

# VISCED

A Transnational Appraisal of  
Virtual School and College Provision

## Potential Success Factors

**Deliverable: D3.3**



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

**Project Agreement Number:**

511578-LLP-1-2010-1-GR-KA3-KA3MP

Project funded by the European Commission

Document Title	VISCED – Potential Success Factors
Deliverable no.	D.3.3
Date of issue	11 December 2011
Author	Paul Bacsich
Contact name	Paul Bacsich
Organisation	Sero Consulting Ltd
Address	Sheffield Technology Parks Arundel Street Sheffield S1 2NS United Kingdom
Telephone	+44 845 111 4122
Email	<a href="mailto:paul.bacsich@sero.co.uk">paul.bacsich@sero.co.uk</a>
Contributors to document	Partners
Quality Reviewers	Giles Pepler
Contractual date of delivery	31 December 2011
Actual date of delivery	11 December 2011
Approval status	Final version
Abstract	This Deliverable has Sero as lead. It derives its input from interim WP2 outcomes, with the help of insights from Re.ViCa Critical Success Factors and related information.
Keyword list	virtual schools; virtual colleges
Distribution list	European Commission
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>
0.5	7 Dec 2011	Paul Bacsich	11 Dec 2011
1.0	11 Dec 2011	Paul Bacsich	N/A



---

## Contents

1.	The brief.....	4
1.1	Partner 1: Lambrakis.....	4
1.2	Partner 2: Sero.....	4
1.3:	Partner 3: EFQUEL.....	4
1.4	Partner 4: ATIT.....	4
1.5	Partner 5: MENON.....	5
1.6	Partner 6: University of Leeds.....	5
1.7	Partner 7: EITF.....	5
1.8	Partner 8: Tensta.....	5
1.9	Partner 9: Aarhus University.....	5
1.10	Partner 10: TIEKE.....	5
2.	Potential success factors.....	6
2.1	Critical Success Factors.....	6
2.2	Key success factors.....	7
3.	References.....	8



## 1. The brief

This is Deliverable 3.3 of Work Package 3. The Deliverable Title is:

*Potential Success Factors*

The Work Package Title is:

*Analysis and Recommendations*

It runs from month 6 (June 2011) until the end of the project (December 2012).

Deliverable 3.1 is summarised, rather cryptically, in the work plan as follows:

*This Deliverable has P2 Sero as lead, with help from ATiT. The lead author person will be Paul Bacsich with assistance from Giles Pepler.*

*It will derive the input from WP2 outcomes, with the help of insights from Re.ViCa Critical Success Factors and any related information.*

The more specific descriptions have to be dug out of the work plan for workpackage 3 which describes the Tasks that the various partners do. Task 3.1 is described there as:

*3.1. Potential success factors – led by Sero, with ATiT, to be fed into WP4 at end of Year 1 - drawing on the exemplars documented - from virtual schools, e-mature schools, etc*

The material below is extracted from the workpackage description of partner duties, with the descriptions reordered so as to be in order of partner number. Only two partners take part, Sero and ATiT. Thus the task management was straightforward.

### 1.1 Partner 1: Lambrakis

No effort.

### 1.2 Partner 2: Sero

Lead subtask 3.1: potential success factors.

### 1.3: Partner 3: EFQUEL

No effort.

### 1.4 Partner 4: ATiT

Contribute to subtask 3.1: potential success factors.



## **1.5 Partner 5: MENON**

No effort.

## **1.6 Partner 6: University of Leeds**

No effort.

## **1.7 Partner 7: EITF**

No effort.

## **1.8 Partner 8: Tensta**

No effort.

## **1.9 Partner 9: Aarhus University**

No effort.

## **1.10 Partner 10: TIEKE**

No effort.



## 2. Potential success factors

### 2.1 Critical Success Factors

Given the interim nature of the WP2 work at this stage, we do not yet have enough information on *failed* virtual schools to carry out any deep analysis.

Thus our starting point for the list of potential success factors is the set of Re.ViCa Critical Success Factors reworded for schools. Below is the Re.ViCa list as adapted for use by the Distance Learning Benchmarking Club in terms of a virtual school within a conventional school.

