

School Reform and the Maturing of Online Learning

David B. Glick

David B. Glick & Associates LLC, USA

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Since the early 1980s a school reform movement has been underway that has led to new standards, new choices for students, and new forms of accountability. In the last few years, online learning has become a significant factor in this school reform and school choice landscape, and its influence is growing fast (Edwards, Chronister, & Bushweller, 2002).

Standards, school choice, and accountability are three facets of school reform that are inextricably linked together. The logic goes something like this: start by defining what students should know and be able to do at various grade levels. These learner expectations have gone by several names, most of which have developed political connotations that flavor our perceptions: outcomes, objectives, or standards. For the purposes of this article, I will use the currently favored term “standards.”

After standards are established at the national, state, or local levels, choices can be created that allow students to achieve these standards in a way that is most suitable for them. This has led to a large increase in options for students in curriculum, instruction, and school type. The increase in choices has in turn led to the need for greater accountability. More rigorous evaluation needs for students, teachers, and schools have led to new forms of assessment, more standardized tests, and greater scrutiny of schools (Elmore, 2000).

The latest nationwide, legislated attempt at school reform, the update to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), encourages charter schools, distance education options, and other educational choices while attempting to set up a strong accountability system (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The rigor of the accountability system, combined with the emphasis on school choice, has led numerous critics to charge that NCLB is an attempt to destroy the public schools (Mathis, 2003; Novak & Fuller, 2003).

NCLB needs to be reauthorized by Congress in 2007, and at the time of this writing, numerous organizations and policy makers are proposing and reviewing changes to the law. Although at this time it is impossible to predict the specifics of those changes, efforts are under way to make the law more workable, less punitive, and better funded.

At the same time, public schools themselves are expanding to include more choices within them. Although available options vary from state to state, charter schools, vouchers, postsecondary enrollment options, the ability for students to attend schools in districts other than their district of residence, and now online learning, are all part of the national public school landscape. Enrollments in such school choice programs have increased dramatically in the last decade. Minnesota, for example, saw a 1,300% increase in public school choice enrollments in the period from 1988 to 2001. By the end of that period, 17% of Minnesota public school students were involved in charter schools, alternative learning programs, or postsecondary enrollment options. This figure does not include students in district-run magnet schools, immersion schools, or other locally developed options (Boyd, Hare, & Nathan, 2002). Nor does it include the students in private schools or home schools, which in Minnesota now comprise over 10% of the school-aged population (Minnesota Department of Education, 2007).

Online learning entered the K-12 scene in the mid-1990s, most notably in the form of the Florida Virtual School (FLVS) and the Virtual High School (VHS) in Massachusetts. Since then, enrollments in such schools have skyrocketed. Enrollments in FLVS went from 77 semester enrollments in 1996 to over 68,000 in the 2005-2006 school year (FLVS, 2007). The growth is occurring in other states as well. According to “Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning,” an annual national review of online learning programs and policies, 24 states now have or are developing statewide, state-run, virtual schools. Only 12 states have neither a state-led

program nor significant state policies (Watson & Ryan, 2006).

The big players in the education business have taken notice of this growth and have begun to move into this segment of the education marketplace. For example, Kaplan Inc., a Washington Post subsidiary and well-known education publisher and service provider, recently purchased Sagemont Virtual, parent to Virtual Sage and the University of Miami Online High School (Kaplan, Inc., 2007). Apollo Group, parent of University of Phoenix, the behemoth of online higher education, recently purchased Insight Schools, a virtual school management company (Apollo Group, Inc., 2007). Due to the newness of these mergers and acquisitions, we do not yet know exactly how they will impact the quality, choice, and accountability in schools.

In order to make sense of the complexity of the school choice/school reform movement and the role of online learning in it, I will address the movement from two angles:

- Finance and governance models, which control how school is paid for, how the money is distributed, or how it is shared (or fought over), and who controls the school system.
- Curriculum and instruction models, which describe what is taught and how it is taught.

MAIN FOCUS: ASPECTS OF REFORM

Finance and Governance

Traditional core funding models are usually based on average daily attendance (ADA) or average daily membership (ADM), and are limited to the particular school district in which a student resides. By contrast, reform-minded, choice-based funding models typically create programs that allow students to share funding between school districts and with colleges or non-public schools. In some way or another in these programs, the money follows the student. These models include open enrollment, postsecondary enrollment options, and vouchers.

In Minnesota's open enrollment program, for example, students can opt to enroll in Minnesota school districts other than their own resident district. Funding is calculated according to the same basic formula that is used for all students, and all general education funding

follows the student to the district of enrollment (Enrollment Options Act, 2003). Approximately 45 states have this sort of option (Ziebarth, 2003).

Through its lack of geographic boundaries, online learning expands this option significantly. No longer are students limited to using open enrollment merely for neighboring districts. Students can now enroll in other school districts without concerns about distance, and the residence, transportation, and even property tax issues that necessarily follow. The number of districts into which a student might enroll has increased to include any district in the state that offers online courses. States like Minnesota and Wisconsin have been called "the Wild West" of online learning because open enrollment and the lack of a statewide online learning program has led districts to compete over students, and the money that follows them (eSchool News, 2002). Minnesota does this intentionally via statute, while Wisconsin does it in the absence of a specific online learning statute, but in keeping with the state's other funding laws. Regardless of the cause or history, many districts in these and other states now seem to be feeling a great deal of pressure to keep their money and their students by offering a wider range of educational opportunities through online learning.

Minnesota's Postsecondary Enrollment Option (PSEO) allows the money generated by the student to be split between the college and the high school of enrollment. The split is done according to a legislated formula that sends the bulk of the dollars to the college and some to the local school district (Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Act, 2003). Thirty states have similar programs in which the state or district pays tuition for the student, and nearly all states allow high school students to take college courses (Education Commission of the States, 2001).

As it has done for open enrollment, online learning has greatly expanded the PSEO program, even though Minnesota's PSEO law, like most states' similar laws, limits the options to colleges or universities within the state (PostSecondary Enrollment Options Act, 2003). Within those limitations, however, students can now exercise their PSEO options at any of the colleges and universities in the state while still living at home. By replacing travel time with online experiences, students can more effectively blend a high school program with their postsecondary program, or even blend courses from a variety of colleges or universities.

6 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/school-reform-maturing-online-learning/11997

Related Content

E-Learning Practice and Experience at Waseda E-School: Japan's First Undergraduate Degree-Awarding Online Program

Shoji Nishimura, Douglass J. Scott and Shogo Kato (2011). *Distance Education Environments and Emerging Software Systems: New Technologies* (pp. 322-342).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/learning-practice-experience-waseda-school/53530

Factors Encouraging or Discouraging Students from Taking Online Classes

Chuleeporn Changchit and Tim Klaus (2010). *ICTs for Modern Educational and Instructional Advancement: New Approaches to Teaching* (pp. 55-67).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/factors-encouraging-discouraging-students-taking/38389

Innovation and Technology for 21st Century Education

Murray Turoff, Caroline Howard and Richard Disenza (2009). *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning, Second Edition* (pp. 1189-1196).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/innovation-technology-21st-century-education/11897

Assessing the Effectiveness of Programmed Instruction and Collaborative Peer Tutoring in Teaching Java

Henry H. Emurian (2006). *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education* (pp. 1-16).

www.irma-international.org/article/assessing-effectiveness-programmed-instruction-collaborative/2283

An Adaptive Course Generation Framework

Frederick W. B. Li, Rynson W. H. Lau and Parthiban Dharmendran (2010). *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies* (pp. 47-64).

www.irma-international.org/article/adaptive-course-generation-framework/45144