Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2014:

Politics, Performance, Policy, and Research Evidence

Section II
The Disconnect Between Policy and Research:
Examining the Research into Virtual Schooling

Michael K. Barbour, Sacred Heart University
March 2014

Executive Summary

This section reviews the research relevant to virtual schools. While there has been some improvement in what is known about supplemental K-12 online learning, there continues to be a lack of evidence to guide the practice of full-time K-12 online learning. This section concludes that despite considerable enthusiasm for full-time virtual education in some quarters, there is little high-quality research to support the practice or call for expanding this form of virtual schools.

Based on the existing research base, it is recommended that:

- State and federal policymakers create long-term programs to support independent research and evaluation of *full-time* K-12 online learning. More than twenty years after the first K-12 online learning programs began, there continues to be a deficit of empirical, longitudinal research to guide the practice of K-12 online learning, particularly full-time learning. Especially critical is research on factors linked to student success and on how the profit motive of commercial providers may affect the quality of programs.

- Researchers focus on collaborating with individual K-12 online learning programs to identify specific challenges that can be answered using a design-based research methodology. This approach will provide data-driven solutions that address real problems experienced by those individual K-12 online learning programs. These solutions can also serve as a starting point when other programs experience similar challenges.

- Policymakers limit the growth and geographic reach of full-time, taxpayer-funded online learning programs. While there is little research to guide policymakers in how they regulate full-time online learning, those programs that have a managed growth and geographic focus have tended to outperform those with unlimited growth and no geographic restrictions.

- State and federal policymakers examine the role of the parent/guardian in the instructional model of full-time online learning to determine the level of teaching support that is necessary for students to be successful. If the instructional model used by full-time online learning resembles traditional homeschooling more than traditional brick-and-mortar instruction, consideration should be given to adjustments in the funding provided to full-time online learning to reflect their decreased teaching responsibilities.

Section II
The Disconnect Between Policy and Research:
Examining the Research into Virtual Schooling

Introduction

A paucity of research exists when examining high school students enrolled in virtual schools, and the research base is smaller still when the population of students is further narrowed to the elementary grades.

—K. Rice[1]

A number of scholars have documented the absence of rigorous reviews of virtual schools.[2] Cavanaugh, Barbour, and Clark (2009) defended this state of affairs, writing that:

in many ways, this [was] indicative of the foundational descriptive work that often precedes experimentation in any scientific field. In other words, it is important to know how students in virtual school engage in their learning in this environment prior to conducting any rigorous examination of virtual schooling.[3]

We can ask, however, "How long must we wait?" K-12 online learning began around 1991.[4] The first cyber charter school began around 1994.[5] The first supplemental online learning programs also began in the mid-1990s,[6] and proliferated considerably throughout the early 2000s.[7]

Eight years after Rice's initial assessment, the state of research into K-12 online learning has not changed.[8] While there has been some improvement in what is known about supplemental K-12 online learning, there continues to be a lack of reliable and valid evidence to guide the practice of full-time K-12 online learning. Yet it is the full-time K-12 online learning that has seen the greatest growth in recent years.[9] It's past time to insist that K-12 online learning policy, particularly when it comes to full-time programs, be driven by what is actually known based on the available research.

Research to Support K-12 Online Learning Policy—
Student Performance

In its 2009 report summarizing the research into the effectiveness of K-12 online learning, the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) concluded, "the preliminary research shows promise for online learning as an effective alternative for improving student performance across diverse groups of students."[10] However, as Larry Cuban outlined in NEPC's 2013 report, this claim that online learning is as effective as face-to-face instruction is comprised of "weak studies that offer little compelling evidence

of enhanced student achievement."[11] Cuban's assessment is further strengthened when the nature of these studies is carefully examined.

To date, the vast majority of research comparing student performance in K-12 online learning with student performance in traditional schools has examined supplemental programs.[12] This is problematic for a number of reasons. The biggest problem—beyond the methodological issues that Cuban raised in the 2013 report—is the fact that when the majority of these studies were conducted, the population of students enrolled in supplemental K-12 online learning opportunities was a highly selective group of students.[13] One of the best descriptions of these online learners was written by Haughey and Muirhead:

> Students who do well in online programs are motivated to learn. They are self-directed and self-disciplined. They are not disenchanted with school . . . Successful online students are at their grade level. They read and write wel. . . . Online students need to be independent learners. They should be curious and able to ask for help . . . [They have or should have an] interest in technology and good computer skills.[14]

This description is certainly not representative of the average K-12 student, nor of many K-12 online learners. Yet it is representative of the nature of students included in the majority of research that has found K-12 online learning to be as effective as face-to-face instruction.

