[Company name]

Distance Education "Quality" Report

Libraries and Educational Services Committee
4-14-2015

I. Executive Summary

This report describes the components of quality distance education (DE) and their importance for IUP. It also provides recommendations for the enhancement of DE at IUP, specifically to support quality online course development, assessment, and monitoring. Distance education is defined by Middle States and the federal government as education that uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support synchronous or asynchronous interaction between the students and the instructor. Universities and educational organizations have developed numerous approaches to assuring the quality of distance education. Most discussions can be divided into a course approach (what makes for good teaching and learning in DE courses) or a systemic approach (what factors, including courses, make for a good online experience). The report emphasizes a systemic approach.

The report is based upon published research on this topic as well as the history of DE at IUP. The status of the quality of distance education at IUP was conceptualized using both the Middle States Characteristics of Excellence for Distance Education and the Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard. An informal assessment of the status of IUP using both these measures can be found within the full report and within associated appendices of the report. Based upon all of the available information, the key recommendations below should be considered. A more comprehensive list of recommendations is provided within the report.

1. The creation of the Office of Extended Studies is a positive step in centralizing employees tasked with administering the organization and planning of DE at IUP. The Office of Extended Studies should serve as a centralized office responsible for DE data collection and analysis, assessment, planning, compliance, and coordinating student services. As the Office of Extended Studies continues to be established, the part-time assignment to this office of a tenured faculty member with a record of teaching high quality DE courses should be considered. This faculty member could serve as a conduit between the Office of Extended Studies and the faculty teaching DE courses to facilitate quality instruction on a peer-to-peer basis.
2. There is a need to increase faculty support and training for online course delivery. There is a perceived need for an increased number of Online Learning Specialists in IT Services to provide adequate support for the delivery of high quality online courses. Consideration should be given to utilizing IUP colleges, libraries, centers and offices in conjunction with resources available through Quality Matters, the Online Learning Consortium, or a similar organization to provide training, peer review, and professional development opportunities related to teaching online.
3. Other support and feedback mechanisms should also be considered – e.g., establishment of an online instructional delivery mentor program, development of a voluntary peer-review process for DE courses, and/or the creation of an online space where DE information is centrally located. There is a need to improve faculty peer evaluations in a DE environment to support faculty in improving the quality of online instruction. One means to accomplish this is to educate faculty to accurately conduct peer evaluations of online classes, based on both general and discipline-specific best practices. IUP faculty would benefit from an increase in the student completion rate of student evaluations for online courses to better understand what works and does not work for learners in online classes.
4. Lastly, consideration should be given to improving the organization of the online learner support resources at IUP. The majority of the necessary support services are available online; however, they are not always easy to find from a centralized location for DE students. An assessment and revision of the DE website and restructuring the Online Information Literacy Design Concepts will largely address this recommendation.

The prioritization of these recommendations is at the discretion of the Provost and the Director of the Office of Extended Studies; however, LESC recommends that the revision of the DE webpages, assessing mechanisms to maintain course integrity, and identifying a form of faculty support and education (Quality

Matters, Online Learning Consortium, etc.) are prudent first steps. Many of these key recommendations will require continued monitoring as DE and its associated technologies continue to evolve.

Contents

II. Introduction

Distance education is defined by Middle States and the federal government as education that uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support synchronous or asynchronous interaction between the students and the instructor. At IUP, this mode of delivery forms a continuum from face-to-face courses (where up to 1/3 of the course content can be delivered online), through blended courses, to entirely online courses and programs. The majority of this report focusses on entirely online courses, but good practice and infrastructure for those courses will elevate the quality of all distance education. The quality of online education at IUP has been a concern among faculty and staff for several years, and it is the opinion of the Libraries and Educational Services Committee (LESC) that a concerted effort, explicitly supported by the university administration, is necessary to gauge and likely improve this aspect of IUP's academic programs. This initiative is in-line with the draft Strategic Plan (Version 3.2), which explicitly references distance learning in Section 1.5, but also mentions innovative classroom practices (Section 1.4.1) and high impact practices (Section 2.1.3), both of which can involve Distance Education modes of delivery.

The purpose of this report is to identify the components of quality distance education, its importance for students and IUP, and to provide recommendations for enhancement, specifically to support quality online course development, assessment, and monitoring.

III. Background

What Recent Research Says about the Quality of DE

Ever since instructional materials began to be placed online, researchers have been trying to understand how online learning compares with face-to-face learning. More than a decade ago, studies began to find that there was "no significant difference" – achievement of learning objectives and levels of satisfaction appeared to be similar. As researchers refined their scope and methods, they began to include hybrid formats and identify some significant differences – e.g., in the achievement levels of various kinds of students online (e.g., those that self-select into online courses vs. those who do not, lowerclassmen vs. upperclassmen, those with varying levels of technology skills, socioeconomic characteristics, two-year vs. four-year college students), achievement in different subjects, and specific facets of online learning such as instructional methods or cost effectiveness. Some studies have found a slightly lower level of persistence in online courses and also in persistence in college among students who took online coursework in early terms (Xu, D. & Jaggars, S. S., 2011, 2010). Such studies often conclude with recommendations not to eliminate online instruction, however, but to strengthen its quality.

History of Distance Education at IUP

Distance education is a multidimensional mode of teaching that goes beyond technology but relies so much on technology that it is often viewed solely in a technical context. Among the many dimensions of distance education that need to be addressed in order to have successful, legally compliant programs are organization, quality, technology, community of learners, electronic accessibility, and state authorization. Some of these issues are too complex individually to discuss thoroughly in this document, but what follows is a summary.

Vision and Organization. Most universities that offer distance learning have a central office that addresses the various strands of DE in a dedicated, integrated and holistic fashion. Even if a university does not wish to become a Phoenix or Capella, it may still wish to serve place-bound students well, attract this population to help meet enrollment goals, and do a good job with whatever level of online programs and courses that it chooses to offer.

IUP started along a path to an integrated Distance Learning unit but has been diverted several times. An Instructional Design Center was founded in 1998 to support faculty, particularly those who wished to incorporate greater use of technology in teaching and learning. It enthusiastically trained faculty in the use

of WebCT, associated technologies and online pedagogy, but was closed in 2007 and some of its functions transferred to a new, consolidated IT Support Center. The mission of the IT Support Center, however, did not include pedagogy, even the pedagogy of distance education. It fell to the Center for Teaching Excellence to fill some of this gap.

Various attempts were made to establish a direction for distance education and to form a group that could address its multiple dimensions. IT Support and the technology committees did not feel that they had the expertise or authorization to address anything outside the technical realm; in DE that meant that marketing, pedagogy, student services for remote students, accessibility, state authorization, and other areas were in danger of being ignored. The university attempted to solve this problem in several steps:

- 2007 - A deans' distance education task force was assembled, but it lacked input from faculty and other stakeholders.
- 2007 - An online learning specialist was hired on a pilot basis to help one of the colleges put programs online.
- 2009 - The DE Planning and Work Group (DEPWG) was formed consisting of stakeholders from many areas.
- 2010 - IUP formed an Office of Distance Learning and Continuing Education (ODLCE) and hired an executive director. The college online learning specialist was transferred to the ODLCE office. Wishing to simplify the technology committee scene, the director ultimately stopped convening DEPWG.

In 2012, the ODLCE was closed. Staff were reassigned and functions were scattered among several entities – e.g., the Graduate School, IT Support, Division of Enrollment Management and Communication. Today, therefore, the issues of distance education are dealt with in a piecemeal manner.

- LESC has tried to keep some needs of distance education before the university community by reporting on the issue to the Senate and Provost.
- ***Training*** on D2L is provided by IT Support. Among online learning IT trainers is one Online Learning Specialist, who left IUP in December 2014, and 1.5 other online learning trainers. The Center for Teaching Excellence has mini-grants that often are given to faculty interested in teaching with technology, and ACPAC provides annual mini-grants for faculty to explore new technologies. There is no requirement for faculty to acquire training before venturing to teach online.
- ***Academic integrity*** is addressed in training, which makes faculty aware of techniques that can be used to minimize cheating – e.g., creating banks of test questions and randomizing question selection, limiting time allowed per question and test, and use of a variety of assessment techniques. IT Support provides a web site on best practices for academic integrity. Students must authenticate to enter an online course. The Testing Center provides information on proctoring for remote students, but no technical solution has been adopted.
- ***Electronic Information Technology (EIT) Accessibility*** is being addressed by the Task Force on Accessibility Guidelines (TAG). Accessibility law applies not only to distance education but to all IT and communications technologies that students and employees need to take courses and to navigate through university systems and campus life. TAG has embarked on a campaign to make faculty and staff aware of the need for EIT accessibility by introducing them to basic techniques as part of technology workshops and offering small mini-grants (funded by a donation). It has also worked with Procurement Services to require Voluntary Product Accessibility Templates (VPATs) from technology vendors. TAG itself has no budget for staff or software to automate the process of checking the web or courses for accessibility, but it did review such technologies. As a

result, the Office of Communications has just subscribed to SiteImprove, which will monitor accessibility, broken links and other aspects of public web sites (but not password-protected courses or systems) State System legal has discouraged the creation of an overall policy on EIT accessibility.

- ***State authorization***. The Graduate School began the effort to secure authorization from states for distance programs and field experiences with part-time assistance from a manager and a Graduate Assistant. The new Office of Extended Studies has now assumed this responsibility. It is awaiting operational guidance on monitoring and enforcing the state regulations. The statements on the consumer complaint process required by federal law are posted on the IUP DE web site.

Meanwhile the contract APSCUF approved in February 2013 required that State System universities provide "appropriate" support for distance education. Effective Fall, 2014, failure of a university to provide such technical support and instructional design professional(s) will result in continuation and/or restoration of development and redevelopment fees for faculty teaching online.

IV. Rationale for "Quality" Distance Education

Distance education, defined by federal law and regulation as "education that uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor," either synchronously or asynchronously (GAO Report: Higher Education: Use of New Data Could Improve Oversight of Distance Education, November 2011), is rapidly growing and developing. For example, in 2002 distance education enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions was 9.6% and in 2011 it grew to 32.0% (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Distance education is no longer a novel way to deliver instruction, but it has become an expectation among current and future students to the point that in some capacity, a majority of instructors use electronic means to communicate and/or disseminate information about their courses. It is estimated that 70% of higher education institutions now offer distance education (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Furthermore, approximately 69% of chief academic leaders say distance education is "critical" to their long-term strategy (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Most IUP courses have some online component today. By contract, up to 33% of any course may be online without a variance for online delivery. Our learning management systems (LMS) are often used as a repository for syllabi, resources, assignments, and assessments in face-to-face courses. IUP offers programs for working professionals that are essentially hybrid programs, especially at the graduate level. They meet face-to-face a limited number of times, which necessitates a strong distance element by email, LMS, or other means.

Beyond ensuring quality education regardless of delivery format for our students and supporting best practices for instruction of our faculty as the right thing to do, there are efforts to improve the oversight and monitoring of distance education by the US Department of Education. A recent US Government Accountability Office (GAO) report highlights the importance of assessing academic quality of distance education and its oversight challenges (GAO, November 2011). In light of sparse data, the Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has started to improve the data collected for monitoring purposes (GAO, November 2011).

According to the GAO (2011) report, accrediting agencies and schools use a variety of ways to assess quality of distance education, many of which include challenges. For accreditors these challenges include: procedures to verify student identity, retention rates, completion/graduation rates, student satisfaction, faculty satisfaction, placement rates (if applicable), and various measures of student learning. For schools these challenges include: application of course design principles, student performance assessments, use of a design team approach for course development, and the use of industry standards and best practices such as Quality Matters. Importantly, both include the expectation that face-to-face and distance programs meet the same standards for curriculum, resources, support, and student learning outcomes (GAO, 2011).

IUP's accrediting body, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, includes characteristics of excellence for online education.

Recruitment

As the sources of traditional-age students dry up, the phrase "Recruitment is life" has become a mantra at IUP. Distance education could allow programs to enter new market niches or expand in existing markets. But competition for students of all types has increased even from State System and other Pennsylvania colleges. Moreover, the explosion of distance education (in 2013 6.7 million students took at least one online course) means that universities that engage in DE are no longer restricted to recruit only from their geographic regions (Allen and Seaman 2013). The increased emphasis on distance education naturally puts pressure on: a) the instructors to design and deliver online programs and courses and b) the university community to promote and support distance education efforts. Therefore, the model/models recommended by the LESC encompasses quality indicators for both: a) instructors and b) the university as a whole.

Retention

According to Allen and Seaman (2013), the majority of chief academic officers cite lower retention rates for online courses as a barrier to further development of distance education initiatives. With the decline of traditional college-age population in Western PA, both recruitment and retention have become major foci here. Some research indicates that retention in online courses is lower than that of face-to-face courses, which could affect overall retention.

V. Definitions of Quality

Universities and educational organizations have developed numerous approaches to assuring the quality of distance education. Most discussions can be divided into a course approach (what makes for good teaching and learning in DE courses) or a systemic approach (what factors, including courses, make for a good online experience).

The quality of distance education courses is essential to maximize each student's learning and experience in an online learning environment. Many rubrics have been developed to assess online course quality. They focus on such critical characteristics as instructional design, communication/ interaction/collaboration, student evaluation and assessment data, learner support and resources, and web design. Among them are:

California State at Chico http://www.csuchico.edu/roi/documents/rubricpdf

Illinois Online Network www.ion.uillinois.edu/initiatives/qoci/rubric.asp

Montana State University http://eu.montana.edu/online/faculty/teach/pdf/61DesignRubric.pdf

Quality Matters rubric https://www.qualitymatters.org/rubric

Blackboard Exemplary Course Program Rubric https://www.blackboard.com/getdoc/7deaf501-4674-41b9-b2f2-554441ba099b/2012-Blackboard-Exemplary-Course-Rubric.aspx

Online Learning Consortium Scorecard http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/consult/quality-scorecard/

However the online experience is determined by factors outside the course as well, and there are multiple examples of a systemic approach. The compendium *Assuring Quality in Online Education: Practices and Processes at the Teaching, Resource, and Program Level* (Shattuck, Kay, 2014) examines multiple factors that contribute to the quality of online education, such as cost, access, course design, professional development, assessment, accessibility, academic integrity, support services for students, and advising.

Though course quality is essential, the position is that the assurance of quality requires a multilevel approach.

The Online Learning Consortium holds that there are five pillars of quality in online learning: a) learning effectiveness, b) scale, c) access, d) faculty satisfaction, and e) student satisfaction (http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/about/quality-framework-five-pillars/). Online Learning Consortium uses a rubric that includes institutional support, technology support, course development/instructional design, course structure, teaching and learning, social and student engagement, faculty support, student support (before, during and after the course/program), and evaluation and assessment, with multiple measures in in each area (Appendix A).

The Quality Matters program provides continuous improvement models for online courses, professional development, and course design rubrics. The 2011-2013 rubric covers 8 areas, of which 5 relate to course quality. The three factors outside the individual course are technology (currency and ease of access), learner support (clear instructions and links to student services), and accessibility (use of accessible technologies, guidance on accommodation, design that facilitates accessibility) (Appendix B). Finally, Middle States addresses characteristics of excellence in online education, including ethics and academic freedom, student support services, institution-wide standards, consistency with institutional mission and goals, planning mechanisms that address legal and regulatory standards, program coherence, commitment to offerings, consortial agreements, faculty validation of externally developed resources, student identify verification, learning resources, faculty support, adequate technology and support, and periodic assessment of the impact of DE on resources, mission and goals.

