

Innovative Good Practice – Final



A Transnational Appraisal of
Virtual School and College Provision

Deliverable: D3.8



Lifelong Learning Programme

Project Agreement Number:
511578-LLP-1-2010-1-GR-KA3-KA3MP

Project funded by the European Commission

Document Title	VISCED – Innovative Good Practice – Final
Deliverable no.	D.3.8
Date of issue	8 December 2012
Author[s]	Sara Frank Bristow
Contact name	Sara Frank Bristow
Organisation	Sero Consulting Ltd
Address	Sheffield Technology Parks, Arundel Street, Sheffield S1 2NS, United Kingdom
Telephone	+44 8451114122
Email	sara@salientresearch.net
Contributors to document	Sara Frank Bristow
Quality Reviewers	Giles Pepler
Contractual date of delivery	31 October 2012
Actual date of delivery	19 November 2012
Approval status	Reviewed internally and approved
Abstract	This final report, updated nearly one year after its predecessor D3.4 was submitted, provides analysis and recommendations for innovative good practice for piloting virtual programmes in schools. It draws on an updated literature review on the topic of innovative good practice for teachers.
Keyword list	Virtual schools; virtual colleges, innovative good practice; piloting; bibliography; literature review
Distribution list	EC DG3; project partners; IAC members; project website
Method of distribution	Email
Electronic copy filed	"VISCED files" in VISCED Dropbox
Confidentiality status	PU

History			
<i>Version number</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Revised by</i>	<i>Revision date</i>
0.1	19/11/ 2012	Giles Pepler	8 December 2012
1.0	08/12/2012	Giles Pepler	8 December 2012

Contents

1	The brief	3
2	Introduction	4
3	Highlights: preliminary recommendations	5
4	Shortlist of guides and standards.....	6
5	Literature review.....	6
5.1	Methodology and subject matter	7
5.2	Underlying conceptualisations in the literature	8
6	Research summary.....	10
6.1	Policy and planning	10
6.2	Advice for teachers	17
6.3	Teacher training (professional development)	20
6.4	Pedagogy and learning styles.....	20
6.5	Content development and instructional design	23
6.6	Technological innovation	25
7	Conclusions	28
8	Updated Bibliography on “Virtual schools – Innovative Good Practice for Teachers”	29

1 The brief

This is Deliverable 3.8 of Work Package 3 (an update of Deliverable 3.4). The Deliverable Title is:

Innovative Good Practice – Final

The Work Package Title is:

Analysis & Recommendations

It runs from month 6 [June 2011] until the end of the project [December 2012].

Deliverable 3.8 is summarised in the work plan as follows:

This report is the final Deliverable from subtask 3.2 of WP3. It has P2 Sero as lead author, with help from Aarhus, Tensta and MENON.

The report is not needed as input to the pilot institutions in Stockholm, Sheffield and Greece, so that it can have a broader focus than DeliverableD.3.4.

2 Introduction

Worldwide, schools have been turning to virtual learning to improve student performance, save money and empower teachers (Blackboard 2011). Online education can increase the range of courses/programmes available to students; offer improved flexibility; and help meet the goal of teaching students much-needed 21st century skills (Berge and Clark 2009, Picciano et al. 2012). Technology has been seen to boost student achievement (Chubb 2012).

Most of the literature to date on virtual schooling has concentrated upon first defining and then describing the benefits and the challenges of online learning at the primary and secondary (K-12) level (Cavanaugh et al. 2009). It is only in recent years that researchers have set their sights on specifically identifying good practice in virtual teaching and learning – and indeed, what it takes to deploy a new online programme in the first place. The research base in K-12 distance education continues to expand, and includes both comparative studies and studies that attempt to identify the factors associated with instructional quality and effectiveness (Rice 2006). This is a complex topic, in which the complementary strands of pedagogy and teaching methodologies must be considered in the context of both technological use and administrative realities.

Based on a survey of the literature on innovation and good practice in virtual schools (undertaken in 2011 and then updated in 2012), this report seeks to provide general analysis and preliminary recommendations for innovative good practice in piloting virtual schools. It includes the results of a literature review on the topic of innovative good practice for teachers.

The main themes emerging in our research, and which we have used as organising principles here, are:

- Policy and planning
- Advice for teachers
- Teacher training
- Pedagogy and learning styles
- Content development and instructional design
- Technological innovation

Highlights of the “good practice” literature in each category are discussed below. Given the scope of this study and the nature of the project, our review is representative but not comprehensive. However, we are confident that – of the hundreds of documents examined – we have identified key documents and salient points which will aid educators preparing their own virtual schools or programmes.

➔ **Update for Final Report:** Online virtual schooling continues to expand, with several million online K-12 learners in the US alone (*Keeping Pace* 2012). Organising principles for online learning have not shifted in the year since the first version of this report was released, but we detect a growing emphasis on certain factors and technologies. These are detailed in context below, but in brief, include:

- Increased awareness of the **parent or guardian** as a student’s learning coordinator, who must be involved in – and feel engaged by – the learning process
- A shift towards the educational use of **technologies previously considered primarily social**, e.g. smartphone apps, Facebook and even Twitter
- More interest in **blended learning models**, such as the “Bring Your Own Device” strategy; rapid uptake of mobile devices like smartphones, iPads and eReaders as educational tools
- The sudden popularity of the video-based “**flipped classroom**”
- Decreased interest in podcasts, Second Life, and other “fringe” learning tools; movement towards **standardisation on learning management and live conferencing systems**

The executive of one online school reports:

Online schooling is much more in the main vocabulary of the district now... the same as nutritional services or special education. (Schacter 2012)

One begins to sense this familiarity and comfort level emerging in more recent literature.

3 Highlights: preliminary recommendations

Recurring themes in our readings suggest that educators piloting virtual programmes in their schools consider the following strategies:

- **Secure advance and on-going support** from the educational community, e.g. school board, department leads, parents, community groups, technical support staff and others
- **Establish clear policies** spelling out how virtual courses will be created and delivered
- **Use a combination of synchronous and asynchronous learning tools** in online courses (e.g. both Elluminate¹ broadcasts and learning management system discussion boards)
- **Train teachers well** in all technologies they must utilise – deploying virtual, rather than face-to-face, professional development courses
- **Ensure direct and frequent communication between teachers and students/parents** – be it through instant messaging, asynchronous discussion boards, telephone or other means
- **Provide adequate technical support** for both teachers and students/parents)

¹ Elluminate web conferencing solution has, since this report was first published, been purchased by Blackboard and rebranded as “Blackboard Collaborate.” As many are more familiar with the former name, we will use both.

- **Engage parents or guardians directly** in the learning process
- **Have quality assurance and evaluation procedures** in place

These will be reviewed in detail below, following a review of our literature search methodology.

4 Shortlist of guides and standards

The reports identified below are in agreement on most critical points regarding good practice in the development and delivery of online courses for students in primary and secondary education. Most are aligned to the US educational system, but the principles addressed are universal. It is recommended that educators piloting virtual programmes review these documents.

- *National Standards for Quality Online Teaching Version 2* (2011)
http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/iNACOL_TeachingStandardsv2.pdf
International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) standards for teaching online.
- *National Standards for Quality Online Courses* (2011)
http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf
International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) standards for online courses.
- The Quality Matters Program: Grades 6-12 Rubric – Nine General Standards (2011)
<http://www.qmprogram.org/grades-6-12-rubric>
Quality Matters Program’s process to ensure quality in online courses.
- *The ISTE NETS and Performance Indicators for Teachers (NETS•T)* (2008)
<http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/nets-t-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
International Society for Technology in Education standards and performance indicators for teachers.
- *2010 Report on State Virtual Schools in SREB States: Executive Summary* (2011)
<http://publications.sreb.org/2010/2010ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
Annual SREB survey of the region’s state virtual schools identifies trends in online education for policymakers and practitioners.
- *Virtual Schools: What Every Superintendent Needs to Know* (2009)
http://www.usdla.org/assets/pdf_files/DL_6-2.pdf
Written for the chief administrative officer of a US K-12 school district, but relevant to deploying online learning in any schools context.

5 Literature review

In preparation for this deliverable, a literature review was undertaken to examine “innovative good practice for teachers” in virtual schools worldwide. Our initial study identified 129 relevant articles, with a strong focus on US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand schools (though no regions have been

excluded); follow-up research resulted in 175. Although the VISCED project focuses on students in the 14-21 age group, publications that focus on primary (and occasionally, tertiary) education have been included here where relevant.

As noted previously, this bibliography is deemed to be representative but not exhaustive.

5.1 Methodology and subject matter

Books, peer-reviewed journals articles, reports and other high-quality publications were collected using the Mendeley reference management and social networking system.² These were then added to a private Mendeley Group entitled “Virtual schools – innovative good practice for teachers”.

For this study we undertook five days of comprehensive research using the federated EBSCOhost online research databases³. EBSCOhost searches multiple databases simultaneously, including ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), Academic Search Complete full-text database, Education Research Complete and LISTA (Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts).⁴ Searches were performed by Keyword, Subject, and Author. A modicum of general Google searching was performed as well, and relevant reference lists and bibliographies were examined.

5.1.1 Keywords

Productive keyword search terms of note (when used in combination) included:

K-12, high school(s), secondary school(s); innovate, innovative, innovation; good practice(s), best practice(s), practice(s); pilot(s), piloting; teacher(s), teaching, instructor(s), instruction; technology; virtual; virtual schools; online; distance, distance education; synchronous, asynchronous; videoconferencing; Illuminate; Canada, Australia, New Zealand

Other terms yielded results that were more isolated or sporadic.

5.1.2 Geography

Most articles included in our survey are written by American authors, and draw on data from studies of American virtual schools – unsurprising in that there are considerably more virtual schools in the US than in any other country.⁵ We initially added additional geographical search terms to specifically examine other English-speaking contexts (e.g. Canada, Australia and New Zealand).

² See <http://www.mendeley.com/>

³ See <http://www.ebscohost.com>

⁴ See <http://www.eric.ed.gov>, <http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/academic-search-complete>, <http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/education-research-complete> and <http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/library-information-science-technology-abstracts-lista>

⁵ There were 264 American virtual schools described on the VISCED wiki when research ceased – see <http://virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/USA>

5.1.3 Target audience

It seems that secondary school teachers are not, for the most part, the stakeholders expected to be reading articles on virtual schooling. Perhaps because of the nature of education within the US,⁶ the target reader is more often an administrative or managerial organiser. Experience confirms that teachers are not always given the agency to innovate, but are often assigned technologies, curricula and content delivery modes based on budgetary decisions taken at an administrative level.

Extrapolating *guidance for teachers in particular* has therefore taken some effort. (Note, however, that over time a significant number of primary and secondary school educators have emerged as authors on peer-reviewed journal articles in this area – as have school librarians.)

5.1.4 Educational level

Although there is a rich and rapidly expanding base of articles addressing innovative good practice and pedagogy at the primary and secondary (K-12) levels, this body of literature is still dwarfed in comparison to that for undergraduate and postgraduate education.

5.1.5 Educational mode

There is much literature addressing technological innovation within traditional, blended or hybrid schools; the general topic of “technological innovative in the classroom” is an expansive one. Many articles work from the assumption that students are based in traditional K-12 face-to-face classrooms exclusively (though this is less common in articles published after roughly 2009). In keeping with the VISCED definition of virtual school, wherein all or most instruction is delivered remotely via the internet (and most homework undertaken online), we have only rarely analysed articles which address the use of technology **only** within the traditional classroom setting.

