DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 856   IR 018 997

AUTHOR   Hillesheim, Gwen
TITLE   The Search for Quality Standards in Distance Learning.
PUB DATE   1998-00-00
NOTE   8p.; In: Distance Learning '98. Proceedings of the Annual
                Conference on Distance Teaching & Learning (14th, Madison,
                WI, August 5-7, 1998); see IR 018 976.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Computer Assisted Instruction; Course Evaluation; *Distance
                Education; Educational Administration; *Educational
                Assessment; *Educational Quality; Empowerment; *Evaluation
                Criteria; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Leadership;
                Models; Online Systems; *Quality Control; Recordkeeping;
                Standards; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT
        This paper explores the issues surrounding quality in higher
education and its necessary adaptation to the online world of educational
delivery. A historical perspective on quality standards is presented, and
characteristics of recent models for quality control are outlined.
Quality-related issues in Walden University's (Minnesota) two new online,
course based programs--a Ph.D. in Professional Psychology and a Master of
Science degree in Educational Change and Technology Innovation--are
discussed. Highlights include: (1) managerial quality/organizational
criteria, including leadership and record keeping; (2) functional
quality/technological criteria, including student support via process teams;
and (3) ethical quality/instructional criteria, including the relationship
between students and faculty, faculty evaluation, and student and faculty
empowerment. (Contains 33 references.) (AEF)

The Search for Quality Standards in Distance Learning

Gwen Hillesheim, Ed.D.
Walden University

Walden University has been delivering non-traditional graduate education to adult learners for 27 years. From 1970 until 1995 Walden granted strictly doctoral-level degrees utilizing a dispersed residency format. The dispersed residency model was once known as "open" or "correspondence" learning. Assuring quality in such a non-traditional, distance model was highly dependent on the quality of the faculty and the mentoring relationship established between the faculty member and the students.

However, with the increasing availability of technologically based means of communication and the rapid development and sophistication of distance education and distance delivery this all changed for Walden University. In 1995 new requirements were instituted for students and faculty grounded in telecommunications. In addition Walden University began offering two new online, course based programs. One a Ph.D. in Professional Psychology, the other an online Master of Science degree in Educational Change and Technology Innovation (ECTI). While these two course based, online programs did not change the mission and vision of Walden University, they clearly have affected the process, procedures and delivery of instruction at Walden University. This paper is an exploration of the issues surrounding quality in higher education and its necessary adaptation to the online world of educational delivery.

Historical Perspective

Quality standards and processes have been available in other industries for decades. These quality processes are highly sophisticated in the manufacturing industry with such well known scholars as Deming and Juran. However, many of the traditional quality models, in education, focused only on the pedagogical factors. The International Council for Distance Education said of quality: "The focus for designing quality distance education should be on the content, the learners, and the learning outcome" (Hardy, 1997). While this author would agree, it appears that this is not enough for a quality distance education program.

Keegan and Rumble in a 1982 study (Verduin & Clark, 1991) established quality indicators as the learner outcomes. Gooler (1979) in looking at quality and distance education felt the important variables were affective skills and the drop out rate. For many institutions, both traditional and distance, it was clear in reviewing quality there was disagreement on what should be evaluated (Verduin & Clark, 1991). Traditional quality standards often included entrance requirements, famous graduates, reputational rankings, illustrious faculty (West, 1984), the value added to graduates, and the level of involvement of students in academic and extra curricular activities. It is easy to see the similarity of these criteria with criteria of accrediting groups in their evaluation of academic institutions. Keegan and Rumble (in Verduin & Clark, 1991) established a set of criteria for distance institutions. These criteria may be useful for the non-traditional correspondence program but a shortcoming is the obvious lack of factors dealing with technology for today's distance delivered programs.

* Quality of the learning materials
* Stability of the subjects taught at a distance
* Cost effectiveness
* The status of the institution

Recent Models

The American National Standards Institute recently applied the American Association of Quality Control international standards (ISO9001) to education and training institutes. These include both traditional and non-traditional delivery models.

* The curriculum specifies expected outcomes.
* Quality systems should be kept simple.
* Precise measurement is essential (quality control).

Only since the beginning of the 1990's have we begun to see the introduction of technology as an important criteria in the quality literature for distance education. However, an earlier reference to the importance to the delivery method by Baldi in 1976 stated, the "method of curriculum delivery serves a critical function in legitimizing such program" (In Poppenhagen, 1986).

* Materials must be learner friendly.
* Materials must be interesting.
* Materials must elicit the appropriate rigor.
* The materials must be relevant.
* The technology must be available.
* Teachers and students must be familiar with the distance methodology.

Hawkes and Duning et al. Models

As the result of this attention to pedagogy, content and delivery a few authors have addressed the aspect of ethics as it affects quality in programs. Duning, Van Kekerix, and Zaborowski in 1993 chose three criteria encompassing the functional, managerial and instructional quality of distance courses. Hawkes (1996) in *Criteria for evaluating school based distance education programs* discusses both the technological aspects of quality and the ethical aspects by discussing four criteria as critical. A comparison of these quality criteria is shown in Table 1. Ethical aspects of quality are a component of each model. Ethics as instruction and ethics as related to access issues.

By combining the Hawkes (1996) and the Duning et al. (1993) models it will be possible to discuss the comprehensive quality model utilized by Walden University. As Lewis (1988) said "As learning systems become more complex quality control and service management of the customers experience will become increasingly important" (Moore, 1990, p. 53).

Managerial Quality/Organizational Criteria

How Does Walden University Lead?

One of the questions infrequently connected overtly to the quality of educational programs, especially online distance programs, is the question of leadership. However, the mission, vision, foundational values and leadership support the overall standards of acceptable

quality within any educational program. This is closely related to the allocation of resources for quality. Resources at Walden University include a dissertation editor, Quality Center of Excellence, an online writing center, and regular a program evaluation and review process. Commitment of resources to quality must be supported by the leadership of the organization.

Table 1. Quality Criteria

Duning et al. (1993)	Hawkes (1996)

1. Functional Quality
   a. Technical
   b. Design
	1. Technological Criteria
	   a. Ease of use
	   b. Speed of Access
	   c. Level of realism
	   d. Flexibility
	   e. Time place independence (Stubbs & Burnham, 1990)

2. Managerial Quality
   a. Policy
   b. Leadership
	2. Organizational Criteria
	   a. Maintenance
	   b. Scheduling
	   c. Support availability
	   d. Staff development

3. Ethical Quality
   a. Instructional aspects
	3. Instructional Criteria
	   a. Interactivity
	   b. Integrative capacity
	   c. Learner control
	   d. Learner-instructor relationship
	   e. Learner achievement

	4. Ethical Criteria a. Access

How Does Walden University Record Keep?

As is common to most educational institutions the gathering, storage and access to information is critical. Walden University is attempting to move toward greater amounts of electronic data as opposed to paper data. The institution supports an electronic student data base that includes all student information, course information, and research project/dissertation information. It also tracks application and registration information, the various approval and signature sheets necessary, advisor assignments, and changes in status. Separate programs support electronic portfolios for students, process checklists for quarterly events, periodic review information is collected for programs, and instructor evaluations are part of the continuous improvement process for faculty.

Functional Quality/Technological Criteria

How Does Walden University Support Students?

In March of 1997 Walden University re-organized into a process team model. Support and administrative functions were re-designed to fall within single process teams. Examples of process teams include: recruitment, admissions, orientation, finance, registration, progress, records, completion, and residencies. This student centered approach provides direct links for service to the graduate students of Walden University.

Ethical Quality/Instructional Criteria

How Does Walden University Teach?

