Section One:
Introduction / Overview:- Terry Gibson, University of Wisconsin

Quality Standards:

Sloan Foundation:

The Distance Education and Training Council:

Pew Foundation – Center for Academic Transformation

Institute for Higher Education Policy:
*Quality On the Line – Benchmarks for Success in Internet –Based Distance Education* (2000)  [http://www.ihep.com](http://www.ihep.com)

American Council on Education:
*Guiding Principles for Distance Learning in a Learning Society* (Last modified March, 2002)  [http://www.acenet.edu/calec/dist_learning/index.cfm](http://www.acenet.edu/calec/dist_learning/index.cfm)

Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications:
*Good Practices in Distance Education* (1997)  [http://www.wiche.edu](http://www.wiche.edu)

American Distance Education Consortium:
ADEC Guiding Principles for Distance Learning  [http://www.adec.edu/admin/papers/distance-learning_principles.html](http://www.adec.edu/admin/papers/distance-learning_principles.html)

American Federation of Teachers:

Additional Resources:
Distance Education Clearinghouse, University of Wisconsin – Extension  [http://www.uwex.edu/disted/home.html](http://www.uwex.edu/disted/home.html)
Common Denominators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sloan</th>
<th>Pew</th>
<th>ACE</th>
<th>WICHE</th>
<th>ADEC</th>
<th>DETC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain technological and human infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustain administrative and organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation and Assessment</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Research</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Issues:**

1. Quality is in the eyes of the beholder:
   - Institution
   - Faculty
   - Current Students
   - Alumni
   - Accrediting Bodies
   - Funders – Institutions, Programs, Courses
   - Benefactors

2. Establishing Benchmarks:
   - Within distance education program
   - Across comparable programs within an institution
   - Across comparable programs at other comparable institutions

3. Research and Evaluation Metrics

4. Stakeholder Involvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Process/Practice</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Progress Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Effectiveness</td>
<td>Quality of learning online is at least as good as the quality the institution provides in traditional programs.</td>
<td>Academic integrity and control reside with faculty in the same way as for traditional programs in the institution.</td>
<td>Faculty and student perception surveys or sampled interviews compare learning effectiveness in delivery modes. Effectiveness measures are identified.</td>
<td>Faculty report online learning is equivalent or better. Direct assessment of student learning is equivalent or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>All learners who are qualified and motivated are enabled to complete a course, program or degree through online learning.</td>
<td>Program entry processes inform learners of opportunities, and ensure that qualified, motivated learners have reliable access. Integrated student support services are available online to learners.</td>
<td>Administrative and technical infrastructure provides access to all prospective and enrolled learners. Institutional reporting mechanisms collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative indicators.</td>
<td>Qualitative indicators show continuous improvement in growth and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Every learner who completes a course is satisfied with: Level of interaction with faculty and other students; Learning outcomes matching the course description; Adequacy and appropriateness of technology and support.</td>
<td>Faculty/learner interaction is provided in a timely and substantive manner. Adequate and fair systems assess course learning objectives and results as used for improving learning.</td>
<td>Metrics show growing satisfaction: Surveys and/or interviews similar to those above (Learning Effectiveness); Alumni surveys, referrals, testimonials; Outcomes measures; Faculty/mentor/advisor perceptions.</td>
<td>Satisfaction measures show continually increasing improvement. Institutional surveys, interviews, and other metrics show satisfaction levels are equivalent of better than those of other delivery modes for the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Satisfaction</td>
<td>Sustain and increase faculty participation and satisfaction in online teaching. Integrate faculty online and face-to-face with online purposes and practices.</td>
<td>Processes that ensure faculty participation in matters particular to online education (e.g., intellectual property, royalty sharing, etc.)</td>
<td>Repeat teaching of online courses by individual faculty.</td>
<td>Data from post course surveys show continuous improvement. Willingness to teach additional online courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Institutional business practices generate and support stable, high quality educational online programs</td>
<td>Tuition rates provide a fair return to the institution and best value to learners; and are equivalent to on-campus tuition. Institutional commitment to online program.</td>
<td>Effective measures are identified. Institutional stakeholders show support for participation in online education.</td>
<td>The institution sustains, expands, and scales upward as desired; strengthens and disseminates its mission and core values through online education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Two: Learning Effectiveness - Karen Swan, Kent State University**

