

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  


Institutional Repository

This document is published in:

R. Calvo, B. Iglesias, A. Gil and A. Iglesias, Accessibility evaluation of Chats and Forums in e-learning environments. En: Hamid R. Arabnia, etc. (eds.), Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Frontiers in Education: Computer Science & Computer Engineering (FECS 2013): WORLDCOMP'13, July 22-25, 2013, Las Vegas Nevada (USA). USA: CSREA Press, 2013, pp. 133-139.

© CSREA Press 2013

**PROCEEDINGS OF  
THE 2013 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
FRONTIERS IN EDUCATION: COMPUTER SCIENCE &  
COMPUTER ENGINEERING**

**FEECS 2013**

**Editors**

**Hamid R. Arabnia, Azita Bahrami  
Victor A. Clincy  
Leonidas Deligiannidis, George Jandieri**

**Associate Editors**

**Ashu M. G. Solo, Fernando G. Tinetti**



***WORLD COMP'13***

July 22-25, 2013

Las Vegas Nevada, USA

[www.world-academy-of-science.org](http://www.world-academy-of-science.org)

©CSREA Press

This volume contains papers presented at The 2013 International Conference on Frontiers in Education: Computer Science & Computer Engineering (FECS'13). Their inclusion in this publication does not necessarily constitute endorsements by editors or by the publisher.

### **Copyright and Reprint Permission**

Copying without a fee is permitted provided that the copies are not made or distributed for direct commercial advantage, and credit to source is given. Abstracting is permitted with credit to the source. Please contact the publisher for other copying, reprint, or republication permission.

Copyright © 2013 CSREA Press  
ISBN: 1-60132-243-7  
Printed in the United States of America

CSREA Press  
U. S. A.

# Foreword

It gives us great pleasure to introduce this collection of papers to be presented at the 2013 International Conference on Frontiers in Education: Computer Science and Computer Engineering (FECS'13), July 22 through 25, 2013, at The New Tropicana Hotel, Las Vegas, USA.

An important mission of the World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Applied Computing (a federated congress to which this conference is affiliated with) includes *"Providing a unique platform for a diverse community of constituents composed of scholars, researchers, developers, educators, and practitioners. The Congress makes concerted effort to reach out to participants affiliated with diverse entities (such as: universities, institutions, corporations, government agencies, and research centers/labs) from all over the world. The congress also attempts to connect participants from institutions that have **teaching** as their main mission with those who are affiliated with institutions that have **research** as their main mission. The congress uses a quota system to achieve its institution and geography diversity objectives."* By any definition of diversity, this congress is among the most diverse scientific meeting in USA. We are proud to report that this federated congress has authors and participants from 82 different nations representing variety of personal and scientific experiences that arise from differences in culture and values. As can be seen (see below), the program committee of this conference as well as the program committee of all other tracks of the federated congress are as diverse as its authors and participants.

The program committee would like to thank all those who submitted papers for consideration. About 50% of the submissions were from outside the United States. Each submitted paper was peer-reviewed by two experts in the field for originality, significance, clarity, impact, and soundness. In cases of contradictory recommendations, a member of the conference program committee was charged to make the final decision; often, this involved seeking help from additional referees. In addition, papers whose authors included a member of the conference program committee were evaluated using the double-blinded review process. One exception to the above evaluation process was for papers that were submitted directly to chairs/organizers of pre-approved sessions/workshops; in these cases, the chairs/organizers were responsible for the evaluation of such submissions. The overall paper acceptance rate for regular papers was 31%; 12% of the remaining papers were accepted as poster papers (at the time of this writing, we had not yet received the acceptance rate for a few individual tracks.)

We are very grateful to the many colleagues who offered their services in organizing the conference. In particular, we would like to thank the members of the Program Committee of FECS'13, members of the congress Steering Committee, and members of the committees of federated congress tracks that have topics within the scope of FECS. Many individuals listed below, will be requested after the conference to provide their expertise and services for selecting papers for publication (extended versions) in journal special issues as well as for publication in a set of research books (to be prepared for publishers including: Springer, Elsevier, BMC, and others).

- *Prof. Afrand Agah; West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, USA*
- *Dr. Selim Aissi (World Congress Steering Committee); formerly, Chief Strategist - Security, Intel Corp., USA; Senior Business Leader & Head of Global Enterprise Security Architecture, Visa Corporation, USA*
- *Prof. Babak Akhgar (World Congress Steering Committee); Fellow of the British Computer Society, CITP; Professor of Informatics; Co-Director of CENTRIC (Centre of Excellence in Terrorism, Resilience, Intelligence & organised Crime research), Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK*
- *Prof. Hussain Al-Asaad (PDPTA); Senior Member, IEEE; University of California at Davis, Davis, California, USA*
- *Dr. Fahad Al-Harby (EEE); The National Centre for Financial & Economic Information, Ministry of Finance, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
- *Prof. Nizar Al-Holou (World Congress Steering Committee); Professor and Chair, ECE Department; Vice Chair, IEEE/SEM-Computer Chapter; University of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, Michigan, USA*
- *Dr. Haider M. AlSabbagh; University of Basra, Iraq*
- *Prof. Hamid R. Arabnia (World Congress Steering Committee); Professor, Computer Science; Editor-in-Chief, The Journal of Supercomputing (Springer); Elected Fellow, Int'l Society of Intelligent Biological Medicine (ISIBM); The University of Georgia, Department of Computer Science, USA*