5.2 Underlying conceptualisations in the literature

We have undertaken extensive tagging of the publications collected in Mendeley, and a review of “top tags” reveals underlying conceptualisations within the bulk of the research. The top tags⁷ are as follows:

⁶ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_the_United_States and http://www.virtualcampuses.eu/index.php/United_States

⁷ As captured on 31 December 2011

Top tags in this group



Figure 1. Tag cloud from “Virtual schools – innovative good practice for teachers” group in Mendeley (most popular tags from top left)

This tag cloud proved an excellent starting point for visualising the body of literature as a whole; one can track the “most popular” topics from top left.⁸ We find that:

- Most articles are written by “USA”-based authors, or focus on US-based schools.
- Modes of innovation within the online schooling context are commonly – e.g. in nearly half of cases – abstracted as either “Asynchronous” or “Synchronous” Learning.
- “Blended Learning” is often discussed alongside purely online learning.
- “Blogs” and “Wikis” are common “go-to” examples of technological innovations in virtual schools. “Instant Messaging” figures prominently in distance learning contexts as well.
- Other top learning tools/modes discussed are “Mobile Learning”, “Videoconferencing”, “Game-based Learning”, and “Virtual Worlds”.
- The most popular commercial learning tool discussed here is “Elluminate” (now Blackboard Collaborate), a synchronous tool exceptionally popular in US virtual schools.
- Issues of general concern for researchers are “Instructional Design”, “Professional Development”, “Pedagogy” and “Standards”. “Curriculum”, “Content Development” and “Evaluation” (of online programmes) follow.
- “Best Practice”, “Good Practice” and “Effectiveness” are discussed quite often.

⁸ As it is the baseline topic of this literature review and most of the articles we have surveyed – as well as a critical keyword in our searches – the prominence of the term “Innovation” is not analysed here.

- “iNACOL” (International Association for K-12 Online Learning) attitudes and reports are widely hailed and openly discussed.⁹
- The “Florida Virtual School” (“FLVS”) is repeatedly profiled, analysed and examined for clues as to its success; lessons are drawn from other exemplars e.g. “Michigan Virtual School”.¹⁰
- “Emerging Technologies” and “Trends” are identified and proscribed for teacher use (the term “emerging” or “emergent” seems a synonym for *innovative* in the US K-12 context).
- We find numerous *How-To* style publications which can only be described as “Guides” for the development and delivery of online courses in the K-12 environment.

6 Research summary

6.1 Policy and planning

6.1.1 General frameworks

Successful online learning begins with advance planning, and online courses cannot simply be “dropped” into an existing school curriculum as seamlessly as something more straightforward like a maths textbook. There are manifold issues to consider, not least of these the changing needs of students, parents, teachers and even key administrators (e.g. principals) as learning moves increasingly online (Quilici 2011/2012).

Many successful online schools first identify a parent, online tutor/mentor, or site facilitator working at the location where a student will access a course, to provide the first line of assistance to students; they are explicit about their expectations of support staff and parents, who are pivotal to student success (Cavanaugh 2003).

In a recent report, the Blackboard Foundation (2011) offers a study of successful US virtual programme traits, with 17 expert interviewees agreeing that the key to virtual schools success is **securing “buy-in” from teachers, administrators, parents and the community**. They specifically recommend integration as follows:

- Every virtual learning programme needs at least two champions: one to serve as an advocate in the community, and one to manage day-to-day operations.
- One to two professionals must spread the leader’s vision by working in small groups or one-on-one with teachers, administrators and counsellors.
- Organisers must actively communicate with and solicit feedback from the community. An on-going dialogue should involve administrators, teachers and others, and be informational (e.g. explore virtual learning benefits, content, research and examples of success).

⁹ See <http://www.inacol.org/research/> for reports, presentations and other iNACOL resources.

¹⁰ See <http://www.flvs.net/areas/aboutus/Pages/default.aspx> and <http://www.mivhs.org/Default.aspx?tabid=246> for more information.

- Leaders must address and dispel common misconceptions immediately (e.g. that online courses are easier, or that online teachers are less available to students).

The following questions should be answered for each virtual programme before proceeding:

- Will we build or buy the course content?
- How will we define and measure the rigour of a course?
- Will virtual classes be synchronous or asynchronous [or both]?
- Will the classes be delivered on a set term or a continuous basis?
- Will the classes involve teamwork?
- How will we determine the pace of online classes?
- Do we want consistency between the classes?
- What will be the role of the teacher in online courses?
- How much flexibility will teachers have with the courses?
- Is the content standardised?
- How will we measure quality?

Panel members offer the following advice:

- Offer an online, open entry/open exit, competency-based model that allows students to go through the material at their pace and on their schedule.
- Use virtual professional development to offer more courses to more teachers, focusing on topics that merge technology and pedagogy, such as 21st Century learning.
- Ensure that leaders have passion, understanding of online learning, know the difference between online education and brick- and-mortar education, and can think in terms of virtual learning's broader impact within a learning community.
- Train parents to use computers and learning management systems to access their child's classes and grades, so they have the knowledge to support their children's online learning.
- Create a mentor programme for new teachers.
- Dispel common misconceptions about online learning as they arise.
- Gain decision-maker approval and funding prior to implementing the programme; actively communicate with and solicit feedback from the learning community.

The International Association of K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) devotes an entire web portal to "How to Start an Online Learning Program: A Practical Guide to Key Issues and Policies."¹¹

A number of US-based organisations offer their own frameworks for preparing, implementing and evaluating schools-based online courses. The National Education Association (2002) makes general recommendations in these areas:¹²

¹¹ See <http://www.onlineprogramhowto.org/>

-
- *Curriculum.* Online curricular offerings should be challenging, relevant, and aligned with appropriate standards for student learning.
 - *Instructional Design.* Online courses should be designed to take advantage of the online learning environment and support the development of 21st-century learning skills.
 - *Teacher Quality.* Teachers should be skilled in the subject matter, learning theory, technologies, and teaching pedagogies appropriate for the content area and the online environment.
 - *Student Roles.* Students should be actively engaged in the learning process and interact on a regular basis with the teacher and online classmates.
 - *Assessment.* Assessment should provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own learning and work quality during the course, and offer an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of content.
 - *Management and Support Systems.* Support systems should provide resources to teachers, students, and parents comparable to those provided by face-to-face courses, and special support necessitated by the unique circumstances of the online environment.
 - *Technological Infrastructure.* The technology behind the course should work reliably, simply, and economically. Technical assistance should be available whenever needed by users.

Berge and Clark (2009) synthesise the work of others cited in this report, and advise that once a school or programme is poised for implementation, the course organiser needs to:

- Set virtual learning programme goals and objectives.
 - Develop a communication plan and begin building a positive image and stakeholder support.
 - Establish development teams as needed in key areas, consider appropriate curriculum and instruction models, and create development timelines.
 - Consider the district's capacity and willingness in terms of resources (funding, staffing, equipment, etc.) to build the components of a virtual school programme.
 - Consider and select virtual learning providers and external partnerships to provide components the district/school will not be building (at least initially).
 - Build district technology, curricular, instructional, and administrative capacity as needed, based on "build or buy" decisions.
 - Institute performance assessment measures at the beginning of the online learning programme.
 - Continually evaluate the programme for improvement and accountability purposes.
 - Demonstrate and communicate the success of the programme to district stakeholders.
- (Berge & Clark 2009)

Others explore related themes. Davis and Niederhauser (2007) examine the related roles and responsibilities for today's administrators; Baskin and Anderson (2003) warn that online teachers

¹² See <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/onlinecourses.pdf>

may feel an increase in workload and dissatisfaction with the teaching experience. One group finds that adequate support services may increase course completion rates; mentors, on-site support staff, counselling, and quality technical support will all result in positive outcomes (NACOL n.d.). For more on the positive role of the “mentor”, see DiPietro (2010) and Davis & Niederhauser (2007), among others.

Less commonly cited, but equally important considerations are:

- Awareness that developing an online or blended programme requires a high level of investment (*Keeping Pace* 2012).
- Accessible high-speed broadband internet, considered as vital to K-12 infrastructure as electricity and water (Fox et al. 2012).
- Frequent communications with the teacher for parents as well as students (Lee & Figueroa 2012), across multiple media.

Successful schools are seen as self-examining, and have been found to **plan for internal and external evaluation measures for success**. They may perform surveys of students, teachers and site coordinators; analyse for cost-effectiveness; and perform annual evaluations of teachers and students (Cavanaugh 2003). Metrics may range from qualitative benchmarks, such as enrolment, retention, passing rates, dropout rates, number of highly qualified teachers and comparisons of standardised test scores (where available), to qualitative measures, such as online evaluations and anecdotal stories (Blackboard 2011). iNACOL advises that schools must invest in data systems and accountability measures to accurately assess student and school performance; as of 2012, robust measures of student achievement did not exist in most US states (*Keeping Pace* 2012, *Education Week* 2012b).

For a number of illuminating case studies of successful virtual schools, see *Keeping Pace with K-12 Online [and Blended] Learning*¹³ or *A National Primer on K-12 Online Learning*, version 2 (2010).¹⁴

In particular, policymakers and planners for larger initiatives might explore the *Keeping Pace* (2011) online learning implementation guide (pages 52-61). In these pages on “Planning for Quality” – which are meant to be printed and laid end-to-end – a simple timeline presents an organised strategic planning process, decision-making guidance in four focus areas (content, teaching, technology and operations) and programme implementation tips. **Planners are advised to include key stakeholders and agree on defined educational goals for a targeted group of students as first steps.**

In any event it is important to be patient when developing new online programmes.

¹³ See <http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2011.pdf> and <http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2012.pdf>

¹⁴ See http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/iNCL_NationalPrimer2010-web.pdf

Remember that successes like ours took a whole lot of time. Let your program grow gradually – don't try to take on the whole world. Learn from those who went before you.
(Blackboard 2007)

6.1.2 Emerging standards

A number of organisations are working to establish standards for course creation and delivery in virtual schools. Online courses must address the unique social, educational, and emotional needs of high (secondary) school students, and standards must be established for this purpose (NEA 2002). An iNACOL *Survey of Policy and Practice of K-12 Schools Around the World* endorses establishment of national standards for quality online courses and quality online teaching as a possible next step for many countries. Standards provide a more consistent experience, and may influence student achievement, retention and satisfaction in online courses (Barbour et al. 2011).

The Quality Matters (QM) Program, which released standards it intends to revise every two years to keep them up to date, has established its own rubric for online education in US grades 6-12 (though its ideas are applicable in numerous other contexts). QM standards, which adapt ideas from existing virtual-learning standards such as those published by SREB and iNACOL (Ash 2011), read as follows:

- *General Standard 1.* The overall design of the course is made clear to the student at the beginning of the course.
- *General Standard 2.* Learning objectives are clearly stated and explained. They assist students in focusing their effort in the course.
- *General Standard 3.* Assessment strategies use established ways to measure effective learning, evaluate student progress by reference to stated learning objectives, and are designed to be integral to the learning process.
- *General Standard 4.* Instructional materials are authoritative, up-to-date and appropriately chosen for the level of the course.
- *General Standard 5.* Meaningful interaction between the teacher and students, among students, and between students and course materials is employed to motivate students and foster intellectual commitment and personal development.
- *General Standard 6.* Course navigation features and the technology employed in the course foster student engagement and ensure access to instructional materials and resources.
- *General Standard 7.* The course facilitates student access to institutional services essential to student success.
- *General Standard 8.* The face-to-face and online course components are accessible to all students.
- *General Standard 9 — Compliance Standards.* This section of the rubric is optional and may be tailored to particular requirements or mandates at the [regional] level. These requirements may deal with subject matter standards, inclusion of specific information in

the course outline or syllabus, mandated communications, etc. Up to 10 standards may be added in this section.¹⁵ (QM's Rubric Standards 2010)

In the interest of nationwide accountability, in the US, the “Common Core State Standards Initiative” – a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers – is being established. The initiative brings diverse state curricula into alignment with each other by following the principles of standards-based education reform, seen as a critical first step toward creating an online learning accountability system. Initial standards have been developed, with more than 40 states adopting them as of autumn 2011 (*Keeping Pace* 2011) and 46 as of winter 2012.¹⁶

6.1.3 A note on funding

The issue of costing and funding virtual schooling is a different and much broader one, specific to each country and regional model. Given the unprecedented success of virtual programmes in US schools, however, a brief glimpse of into their funding mechanisms is worthwhile.