While there is little peer-reviewed research into the effectiveness of full-time K-12 online learning, there is a growing body of literature from state governments, policy think tanks, and investigative journalists. For example, the Colorado Department of Education found in 2006 that full-time "online student scores in math, reading, and writing have been lower than scores for students statewide over the last three years."[15] Five years later, an iNews Network investigation found that full-time "online student scores on statewide achievement tests are consistently 14 to 26 percentage points below state averages for reading, writing and math over the past four years."[16] These are not isolated examples.

In Wisconsin, a state audit found mixed performance in comparisons of full-time online students and students in brick-and-mortar schools. Online charter school students had higher median scores in reading, but lower median scores in math.[17] A similar audit in Minnesota found similar mixed results. Online charter school students performed at approximately the same level in reading as compared with brick-and-mortar students, but a much smaller percentage of full-time online students scored proficient in math.[18] Further, the audit found that 25% of online charter school seniors dropped out of school, compared with a statewide average of only 3%. Investigative journalists reported similar findings in Arizona, where the largest online charter schools—which together enroll 90% of all full-time online students in the state—all had lower levels of performance in mathematics and only two had performance levels in reading above the statewide average.[19] Further, all of the state's online charter schools had lower graduation rates than the state average. Issues related to poor student performance even prompted a class action

lawsuit by shareholders against one for-profit, online charter provider for inflating student results.[20]

A RAND Corporation study of charter school performance in eight states included an analysis of virtual charter schools in Ohio. The authors found that online charter school students showed significantly lower achievement gains than students in the state's brick-and-mortar charter schools.[21] Ohio also represents an interesting example of the potential bias that may be present in "research" produced by policy think tanks. While the RAND Corporation study concluded that the performance of students attending traditional charter schools was similar to the performance of students in non-charter traditional public schools, the authors' findings relative to online charter schools were quite negative. In contrast, another report the same year by the Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools—an "organization dedicated to the enhancement and sustainability of quality charter schools"[22]—found that online charter schools "rank higher when looking at their 'value-added' progress over one year rather than simply measuring their one-time testing performance."[23] Interestingly, two years later Innovation Ohio—a self-described progressive think tank—compared the performance of Ohio's online charter schools to their brick-and-mortar counterparts.[24] The authors found that only three of the state's 23 online charters were rated effective or better on the state report card, compared with more than 75% of the brick-and-mortar schools. Further, the authors reported that "nearly 97 percent of Ohio's traditional school districts have a higher score than the average score of the seven statewide" online charter schools (p. 4) and that the traditional charter schools had better graduation rates as well.

While this is an example of the potential skewing of data that often occurs when policy think tanks report the results of their "research," it is also a good illustration of how proponents of online charter schooling often attempt to confound measures of student performance used to highlight their gains. The use of value-added performance data by the Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools is an example of this selective use of possible measures. Another example of issues in measurement comes from Miron and Urschel's study of achievement in K12, Inc. online charter schools, in which the authors found that "all of the diverse measures we reviewed indicated a consistent pattern of weak performance."[25] The authors made this conclusion based largely on annual yearly progress data, which they described as the only consistent measure available to use in comparing performance of online and traditional schools. In response, Jeff Kwitowski, K12, Inc. Vice President of Public Affairs, wrote:

> AYP is not a reliable measure of school performance…. There is an emerging consensus to scrap AYP and replace it with a better system that measures academic progress and growth. K12 has been measuring student academic growth on behalf of its partner schools, and the results are strong with academic gains above the national average.[26]

The strong academic gains Kwitowski references are available in *K12® Virtual Academies Academic Performance Trends* and *2013 K12® Academic Report*.[27] However, data from Colorado—one of the minority of states that factor performance growth into the state reporting system—indicate that K12's Colorado Virtual Academy showed adequate

academic growth in only one of four areas within the middle school and high school levels, and none of the four areas at the elementary school level.[28]