Although the quality of delivering online learning options at a university is dependent on several system-based factors, as previously discussed, several of the five pillars directly apply to the overall quality of online courses. For example, a) learning effectiveness and e) student satisfaction are highly related to course quality. Therefore, in this paper, additional details regarding course quality are provided, including recommendations for further development at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

VI. Status of Quality at IUP

LESC decided to use the Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard and the Middle States characteristics of excellence for distance education (pp. 58-60, MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence, 2011) to do an initial assessment of the quality of distance education at IUP. This assessment was conducted to identify gaps or needs for distance education.

Middle States Characteristics of Excellence for Distance Education

The following characteristics are identified by the MSCHE. The provided definitions are derived from the MSCHE characteristics of excellence. LESC endorsed the ratings developed by the quality sub-committee. Members rated each category as Accomplished, Developing, or Needs Work. No systematic university-wide rating was done.

Integrity

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

Status: Our online programs are clearly advertised as such, and all materials related to recruiting and admissions indicate that these are online programs. All faculty are hired under the same standards, processes and procedures. IUP does not hire a separate group of faculty to teach exclusively online. IUP's

distance education curricula were established and are overseen by qualified faculty who are compensated according to the same Collective Bargaining Agreement for teaching online courses and enjoying the same academic freedoms. They receive the same pay for distance courses plus a payment per remote site (ITV courses) or per student (online courses). Students seeking admission to any program are evaluated under the same university and department standards.

There are some unresolved issues of academic integrity in the online environment. Proctoring can require that programs be authorized in other states, a costly process. On campus, proctoring is not permitted unless students live more than 50 miles from campus. There are reports about students taking examinations for each other or together in groups, and questions about the security of publisher pack test banks have been raised. Faculty committees have not yet made a recommendation on seeking a technological solution to academic integrity. The IT Services web site does provides a list of best practices to discourage cheating, and DE course proposals must discuss how academic honesty will be addressed in online courses.

Student Support Services

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

Status: IUP provides information on the curriculum, course and degree requirements, nature of faculty/student interaction, assumptions about technology competence and skills, equipment requirements, learning management system, and academic support services in syllabi or on the web. Many of these items are included in the distance education course proposal which is reviewed and approved through the new stream-lined electronic curricular process. Faculty members may include them in the course syllabus. Financial aid, costs, and payment policies are located on the Bursar's web site. All advisors are faculty. Students and faculty have access to Degree Works to assist in advising. It appears that IUP's online students have access to most of the same support services as on-campus students, but this has not been systematically assessed.

An online orientation is available for students new to distance learning. Some graduate programs provide orientation within the first course in the program. IUP's online portal has a specific view defined for students in distance education programs, but we have few specialized web pages that can contribute to this view. *The Penn* is available online, and students receive *The Beak*, a daily online newsletter, but these publications do not run features that focus on online students or faculty. Student conduct policies and other university policies are published online in the undergraduate manual *The Source* and in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. IT policies are on the web.

Students are able to request help through online forms and email. Continuing Education and IT personnel indicate, however, that they receive inquiries about problems that are not in their area and for which there may be no clear recourse. The consumer complaint process for out-of-state online students is described on the Distance Education page, as required by federal law, but an internal process for complaint resolution is not described there. The newly formed Office of Extended Studies may be helpful in clarifying online help.

Although many services can be accessed online, there are few services or activities that are specifically designed for students in online programs. Student services are assessed on an ongoing basis by the Student Affairs Division, but it does not seem that the results for online students are specified.

There is no equivalent of a PSU World Campus or Distance Learning Office that serves as a hub for online students. Commencement ceremonies have only recently begun to be streamed, and there has been

no welcome for online students or families in the script as yet. No online alumni have been the subject of the university's home page features, there are no features about current students or DE in general, and there is no newsletter or other communication vehicle specifically for online students. Student organizations have access to Crimson Connect, but there do not appear to be activities or organizations for online students. Student government elections are held online, but there does not seem to be a way in which online students could serve or have a voice in SGA or the Graduate Student Association.

A review of IUP's distance education webpages was conducted as part of this report. A major problem observed was fragmentation of information across a variety of unit web sites and maintainers. As mentioned, there is no site that provides a sense of belonging for the online student. Instead, a main objective appeared to be to communicate rules and policies. A suggested revision of the webpages to make them more useful and attractive to current online students, prospects, and faculty is given in Appendix C.

Institution-Wide Standards

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Distance education offerings meet institution-wide standards for quality of instruction, articulated expectations of student learning, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness. If the institution provides parallel on-site offerings, the same institution-wide standards should apply to both.

Status: Several aspects of the quality of distance education instruction are addressed at IUP. Students seeking admission to any program are evaluated under the same university standards along with the standards established by the academic department in which it is housed. The faculty members that teach online courses are the same faculty that teach in the corresponding face-to-face programs, are compensated according to the same Collective Bargaining Agreement for teaching online courses, and enjoy the same academic freedoms. All State System universities follow the same minimum criteria for approving distance education courses, as stipulated in the CBA.

The APSCUF collective bargaining agreement stipulates the schedule and types of evaluation of all faculty. SET course questionnaires are required for faculty evaluation for tenure, promotion, and five-year review, but in online courses, it is not possible to get the same level of response as for a face-to-face course, where time is set aside during class to fill out the SET. The SET is administered before the end of each course. In a face-to-face course, a different faculty member collects the forms in class and seals the envelopes to be delivered to the office that runs the results, demonstrating that the course instructor will not see the evaluations before the course ends. Online students are sometimes suspicious of the process, however. The survey is not conducted in the LMS, and faculty do not receive results until after grades are posted, but the students may not perceive the online survey as separate from the course and are not sure when the results go to the instructor. Faculty technology committees, therefore, have questioned whether the promotion and tenure committees have realistic expectations for faculty that teach online frequently early in their career, when ratings on the SET are critical.

Faculty provide input on technology selection and use through technology committees at the college and university-wide levels. Small grants are available for innovative uses of instructional technology, but the budget for some of them has been reduced. The teacher-scholar model recognizes the value of the scholarship of pedagogy in tenure and promotion at IUP. As a result, IUP has award-winning programs and faculty who publish and present in the field of distance education. Our instructional designers offer training and support, but IUP does not have enough instructional designers for them to take a major role in actually creating new courses. Faculty must attend training and create their own courses, with the guidance of designers.

IUP has an electronic format curricular process that requires review at the department, college dean, and university level. The new distance education course proposal template includes specific areas to address the CBA requirements listed above. This includes: identifying the instructor(s) distance education delivery qualifications; how the outcomes of the course will be met using distance education technologies; instructor-student and student-student (if applicable) interaction will take place; how student achievement will be evaluated; and how academic honesty for tests and assignments will be addressed. The approval process includes review and approval by the department curriculum committee (DPC), department chairperson, college dean, respective university-wide curriculum committee, and provost. After the approval process is complete, the approved proposal is submitted to the Senate for information only.

Consistency of Offerings with Institutional Mission and Goals

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Distance education offerings are consistent with the institution's mission and goals, and the rationale for the distance education delivery.

Status: The IUP Vision states that "Professors use technology to enhance student learning and augment the face-to-face and peer-learning experiences that are the foundation of excellent education." It also affirms the value of "using technology to reach place-committed students and enhance learning for all."

This vision reflects the fact that IUP's distance education offerings have been developed as a means to reach students that have limited mobility or time to participate in campus-based courses or programs. In addition, certain IUP programs are unique or distinctive and have a national reach; they have been placed online to respond to demand. DE offerings at IUP serve as a means to an end – to serve the overall mission to engage students as learners and leaders in an intellectually challenging, culturally enriched, and diverse environment.

Similarly, the draft strategic plan made public in December places distance learning in the context of offering innovative, quality programs. So far the goals do not indicate whether distance education will be used as a means to compensate for the current decline in enrollment.

This characteristic will require monitoring as IUP implements the strategic plan intended to realize its new vision.

Planning

IUP Rating: Needs Work

MSCHE Definition: Planning includes consideration of applicable legal and regulatory requirements.

Status: Distance education planning starts at the departmental level, which is natural since faculty play a critical role in successful programs. All program and course proposals, whether distance or campus-based, must be vetted by the departmental, college, the undergraduate or graduate university-wide curriculum committee, and the University Senate. New programs must then be approved by the IUP Council of Trustees and the State System Board of Governors. Starting at the department level is natural but makes it more difficult to generate and operate interdisciplinary programs. Recent efforts of administration and faculty together to identify and plan interdisciplinary programs show promise.

In 2013, the university allocated a portion of two administrators' time and a full-time graduate assistantship to the effort to secure state authorizations for our programs. Oversight was originally assigned to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Research, who then was reassigned to direct the new Office of Extended Studies. This new unit will have responsibility for state authorization, but it is not clear whether it will be involved in other aspects of distance education. IT Services and the Center for

Teaching Excellence (CTE) recently formed a partnership to support instructional technology, and the CTE director is the IUP representative to the State System task force defining the functional requirements for the next LMS contract. These changes are concrete manifestations of the principles stated in the Vision Statement and draft Strategic Plan, but it is not yet clear if they will solve the fragmentation of distance education and lack of direction that have been problems from the beginning.

Overarching planning for distance education is being addressed in the Vision Statement, strategic planning, and the Middle States self-study, which have had broad representation. The draft strategic plan also states the need to comply with legal requirements surrounding distance education but does not say how this will be accomplished. For example, the university has a task force on the accessibility of electronic information technology, but it has no budget to purchase systems that could make accessibility easier or to hire staff to run them. It is expected that the new Office of Extended Studies will assume responsibility for state authorization, but it is not yet clear what other aspects of distance education compliance, support or infrastructure it may oversee. As yet, there is no body that brings together all units that touch distance education.

Program Coherence

IUP Rating: Accomplished

MSCHE Definition: Program coherence includes stated program learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor and breadth of the degree or certificate awarded.

Status: As indicated above, learning outcomes are required at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and the learning outcomes for a course approved to be taught by DE must be the same as those of the on-site version. The appropriateness of learning outcomes is examined during the curriculum approval process. The State System guidelines for new program proposals require learning outcomes and program goals to be clearly defined. Similarly, the IUP undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees require that program proposals identify learning outcomes and program goals and also explain how each course will support them. The new template continues to ask how DE will be used to achieve learning outcomes in online courses. Most of IUP's distance learning programs are at the graduate level or are completion degrees, which are less complex than full undergraduate degrees. Program review and accreditation review assess the achievement of course and program outcomes.

Commitment to Offerings

IUP Rating: Accomplished

MSCHE Definition: Demonstrated commitment to continuation of offerings for a period sufficient to enable admitted students to complete the degree or certificate in a publicized time frame.

Status: IUP has committed through its Vision Statement and its adherence to the Collective Bargaining Agreement of APSCUF that it has a commitment to ongoing support, both financial and technical, and to continuation of a program for a period sufficient to enable students to complete a degree or certificate. Any State System institution that puts a program into moratorium is required to support current students in the program until they finish or transfer.

Consortial Agreements

IUP Rating: Not Applicable (due to restrictions with agreements)

MSCHE Definition: Assurance that arrangements with consortial partners or contractors do not compromise the integrity of the institution or of the educational offerings.

Status: Programs involving consortial agreements undergo the same review and approval process as other programs. All program proposals require detailed budget and operational plans, which would include

consortial arrangements. In addition, program reviews are required every five years by State System, which provides specific guidance. Accredited programs may substitute accreditation self-studies for program reviews.

The State System legal office provides standard templates for affiliation agreements with clinical and internship sites and assists member universities with agreements where the sites may make special stipulations. The Dean of Extended Studies makes recommendations to the Provost on approval. The purpose of the agreements and approval process is to ensure the quality and safety of these learning experiences for students.

Contractors in the area of technology are scrutinized for security purposes. For example, IT Services avoids add-ons that directly connect with protected information (e.g., LMS grade books).

Faculty Validation of Externally Developed Resources

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Validation by faculty of any course materials or technology-based resources developed outside the institution.

Status: Faculty members initiate, design and approve the development and revision of courses and programs at IUP, as described above. The department curriculum committee verifies that the outcomes listed in the distance education course proposal mirror the outcomes of the approved face-to-face course, organization, mode of delivery, and assessment. Faculty have a strong voice in the review and selection of instructional technology by serving on the committees that select technology in the colleges (e.g., college technology committee) and at the university (e.g., Academic Computing and Policy Advisory Committee and the Library and Educational Services Committee).

Student Identity Verification

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: A system of student identity verification that ensures that the student who participates in class or coursework is the same student who registers and receives academic credit; that students are notified at the time of registration or enrollment of any additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity; and that the identity verification process protects student privacy.

Status: Each student receives a unique ID and password, which is authenticated using Shibboleth single-sign-in credentials. FERPA rules are carefully observed.

There is interest on campus in exploring some unresolved issues of academic integrity in the online environment. The IT Support site reviews best practices for online integrity. There is currently no way, however, to verify that the person signed-in is the same person who is completing the assignment or registered for the course. There are reports of students taking online examinations for each other or together in groups. The Testing Center's proctoring service is restricted to students living 50+ miles from campus, and no technical solutions for online proctoring have been adopted. Effective and secure online proctoring standards have not yet been established for IUP DE courses. Proctoring can require that programs be authorized in other states, a costly process. It is not certain that publisher pack test banks are as secure as those of individual faculty members.

Learning Resources

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Available, accessible, and adequate learning resources (such as a library or other information resources) appropriate to the offerings at a distance

Status: IUP offers a variety of online learning resources for students and faculty - two learning management systems to enhance on-site courses and deliver instruction at a distance. Blackboard Collaborate is available for online courses with a need for synchronous class sessions or office hours. The university has licenses for an email and calendar service, a blogging service, I-Tube (Kaltura, a private streaming video tool), MS Office, Adobe Creative Suite, Camtasia, and Captivate. IT Services offers remote access to the campus network, a technology guide for students, technology how-to guides, Microsoft online training courses, and a Virtual Computer Lab (VCL), which allows remote access to software applications in the public computer labs.

The IUP Libraries provide support for distance education and off-campus access to library resources. Students have electronic access to the catalog, online databases, and research tips on the web 24 hours a day. The libraries offer two online services – Ask a Librarian and Research Guides – that answer common questions and help with online library research. Students can also contact a librarian at the Reference Desk by email or telephone during regular reference hours. The university-wide Library and Educational Services Committee recommends policies and allows faculty and student members to address issues related to library services and technology.

The accessibility of IUP online resources to people with disabilities is a weakness of the current system. The university has formed a task force to address the issue of accessibility of its electronic information technology to students with disabilities. The task force is currently in the midst of increasing awareness about the importance of accessibility by offering mini-grants for accessible course design, demonstrations and workshops. The Office of Communications has subscribed to SiteImprove, which will identify accessibility problems with web sites, but it can monitor courses in an LMS or other passworded systems. Both LMSs have the capacity to be accessible, but the designer must apply that capacity to realize the accessibility. LMS web design training incorporates methods to make courses and web sites accessible. State System legal has discouraged the development of a general policy on electronic information technology accessibility.

Faculty Support

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: An ongoing program of appropriate orientation, training, and support for faculty participating in electronically delivered offerings.

Status: IUP has professionals within IT Services, Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Online Information Literacy Design Center at the library who have responsibilities associated with supporting faculty conducting DE. Additionally, deans in collaboration with college technology managers provide some support for faculty conducting DE. Several instructional designers at IT Services offer consultation on DE technology and pedagogy. There is a perceived lack of Online Learning Specialists support, although data indicate that these services are underutilized. It will be worthwhile investigating the disjuncture between availability and perception.