General costs are categorised in a broad US survey of virtual schools (*Keeping Pace* 2011) as follows:

- Teachers and instruction
- Curriculum and instructional materials
- Technology and infrastructure
- School outreach
- School office

Funding methods may include:

- ADA/ADM: Many states fund schools based on *average daily attendance* (ADA) or *average daily membership* (ADM).
- Count day: Some states (e.g., Nevada and Colorado) have certain “count days”, in which per-student funding is generated based on enrolment on one or a minimal number of days.
- Size-based: A few states fund on something akin to a sliding scale, with funding decreasing on a per-student basis as the total number of students increases.

A few states (e.g. Florida, Utah and Louisiana) have implemented online school funding based on successful completion, instead of on time or a proxy for time. Funding models may be subject to dramatic changes each year as the sector expands (and, potentially, contracts). It was possible to generalise in 2011 that, generally speaking under the US system, most states fund state-wide virtual schools at a per-student level of between \$6,000 and \$7,000 per year. Per-student costs were harder to quantify in 2012 (*Keeping Pace* 2011 and 2012).

¹⁵ See <http://www.qmprogram.org/g6-12-rubric-standards-0>

¹⁶ See <http://www.corestandards.org/in-the-states>

The aforementioned Blackboard panel (with budgeting experience at a per-school or per-region level) offered these related “lessons learned”:

- Reallocating existing funds (e.g. those previously allocated for face-to-face professional development, physical textbooks and travel expenses) is the most common way to cover expenses associated with virtual learning initiatives.
- Virtual professional development courses can be considerably more cost-effective.
- Charging teachers to take courses online and students for optional (supplemental) classes can create a new revenue stream.
- Districts or allied schools that sell their course materials to other districts generate additional funding for their own virtual learning programmes.
- When new facilities are built, schools no longer pay for wired classrooms – “everything is wireless”.

Of course, this is but a brief glimpse of a very diverse topic; to draw specific conclusions, a separate study of the costing and funding of online schools would be required.

6.1.4 Case study: Florida Virtual School (FLVS)

The Florida Virtual School (FLVS) is the world’s largest and, by most measures, most successful virtual school. Some might find it useful to know how this unusual entity – which served 303,329 course enrolments in SY 2011-12 (*Keeping Pace* 2012) – is structured and operated.

Florida TaxWatch (2007) examines FLVS closely, asserting that “programs that work must be identified, replicated, and enhanced; those that do not must be eliminated.”

- School Funding is tied directly to student performance.
- FLVS students recently outperformed their state-wide counterparts on two independent assessments, accomplished with less money than typically spent on traditional instruction.
- FLVS views parents as “partners in student success”, and they are provided a Guardian Account with full access to assignments and grade-book.
- Teachers are available from 8:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. weekdays and additional hours on weekends. Parents receive one additional telephone call per month, monthly progress reports and regular email updates.
- FLVS teachers are Florida-certified in their content area. Not all are Florida residents, though, and they actually reside all over the country.
- Teachers are brought in at least once a year for state-wide training.
- Faculty members function in Learning Communities; an Instructional Leader provides guidance and administrative oversight to approximately 55 teachers.
- Teachers have access to instructional assistants on a part-time basis.

Florida Virtual School has been built on many of the same principles of good practice endorsed by the Blackboard panel cited earlier in this report (2011). Florida TaxWatch 2007 finds that elements that have enabled FLVS to succeed include:

- Steadfast support by the Florida Legislature
- Stability of leadership
- Sustained interest by the [regional] business community
- Powerful networking throughout the country
- Consistent focus on its core mission: “To deliver a high quality, technology-based, education that provides the skills and knowledge students need for success in the 21st century”

See also Findlay (2009) for more on the Florida Virtual School.

6.2 Advice for teachers

While little research exists to address existing best practices of virtual school teaching in the K-12 context (DiPietro et al. 2008), the roles and responsibilities of today’s teachers within online learning are frequently and exhaustively examined (Davis and Niederhauser 2007). Many agree that effectiveness in distance education appears to have more to do with who is teaching, who is learning, and how that learning is accomplished, and less to do with the medium (Rice 2006). Indeed, the traits that make a successful online instructor may be the same as those for any successful instructor: namely, good communication and classroom organisation skills (Roblyer 2006). In any event, teachers hold the key to virtual learning success (Blackboard 2011); the elements of excellent teaching that are most difficult for technology to replace will increasingly differentiate student outcomes (Hassel & Hassel 2011).

Successful online teachers do nonetheless require a unique set of skills, which includes learning to capitalise on distance learning strengths while minimising constraints, using verbal and nonverbal presentation skills specific to distance learning situations, working collaboratively with others to produce effective courses, using questioning strategies, and involving and coordinating student activities among several sites (Cyrus 1997, Roblyer 2006).

Cavanaugh (2003) notes that, just as in the traditional classroom, online learning is enhanced when teachers are actively involved in the learning process.

- Frequent communication, feedback, and scheduled tutoring or “skill checks” benefit learners and contribute to the structure and communication that most K-12 learners need in the absence of face-to-face meetings.
- A uniform method for online discussions helps students plan participation and allocate time to prepare; student and teacher roles in online discussions must be defined and understood. Discussions should be designed with open-ended questions which lead to higher-order thinking and deeper learning.
- Further, courses designed to require more time applying the course content through writing and speaking correspond to higher achievement, as do simulations, manipulatives, and tutorials that offer student feedback.

Several organisations are working to extrapolate guidelines for online teachers. The International Society for Technology in Education's *NETS and Performance Indicators for Teachers* (2008) suggests that online teachers meet the following standards and performance indicators:

- Facilitate and inspire student learning and creativity
- Design and develop digital-age learning experiences and assessments
- Model digital-age work and learning
- Promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility (ISTE 2008)

Teachers must also know what constitutes quality in online teaching and to what standards they will be held accountable. The NEA (2002) suggests they explore the following questions:

- What do I need to know and how can I learn this prior to teaching online?
- Can I participate in the development of the curriculum?
- Am I required to use lessons that are designed by others?
- How will this change my assessment of student learning?
- How can I ensure that the student is doing his/her own work?
- How will this change the way I interact with parents/ guardians?
- What kinds of support structures will be in place to assist me?
- How will teaching online change the way I am evaluated?
- How will this affect my overall workload?
- Who owns the lesson materials and teaching ideas I use online?
- Will I be compensated if others use my designs and ideas or if they are marketed by [a] "provider"? (NEA 2002)

iNACOL's national standards for quality online teaching are used in the professional development and evaluation of online teachers. There is a particular focus is on what online teachers should know, understand, and be able to do:

- Standard A: Knows primary concepts and structures of effective online instruction and is able to create learning experiences to enable student success.
- Standard B: Understands and can use both existing and emerging technologies that effectively support student learning and engagement.
- Standard C: Plans, designs, and incorporates strategies to encourage active learning, application, interaction, participation, and collaboration.
- Standard D: Promotes student success through clear expectations, prompt responses, and regular feedback.
- Standard E: Models, guides, and encourages legal, ethical, and safe behavior related to technology use.
- Standard F: Is cognisant of the diversity of student academic needs and incorporates accommodations as needed.
- Standard G: Demonstrates competencies in creating and implementing online assessments that ensure validity and reliability of the instruments and procedures.

- Standard H: Develops and delivers assessments, projects, and assignments that meet standards-based learning goals; assesses learning progress by measuring student achievement of goals.
- Standard I: Demonstrates competency in using data from assessments and other sources to modify content and guide student learning.
- Standard J: Interacts in a professional, effective manner with colleagues, parents, and other members of the community to support student success.
- Standard K: Arranges media and content to help other users transfer knowledge effectively. (*iNACOL Quality Online Teaching*, 2011)

In an unpublished research briefing, a NACOL literature review (n.d.) finds the following key factors in effective programmes (note the more focus on teachers and technology):

- Student perceptions of their learning environment may relate to the amount of professional development their teachers receive in technology.
- An instructor's technological skill may be a significant factor in student success.
- Professional development is required for at least three different roles: designer, teacher and facilitator.
- Simulations, online tutoring and tutorials that offer student feedback can improve performance, providing students with the visual and cognitive support they need to master abstract concepts (NACOL briefing, n.d.).
- Online students value frequent and timely responses (communication with instructors is sometimes identified as the most valuable aspect of online courses).
- Simultaneous use of various teaching and communication tools enables collaboration, one-to-one coaching, oral practice, and other compensations for a lack of visual cues.

In one survey, a consensus identifies online presence, diligent student monitoring and enjoyment of technology as contributing to teaching success. Instructors also identify face-to-face student mentors as key (see the [policy and planning section](#) above) (Black et al. 2009). Other researchers discuss cultural concerns (Collis 1999), competency-based learning pathways and the timing of assessment (e.g. upon module completion rather than the end of a school year (*Keeping Pace* 2011)).

In one creative and thoughtful article, Savery (2005) endorses a "VOCAL" approach to online instruction, in which teachers are Visible, Organised, Compassionate, Analytical and Lead-by-example. He focuses on issues of online presence; on closeness and the importance of getting to know one's students; and on teacher modelling to guide students new to the online realm. Similarly, Barbour and Hill (2011) suggest that e-teachers devise strategies that allow students to get to know their online classmates better (in an attempt to develop a sense of community online).

Teachers unfamiliar with the basics of online learning structures are advised to explore *A National Primer on K-12 Online Learning* (2010) at http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/iNCL_NationalPrimerv22010-web.pdf, which defines online learning terms and provides overviews of common online school arrangements.

6.3 Teacher training (professional development)

The issue of teacher training (or professional development) has been set aside as a topic for another research team under the VISCED project, and is therefore not treated in detail in this report. The issue is such a broad one that a separate literature search is entirely appropriate.

We will state briefly, however, that **teachers must be prepared by targeted education programmes** to serve the rapidly escalating number of online students. Studies find a direct correlation between a) a teacher's own level of experience with technology, b) their enthusiasm for deploying technology among their students, and c) successful classroom technology integration and student uptake (Ritzhaupt et al. 2012). Teachers, principals and administrators who have taken online classes generally think of them more favourably; those who frequently use mobile devices themselves more highly value the benefits of using mobile devices in the classroom (Project tomorrow 2012b); and so forth. Familiarity can, it would seem, make all the difference. Yet one recent study finds that only 1.3% of teacher education programmes are addressing the need to prepare educators for settings other than the traditional (Kennedy & Archambault 2012). The critical need for high-quality teacher training is addressed further by Wilson and Stacey (2004), Davis and Roblyer (2005), Cavanaugh and Hargis (2010), Davis and Rose (2007), Signer (2008), DiPietro (2010), Oliver et al. (2010) and others.