In Pennsylvania, the Hoover Institution-based Center for Research on Education Outcomes compared gains on the state's standardized math and reading test scores for students in the state's charter schools and for comparable students in "feeder schools" (the brick-and-mortar schools that the charter school students left).[29] The authors found that 100% of students in the full-time online schools performed significantly worse in both reading and math than students in the feeder schools. In response to the poor performance reported for their Pennsylvania school, a K12, Inc. representative stated, "the type of child now coming to an online school, 75 percent of those kids coming in are behind more than one grade level."[30] Interestingly, a study of special education students enrolled in cyber charter schools in Pennsylvania found that it mirrored the special education population in brick-and-mortar schools in that state.[31] Further, Miron and Urschel found that K12, Inc. online schools enrolled more white, more affluent, fewer English-language learner, and few special education students (i.e., all characteristics that often indicate more academically able students) than their brick-and-mortar counterparts,[32] although this national trend may not be reflective of Pennsylvania or for other cyber charter providers.

It is evident that this body of research is rife with issues. Results vary with such methodological choices as how to measure student achievement; much of the literature applies to supplemental rather than full-time offerings; findings are often over-generalized from specific to general contexts, and vice versa. Based on this decidedly mixed research, one would expect that policymakers would approach online learning cautiously. Even the authors of the U.S. Department of Education's 2009 *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies* (one of the most often cited studies to support the growth of both supplemental and full-time K-12 online learning), advised that "caution is required in generalizing to the K–12 population because the results are derived for the most part from studies in other settings."[33] However, a cautious approach has not been the case in many jurisdictions.

For example, in 2009 the Michigan legislature passed *Public Act 205*. This legislation allowed for two online charter schools to be created in the state, limiting each to 400 students in the first year of operation and to an additional 1,000 students in the second year of operation. However, in the second year, to access these additional 1,000 students the cyber charter schools were required to enroll one student from the state's dropped-out roll for each regular student (e.g., in order to enroll a student who had attended a brick-and-mortar school during the previous school year, the cyber charter school had to re-capture a student who had officially dropped out). At the end of two years, each of the two online charter schools was required to submit a report to the State Superintendent providing data in a number of areas, including student participation and performance. The reports, or the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), were to serve as a base to determine future growth rates.[34] Results for the Michigan Virtual Academy indicated that in 2010, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency fell below the state average in 9 of 17 categories reported; in 2011, that percentage fell below the state average in 13 of 15 categories.[35] Similarly, results for the Michigan Connections Academy

indicated that in 2010, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency fell below the statewide average in 9 of the 18 categories; in 2011, that percentage fell below the state average in 9 of 15 categories. However, before these reports had even been submitted, the legislature passed *Public Act 219*, which incrementally increased the number of online charter schools to 15 by the end of 2014 and removed any meaningful limits to the number of students to be enrolled.[36] This potential massive expansion of full-time K-12 online learning in Michigan was not justified either by the performance of the state's existing online charter schools or by the existing research into full-time online learning.

Research to Support K-12 Online Learning Policy—Funding

Another area where existing, if limited, research can provide some guidance to policymakers is how to approach funding for online learning—an area where there is more attention to full-time online alternatives. In To date, proponents of K-12 online learning have often argued that it should be funded at equal levels to brick-and-mortar education. In one case, proponents even argued that costs not only equal those of traditional schools but actually exceed them at some points. In a 2004 presentation to the Colorado State Legislature, the Colorado Cyberschool Association argued that the "cost per student [of cyber schooling] is not enormously higher than for in-class students. Over time, cybereducation will become substantially more cost-efficient."[37] The iNACOL position that "online schools should be funded within the range of brick-and-mortar school operating costs" is typical of arguments for comparable funding.[38] The organization's stance is based, in large part, on a BellSouth Foundation funded report that concluded "the operating costs of online programs are about the same as the operating costs of a regular brick-and-mortar program."[39] This conclusion, however, rests on the opinions of individuals largely representing both supplemental and full-time K-12 online learning programs. In addition, the report authors excluded from their estimates traditional schools' capital expenses and transportation costs; had those costs been included, the authors noted, "the costs of operating virtual schools would have been less per pupil than brick-and-mortar schools."[40]

