibly also participants to review meeting or workshop reports and discuss implications for substantive solutions and next steps in the process. It might be a way to engage elected officials without having to get them to a meeting.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
This could be a good tool for idea generation/brainstorming.

9. If you participated in both presentations, which technology platform did you prefer?

5 Gail Bingham Presentation
0 Mike Harty Presentation

1 Both the same

Why?

Elaine Hallmark - 2003-06-17
The live discussion was much easier to follow, and able to get more info presented in a shorter time. Both are helpful, and I would be interested in the cost comparison.

John Helie - 2003-06-17
People very knowledgeable on the subject they are addressing are better at orally presenting what they know, better than by writing text, especially if they have written about the topic. I suspect that if a presenter could have "text Bites' on their screen they could do a better job of making timely and comfortable responses with a cut and paste method. Stilted but might be interesting to read author in the context of questions. In my books, Text only asynchronous communication is seldom worth the time. I was disturbed at the thought of the many minutes of valuable time X 20 of our valued colleagiues, that was being spent waiting for a response from someone. Sorry, I have long been down on CHAT, little changed here. CHAT blended with Voice is promising. John

---

John Tatum - 2003-06-14
much better way to review complex information and structure questions.

Michael Eng - 2003-06-19
Text chat was too slow, disjointive, and lacked much depth. I started multi-tasking rather than payingattention. The audioconference was much more engaging.

Tim Hicks - 2003-06-17
Wasn't able to join the Bingham presentation but from what I heard from others it was the more productive. I'm guessing this was due in part to the heighten ability to conduct a conversation voice to voice with no limits on number of characters and without the apparent disjointed interruptions of the chat room format.

Xantha Bruso - 2003-06-13
I think the technologies best serve different purposes. Mike's technology platform was not best suited for a discussion of a very long and complex assessment, whereas Gail's was better suited for a talk about a shorter and apparently better-known assessment.