6.4 Pedagogy and learning styles

Ferdig (2006) observes:

...We can support teachers with pedagogically sound technology; and we can learn from teachers who make technology pedagogically sound... One will always require the other; good pedagogy is part of a process, and the process includes teaching with good pedagogy.

It is primarily for the purposes of organising this literature base that pedagogy has been set aside for separate treatment, considered separately from both teachers and technology. In the virtual schools context, these topics are not always clearly separated. We draw on a meagre evidence base in drafting this section, presenting more of a literature review than guidance in good practice.

The very nature of delivering K-12 course content via a web-based medium implies the need to re-conceptualise school pedagogy DiPietro (2010). Online curriculum can't just "be the electronic equivalent of the old snail-mail correspondence course" (Johnson 2012); nor does technology "suddenly improve teaching" without a modern pedagogy to complement the new equipment. (Wyatt 2012)

Teachers' decisions related to pedagogical activities play an important role in effective use of the tools (Murphy & Coffin 2003), and online teachers need to have not only an excellent grasp of their given content area, but also an appreciation of how technology and the online environment affect the content and the pedagogy of what they are attempting to teach (Archambault 2010). In many cases pedagogy emerges as more important than media in online teaching (Murphy et al. 2011).

Other publications addressing pedagogy in virtual programmes include:

- Kapitzke and Pendergast (2005), who report a case in which the pedagogical opportunities presented by virtual schooling are not fully realised.
- Koehler and Mishra (2005) assess the development of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPCK) in educational technology.
- Muris (2001) reviews methods of adapting online education to different learning styles.
- Anderson (2008) cites various constructivist, collaborative and inquiry-based learning models which demand that students be active and engaged and that this engagement leads to significant improvements in learning and attitudes towards learning.
- Felvégi & Matthew (2012) analyse reading pedagogy in the K-12 context, as dedicated devices have led to have led to changes in reading literacy instruction; see also Kasman and Stephens (2012).
- Schacter (2012), Curriculum Review (2012), Ash (2012), Bergman and Sams (2012), and Fulton (2012) debate the pros and cons of the “flipped classroom”, a pedagogy enjoying much popularity at the time of publication.

Brill and Park (2008) examine the specific emerging technologies laid out in the 2008 *NMC Horizon Report*,¹⁷ relating them to “engaged learning” and the features and students of the “Interaction Age” in seeking best practice in improved teaching and learning. They explore the intersection of these three areas in examples which connect engaged learning with emergent technologies and the “digital native”¹⁸ learner as follows:

TABLE 3
Connecting Engaged Learning with Emergent Technologies and the Digital Native

Common Indicator of Engaged Learning	Emerging Digital Technologies Supporting Engagement Indicator	Alignment with the Digital Native Student
Ownership of and responsibility for learning goals	Mobile learning devices with unique, individual scaffolding designed for and built in	Capitalizes on their early access to and frequent use of mobile devices to achieve personal goals
Interactive, collaborative, and generative approach to learning within the context of solving authentic problems	Virtual worlds and game-based learning designed as realistic learning spaces which enable learners to manipulate a variety of variables	Connects with their pervasive habits to interact and stay in touch via digital means (e.g., mobile phone, Web spaces, email, etc.)
Facilitative role of experts, teachers, and “expert” resources	Mobile device or pervasive learning space where expert learning content is designed for and embedded	Speaks to their use of widely available digital information resources to move through the world and achieve personal goals

Figure 2. Brill and Park (2008) explore possibilities for engaged learning today

Anderson and Dron (2011) present a thorough analysis of general online pedagogy (including schools), defining and examining three past generations of distance education pedagogy: cognitive-behaviourist, social constructivist, and connectivist. These are outlined in the table below:

¹⁷ See <http://www.nmc.org/horizon-project>

¹⁸ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_native

Summary of Distance Education Pedagogies

Generation of distance education pedagogy	Technology	Learning activities	Learner granularity	Content granularity	Evaluation	Teacher role	Scalability
Cognitive-behaviourism	Mass media: Print, TV, radio, one-to-one communication	Read and watch	Individual	Fine: scripted and designed from the ground up	Recall	Content creator, sage on the stage	High
Constructivism	Conferencing (audio, video, and Web), many-to-many communication	Discuss, create, construct	Group	Medium: scaffolded and arranged, teacher-guided	Synthesize: essays	Discussion leader, guide on the side	Low
Connectivism	Web 2.0: Social networks, aggregation & recommender systems	Explore, connect, create, and evaluate	Network	Coarse: mainly at object and person level, self-created	Artifact creation	Critical friend, co-traveler	Medium

Figure 3. Anderson and Dron (2011) summarise distance education pedagogies

They conclude that learning modes do not replace but rather complement each other over time, and that high-quality distance education must exploit all three generations as determined by the learning content, context, and learning expectations. They consider fourth- and even fifth-generation distance technologies as difficult to define, except for their predictable use of intelligent databases that incorporate Web 2.0 or semantic web technologies. (CloudWorks¹⁹ is identified as an example of the new trends.)

In a relevant piece, Asselin and Moayeri (2011) describe ways of using new literacies and new forms of texts for locating and critically examining information, and ways of sharing and building knowledge within Web 2.0. Teachers can tap into the social attractions of Web 2.0 applications to support student learning. These applications are not only new technologies, but new genres and new literacies that require new forms of contribution. Teachers must therefore question:

Are our students just writing a series of short term papers and posting them under the guise of blogs, wikis, or social networks; or are they using the software in innovative ways that stimulate them to learn, collaborate, share, and create in democratic ways?

Teachers are directed to social networking sites (SNS) such as Web 2.0 classroom (<http://web20classroom.blogspot.com>) and Ning in Education (<http://education.ning.com/>) to help adapt to this new pedagogical and critical framework.

¹⁹ See <http://cloudworks.ac.uk/>

DiPietro (2010) identifies a need for further research into the pedagogy of K-12 virtual school teaching in order to understand the coordination of content, pedagogy, and technology underlying the delivery of a virtual school course. We agree with her assessment and echo her plea, and are pleased to include a selection of the use of Web 2.0 pedagogy in this version of the report (see [Other technologies of note](#)).

6.5 Content development and instructional design

Researchers have thoroughly examined the state of course development and instructional design in the schools context. How schools obtain course content varies widely, with some organisations opting to create it, others purchasing it and still others pursuing a hybrid buy/build strategy (e.g. purchasing content initially before transitioning to in-house development) (Blackboard 2011). Content may be developed by teams or individuals, by teachers and/or technologists.

Many agree that, the more clearly expectations and processes are laid out, the better the outcome. US virtual schools often develop a rubric for course quality, facilitator rules for what they can and cannot change in a course, course templates to maintain the same look and feel across courses, and a selection of extra resources (Blackboard 2011).

Some schools allow teachers great freedom in course design, while others have found that this does not reflect long-term thinking. Members of the Blackboard expert panel differ widely on the amount of control required over content development, but all support a consistently applied process to make that determination. One commented:

When virtual learning programs start out small, it's tempting to allow people the freedom to do whatever they want. However, when freedom can't scale, fragmentation is the result.

Others advise that online instructional strategies include collaborative project-based design, clear expectations/requirements, concrete yet flexible deadlines with some flexibility, timesheets, study guides, and rich interactive collaboration among students and teachers. Courses must be straightforward and consistent in their design, providing clear instructions and expectations, and making use of appropriate media (NACOL n.d.). A study by Hastie et al. (2007) finds that when a simplified and "minimalist" approach to instructional design is adopted, students contribute significantly more information to online discussions, faster, and demonstrate higher levels of learning.

Control over course content – or lack thereof – can be a major area of concern for teachers. When teachers do not have control over the content, this can become a source of frustration; content providers may want to consider allowing greater access for teachers to incorporate their own lesson ideas, as well as the ability to make corrections or revisions to curriculum directly, allowing the medium to capitalise on teachers' knowledge and experience (Archambault 2010).

Barbour (2007) develops guidelines that future course developers might utilise, examining a combination of synchronous instruction using Elluminate Live and asynchronous instruction using WebCT. These are broken down as follows:

1. *Preparing to Develop.* Significant advance planning is required.
2. *Simple Navigation, but Diverse Content Presentation.* Every lesson should feel different to learners.
3. *Summarize and Personalize:* Course developers should provide a summary which includes examples personalised to the students' own context.
4. *Clear Instructions and Expectations.* Course developers should ensure students are given clear instructions which model expectations of the style and level of work required.
5. *Use of Text and Visuals.* Course developers use minimal text and use visuals to replace or supplement text when applicable.
6. *Smart Use of Multimedia and Interactive Elements.* Course developers should use multimedia to enhance the content, and not simply because it is available.
7. *Who to Target.* Course developers should develop their content for average or below average students, while including enrichment activities for above average students.
(Barbour 2007)

In 2011, iNACOL released its *National Standards for Quality Online Courses*, version 2, the results of a refreshed research review and survey of online course quality criteria. iNACOL endorses previously published higher-education focused standards for online courses; see <http://www.sreb.org/page/1295/publications.html>.

iNACOL reiterates, enforces and enhances the views seen elsewhere in this review. High-quality online courses require:

- *Content development.* The course provides online learners with multiple ways of engaging with learning experiences that promote their mastery of content and are aligned with state or national content standards.
- *Instructional design.* The course uses learning activities that engage students in active learning and provides students with multiple learning paths; the content is based on student needs and provides ample opportunities for interaction and communication (student to student, student to instructor and instructor to student).
- *Student assessment.* The course uses multiple strategies and activities to assess student readiness for and progress in course content and provides students with feedback on their progress.
- *Technology.* The course takes full advantage of a variety of technology tools, has a user-friendly interface and meets accessibility standards for interoperability and access for learners with special need.
- *Course evaluation and support.* The course is evaluated regularly for effectiveness, using a variety of assessment strategies, and the findings are used for improvement. The course is kept up to date in content, course design and technologies. Instructors and students are prepared to teach and learn in an online environment and are provided on-going support.

A scoring rubric is also included for use by educators in their own programmes. (*iNACOL Quality Online Courses 2011*)

Non-traditional course designers, e.g. traditional teachers, may share common needs during course development efforts. Findings suggest virtual schools can better support these designers via technological leadership, regular feedback, and clear expectations. Ideally, designers need professional development in replicating model courses, using course management systems, assessing learners online, designing with copyright and safety issues in mind, integrating Web tools, and developing course documentation (Oliver et al. 2010).

6.6 Technological innovation

Numerous technologies are being used to great effect in today's virtual schools, and in our literature review we found proponents of many tools and systems. We examine many of these below.²⁰

However, the Elluminate Live! tool²¹ emerges in our research as a top candidate for use in any school piloting virtual programmes, due to its wide-ranging success in virtual schools. Its synchronous collaboration model, or “virtual classroom”, allows for real-time interaction between students and instructors via integrated VoIP and teleconferencing, application and desktop sharing, polling and quizzing, and session recording – as well as technologies such as multipoint videos, shared whiteboards, web tours, and breakout rooms, adding what one author describes as “the value of real-time interaction rather than just static content” (Arora 2009).