Almost all other sources have found that K-12 online learning, particularly full-time K-12 online learning, costs less than traditional brick-and-mortar instruction. For example, Barbour recently detailed costs in one full-time, district-based K-12 online learning program in Michigan, the Virtual Learning Academy managed by the St. Clair County Regional Education Service.[41] After analyzing budgets posted on the academy's website, Barbour concluded that it cost 16% less in 2009-10 and was projected to cost 7% less in 2010-11 to provide full-time online learning than to provide traditional schooling. Similarly, Dodd reported that the Georgia Cyber Academy, a full-time online charter school, was able to meet Annual Yearly Progress in 2009-10 with 65% of the funding provided to traditional schools, or $3500/student.[42] During an online presentation to the Classroom 2.0/Future of Education organization, Lisa Gillis, Director of Government Affairs and School Development for the full-time online charter provider Insight Schools, stated that during the 2008-09 school year the average per student funding in the states where Insight Schools operated was $9,760.[43] However, Insight Schools was able to operate its full-time online charter schools at 65% of traditional funding, or

$6,480/student. Similar findings emerged in a study of costs in Ohio's full-time online charter schools. The Ohio Legislative Committee on Education Oversight reported that the actual cost of the five existing full-time online charter schools was $5382/student, compared with $8,437/student for traditional public brick-and-mortar schools.[44] Overall, findings suggest that full-time online learning costs approximately 65% of funding for traditional schools.

Similar results have emerged in research on supplemental programs. When considering the costs of supplemental K-12 online learning, the Florida TaxWatch Center for Educational Performance and Accountability examined student performance in and costs of the Florida Virtual School (FLVS). After examining the funding provided to the FLVS from 2002-07, authors of the Center's report concluded that the FLVS was "a credible alternative to traditional schooling as regards both student achievement outcomes and cost-effectiveness."[45] Specifically, the report found FLVS to be $284 more cost effective than brick-and-mortar education in 2003-04, and $1,048 more cost effective by 2006-07. The authors' overall conclusion was that "FLVS gets solid student achievement results at a reduced cost to the State."[46]

Moreover, evidence of lower costs comes not only from disinterested researchers and watchdog groups, but even from strong proponents of full-time, online K-12 programs. For example, a study from the Thomas B. Fordham Institute— a strong proponent of full-time online K-12 learning[47]—has reported that online learning is less expensive to provide than traditional brick-and-mortar schooling. In *The Costs of Online Learning*, the authors found that traditional brick-and-mortar education costs on average $10,000/student[48]; they found that, in contrast, full-time K-12 online learning costs between $5,100/student and $7,700/student—or between 51% and 77% of the cost of traditional brick-and-mortar schooling.

As noted in the first segment of this report, some states have begun rethinking funding for online providers. And yet, even in the face of the growing body of consistent findings, full-time online charter school providers (and the trade organizations that represent them) continue to argue in favor of equal funding. Recent legislative action in Pennsylvania is an excellent example.[49] After reports about the student achievement limitations of full-time online charter schools,[50] *Senate Bill 1085* proposes to cut the funding to the state's full-time online charter schools to approximately 60% of the funding provided to traditional brick-and-mortar schools.[51] Yet proponents of full-time K-12 online learning in Pennsylvania continue to argue against this proposed legislation, insisting that funding for their programs should be kept level with traditional brick-and-mortar schooling.[52]

Research to Support K-12 Online Learning Policy—Practice

Unfortunately, there is little in existing research to guide policy relevant to K-12 instructional practice in full-time, online programs. This is not to say that research doesn't exist, only that it is context specific or methodologically limited in other ways—and generally both (Barbour, 2013). Much of the existing research is based on studies of supplemental rather than full-time instruction, for example.

One illustration of other typical limitations comes from DiPetro, Ferdig, Black, and Preston, who authored a report on "37 best practices in teaching online."[53] Reliably identifying best practices for the online context would require such factors as a large and varied sample of K-12 online teachers, an examination of teaching practices within varied online contexts, and verification that the practices had a positive impact on student engagement or achievement. However, this study examined the perceptions of 16 online teachers with the Michigan Virtual School (MVS), identified as "effective" by the administrators of the online program themselves. There was no verification of whether the teachers actually implemented the practices that they believed to be effective, or how faithfully they might have done so. There was also no evidence as to whether the practices affected student outcomes. These issues do not make the study of no value, but it does limit the usefulness of the findings. The 37 practices outlined by DiPietro and her colleagues are likely useful pedagogical strategies for new and struggling teachers at the MVS. They are also likely useful for teachers who are in contexts similar to the MVS environment, or who are teaching students similar to those in MVS student population. And finally, these 37 practices may provide a useful starting point for researchers interested in identifying and validated best K-12 online practices. The study does not, however, provide useful guidance to policy.