Code	Criterion name	Criterion level 5 statement (reworded for schools)	Relevance?
04	Usability	All systems usable, with internal evidence to back this up.	not sure
06	e-Learning Strategy	Regularly updated Distance e-Learning Strategy, integrated with Learning and Teaching Strategy and all related strategies	yes
07	Decisions on Projects	Effective decision-making for e-learning projects across the whole school, including variations when justified.	no
10	Training	All staff trained in virtual school system use, appropriate to job type – and retrained when needed.	yes – but does it ever happen?
12	Costs	A fit for purpose costing system is used in all departments for costs of schooling both face to face and virtual.	not sure
13	Planning Annually	Integrated annual planning process for the virtual school department integrated with overall school and course planning.	yes
16	Technical Support to Staff	All staff engaged in the virtual school process have "nearby" fast-response technical support.	yes
19	Decisions on Programmes	There is effective decision-making for new virtual school courses across the whole school	yes
22	Leadership in e-Learning	The capability of leaders to make decisions regarding virtual schooling is fully developed at departmental and school level.	hard to see what it means in a school



Code	Criterion name	Criterion level 5 statement (reworded for schools)	Relevance?
29	Management Style	The overall institutional management style is appropriate to manage its mix of educational and business activities	not sure
35	Relationship Management Upwards	The school has effective processes designed to achieve high formal and informal credibility with relevant government and public agencies overseeing it.	yes
53	Reliability	The virtual school e-learning system is as reliable as the main systems students and staff are used to from their wider experience as students and citizens,	yes!
58	Market Research	Market research (to assess demand for virtual schooling) done centrally and in or on behalf of all departments, and aware of e-learning aspects; updated annually or prior to major programme planning.	yes?
60	Security	A virtual school system where security breaches are known not to occur yet which allows staff and students to carry out their authorised duties easily and efficiently.	yes – but boring
91	Student Understanding of System	School pupils have good understanding of the rules governing assignment submission, feedback, plagiarism, costs, attendance, etc and always act on them.	yes
92	Student Help Desk	Help Desk is deemed as best practice.	yes
94	Student Satisfaction	Frequent (ideally annual) Pupil Satisfaction survey which explicitly addresses the main e-learning issues of relevance to pupils and their parents	not sure

## 2.2 Key success factors

This will be looked at when WP4 starts.



### 3. References

This is a working bibliography private to VISCED. Similar public bibliographies with a more general focus (covering higher education also) can be found on Mendeley at

<http://www.mendeley.com/groups/1075191/benchmarking-e-learning/> and

<http://www.mendeley.com/groups/1087051/quality-of-e-learning/>

Adamson, V., & Plenderleith, J. (2007). *Higher Education Academy/JISC e-Learning Benchmarking Exercise: Phase 1 Review*. York. Retrieved from [http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/2\\_EDSuTBenchmarkingPhase1Report.pdf](http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/2_EDSuTBenchmarkingPhase1Report.pdf)

Andersen, V. N., Dahler-Larsen, P., & Pedersen, C. S. (2009). Quality assurance and evaluation in Denmark. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(2), 135-147. Routledge, part of the Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/02680930902733071&magic=crossref>

Appana, S. (2008). A Review of Benefits and Limitations of Online Learning in the Context of the Student, the Instructor, and the Tenured Faculty. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 7(1), 5-22. Retrieved from <http://editlib.org/p/22909>

Archambault, L. (2008). *The characteristics, knowledge, and preparation levels of K-12 online distance educators in the United States*. University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Archambault, Leanna, & Crippen, K. (2009). Examining TPACK among K-12 online distance educators in the United States. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 71-88. Retrieved from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol9/iss1/general/article2.cfm>

Bacsich, P. (2006). The relevance of the MIT90s framework to benchmarking e-learning. Retrieved online at: <http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2006/09/MIT90s-survey-20060925.doc>. Retrieved from <http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2006/09/MIT90s-survey-20060925.doc>

Bacsich, Paul. (2003). Evaluation and benchmarking of ICT in schools (presentation). Hong Kong: Education and Manpower Bureau. Retrieved from [http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content\\_2336/power\\_point\\_presentation\\_o.ppt](http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content_2336/power_point_presentation_o.ppt)

Bacsich, Paul. (2005). Benchmarking e-learning in HE : Global perspective & UK case study. *World Review*, (November).