6.6.1 Synchronous versus asynchronous tools

An on-going comparison of the respective merits and constraints of synchronous and asynchronous learning tools exists in the literature reviewed. Many successful virtual schools use a synthesis of both to best effect, and their ability to complement each other is addressed directly. **Most authors favour synchronous tools like Elluminate and Videoconferencing for their immediacy and sense of “presence,” but many learning technologists would prefer to see these deployed in a broader teaching context – i.e. one using both synchronous and asynchronous tools together.**

In a study by Barbour and Hill (2011), students find asynchronous coursework (e.g. over WebCT) routine and unchallenging, and lack the internal motivation to complete asynchronous assignments. Conversely, they are engaged during their Elluminate Live sessions, during which they communicate actively with their teacher and each other. Similarly, Berge and Clark (2009) acknowledge problems with asynchronous online teaching; there are many conveniences afforded by anytime, anyplace teaching and learning, but it can lead to problems for students with poor time-management skills or a tendency to procrastinate. Hastie et al. agree (2007), stating that “The online synchronous cyber classroom provides learners with more authentic and engaging learning activities enabling higher levels of learning compared to purely asynchronous modes of self-paced learning”.

²⁰ Ferdig (2006) notes that argued that a good technology innovation involves pedagogy, people and performance, but we have done our best to address technology discretely in this section.

²¹ Now Blackboard Collaborate; see <http://www.blackboard.com/platforms/collaborate/overview.aspx>

Barbour 2007 examines the effective use of a combination synchronous/asynchronous system in remote regions of Canada, in which Elluminate lectures and chats are complemented by WebCT:

- Elluminate provides for two-way voice, a shared, interactive whiteboard, instant messaging, application sharing, breakout rooms, and interactive quiz and survey management. “Teachers are able to provide synchronous instruction in much the same way that they would in a traditional classroom.”
- WebCT provides an asynchronous discussion forum, calendar, e-mail system, and a place to house the course web pages. The web pages are designed by a team of two individuals: a teacher acting as a subject matter expert and a multimedia specialist to add images and interactive items into the content.

(Barbour concludes that, regrettably, as recently as 2007, isolation in remote and rural communities may still cut students off from the affordances of online learning, due to slow uptake in broadband speeds, mobile technologies/networks, etc.)

Poggi and Di Blas (2008) find that forums offer a significant contribution to overall educational impact (when considered within a more eclectic “live” 3D learning experience). Murphy et al. 2011 also find both learning modes beneficial; asynchronous online teaching provides support for self-paced, independent forms of secondary distance education, supplemented by synchronous online teaching for answering questions and troubleshooting. Roblyer et al. (2007) discover that synchronous and asynchronous formats can be equally effective and motivational to students.

A few specific technological trends are reviewed below.

6.6.2 Mobile learning

Mobile learning has become vastly popular in recent years, with classroom/home-based deployment at an all-time high. As handheld devices gain ubiquity, instructors assign tasks that make the most of them (via the “Bring Your Own Device” model). Publishers move textbooks online as well; many students have used at least one “eBook” or its equivalent in their studies. Devices used include inexpensive android phones, laptops, iPads, iPods, Kindles, Nooks and other eReaders (Wyatt 2012, Pimmer et al. 2012, Stephens 2012a, Stephens 2012b, Leverkus 2012, Burt 2012, Schacter 2012, Beitenhaus 2012, Project Tomorrow 2012a and Project Tomorrow 2012b).

The advent of digital OERs may be another driver for use of mobile devices, as more resources become “free.” (Burt 2012) Note that usage does not necessarily translate into comfort, however. In 2010, Scholastic reported that 25 percent of American students aged 6-17 had read a book on a digital device; yet in one pilot programme, one quarter of students returned Nook readers²² provided by librarians “almost immediately” to exchange them for hard copies (Stephens 2012a).

²² See <http://www.barnesandnoble.com/u/nook/379003208/>

Earlier, Brown (2008) explored mobile learning (m-learning), hailing it as “the gateway to e-learning for most learners in Africa.” See also Gubacs-Collins and Juniu (2009) on the use of tablet PCs in physical education; Murray and Olcese (2011) and Zwang (2011) focus on iPads; Shumack and Reilly (2011) on Video podcasting in physical education.

6.6.3 Virtual worlds

Barkand and Kush (2009) are among many (e.g. Inman 2010, Merchant 2009) who evaluate the use of 3D learning environments such as Second Life²³ in schools – and US high schools in particular. They find virtual reality helps create a vivid sense of community, in part because it allows users a 3D avatar whose gestures, moods, and customisable appearance to project a “cognitive presence” unavailable in other remote learning tools. (In one new article, Sutcliffe & Alrayes (2012) compare learning outcomes in Second Life to those obtained via Blackboard.)

6.6.4 Videoconferencing

Videoconferencing is quite popular in remote communities. It is not always seen as presenting a sufficiently rich learning experience on its own, however.

In a study of five schools, Anderson (2008) reveals the effective use of videoconferencing for enrichment, professional development, and administration – with less successful application as the primary tool for distance education delivery; it simply does not provide the level of student engagement with teachers, other students or content needed. However, it can be effectively used as part of a broader range of networking tools, and in particular those which provide students access to internet-based resources (e.g. Learning Management Systems, blogs, wikis, polling, quizzes, web safaris, and applications sharing) which allow students to interact with each other and the content, rather than simply listening to “teacher talk” (Anderson 2008).

Lawson and Comber (2010) find that the educational use of videoconferencing technology is not a uniform phenomenon; teachers exposed to its potential quickly find new ways of exploiting its pedagogical possibilities. Bell and Unger (2003) report on one successful implementation in Cape Elizabeth Middle School in Maine, USA – allowing students to engage in interactive communications with experts outside of the region, e.g. at the Bronx Zoo in New York. Benefits include cost savings (*District Administration* 2012), enhanced interaction in language learning (Hampel and Stickler 2012), and improved motivation, participation and performance (Giesbers, B. et al. 2012).

Still other views are proffered by Lockee et al. (2005) and Lai and Pratt (2009), who look at constraints and implementation barriers.

²³ See <http://secondlife.com/destinations/learning>

6.6.5 Other technologies of note

Stakeholders in the educational process have embraced a wide range of technologies as of 2012. Even Facebook (Schacter 2012, Pimmer et al. 2012), Twitter (Orech 2012) and LinkedIn (*Project Tomorrow* 2012b) are cited as having educational use, as social learning tools increasingly connect students, parents and educators (*Project Tomorrow* 2012c).

Borjoa (2005) and others focus on the popularity of podcasting in US K-12. Ferris and Wilder (2006) examine the potential of wikis; Richardson (2006) looks at blogs, wikis, podcasts, and other powerful web tools. Towell (2009) suggests Mashable, Ning, Second Life, and other innovations.

Murphy et al. (2008) interrogate instant messaging (IM) in a context of virtual schooling, finding that e-teachers are embracing the technology in recognition of high-school students' proficiency and comfort with it. The benefits of IM in promoting social presence and a "sense of community" seem to outweigh the challenges it poses, even allowing e-teachers to establish individual rapport with students during non-instructional times. Fullick (2006) further explores synchronous web-based communication using text as a means of enhancing student discussion.

The *Horizon Report* (Johnson et al. 2011) embraces cloud computing, mobile learning, game-based learning, and open content as "emerging" to prominence in K-12 education (be it blended or otherwise) within the next few years. Regardless of the nature of the tools, one author adds, school systems require "leverage-able [private] partnerships that can get them higher on the food chain of innovation" (*Education Week* 2012c).

7 Conclusions

Although a preliminary base of research into good practices in virtual schools has now been established, more research into this area is still required. In analysing their own lessons learned from Michigan Virtual School teachers, DiPietro et al. 2008 state:

...Without research on best practice, it is impossible to identify exemplary instructors. Without research on subjectively-defined exemplary instructors, it is impossible to determine best practice.

Within this context we have done our best to extrapolate practices which – if not yet seen as "best practices", per se – might at least be seen as "good" and "innovative" within the broader educational community. Guidance in policy and planning, advice for teachers, pedagogy and learning styles, content development and instructional design, and technological innovation have all been explored. Where available, we have reviewed emerging US standards in the hope that these will transfer to a broader European context.

We understand that organisers and teachers within the VISCED pilot institutions drew on an earlier version of this document when developing innovative good practice for their teaching terms. We hope sincerely that others find this report similarly useful in the future.

8 Updated Bibliography on “Virtual schools – Innovative Good Practice for Teachers”²⁴

- Al-Nuaim, H.A. (2012). The Use of Virtual Classrooms in E-learning: a case study in King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 9(2), 211-222. Retrieved from <http://www.wwwwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=elea&aid=4994>
- Anderson, T. (2008). Is Videoconferencing the Killer App for K-12 Distance Education? *Journal of Distance Education*, 22(2), 109-124. Retrieved from <http://www.sfu.ca/~ada27/JDE/MarkPDFs/Vol05/Anderson.pdf>
- Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). Three Generations of Distance Education Pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(3), 80-97. CIDER sessions; Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/890>
- anon. (2002). *Guide to Online High School Courses*. National Education Association. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/onlinecourses.pdf>
- anon. (2004). Teacher’s Toolbox. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 79(6), 58-59.
- anon. (2007). *Final Report: A Comprehensive Assessment of Florida Virtual School*. Florida TaxWatch Center for Educational Performance and Accountability. Tallahassee, FL. Retrieved from [http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/FLVS_Final_Final_Report\(10-15-07\).pdf](http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/FLVS_Final_Final_Report(10-15-07).pdf)
- anon. (2008). Online Clearinghouse Offers Help for K-12 History Teachers. *Education Week*.
- anon. (2008). *The ISTE NETS and Performance Indicators for Teachers (NETS•T)*. International Society for Technology in Education. Retrieved from <http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/nets-t-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- anon. (2010). Grades 6-12 Edition -- QM’s Rubric Standards (2010). *Quality Matters Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.qmprogram.org/g6-12-rubric-standards-0>
- anon. (2011). Grades 6-12 Rubric – Nine General Standards. *Quality Matters Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.qmprogram.org/grades-6-12-rubric>
- anon. (2011). *2010 Report on State Virtual Schools in SREB States: Executive Summary*. Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from <http://publications.sreb.org/2010/2010ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
- anon. (2011). *National Standards for Quality Online Courses*. iNACOL. Vienna, VA. Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf

²⁴ Initially downloaded from the Mendeley Group on “Innovative good practice for teachers” on 31 December 2011; updated for accuracy in November 2012.