**Sloan-C Five Pillars of Quality Online Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Process/Practice</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Progress Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Effectiveness</td>
<td>Quality of learning online is at least as good as the quality the institution provides in traditional programs.</td>
<td>Academic integrity and control reside with faculty in the same way as for traditional programs in the institution.</td>
<td>Faculty and student perception surveys or sampled interviews compare learning effectiveness in delivery modes.</td>
<td>Faculty report online learning is equivalent or better. Direct assessment of student learning is equivalent or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationships between Interactions and Learning in Online Environments**

adapted from Rourke, et. al's (2001) community of inquiry model
### Effects and Principles of Multimedia Learning, adapted from Mayer, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects/Principles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODALITY EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer from animation &amp; narration than for animation &amp; on-screen text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMEDIA EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer from animation and narration than from narration alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTIGUITY EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when corresponding narration &amp; animation are presented simultaneously rather than successively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONALIZATION EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when narration is in conversational rather than formal style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHERENCE EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when irrelevant video, narration &amp;/or sounds are excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUNDANCY EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer from animation &amp; narration than from animation, narration &amp; on-screen text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETRAINING EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when training on components precedes rather than follows a narrated animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when organization of narrations are signaled rather than non-signaled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACING EFFECT</td>
<td>Better transfer when the pace of presentation is under learner rather than program control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### When designing a multimedia explanation . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODALITY PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Present words in spoken form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMEDIA PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Use both words and pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTIGUITY PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Present corresponding words and pictures at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONALIZATION PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Present words in conversational style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHERENCE PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Avoid extraneous video and audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUNDANCY PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Do not add redundant on-screen text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETRAINING PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Begin the presentation with concise descriptions of the components of the concept you are presenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Provide signaling as to organization of the narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACING PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>Allow the learner to control the pace of the presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction with Interface Conceptualized

Vicarious Interaction Conceptualized, adapted from Sutton, 2001
# Interaction with Content: Research Findings and Practical Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH FINDING</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interactions with course interfaces are a real factor in learning; difficult or  | Work with major platforms to improve interfaces to support learning.  
| negative interactions with interfaces can depress learning.                     | Develop consistent interfaces for all courses in a program.  
|                                                                                 | Provide orientations to program interfaces that help students develop useful mental models of them.  
|                                                                                 | Provide 24/7 support for students and faculty.  
|                                                                                 | Make human tutors available.                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Greater clarity and consistency in course design, organization, goals, and      | Review courses taught &/or being developed to insure clarity & consistency.  
| instructor expectations leads to increased learning.                            | Establish quality control guidelines that address issues of clarity & consistency.  
|                                                                                 | Address issues of course design & organization & instructional goals & expectations in faculty development.                                                                                                           |
| Better learning from narration and animation presented simultaneously, in        | Present words in spoken form  
| conversational style, with irrelevant elements and on-screen text eliminated      | Use both words and pictures simultaneously  
|                                                                                 | Avoid extraneous video & audio  
|                                                                                 | Do not add redundant on-screen text                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Better learning when components of concepts are addressed, when organization is  | Begin presentations with descriptions of components & organization  
| signaled, * when pace of presentation is learner-controlled                       | Allow learners to control the pace of presentations                                                                                                                                                                    |
|                                                                                 | Encourage experimentation, divergent thinking, multiple perspectives, complex understanding & reflection in online discussion through provocative, open-ended questions, modeling & support & encouragement for diverse points of view.  
|                                                                                 | Develop grading rubrics for discussion participation that reward desired cognitive behaviors.  
|                                                                                 | Develop initial course activities to encourage the development of swift trust.                                                                                                                                           |
| Online discussion/learning may be more supportive of experimentation, divergent   | Use other course activities to support these such as written assignments, one-on-one tutorials, small group collaboration & self-testing.  
| thinking, exploration of multiple perspectives, complex understanding &           | Develop grading rubrics for discussion participation that reward desired cognitive behaviors.                                                                                                                            |
| reflection than F2F discussion.                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Online discussion/learning may be less supportive of convergent thinking,        | Automate testing & feedback when possible  
| instructor directed inquiry & scientific thinking than F2F discussion.         | Provide frequent opportunities for testing & feedback  
|                                                                                 | Develop general learning modules w/ opportunities for active learning, assessment & feedback that can be shared among courses &/or accessed by students for remediation or enrichment                                                   |
| Ongoing assessment of student performance linked to immediate feedback &         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| individualized instruction supports learning.                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
### Interaction with Instructors: Research Findings and Practical Implication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH FINDING</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quantity and quality of instructor interactions with students is linked to student learning.</td>
<td>Provide frequent opportunities for both public and private interactions with students. Establish clear expectations for instructor-student interactions. Provide timely &amp; supportive feedback. Include topic of instructor interaction in faculty development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor roles are changed in online environments.</td>
<td>Include the topic of changing roles in faculty development &amp; provide examples of how other instructors have coped. Provide ongoing educational technology support for faculty. Develop forums for faculty discussion of changing roles – online &amp; F2F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching presence – design &amp; organization, facilitating discourse &amp; direct instruction – is linked to student learning</td>
<td>Highlight three elements of teaching presence in faculty development &amp; provide examples of how to improve in each area. Provide ongoing support for instructors in each of these areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interaction with Classmates: Research Findings and Practical Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH FINDING</th>
<th>IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning occurs socially within communities of practice; there is greater variability in sense of community ratings among online courses than in F2F courses.</td>
<td>Design community-building activities. Model the use of cohesive immediacy behaviors in all interactions with students. Develop initial course activities to encourage the development of swift trust. Address issues of community in faculty development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal immediacy behaviors can lesson the psychological distance between communicators online; overall sense of social presence is linked to learning.</td>
<td>Develop initial course activities to encourage the development of swift trust. Model &amp; encourage the use of verbal immediacy behaviors in interactions with students. Encourage students to share experiences &amp; beliefs in online discussion. Introduce social presence &amp; verbal immediacy in faculty development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning is related to the quantity &amp; quality of postings in online discussions &amp; to the value instructors place on them.</td>
<td>Make participation in discussion a significant part of course grades. Develop grading rubrics for discussion participation. Require discussion participants to respond to their classmates postings &amp;/or to respond to all responses to their own postings. Stress the unique nature &amp; potential of online discussion in faculty development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious interaction in online course discussion may be an important source of learning from them.</td>
<td>Encourage &amp; support vicarious interaction. Require discussion summaries that identify steps in the knowledge creation process. Use tracking mechanisms to reward reading as well as responding to messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion threads die when participants don’t respond to them immediately</td>
<td>Make students responsible for sustaining discussion threads. Make students summarize discussion threads. Require students to incorporate materials from the discussions in their assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


### RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

#### COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF ONLINE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measure(s) of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Progress Indices</th>
<th>Institution and Research Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Commitment** | Cost reduction | Lower instructional expenses while holding student enrollments steady. | Cost savings per student ranged from $31 (University of Central Florida) to $105 (University at Buffalo) while enrollments remained constant or increased slightly. | Penn State  
U at Buffalo  
U of Central Florida  
U of Colorado-Boulder  
U of Illinois-Urbana  
UW-Madison  
VA Tech  
For individual school results, see http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award.html  
See Pew Grant Round I Actual Savings Summary at http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html |
| | Cost containment | Increase student enrollments without additional expense. | Increased section sizes at IUPUI and University of Southern Maine resulted in goal achievement. Rio Salado met its objective by reallocating a faculty member’s time across course sections and adding a course assistant. | IUPUI  
Rio Salado  
U. Southern Maine  
See Pew Grant Round I Actual Savings Summary at http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measure(s) of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Progress Indices</th>
<th>Institution and Research Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Commitment** | Maximize available resources | Form partnerships and consortia to leverage costs and benefits to the institution. | Through the development of a college/university consortium, the Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA) has been able to achieve cost savings, improve library services, and expand the holdings of the individual institutions. | See VIVA homepage at http://www.viva.lib.va.us/  
For financial report, see http://www.gmu.edu/library/fen/viva/about.html#BUDGET |
| **Faculty Support** | Reduce the amount of faculty time spent on administrative tasks. | Implement efficient course management system that allows faculty to record and calculate grades, post changes in syllabi, etc. | Faculty used various CMS products (commercial and proprietary) to handle administrative functions more efficiently. According to the research, CMS contributed extensively to redesign efforts and effective time management. | For individual school results, see http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award.html  
For summary results, see http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html |
| | Automate various assessments to reduce faculty labor. | Implement efficient online assessment process for exercises, quizzes, and tests to reduce faculty labor in preparing, grading, recording assessments and posting results. | Automated process greatly reduced faculty time on these processes and generated tests more quickly. | For individual school results, see http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award.html  
For summary results, see http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html |
Area of Focus | Indicator(s) | Measure(s) of Effectiveness | Progress Indices | Institution and Research Sites
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Faculty Support | Increase faculty productivity | Provide mechanisms for faculty to share resources, such as revised curricula and course materials. | Substantial amounts of faculty time have been reduced in course redesign efforts by eliminating duplicative efforts and streamlining process. | See Penn State results at [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award/PSU.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award/PSU.html)
For summary results, see [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html)