Bacsich, Paul. (2005). Benchmarking e-Learning: An Overview for UK HE. *ALT-C 2005* (p. 10). Oxford: Association for Learning Technology. Retrieved from [http://www.alt.ac.uk/altc2005/timetable/files/527/Benchmark\\_overview.doc](http://www.alt.ac.uk/altc2005/timetable/files/527/Benchmark_overview.doc)

Bacsich, Paul. (2005). Evaluating Impact of eLearning: Benchmarking. *Towards a Learning Society: Proceedings of the eLearning Conference, Brussels, May 2005* (pp. 162–176). Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved from <http://www.matic-media.co.uk/benchmarking/Bacsich-benchmarking-2005-EU.doc>





- Bacsich, Paul. (2005). *theory of benchmarking for e-learning: a helicopter review of the literature* (p. 26). Sheffield. Retrieved from <http://www.matic-media.co.uk/benchmarking/Bacsich-benchmarking-2005-01.doc>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2005). Benchmarking e-learning in HE: Global perspective & UK case study (presentation). *Crafting Sydney's Future* (p. 18). Sydney: University of Sydney. Retrieved from <http://sydney.edu.au/learning/quality/docs/bacsich.pdf>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2005). *Theory of Benchmarking for e-Learning A Top-Level Literature Review* (p. 40). Sheffield. Retrieved from <http://www.matic-media.co.uk/benchmarking/Bacsich-benchmarking-2005-04.doc>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). *E-xcellence benchmarks compared* (p. 12). Sheffield. Retrieved from <http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2006/12/E-xcellence-analysed-rel1.doc>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). Pick&Mix mapping into MIT90s. *Report to the Higher Education Academy, September*. Retrieved from <http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2006/09/PicknMix-MIT90s-20060925.doc>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). *Higher Education Academy e-Learning Benchmarking Project - Consultant Final Public Report* (p. 28). York. Retrieved from <http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2006/09/bacsich-report-public20060901.doc>
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). *Concordance Project Summary*. York.
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). *The BENVIC indicators and measurements - correlated with Pick & Mix* (p. 15). Sheffield. Retrieved from [http://www.matic-media.co.uk/benchmarking/BENVIC-PnM\\_1-1-general.doc](http://www.matic-media.co.uk/benchmarking/BENVIC-PnM_1-1-general.doc)
- Bacsich, Paul. (2006). How successful is Swiss Virtual Campus? Benchmarking with other national programs. *Swiss Virtual Campus SVC Days, March 2006*. Swiss Virtual Campus.
- Bacsich, Paul. (2009). Benchmarking e-learning in UK universities: lessons from and for the international context. *23rd ICDE World Conference on Open Learning and Distance Education 7–10 June 2009*. Retrieved from [http://www.openhogeschoolnetwerk.com/Docs/Campagnes/ICDE2009/Papers/Final\\_Paper\\_338Bacsich.pdf](http://www.openhogeschoolnetwerk.com/Docs/Campagnes/ICDE2009/Papers/Final_Paper_338Bacsich.pdf)
- Bacsich, Paul, & over 12 authors. (2005). *Overall Study on Reviewing the Progress and Evaluating The Information Technology in Education (ITEd) Projects 1998/2003: Final Report* (p. 338). Hong Kong. Retrieved from [http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content\\_4447/finalreportfinalver.pdf](http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content_4447/finalreportfinalver.pdf)
- Barbera, E. (2004). Quality in virtual education environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), 13-20. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2004.00364.x>
- Barbour, M. K., & Reeves, T. (2009). The reality of virtual schools: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education*, 52(2), 402-416. Elsevier Ltd. Retrieved from <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0360131508001450>
- Barker, K. C. (2007). E-learning Quality Standards for Consumer Protection and Consumer Confidence : A Canadian Case Study in E-learning Quality Assurance. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(2), 109-119. Retrieved from [http://www.ifets.info/index.php?http://www.ifets.info/abstract.php?art\\_id=754](http://www.ifets.info/index.php?http://www.ifets.info/abstract.php?art_id=754)