Similarly, Barbour reported ten, and then seven, principles of effective online content for K-12 learners.[54] Like the research conducted by DiPietro and her colleagues, this study examined the perceptions of six online course developers with the Centre for Distance Learning and Innovation (CDLI) in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. As was true for the study described above, the author did not examine course content in context to determine whether the developers actually used the principles they perceived to be effective, nor did he attempt to determine whether online courses reflecting these principles were more engaging or led to better student achievement. Finally, in a separate study, Barbour and Hill found that because CDLI relied on a heavily synchronous model of instruction, its online teachers made little use of asynchronous online course content.[55] As for the research conducted by DiPietro and her colleagues, the findings on the ten/seven principles and on asynchronous course content are limited, useful primarily in a limited context, or as starting points for future research. Such studies are typical. Unfortunately, there are few large scale, longitudinal research studies presently available. In fact, there are so few, the following discussion includes nearly every one.

One effort toward larger scale analysis has been made by researchers at the University of Florida, who established the *Virtual School Clearinghouse*. This project was funded by the AT&T Foundation from 2006-2009. The project was designed to provide K-12 online learning programs, particularly statewide supplemental programs throughout the United States, with data analysis tools, metrics and human resources for school improvement..[56] The school improvement lessons generated for 13 of those K-12 online programs were outlined in a publication entitled *Lessons Learned for Virtual Schools: Experiences and Recommendations from the Field*.[57] Similarly, the National Research Center for Rural Education Support (NRCRES) created a *Facilitator Preparation Program* designed to prepare school-based facilitators to support K-12 students enrolled in online courses.[58] Supported by an Institute of Education Sciences grant, NRCRES researchers conducted a

two year, randomized controlled trial with more than 600 students in 93 rural high schools to examine the effectiveness of their *Facilitator Preparation Program*—eventually finding that facilitators who participated in the training had an increased level of student retention and student performance.[59] Finally, Barbour outlined a design-based research approach that was employed by SRI International (i.e., the external evaluators), in partnership with the Virtual High School Global Consortium (VHS).[60] Essentially, SRI International and VHS identified seven goals and focused all of their research and evaluation, as well as all of the instructional activities and professional development, on achieving these seven goals. SRI International would report, through annual evaluations[61] how VHS was doing in meeting the seven goals. Goals that the VHS did not met in one evaluation would become a specific focus of activities throughout the subsequent year (and the next annual evaluation would have a specific focus on that goal(s). In two instances, SRI International conducted goal-specific evaluations to provide an event greater focus on areas where progress was not being made.[62]

Several of the studies just described are limited in that much of the data informing them comes from supplemental rather than full-time programs. For example, the NRCRES studies, the SRI International research on the VHS global consortium, and the majority of programs included in the *Virtual School Clearinghouse* focused on supplemental K-12 online learning programs. Whether or to what extent insights might apply to full-time programs is unknown.

While research on practice in full-time K-12 online learning environments is scarce, some exists. For example, Liu and Cavanaugh examined factors affecting student academic success in a Midwestern K-12 online learning program that offered supplemental and full-time K-12 online learning opportunities.[63] The authors found that full-time online learning was particularly effective for students who spent a lot of time in the learning management system and who were not participating in a free or reduced lunch program. The authors acknowledged that this did not mean that students not described in the study should not enroll in full-time online learning, only that they would need additional levels of support in order to succeed. As the NRCRES research suggested, the presence of a local facilitator can have a significant impact with online student success.[64]

In the full-time K-12 online learning environment, such local support often comes from the parent or a learning coach, a role that was found to be critical when full-time online programs faced legal challenges in Wisconsin.[65] The importance of the learning coach is also evident in the fact that programs such as Connections Academy and Insight Schools have created substantial guides aimed at assisting parents/guardians on performing the learning coach role to support their children.[66] In fact, the reliance of these online charter schools on the parent as a primary provider of instruction and instructional support have led some to question whether these programs are publicly-funded instances of homeschooling.[67]

Some isolated studies have probed the role of the learning coach. For example, Carol Klein's dissertation study examined the relationship between the California Virtual Academy (CAVA) program and its "home schooling constituents." Klein's study found that CAVA parents/guardians were generally satisfied with their child's online learning

experience. Klein also found that CAVA parents/guardians were "well educated and… wanted a solid educational foundation for their own children."[68] Such parents are well-equipped to support the full-time K-12 online learner in the home in multiple ways. More detail on services learning coaches provide comes from a dissertation study by Lisa Hasler Waters. Examining the performance of parents of full-time online students, Hasler Waters found that they: encouraged their children, modeled potential responses, reinforced content covered earlier, provided direct instruction, adapted instructional strategies and learning content, and leveraged resources.

Interestingly, Hasler Waters also reported that these parental "learning coaches believed they and not their children's teachers were ultimately responsible for instructing their children."[69] Again, however, a limited context makes it unclear to what extent these parents may be similar to other parents of online students. For example, Borup, Graham, and Davies indicated that 40% of parents whose children were enrolled in the Open High School of Utah had no instructional interaction with their children. Further, the authors found an inverse relationship between the level of parental interaction and student achievement. This led them to speculate that the correlation "reflected parents' tendency to increase interaction levels following academic problems." [70] Liu, Black, Algina, Cavanaugh, and Dawson actually developed an instrument to measure parental involvement in K-12 online learning environments that was found to be valid and reliable in their initial study.[71] However, to date this one study with a single statewide, supplemental K-12 online learning program in the Southeast has been the only research to examine the use of this instrument.

It is important to remember, and so it bears repeating, that much of the research into full-time K-12 online learning has the same weaknesses as K-12 online learning literature in general. Most of the literature consists of unpublished dissertations,[72] which by their nature tend to be limited in a variety of ways. As a body, research on practice frequently focuses on specific contexts and often has other methodological limits, making it difficult— and unwise—to generalize based on their findings.[73]

Research to Support K-12 Online Learning Policy—For Profit Corporations

A common theme in popular media, if not in academic literature, is the role of for-profit corporations and educational management organizations (EMOs) within the cyber charter school sector. For example, Andrew Knittle noted in *The Oklahoman* that online charter schools were receiving generous state funding—and that two of the three pending applications for new cyber charter schools were from for-profit corporations.[74] Similarly, Kalyn Belsha wrote in the Illinois *The Courier-News* about a non-profit group attempting to block the ability of a for-profit corporation to create an online charter school in the state.[75] More recently, the Pennsylvania Department of Education rejected all of the applications for new full-time cyber charter schools.[76] In the written rationale for the decision, the department questioned the independence of the "independent boards" from the for-profit corporations that would be contracted to operate the online schools.

Of primary concerns in such reports is the tension between providing a quality online school experience and the need of corporations and EMOs to maximize profit. A notable example is the crucial issue of student to teacher ratio, which is a major factor in determining overall quality of online schooling. EMOs commonly have much higher student to teacher ratios in order to reduce labor costs, which is not surprising given that their business model depends on maximizing the difference between funding and delivery cost.[77] This tension is likely reflected in EMOs' extensive public relations and lobbying efforts.

Utah is one jurisdiction where the performance for-profit and non-profit online charter schools can be compared. Mountain Heights Academy, formerly the Open High School of Utah, is a non-profit online charter school that was created based on a philosophy of "open access software and open educational resources for course delivery and content."[78] Conversely, two for-profit corporations—K12, Inc. and Connections Education, a division of Pearson Education—operate the Utah Virtual Academy and Utah Connections Academy, respectively. An examination of the Utah State Office of Education *Public School Data Gateway* indicated that for the 2012-13 school year the Mountain Heights Academy received a grade of C, while the Utah Virtual Academy received a grade of F (the Utah Connections Academy did not have enough students enrolled and/or tested to receive a grade).[79]

While this example is itself limited to a single state and only three educational entities, and *Gateway* is an imperfect measurement tool, it nevertheless raises the larger question of whether there are pervasive and significant differences in the quality of education and the level of services being provided by non-profit and for-profit online charter schools.

Researchers and policymakers need to look closely at this area to determine if public funding for schools run by for-profit corporations constitutes an investment in quality education.

Recommendations

In last year's report, Larry Cuban wrote that "the current climate of K-12 school reform promotes uncritical acceptance of any and all virtual education innovations, despite lack of a sound research base supporting claims that technology in and of itself will improve teaching and learning."[80] While Cuban did not make the distinction between supplemental and full-time online learning, his general sentiment is still applicable to the field as a whole.