- *Peyman Arebi; Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Engineering, Technical and Vocational University, Bushehr, Iran*
- *Prof. Ezendu Ariwa (Publicity Vice-Chair); Chair, IEEE Consumer Electronics Chapter, UK&RI; Visiting Professor, Gulf University, Bahrain and University of Lagos and Kano State Polytechnic, Nigeria*
- *Dr. Azita Bahrami; President, IT Consult, USA*
- *Prof. Juan-Vicente Capella-Hernandez; Editorial Board: IEEE RITA Journal; International Journal On Advances in Networks and Services; International Journal of Computer Science & Information Technology Applications; UPV, Spain; Executive Manager, Wireless Sensor Networks Valencia, Spain*
- *Prof. Juan Jose Martinez Castillo; Director of The Acantelys Research Group and Coordinator of the Computer Engineering Department, Universidad Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho, Venezuela*
- *Prof. Victor A. Clincy; Professor of Computer Science, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, USA*
- *Prof. Juan Cuadrado-Gallego; Universidad de Alcala, Edificio Politecnico, Madrid, Spain*
- *Prof. Kevin Daimi (World Congress Steering Committee); Director, Computer Science and Software Engineering Programs; Department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Software Engineering; University of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, Michigan, USA*
- *Prof. Leonidas Deligiannidis; Professor, Computer Science, Wentworth Institute of Technology, MA, USA*
- *Somdip Dey (FCS); St. Xavier's College (Autonomous), India*
- *Dr. Bilel Gargouri (IKE); Faculty of Management and Economic Sciences; University of Sfax, Tunisia*
- *Prof. Debasis Giri (IPCV); Haldia Institute of Technology, Haldia, India*
- *Prof. George A. Gravvanis; Democritus University of Thrace, Greece*
- *Dr. Hicham H. Hallal (SAM); Fahad Bin Sultan University, Saudi Arabia*
- *Prof. Houcine Hassan; Universitat Politecnica de Valencia, Spain*
- *Dr. Bing He (PDPTA); Cisco System Inc., USA*
- *Dr. K. S. S. Iyer; Symbiosis Institute of Telecom Management, India*
- *Prof. George Jandieri (World Congress Steering Committee); Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia; Chief Scientist, The Institute of Cybernetics, Georgian Academy of Science, Georgia; Editorial Board Member: International Journal of Microwaves and Optical Technology, Georgia*
- *Prof. Dong Hwa Kim; Hanbat National University, Korea; International Einstein awardee for Scientific achievement (2010)*
- *Prof. Dattatraya V. Kodavade (World Congress Steering Committee); Head of Computer Science and Engineering, D.K.T.E Society's Textile & Engineering Institute, Ichalkaranji, Maharashtra State, India*
- *Prof. Raghu Korrapati; Elected Fellow, Information Systems, Walden University, MN, USA*
- *Prof. B. Raja Sarath Kumar; Principal, Lenora College of Engineering, India*
- *Dr. Vitus S.W. Lam (SERP + FCS); Chartered Member of The British Computer Society; The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*
- *Prof. Kun Chang Lee (World Congress Steering Committee); Professor of MIS and WCU Professor of Creativity Science, Business School and Department of Interaction Science, Sungkyunkwan University, Korea*
- *Dr. Bala Krishna Maddali (ESA + PDPTA); GGS Indraprastha University, India*
- *Dr. Veenu Mangat (ICAI + GEM + IKE); Panjab University, India*
- *Muhammad Naufal Bin Mansor; University Malaysia Perlis, Perlis, Malaysia*
- *Arshad Mansoor; Pakistan Aeronautical Complex, Pakistan*
- *Dr. Tao Mao (ICAI + GEM); Oracle America, Inc., USA*
- *Prof. Gevorg Margarov; Head of Information Security and Software Development Department, State Engineering University of Armenia, Armenia*
- *Prof. George Markowsky (World Congress Steering Committee); Professor and Associate Director, School of Computing and Information Science; Chair International Advisory Board of IEEE IDAACS; Director 2013 Northeast Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition; Cooperating Professor Math and Statistics Department UMaine and School of Policy & International Affairs UMaine; University of Maine, Orono, Maine, USA*
- *Suzanne Kranjac McIntosh (SERP); Team Lead, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, New York, USA*
- *Dr. Sara Moein; Editorial Board, Int'l Journal of Science and Technology; MultiMedia University, Malaysia*
- *Dr. Ehab Morsy (FCS); Suez Canal University, Egypt*
- *Dr. Ali Mostafaiepour; Industrial Engineering Department, Yazd University, Iran*
- *Dr. Saurabh Mukherjee; Banasthali University, Banasthali, India*
- *Prof. Prashant R. Nair; Vice-Chairman, Information Technology & Accreditation; Faculty, AMRITA-TIFAC Centre of Excellence in Cyber Security; Amrita University, India*
- *Dr. Asoke Nath (EEE + FCS), St. Xavier's College, India*
- *Prof. G. N. Pandey (World Congress Steering Committee); Vice-Chancellor, Arunachal University of Studies, Arunachal Pradesh, India; Adjunct Professor, Indian Institute of Information Technology, Allahabad, India*

- Prof. James J. (Jong Hyuk) Park (World Congress Steering Committee); Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, Seoul National University of Science and Technology (SeoulTech), Korea; President, KITCS; President, FTRA; Editor-in-Chiefs: HCIS, JoC and IJITCC Journals
- Prof. R. Ponalagusamy (SERP); National Institute of Technology, India
- Prof. Junfeng Qu; Clayton State University, Georgia, USA
- Prof. B. V. A. N. S. S. Prabhakar Rao (ICAI + SERP); VIT University, India
- Dr. Liang Shi; Senior Researcher, McAfee, USA
- Dr. Marek Sikora (IKE); Silesian University of Technology, Poland
- Dr. Kok Swee Sim; Jalan Ayer Keroh Lama, Melaka, Malaysia
- Ashu M. G. Solo, (Publicity Chair); Fellow of British Computer Society, Principal/R&D Engineer, Maverick Technologies America Inc., USA
- Dr. Jiao Tao (ICAI); Oracle USA
- Prof. Fernando G. Tinetti (World Congress Steering Committee); School of Computer Science, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, Argentina; Co-editor, Journal of CS and Technology (JCS&T)
- Dr. Predrag Tomic (World Congress Steering Committee); Microsoft, Washington, USA
- Prof. Ion Tutasescu (ICWN); University of Pitesti, Romania
- Dr. Vinay Vaidya (IPCV); CTO and Vice President, CREST, KPIT Cummins Infosystems Limited, India
- Prof. Vladimir Volkov (World Congress Steering Committee); The Bonch-Bruевич State University of Telecommunications, Saint-Petersburg, Russia
- Dr. Wei Wei (GCA + ICOMP + ICWN); Xi'an University of Technology, Xi'an, P. R. China
- Dr. Alexander Wohrer (ICOMP + GCA); Program Manager ICT at Vienna Science and Technology Fund, Vienna, Austria
- Prof. Jongwook Woo; Director, High-Performance Information Computing Center (HiPiC), California State University, Los Angeles, California, USA

As Sponsors-at-large, partners, and/or organizers each of the followings (separated by semicolons) provided help for at least one track of the World Congress: Aldebaran Robotics Inc., USA (<http://www.aldebaran-robotics.com>); Altera Corporation, USA (<http://www.altera.com/>); Computer Science Research, Education, and Applications Press (CSREA); Impulse Accelerated Technologies, Inc., USA (<http://www.impulseaccelerated.com/>); NVIDIA Corporation, USA (<http://www.nvidia.com/object/about-nvidia.html>); Parallella Community, Supercomputing for Everyone, USA (<http://forums.parallella.org/>); Pico Computing, Inc., USA (<http://picocomputing.com/>); SemiWiki.com, The Semiconductor Wiki Project, USA (<http://www.semiwiki.com/>); Solarflare Communications, Inc., USA (<http://www.solarflare.com/>); Stream Computing, Performance Engineers, The Netherlands (<http://streamcomputing.eu/>); Taylor & Francis, UK (<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com/>); US Chapter of World Academy of Science (<http://www.world-academy-of-science.org/>); and WEBestSOL & Webest Solutions Ltd, UK (<http://webestsol.com/>). In addition, a number of university faculty members and their staff (names appear on the cover of the set of proceedings), several publishers of computer science and computer engineering books and journals, chapters and/or task forces of computer science associations/organizations from 5 countries, and developers of high-performance machines and systems provided significant help in organizing the conference as well as providing some resources. We are grateful to them all.

We express our gratitude to keynote, invited, and individual conference/tracks and tutorial speakers - the list of speakers appears on the conference web site. We would also like to thank the followings: UCMSS (Universal Conference Management Systems & Support, California, USA) for managing all aspects of the conference; Dr. Tim Field of APC for managing the printing of the proceedings; and the staff of the New Tropicana Hotel in Las Vegas for the professional service they provided. Last but not least, we would like to thank the Co-Editors and Associate Co-Editors of FECS'13: Prof. Hamid R. Arabnia, Dr. Azita Bahrami, Prof. Victor A. Clincy, Prof. Leonidas Deligiannidis, Prof. George Jandieri, Ashu M. G. Solo, and Prof. Fernando G. Tinetti.