- anon. (2011). *View from the Field: How to Launch District Virtual Learning*. Blackboard Institute. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.blackboard.com/about-bb/blackboard-institute.aspx>
- anon. (2011). National Standards for Quality Online Teaching Version 2. *International Association for K-12 Online Learning*. Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/iNACOL_TeachingStandardsv2.pdf
- anon. (n.d.). *Effectiveness of K-12 Online Learning*. NACOL Research Committee. Retrieved from <http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/VSresearch-summary.pdf>
- anon. (2012a). Leveraging Technology for K-12 Learning. *Education Week*, 31(25), 36-37. Retrieved from <http://edtechdigest.wordpress.com/2012/08/29/trends-leveraging-technology-for-k-12-learning/>
- anon. (2012b). Spotlight Turns Toward Virtual Ed. Accountability. *Education Week*, 31(25), 10-11. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/03/15/25execsum.h31.html>
- anon. (2012c). Q&A: Rudy Crew's Public-Private Ed. Perspective. *Education Week*, 31(20). Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/02/08/20bizganda.h31.html>
- anon. (2012). Profile [Jill Hobson]. *THE Journal*, 39(5), 58. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/library/1G1-295058358/profile>
- anon. (2012). Flipped Classrooms Making a Splash in American Schools. *Curriculum Review* 52(3), 2-3.
- anon. (2012). A Brick-and-Mortar Space for Online School. *District Administration*, 48(8).
- anon. (2012a). Learning in the 21st Century: Mobile Devices + Social Media = Personalized Learning. Project Tomorrow/Blackboard. Retrieved from http://www.blackboard.com/resources/markets/k-12/collateral/project-tomorrow/K12_Prjct-Tmrw_Mbl-Rpt_2012.pdf
- anon. (2012b). Personalizing the Classroom Experience—Teachers, Librarians and Administrators Connect the Dots with Digital Learning. Project Tomorrow, Speak Up 2011 National Findings. Retrieved from http://www.tomorrow.org/speakup/pdfs/SU11_PersonalizedLearning_Educators.pdf
- anon. (2012c). Defining the Emerging Role of Social Learning Tools to Connect Students, Parents & Educators Project Tomorrow and Schoolwires, Inc. Speak Up 2011 National Data. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolwires.com/site/default.aspx?PageType=3&ModuleInstanceID=174&ViewID=E870C439-A836-49C9-B574-72A6A1F8213F&RenderLoc=0&FlexDataID=1117&PageID=75>
- Archambault, L. (2010). Identifying and Addressing Teaching Challenges in K-12 Online Environments. *Distance Learning*, 7(2), 13-18. Retrieved from <http://www.infoagepub.com/index.php?id=89&i=52>

- Aronowitz, S. (2010). iNACOL Online Innovator Award Winners Announced. *T.H.E. Journal*, 37(1). Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/articles/2009/11/20/inacol-online-innovator-award-winners-announced.aspx>
- Arora, R. (2009). The K–12 Online Evolution: 21st-Century Solutions for 21st-Century Learning. *Multimedia & Internet@Schools*, 16(6), 16-19. Retrieved from <http://www.mmischools.com/Articles/Editorial/Features/The-Ke2809312-Online-Evolution-21st-Century-Solutions-for-21st-Century-Learning-60015.aspx>
- Ash, K. (2010). U.S. Ed-Tech Plan Urges Rethinking in K-12 Schools. *Education Week*, 16-17. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ880056&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ880056
- Ash, K. (2011). Group Outlines K-12 Online Course Standards. *Education Week*, 30(15). Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/01/12/15edtech_standardsside.h30.html
- Ash, K. (2012). Educators View 'Flipped' Model With a More Critical Eye. *Education Week*, 32(2). Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/79547399/educators-view-flipped-model-more-critical-eye>
- Asselin, M., & Moayeri, M. (2011). Practical Strategies - The Participatory Classroom: Web 2.0 in the Classroom. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, 19(2). Retrieved from <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/152906753>
- Barbour, M. (2007). Portrait of Rural Virtual Schooling. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 59. Retrieved from <https://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/barbour.html>
- Barbour, M. K. (2007). Principles of Effective Web-based Content for Secondary School Students: Teacher and Developer Perceptions. *Journal of Distance Education*, 21(3), 93-114. Retrieved from <http://www.sfu.ca/~ada27/JDE/MarkPDFs/Vol03/Barbour.pdf>
- Barbour, M. K., & Hill, J. (2011). What are They Doing and How are They Doing It? Rural Student Experiences in Virtual Schooling. *The Journal of Distance Education*, 25(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/725/1248>
- Barbour, M., Brown, R., Waters, L. H., Hoey, R., Hunt, J. L., Kennedy, K., Ounsworth, C., et al. (2011). *Online and Blended Learning: A Survey of Policy and Practice of K-12 Schools Around the World*. iNACOL. Vienna, VA. Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/iNACOL_IntnlReport2011.pdf
- Barkand, J., & Kush, J. (2009). GEARS a 3D Virtual Learning Environment and Virtual Social and Educational World Used in Online Secondary Schools. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 7(3), 215-224. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ872406&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ872406

- Baskin, C., & Anderson, N. (2003). The Online Classroom: A Self-Actualising Theme Park or a Trial by Multimedia? *Australian Educational Computing*, 18(1), 11-20. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ874299&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ874299
- Beitenhaus, C. (2012). Mobile Tools in the Classroom. *School Planning & Management*, 51(7), 53-55. Retrieved from <http://schoolplanning.epubxp.com/i/74643/53>
- Belair, M. (2012). An Investigation of Communication in Virtual High Schools. *IRRODL*, 13(3). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1123/2085>
- Bell, J. K., & Unger, L. C. (2003). Videoconferencing Takes Cape Elizabeth Middle School on a Distance Learning Adventure. *THE Journal*, 31(4), 51-54. Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/articles/2003/11/01/videoconferencing-takes-cape-elizabeth-middle-school-on-a-distance-learning-adventure.aspx>
- Berge, Z. L., & Clark, T. (2004). *Virtual Schools: Planning for Success*. (Z. L. Berge & T. Clark, Eds.) *Teachers College Press* (Vol. 7). New York: Teachers College Press. Retrieved from <http://store.tcpress.com/0807745715.shtml>
- Berge, Z., & Clark, T. (2009). Virtual Schools: What Every Superintendent Needs to Know. *Distance Learning*, 6(2), 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.usdla.org/assets/pdf_files/DL_6-2.pdf
- Bergmann, J. and Sams, A. (2012). Before you flip, consider this. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(2). Retrieved from <http://www.kappanmagazine.org/content/94/2/25.short>
- Black, E., DiPietro, M., Ferdig, R., & Polling, N. (2009). Developing a Survey to Measure Best Practices of K-12 Online Instructors. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 12(1). Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring121/black121.html>
- Borja, R. R. (2005). Podcasting Craze Comes to K-12 Schools. *Education Week*, 25(14). Retrieved from <http://blogs.canby.k12.or.us/uploads//moreloci/podcasts/teacherpodcastdox/podcastcrazek12.pdf>
- Bradley, J. (2003). *The Open Classroom: Distance Learning In and Out of Schools*. (J. Bradley, Ed.) *Kogan Page, Open and Distance Learning Series*. London, UK and Sterling, VA: Kogan Page, Open and Distance Learning Series. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED481077&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED481077
- Brill, J. M., & Park, Y. (2008). Facilitating Engaged Learning in the Interaction Age: Taking a Pedagogically-Disciplined Approach to Innovation with Emergent Technologies. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(1), 70-78.
- Brown, T. H. (2008). M-Learning in Africa: Doing the Unthinkable and Reaching the Unreachable. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), *International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education North* (Vol. 20, pp. 861-887). Springer International Handbooks of Education. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-73315-9

- Burt, D.J. (2012). Public Doman Ebooks. *School Library Monthly*, 28(5), 40.
- Butcher, N., & Wilson-Strydom, M. (2008). Technology and Open Learning: The Potential of Open Education Resources for K-12 Education. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), *International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education* (pp. 725-745). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media LLC. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/h6220505078672w7/>
- Campbell, M. (2012). The End of School as We Know It. *New Scientist*, 215(2881), 6-8.
- Cavanaugh, Catherine. (2004). *Development and Management of Virtual Schools: Issues and Trends*. Information Science Pub. Hershey, PA: Information Science Pub. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=6-26W8NazAC&pg=PP1&dq=development%20and%20management%20of%20virtual%20schools&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Cavanaugh, Catherine S. (2001). The Effectiveness of Interactive Distance Education Technologies in K-12 Learning: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 7(1), 73-88. Retrieved from <http://faculty.education.ufl.edu/cathycavanaugh/docs/CavanaughIJET01.pdf>
- Cavanaugh, Cathy. (2003). Information Age Teacher Education: Educational Collaboration to Prepare Teachers for Today's Students. *TechTrends*, 47(2), 24-27. doi:10.1007/BF02763421
- Cavanaugh, Cathy. (2008). Real Learning Happens in Virtual Schools. *Threshold*, 10-14. Retrieved from <http://connections.blackboard.com/files/cb4c89dd31/THFall08RealLearningVirtualSchools.pdf>
- Cavanaugh, Cathy S, Barbour, M. K., & Clark, T. (2009). Research and Practice in K-12 Online Learning: A Review of Open Access Literature. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 10(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/607/1182>
- Cavanaugh, Cathy, & Blomeyer, R. (2007). *What Works in K-12 Online Learning*. (Cathy Cavanaugh & R. Blomeyer, Eds.) *International Society for Technology in Education* (1st ed., Vol. 3777, p. 2). Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education. Retrieved from <http://www.iste.org/images/excerpts/K12OLL-excerpt.pdf>
- Cavanaugh, Cathy, & Dawson, K. (2010). Design of Online Professional Development in Science Content and Pedagogy: A Pilot Study in Florida. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 19(5), 438-446. doi:10.1007/s10956-010-9210-2
- Cavanaugh, Cathy, & Hargis, J. (2010). Redefining School: From Site to Service Learning In and From K-12 Online Education. *Distance Learning*, 7(2), 1-5.
- Cavanaugh, Cathy, Gillan, K. J., Kromrey, J., Hess, M., & Blomeyer, R. (2004). The Effects of Distance Education on K-12 Student Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Learning Point Associates*, (October). ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED489533&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED489533

- Cavanaugh, C. and DiPietro, M. (2011). An introduction and overview of K–12 virtual schooling. In R. E. Ferdig, & C. Cavanaugh, (Eds.) *Lessons learned from virtual schools: Experiences and recommendations from the field* (pp. 1–10). Vienna, VA: International Association for K–12 Online Learning (iNACOL).
- Chubb, John E. (2012). Overcoming the Governance Challenge in K-12 Online Learning: Creating Sound Policy for Digital Learning. *Thomas B. Fordham Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED530433>
- Collis, B. (1999). Designing for Differences: Cultural Issues in the Design of WWW-based Course-support Sites. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(3), 201-216. doi:10.1111/1467-8535.00110
- Compton, L., & Davis, N. (2010). The Impact of and Key Elements for a Successful Virtual Early Field Experience: Lessons Learned From a Case Study. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 10(3), 309-337. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/recordDetails.jsp?ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ912428&searchtype=keyword&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&pageLabel=RecordDetails&accno=EJ912428&nfls=false&source=ae
- Cooze, M., & Barbour, M. (2007). Learning Styles: A Focus Upon E-Learning Practices and Their Implications for Successful Instructional Design. *Journal of Applied Educational Technology*, 4(1), 7-20. Retrieved from http://www.eduquery.com/jaet/JAET4-1_Cooze.pdf
- Cyrs, T. E. (1997). Competence in Teaching at a Distance. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 71, 15-18. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ554107>
- Davis, N. E., & Roblyer, M. D. (2005). Preparing Teachers for the “Schools That Technology Built”: Evaluation of a Program to Train Teachers for Virtual Schooling. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37(4), 399-409. International Society for Technology in Education. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ690980.pdf>
- Davis, N., & Niederhauser, D. S. (2007). Virtual Schooling. *Learning & Leading With Technology*, (April), 10-15. Retrieved from http://www.dav.sceu.frba.utn.edu.ar/newsletter/escuelas_del_futuro.pdf
- Davis, N., Rose, R., & NACOL. (2007). *Research Committee Brief: Professional Development for Virtual Schooling and Online Learning*. (Tel, Fax, & I. I. O. E-Mail, Eds.) *North American Council for Online Learning* (Vol. 1, p. 25\). Vienna, VA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED). Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/NACOL_PDforVSandOlnLrng.pdf
- Dawson, K., Cavanaugh, C., & Ritzhaupt, A. D. (2006). Florida’s EETT Leveraging Laptops Initiative and Its Impact on Teaching Practices. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 41(2), 143-