Given this reality, only slight revisions are needed to Cuban's original recommendations. Therefore, it is recommended that:

- State and federal policymakers create long-term programs to support independent research and evaluation of *full-time* K-12 online learning. More than twenty years after the first K-12 online learning programs began, there continues to be a deficit of empirical, longitudinal research to guide the practice of K-12 online learning, particularly full-time learning. Especially critical is research on factors linked to

student success and on how the profit motive of commercial providers may affect the quality of programs.

- Researchers focus on collaborating with individual K-12 online learning programs to identify specific challenges that can be answered using a design-based research methodology. This approach will provide data-driven solutions that address real problems experienced by those individual K-12 online learning programs. These solutions can also serve as a starting point when other programs experience similar challenges.

- Policymakers limit the growth and geographic reach of full-time, taxpayer-funded online learning programs. While there is little research to guide policymakers in how they regulate full-time online learning, those programs that have a managed growth and geographic focus have tended to outperform those with unlimited growth and no geographic restrictions.

State and federal policymakers examine the role of the parent/guardian in the instructional model of full-time online learning to determine the level of teaching support that is necessary for students to be successful. If the instructional model used by full-time online learning resembles traditional homeschooling more than traditional brick-and-mortar instruction, consideration should be given to adjustments in the funding provided to full-time online learning to reflect their decreased teaching responsibilities.

As three of the four recommendations focus on some aspect of research, it is worth identifying several key categories where research is needed.

1. The overall performance of full-time K-12 online learning programs has been suspect, yet growth continues. However, limited research has suggested some parameters that might lead to increased success (for example, geographically focused, managed growth, and so on). Researchers should work to identify factors reliably linked to student success in full-time online learning programs.

2. It is likely that, as is true in brick-and-mortar schools, instructional design needs to be tailored to the needs of specific kinds of learners. It is important to know the characterstics of various groups of students who enroll in full-time online programs and the types of instruction and support they need to be successful. For example, the Educational Success Prediction Instrument, which considers several independent learning variables, has been found to be a reliable predictor of K-12 online student success.[81] Researchers might investigate how student responses to this instrument might help shape individual instruction plans and support for students who do not possess the self-directed, self-regulated, self-motivated learning skills they need to succeed in an online environment.

3. The vast majority of the research into the design, delivery, and support of K-12 online learning has focused on the supplemental K-12 online learning environment. More research on strategies for the effective design, delivery and support of *full-time* K-12 online learning is crucial.

4. Finally, additional research is required to determine whether the business model of for-profit, corporate online charter schooling affects the factors that lead to a high-quality online learning experience. It is unclear, but essential to know, whether alternative management arrangements for online charter schools affect the quality of education provided.

Notes and References: Section II

1 Rice, K. L. (2006). A comprehensive look at distance education in the K-12 context. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 38*(4), 425-448.

2 Barbour, M. K. & Reeves, T. C. (2009). The reality of virtual schools: A review of the literature. *Computers and Education, 52*(2), 402–416.

3 Cavanaugh, C., Barbour, M. K., & Clark, T. (2009). Research and practice in K-12 online learning: A review of literature. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 10*(1). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/607.

4 Barbour, M. K. (2011). The promise and the reality: Exploring virtual schooling in rural jurisdictions. *Education in Rural Australia, 21*(1), 1-20.

5 Darrow, R. (2010). *A comparative study between online charter high schools and traditional high schools in California*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California State University, Fresno, CA.

6 Clark, T. (2001). *Virtual schools: Trends and issues - A study of virtual schools in the United States*. San Francisco, CA: Western Regional Educational Laboratories.

Clark, T. (2003). Virtual and distance education in American schools. In M. G. M. W. G. Anderson (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 673-699). Mahwah, NJ Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

7 Clark, T. (2013). The evolution of K-12 distance education and virtual schools. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 555-573). New York: Routledge.

8 Barbour, M. K. (2013). The landscape of K-12 online learning: Examining what is known. In M. G. Moore (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 574-593). New York: Routledge.

9 Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2011). *Keeping pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of state-level policy and practice*. Evergreen, CO: Evergreen Education Group. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2011.pdf.

10 Patrick, S. & Powell, A. (2009). *A summary of research on the effectiveness of K-12 online learning*. Vienna, VA: International Association for K-12 Online Learning.