IT Services offers workshops, tutorials, webinars, and a brown bag lunch series that include many aspects of distance education. IT Services has purchased an institutional membership in the Online Learning Consortium, which will be piloted by faculty to assess the opportunities for professional development in this area. Numerous faculty participate in the activities sponsored by the IUP Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), which runs a Reflective Practice (RP) program and brings in guest speakers on a variety of teaching strategies, including distance education. As part of RP, some teaching circles addressed such issues as online pedagogy and electronic accessibility. CTE subscribes to *The Teaching Professor*, the *Online Classroom*, Monday Morning Mentors and Magna Commons videos, some of which address issues in distance education.

The New Faculty Orientation introduces the technologies used at IUP. Additionally, before each semester, the College of Education and Educational Technology offers a Technology Day where faculty can choose from among 60 or more presentations and workshops on instructional technology. The Libraries' Online Information Literacy Design Center (OILDC) helps faculty incorporate information literacy and library resources in online courses and provides copyright consultation and multimedia production assistance. The Center for Digital Humanities and Culture, which supports exploration and applications of digital technologies in humanistic inquiry, offers some training in instructional technologies.

As stated above, faculty may provide input on technology selection and use through technology committees. ACPAC, the University Senate, the system-wide Faculty Professional Development Committee, some colleges, and CTE provide small grant opportunities for faculty, for which many proposals involve online education and instructional technology. Together, these types of training and support allow faculty to learn about best practices for teaching in a distance education format.

Facilities and Staffing

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Adequate technical and physical plant facilities, including appropriate staffing and technical assistance, to support electronic offerings.

Status: The IT Support Center, which houses instructional designers, the help desk and a training lab, is centrally located in Delhaney Hall. An additional test bed lab is located in Stright Hall. IT Services has 2 instructional designers and trainers as well as student workers and graduate assistants that serve students and faculty. A number of developers and technology project managers are also located in the Stright facility, including the LMS coordinator that represents IUP at State System meetings. The IUP Libraries house the Online Information Literacy Design Center (OILDC), which offers assistance with multimedia production and incorporating information literacy into online courses. It is staffed with librarians specializing in information literacy and instructional technology, as well as student workers.

Periodic Assessment

IUP Rating: Developing

MSCHE Definition: Periodic assessment of the impact of distance education on the institution's resources (human, fiscal, physical, etc.) and its ability to fulfill its institutional mission and goals.

Status: The previous IUP strategic plan concluded in 2012. The new president of IUP began the process of creating a new strategic plan with a university-wide initiative to develop a vision statement. As indicated above, the IUP Vision states that "Professors use technology to enhance student learning and augment the face-to-face and peer-learning experiences that are the foundation of excellent education." It also affirms the value of "using technology to reach place-committed students and enhance learning for all."

IUP also has a University Assessment Committee, which is currently focused on student learning outcomes. Each program at IUP must undergo program review every five years. A comprehensive self-study of the program is done at that time. There is no overall assessment of distance learning courses and programs and courses at IUP, however.

The University Planning Committee (UPC) is creating the new university strategic plan, including goals for distance education. The plan will become part of the Middle States self-study that is being prepared for the 2016 re-accreditation site visit. Several Middle States sub-committees are expected to address aspects of distance education as related to the goals, standards and research questions. The intention is that the entire Strategic Plan will be assessed on a regular basis and adjusted as needed.

Despite these mechanisms for university-wide assessment, DE programs are not regularly assessed to determine their impact on institutional resources or mission.

Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard

The Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard was completed as part of this review. The scorecard is included as Appendix A. The justifications for the various scores closely map to the discussion of the Middle States Characteristics above and are not repeated here. The ratings were developed by the quality sub-committee and endorsed by the LESC. They include Deficient (0), Developing (1), Accomplished (2) and Exemplary (3). No systematic university-wide rating was done, nor did the university receive a formal review by the Online Learning Consortium.

VII. What Areas Need Work?

Based on the review of Online Learning Consortium and MSCHE standards, several components of IUP's DE scheme that need improvement were identified. Specifically, aspects of institutional support, accessibility, and integrity were primary concerns. IUP currently does not offer a DE community for online learners. Additionally, IUP's website is only partially accessible to students with disabilities. Strides are being made in this direction but portions of the website remain inaccessible to the widest possible community. Within online courses there is no systematic way to ensure that student identity verification. This inability opens the possibility for students to cheat. The prevalence of this problem, and possible solutions, should be assessed.

In addition to these primary concerns, there are several areas where IUP could significantly improve: retention, student services, planning, faculty validation, assessment, consortial agreements, and state authorization. The majority of these are strong for IUP in general, but weaker for DE offerings. IUP currently has limited means to track the retention of students in online courses; this ability is stronger in online only programs. IUP offers excellent student services for on-campus students, but far fewer for online only students. Courses are offered online but the remainder of the university experience is still largely inaccessible to students who are not on campus. In addition to no social experience for online students, assistance and other services can sometimes be difficult to identify or access. An update of the DE webpages (Appendix C) will partially, but not entirely, address this concern. **IUP's DE planning is currently decentralized with insufficient coordination of the technical, social, and pedagogical aspects of DE.** Similarly, the assessment of DE courses is weakened by the lack of a centralized DE authority. For example, there has not been a university-wide initiative to address the low response rate to the SET in online courses. IUP has made steps to manage state authorization in states where we would like to teach on-line students, but this process will require continued effort and attention. Faculty validation and consortial agreements are potential concerns but extend beyond IUP. Consortial agreements are decided at the State System level. The State System LMS selection process and publisher packs have somewhat eroded the ability of faculty to validate externally developed resources.

VIII. Recommendations

While course quality depends on multiple aspects of IUP's DE scheme, several steps could be taken to ensure course quality at IUP. The creation of the Office of Extended Studies is a positive step in centralizing employees tasked with administering the organization and support of DE at IUP. The Office of Extended Studies should serve as a centralized office responsible for DE data collection and analysis, assessment, planning, compliance, and coordinating student services.

The Office of Extended Studies is a natural entity to facilitate the recommendations listed below, working with a variety of stakeholders (e.g., faculty, APSCUF, administration, CTE, IT Services, IUP Libraries and others).

1. Work with faculty to increase student completion of the SET and facilitate peer evaluations for online courses. One means to accomplish this is to educate faculty to accurately conduct peer evaluations of online classes. Since a portion of peer evaluations is discipline specific, it is necessary to have competent evaluators in all programs teaching online courses. Better response rates and peer evaluations will provide more data about what works and does not work from learners' perspectives and best pedagogical practices. Decisions regarding course evaluation will require APSCUF and administration approval.
2. Improve the organization of the online learner support resources at IUP. The majority of the necessary support services are available online; however, they are not always easy to find from a centralized location for DE students.
    a. Inventory the needed services to check that everything students need is indeed online.
    b. Revise and streamline the DE website. Responsibility should be centralized in the Office of Extended Studies and the webpages should reference the official pages of other divisions so that information is always up-to-date. An outline of revised DE webpages is in Appendix C.
    c. The self-assessment for students to gauge if online learning is appropriate for them should be more prominently displayed and should involve a conversation – online, by telephone or, face-to-face – with an advisor who can review the results and advise accordingly.
    d. There should be a clearer path to solve problems that occur during an online course, both technical and non-technical.
3. Explore mechanisms to ensure course integrity. These should include technological, pedagogical and social mechanisms to limit the ability of students to violate the IUP Academic Integrity Policy.
4. Increase faculty support and training for online course delivery.
    a. Consideration should be given to utilizing the Center for Teaching Excellence in conjunction with resources available through Quality Matters, the Online Learning Consortium, or a similar organization. These services should be reviewed through pilot programs and an informed decision made based on services, benefits, and costs.
    b. Investigate the perceived lack of sufficient Online Learning Specialists in light of data that suggests that they are underutilized. Develop a means for the Specialists to support faculty in the way that they need support for high quality online courses. Other internal resources should also be considered, such as online instruction peer mentors, peer review, and/or the creation of a wiki or other online space where DE information is centrally located and exchanged.
    c. Assess what tools faculty are using for distance education other than the two LMSs at IUP, e.g., publisher packs, Pinterest, Squarespace, external blogs, Google Drive, etc. A full understanding of what technology is being employed is necessary to understand gaps and opportunities in quality.
    d. The Libraries have recommended, in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence, the restructuring of the Libraries' Online Information Literacy Design Concepts (OILDC) to the Information Technology and Innovation Center (ITIC). Located in the Stapleton Library, the ITIC will provide direct technology and curriculum creation support of the DE curriculum and will act as a one-service-point for support of faculty and students in the creation and delivery of DE courses. This change is supported by the Association of College and Research Libraries *Standards for Distance Learning Library Services* (Appendix D).
    e. Recognize exemplary online instructors.
5. Improve the integration of DE students into the IUP community to increase retention and alumni support. A virtual campus experience could include such events as online orientation and graduation, as well as the development of an online community that both has program-specific aspects and is integrated into the larger IUP community. Ways to integrate the online community into the larger community might include featuring DE students and stories, DE alumni, and outstanding online

instructors in the news and home page. The level of investment in this recommendation will depend on the strategic goal of distance education at IUP, i.e., if the goal is to increase enrollments through entirely online programs a greater level of effort will be necessary than if distance education is to serve primarily as an alternative for face-to-face courses within an otherwise face-to-face curriculum.

6. Provide a faculty associate to the Office of Extended Studies, preferably a tenured faculty member with a proven record of quality DE instruction. The faculty associate would serve as a conduit between the Office of Extended Studies and the faculty to facilitate quality instruction on a peer-to-peer basis.
7. Establish formal relationships between the Office of Extended Studies and LESC, the ACPAC Online Learning Committee, and the Center for Teaching Excellence.
8. Support and protect faculty, students and IUP by promoting compliance and providing clear guidelines on laws that affect distance education – e.g., on state authorization, Electronic Information Technology Accessibility, management of copyrighted materials, and intellectual property law.

These recommendations are only a starting point; the Office of Extended Studies should also be responsible for new initiatives to continuously improve the quality of DE at IUP.

IX. Future Considerations/Prioritization of Needs

Many of the recommendations will require continued monitoring as DE and its associated technologies continue to evolve. An office tasked with monitoring these changes and adapting to them is best suited for maintaining quality DE at IUP.

The prioritization of these recommendations is at the discretion of the Provost and the Director of the Office of Extended Studies; however, LESC recommends that the revision of the DE webpages, assessing mechanisms to maintain course integrity, and identifying a form of faculty support and education (Quality Matters, Online Learning Consortium, etc.) are prudent first steps. The other recommendations could then be prioritized by the Office of Office of Extended Studies in consultation with the Provost Office.

X. References

Allen, E. & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC.

Illinois Online Network (ION). (n.d.). A tool to assist in the design, redesign, and/or evaluation of online courses. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL. http://www.ion.uillinois.edu/initiatives/qoci/ rubric.asp

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2011). Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Requirements of affiliation and standards for accreditation. Philadelphia, PA: Author Retrieved from https://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011-WEB.pdf

Online Learning Consortium. (n.d.). The 5 pillars. http://olc.onlinelearningconsortium.org/5pillars

Shattuck, K. (2014). Assuring quality in online education: Practices and processes at the teaching, resource, and program levels. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2011, November). Use of new data could help improve oversight of distance education. (Publication No. GAO-12-39). Retrieved from

http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/586340.pdf

Xu, D. & Jaggars, S. S. (2010). *The effectiveness of distance education in Virginia's community colleges: Evidence from introductory college-level math and English courses.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Xu, D., & Jaggars, S. S. (2011a). The effectiveness of distance education across Virginia's community colleges: Evidence from introductory college-level math and English courses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*(3), 360–377.

Appendix A: Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard for Online Programs

The Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard for the Administration of Online Programs provides a rigorous metric to gauge an institution's preparation to offer and support quality online programs. **The scores provided are LESC's understanding of IUP's progress in establishing the infrastructure for quality distance education.**

Quality Scorecard

for the Administration of Online Programs

0 = Deficient | **1** = Developing | **2** = Accomplished | **3** = Exemplary

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT (27 POINTS)

SCORE: 8

1	The institution has a governance structure to enable clear, effective, and comprehensive decision making related to online education.	1
2	The institution has policy and guidelines that confirm a student who registers in an online course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives academic credit. This is done by verifying the identity of a student by using methods such as (a) a secure login and passcode, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identity.	1-2 (BPs & authentication but little proctoring or specialized technologies)
3	The institution has a policy for intellectual property of course materials; it specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online.	2 (CBA)
4	The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and stakeholders.	2 (vision statement)
5	The organizational structure of the online program supports the institution's mission, values, and strategic plan.	0 The strategic planning mechanism may lead to such structure.
6	The online program's strategic plan is reviewed for its continuing relevance, and periodically improved and updated.	0 none

7	The institution has a process for planning and allocating resources for the online program, including financial resources, in accordance with strategic planning.	0 there is no overall allocation.
8	The institution demonstrates sufficient resource allocation, including financial resources, in order to effectively support the mission of online education.	1 No funds committed to compliance.
9	The institution has a governance sructure to enable systematic and continuous improvement related to the administration of online education.	0-1 Several committees and units; no systematic CI specifically for DE.

TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT (21 POINTS)

SCORE: 17.5

1	A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality, in accordance with established standards and regulatory requirements.*	1-2 questions about online assessments

2	The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.*	3
3	A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.*	3
4	The course delivery technology is considered a mission-critical enterprise system and supported as such.	3
5	The institution has established a contingency plan for the continuance of data centers and support services in the event of prolonged service disruption.	3
6	Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	2
7	Whether the institution maintains local data centers (servers), and/or contracts for outsourced, hosted services or cloud services, those systems are administered in compliance with established data management practices such as the Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) standards which include appropriate power protection, backup solutions, disaster recovery plans, etc.	2?

COURSE DEVELOPMENT/INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

(36 POINTS) SCORE: 22.5

1	Guidelines regarding minimum requirements for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback) are followed.*	2
2	Course embedded technology actively supports the achievement of learning outcomes and delivery of course content, and superfluous use of technology is minimized.*	2 There is no assessment of this element.
3	Instructional materials and course syllabi are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet online course and program learning outcomes.*	2
4	A course development process is followed that ensures courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet measurable learning outcomes at the course and program level.*	2
5	A process is followed that ensures that permissions (Creative Commons, Copyright, Fair Use, Public Domain, etc.) are in place for appropriate use of online course materials.	2?
6	Course assignments and activities are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet online course and program learning outcomes.*	1 program yes; no online outcomes identified
7	Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	2
8	There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	1-2? Online retention has not yet been assessed or addressed.
9	Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	2

10	A process is followed for evaluating the effectiveness of current and emerging technologies to support the achievement of learning outcomes and delivery of course content.	2 yes, but some go around it
11	Usability tests are conducted and applied, and recommendations based upon Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAGs) are incorporated.	1 WCAG is not used.
12	Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision-making for the online curriculum choices).	3

COURSE STRUCTURE (24 POINTS)

SCORE: 17.5

1	The online course includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent.*	3
2	The course structure ensures that all online students, regardless of location, have access to library/learning resources that adequately support online courses.*	3
3	Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.*	3
4	Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	2-3
5	Instructional materials are accessible to the student, easy to use, and may be accessed by multiple operating systems and applications.	1 no accessibility policy or requirement in curric process; Macs?
6	Instructional materials are easily accessed by students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	1 DS makes specific accommodations but faculty are not required to make courses accessible as a whole.