Student Support | Help students be better prepared for class discussions | Develop and implement online tutorials with key concepts and discussion points to increase student participation. | Tutorials provided consistency in the presentation of key concepts and provided opportunity for more efficient usage of both student and faculty time. | See U Wisconsin-Madison results at [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award/UWM.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award/UWM.html)
See VA Tech results at [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/RD1award/VA.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/RD1award/VA.html)
For summary results, see [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd1saving.html)

Increase student retention | Improve drop-failure-withdrawal (DFW) rates. | Redesigned courses at two institutions resulted in decreases in DFW rates ranged between 2-14%. Another school reported a 9% decrease in failure rate. Yet another found a 7% increase in students completing redesigned course in comparison to traditional offering. | Penn State (Elementary Statistics)
IUPUI (Sociology)
Rio Salado (Mathematics)
VA Tech (Linear Algebra)
For individual school results, see [http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award.html](http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd1award.html)

---

**RESOURCES RELATED TO COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

**Operational Definitions**

**Cost-Effectiveness**

**ROI (Return on Investment)**

**Metrics for Research and Evaluation**

The National Association of College and University Business Officers) provides a template for reporting cost of instruction that is useful for internal benchmarking. Searching NACUBO for “Cost of College Project” will produce the downloadable template. [http://www.nacubo.org](http://www.nacubo.org)

Pew costing method

**Pew Course Redesign Project Outcomes Analysis**


WCET costing method
http://www.wcet.info/projects/tcm/index.htm

WICHE Technology Costing Methodology Project
http://www.wcet.info/Projects/tcm/index.asp

Standards
http://www.acenet.edu/calec/dist_le...ciplesIntro.cfm

American Distance Education Council (ADEC, 2002). Guiding principles for distance teaching and learning.
http://www.adec.edu/admin/papers/di...rinciples.html

American Distance Education Council (ADEC, 2002). Guiding principles for distance learning.
http://www.adec.edu/admin/papers/di...rinciples.html

Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC). (2000). Statement of the regional accrediting commissions on the evaluation of electronically offered degree and certificate programs.
http://www.wcet.info/Article1.htm

Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC). (2000). Statement of the regional accrediting commissions on the evaluation of electronically offered degree and certificate programs.
http://www.wcet.info/Article1.htm

Distance Learning Programs: Interregional Guidelines for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs (2002), published by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education
http://www.msache.org/distguide02.pdf

Middle States Association, titled "Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education."

Moving Beyond No Significant Difference
http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewSym/Mono4.html

Open and Distance Learning Quality Council (ODLQC) (2001). Standards in open and distance education.
http://www.odlqc.org.uk/st-int.htm

Benchmarking
The American Productivity and Quality Center offers guidance for benchmarking.
http://www.apqc.org


The Southern Regional Board Distance Education Laboratory examines issues such as “tuition, fees and charges, funding methods, costs and resource management, and education as e-commerce. Case studies of four SREB states -- Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, and North Carolina -- representing centralized, decentralized, mixed, and freestanding were used in the analysis are described, along with ‘lessons learned’ from the casework.” See “Using Finance Policy to Reduce Barriers to Distance Learning” at this URL.
http://www.electroniccampus.org/policylab/Reports/Finance_Final_9.06.pdf

Key Reports and Research Sites
(See replicable effective practices at Sloan-C “Effective Practices” -- cost-effectiveness site.)
http://www.sloan-c.org/effective/index.asp
(See Sloan cost-effectiveness ALN research included in the following publications.)
   Needham, MA: Sloan Center for Online Education (SCOLE).
   Needham, MA: Sloan Center for Online Education (SCOLE).

(See ALN research published in the Sloan-C Journal of Asynchronous Learning – JALN)

American Council on Education (Center for Institutional and International Initiatives – see Cost Awards for Distance Education)
http://www.acenet.edu/programs/cost-awards/

Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology
http://www.c2t2.ca

Educause
http://www.educause.edu/ep/

Feldberg, J. (2002) Five insider secrets to designing and developing effective online course in record time without a big budget. Educational Pathways, January.
http://www.edpath.com

Knowledge Media Lab
http://kml2.carnegiefoundation.org/gallery/index.html

Merlot
http://www.merlot.com

TLT Group
http://www.tltgroup.org

World Lecture Hall
http://www.utexas.edu/world/lecture
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An interesting answer to a question about the effectiveness of online learning
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http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=459
A response to the IHEP report

An Australian perspective

http://www.library.siue.edu/fte/links.html
Good resource list
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Section Six:
Panel of Presenters Q&A
Moderator: Tony Piccino, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation