



**NATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE'S TOOLKIT 2005  
eLEARNING LEADERSHIP & POLICIES**

**Guide for Determining the role of the state in elearning:  
Decision points for state leaders**

<b>Beginning the Conversation</b>	<b>Current Reality:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess need</li> <li>• Determine ad hoc implementation across the state</li> <li>• Identify state resources</li> <li>• Assess political will and other influencing factors across state</li> </ul>
<b>Decision Points:</b>	<b>Issues and Options:</b>
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislation stipulating funding source</li> <li>• Student eligibility for funding               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On-site only</li> <li>○ Any time, anywhere</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Funding Methods               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full-Time Equivalent Model</li> <li>○ Successful course completion</li> <li>○ Charge back to LEAs (Local Educational Agencies)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Create new model for eLearning</li> </ul>

Quality Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courses evaluated and approved by state</li> <li>• Accountability for quality is provided through student results from a statewide assessment or a state recognized course assessment</li> <li>• Quality assurance is predetermined locally by applying the state’s criteria for online courses</li> <li>• Course meets a state accepted standard of quality</li> <li>• Courses not evaluated</li> </ul>
Governance structure	A. Centralized approach; or B. Decentralized approach
<b>A. Centralized Approach</b>	
<p>Definition: State-directed through legislation and policy</p> <p>Models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Developed Courses</li> <li>• State Brokers Courses</li> <li>• Hybrid - State Developed/Brokered Courses</li> <li>• State as Clearing House <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Courses Evaluated</li> <li>○ Courses not evaluated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>B. Decentralized Approach</b>
<p>Definition: Locally-directed by school district/local school board</p>	

<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control of quality and administration rests with one entity, the state</li> <li>• Consistency of program</li> <li>• More centralized accountability for student performance</li> <li>• Facilitates Data Collection</li> <li>• Easier assurance of equitable access for all students throughout state</li> <li>• Interoperability</li> <li>• Allows student mobility</li> </ul>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State funding not required</li> <li>• Local buy-in to program</li> <li>• Ability to respond to and address local needs</li> <li>• Supports innovative programs</li> </ul>
<p>Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single Funding Source</li> <li>• Need for Legislation</li> <li>• Development of Policies and Rules</li> <li>• Need for Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staffing</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need for Policies Regarding Issuing Credits</li> </ul>	<p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially inconsistent programs and offerings across state</li> <li>• Differentiated data collection across districts</li> <li>• Multiple management systems within the state</li> <li>• Need for policies determining portability of both course work and credits across districts within states</li> <li>• Local funding</li> <li>• Variations in professional development for online faculty across districts within the state</li> <li>• Differentiated online learning opportunities for students across districts within the state</li> </ul>