7	Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-to-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	2
8	Rules or standards for appropriate online student behavior are provided within the course.	2

TEACHING AND LEARNING (15 POINTS)

SCORE: 9

1	Student-to-student and faculty-to-student interaction are essential characteristics and are encouraged and facilitated.*	2? In syllabus yes; in reality?
2	Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.*	2?
3	Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.*	2?
4	Students are provided access to library professionals and resources to help locate, analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and ethically use a variety of information resources.	2
5	Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	1

SOCIAL AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (3 POINTS)

SCORE: 0

1	Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community (outside the course).	0

FACULTY SUPPORT (18 POINTS)

SCORE: 7

1	Technical assistance is provided for faculty during online course development and online teaching.*	1
2	The institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support to prepare for course development and teaching online.*	1 opportunity but no requirement

3	Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.*	1 Not state auth or accessibilit y
4	Faculty are provided ongoing professional development related to online teaching and learning.	1 enough? Tutorials?
5	Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations concerning online teaching (e.g. response time, contact information, etc.).	1
6	Faculty are informed about emerging technologies and the selection and use of new tools.	2

STUDENT SUPPORT (48 POINTS)

SCORE: 20.5

1	Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.*	2 optional self-assessment . On-line orientation
2	Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimum technology skills and equipment required by the course design.*	1-2 Letter
3	Before starting an online program, students receive (or have access to) information about the program, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services.*	2
4	Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, news services, and other sources.*	2
5	Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.*	2
6	Support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.*	1 technical-yes; non-technical problems & complaints tend to go

		to CE or IT even if they relate to course or program issues.
7	Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	1 Online?
8	Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) are provided in order to respond to students' most common questions regarding online education.	1 List but not in FAQ format; in some courses
9	Students are provided non-instructional support services such as admission, financial assistance, registration/enrollment, etc.	2?
10	Policy, processes, and resources are in place to support students with disabilities.	2 DS yes. Advance design-not really.
11	Students have access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes prior to course enrollment.	?
12	Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit existing oncampus services to the online student.	0
13	Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution in order to minimize feelings of isolation and alienation.	0-1 not systematic
14	The institution provides guidance/tutorials for students in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	2 if it is supported technology

15	Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	0 online?
16	Students are provided clear information for enlisting help from the institution.	1-2

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT (33 POINTS)

SCORE: 12.5

1	The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.*	2
2	**A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.***	**2**
3	**Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure alignment, clarity, utility, appropriateness, and effectiveness.***	**2**
4	**A process is in place and followed for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.**	**1** reviews of units but not focused on online population
5	**A process is in place and followed for the assessment of student retention in online courses and programs.**	**1** not focused on online
6	**A process is in place and followed for the assessment of recruitment practices.**	**1** not focused on online
7	**Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).**	**0** task force exists but legal would not permit overall policy; no requirement
8	**Course evaluations collect feedback on the effectiveness of instruction in relation to faculty performance evaluations.**	**1** SET process exists but ineffective in online courses
9	**A process is in place and followed for the institutional assessment of faculty online teaching performance.**	**1** General process exists but not

		specifically for online
10	**A process is in place and followed for the assessment of stakeholder (e.g., learners, faculty, staff) satisfaction with the online program.**	**0-1**
11	**Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of online course materials.**	**1** SET process exists but ineffective in online courses

Appendix B: Quality Matters Rubric

The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric provides a way for gauge the quality of a specific online course. The rubric is included here as an example of available resources.

The Quality Matters™ Higher Education Rubric 2011-2013 Edition

Standard	Points	Annotation
General Standard 1: The overall design of the course is made clear to the student at the beginning of the course.		The course introduction sets the tone for the course, lets students know what to expect, and provides guidance to ensure they get off to a good start.
1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.		Instructions provide a general course overview, present the schedule of activities, guide the new student to explore the course website, and indicate what to do first, in addition to listing detailed navigational instructions for the whole course. Instructors may choose to incorporate some of this information in the course syllabus. In this case, students should be directed to the syllabus at the beginning of the course. A useful feature is a "Read Me First" or "Start Here" button or icon on the course home page, linking students to start-up information. Examples: 1. A course "tour". 2. Clear statements about how to get started in the course. 3. A "scavenger hunt" assignment that leads students through an exploration of the different areas of the course. 4. A graphical table or diagram that depicts the relationship between the online and face-to-face portions of a blended course. Blended Courses: Instructions in the online classroom make it clear to students that the course is a blended course, with both online and face-to-face components and activities. Instructions specify the requirements for participation in both the online and face-to-face portions of the course. The introductory information clearly states when and where students should participate each week, and a structured set of topics and a schedule are provided for each face-to-face meeting.

1.2 Students are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.		Information is provided to help students understand the purpose of the course and how the learning process is structured and carried out, including course schedule, delivery modalities (online or blended), modes of communication, types of learning activities, and how learning will be assessed. Such information may be provided or reinforced in the course syllabus or other course documents; or in areas with titles such as "Course Introduction," "Welcome from the Instructor, "Start Here," "Course Schedule," "Course Outline," "Course Map," "Course Calendar," etc. *Blended Courses:* The purpose of both the online and face-to-face. Portions of the course are clearly explained to students to help them understand how and why both formats are important to the learning process. The course schedule or calendar fully covers both the online and face-to-face portions of the course and clearly specify the dates, times, and locations of face-to-face class meetings.
1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called "netiquette") for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are stated clearly.		Expectations for how students are to communicate online and in the classroom are clearly stated. Since student behavior is culturally influenced, it is important to be explicit about standards for communication that apply in the course. The substance of etiquette expectations is not to be evaluated. Examples of etiquette considerations: 1. Expectations for the tone and civility used in communicating with fellow students and the instructor, whether the communication is by electronic means or by telephone or face-to-face. 2. Expectations for email content, including "speaking style" requirements (e.g., standard English as opposed to popular abbreviations used online). 3. Spelling and grammar expectations. 4. Rules of civility for classroom/discussion board participation. To reinforce etiquette and civility, the instructor may provide a link or reference to the institution's student handbook or code of conduct.
1.4 Course and/or institutional policies with which the student is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.		Policies may be promulgated by the instructor or by the institution. Policies may include student conduct, academic integrity, late submission of assignments, the grade of Incomplete, confidentiality in the classroom, student grievances, etc. Confirm that the policies are adequately explained and up-to-date.

1.5 Prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.		Information about prerequisite knowledge and/or competencies is found within the course, in documents linked to the course, or in supporting material provided to the student by another means. Look for a link to that information and/or a reminder of it for the student. Discipline knowledge prerequisites should specify courses that meet the requirements.
1.6 Minimum technical skills expected of the student are clearly stated.		General as well as course-specific technical skills students must have to succeed in the course are specified. Examples of technical skills might include: 1. Using the learning management system. 2. Using email with attachments. 3. Creating and submitting files in commonly used word processing program formats. 4. Copying and pasting. 5. Downloading and installing software. 6. Using spreadsheet programs. 7. Using presentation and graphics programs.
1.7 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.		The initial introduction creates a sense of connection between the instructor and the students. It presents the instructor as professional as well as approachable, and includes the essentials, such as the instructor's name, title, field of expertise, email address, phone number, and times when the instructor is typically online or may be reached by phone. Expectations of the relationship and communication style between teacher and learner are culturally influenced. Including information about the role of the instructor in the particular course and how to address the instructor is helpful to students from all backgrounds. The self-introduction helps students get to know the instructor and extends beyond the essentials. It could include: 1. Comments on teaching philosophy. 2. A summary of past experience with teaching online courses. 3. Personal information such as hobbies, family, travel experiences, etc. 4. A photograph. *Blended Courses*: The instructor's self-introduction is available electronically for students who missed early face-to-face meetings.

1.8 Students are asked to introduce themselves to the class.		Student introductions at the beginning of the class help to create a welcoming learning environment and a sense of community. Students are asked to introduce themselves and given guidance on where and how they should do so. In a few situations, such as when a class is very large, student introductions may not be feasible. Instructors are asked to indicate in the Instructor Worksheet if there is a reason for not providing an opportunity for student introductions. Instructors may ask students to respond to specific questions (such as why they are taking the course, what concerns they have, what they expect to learn, etc.) or may choose to let the student decide what to include. Instructors may provide an example of an introduction and/or start the process by introducing themselves. *Blended Courses*: The opportunity for introductions is available electronically for students who may have missed the opportunity during early face-to-face meetings. Ideally, student introductions are posted online, for future reference, even if students have introduced themselves in a face-to-face meeting.
General Standard 2: Learning objectives are measurable and are clearly stated.		The learning objectives establish a foundation upon which the rest of the course is based.

2.1 The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.		Measurable course learning objectives precisely describe what students are to gain from instruction and provide the criteria instructors need to accurately assess student accomplishment. Objectives describe student performance in specific, observable terms. If this specificity is not possible (e.g., internal cognition, affective changes), check for clear indications that the learning objective can be meaningfully assessed. Note that at some institutions, learning objectives may be referred to as learning outcomes. Examples of measurable objectives: 1. Select appropriate tax strategies for different financial and personal situations. 2. Develop a comprehensive, individualized wellness action program focused on overcoming a sedentary life-style. 3. Describe the relationship between the components of an ecosystem. 4. Explain the factors that contribute to economic inflation. In a course in which students are expected to demonstrate analytical skills and/or ability to express themselves effectively in writing or in other forms of communication, the learning objectives should include reference to these objectives in addition to objectives that relate to mastery of content. In addition to measurable objectives, a course may have objectives or desired outcomes that are not measurable, such as increased awareness, sensitivity, or interest in certain issues or subjects; but they do not substitute for measurable objectives when determining whether the standard is met. Special situations: In some cases (check the Instructor Worksheet), the course objectives are institutionally mandated, and the individual instructor does not have the authority to change them.
		If the institutionally mandated learning objectives are not measurable, make note of it in the "comments" box. Write specific suggestions for improvement so the institution has the information needed to improve the objectives. If the course objectives are institutionally mandated, then the reviewer may need to consider Standard 2.1 in conjunction with Standard 2.2, as follows: Standard 2.1 is considered as being MET under the following circumstances: 1. The course objectives are measurable, whether set by the institution or by the instructor. 2. The institutionally mandated course objectives are not measurable, but the faculty-written module/unit objectives are measurable.

		Standard 2.1 is NOT MET under the following circumstance: 1. There are no course objectives. 2. The course objectives set by the instructor are not measurable. 3. The institutionally mandated course objectives are not measurable, and the faculty-written module/unit objectives are either not measurable or not present. Alignment: The concept of alignment is intended to convey the idea that critical course components work together to ensure that students achieve the desired learning outcomes. Measurable course and module/unit learning objectives form the basis of alignment in a course. Other elements of the course, including those addressed in Standards 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, and 6.1, contribute to the accomplishment of the learning objectives. It may not be possible to complete the course review if measurable learning objectives are not present. In such a case, the review team chair should first consult the instructor to clarify whether measurable objectives are absent and whether the matter can be quickly addressed so the review can continue.
2.2 The module/unit learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives.		Measurable module or unit learning objectives are important. They precisely describe the specific competencies, skills, and knowledge that students should be able to master and demonstrate at regular intervals throughout the course. The learning objectives make clear to students learning expectations and outcomes on a weekly, modular, or unit basis. Module or unit objectives may be written by the instructor or come from the textbook. Regardless of origin, these objectives are prominently stated in the corresponding module or unit so that they are accessible to the student from within the online classroom. Module/Unit learning objectives enable instructors to accurately assess student accomplishment. Objectives describe student performance in specific, observable terms. Note that at some institutions learning objectives may be referred to as learning outcomes. The module/unit objectives are consistent with the course objectives, either implicitly or explicitly. For example, the module/unit objective *"Students will write sentences that demonstrate correct use of commas, semicolons, and periods."* is consistent with the course objective *"Students will demonstrate a mastery of rules of punctuation."* ***Alignment:*** See the statement in the annotation for Standard 2.1.

2.3 All learning objectives are stated clearly and written from the student's perspective.		The learning objectives are stated clearly in the online classroom for all course delivery formats. The learning objectives are written in a way that allows students, including non-native speakers, to easily grasp their meaning and the learning outcomes expected. The use of educational jargon, confusing terms, unnecessarily complex language, and puzzling syntax is avoided. The learning objectives are clearly stated by the instructor, verbally during face-to-face meetings, if applicable, and electronically in the online classroom. As a reviewer, consider both the course and module/unit learning objectives in your assessment of this standard.
2.4 Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate and stated clearly.		Instructions may take various forms (e.g., narratives, bulleted lists, charts) and may appear at different levels within the course, such as module- based or in weekly assignment sheets. Instructions are stated clearly, are complete, and are provided electronically in the online classroom. As a reviewer, consider both the course and module/unit learning objectives in your assessment of this standard. Reviewers may look for information indicating which learning activities, resources, assignments, and assessments support specific learning objectives. Students may be given a list of steps that guides them in meeting the learning objectives for each week. An example would be weekly assignment pages in narrative, bulleted list, or chart form.
2.5 The learning objectives are appropriately designed for the level of the course.		Examine the course and module/unit learning objectives as a whole to ensure they describe knowledge and skills appropriate to the course level. All knowledge and skills need not be present in both the course and module/unit objectives, nor in every single objective. Content mastery is appropriate for the type and level of the course. Lower-division courses address content mastery, critical thinking skills, and core learning skills.

		Upper-division and graduate courses may focus on objectives more closely related to the specific discipline. Taxonomies that describe levels of learning can be helpful in categorizing learning objectives by level. Evaluating the appropriateness of content mastery expectations may be difficult for reviewers whose expertise is not in the course discipline. Reviewers should consult with the SME (subject matter expert) on the review team. Core learning skills, including critical thinking, are typically those that transcend an individual course and are integrated across the curriculum. Core learning skills are sometimes called "core competencies." Core learning skills may include: 1. Proficiency in written and oral communication. 2. Ability to perform mathematical operations. 3. Ability to organize and use information in various ways, with different tools. 4. Understanding what one knows and how one knows it, and also understanding what one does not know and what one needs in order to find it out. Critical thinking skills may include the ability to: 1. Distinguish between fact and opinion. 2. Distinguish between primary and secondary sources. 3. Identify bias and stereotypes. 4. Evaluate information sources for point-of-view, accuracy, usefulness, timeliness, etc. 5. Recognize deceptive arguments. Upper-division and graduate course objectives might include: 1. Mastery of the professional standards of the field. 2. Ability to communicate using the specialized terminology and methods of discourse appropriate to the field.
General Standard 3: Assessment strategies are designed to evaluate student progress by reference to stated learning objectives; to measure the effectiveness of student learning; and to be integral to the learning process.		Assessment is implemented in a manner that not only allows the instructor a broad perspective on the students' mastery of the content, but also allows students to measure their own learning throughout the course.

