

Chapter 8.1

Trends and Perspectives in Online Education

Bruce Rollier

University of Baltimore, USA

Fred Niederman

Saint Louis University, USA

INTRODUCTION

Although the Internet has been in existence since 1969, it was not widely used for educational purposes in its first two decades. Few students had access to e-mail, and few educators could visualize its value as a teaching tool. Programs to serve students from remote locations, often called “distance education,” became popular; these were generally delivered synchronously through television broadcasts and did not involve the Internet. When the World Wide Web was created in the early 1990s (Berners-Lee, 1999) and the first browsers became available (Waldrop, 2001), the enormous potential for education began to be recognized. New global users came online at a fantastic pace, and the value of all this connectivity was increasing even more rapidly in accordance with Metcalf’s Law (Gilder, 1996). Nearly all students used e-mail regularly, and college professors were putting syllabi and course assignments online and

creating Web pages with increasing sophistication. Soon entire programs were offered completely via the Internet, with students from all over the globe taking courses together.

According to a major survey conducted by Allen and Seaman (2003), there were more than 1.6 million students who took at least one online course during the Fall 2002 semester and 11% of U.S. higher education students took at least one such course. These numbers were projected to increase rapidly, and most institutions considered online education as a critical long-term strategy.

BACKGROUND

At first, online courses tended to be offered sporadically, often by a few technically savvy faculty members exploring how best to use the Web. Developing the courses to fit this new me-

dium was difficult and time-consuming, and these professors began to demand some recognition for their efforts. Soon, university administrators noticed that the online courses were very popular, that they could attract students from distant locations, and that programs in other institutions were proliferating. The need for uniform policies was recognized. What is a reasonable class size? Should development of a new Web course count toward promotion and tenure? Should Web courses be taught the same way as face-to-face classes?

It soon became clear that there were major differences between face-to-face classes and online classes in providing high quality instruction. Online, at least with the currently available technologies, must be almost completely asynchronous, whereas face-to-face is primarily synchronous. The term “virtual university” (Morrissey, 2002; Schank, 2002; Stallings, 2001) has recently come into vogue, but with varying meanings. The term is often applied to an institution with no physical campus and that is completely online; Jones International University, Cardean University, and University of Phoenix Online are examples (Mason, 2000). These are usually for-profit companies and may be spin-offs from private universities. The term can also signify an institution that has a large physical campus but that has a coordinated approach to online education and devotes significant resources to its online programs. Some of the largest of these include Penn State’s World Campus and the University of Maryland’s University College (Stallings, 2001). There are also a large number of Virtual University Consortia (VUCs) that have been formed to offer online programs in multi-institutional partnerships. A recent study identified 63 of such consortia, primarily state-based (Twigg, 2003).

There are many reasons for the rapid growth of VUCs. In many countries, including the U.S., governmental funding of education has decreased in recent years, forcing universities to look for new markets and new sources of revenue (Mason,

2000). Lifelong learning has become much more critical for the workforce as skills and careers become obsolete at a rapid clip. There is high demand from adult learners for retraining for new careers or for upgrading of skills, and online programs are ideal for this.

Twigg (2003) lists several factors motivating the growth of VUCs and other online programs: increased demand for adult education and training; the educational needs of underserved communities; coping with the increasing frequency of interuniversity transfers; streamlined access to the state’s institutions via a portal; providing increased variety of degrees; lowering costs, and “overcoming the possibility that the state’s institutions will be left behind in the new, highly competitive online environment” (p. 5). She comments that most states have decided that “stand-alone virtual university initiatives are too expensive to initiate and sustain both fiscally and politically” (p. 7). Most VUCs do not offer degrees because that would put them in direct competition with the other state institutions. Instead, they have adopted the collaborative model, which can mean anything from a passive posting of available courses or library sharing to a fairly aggressive stance as an alternative degree path.

Twigg notes that the most successful VUCs have adopted the following policies (2003, p. 10): (1) focus on increasing access for new students that might not otherwise attend; (2) find out what students need and create a viable response rather than merely aggregating what the member institutions can offer; (3) do not get involved in irrelevant higher education policy issues; (4) create a business plan for long-term viability without reliance on state aid, and (5) use a cost-effective development and delivery model.

Morrissey (2002, pp. 460-461) cites the following conflicts which may inhibit achieving the virtual university’s full potential: compensation and ownership issues; lack of recognition for course development; poor course support; push for large classes, which may result in fewer fac-

4 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/trends-perspectives-online-education/27638

Related Content

Adaptive Device Context Based Mobile Learning Systems

Haitao Pu, Jinjiao Lin, Yanwei Song and Fasheng Liu (2013). *System and Technology Advancements in Distance Learning* (pp. 43-54).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/adaptive-device-context-based-mobile/68750

Online Courses: Strategies for Success

Linda Cooper (2002). *The Design and Management of Effective Distance Learning Programs* (pp. 125-140).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/online-courses-strategies-success/30290

Twitter Chat as an Informal Learning Tool: A Case Study using #sachat

Kevin R. Guidry and Laura Pasquini (2013). *Cases on Formal and Informal E-Learning Environments: Opportunities and Practices* (pp. 356-377).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/twitter-chat-informal-learning-tool/68246

Crowdfunding for Entrepreneurial Education: A Classroom Exercise in a Business School

Carlos Denner dos Santos, Marina Moreira, Amanda Panis and Dyego Alves (2022). *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education* (pp. 1-13).

www.irma-international.org/article/crowdfunding-for-entrepreneurial-education/315762

The Efficacy of Case Method Teaching in an Online Asynchronous Learning Environment

Charlie C. Chen, Rong-An Shang and Albert Harris (2006). *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies* (pp. 72-86).

www.irma-international.org/article/efficacy-case-method-teaching-online/1677