This is one of the most critical components of a quality education program. Desmond Keegan (1993) in an article called *Theoretical Principles of Distance Education* discusses the importance of the relationship between the student and the faculty member. He feels it is "interaction for the purpose of identifying, understanding, confirming worthwhile knowledge" (p. 13). However what is "worthwhile knowledge"? "The difficulty with assessing the quality of distance education is agreeing on a common meaning or set of objective criteria" (Keegan, 1993, p. 10). While it has already been stated there a many influencing factors of quality, much of it is invisible to the students in the online arena. However, the interaction between the student and the instructor is not invisible. The creation of the relationship and the community of students with the faculty member in an online environment is critical to the pursuit of knowledge. It is also critical to student satisfaction.

How Does Walden University Evaluate Faculty?

Evaluation of faculty is critical to establishing a quality program. It is important to the program, the students and the faculty themselves to know how they are doing. Holmberg (1989) said there are two reasons for evaluation 1) to safeguard the highest possible education quality and 2) to assure resources are spent wisely. There are no unique problems regarding evaluation in the online area. If anything evaluation is easier as students easily adjust to responding to questions online and the ease of documentation of the interaction between the faculty and the students. Walden faculty are regularly evaluated. Students complete a program evaluation after their first quarter of the program. In each case they evaluate the services provided them by the recruitment, admissions, registration, orientation, and progress teams. In addition each course has a mid-quarter course evaluation and a final instructor evaluation. These evaluation tools are utilized in the faculty performance and re-contracting process. However, student data alone do not make up the evaluation process. In addition to the perspective and satisfaction of the students there is also the evaluation by the program director. In this case the program director is part of each course as an observer. Lastly, the instructor himself or herself writes a narrative summary and evaluation of their performance at the course conclusion. These three perspectives, student, teacher and administrator are used to fully evaluate the course related to both satisfaction and to quality outcomes.

5

How Does Walden University Empower?

The empowerment of all the participants is an important ethical aspect of quality in an online educational program. Because of the independence of all the participants in an online educational program it is important that they feel empowered. Students must be empowered to make their own decisions. Faculty must be empowered to adjust the course to follow the cconstructivist model, administrators must be empowered to intervene with students or faculty when appropriate, and support process teams must be empowered to meet the students needs.

Conclusion

It is clear that a quality assurance program is vital to the ongoing success and the fiscal requirements of online educational programming. It must be continuous and permeate all aspects of the delivery and content of the program. It must be evidenced by the leadership of the institution, the faculty, the curriculum, the materials, the delivery model and student services. An institution could create a model based only in quality of the classroom, but it will fall short in other critical areas of assuring success for students.

It is the tension between being a student centered institution and having integrity that can give administrators their greatest challenges. This model, in which the managerial, functional and ethical (Duning, et al. 1993) aspects of quality are explored through a series of questions is one way to develop a quality program. The ECTI program at Walden University is able to answer each of these questions for its program, the faculty, the delivery and the students. As the program continues to develop it is clear the commitment toward quality by all the involved constituencies is in place. The retention is high, the satisfaction is documented in the student responses and the faculty commitment is in place. Students currently are progressing through their program, their research projects and are able to find success at Walden University. Quality assures student success, faculty success and program success will only continue.

Bibliography

Biehl, R. (1997). Software quality assurance and planning for teacher and classroom. Unpublished paper, Walden University: MN.

Burt, G. (1996). Quality provision for students: The implications of social choice theory. *American Journal of Distance Education 10*(1), 36–40.

Case, P. & B. Elliot. (1997). Distance learning programs: Problems, strategies and solutions. *Open Praxis 1*, 29–33.

Cronk, P. & E. McLendon. (1995). Quality assurance for distance education: Concepts and strategies. Unpublished paper.

Dixon, P. (1996). Virtual college. Petersons: New Jersey.