We present the proceedings of FECS'13.

**Steering Committee, 2013**  
<http://www.world-academy-of-science.org/>

# Contents

## **SESSION: ACCREDITATION + ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES + ACADEMIC REVIEWS**

<b>Assessing Student Learning in Computer Science - A Case Study</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>K.B. Lakshmanan, Sandeep R. Mitra, T.M. Rao</i>	
<b>Using A Learning Management System to Facilitate Program Accreditation</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Harry Keeling</i>	
<b>A Bottom-Up Outcome-Based Learning Assessment Process for Accrediting Computing Programs</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Haidar Harmanani</i>	
<b>Three First-time computer Engineering Program Accreditation Experiences</b>	<b>23</b>
<i>William A. Stapleton</i>	
<b>Improving Academic Quality in a Computer Science Graduate Program</b>	<b>29</b>
<i>Meline Kevorkian, Gregory Simco</i>	
<b>Student Assessment of Student Work</b>	<b>32</b>
<i>Donald Schwartz</i>	
<b>Using a Dashboard as a Visualization Tool for Assessment Data</b>	<b>38</b>
<i>Courtney Lamar, Velma Latson, Quincy Brown, Lethia Jackson, Gail Fink</i>	
<b>A Heuristic Approach for Student-Outcomes Assessment Using Bloom's Taxonomy</b>	<b>42</b>
<i>Iraj Danesh</i>	
<b>A General Course-Level Assessment Cycle for Computing Courses</b>	<b>48</b>
<i>Iraj Danesh</i>	

## **SESSION: TOOLS AND SYSTEMS + STUDIES INCLUDING, PLAGIARISM, ATTENDANCE TRACKING, CLASS MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, RESEARCH METHODS, CAPSTONE PROJECTS, AND OTHERS**

<b>Online Detection of Source-code Plagiarism in Undergraduate Programming Courses</b>	<b>57</b>
<i>Dieter Pawelczak</i>	
<b>Some useful components of an effective class management system</b>	<b>64</b>
<i>Luby Liao</i>	

<b>Portal of Research Methods and Methodologies for Research Projects and Degree Projects</b>	<b>67</b>
<i>Anne Hakansson</i>	
<b>Investigating Female Students Attitude towards Cheating and Plagiarism: A Study in King Saud University</b>	<b>74</b>
<i>Manar Hosny, Shameem Fatima</i>	
<b>Attendance Tracking</b>	<b>79</b>
<i>Dwight Deugo</i>	
<b>Breaking the Programming Obstacles Using an Automatic Tool</b>	<b>86</b>
<i>Luis Humberto Gonzalez Guerra, Armandina Juana Leal Flores</i>	
<b>International Computer Science Capstone Project Exchange Program: A Case Study Report</b>	<b>92</b>
<i>Dean Knudson</i>	
<b>A JFLAP Extension for Checking Context-Free Grammars</b>	<b>97</b>
<i>Priyanka Bansal, Viraj Kumar</i>	
<b>SESSION: LEARNING MODELS, METHODOLOGIES, TOOLS AND CASE STUDIES</b>	
<b>The Know-How Kit Software</b>	<b>103</b>
<i>Marcella Coccnari, Rocco Lanata</i>	
<b>Cluster Analysis of Chinese International Business Students Based on Learning Styles</b>	<b>110</b>
<i>Da Huo, Yan Chen</i>	
<b>Interactive Learning to Improve Student Success Rates in Teaching Programming: A Case Study</b>	<b>116</b>
<i>Said Fares, Mary Fares</i>	
<b>The Design of Open Learner Model to Improve Interaction of Peer Assessment in Learning</b>	<b>121</b>
<i>Qingchun Hu, Yong Huang</i>	
<b>Games as a Proposal for Change in the Civil Engineering Learning Process</b>	<b>127</b>
<i>Maria Elena Rosas Sanchez, Francisco Casanova del Angel</i>	
<b>Accessibility Evaluation of Chats and Forums in e-learning Environments</b>	<b>133</b>
<i>Rocio Calvo, Beatriz Iglesias, Almudena Gil, Ana Iglesias</i>	
<b>802.11 Wireless Networks: Incorporating Hands-On Learning Experience into the Undergraduate Classroom</b>	<b>140</b>
<i>Mira Yun, Charlie Wiseman, Leonidas Deligiannidis</i>	



**Blogging and Online Collaborative Discovery Learning : Making a case for a successful group-tracking technique** 147

*Zeenath Reza Khan*

**A Learning Model of Simple Computing Machine Architecture** 154

*Tai-Chi Lee, Hector Zimmermann-Ayala*

**Learning computer programming with a COAC#** 160

*Marcos Abed Jakeline*

**Implementing a Virtual Teaching and Learning Environment: a model proposed by UNNOBA (National University of the North West of the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina)** 166

*Claudia Russo, Monica Sarobe, Hugo Ramon, Nicolas Alonso, Leonardo Esnaola, Paula Lencina, Tamara Ahmad*

**What Makes the Difference, the Active Learning Activities or the Technology in the Classroom?** 170

*Yolanda Martinez Trevino*

**Methodology Strategies for a University Entrance Course: Coaching and Tutoring, The Experience at The National University of The North West of The Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina** 176

*Claudia Russo, Monica Sarobe, Hugo Ramon, Nicolas Alonso, Leonardo Esnaola, Paula Lencina, Tamara Ahmad*

**Improvements in Communication Process in Real Projects Using Social Network** 180

*Eulalia C. da Mata, Marcia F. Pinheiro, Antonio F. L. Jacob Jr., Fabio M. L. Lobato, Carlos R. L. Frances, Adamo L. Santana, Joao C. W. A. Costa*

**ACM ICPC In China : Learning From Contests** 184

*Dalie Sun, Lixin Wang, Zhaonian Zou*

**SESSION: TEACHING PROGRAMMING + SOFTWARE ENGINEERING AND SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT + TESTING AND DEBUGGING + ONLINE COURSES**

**Software Development Educational Pathway: AS to BAS** 193

*Colin Archibald, Richard Grant, Craig Tidwell, Ali Orooji, Greg Garver*

**Analysis of Suitable Languages to Teach Procedural Programming at the Universidad Nacional del Noroeste de la Provincia de Buenos Aires** 199

*Germán Osella Massa, Cecilia De Vito, Claudia Russo, Monica Sarobe, Sabrina Pompei*

<b>Advanced Java Features for Using JUnit in CS1/CS2</b>	<b>204</b>
<i>Hans Dulimarta, Scott Grissom</i>	
<b>Fuzzy Logic Model for Predicting the Number of Online Courses Needed from Number of Students Enrolled in Higher Education</b>	<b>211</b>
<i>Rosa Leonor Ulloa-Cazarez, Cuauhtemoc Lopez-Martin</i>	
<b>An Empirical Study on Remote Lectures Using Video Conferencing Systems</b>	<b>217</b>
<i>Tetsuya Oishi, Weiqiang Kong, Yasutaka Kamei, Norimichi Hiroshige, Naoyasu Ubayashi, Akira Fukuda</i>	
<b>Empirical Development of a Mobile Application: UVA-Wise Undergraduate Software Engineering Capstone Project</b>	<b>224</b>
<i>Ira Weissberger, Stephen Showalter, Travis Deel, Michael Ward, Matthew Whitt, Abrar Qureshi</i>	
<b>Code Debugging Tool to Help Teach Mainframe Programming Languages</b>	<b>229</b>
<i>Claudio Goncalves Bernardo, Paulo Roberto Chineara Batuta</i>	
<b>Game Programming for High School Mathematics Education</b>	<b>236</b>
<i>Josh Archer, Robert Johnson, Nelson Rushton</i>	
<b>Our Experience Teaching After-School Programming to Parents and Their Children</b>	<b>241</b>
<i>Rudolf Pecinovsky, Jiri Kofranek</i>	
<b>Turtles, Robots, Sheep, Cats, Languages what is next to teach programming? A Future developer s crisis?</b>	<b>248</b>
<i>Francisco Castillo-Barrera, David Arjona-Villicana, Cesar Ramirez-Gamez, Eloy Hernandez-Castro, Masoud Sadjadi</i>	

**SESSION: DEGREE PROGRAMS, CURRICULUM, AND COURSE  
DEVELOPMENT + RELATED ISSUES**

<b>Requiring a Systems Analysis and Design Course for a Computer Science Major</b>	<b>257</b>
<i>David Beard, Kevin Parker, Thomas Ottaway, William Davey, Corey Schou</i>	
<b>Including Computer Design in Early Hardware Study in Computer Science</b>	<b>263</b>
<i>Hassan Farhat</i>	
<b>Cloud Computing in the Curriculum: A Current Perspective</b>	<b>268</b>
<i>Kathy J. Liszka, Chien-Chung Chan, Michael L. Collard</i>	

<b>A Minor in Computational Statistics</b>	<b>275</b>
<i>Xiaohui Zhong, Kevin Daimi</i>	
<b>A Writing Intensive, Oral Presentation, Ethics Course in Computer Science</b>	<b>282</b>
<i>Laurie Patterson</i>	
<b>Web-Enhanced Design of University Curricula</b>	<b>288</b>
<i>Elisabeth Bacon, Georg Hagel, Michael Charnine, Richard Foggie, Brian Kirk, Georgy Kravtsov, Igor Schagaev</i>	
<b>A Curriculum Model for Preparing K-12 Computer Science Teachers</b>	<b>295</b>
<i>Cameron Fadjo, Ted Brown, Leigh Ann DeLyser</i>	
<b>Development of ICT Curricula through Graduate Career Outcomes and Required Skills</b>	<b>300</b>
<i>Ian Lewis, Kristy de Salas, Nicole Herbert, Winyu Chinthammit, Julian Dermoudy, Leonie Ellis, Matthew Springer</i>	
<b>Firing Up All Cores While Introducing Parallel and Distributed Concepts</b>	<b>307</b>
<i>Jie Liu, David Olson, Feng Liu, Mitchel Fry</i>	
<b>Design of Curriculum on Cloud Computing</b>	<b>312</b>
<i>Ram Krishnan, Eugene John</i>	
<b>Teaching Mobile Computing - Curriculum Design and Strategies Applied</b>	<b>316</b>
<i>Xiaoyuan Suo</i>	
<b>Integrating Games into the Computer Science Curriculum: From General Education to the Graduate Level</b>	<b>321</b>
<i>Robert Marmelstein, Eun-Joo Lee</i>	

**SESSION: RECRUITMENT AND MENTORING + METHODS FOR  
ENHANCING EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT + TOOLS AND CASE  
STUDIES**

<b>Android Control Application for Nao Humanoid Robot</b>	<b>329</b>
<i>Roslyn Brown, Heather Helton, Allison Williams, Michael Shrove, Mladen Milosevic, Emil Jovanov, David Coe, Jeff Kulick</i>	
<b>Evaluating a Prospective Student Mentoring Program</b>	<b>336</b>
<i>Amber Settle, Sarah Pieczynski, Liz Friedman, Nathan Kizior</i>	
<b>Transformative Pedagogy For Integrative Amelioration</b>	<b>343</b>
<i>Bandi Samson Herold, Maddula Muralidhara Rao, Ramesh Babu Satrasala</i>	

<b>Exploring Computer Science and a High School Program of Study in Computing</b>	<b>349</b>
<i>Daniel Lewis, Ruth Davis</i>	
<b>Coaching Robotics Competitions with Tekkotsu</b>	<b>355</b>
<i>Xuejun Liang</i>	
<b>Engaging Underrepresented Students in Computer Science: Examining the Effectiveness of a 5-week Computer Science Course in the SMASH Summer Academy</b>	<b>362</b>
<i>Alexis Martin, Allison Scott</i>	
<b>Creating An Environment Supportive Of Diversity in Computing</b>	<b>367</b>
<i>Paul Mullins, Deborah Whitfield, David Dailey, Beverly Gocal</i>	
<b>Microsoft Kinect Interface for Children's Education</b>	<b>374</b>
<i>Bryant Hicks, Jonathan Kissinger, Roger Lee</i>	
<b>Engaging Preadolescent Females in Computer Science Through Robotic Art</b>	<b>379</b>
<i>Brian McLaughlan</i>	
 <b>SESSION: TEACHING METHODS + TEACHING SUPPORT SYSTEMS AND TOOLS + CASE STUDIES</b> 	
<b>Teaching Hands-on Design in Systems Engineering Principles</b>	<b>387</b>
<i>Ken Ferens</i>	
<b>The Development An Interactive ibook Application To Harness The Next Generation of 'Computer Architecture' Educational Experiences</b>	<b>391</b>
<i>Fiona Carroll, Nathan Thomas, Mark Ware</i>	
<b>Using BDI-extended NetLogo Agents in Undergraduate CS Research and Teaching</b>	<b>396</b>
<i>Jonathan Wiens, Dagmar Monett</i>	
<b>A Problem Based Approach to Teaching Programming</b>	<b>403</b>
<i>Wayne Pullan, Steven Drew, Steven Tucker</i>	
<b>Computing Education and Research for High School Students Through Subject Modularization and Basic Software</b>	<b>409</b>
<i>Jiho Kim, Hwamog Kim, Seongjai Kim</i>	
<b>Incorporating Output Interface in Studying Computer Graphics in Computer Science</b>	<b>416</b>
<i>Hassan Farhat</i>	
<b>A Real-World Project to Apply Discrete Structures</b>	<b>422</b>
<i>Anja Remshagen</i>	

**Implementing Strategies To Improve A Video Game Programming Course** 429  
*Antonio Mejorado*

**A Monitored Student Testing Application Using Cloud Computing** 433  
*RamaKrishna Mullapudi, George Hsieh*

**Research of Computational Thinking-driven Teaching and Innovative Practice Pattern** 440  
*Zhanquan Wang, Jiang Liu, Chunhua Gu, Qingchun Hu, Xinxiu Wen*

**SESSION: POSTERS AND SHORT PAPERS**

**An Overview on Big Data** 447  
*Qiming Niu, Feng Liu, Chun Zhang, Jie Liu*

**Using an Insurance Company Database Example to Teach Database Design and Data Mining Principles** 450  
*Julia Bao, Chris Helwig*

**SESSION: DATA STRUCTURES, RESEARCH EXPERIENCE, ABET AND ASSESSMENT**

**An Analytical Study of Data Structure, Algorithms and Link Utilization of Perfect Difference Network** 455  
*Rakesh Kumar Katare, Narendra Shivaji Chaudhari, Shashi Kant Verma, Rajesh Roshan Raina*