159. Retrieved from
http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ826090&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ826090
- Del Litke, C. (1998). Virtual Schooling at the Middle Grades: A Case Study. *Journal of Distance Education*, 13(2), 33-50. Retrieved from
http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ588321&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ588321
- Di Blas, N., & Poggi, C. (2007). European Virtual Classrooms: Building Effective “Virtual” Educational Experiences. *Virtual Reality*, 11(2-3), 129-143. doi:10.1007/s10055-006-0060-4
- DiPietro, M. (2010). Virtual School Pedagogy: The Instructional Practices of K-12 Virtual School Teachers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 42(3), 327-354. doi:10.2190/EC.42.3.e
- DiPietro, M., Ferdig, R. E., Black, E. W., & Preston, M. (2008). Best Practices in Teaching K-12 Online: Lessons learned from Michigan Virtual School teachers. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 7(1), 10-35. Retrieved from
<http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/getfile.cfm?volid=7&IssueID=22&ArticleID=113>
- Dickey, M. D. (2011). The Pragmatics of Virtual Worlds for K-12 Educators: Investigating the Affordances and Constraints of “Active Worlds” and “Second Life” with K-12 In-Service Teachers. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(1), 1-20. doi:10.1007/s11423-010-9163-4
- Elbaum, B., McIntyre, C., & Smith, A. (2002). *Essential Elements: Prepare, Design, and Teach Your Online*. Atwood Publishing. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing. Retrieved from
<http://www.atwoodpublishing.com/books/180.htm>
- Felvégi, E. and Matthew, K. (2012). eBooks and Literacy in K–12 Schools. *Computers in the Schools*, 29(1/2), 40-52. Retrieved from
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07380569.2012.651421>
- Ferdig, R. E. (2006). Technologies for Teaching and Learning: Understanding the Importance of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(5), 749-760. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00559.x
- Ferdig, R. E., & Cavanaugh, C. (2010). *Lessons Learned from Virtual Schools: Experiences and Recommendations from the Field*. iNACOL. International Association for K-12 Online Learning. Retrieved from <http://www.inacol.org/research/bookstore/detail.php?id=21>
- Ferdig, R. E., Cavanaugh, C., DiPietro, M., Black, E. W., & Dawson, K. (2009). Virtual Schooling Standards and Best Practices for Teacher Education. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 479-503. AACE. Retrieved from <http://www.editlib.org/p/30481>
- Ferris, S. P., & Wilder, H. (2006). Uses and Potentials of Wikis in the Classroom. *Innovate Journal of Online Education*, 2(5). Retrieved from

http://www.innovateonline.info/pdf/vol2_issue5/Uses_and_Potentials_of_Wikis_in_the_Classroom.pdf

- Findley, M. (2009). Florida Virtual School Paves the Way in Distance Education. *Distance Learning*, 6(2), 41-45. Retrieved from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3220331&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
- Fox, C., Waters, J., Fletcher, G., and Levin, D. (2012). The Broadband Imperative: Recommendations to Address K-12 Education Infrastructure Needs. *State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA)*. Retrieved from http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=353&name=DLFE-1517.pdf
- Freedman, G., Darrow, R., & Watson, J. (2002). *The California Virtual School Report: A National Survey of Virtual Education Practice and Policy with Recommendations for the State of California*. (G. Lorenzo, Ed.) University of California System. University of California College Preparatory Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.edpath.com/images/VHSReport.pdf>
- Frye, E. M., Trathen, W., & Koppenhaver, D. A. (2010). Internet Workshop and Blog Publishing: Meeting Student (and Teacher) Learning Needs to Achieve Best Practice in the Twenty-First-Century Social Studies Classroom. *The Social Studies*, 101(2), 46-53. doi:10.1080/00377990903284070
- Fullick, P. (2006). Synchronous Web-based Communication Using Text As a Means of Enhancing Discussion Among School Students. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 23(3), 159-170. Retrieved from <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/24154/>
- Fulton, K.P. (2012). 10 reasons to flip. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(2). Retrieved from <http://www.kappanmagazine.org/content/94/2/20.full>
- Giesbers, B. et al. (2012). Investigating the relations between motivation, tool use, participation, and performance in an e-learning course using web-videoconferencing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 285-292.
- Grades, M. (2001). *Essential Principles of Quality: Guidelines for Web-based Courses for Middle Grades and High School Students*. Educational Technology. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED475676&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED475676
- Grant, A. C. (2010). Tearing Down the Walls: Creating Global Classrooms Through Online Teacher Preparation Programs. *Distance Learning*, 7(2), 37-41. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5047659364>
- Gubacs-Collins, K., & Juniu, S. (2009). The Mobile Gymnasium Using Tablet PCs in Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 80(2), 24-31. Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ867653&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ867653

Ham, V., & Davey, R. (2005). Is Virtual Teaching, Real Teaching? Learnings from Two Self-Studies. In C. Cosnik, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & A. P. Samras (Eds.), *Making a Difference in Teacher Education Through Self-Study* (pp. 101-116). Netherlands: Springer. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=MlgtkqMGZ9IC&pg=PA101&ots=ZMTifFpepp&dq=%E2%80%9CVirtual%20Teaching%2C%20Real%20Teaching%3FLearnings%20from%20Two%20Self-Studies%E2%80%9D&pg=PA101#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Hampel, R. and Stickler, U. (2012). The Use of Videoconferencing to Support Multimodal Interaction in an Online Language Classroom. *ReCALL*, 24(2), 116.

Hampson et al. (2012). 10 Schools for the 21st Century. *Innosight Institute, Innovation Unit*. Retrieved from http://www.innovationunit.org/sites/default/files/10%20Schools%20for%20the%2021st%20Century_0.pdf

Hartley, J. (2007). Teaching, Learning and New Technology: a Review for Teachers. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(1), 42-62. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00634.x

Harwood, P. G., & Asal, V. (2007). *Educating the First Digital Generation. Educating the First Digital Generation (Educate US Series)*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers. Retrieved from <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0717/2007018648.html>

Hassel, B. and Hassel, E.A. (2012). Teachers in the Age of Digital Instruction: Creating Sound Policy for Digital Learning. *Thomas B. Fordham Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED530433>

Hassel, B. C., & Hassel, E. A. (2011). Teachers in the Age of Digital Instruction. *Thomas B. Fordham Institute*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2011/2011_CreatingSoundPolicyforDigitalLearning/20111116_TeachersintheAgeofDigitalInstruction.pdf

Hastie, M., Chen, N.-shing, & Kuo, Y.-hung. (2007). Instructional Design for Best Practice in the Synchronous Cyber Classroom. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(4), 281-294. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info/journals/10_4/24.pdf

Haughey, Margaret; Muirhead, B. (1999). *On-Line Learning: Best Practices for Alberta School Jurisdictions. Learning Resources Distributing Center*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED438798&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED438798

Hawkins, A., & Graham, C. R. (2010). A Comparison Study of How Teachers With High and Low Completion Rates Interact With Virtual High School Students. In D. Gibson & B. Dodge (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International*

- Conference 2010* (Vol. 2010, pp. 2930-2933). Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/present/view?id=dcdq2rhk_2143cztvdsfm
- Herbert, D., Cabell, C., Turner, D., Archer, E., Cator, K., & Walkup, H. (2010). Transforming Education with Web-based Curricular and Instructional Resources. *Education Innovator*, 9(9), 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/news/newsletters/innovator/2010/1207.pdf>
- Holker, B., Romeo, G., Henderson, M., Auld, G., Russell, G., Seah, W. T., & Fernando, A. (2008). *Exemplar Schools: Using Innovative Learning Technologies*. Monash University. Barton, Australian Capital Territory. Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/DigitalEducationRevolution/Documents/exemplar_schools_report1.pdf
- Horn, M. B. (2009). K-12 Online Education is Increasingly Hybrid Learning. *Distance Learning*, 7(2), 18-20.
- Huerta, L.A. (2012). Review of “Teachers in the Age of Digital Instruction”. *National Education Policy Center*. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-teachers-digital-age>
- Hwang, W.-yuin, Su, J.-han, Huang, Y.-min, & Dong, J.-jie. (2009). A Study of Multi-Representation of Geometry Problem Solving with Virtual Manipulatives and Whiteboard System. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(3), 229-247.
- Inman, C., Wright, V. H., & Hartman, J. A. (2010). Use of Second Life in K-12 and Higher Education: A Review of Research. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 9(1), 44-63. Retrieved from <http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/viewarticle.cfm?volid=9&issueID=28&ArticleID=143&Source=2>
- Ishtaiwa, F.F. and Abulibdeh, E.S. (2012). The Impact of Asynchronous e-Learning Tools on Interaction and Learning in a Blended Course. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 39(2), 141-159.
- Johnson, L. F., Levine, A., Smith, R. S., & Haywood, K. (2010). Key Emerging Technologies for Elementary and Secondary Education. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 76(1), 36-40. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ916644&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ916644
- Johnson, L., Adams, S., & Haywood, K. (2011). *NMC Horizon Report > 2011 K-12 Edition*. The New Media Consortium. Austin, TX: The New Media Consortium. Retrieved from <http://www.nmc.org/pdf/2011-Horizon-Report-K12.pdf>
- Jones, R., Levin, D., & Fox, C. (2011). *National Educational Technology Trends: 2011 - Transforming Education to Ensure All Students Are Successful in the 21st Century*. State Educational Technology Directors Association. Retrieved from http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=6&name=DLFE-1302.pdf

- Kapitzke, C., & Pendergast, D. (2005). Virtual Schooling Service: Productive Pedagogies or Pedagogical Possibilities? *Teachers College Record*, 107(8), 1626-1651. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00536.x>
- Kasman V.J. and Stephens, W. (2012). Reading Remixed. *Educational Leadership*, 69(6).
- Kennedy, K. and Archambault, L. (2012). Offering Preservice Teachers Field Experiences in K-12 Online Learning: A National Survey of Teacher Education Programs. (2012). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(3), 185-200.
- Kincaid, M. (2011, November 10). Education Leaders Recognized for Efforts in Online Learning. *iNACOL Press Release*. Vienna, VA. Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/press/docs/20111110_innovator_awards.pdf
- Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2005). What Happens When Teachers Design Educational Technology? The Development of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(2), 131-152. doi:10.2190/0EW7-01WB-BKHL-QDYV
- Kuzmich, Jr, J. (2010). Today's K-12 Virtual Music Instruction. *School Band and Orchestra*, 13(2), 12-14. Retrieved from <http://www.kuzmich.com/articles/img128.pdf>
- LaPrade, K., Marks, A., Gilpatrick, M., Smith, D., & Beazley, J. (2011). Walking Through Online Classrooms: A Study in Best Practices. *Review of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, 3(9), 24-30.
- Lai, K.-W., & Pratt, K. (2009). Technological Constraints and Implementation Barriers of Using Videoconferencing for Virtual Teaching in New Zealand Secondary Schools. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 505-522. Retrieved from <http://editlib.org/p/28282>
- Lake, D. (2008). Science Education: Innovation in Rural and Remote Queensland Schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 7, 123-136. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/index/85275K332112842Q.pdf>
- Lamb, A., & Callison, D. (2005). Online Learning and Virtual Schools. *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 21(9), 29-35. Retrieved from <http://www.schoollibrarymonthly.com/PDFs/keywordsMay05.pdf>
- Lawson, T., & Comber, C. (2010). Videoconferencing in English Schools: One Technology, Many Pedagogies? *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 19(3), 315-326. doi:10.1080/1475939X.2010.513764
- Lee, M. and Figueroa, R. (2012). Internal and External Indicators of Virtual Learning Success: A Guide to Success in K-12 Virtual Learning. *Distance Learning*, 9(1), 21-28.
- Leverkus, C. The Expanding Book Apps Market. *Library Media Connection*, 31(2), 26-27.