3.1 The types of assessments selected measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources.		***Alignment*:** Course assessments (ways of confirming student mastery) are consistent with the course and module objectives of the course (see Standards 2.1 and 2.2) by measuring the accomplishment of those objectives. From the types of assessments chosen, it is clear that students can successfully complete the assessments if they have met the objectives stated in the course materials and learning activities. Note: At some institutions, learning objectives may be called learning outcomes. Examples of learning objective-assessment alignment: 1. A problem analysis demonstrates critical thinking skills. 2. A multiple-choice quiz verifies vocabulary knowledge. 3. A composition shows writing skills. Examples of lack of alignment between learning objectives and assessments: 1. The objective is to be able to "write a persuasive essay," but the assessment is a multiple-choice test. 2. The objective is to "demonstrate discipline-specific information literacy," but the assessment is a rubric-scored term paper; and students are not given any practice with information literacy skills on smaller assignments. Some assessments may be geared toward meeting outcomes other than those stated in the course; for example, a course may have a writing component as part of a college-wide "Writing Across the Curriculum" requirement. In that case, the reviewer should suggest including in the course the objectives that reflect the college-wide requirement, if those objectives are not already included in the course. Special situations: In some cases (check the Instructor Worksheet), the course objectives are institutionally mandated, and the individual instructor does not have the authority to change them. For such cases, consider instead the module/unit objectives to assess and score Standard 3.1.

3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.		A clear, written statement fully explains how the course grades are calculated. The points, percentages, and weights for each component of the course grade are clearly stated. The relationship(s) between points, percentages, weights, and letter grades are explained. The instructor's policy on late submissions is clearly stated. Review the clarity of the explanation and presentation to the student, not the simplicity or complexity of a given grading system itself. Even a relatively complex grading system can be made easy to understand. Look for some or all of the following: 1. A list of all activities, tests, etc., that will determine the student's final grade. 2. An explanation of the relationship between the final course letter grade and the student's accumulated points and/or percentages. 3. If points and percentages are used, an explanation of the relationship between the two.
3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation and are tied to the course grading policy.		Students are provided with a clear and meaningful description of the criteria that will be used to evaluate their work and participation in the course. These criteria are stated up-front at the beginning of the course. The description and/or statement of criteria provide students with clear guidance on the instructor's expectations and on the required components of coursework and participation. The criteria give students the information they need to understand how a grade on an assignment or activity will be calculated. As a reviewer, you will ascertain that the criteria used to evaluate students' performance align with the course objectives and contribute to students' future growth and improvement. Note, however, that as a reviewer you are not asked to look for and evaluate the instructor's specific feedback to students in Standard 3.3. Your focus is the design of the course, not the delivery of the course. Examples of what to look for: 1. Evidence that the instructor has stated the criteria for evaluation of students' papers and assignments, such as rubrics or a list of criteria with associated point values. 2. A description of the how students' participation in discussions will be graded, including the number of required postings per week; the criteria for evaluating the originality and quality of students' comments and their responsiveness to classmates' comments; and grade credit students can expect for varying levels of performance.

3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the student work being assessed.		Multiple assessment strategies are used in both the online and face-to-face settings, and they are appropriate to the student work being measured and the format in which they are used. Assessments are varied in order to provide multiple ways for students to demonstrate mastery, and to accommodate multiple learning styles. The assessments are appropriately sequenced so as to promote the learning process and to build on previously mastered knowledge and skills gained in this course and prerequisite courses. Assessments are paced to give students adequate time to achieve mastery and complete the work in a thoughtful manner. Examples that meet the standard: 1. A series of assessments that progress from the definition of terms, to a short paper explaining the relationship between various theoretical concepts, to a term paper that includes the application of theoretical concepts and critical analysis of a journal article. 2. Multiple types of assessment that enable the instructor to become familiar with an individual student's work and that discourage "proxy cheating" (someone other than the student completing and submitting work). 3. A series of assessments evenly paced every two weeks throughout the course. Examples that DO NOT meet the standard: 1. The assessments consist of only multiple-choice tests. 2. The first assessment requires students to locate research materials, while library research skills and methods are not covered until later in the course and are tied to the third assessment. 3. No assessments are administered during the first 12 weeks of the semester, with an essay, term paper, and final exam due during the 13th, 14th, and 15th weeks, respectively. 4. Discussion board posts are assessed on the basis of frequency or word count instead of on criteria related to the course objectives. Circumstances affecting some graduate courses: The grade may be entirely based on a major assignment due at the end of the term. In this case, benchmarks for progress are provided during the term, with feedback from the instructor. Examples of benchmark assignments might include submission of: 1. A bibliography; 2. An outline or project plan; 3. A précis of the paper or project; 4. One or more preliminary drafts.

3.5 Students have multiple opportunities to measure their own learning progress.		Students learn more effectively if they receive frequent, meaningful, and timely feedback. This feedback may come from the instructor directly, from assignments and assessments that have feedback built into them, or even from other students. Look for examples of self-check quizzes and activities, as well as other types of practice opportunities that provide timely feedback. These types of assignments should be voluntary or allow multiple attempts. Examples: 1. Writing assignments that allow for the submission of a draft for instructor comment and suggestions for improvement. 2. Self-mastery tests that include informative feedback with each answer choice. 3. Interactive games and simulations that have feedback built in. 4. Self-scoring practice quizzes. 5. Practice written assignments. 6. Peer reviews. 7. Model papers or essays provided for students' viewing. 8. Sample answers or answer keys provided for students' viewing.
General Standard 4: Instructional materials are sufficiently comprehensive to achieve stated course objectives and learning outcomes.		The instructional materials form the core of the course, and these standards respect the instructor's prerogative in selecting them. The focus of this standard is on supporting the course objectives and competencies, rather than on qualitative judgments about the materials.

4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives.		***Alignment*:** The instructional materials used in the course align with the course and module learning objectives of the course (see Standards 2.1 and 2.2) by contributing to the achievement of those objectives and by integrating effectively with the tools and media selected for delivery (see Standard 6.1). Course materials, resources, and learning objectives align in a clear and direct way. The course materials and resources enable students to achieve the stated learning objectives. As a reviewer, consider both the course and module/unit learning objectives in your assessment of this standard. Note: at some institutions, learning objectives may be called learning outcomes. Decisions on this standard may be difficult for reviewers whose expertise is not in the course discipline. Reviewers should consult with the team SME (subject matter expert) and use common sense to determine if the instructional materials support the learning objectives. Normally textbooks are not provided to reviewers because of cost and logistical limitations. Many publishers provide web links to their textbooks, and reviewers may wish to consult these links. In evaluating the course against this standard, reviewers will work closely with the SME on the team. NOTE: If the course is built solely or predominantly from publisher material, the Quality Matters Publisher Rubric may be a better evaluation tool. In some advanced undergraduate courses and graduate courses, no textbook(s) are assigned. Reviewers will need to consider bibliographies and webliographies provided by the instructor, or, in some cases, developed by students themselves, following guidelines provided by the instructor. Reviewers should focus only on the alignment of the instructional materials with the learning objectives rather than attempt to evaluate the content. If the learning objectives have been judged to be appropriate to the level of the course (Standard 2.5), we assume instructional materials that support these objectives are also appropriate to the level of the course. Special situations: In some cases (check the Instructor Worksheet), the course objectives are institutionally mandated, and the individual instructor does not have the authority to change them. For such cases, consider instead the module/unit objectives to assess and score Standard 4.1.

4.2 The purpose of instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.		Students can easily determine the purpose of all content, materials, resources, technologies, and instructional methods used in the course, and how each will help them achieve the stated learning objectives. Examples: 1. Links to external websites indicate the purpose of the links or are completely self-evident. 2. The function of animated games or exercises is clearly explained or is completely self-evident. If various instructional materials (books, manuals, videos, CD-ROMs/DVDs, computer software, etc.) are used in the course, the purpose of their use and relationship to one another is clearly explained to students. Reviewers should determine if the diversely formatted course materials are integrated well enough to be useful to the student. For example, a course requires students to use the following materials: a textbook divided into chapters, video segments ordered by topics, a website organized around specific skills, and a tutorial CD-ROM or DVD that has an opening menu consisting of "practice quizzes," "images," and "audio examples." Consider whether it is clear to students the order in which they should approach these varied materials, how each is related to the learning objectives and activities, and how the materials are related to one another. In some advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in which students are expected to find their own learning materials, the instructor posts guidelines that assist the student in identifying relevant materials and in distinguishing between core and supplementary materials and between scholarly and non-scholarly sources for academic writing. Reviewers should determine whether these guidelines satisfy the standard.
4.3 All resources and materials used in the course are appropriately cited.		Sources for materials used in the course are clearly identified. Text, images, graphic materials, tables, videos, audios, websites, and other forms of multimedia are appropriately referenced according to the institution's copyright and intellectual property policies. When an extensive body of material comes from a single source, a general statement will suffice. The material may include an e-pack, instructor material, publisher material, etc.
4.4 The instructional materials are current.		The instructional materials represent current thinking in the discipline. Older works considered to be seminal are cited with publication dates. The SME on the team should verify that the works are seminal in the discipline. Decisions on this standard may be difficult for individual reviewers whose expertise is not in the course discipline. Reviewers should consult with the team SME (subject matter expert) and use common sense to determine if the materials are current.

4.5 The instructional materials present a variety of perspectives on the course content.		The course materials are robust and create a rich learning environment for students. The course presents meaningful instructional materials from a variety of sources, including the textbook(s), PowerPoint presentations, websites, lecture notes, periodicals, outlines, and multimedia. Instructional materials are varied, and different perspectives are presented (including, if relevant, perspectives from different cultures). Typically, reviewers would expect to find multiple sources and not just one author. In some disciplines, it may be appropriate to have all materials from a single author. If multiple sources are used, evidence of the intent to include a range of cultural perspectives is found in the sources selected for the course. Decisions on this standard may be difficult for individual reviewers whose expertise is not in the course discipline. Reviewers should consult with the team SME (subject matter expert) and use common sense to determine if the materials are from multiple sources.
4.6 The distinction between required and optional materials is clearly explained.		Clear explanations are provided to students regarding which materials and resources are required and which are optional. Particular attention is given to those resources students need to acquire through purchase, download, CD-ROM, or web access outside of the course. Instructors should clearly indicate materials students are expected to acquire and use to complete course activities and assignments. Such indications about required and optional materials may appear in the syllabus, class schedule, or instructions for learning activities. Ideally, students should be provided this information at the beginning of the class or prior to the start of the class.
General Standard 5: Forms of interaction incorporated in the course motivate students and promote learning.		Engaging students to become active learners contributes to the learning process and to student persistence.

5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives. (Note: in some institutions learning objectives may be called learning outcomes.)		***Alignment*:** Learning activities align with the course and module objectives of the course (see Standards 2.1 and 2.2) by engaging students in activities that directly contribute to the achievement of those objectives and integrating smoothly with the tools and media (Standard 6.1) that enable these activities. The purpose of learning activities is to facilitate the student's achievement of the stated objectives. The learning activities actively engage the learner with the course content. Learning activities are varied in order to provide reinforcement and mastery in multiple ways and to accommodate multiple learning styles. Activities may include reading assignments, student presentations, science labs, class discussions, case studies, role playing, simulation exercises, practice quizzes, tests, etc. Examples of mismatches between activities and objectives: 1. The objective requires students to be able to deliver a persuasive speech, but the activities in the course do not include practice of that skill. 2. The objective is "Prepare each budget within a master budget and explain the importance of each in the overall budgeting process." The students review information about this objective in their texts and observe budgets worked out by the instructor, but they themselves produce only one of the several budgets. *Blended Courses*: In courses that use both the online and face-to-face settings, the learning activities that occur in these two settings are connected by a common thread or theme and are mutually reinforcing. The connection and reinforcement are made clear to students. For example, the different parts of a particular activity might be sequenced in an alternating way in online and face-to-face meetings of the course. Special Situations: When course objectives are institutionally mandated, the reviewer should refer to module/unit objectives to assess Standard 5.1.

5.2 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.		Activities encourage students' engagement during learning through different types of interaction as appropriate to the course. Interactions are designed as activities to support the course objectives and may vary with the discipline, purpose, and level of the course. Reviewers should look for the purpose of the interactions and not just the number of opportunities for interaction. Types of interaction include student-instructor, student-content, and student-student. Active learning involves students engaging by "doing" something, such as discovering, processing or applying concepts and information. Active learning implies guiding students to increasing levels of responsibility for their own learning. Activities for student-instructor interaction might include an assignment or project submitted for instructor feedback; an opportunity for student-instructor discussion in a synchronous session or an asynchronous discussion board exchange; or a frequently-asked-questions (FAQ) discussion forum moderated by the instructor. Activities for student-content interaction might include assigned reading from a text, article, or online resource, assigned completion of a workbook or online exercise, or a learning-how-to-learn activity. Activities for student-student interaction might include assigned collaborative activities such as group discussions, small-group projects, group problem-solving assignments, or peer critiques. Reviewers should look for opportunities for student-instructor interaction, student-content interaction, and, if appropriate to the course, student- student interaction. Refer to the Instructor Worksheet to determine whether or not opportunities for student-student interaction are appropriate to the course. NOTE: Reviewers' evaluation of the types of interactions designed into the activities should be based on what is found to be the nature of the course and not on personal preferences. Students' learning environments usually are broader than a single course and may include informal networks that are beyond the scope of a QM review.

5.3 The instructor's plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.		A clear statement of instructor responsibilities is an important component of an online or blended course. Students are better able to manage their course activities when the instructor has stated his or her timeframe for responding to student emails and discussion postings and lets students know in advance when they will receive feedback on assignments and when grades will be posted. By sharing this information, the instructor also deflects unrealistic student expectations of 24/7 service from the instructor. Frequently this information is conveyed in the syllabus or the "meet the instructor" message. If it is necessary to alter the response-time standards during the course, the instructor is responsible for clearly communicating the adjustment to students.
5.4 The requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.		Look for a clear statement of the instructor's expectations for student participation in required course interactions (frequency, length, timeliness, etc.). The statement helps students plan and manage their class participation and provides a basis for the instructor to evaluate student participation. The more specifically the expectations are explained, the easier it is for the student to meet the expectations. Clearly explaining the role of the instructor and expectations for interactions with the instructor and with other students is especially helpful to students from cultures in which deference to the instructor is customary and who may need encouragement to "speak up." Typically, general statements of student performance expectations are included in the course information page or syllabus. These general requirements may specify the nature of the required participation and expectations for frequency and quality of the student's interactions. More specific, task-related performance expectations may be included in the individual task description. The instructor may also provide rubrics detailing how student interactions are evaluated, including reading and responding to the instructor's and classmates' posts.
General Standard 6: Course navigation and technology support student engagement and ensure access to course components.		The technology enabling the various course components facilitates the student's learning experience and is easy to use, rather than impeding the student's progress.

6.1 The tools and media support the course learning objectives.		***Alignment*:** The tools and media selected for the course align with the course and module objectives of the course (see Standards 2.1 and 2.2) by effectively supporting the assessment instruments (Standard 3.1), instructional materials (Standard 4.1), and learning activities (Standard 5.1) in the course. Tools are functional software that provide areas for interaction in the course; they may be included in the learning management system (LMS) or external to the LMS. Examples of tools include discussion boards, chat rooms, grade book, social media, games, whiteboard, wikis, blogs, virtual classrooms, web conferencing, etc. Media are one-way delivery modalities that enhance learning. Examples of media include video, audio, animations, and podcasts. Specific tools and media are not required for this standard to be met. If they are used, they support the learning objectives and fit the learning activities. Clear information and instructions are provided regarding how the tools and media support the learning objectives. Technology is not to be used simply for the sake of using technology. For example, a course might require viewing video materials, but it may not be clear how the video materials illustrate or support a learning objective. Special situations: In some cases (check the Instructor Worksheet), the course objectives are institutionally mandated, and the individual instructor does not have the authority to change them. For such cases, consider instead the module/unit objectives to assess and score Standard 6.1.
6.2 Course tools and media support student engagement and guide the student to become an active learner.		Tools and media used in the course help students actively engage in the learning process rather than passively absorb information. Selected tools and media help the student engage in the reflection that leads to deep learning. Types of learner interaction include learner-content, learner- instructor, and learner-learner. Interactions can provide opportunities to increase students' comfort with course material and technology, and the goal should be to facilitate the broadest and deepest learner engagement possible in the course. Examples of tools and media that support engagement: 1. Interactive, real-time software, such as real-time collaborative tools, webinars, and virtual worlds. 2. Software that facilitates interactions and collaborations, such as shared documents or wikis. 3. Animations, simulations, and games that require student input. 4. Discussion tools with automatic notification or a "read/unread" tracking feature. 5. Automated self-check exercises requiring student responses.