**Modeling of Gravity Anomalies of Folds with Depth-dependent Density Contrast** 462  
*Abdulwahab Abokhodair, Abdulaziz Aldughaiter, Abdulmajeed Al-Zaharni, Ali Al-Mulla*

**Assessment Agent based ABET Criteria** 466  
*Abbas M. Al-Bakry*

**SESSION: LATE BREAKING PAPER: PARALLEL COMPUTING, CLOUD COMPUTING, SOFTWARE ENGINEERING AND PROGRAMMING + GROUP LEARNING**

**Haskell as an Introduction to Parallel Computing for Undergraduates** 475  
*Kyle Barton, Samuel Dodson, Danielle Fenske, Benjamin Whitehead, Jens Mache*

**Computing Education on Cloud** 479  
*Ying Xie, Ken Hoganson*

**Using a Multidisciplinary Research Project to Strengthen Learning in Software Engineering** 483  
*Wendy Lawrence-Fowler, Laura Grabowski, Richard Fowler*

<b>Evaluating a tool to Support Programming Learning</b>	<b>488</b>
<i>Carlos Costa, Manuela Aparicio</i>	
<b>Effects of Group Learning in Programming Class</b>	<b>495</b>
<i>Youngmi Kwon</i>	
<b>A Process for Updating Computer Science Curriculum for Non-Majors</b>	<b>499</b>
<i>Melis Oner, David Kaczynski, Roger Lee</i>	
<b>Should College Algebra be a Corequisite for Computer Science 1?</b>	<b>505</b>
<i>Christine Reilly, Emmett Tomai</i>	

# Accessibility evaluation of Chats and Forums in e-learning environments

R. Calvo<sup>1</sup>, B. Iglesias<sup>1</sup>, A. Gil<sup>1</sup> and A. Iglesias<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Computer Science, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Leganés, Madrid, Spain

**Abstract** - Collaborative learning is useful for students in their learning process. Nowadays, most e-learning systems include Computer Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) tools like chats and forums; however, are they accessible for everybody? This paper presents a heuristic evaluation of accessibility of two CSCL tools (chat and forum) in four web-based, open-source Learning Content Management Systems (LCMS): Moodle, ATutor, dotLRN and Claroline. The evaluation results show that the CSCL tools evaluated present accessibility barriers which are a handicap for many students who want to use the LCMSs. Moreover, some recommendations are offered in order to improve the accessibility of the evaluated tools. Considering these recommendations in the development of the evaluated tools, all students could participate actively in the collaborative tasks proposed by teachers.

**Keywords:** Accessibility; Computer Supported Collaborative Learning Tools; Chats; Forums; Learning Content Management Systems.

## 1 Introduction

Nowadays, many educational centers combine their traditional learning based on face-to-face classes and electronic learning (e-learning) systems based on web sites [1]. These e-learning systems are created with Learning Content Management Systems (LCMS) or Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) [2]. It is software which facilitates the creation and management of courses. Among all their functionalities, LCMSs offer typically tools to share materials, to assess or to collaborate. With regard to the collaborative tools, which are usually named Computer Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) tools, there are many tools which help users in the collaborative process. Some of the most important CSCL tools are chats and forums, which are really useful for students. However, some students cannot access to these CSCL environments because they have accessibility barriers. As a result, these LCMSs do not accomplish with some educational laws.

The main goal of this research work is to answer the question: are the chat and forum of the most used LCMSs (Moodle, ATutor, dotLRN and Claroline) accessible for everybody? To achieve it, a heuristic accessibility evaluation is carried out from the point of view of World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) guidelines. Then, considering the obtained results, some recommendations are specified to improve the accessibility of the

evaluated tools.

## 2 State of art

### 2.1 Accessibility: laws and guidelines

Everybody has the right to access to the Information Technologies (IT) in spite of their disabilities, age, technical environment or circumstances. Thus, there are different accessibility standards, guidelines and laws which try to normalize or regulate access to ITs and learning environments.

From the point of view of IT laws, United States of America (USA) has created a law to protect the rights of people with disabilities, Section 508 [3] and Europe developed the Recommendation 2006/952/EC on the Protection of Minors and Human Dignity in Audiovisual and Information Services [4].

On the other hand, there are laws and recommendations which enshrine the rights of every student, nevertheless of their abilities and functional diversity. For instance, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) conventions, recommendations and declarations [5] and the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities [6], in particular article 24 on education, consider that discrimination in education is a violation of the human rights. Moreover, United Kingdom has specified the law Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) [7] for education and USA has created the law Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) [8].

With regard to the accessibility standards and guidelines that LCMSs must accomplish, W3C provides some accessibility guidelines like Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines (ATAG) [9] and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) [10], which has been converted in a ISO standard the ISO/IEC 40500:2012 Information technology -- W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 [11].

### 2.2 Computer supported collaborative learning tools and accessibility barriers

CSCL tools provide teachers and students benefits such as: share information and knowledge; facilitate the communication between them or allow them to participate in their learning process in an effective way [12]. Chat and Forum are two of the most useful CSCL tools in e-learning systems [13]. These tools allow students to exchange information and to communicate with other students or teachers easily.

Currently, an active participation in these CSCL tools is really useful for students and this participation is even taken into account for the final marks by some teachers [14]. However, some students cannot access to these tools because they present accessibility barriers. Previous studies have detected that the basic functions of LCMSs usually present accessibility barriers [15].

Specifically in CSCL tools, preliminary evaluations detected the main accessibility problems that forums and chats have [16]. These problems are explained in detail in this research work.

With regard to Chats, some specific accessibility barriers have been detected in previous research works. For instance, screen reader users have accessibility problems if the website is auto-refreshing continuously and it is not tagged properly because it causes the screen reader restarts [17]. Moreover, if the user is not informed about new opened Windows or new created buttons the user can be disoriented [18]. Besides, if one of the emitters is not able to write quickly, he could not be able to follow the conversation [19].

On the other hand, Forums present also specific accessibility barriers because these tools used to have a What You See Is What You Get (WYSIWYG) feature which is not accessible for some users [20]. Furthermore, this tool allows users to create content and, if the user is not an accessibility expert, s/he could generate inaccessible content. For instance, s/he could use tables for layout or colors without a minimum contrast [21].

However, none of these previous evaluations carried out heuristic accessibility evaluations of these tools from the point of view of W3C guidelines. Thus, the main goal of this research is to detect the main accessibility barriers that people have to face when use these tools in four of the most used CSCL environments.

## 3 Evaluation

The details of the heuristic evaluation of accessibility carried out in this study are described in next subsections.

### 3.1 Evaluation objective and environment

The main objective of the paper is to evaluate the accessibility of a synchronous and an asynchronous tool because they have different ways of interaction. Previous studies have demonstrated the usefulness of the chat and forum as synchronous and asynchronous CSCL tools respectively. Thus, this research is focused on the evaluation of the chat and forum tools in the selected e-learning systems from the point of view of accessibility. Moreover, as the study reveals accessibility barriers, some recommendations are specified to correct them.

With regard to the LCMSs selected, four of the most used web-based, open-source LCMS in the world have been chosen for the comparative study: Atutor 2.0.3<sup>1</sup>, Claroline 1.10.6<sup>2</sup>, dotLrn 2.4<sup>3</sup> and Moodle 2.0.5<sup>4</sup>. Furthermore, all of them take into account accessibility in their development.