Duning, B., M. VanKekerix & I. Zaborowski. (1993). Reaching learners through telecommunications. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Freedman, L. (1987). Quality in continuing education. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Garrison, D. R. (1989). Understanding distance education. Rutledge: NY.

Gibson, C. (1997). Teaching/learning at a distance: A paradigm shift in progress. *Open Praxis 1*, 7–9.

Glasser, W. (1992). The quality school. Harper Perennial: NY.

Guidelines for Distance Education. North Central Association Commission on Institutions of Higher education. Http://www.ncaihe.org/aice/guidelines/gdistance.cfm.

Hardy D. W. (1997). Instructional design for distance education. *Open Praxis 1*, 26–27.

Hawkes, M. Criteria for evaluating school based distance education programs. *National Association of Secondary School Principals 80*(581), 45–52.

Holmberg, B. (1989). Theory and practice of distance education. Routledge: NY.

Johnstone S. & B. Krauth. (1996). Some principles of good practice for the virtual university. *Change 28*(2), 38–41.

Keegan, D. (1993). Theoretical principles of distance education. Routledge: NY.

Malcom Baldridge National Quality Award. (1994). 1995 Educational Quality Criteria.

Marchese, T. (1995). The Baldridge in education: Why it is needed and what the first pilot year produced. *The AAHE Bulletin 48* (1–10).

Minoli, D. (1996). Distance learning technology and application. Artech House: Boston.

Moore, M. (1990). Contemporary issues in American distance education. Pergamon Press: NY.

Murgatroyd, S. (1993). The house of quality: Using QFD for Instructional design in distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education 7*(2), 34–38.

Nunan, T. & J. Calvert. (1992). Quality and standards in distance education. Report to the National Distance Education Conference.

Poppenhagen, B. (1986). Defining quality in overseas degree programs: The tyranny of instructional hierarchies. *National Issues in Higher Education. 32*, 202–211.

Quality assurance standards-guidelines for the application of ANSI/ISO/ASQC Q9001 or Q9002 to education and training institutions. (1996). American National Standards Institute.

Quality distance education: Lessons learned. (1996). Http://www.uwex.edu/disted/qde/eval.html.

Scriven, M. (1996). The treason of the intellectuals. *AAF* 6(2), 6–7.

Seligman, D. (1992). The comparative nature of quality: Distance education in the developing world. Paper presented at the World Conference of the International Council for Distance Education.

Shaw, M. (1993). Indicators of program quality. Penn State Dept. Of Education Adult Basic and Literacy Education Handbook for Program Administration.

Smith, R. & M. Kelly (Ed.). (1987). Distance education and the mainstream. Room Helm: NY.

Stubbs, S. & B. Burnham. (1990). An instrument for evaluating the potential effectiveness of electronic distance education systems. *The American Journal of Distance Education* 4(3), 25–37.

Upham, S. (1995). University of Oregon guidelines for good practice in graduate education. *Communicator*. October, 10–12.

Verduin, J. & T. Clark. (1991). Distance education: The foundations of effective practice. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Willis, B. (1993). Distance education a practical guide. Education Technology Publications: Englewood Cliffs.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
14th ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON DISTANCE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Author(s): *NA*

Corporate Source:
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Publication Date:
8/6/98

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____
_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

↑

[✓]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____
_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

↑

[ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____
_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

↑

[ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: *Christine H. Olgren*

Organization/Address:
UW-MADISON
1050 UNIVERSITY AVE Rm 6136
MADISON, WI 53706

Printed Name/Position/Title:
CHRISTINE H. OLGREN, CONFERENCE DIRECTOR

Telephone: *608-262-8530*
FAX: *608-262-7257*

E-Mail Address:
CHOLGREN@ FACSTAFF. WISC. EDU

Date: *9/10/98*

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

~~PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM~~

Publisher/Distributor:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Address:

1050 UNIVERSITY AVE., Rm B136
MADISON, WI 53706

Price:

$25 PLUS SHIPPING

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.