6.3 Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.		Navigation refers to the process of planning, recording, and controlling the movement of a learner from one place to another in the online course. Considerations for effective navigation devices in the online course may include: 1. Adherence to accepted web standards-of-function for hypertext links, buttons, and windows. 2. Provisions for intuitive understanding of a function when non-standard navigation devices are employed (e.g., clicking and dragging a playing card from a deck into an appropriate category). 3. Consistent use of navigation devices within the learning management system (LMS) and for moving between the LMS and other sites, such as a publisher site. Some navigation devices--next and previous links, for example--are provided by the learning management system used for course delivery and cannot be modified. Other navigation devices--hypertext links, icons, and window functions, for example--may be within the control of the course designer. In evaluating this standard, the reviewer should determine the locus of responsibility for the design of course navigation features.

6.4 Students can readily access the technologies required in the course.		All required technologies are easily obtainable, either through download, purchase at the bookstore, or another means. The word "technologies" covers a wide range, including hardware, software, subscriptions, and plug-ins. In evaluating this standard, reviewers should consider both the availability of the technologies and other resources and whether clear instructions are provided for access, installation, and use. From information provided in the course instructions, students are able to readily obtain the hardware and peripherals necessary to complete all course activities. For specific peripheral devices needed for course completion, instructions are included on how to obtain the peripheral devices, and on how to install and use them. Students have ready access to all software used in the course. Examples of software include statistical analysis software, equation editors, web authoring tools, or programming software. Students also have access to online tools and plug-ins, such as Acrobat Reader and Flash, Java, media players, MP3 players, wikis, social media, etc. A clearly worded statement lists the required software and plug-ins, along with instructions for obtaining and installing them. For technologies that require subscriptions, instructions are provided on how to obtain the subscription, including information on acquisition of access codes and on user identification requirements. Examples of how to help ensure student access: 1. If speakers, a microphone, and/or a headset are necessary, the need for such peripherals is clearly stated.

		2. Links are provided to required peripherals to be purchased from the college bookstore or other source. 3. A list of required downloadable resources, including links, is provided. 4. Links are provided to access materials such as OpenOffice, to allow students free access to necessary course documents. 5. If publisher materials are used, clearly stated information about how to obtain and use any required access codes is provided. 6. Instructions are provided on how to access materials available through subscriptions to online journals or databases. When feasible, links are also provided. 7. For textbooks, CDs, and DVDs, information provided includes the title, author, publisher, ISBN number, copyright date, and details on where copies can be obtained. 8. A navigation button devoted to "Resources" is integrated in the overall course design. 9. A custom CD or DVD prepared for the course is surface-mailed to students. Information on how to reach technical support likewise is easy to find and clearly presented for students who may need assistance with obtaining necessary course technologies or with changing software versions.

6.5 The course technologies are current.		Innovative technologies continuously appear on the market, and course technology should be up-to-date and chosen to best meet the needs of the course. Look for evidence of appropriate incorporation of tools and media such as social media, mobile technologies, games, simulations, wikis, blogs, podcasts, and virtual worlds in the course's online and technology- supported design. Courses not recently developed may need to be updated. Examples of current technology that may be used in support of the course objectives to enhance student learning: 1. Synchronous web conference tools used for orientation, group projects, tutoring, test reviews, etc. 2. A mobile application that, for instance, students use to identify plants in a botany course. 3. A wiki used for group collaboration. 4. Blogs used for student journals. 5. A simulation that demonstrates something not possible in the physical world; for instance, a process or procedure that takes place inside a dangerous or inaccessible place. 6. A simulation replicating laboratory activities that allows manipulations of objects on the screen similar to hands-on lab experiences. 7. Web-based voice tools used by English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instructors and students to practice pronunciation, vocabulary, etc. The course design takes advantage of the features of the learning management system. Courses may incorporate new features of the learning management system that further support learning objectives (see 6.1 regarding learning objectives). As a reviewer, keep in mind that the tools and media available to an instructor may vary greatly from institution to institution and are sometimes limited by the access and support provided by the institution.
General Standard 7: The course facilitates student access to institutional support services essential to student success.		In the learner support standard, four different kinds of addressed: technical support, accessibility support, academic services support, and student services support.

7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to access it.		Technical support for learners differs from institution to institution and includes such information as how to log in; how to use the tools and features of the learning management system; and how to get help desk support. Technical support does not include help with course content or assignments or academic or student support services (see Standards 7.3 and 7.4). Look for evidence that learners have access to technical support services from within the course or the learning management system. The purpose is not to review the adequacy of those services at an institutional level but rather to determine if technical support services are provided for learners and that the course contains information about the services and how to access them. Examples of providing information about technical support: 1. A clear description of the technical support services provided by the institution, including a link to a technical support website. 2. An email link to the institution's technical support center or help desk. 3. A phone number for the institution's technical support center or help desk. 4. Clearly worded directions for obtaining support for access to publisher- supplied materials (e.g., e-packs or course cartridges). 5. Links to tutorials or other resources providing instructions on how to use the tools and features of the learning management system. 6. A link to "frequently asked questions".
7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to the institution’s accessibility policies and services.		Accessibility policies or accommodation statements state that services and accommodations are available for students with disabilities and inform the student how such services may be accessed. To meet this standard, the course may include: 1. A link to the institution's formal accessibility policy, if a policy exists. 2. A statement that informs the student how to gain access to an institution's disability support services, if such services exist; for example, a telephone number or website link for the disability services office. If the institution does not have an applicable disability policy or disability services, the instructor may provide a policy that will be adhered to in the course to assure that student disabilities will be accommodated.

7.3 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help students succeed in the course and how students can access the services.		Academic support for students, and the scope of what "academic support services and resources" entails, differs from institution to institution. For the purposes of review, academic support services and resources may include an online orientation; access to library resources; a readiness assessment or survey; testing services; tutoring; non-native language services; writing and/or math centers; tutorials or other forms of guidance on conducting research, writing papers, citing sources, using an online writing lab, and using institution-specific technology; supplemental instruction programs; and teaching assistants. Look for evidence that learners have access to academic support services and resources from within the course or the learning management system. The purpose is not to review the adequacy of these services and resources on an institutional level but rather to determine if academic support services and resources are provided for learners and if the course contains information about the services and how to access them. Examples of features that connect students with academic support services: 1. A link to the academic support website, along with a listing and definition of academic support services and resources provided for learners. 2. Links to institution-specific academic support services and how to access these services (e.g., location of testing center and/or proctored test sites, hours of operation, phone numbers and email addresses for key personnel). 3. Links to online orientations or demo courses. 4. A link to the library, including information on how to obtain library access, request materials, access databases, and contact a librarian. 5. A link to tutorials or guides on conducting research, writing papers, and citing sources.

7.4 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's student support services can help students succeed and how students can access the services.		Student support services, and the scope of what such support entails, differ from institution to institution. For the purposes of this review, student support services include advising, registration, financial aid, student or campus life, counseling, career services, online workshops, and student organizations. Look for evidence that learners have access to student support services from within the course or the learning management system. The purpose is not to review the adequacy of those services on an institutional level but rather to determine if information about student support services and how to access them is provided in the course. The course may provide the following: 1. A clear description of institution-specific student support services and how to access them (including email addresses and phone numbers for key personnel). 2. A link to the student support website, along with a listing and description of student support services. 3. Guidance on when and how students should access a particular support service.
General Standard 8: The course demonstrates a commitment to accessibility for all students.		The accessibility standard incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and is consistent with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG).
8.1 The course employs accessible technologies and provides guidance on how to obtain accommodation.		As electronically delivered courses continue to evolve, instructors will face many choices when they select the tools and media that best support their learning objectives. The intent of this standard is to ensure the learning management system and the tools and media selected are accessible to students with disabilities. To meet this standard, reviewers should determine if both of the following conditions are met: 1. If the course is offered in an accessible learning management system (LMS), a statement by the LMS provider certifying accessibility should be readily available as a link or attached to the Instructor Worksheet. 2. The instructor provides documentation stating the degree of accessibility of any content, tools, and software used in the course. If any component of the course is inaccessible, instructions are provided on how to obtain accommodation.

8.2 The course contains equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content.		To meet this standard, alternative means of access to course information are provided for the vision- or hearing-impaired student, such as equivalent textual representations of images, audio, animations, and video in the course website. Such alternatives may be found within the course, or learners may be directed to where they may access the alternative representations. Examples: 1. An audio lecture has a text transcript available. 2. A video clip, image, or animation is captioned and/or available with a text transcript. A statement accompanies any of the above media explaining how to seek accommodations or content in alternative formats. Note to reviewers: In instances where alternative formats need to be requested, the review team should test the availability of the alternate content.
8.3 The course design facilitates readability and minimizes distractions.		The course uses appropriate design elements, including colors, fonts, spacing, graphics, formatting, and color coding to facilitate readability and minimize distractions for the student. Colors are used judiciously and do not present a barrier to students accessing the content. Fonts and spacing do not crowd words or present a barrier to the content. Graphics and animations are used to enhance instructional materials and illustrate ideas without causing distraction from the materials. Formatting (how content is arranged on the page) and color coding are used to serve specific instructional purposes. For example, format and color are used purposefully to communicate key points, group like items, emphasize relevant relationships, etc. Sufficient contrast between backgrounds and fonts is used to distinguish text from background, with thought given to color choices for those with difficulties distinguishing among colors. If color-coding is used, an additional means to communicate information, such as bold or italics, should be used in conjunction with color coding.

8.4 The course design accommodates the use of assistive technologies.		Presenting information in text format is generally acceptable because screen reader software (used by the vision-impaired) can read text. Course pages have links that are self-describing and meaningful, with file names and web hyperlinks having easy-to-understand names. Icons used as links also have HTML tags or an accompanying text link. Reviewers should also consider whether the use of tables, particular document formats, navigation, and links may impose barriers to assistive technology. Examples: 1. Navigation is streamlined by providing a method that allows users to skip navigation or other elements that repeat on every page. This shortcut is usually accomplished by providing a "Skip to Content," "Skip to Main Content," or "Skip Navigation" link at the top of the page that goes to the main content of the page. 2. HTML documents and tagged PDF files are mostly accessible to assistive technology. 3. Tables are used for layout and to organize data. Tables used to organize tabular data have appropriate table headers. Data cells are associated with their appropriate headers, making it easier for screen-reader users to navigate and understand the data table.

Appendix C: Revised DE Webpages Outline

DE Homepage should be linked from IUP Homepage, MyIUP, online program pages, and homepages of departments that teach distance education courses.
All links to pages outside of DE webpages to be to the single authoritative source.

Text in BLACK references existing pages and only requires restructuring. Text in BLUE references pages and resources that require development.

DE Homepage
Homepage will include four main components: a clickable banner, and a button for each audience - online admissions, current students, and faculty.

1. Clickable Banner to feature different events/aspects of online learning (e.g., Summer Session, Winter Session, Act 48, CEUs, featured faculty, featured courses, featured programs, etc.)
2. IUP Online Admissions (Prospective Students)
    - Request more information [Online form to be created]
    - Programs and Courses
        - Undergraduate Programs
        - Graduate Programs
        - Online Courses [Will revive the old listing of the courses approved to be offered online AND a link to URSA to look up the current course offerings]
    - How to Apply
        - Undergraduate/Post-Bacc Students [Information from http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=21247]
            - Non-IUP Students
            - Current Students
        - Graduate Students [Information from http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=96957]
            - Non-IUP Students
            - Current Students
    - Is online learning right for me?
      Summary of baseline of what is involved in typical online class.
      Self-assessment for online learning (Interactive PDF) [Search online for assessments at other institutions]
        - Authorized states listed here or included in interactive PDF. Documentation regarding state authorization is currently available only as a news item on DE webpage. A permanent link to this information needs to be created.
    - What technology and skills do I need? [Title: Getting Started]
        - This is currently buried here: http://www.iup.edu/distance/students/responsibilities/default.aspx
        - IUP's recommended computer specs (see http://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/howto.aspx?id=85564 AND http://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/howto.aspx?id=46433)

        - These pages are hardware/software specific – it would be helpful to generate help documents to instruct students in the technical components of courses and link them on the 'Computing Guides for Online Learning' page.
    - Content to be developed; general statement of the types of skills expected in an online course. Identify entry-level competencies and use material from Basic Abilities at http://www.iup.edu/distance/students/responsibilities/default.aspx
- How much it costs
  Link to http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=17313
  The link should be accompanied by some commentary that helps the student calculate the cost per class or for a program.
- Get financial aid
  Link to http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=16943
    - This page requires some edits: 1) Title references Distance Education rather than Online Learning; 2) Question should refer to "completing courses" in order to include both courses and programs; 3) The last sentence should read, "For more information regarding online programs and courses, please refer to the IUP Online site." In order to eliminate ambiguity about it containing financial aid information.

3. <u>Current IUP Online students</u>
    - Getting started for new online students
        - Online orientation [content and format needs to be developed]
        - Getting Started (for students who miss the online orientation, such as winter transients, or those requiring a refresher)
            - Change the order of responsibilities: 1) What to do 2 – 3 weeks before; 2) Checklist of what to do; 3) FAQs
            - Short video (15 minutes) outlining online learning process and resources
            - Screen shots of D2L pages and walk-through of set-up
            - Starting the course
            - Call department if course is not open on Day 1 of classes
    - Order Textbooks
        - In MyIUP under Academic tab
    - Student Resources [current page requires some revision and reformatting]
    - IUP Online Student Handbook [a version of this is available from Continuing Education]
    - IUP Grad and Undergrad Catalogs / The Source
    - Get assistance for an on-line learning problem
        - Information regarding IT Support and how to report problems
        - Link to online 24/7 support form (http://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/help/default.aspx)

- Link to relevant IT Support pages (see above What Technology and Skills do I Need)
- Information on online proctoring
- Link to Student Complaint Process on State Authorization page
    - What is the internal complaint process? State authorization page tells them to seek internal resolution first but doesn't say what that is; then refers them to appropriate agency in home state (as required by federal regulations).

- Access your online course [Link to D2L and Moodle with log-in instructions. Need to note on here that the course may not be available until the first day of classes]
- Online community
    - Student affairs and activities
    - On-line community developed following recommendations in body of this report.

4. IUP Faculty [IUP Only Access/password-protected]
    - Develop an on-line course
      Overview of development process
      Services offered for course development
    - Teaching online
        - Checklist of logistical practices in preparation for teaching a course
        - Open the course early if at all possible – acclimates students, and they know it is open
        - Suggested resources for faculty wishing to teach online
        - IT Services' relevant links – e.g. video support under itsupport/D2L
        - Bibliography of teaching resources and texts
    - Get help with your on-line course
    - Interactive form to ask questions of the instructional designer OR link to designer blog where people can post questions and get responses.
    - Funding on-line development
    - Include links to support services (IT, peer to peer, CTE, etc.)