The accessibility evaluation includes two different perspectives: one evaluates the accessibility of the interface in all CSCL tools; and the other evaluates the accessibility of the CSCL tool as an authoring tool.

Thus, to achieve it the WCAG 2.0 (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines)[10] and the ATAG 2.0 (Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines)[9] are considered. These guidelines are divided into different priority levels, from A to AAA. For this evaluation, the priority level selected is the AA conformance level because it is the minimum accessibility level required by the law; thus, the tool should accomplish with the A and AA guidelines.

### 3.2 Method for evaluation

A heuristic evaluation has been carried out by three different accessibility experts. According to the methodology and recommendations of W3C [22], the interface evaluation of the CSCL tools was conducted automatically, semi-automatically and manually from the perspective of WCAG 2.0. In this case, the automatic tools used were TAW<sup>5</sup> and Hera<sup>6</sup> and the semi-automatic tool was WAVE<sup>7</sup>.

On the other hand, the accessibility evaluation of the CSCL tools from the point of view of an authoring tool was carried out manually and with the help of semi-automatic tools according to the ATAG 2.0 draft guidelines. Considering that, to the knowledge of the authors of this article, no automatic tools exist currently for this kind of evaluations but the semi-automatic tool WAVE was used.

### 3.3 Evaluation results

This section presents the main results obtained in the heuristic evaluation. These results indicate that accessibility barriers are presented in the CSCL tools of each LCMS evaluated. Actually, the analysis of the findings shows that none of the collaborative tools accomplish even the A priority level of WCAG or ATAG guidelines.

The obtained results are summarized in Table 1. The errors have been categorized in general errors (E1 to E14) depending on the nature of the error. For instance, the category E1 groups the WCAG 2.0 and ATAG 2.0 guidelines which are related with non-textual content. Thus, it considers that non-textual content in the system should need alternative information in order to be accessible. Table 1 shows the Code of error (name of the category) and the WCAG 2.0 and ATAG 2.0 guidelines which are related to this category. For instance, guidelines 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.5 and 4.1.2 of WCAG 2.0 and guidelines A.1.1.1, A.1.2.1, A.1.2.2, A.2.1.1 and A.2.1.2 of ATAG 2.0.

On the other hand, Table 2 and Table 3, which are showed in the Annex 1, detail the errors found in the CSCL tools and how they have been categorized in this paper (code and description).

According to the results, the most accessible chat tools are the chats of Moodle and ATutor, because they accomplish more guidelines of A priority level than the others tools. Moreover, they try to solve one of the specific accessibility problems of chats, the auto-refresh.

On the other hand, the most accessible forum is the forum in DotLRN because it is the tool which fulfills more accessibility guidelines of A priority level. However, all of the tools present accessibility problems and none of them help the author to create accessible content.

A complete list of accessibility barriers presented in each collaborative tool for each LCMS can be found at the website <http://labda.inf.uc3m.es/Evaluations><sup>8</sup>. Next, the main accessibility barriers found are explained for each CSCL tool: chat and forum.

<sup>1</sup> Atutor. <http://atutor.ca/atutor/> (May 2013)

<sup>2</sup> Claroline. <http://www.claroline.net/?lang=en> (May 2013)

<sup>3</sup> dotLrn. <http://www.dotlrn.org/index.html> (May 2013)

<sup>4</sup> Moodle. <https://moodle.org/> (May 2013)

<sup>5</sup> TAW. <http://www.tawdis.net/> (May 2013)

<sup>6</sup> Hera <http://www.sidar.org/hera/> (May 2013)

<sup>7</sup> Wave. <http://wave.webaim.org/> (May 2013)

<sup>8</sup> Password: EVALUATIONS



**Table 1. Relationship between errors categories and WCAG and ATAG guidelines**


Code	WCAG 2.0	ATAG 2.0
E1_ NonTextualContent	1.1.1;1.2.1;1.2.2; 1.2.3;1.2.5; 4.1.2	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1; A.1.2.2;A.2.1.1; A.2.1.2
E2_ Information	1.3.1;1.3.2;1.4.3 2.4.2;2.4.4;2.4.5 2.4.6;2.4.7;3.1.1 3.1.2;3.2.2;3.2.3 3.3.2	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2
E3_ Sensorial	1.3.3;1.4.1	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2
E4_ Focus	2.4.3;2.4.7	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2
E5_ Personalization	1.4.2;2.2.1;2.2.2	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2;A.3.2.2 A.3.3.1;A.3.6.2
E6_ Keyboard	2.1.1;2.1.2;2.4.1 2.4.3; 3.2.2	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2;A.3.1.1 A.3.1.2;A.3.1.3
E7_ ControlErrors	3.3.1;3.3.3	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2
E8_ StandardErrors	4.1.1	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2
E9_ EditingViews	--	A.1.1.1;A.1.2.1 A.1.2.2;A.2.2.1 A.2.2.2;A.3.4.1 A.3.5.1, A.3.7.1
E10_ ImproveSession	--	A.3.2.1, A.3.2.2
E11_ Documentation	--	A.4.2.1, A.4.2.2; B.2.4.1
E12_ Generation Accessible Content	--	B.1.1.1;B.1.1.2 B.1.2.2;B.1.2.1 B.1.2.4
E13_ Produce Accessible Content	--	B.2.1.1;B.2.2.1 B.2.2.2;B.2.3.2 B.2.3.3;B.2.4.1 B.2.4.2;B.3.1.1 B.3.1.2
E14_ AccessibilityFeatures	--	B.4.1.1;B.4.1.3 B.4.1.4;B.4.1.5 B.4.2.1;B.4.2.2

### 3.3.1 Chat

With regard to the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, some errors can be highlighted in chats. All the non-textual content must contain alternative information; however, none of the tools provide a description for all images (E1). Moreover, the information is not well-structured or visualized (E2). For instance, the headers and the website title are not used properly in each chat tools evaluated. The Figure 1 DotLRN uses headers in an improper way because it specifies the left menu and not the page structure. Moreover, Moodle and Claroline do not follow a proper logic order and

Atutor does not use headings in the chat but it is not showed because the result is null.

**Figure 1. Headings**




Besides, the contrast ratio is not the minimum in the chats except in Moodle (E3) as it is shown in the Figure 2. Thus, the user is not able to distinguish the information showed in the chat.

**Figure 2. Contrast Ratio in Chats**



The focus is not visible in all the evaluated chats except of Moodle and the focus order is correct only in Claroline (E4). Related to the error category E5, all chats except the chat of Moodle and Atutor do not allow adjusting the timing. Thus, the time of the conversation cannot be stopped, paused or adjusted. For instance, as it is shown in the Figure 3, the Atutor chat allows the user to specify the time interval to refresh the chat and if the user prefers to refresh the chat manually. Moreover, the user can specify the sound of the new messages but he cannot disable the sound of new connected users, for example.

**Figure 3. Atutor Chat Preferences**



Other important error is that the user is not able to control any chat with the keyboard exclusively (E6). With regard to error E7, Claroline and Atutor do not check all the errors that the user


can commit. For instance, the user could send blank messages. Finally, all the tools have webpages which have not been developed using web standards as HTML or CSS (E8).