- Lockee, B. B., Hu, D., & Burton, J. (2005). Getting Connected: IP-Based Videoconferencing in K-12 Schools. *Distance Learning*, 2(6), 9-13. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-1040187661.html>
- McBrien, J. L., Jones, P., & Cheng, R. (2009). Virtual Spaces: Employing a Synchronous Online Classroom to Facilitate Student Engagement in Online Learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 10(3), 1-17. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/viewArticle/605>
- Mellon, E. (2011). Virtually Possible. *District Administration*, 47(2), 56-61. Retrieved from <http://www.districtadministration.com/article/virtually-possible>
- Merchant, G. (2010). 3D Virtual Worlds as Environments for Literacy Learning. *Educational Research*, 52(2), 135-150. doi:10.1080/00131881.2010.482739
- Morris, S. (2003). *Teaching and Learning Online: A Step-By-Step Guide for Designing an Online K-12 School Program*. R & L Education. R & L Education. Retrieved from <https://rowman.com/ISBN/9780810844049>
- Muir, D. J. (2001). Adapting Online Education to Different Learning Styles. *National Educational Computing Conference, "Building on the Future"* (pp. 1-15). Chicago, IL. Retrieved from [http://realaudio.rice.edu/ecot/ust/bied5336/session i/On-Line Learning.pdf](http://realaudio.rice.edu/ecot/ust/bied5336/session%20i/On-Line%20Learning.pdf)
- Murphy, E., & Coffin, G. (2003). Synchronous Communication in a Web-Based Senior High School Course: Maximizing Affordances and Minimizing Constraints of the Tool. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 17(4), 235-246. doi:10.1207/s15389286ajde1704
- Murphy, E., & Rodríguez Manzanares, M. A. (2008). Instant Messaging in a Context of Virtual Schooling: Balancing the Affordances and Challenges. *Educational Media International*, 45(1), 47-58. Routledge. doi:10.1080/09523980701847180
- Murphy, E., Rodríguez-Manzanares, M. A., & Barbour, M. (2011). Asynchronous and Synchronous Online Teaching: Perspectives of Canadian High School Distance Education Teachers. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 583-591. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01112.x
- Murray, O. T., & Olcese, N. R. (2011). Teaching and Learning with iPads, Ready or Not? *TechTrends*, 55(6), 42-48. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/I3r6431q75582370/>
- Nachmias, R., Mioduser, D., & Forkosh-Baruch, A. (2008). Innovative Pedagogical Practices Using Technology: The Curriculum Perspective. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), *International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education* (pp. 163-179). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media LLC. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/h631525j74m3r751/>
- Oliver, K., Kellogg, S., Townsend, L., & Brady, K. (2010). Needs of Elementary and Middle School Teachers Developing Online Courses for a Virtual School. *Distance Education*, 31(1), 55-75. Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ880782&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ880782

Oliver, K., Osborne, J., & Brady, K. (2009). What Are Secondary Students' Expectations for Teachers in Virtual School Environments. *Distance Education*, 30(1), 23-45. Routledge, part of the Taylor & Francis Group. doi:10.1080/01587910902845923

O'Neill, E. J. (2007). Implementing International Virtual Elementary Classroom Activities for Public School Students in the U.S. and Korea. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 5(3), 207-218.

Orech, Jon. (2012). How It's Done: Incorporating Digital Citizenship Into Your Everyday Curriculum. *Technology & Learning*, (33)1, 16-18. Retrieved from <http://www.techlearning.com/features/0039/how-its-done-incorporating-digital-citizenship-into-your-everyday-curriculum/52762>

Picciano, A.G. et al. (2012). Examining the Extent and Nature of Online Learning in American K-12 Education: The Research Initiatives of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. *Internet and Higher Education*, 15(2), 127-135.

Pimmer, C. et al. (2012). Facebook as a learning tool? A case study on the appropriation of social network sites from mobile phones in developing countries. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(5), 726-738.

Poggi, C., & Di Blas, N. (2008). Evaluating Asynchronous Message Boards to Support Cross-Cultural Communities of High-School Students. In H. Leung, F. Li, R. Lau, & Q. Li (Eds.), *Advances in Web based learning--ICWL 2007: 6th international conference* (pp. 484-495). Germany: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=UyPd2wGN76YC&pg=PA484&ots=cAddeKA8v0&vq=Evaluating%20Asynchronous%20Message%20Boards%20to%20Support%20Cross-Cultural%20Communities%20leung&dq=Evaluating%20Asynchronous%20Message%20Boards%20to%20Support%20Cross-Cultural%20Communities%20leung&pg=PA484#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Powell, A., & Patrick, S. (2006). *An International Perspective of K-12 Online Learning: A Summary of the 2006 NACOL International E-Learning Survey*. iNACOL (Vol. 20). Retrieved from <http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/InternationalSurveyResultsSummaries.pdf>

Quilici, S.B. and Joki, R. (2011/2012). Investigating Roles of Online School Principals. *JRTE* 44(2), 141-160. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ967829.pdf>

Quillen, I. (2012a). Virtual Ed. Faces Challenges In Building Quality Controls. *Education Week*, 32(2), S12-S13.

Quillen, I. (2012b). E-School Conference Highlights Blended Ed. *Education Week*, 32(10), 9. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/10/31/10virtual.h32.html>

- Reid, K. M., Aqui, Y., & Putney, L. G. (2009). Evaluation of an Evolving Virtual High School. *Educational Media International*, 46(4), 281-294. Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ870424&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ870424
- Rice, K. L. (2006). A Comprehensive Look at Distance Education in the K-12 Context. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 38(4), 425-448. Retrieved from http://people.uncw.edu/caropresoe/EDN523/523_Spr_07/K12_Distance_Learning.pdf
- Richardson, W. (2006). *Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts, and Other Powerful Web Tools for Classrooms*. Corwin Press. Corwin Press. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/dp/1412959721>
- Ritzhaupt, A. D., Dawson, K., & Cavanaugh, C. (2012). An investigation of factors influencing student use of technology in K-12 classrooms using path analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 46(3), 229-254. Retrieved from <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/ed078p99>
- Roblyer, M. (2006). Who plays Well in the Virtual Sandbox? Characteristics of Successful Online Students and Teachers. *SIGTel Bulletin*, 2. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/20060930130650/http://www.iste.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Membership/SIGs/SIGTel_Telelearning_/SIGTel_Bulletin2/Archive/2005_20067/2005_July_-_Roblyer.htm
- Roblyer, M. D., Freeman, J., Donaldson, M. B., & Maddox, M. (2007). Comparison of Outcomes of Virtual School Courses Offered in Synchronous and Asynchronous Formats. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(4), 261-268. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ796856&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ796856
- Roblyer, M. D., Porter, M., Bielefeldt, T., & Donaldson, M. B. (2009). "Teaching Online Made Me a Better Teacher": Studying the Impact of Virtual Course Experiences on Teachers' Face-to-Face Practice. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 25(4), 121-126. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ844209&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ844209
- Roland, C. (2010). Preparing Art Teachers to Teach in a New Digital Landscape. *Art Education*, 63(1), 17-24. Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/47677703/preparing-art-teachers-teach-new-digital-landscape>
- Ross, S. M., Morrison, G. R., & Lowther, D. L. (2008). Educational Technology Research Past and Present: Balancing Rigor and Relevance to Impact School Learning. In M. Simonson (Ed.), *Annual Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Papers Presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (31st, Orlando, FL, 2008)* (Vol. 1, pp. 325-330). Orlando. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED504371.pdf>
- Savery, J. R. (2005). BE VOCAL: Characteristics of Successful Online Instructors. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 4(2), 141-152. Retrieved from <http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/pdf/4.2.6.pdf>

- Schachter, R. (2012). Avoiding the Pitfalls of Virtual Schooling. *District Administration*, July/August. Retrieved from <http://www.districtadministration.com/article/avoiding-pitfalls-virtual-schooling>
- Shumack, K. A., & Reilly, E. (2011). Video Podcasting in Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 82(1), 39-43. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ914313&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ914313
- Signer, B. (2008). Online Professional Development: Combining Best Practices from Teacher, Technology and Distance Education. *Journal of In-service Education*, 34(2), 205-218. Routledge. doi:10.1080/13674580801951079
- Staker, H. and Horn, M. (2012). Classifying K–12 Blended learning. *Innosight Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.innosightinstitute.org/innosight/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Classifying-K-12-blended-learning2.pdf>
- Stephens, W.S. (2012a). One semester circulating e-readers: One High School Library's Pilot Project. *Library Media Connection*, 31(1), 40-41. Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/79243488/one-semester-circulating-e-readers-one-high-school-librarys-pilot-project>
- Stephens, W.S. (2012b). Deploying e-Readers Without Buying e-Books. *Knowledge Quest*, 40(3), 4. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ976162&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ976162
- Sutcliffe, A. and Alrayes. (2012). Investigating user experience in Second Life for collaborative learning. *A. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, (70)7, 508-525. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1071581912000262>
- Thomas, A. (2005). Children Online: Learning in a Virtual Community of Practice. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 2(1), 27-38. doi:10.2304/elea.2005.2.1.3
- Towell, L. (2009). The Student-Teacher Digital Divide and Six New Technology Roller Coaster Rides. *Distance Learning*, 6(2), 53-57. Retrieved from http://www.usdla.org/assets/pdf_files/DL_6-2.pdf
- Tucker, B. (2007). *Laboratories of Reform: Virtual High Schools and Innovation in Public Education*. Education Sector (Vol. 5, p. 19). Washington, DC: Education Sector. Retrieved from <http://www.educationsector.org/publications/laboratories-reform-virtual-high-schools-and-innovation-public-education>
- Vadillo, G. (2010). Five Myths Surrounding K-12 Online Learning. *Distance Learning*, 7(2), 61-64. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb5835/is_201003/ai_n57037383/

-
- Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2011). *Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning: An Annual Review of Policy and Practice (2011)*. Evergreen Education Group. Retrieved from <http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2011.pdf>
- Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2012). *Keeping Pace with K-12 Online and Blended Learning: An Annual Review of Policy and Practice*. Evergreen Education Group. Retrieved from <http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2012.pdf>
- White, B. (2010). Using ICT to Enhance Curriculum Opportunities for Students in Rural and Remote Schools. *Australian Educational Computing*, 25(2), 27-30. Retrieved from http://acce.edu.au/sites/acce.edu.au/files/pj/journal/AEC_V25N2_UsingICTtoEnhance.pdf
- Wicks, M., & Watson, J. (2010). *A National Primer on K-12 Online Learning, Version 2*. iNACOL. Vienna, VA: iNACOL. Retrieved from http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/iNCL_NationalPrimerv22010-web.pdf
- Wilson, G., & Stacey, E. (2004). Online Interaction Impacts on Learning: Teaching the Teachers to Teach Online. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 20(1), 33-48. [//www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet20/wilson.html](http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet20/wilson.html). Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet20/wilson.html>
- Wyatt, D. (2012). "Innovative practice - High-tech all the way." *Times Educational Supplement (Pathfinder)*, 11.
- Zandberg, I., & Lewis, L. (2008). *Technology-Based Distance Education Courses for Public Elementary and Secondary School Students: 2002-03 and 2004-05 (Statistical Analysis Report)*. NCES - IES. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED501788.pdf>
- Zwang, J. (2011). New Jersey District Plans iPad Only Algebra Course. *eSchool News*. Retrieved from <http://www.eschoolnews.com/2011/06/02/new-jersey-district-plans-ipad-only-algebra-course/>