Appendix D: Association of College and Research Libraries Standards for Distance Learning Library Services

Part I Foundations

Executive Summary: The Access Entitlement Principle

Every student, faculty member, administrator, staff member, or any other member of an institution of higher education, is entitled to the library services and resources of that institution, including direct communication with the appropriate library personnel, regardless of where enrolled or where located in affiliation with the institution. Academic libraries must, therefore, meet the information and research needs of all these constituents, wherever they may be. This principle of access entitlement, as applied to individuals at a distance, is the undergirding and uncompromising conviction of the *Standards for Distance Learning Library Services*, hereinafter designated as the *Standards*.

The access entitlement principle applies equally to individuals on a main campus, off campus, in distance learning or regional campus programs, or in the absence of any physical campus. The principle applies to all public, private, profit, and non-profit academic institutions. The principle likewise applies to courses taken for credit, non-credit, and through continuing education programs, and to courses taught face-to-face in classrooms in remote settings, or via any medium - or through any other means of distance learning. The *Standards* delineate elements necessary to achieving this and the other closely related principles provided in the Philosophy section.

Introduction: A Living Document

Since their inception as *Guidelines* (see Provenance section) in 1963, and throughout their close to half a century of revision, expansion, and use, the primary motivation for establishing and maintaining the *Standards* has indeed been concern for ensuring the delivery of equivalent library services and information resources to college and university students, faculty, and other personnel in remote settings. The *Guidelines*, from which the *Standards* evolved, had been under particularly frequent revision and expansion in the past decade. These *Standards*, like the *Guidelines* before them, have been prepared by the Guidelines Committee of the Distance Learning Section (DLS) of the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association (ALA).

Incentive to adapt and expand the *Guidelines* , leading to their evolving into today's *Standards*, stemmed from the following increasingly critical factors: non-traditional study having rapidly become a major element in higher education; the expanding diversity of educational opportunities; a growing number of unique environments where educational opportunities are offered; greater recognition of the need for library resources and services at locations other than main campuses; growing concern and demand for equitable services for all students in higher education, no matter where the "classroom" may be; a greater demand for library resources and services by faculty and staff at distance learning sites; and the expansion and advancement in technological innovations in the transmittal of information and the delivery of courses. To these may be added shifts away from central campus enrollments, the search for more cost-effective

sources for post-secondary education, and the appearance and rapid development of the virtual or all-electronic university, having no physical campus of its own.

Online access to library resources has blurred the distinctions between main campus online users of library resources and distance learning online users. Main campus online users are typically enrolled there, or employed there, and are using online library resources in their dorms or offices, in their apartments, in their nearby family homes, or anywhere they can get Internet access for their laptop computers or other portable devices. These individuals function very much like distance learners and faculty in their online use of library resources and require some of the same kinds of interactions with library personnel.

Some main campus online users do literally become distance learners, or distance learning personnel, by dual enrollment, or through dual employment, in both on-campus and distance learning courses. Often distance learning courses are chosen by students in order to obtain some of the additional services provided through these courses. Other students choose these courses in order to avoid being in a classroom.

Contrasted with the main campus online users and nearby distance learners are those distance learners or instructors who are truly geographically isolated from the originating institution, often hundreds or thousands of miles away. Such individuals frequently have little institutional contact or identity. Further, these individuals also typically have special needs for the services and resources their institutional libraries can supply and are therefore targeted for services to supply those needs.

These categories of main campus online users and distance learning online users differ primarily because of variations in their degree of isolation from the originating institution and the library. The *Standards* are designed to apply to all categories of distance users of their institutional libraries.

Although some virtual institutions have created their own virtual libraries, many have found it necessary to compensate for their lack of library facilities by contracting with libraries on academically respected physical campuses in order to provide their own students adequate library services and materials. A librarian-administrator from the virtual institution will be stationed at the physical library to coordinate the provision of materials and services to the virtual university students. Combinations of virtual and physical libraries may also be undertaken. Whatever solutions are developed for providing library services and materials to students of virtual institutions, care must be taken to meet the requirements specified throughout these *Standards*.

In addition to providing their own content, the *Standards* function as a gateway to adherence to other appropriate standards and guidelines of ACRL, to the extent that each document, or portions thereof, apply to services provided the distance learning community. The most recent editions of these ACRL standards and guidelines may be found at:
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/index.cfm

It is further anticipated that additional guidance will be provided by check lists, guidelines, and standards from other divisions of ALA, or other organizations, such as professional accrediting associations, and the United States regional accrediting associations and commissions for educational institutions. Selected specific examples are provided where appropriate in later sections of the *Standards*.

Guidance in the use and application of the *Standards* may be found at the DLS website.

A comprehensive bibliography of recent literature on distance learning library services and information on earlier editions of the bibliography can be accessed from the DLS website.

The intended audience for the *Standards* includes administrators at all levels of post-secondary education, librarians planning for managing and providing distance learning library services, other librarians and library personnel serving distance learning students or working with distance learning program staff, distance learning faculty, funding sources, accrediting organizations, and licensure agencies.

Definitions

Distance learning library services: Library services in support of college, university, or other post-secondary courses and programs offered away from a main campus, or in the absence of a traditional campus, and regardless of where credit is given. Courses thus supported may be taught in traditional or nontraditional formats or media, may or may not require physical facilities, and may or may not involve live interaction of teachers and students. The phrase is inclusive of services to courses in all post-secondary programs designated as: extension, extended, off-campus, extended campus, distance, distributed, open, flexible, franchising, virtual, synchronous, or asynchronous.

Distance learning community: All individuals, institutions, or agencies directly involved with academic programs or extension services offered away from or in the absence of a traditional academic campus, including students, faculty, researchers, administrators, sponsors, and staff, or any of these whose academic work otherwise takes them away from on-campus library services.

Originating institution: The credit-granting body; that is, the entity, singular or collective, and the chief administrative officers and governance organizations responsible for the offering, marketing, and/or supporting of distance learning courses and programs. Each institution in a multi-institutional cluster is responsible for meeting the library needs of its own students, faculty, and staff at the collective site.

Library: Denotes the library operation directly associated with the originating institution. In the case of virtual universities, the library itself may be virtual, or it may be the library of an existing traditional institution, contracted for services and materials to the students, faculty, and other personnel of the virtual institution.

Librarian-administrator: A librarian holding a Master's degree from an ALA-accredited program who specializes in distance learning library services and is directly responsible for the

administration and supervision of those services. Libraries that use innovative staffing models or distributed service models which do not have a single specified distance learning librarian-administrator, must assign portions of that position among librarians with the requisite expertise throughout the library operation in order to carry out all the duties and responsibilities specified for the librarian-administrator in these *Standards* .

Philosophy: A Bill of Rights for the Distance Learning Community

Along with the access entitlement principle, the *Standards* are founded upon the following additional precepts:

- Access for Achievement of Superior Academic Skills: Access to appropriate library services and resources is essential for the attainment of superior academic skills in post-secondary education, regardless of where students, faculty, staff, and programs are located. Members of the distance learning community, including those with disabilities, must therefore be provided effective and appropriate library services and resources, which may differ from, but must be equivalent to those provided for students and faculty in traditional campus settings.

- Direct Human Access: Direct human access must be made available to the distance learning community through instruction, interaction, and intervention from library personnel in the provision of library services and in facilitating successful use of library resources, particularly electronic resources requiring computer literacy and information literacy skills.

- Additional Investment: Traditional on-campus library services and personnel cannot simply be stretched in an attempt to meet the library needs of the distance learning community without any additional investment. Even with technological developments rendering location less relevant than in the past, distance learning students and faculty still face distinct and different challenges involving library access and information delivery. Special funding arrangements, specialized staffing, proactive planning, and promotion are necessary to deliver equivalent library services and to achieve equivalent results in teaching and learning, and generally to maintain quality in distance learning programs. Equitable distance learning library services are often more personalized than might be expected on campus, because students and faculty in distance learning programs seldom have direct access to a full range of library services and materials.

- Mandated Support: The originating institution must, through its chief administrative officers and governance organizations and the active leadership of the library administration, provide for funding and appropriately meeting the information needs of its distance learning programs in support of their teaching, learning, and research. This support must provide ready and equivalent library service and learning resources to all of the institution's students, faculty, and other personnel, regardless of location. This support must be funded separately, in addition to, rather than drawn from, the regular funding of the library. Innovative or distributed systems should not be used simply to provide distance learning library services in avoidance of making any additional separate

investments in these services. In growing and developing institutions, funding should expand as programs and enrollments grow.

- Technical Linkages: The originating institution must provide for service, management, and technical linkages between the library and other complementary resource bases such as computing facilities, instructional media, support services for people with disabilities, and telecommunication centers.

- Meeting Other Standards, Guidelines, Laws, and Regulations: The originating institution must assure that its distance learning library programs meet or exceed national and regional accreditation standards and professional association standards and guidelines, as well as the mandate for equal program and service access for users with disabilities and compliance with appropriate federal and state laws, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Programs offered in other nations must likewise meet all relevant local and national laws and regulations.

- Institutional Involvement of Library and Other Personnel: The originating institution must involve library and other personnel in all stages of the detailed analysis of planning, developing, evaluating, and adding or changing of the distance learning programs.

- Written Agreements: The originating institution is responsible, through the library, for the development and periodic review of formal and documented written agreements when resources and services from unaffiliated local libraries are to be used to support information needs of the distance learning community. Such resources and services are not to be used simply as substitutes for supplying adequate materials and services by the originating institution.

- Meeting Needs, the Primary Responsibility: The library has primary responsibility for making its resources and services available to its users regardless of physical location. Therefore, the library identifies, develops, coordinates, implements, and assesses these resources and services. The library's programs must be designed to meet not only standard informational and skills development needs but also the unique needs of the distance learning community. The requirements and desired outcomes of academic programs should guide the library's responses to defined needs. Innovative approaches to the design and evaluation of special procedures or systems to meet these needs, both current and anticipated, are encouraged.

- Strategic Planning: The library must maintain a current strategic plan and vision for serving distance learners. Strategic planning is an iterative process that includes evaluation, updating, and refinement. Formal planning procedures and methods must be used. These planning methods require input from a broad spectrum of the originating institution's community, including distance learners. The library must likewise include distance learning library services in its mission statement and goals, which serve as a framework for all its activities. The mission and goals should be compatible and consistent with those developed by the originating institution. These methods help the institution prepare for the future by clearly defining a vision and mission, by setting goals

and objectives, and by implementing specific strategies or courses of action designed to help meet those ends.

- Outcomes Assessment: The library must make outcomes assessment a major component of distance learning library services. Outcomes assessment addresses the accountability of institutions to determine whether distance students are learning effectively and whether library services are effectively meeting their needs. As an active mechanism for improving current library practices, outcomes assessment focuses on the achievement of outcomes that have been identified as desirable in the goals and objectives of distance learning library services and identifies performance measures, such as proficiencies, that indicate how well the library is doing what it has stated it wishes to do. Outcomes assessment of distance learning library services should take into consideration the greater dependence of libraries on technology, their increasing use of online services, their growing responsibility to provide information literacy skills, their increasing reliance on consortial services, and new developments in the ways in which scholarly information is published and distributed.

- Information Literacy: The library must provide information literacy instruction programs to the distance learning community in accordance with the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, as cited below under Services. The attainment of lifelong learning skills through general bibliographic and information literacy instruction in academic libraries is a primary outcome of higher education, and as such, must be provided to all distance learning students.

Part II Specific Requirements

Fiscal Responsibilities

The originating institution must provide continuing, optimum financial support for library services to the distance learning community. This support must be sufficient to meet not only the specifications listed below, but also those given in other sections of the *Standards*, as well as specifications in other applicable ACRL standards and guidelines, and those of professional, state, and regional accrediting agencies, as noted earlier. This financing should be:

- related to the formally defined needs and demands of the distance learning program;
- allocated on a schedule matching the originating institution's budgeting cycle;
- designated and specifically identified within the originating institution's budget and expenditure reporting statements;
- accommodated to arrangements involving external agencies, including both unaffiliated and affiliated, but independently supported, libraries;
- sufficient to support staffing as specified in Personnel;
- sufficient to cover the type and number of services provided to the distance learning community; and
- sufficient to support innovative approaches to meeting needs.

Personnel

As noted in the definition of the librarian-administrator and in the opening statement of the following Management section, the functions of the librarian-administrator may be dispersed across innovative or distributed library systems among a number of librarians rather than assigned to one designated individual; however, under such circumstances, care must be taken to ensure that none of the essential functions of the librarian-administrator, as provided in the *Standards* and other closely related documents, are omitted from these systems.

Personnel involved in the management and coordination of distance learning library services include both library administrators and key administrative and support personnel from the originating institution, who participate on the main campus, and at distance learning sites. Among these are the ADA compliance officer or staff from support services for people with disabilities. Participating library personnel include the librarian-administrator and librarians with the appropriate expertise to provide services to the distance learning community.

The originating institution must provide professional and support personnel with clearly defined responsibilities at the appropriate location(s) and in the number and of the qualifications necessary to attain the goals and objectives for library services to the distance learning program, including direct human access for the distance learning community. These individuals may be assigned to the library or in separately administered units, and should include:

- a librarian-administrator to plan, implement, coordinate, and evaluate library resources and services addressing the information and skills needs of the distance learning community;
- additional professional and/or support personnel with the capacity and training to identify informational and skills needs of distance learning library users and respond to them directly, regardless of location. The exact combination of central and site staffing for distance learning library services will differ from institution to institution.

Distance learning library personnel must have:

- classification, status, salary scales, and workload equivalent to that of other comparable library employees, while reflecting the compensation levels and cost of living for those residing at distance learning sites;
- written policies establishing their status, rights, and responsibilities. Policy regarding faculty librarians should be consistent with the ACRL *Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians* , http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standardsfaculty.cfm, and
- opportunities for continuing growth and development, including continuing education, professional education, and participation in professional and staff organizations.

Library Education

To enable the initiation of an academic professional specialization in distance learning library services, schools of library and information science should include in their curriculum, courses and course units in this growing area of specialization within librarianship.

Management

As noted above both in Definitions and Personnel, the functions of the librarian-administrator may be dispersed across innovative or distributed library systems among a number of librarians rather than assigned to one designated individual. Care must be taken under such circumstances to ensure that none of the essential functions of the librarian-administrator, as presented below, are omitted from these systems.

The librarian-administrator, either centrally located or at an appropriate site, is the principal and direct agent for implementation of library services and resources in support of distance learning programs, as funded by the chief administrative officers and governance organizations of the originating institution, and as framed through the active leadership of the library administration.

As an agent of both the originating institution and the library, the librarian-administrator manages services and access to resources for the distance learning community. At a minimum, the librarian-administrator pursues, implements, and maintains all of the following areas of management in order to provide a facilitating environment in support of teaching and learning, and in the acquisition of lifelong learning skills.

1. Mission, goals, and objectives
The librarian-administrator:

- develops a written statement of immediate and long-range goals and objectives for distance learning library services, which addresses defined needs and outlines the methods by which progress can be measured;
- promotes the incorporation of the distance learning mission statement, goals, and objectives into those of the library and of the originating institution as a whole;
- involves distance learning community representatives, including local administrators and on-site faculty and students, in the formation of the objectives and the regular evaluation of their achievement; and
- participates in the strategic planning processes of the originating institution and the library.

2. Needs and outcomes assessments
The librarian-administrator is responsible for ensuring and demonstrating that all requirements for distance learning library services are met through needs and outcomes assessments, and other measures of library performance, as appropriate.