From the point of view of ATAG guidelines it is important to emphasize that this module produces fewer content than forums. Thus, there are fewer accessibility guidelines which are not fulfilled. The first guideline of the ATAG makes a reference to the accomplishment of the WCAG; so, as it has been explained before, there are many WCAG guidelines (errors from E1 to E8) which are not fulfilled. Moreover, when the authoring tool generates content, this content is not accessible (E12) as it is shown in the figures, Figure 1 and Figure 2; Furthermore, the author cannot check the accessibility of the content created by himself automatically or semi-automatically (E13) because there is not functionalities for it. Finally, the documentation of the e-learning tools does not provide accessibility information to inform the user about the accessibility functionalities and the accessibility problems that users can face when they use chats (E11, E14).

### 3.3.2 Forum

Regarding to the content, according to WCAG 2.0, a general error that exists in all the forums is that alternative text is not provided for the images and likewise subtitles or audio-descriptions files are not provided for the uploaded videos (E1). Moreover, there are not elements to make the navigation easier within the application and some pages do not have an appropriate title (E2). Also, Claroline, Moodle and DotLRN use colors to represent the elements that are enabled or disabled (E3). The Figure 4 shows the WYSIWYG Editors of Claroline, Moodle and DotLRN which use colors to represent the enabled or disabled buttons. Besides, there are elements which are not accessible and manageable through keyboard and the focus is not visible (E4, E6). For instance, the WYSIWYG editors used in the LCMSs are not accessible by keyboard (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. WYSIWYG Editors




Finally, ATutor does not allow to personalize the audio (E5), Claroline does not control the errors produced by the users (E7) and all the tools evaluated have bugs in the code and style sheet (E8).

Considering the ATAG 2.0 guidelines, all the tools have accessibility problems related to the WCAG (errors from E1 to E8). Thus, they do not accomplish the first guideline of the ATAG. Claroline and Atutor do not show the status messages and the text presentation in a programmatic way and all tools, except Moodle, do not allow searching through the content (E9). Moreover, ATutor cannot preview the content properly (E9) and Claroline does not auto-save the content (E10). The tools evaluated do not provide a mechanism to verify the accessibility of that content and the generated content is not accessible (E12). Furthermore, the tools do not suggest and serve as a guide to the author, in the same way it must warn about accessibility errors when needed (E13). For


instance, Claroline allows users to include templates in the generated content. However, this content is not accessible because it includes a table for layout as it is shown in the Figure 5 and the template does not specify its accessibility level.

Figure 5. Insert Predefined Template Content



Moreover, ATutor provides accessibility features; however, these features are not activated by default, see error E14.

Figure 6. Accessibility Features Are Not Activated by Default



Finally, none of the tools provide clear and complete instructions about the use of the tool, including accessibility examples and documentation related to the accessibility (E11, E14).

## 4 Recommendations

Considering the evaluation results obtained from this research work, a set of recommendations has been elaborated in order to improve the accessibility of the chat and forum tools for the four LCMS. A summary of them is list next:

- **Provide textual information:** The chat and the forum should provide textual information for the non-textual content showed in the interface. For instance, every image should have alternative content, every video uploaded should include subtitles and audio-description and every text input should have a label associated.
- **Keyboard:** The CSCL tools should be controlled completely through keyboard. For instance, users who cannot use the mouse would not have any handicap to use it.
- **Skip content:** The CSCL tools should include mechanisms to skip content or use shortcuts.
- **Avoid errors:** The tools should help the author to avoid errors like sending blank messages or creating inaccessibility content. It is important to remark that authors could not be accessibility experts and even expert users can commit errors.
- **Web standards:** All the webpages and style sheets should be created without code errors and according to web standards like HTML, CSS, etc.
- **Check accessibility:** The tools should inform the authors about the accessibility errors and how to solve them.

- **Accessibility documentation:** The tools should provide documentation related to accessibility features and how to create accessible content as well as complete documentation about the entire tool.

Specifically for the chat tool, due to its synchronous character, it is really important for the users to be able to stop, control and adjust the time of auto-refreshing the sentences. Thus, users could be able to follow the conversation without any problem.

Finally, the forum tool should check the accessibility of the content generated by the authors. Thus, the tool should control the accessibility automatically and inform the authors when there were accessibility errors in their content and how to solve them. Moreover, the tool should allow searching through the content and if the tool allows previews of the content, the previewed content should be showed properly.

## 5 Conclusion

The study presented in this paper lay out the accessibility barriers that students and teachers usually face when using chat and forum as CSCL tools in e-learning systems and offers a set of general and specific recommendations to solve these barriers.

This comparative study is based on a heuristic evaluation of four of the most used LCMSs worldwide: Moodle, Atutor, Claroline and dotLRN. The research concludes that every CSCL tool in each LCMS present accessibility barriers. The most accessible chat tools are the ones of Atutor and Moodle, which also incorporate ways to control the auto-refresh of the website. On the other hand, the most accessible forum tool is the DotLRN forum because it accomplishes more guidelines of A priority level,

Currently we are working in evaluating the accessibility of other collaborative tools in e-learning systems and moreover we are preparing a user evaluation of all these tools.

## 6 Acknowledgments

This research work has been supported by the Regional Government of Madrid under the Research Network MA2VICMR (S2009/TIC-1542) and by the Spanish Ministry of Economy under the project MULTIMEDICA (TIN2010-20644-C03-01).

## 7 References

- [1] Clark, R. and Mayer, R. 2011. *E-Learning and the Science of Instruction*. John Willey and Sons.
- [2] Pizzutilo, S., Tangorra, F., and De Carolis, B. 2005. An e-learning environment based on open-source software. In *Proceedings of the 4th WSEAS international Conference on Telecommunications and informatics* (Prague, Czech Republic, March 13-15, 2005) pp. 1-6.
- [3] Sección 508 United States Laws, Overview of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Sections 504 and 508). (1998). <http://www.section508.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Content&ID=12>
- [4] Recommendation 2006/952/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of minors and human dignity . (2006) [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/audiovisual\\_and\\_media/l24030a\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/audiovisual_and_media/l24030a_en.htm)
- [5] UNESCO. Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960) [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=12949&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)
- [6] Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (2006) <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>
- [7] Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) of 1995. (1995) [http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/RightsAndObligations/DisabilityRights/DG\\_4001068](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/RightsAndObligations/DisabilityRights/DG_4001068)
- [8] Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004. (2004) <http://idea.ed.gov/>
- [9] W3C. Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines. 2012. <http://www.w3.org/TR/ATAG20/>
- [10] W3C. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. 2008. <http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG/>
- [11] ISO/IEC 40500:2012 Information technology -- W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0. [http://www.iso.org/iso\\_catalogue/catalogue\\_tc/catalogue\\_detail.htm?csnumber=58625](http://www.iso.org/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=58625)
- [12] Soller, A. (2001) Supporting Social Interaction in an Intelligent Collaborative Learning System International *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 12, 40–62
- [13] Curran, K. (2002) A Web-based collaboration teaching environment. *IEEE Multimedia*, 9, 3. (Jul-Sept 2002) 72-76. DOI= 10.1109/MMUL.2002.1022860
- [14] Shih, C. and Gamon, J. (2002) Relationships among learning strategies, patterns, styles and achievement in web-based courses. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 43, 4. 1-11. DOI= 10.5032/jae.2002.04001
- [15] Iglesias, A., Moreno, L., Martínez, P. and Calvo, R. (2011) Evaluating the accessibility of three open-source learning content management systems: a comparative study. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*. (June 2011) DOI= 10.1002/cae.20557
- [16] Calvo, R., Gil, A., Iglesias, B. and Iglesias, A. (2013) Are Chats and Forums accessible in e-learning systems? A heuristic evaluation comparing four Learning Content Management Systems. In *proceedings of the ITiCSE 2013*, Canterbury, UK, July 1-3, 2013. ACM. (In press)
- [17] Lazar, J., Allen, A., Kleinman, J. And Malarkey C. (2007) What Frustrates Screen Reader Users on the Web:A Study of 100 Blind Users. *Internation Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*. 22, 3, 247–269.
- [18] Harrison, L. (2002). Access to online learning: the role of the courseware authoring tool developer. *Library Hi Tech*. 20, 4. 433-440 DOI= 10.1108/07378830210452631
- [19] Guenaga, M., Burguer, D. and Oliver, J. Computers Helping People with Special Needs. In *proceedings 9th International Conference, ICCHP 2004*, Paris, France, July 7-9, 2004 Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2004, Volume 3118/2004, 626
- [20] Moreno, L., Martínez, P. and Ruiz, B.(2008) Guiding accessibility issues in the design of websites. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual ACM international conference on Design of communication, SIGDOC 2008*, Lisbon, Portugal, Sept. 22-24, 2008. ACM, DOI= 10.1145/1456536.1456550
- [21] Taras, C., Siemoneit, O., Weisser, N., Rotard, M. and Ertl, T. (2008) Improving the Accessibility of Wikis. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Computer Helping*