- Blackmur, D. (2008). A critical analysis of the INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice for higher education quality assurance agencies. *Higher Education*, 56(6), 723-734.
- Blass, E., & Davis, A. (2003). Building on Solid Foundations : establishing criteria for e-learning development. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(3), 227-246.
- Bozo, D., Tamo, A., & Hafizi, M. (2005). *Guidelines on External Examination of Quality in Higher Education* (p. 46). Tirana. Retrieved from [http://www.aaal.edu.al/pagesEN/pages/Manual\\_foreign\\_estimat.htm](http://www.aaal.edu.al/pagesEN/pages/Manual_foreign_estimat.htm)
- Brown, R. (2011). Community-College Students Perform Worse Online Than Face to Face. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Washington. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Community-College-Students/128281/>
- Buck, J. (2001). Assuring Quality in Distance Education. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXVI(4).
- Chua, A., & Lam, W. (2007). Quality assurance in online education: The Universitas 21 Global approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(1), 133-152. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00652.x>
- David Glenn. (2011). Presidents Are Divided on Best Ways to Measure Quality. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from [http://chronicle.com/article/Presidents-Dont-Agree-on-What/127528/?sid=wb&utm\\_source=wb&utm\\_medium=en](http://chronicle.com/article/Presidents-Dont-Agree-on-What/127528/?sid=wb&utm_source=wb&utm_medium=en)
- Davis, N., Eickelmann, B., Patru, M., Schulz-Zander, R., & Dzvimbo, P. (2011). TWG 1: Restructuring educational systems to move into the digital age: brief informative paper. *EduSummit 2011* (pp. 2010-2012). Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://downloads.kennisnet.nl/algemeen/edusummit2011/1 EduSummit 2011 Restructuring Educational Systems.pdf>
- Dee, J. R. (2008). Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(2), 201-204. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?issn=0968-4883&volume=16&issue=2&articleid=1723178&show=html>
- Deepwell, F. (2007). Embedding Quality in e-Learning Implementation through Evaluation. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(2), 34-43. Citeseer. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.128.3666&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Detert, J., Schroeder, R. G., & Cudeck, R. (2003). The measurement of quality management culture in schools: development and validation of the SQMCS. *Journal of Operations Management*, 21(3), 307-328. Retrieved from <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0272696302001304>
- ENQA. (2009). *Guidelines for external reviews of quality assurance agencies in the EHEA*. (ENQA, Ed.). Educational, A., & Brief, P. (n.d.). Policy for Educational Transformation : An Educational Policy Brief. *Education*.
- Ehlers, U. D. (2009). Web 2.0 – e-learning 2.0 – quality 2.0? Quality for new learning cultures. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 17(3), 296-314. doi:10.1108/09684880910970687
- Ehrmann, S. C. (2010). Taking the Long View: Ten Recommendations about Time, Money, Technology, and Learning. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 42(5), 16-22.