The librarian-administrator assesses the existing library support for distance learning, its availability, appropriateness, and effectiveness, using qualitative, quantitative, and outcomes measurement devices as well as a written profile of needs.

The librarian-administrator regularly surveys distance learning library users to monitor and assess both the appropriateness of their use of services and resources and the degree to which needs are being met and skills acquired.

Assessment instruments may include surveys, tests, interviews, and other valid measuring devices. These instruments may be designed specifically for the function being measured, or previously developed instruments may be used. It is critical, however, to choose carefully the instrument, the size of the sample, and the method used for sampling. The instrument should be valid, and the way it is used should be appropriate for the task.

These planning and evaluation processes are ongoing and should be conducted in cooperation with the library and the originating institution. The librarian-administrator:

- uses inputs, outputs, outcomes, and assessments as detailed in *Standards for Libraries in Higher Education* http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standardslibraries.cfm
- prepares a written profile of the information and skills needs of the current and potential distance learning community;
- conducts general library knowledge surveys of students at the beginning, midpoint and near graduation to assess the effectiveness of their information literacy instruction;
- uses evaluation checklists for librarian and tutorial instruction to gather feedback from students, other librarians, and teaching faculty;
- tracks student library use through student journal entries, or information literacy diaries;
- asks focus groups of students, faculty, staff, and alumni to comment on their experiences using distance learning library services over a period of time;
- assesses and articulates both the electronic and traditional library resource needs of the distance learning community; and
- assesses and articulates needs related to library services, including instruction;
- assesses and articulates needs for facilities, in both traditional and online environments;
- conducts reviews of specific library and information service areas or operations which support distance learning library services;
- reviews accessibility of distance learning library services for the entire learning community;
- considers distance learning library services in the assessment strategies related to institutional accreditation;
- compares the library as a provider of distance learning library services with its peers through self-study efforts of the originating institution;
- employs assessment and evaluation by librarians from other institutions or other appropriate consultants, including those in communities where the institution has concentrations of distance learners; and
- participates in continuous institutional assessment and effectiveness programs and processes.

3. Collections and services
The librarian-administrator:

- prepares or revises collection development and acquisitions policies to reflect the profile of needs;
- develops methods for delivering library materials and services to the distance learning community;
- ensures that needed services identified in the planning process are provided to the distance learning community; and
- Promotes library support services to the distance learning community.

4. Cooperation and collaboration
The librarian-administrator:

- participates in the curriculum development process and in course planning for distance learning to ensure that appropriate library resources and services are available;
- works collaboratively with teaching faculty in distance-delivered programs to integrate information literacy into courses and programs in order to foster lifelong learning skills;
- promotes dialogue between distance learning and library administrators to ensure cooperation between the two groups;
- Initiates dialogue leading to cooperative agreements and possible resource sharing or compensation for unaffiliated libraries, where applicable.
- develops partnerships that ensure the necessary technology support for the distance learning community; and
- Acts as an advocate for the distance learning community among colleagues in the library and on campus.

Facilities and Equipment

The originating institution must provide sufficient facilities, equipment, and communication tools to attain the objectives of the distance learning programs. The size, number, scope, and accessibility of these facilities and equipment must be sufficient to provide timely access for all students, including those with disabilities. Arrangements may vary and should be appropriate to programs offered. Examples of suitable arrangements include but are not limited to one or a combination of:

- access to facilities through agreements with a nonaffiliated library;
- designated space for consultations, ready reference collections, reserve collections, electronic transmission of information, computerized data base searching and interlibrary loan services, and offices for the library distance learning personnel;
- a branch or satellite library; and
- Online services, including Web-based virtual libraries, electronic communication tools, and course management software.

Resources

The originating institution is responsible for ensuring that the distance learning community has access to library materials equivalent to those provided in traditional settings. Thus, the institution must provide or secure convenient, direct access to library materials in appropriate formats that are of sufficient quality, depth, number, scope, and currency to:

- meet all students' needs in fulfilling course assignments;
- enrich the academic programs;
- meet teaching and research needs;
- support curricular needs;
- facilitate the acquisition of lifelong learning skills;
- accommodate students with varying levels of technological access (i.e. low bandwidth); and
- accommodate other informational needs of the distance learning community as appropriate.

When more than one institution is involved in the provision of a distance learning program, each is responsible for the provision of library materials to the students enrolled in its courses, unless an equitable agreement for otherwise providing these materials has been made. Costs, services, and methods for the provision of materials for all courses in the program should be uniform.

Services

Library services offered to the distance learning community must be designed to meet a wide range of informational, *instructional*, and user needs, and should provide some form of direct user access to library personnel. The exact combination of service delivery methods will differ from institution to institution. Specific professional standards and guidelines which should be utilized in providing these services include, but are not limited to:

Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), American Library Association, 2000.
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm

Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers. Reference and User Services Association (RUSA), American Library Association, 2004.
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/archive/protools/referenceguide/guidelinesbehavioral.cfm

Guidelines for Implementing and Maintaining Virtual Reference Services. Reference and User Services Association (RUSA), American Library Association, 2004.
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/archive/protools/referenceguide/virtrefguidelines.cfm

Professional Competencies for Reference and User Services Librarians. Reference and User Services Association (RUSA), American Library Association, 2003.
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/archive/protools/referenceguide/professional.cfm

The following, although not necessarily exhaustive, are essential:

- reference assistance;
- online instructional and informational services in formats accessible to the greatest number of people, including those with disabilities;
- reliable, rapid, secure access to online resources;
- consultation services;
- a library user instruction program designed to instill independent and effective information literacy skills while specifically meeting the learner support needs of the distance learning community;
- reciprocal or contractual borrowing, or interlibrary loan services using broadest application of fair use of copyrighted materials;
- access to reserve materials in accordance with copyright fair use policies or permissions;
- adequate service hours for optimum user access;
- promotion of library services to the distance learning community, including documented and updated policies, regulations and procedures for systematic development, and management of information resources;
- prompt delivery to users of items obtained from the institution's collections, or through interlibrary loan agreement via courier or electronic delivery system; and
- point of use assistance with and instruction in the use of nonprint media and equipment.

Documentation

Documentation must be maintained in order to indicate the degree to which the originating institution is meeting the *Standards*. The library and the librarian-administrator should have the following current information available in print and/or online in an accessible format:

- user guides and other library instructional materials;
- statements of mission and purpose, policies, regulations, and procedures;
- statistics on library use;
- statistics on collections;
- facilities assessment measures;
- collections assessment measures;
- needs and outcomes assessment measures;
- data on staff and work assignments;
- institutional and internal organization charts;
- comprehensive budget(s);
- professional personnel vitae;
- position descriptions for all personnel;
- formal, written agreements;
- library evaluation studies or documents; and
- evidence of involvement in curriculum development and planning.

The *Standards* Provenance

Today's *Standards* are the culmination of the expansion and revision of the following series of documents, the first of which originated in processes initiated in 1963: *ACRL Guidelines for Library Services to Extension Students*, 1967; *ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services*, 1981; *ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services*, 1990; *ACRL Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services*, 1998; *ACRL Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services*, 2000; *Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services*, 2004.

With completion of the 2004 revision, which had included only changes to the Introduction and the Revising the *Guidelines* section, the need for a new, major revision of what was still essentially the 1998 document had become evident, and members of the Guidelines Committee began the initial work toward making the transition from a guidelines document to a standards document. At that time, Rob Morrison, at Utah State University and later National-Louis University, served as Chair of the Guidelines Committee and set out to lead these efforts. Harvey Gover from Washington State University Tri-Cities continued to contribute to the new revision processes as Consultant to the Guidelines Committee.

Rob Morrison set up and led revision activities for three years. Under Morrison's leadership, three major revision hearings and two revision discussion groups took place. The first hearing was at the 2004 ALA Midwinter conference, in San Diego on January 11, the second at the 2005 ALA Annual conference, in Chicago on June 25, and the third at the 2006 ALA Midwinter conference in San Antonio on January 21. One discussion group took place at the Twelfth Off-Campus Library Services Conference in Savannah in April 2006, and the second was a roundtable discussion at the Thirteenth National Conference of the ACRL in Baltimore, March 31, 2007.

Further opportunity for outside participation in the *Guidelines* revision has been provided through a wiki, since it was first made available in 2005. The wiki has been used by members of the Guidelines committee to post proposed changes for consideration by other committee members and to request email participation from individuals not on the committee and not eligible to write to the wiki. Michelle (Shelly) Drumm, Emergent Technology Trainer at BCR (Bibliographical Center for Research) and a member of the DLS Web committee, was instrumental in setting up the wiki and has both moved and maintained it since.

Members of the Guidelines Committee, who participated actively with Rob Morrison in the revision activities while he was Chair, were Betty Brice, University of Alabama; Marie Jones, East Tennessee State University; and Melissa Koenig, DePaul University.

Axel Schmetzke of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point provided valuable input on Americans with disabilities issues at the Chicago 2005 hearing. The former *Guidelines* had neither acknowledged nor addressed these issues.

David L. Bickford of the University of Phoenix participated actively in the roundtable discussion at the ACRL Thirteenth conference, making a number of valuable suggestions. Bickford later became a member of the Guidelines Committee.

Rob Morrison left the committee in 2007 and Jessica Catherine McCullough of ARTstor User Services took over as Chair. Harvey Gover continued to work actively on adding new content, rewriting, restructuring, and refining the final document for submission to the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee (SAC) and the ACRL Board for approval at the 2008 ALA Annual conference. Gover also served as Acting Chair of the committee in 2008 in McCullough's absence.

New members of the committee, Daniel Gall of the University of Iowa and Jan H. Kemp of the University of Texas at San Antonio, provided valuable assistance to Gover in preparation of the final 2008 draft.

An editorial discussion leading to further revisions took place during the online approval process by the DLS Executive Board in April 2008. Specific editorial suggestions were provided by Ruth Hodges of South Carolina State University, Jessica Catherine McCullough of ARTstor User Services, and Allyson Washburn of Brigham Young University. The draft was approved on April 17, 2008.

When reviewing the publication history of the *Guidelines*, one readily notices the short span in editions from 1998 to 2000. The 1998 *Guidelines* were approved with the proviso from SAC that efforts be undertaken immediately upon their final approval to make the *Guidelines* more outcomes oriented through a minor rhetorical revision that would not require as complete a subsequent approval process as would a more thorough revision. This minor outcomes revision was actually initiated during the 1998 approval process, when the Guidelines Committee members began reviewing the draft document for possible outcomes additions and then Chair, Harvey Gover, prepared an additional precept for the *Guidelines* Philosophy section acknowledging the importance of instilling lifelong learning skills through information literacy instruction for students in extended academic settings. With the approval of SAC, that precept was incorporated into the final draft of the 1998 *Guidelines*.

The outcomes revision continued through Annual 2000, when it was approved by SAC and the ACRL Board of Directors. Those Guidelines Committee members who participated actively in the outcomes revision throughout this time included Committee Chair Jean Caspers, Oregon State University; and Geraldine Collins, University of North Florida; Linda Frederiksen, Washington State University Vancouver; Lisa Hinchliffe, Illinois State University; Mae O'Neal, Western Michigan University; Bill Parton, Oklahoma Tech University; and Bernie Sloan, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. Susan Maltese, Oakton Community College, then liaison from SAC to DLS, and Barton Lessin, Wayne State University, Chair of SAC, also contributed suggestions and guidance. Harvey Gover, then DLS Chair and Consultant to the Guidelines Committee, monitored the entire outcomes revision process, and prepared the final revision draft submitted to SAC just prior to Annual 2000. The final revision draft was based upon a draft insert that had been prepared by Jean Caspers and submitted to the Guidelines Committee for review on June 6. Gover's final draft consisted largely of an incorporation of Caspers' insert throughout the entire 1998 Guidelines text and was forwarded to Susan Maltese, SAC liaison to DLS, on June 9 for submission to SAC.

During the approval process for the outcomes revision, it was suggested by members of SAC that the *Guidelines* Introduction needed strengthening and recommended that an additional minor revision be prepared, rewriting the introduction. During the process of revising the introduction, it became evident that the Revising the *Guidelines* section would also require some corresponding strengthening and revision. These efforts, which led to approval of the 2004 edition, were initiated and prepared by Harvey Gover, then Consultant to the Guidelines Committee, with input from members of the Guidelines Committee, Linda Frederiksen, Chair, Washington State University Vancouver; Betty K. Bryce, University of Alabama Libraries; Deborah F. Cardinal, WiLS OCLC; Catharine Cebrowski, ITESM – Tec De Monterrey; Geraldine Collins, University of North Florida; Marie F. Jones, East Tennessee State University; Melissa H. Koenig, DePaul University; Debra Lamb-Deans, Cornell University; and Bernie Sloan, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign.

From the beginning, those undertaking preparation or revision of the *Standards* have sought the widest possible input from everyone involved in all aspects and on all levels of distance teaching and learning in higher education. For example, the decision to revise the 1990 *Guidelines* was made initially by DLS Guidelines Committee. Then the official mandate came from the DLS Executive Board at its final 1996 Midwinter meeting. The revision of the 1990 *ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services*, which produced the 1998 *ACRL Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services*, was prepared by Harvey Gover, then Chair of the DLS Guidelines Committee. The revision was based upon input from members of the Guidelines Committee, members of the DLS Executive Board, the general membership of DLS, and other librarians and administrators involved in post-secondary distance learning programs from across the nation and around the world.

Members of the Guidelines Committee who initiated or contributed to the revision process for the 1990 *Guidelines* included: Stella Bentley, University of California at Santa Barbara; Jean Caspers, Oregon State University; Jacqueline A. Henning, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University; Sharon Hybki-Kerr, University of Arkansas, Little Rock; Gordon Lynn Hufford, Indiana University East; Ruth M. Jackson, West Virginia University; Chui-Chun Lee, SUNY--New Paltz; G. Tom Mendina, University of Memphis; Virginia S. O'Herron, Old Dominion University; Mae O'Neal, Western Michigan University; Bill Parton, Arkansas Tech University; Mercedes L. Rowe, Mercy College; Dorothy Tolliver, Maui Community College Library; and Steven D. Zink, University of Nevada, Reno.

Others outside the Committee who contributed significantly to the cycle of revision of the 1990 *Guidelines* included: Thomas Abbott, University of Maine at Augusta; Janice Bain-Kerr, Troy State University; Nancy Burich, University of Kansas, Regents Center Library; Anne Marie Casey, Central Michigan University; Tony Cavanaugh, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia; Monica Hines Craig, Central Michigan University; Mary Ellen Davis, ACRL; Tom DeLoughry, Chronicle Of Higher Education; Jill Fatzer, University of New Orleans, ACRL Board, Task Force on Outcomes; Jack Fritts, Southeastern Wisconsin Information Technology Exchange Consortium (SWITCH); Barbara Gelman-Danley of SUNY Monroe Community College, Educational Technology, and the Consortium for Educational Technology for University Systems; Kay Harvey, Penn State, McKeesport; Maryhelen Jones, Central Michigan University; Marie Kascus, Central Connecticut State University; Barbara Krauth, Student Services Project

Coordinator for the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunication of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE); Eleanor Kulleseid, Mercy College; Rob Morrison, Utah State University; Kathleen O'Connor, Gonzaga University; Alexander (Sandy) Slade, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada; Mem Catania Stahley, University of Central Florida, Brevard Campus; Peg Walther, City University, Renton, Washington; Virginia Witucke, Central Michigan University; Jennifer Wu, North Seattle Community College and College Librarians and Media Specialists (CLAMS).