People with Special Needs, ICCHP 2008, Linz, Austria, July 9-11, 2008. Springer. DOI= 10.1007/978-3-540-70540-6\_62

[22] W3C (2005), WAI, Conformance Evaluation of Websites for Accessibility.  
<http://www.w3.org/WAI/eval/conformance.html>

## 8 Annex 1

The Annex shows the errors found in the evaluation and they are summarized in Table 2 and Table 3. These tables are divided

into four columns: Code, Description, Important Errors and Tools. The first column shows the code of the error. These codes are the groups in which the errors of the column *Important Errors* are grouped. To carry out this aggregation, it has been considered the experience of the authors according to the nature of the errors. The column *Description* specifies more information about the error shown in the column *Code*. Finally, the column *Tools* specifies which are the tools that present this error.

**Table 2. Error description and code of the Accessibility Problems Found in Chats and Forums. Errors E1-E7**

Code	Description	Important Errors	Tools*
E1_ NonTextual Content	The non-textual content does not have alternative information	The images do not have alternative content or do not ask you to provide them. (A)	All
		Videos or audio cannot be uploaded with alternative content. (A)	MF  DF  CF  AF
		There are not labels for input text. (A)	All
E2_ Information	The information is not well structured, visualized or represented.	Headers are not used properly. (A)	All (Ex. AF)
		The title is not descriptive. (A)	All (Ex. CC)
		The links are not descriptive and there are link icons without identification purpose. (A)	CF   AF   AC
		Multiple ways of navigation (AA)	AC
		Coherent navigation (AA)	CF   CC
		Website language (A  AA)	All (Ex. AF  AC)
		Meaningful Sequence and visible focus. (A AA)	CF  CC  DF   DC
		The tool uses pop-ups (A)	MF  MC  CF  CC
E3_ Sensorial	There is information which is related to colors, shapes, etc.	There are icons which are not specified with text. (A)	All
		The tool uses color to specify information. (A)	CF   DF  MF   MC
E4_ Focus	The focus cannot be seen	Visible focus (AA)	CF   DF   DC
		Focus order (A)	AF   AC   CF
E5_ Personaliza tion	The user cannot personalize the content or features	The user cannot control the audio. (A)	AF   AC
		The user cannot personalize the autorefresh (A)	DC   CC
		The time session is not adjustable. (ATAG) (A)	CF   CC
		Visual information cannot be stopped (ATAG) (A)	AF   AC
E6_ Keyboard	The user cannot access to all the information through keyboard	The author settings are not preserved (ATAG) (A  AA)	AF   AC
		There are elements which cannot be selected or there are keyboard traps. (A)	All (Ex. DF  CC)
		The web cannot be navigated sequentially by keyboard (A)	MF  MC  AC
		There are no mechanisms to skip content. (A)	CF   CC
E7_ ControlErr ors	The tool does not inform the user about errors	There are no shortcuts or they are overlapped (ATAG) (AA)	AC   CF   CC
		The user can send information without text and the tool does not alert about it. (A  AA)	CF   CC   AC
		The user cannot cancel the action. (A)	DC

\*Values: Moodle Forum (MF); Moodle Chat (MC); dotLRN Forum (DF); dotRN Chat (DC); ATutor Forum (AF); ATutor Chat (AC); Claroline Forum (CF); or Claroline Chat (CC); All if all tools present this error; or All (Ex: XY) which means that all the evaluated tools have the error except the tools specified in the parenthesis.

**Table 3. Error description and code of the Accessibility Problems Found in Chats and Forums. Errors E8-E14**

Code	Description	Important Errors	Tools*
E8_StandardErrors	The tool does not accomplish standards and guidelines	The HTML and CSS code contain errors (A)	All (Ex. MF   MC)
E9_EditingViews	The editing view is not accessible	The editing view does not show the status messages or the text presentation in a programmatically way. (A)	CF CC AF AC
		The user cannot navigate through content structures. (AA)	All (Ex. CC)
		Text search through the content (AA)	MF DF AC CF
		The content cannot be previewed properly. (A)	AF
E10_ImproveSession	The tool does not autosave the information.	The tool does not autosave the information. (A)	CF CC
E11_Documentation	Accessibility documentation	The documentation is not complete and does not include information related to accessibility (A AA)	All
E12_GenerationAccessibleContent	Fully automatic processes must produce accessible content	The generated content during session is not accessible. (A)	All (Ex. CC)
		The content generated after session is not accessible (A)	MF MC DF DC
		Transformations and copies do not preserve the accessibility (A)	CF   AF  AC
E13_ProduceAccessibleContent	Authors must be supported in producing accessible content	The author has restrictions which do not allow him to create accessible content (A)	AF   CF
		Authors are not guided to produce accessible content (A)	CF CC AF AC
		The tool does not check the accessibility (A)	All
		The tool provide default alternative text which does not identify the element (A)	AF
		Templates are not accessible and do not specify its accessibility level. (A)	All (Ex. CC)
E14_AccessibilityFeatures	Authoring tools must promote and integrate their accessibility features	The accessibility features are not activated by default (A)	AF AC
		If the user deactivates an accessibility function the tool does not inform about the problem. (AA)	AF AC
		The tool does not inform about accessibility of each format and does not check it. (AA)	All
		There is not documentation related to accessibility and how to implement it (A)	All

\*Values: Moodle Forum (MF); Moodle Chat (MC); dotLRN Forum (DF); dotRN Chat (DC); ATutor Forum (AF); ATutor Chat (AC); Claroline Forum (CF); or Claroline Chat (CC); All if all tools present this error; or All (Ex: XY) which means that all the evaluated tools have the error except the tools specified in the parenthesis.