- Ellis, R. A., Jarkey, N., Mahony, M. J., Peat, M., & Sheely, S. (2007). Managing quality improvement of eLearning in a large, campus-based university. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 15(1), 9-23. doi:10.1108/09684880710723007
- Faculty, E. D. I. (1994). DEVELOPMENT OF A QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM FOR ELEARNING PROJECTS. *Quality*, 8, 2008. Citeseer. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.137.8630&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fresen, J. (2007). A Taxonomy of Factors to Promote Quality Web-Supported Learning. *International Journal of Elearning*, 6(3), 351-362.
- Frydenberg, J. (2002). A matrix of analysis. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 3(2).
- Ginns, P., & Ellis, R. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(1), 53-64. Elsevier. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.10.003
- Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., & Varjo, J. (n.d.). North by northwest: quality assurance and evaluation processes in European education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(2), 121-133. Routledge, part of the Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/tepd/2009/00000024/00000002/art00001>
- Hanson, M. et al. (n.d.). Benchmarking e-larande vid KTH.
- Hjort, M., & Sundkvist, M. (2011). *The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education's quality evaluation system 2011–2014. Communications* (p. 18). Swedish National Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from [www.hsv.se](http://www.hsv.se)
- JISC. (2009). *Effective Practice in a Digital Age*.
- Jamtshoa, S., & Bullen, M. (2007). Distance Education in Bhutan: Improving access and quality through ICT use. *Distance Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/index/780428386.pdf>
- Jeliazkova, M., & Westerheijden, D. F. (2001). A next generation of quality assurance models: On phases, levels and circles in policy development. *CHER 14th Annual Conference*. Dijon. Retrieved from <http://doc.utwente.nl/56078/>
- Kidney, G., Cumming, L., & Boehm, A. (2007). Toward a quality Assurance Approach to E-Learning Courses.pdf. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 6(1), 17-30.
- Kristensen, B. (2010). Has External Quality Assurance Actually Improved Quality in Higher Education Over the Course of 20 Years of the "Quality Revolution"? *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(2), 153-157. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/13538322.2010.485732&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3>
- Lim, F. C. B. (2008). Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America – World Class Worldwide. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(2), 199-201. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?issn=0968-4883&volume=16&issue=2&articleid=1723177&show=html>
- Liz, P., Mickey, R., John, W., & Matthew, W. (2006). Measuring Outcomes in K-12 Online Education Programs: The Need for Common Metrics. *Distance Learning*, 3(3), 51. Retrieved from



<http://proquest.umi.com.dbgw.lis.curtin.edu.au/pqdweb?did=1269843771&Fmt=7&clientId=22212&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Luckett, K. (2010). A "Quality Revolution" Constrained? A Critical Reflection on Quality Assurance Methodology from the South African Higher Education Context. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 71-75. Retrieved from

<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/13538321003679556&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3>

MacKeogh, K., & Fox, S. (2009). Strategies for embedding eLearning in traditional universities: drivers and barriers. *Electronic Journal of eLearning*, 7(2), 147 - 154. Academic Conferences Limited. Curtis Farm, Kidmore End, Nr Reading, RG4 9AY, UK. Tel: +44-1189-724148; Fax: +44-1189-724691; e-mail: [info@academic-conferences.org](mailto:info@academic-conferences.org); Web site: <http://academic-conferences.org/ejournals.htm>. Retrieved from <http://doras.dcu.ie/2166/>

Marcus, J. (2011). US unplugged: manifold benefits of disconnected learning. Retrieved June 2, 2011, from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=416375&c=1>

Marianne Azer, & Mostafa El-Sherbini. (2011). Cultural Challenges in Developing E-Learning Content. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://online-journals.org/i-jet/article/viewArticle/1467>

Marshall, S, & Mitchell, G. (2006). Assessing sector e-learning capability with an e-learning maturity model BT - ALT-C 2006: The next generation: Research Proceedings. Heriot-Watt University. Retrieved from [http://www.alt.ac.uk/altc2006/altc2006\\_documents/research\\_proceedings\\_altc2006.pdf#page=59](http://www.alt.ac.uk/altc2006/altc2006_documents/research_proceedings_altc2006.pdf#page=59)

Marshall, Stephen. (2010). Change, technology and higher education: are universities capable of organisational change? *ALTJ*, 18(3), 179-192. Routledge. doi:10.1080/09687769.2010.529107

Marshall, Stephen, & Mitchell, G. (2002). An E-Learning Maturity Model? ASCILITE. Retrieved from <http://www.unitec.ac.nz/ascilite/proceedings/papers/173.pdf>

Marshall, Stephen, & Mitchell, G. (2004). Applying SPICE to e-learning: an e-learning maturity model? *Proceedings of the sixth conference on Australasian computing education Volume 30*, 30(Ims 2003), 185-191. Australian Computer Society, Inc. Retrieved from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=979968.979993>

McLoughlin, C., & Luca, J. (2001). QUALITY IN ONLINE DELIVERY : WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR ASSESSMENT IN E-LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS ? (G. Kennedy, M. Keppell, C. McNaught, & T. Petrovic, Eds.) *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education*, 417-426. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Mitchell, G, & Marshall, S. J. (2005). E-Learning Process Maturity in the New Zealand Tertiary Sector. Proceedings of EDUCAUSE in Australasia 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.utdc.vuw.ac.nz/research/emm/documents/E-LearningProcessMaturity.pdf>

Mukhopadhyay, M. (n.d.). *Total Quality Management in Education: Marmar Mukhopadhyay*: SAGE the natural home for authors, editors and societies. Sage. Retrieved from <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/books/Book228402?siteId=sage-uk&prodTypes=any&q=quality+education>



- OECD. (2011). learning our lesson: review of quality teaching in higher education. *OECD Report*. Retrieved December 5, 2011, from [http://www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3746,en\\_2649\\_35961291\\_44661638\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3746,en_2649_35961291_44661638_1_1_1_1,00.html)
- Ossiannilsson, E., & Landgren, L. (2011). Quality in e-learning - a conceptual framework based on experiences from three international benchmarking projects. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, no-no. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2011.00439.x
- Pape, L. (2005). High School on the WEB. *American School Board Journal*, 192(7), 12-16.
- Parker, N. K. (2008). The quality dilemma in online education revisited. In T. Anderson (Ed.), *Theory and Practice of Online Learning* (2nd ed.). AU Press.
- Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (2000). *Quality on the Line: Benchmarks for Success in Internet Based Distance Education* (p. 37). Washington, DC.
- Powell, A., & Patrick, S. (2006). *An international perspective of K-12 online learning: A summary of the 2006 NACOL international e-learning survey*. Retrieved December. Retrieved from <http://www.inacol.org/resources/docs/InternationalSurveyResultsSummaries.pdf>
- Robinson, B. (2008). Using distance education and ICT to improve access, equity and the quality in rural teachers' professional development in western China. ... *Review of Research in Open and ...*. Retrieved from <http://www.distanceandaccesstolearning.net/contents/IRRODL-Robinson.pdf>
- Selim, H. (2007). Critical success factors for e-learning acceptance: Confirmatory factor models. *Computers & Education*, 49(2), 396-413. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2005.09.004
- Sloan, M., & Olive, J. (2006). Distance learning: mathematical learning opportunities for rural schools in the United States. ... *of the Seventeenth Study Conference of the ...*. Retrieved from <http://www.math.msu.edu/~nathsinc/ICMI/papers/GroupeA.pdf>
- Stella, A., & Gnanam, A. (2004). Quality assurance in distance education: The challenges to be addressed. *Higher Education*, 47(2), 143-160. doi:10.1023/B:HIGH.0000016420.17251.5c
- Strigel, C. (2007). Where desert meets technology: Findings from ICT in education initiatives in rural schools in Mongolia. Retrieved from <http://www.adb.org/Documents/Reports/Consultant/39035-REG/appendix8.pdf>
- Sun, P., Tsai, R., Finger, G., Chen, Y., & Yeh, D. (2008). What drives a successful e-Learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. *Computers & Education*, 50(4), 1183-1202. Elsevier. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2006.11.007
- Twigg, C. (2001). *Quality Assurance for Whom? Providers and Consumers in Today's Distributed Learning Environment*.
- Veronica Adamson, & Jane Plenderleith. (2007). *Higher Education Academy/JISC e-Learning Benchmarking Exercise: Phase 1 Review*. York. Retrieved from [http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/2\\_EDSuTBenchmarkingPhase1Report.pdf](http://elearning.heacademy.ac.uk/weblogs/benchmarking/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/2_EDSuTBenchmarkingPhase1Report.pdf)
- Zhao, F. (2003). Enhancing the quality of online higher education through measurement. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(4), 214-221. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/09684880310501395>