11 Molnar, A. (Ed.); Miron, G., Huerta, L., Cuban, L., Horvitz, B., Gulosino, C., Rice, J. K., & Shafer, S. R. (2013). *Virtual schools in the U.S. 2013: Politics, performance, policy, and research evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2013/.

12 Barbour, M. K. & Mulcahy, D. (2006). An inquiry into retention and achievement differences in campus based and web based AP courses. *Rural Educator, 27*(3), 8-12;

Barbour, M. K. & Mulcahy, D. (2008). How are they doing? Examining student achievement in virtual schooling. *Education in Rural Australia, 18*(2), 63-74;

Barbour, M. K. & Mulcahy, D. (2009a). Student performance in virtual schooling: Looking beyond the numbers. *ERS Spectrum, 27*(1), 23-30;

Cavanaugh, C. (2001). The effectiveness of interactive distance education technologies in K-12 learning: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 7*(1), 73-88;

Cavanaugh, C., Gillan, K., Bosnick, J., & Hess, M. (2008). Effectiveness of online Algebra learning: Implications for teacher preparation. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 38*(1) 67-95;

Cavanaugh, C., Gillan, K., Kromrey, J., Hess, M., & Blomeyer, R. (2004). *The effects of distance education on K-12 student outcomes: A meta-analysis*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates;

Florida Tax Watch Center for Educational Performance and Accountability (2007). *A comprehensive assessment of Florida Virtual School*. Talahassee, FL: Author;

Hughes, J. E., McLeod, S., Brown, R., Maeda, Y., & Choi, J. (2007). Academic achievement and perceptions of the learning environment in virtual and traditional secondary mathematics classrooms. *American Journal of Distance Education, 21*(4), 199-214;

O'Dwyer, L., Carey, R., & Kleiman, G. (2007). A study of the effectiveness of the Louisiana Algebra I on-line course. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 39*(3), 289-306.

13 Barbour, M. K. (2013). The landscape of K-12 online learning: Examining what is known. In M. G. Moore (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 574-593). New York: Routledge.

14 Haughey, M. & Muirhead, W. (1999). *On-line learning: Best practices for Alberta school jurisdictions*. Edmonton, AB: Government of Alberta.

15 Colorado Department of Education. (2006). *Report of the State Auditor: Online education*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.cde.state.co.us/onlinelearning/download/2006%20Report%20of%20the%20State%20Auditor.pdf.

16 Hubbard, B. & Mitchell, N. (2011). Online K-12 schools failing students but keeping tax dollars. *I-News Network*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.inewsnetwork.org/special-reports/online-k-12-schools/.

17 Joint Legislative Audit Committee. (2010). *An evaluation: Virtual charter schools*. Madison, WI: Legislative Audit Bureau. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lab/reports/10-3full.pdf.

18 Office of the Legislative Auditor. (2011). *K-12 online learning*. St. Paul, MN: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us/ped/2011/k12oll.htm.

19 Ryman, A. & Kossan, P. (2011). The race to online: Arizona experiments with virtual K-12 schools. Will they work for your child? *Arizona Republic*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.azcentral.com/news/education/online-school/.

20 Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP. (2012). *Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP files securities class action suit against K12, Inc. and certain of its executives*. New York: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.faruqilaw.com/LRN.

21 Zimmer, R., Gill, B., Booker, K., Lavertu, S., Sass, T. R., & Witte, J. (2009). *Charter schools in eight states effects on achievement, attainment, integration, and competition*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG869.sum.pdf.

22 Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2009). *E-schools show superior results: Analysis of state value-added data confirms e-schools students' progress*. Columbus, OH: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.oapcs.org/files/EschoolStudy_final6-24-09.pdf.

23 Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2009). *E-schools show superior results: Analysis of state value-added data confirms e-schools students' progress*. Columbus, OH: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.oapcs.org/files/EschoolStudy_final6-24-09.pdf.

24 Innovation Ohio. (2011). *Ohio e-schools: Funding failure; Coddling contributors*. Columbus, OH: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://innovationohio.org/2011/05/12/ohio-e-schools-funding-failure-coddling-contributors-2/.

25 Miron, G. & Urschel, J. (2012). *Understanding and improving full-time virtual schools*. Denver, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/understanding-improving-virtual.

26 Kwitowski, J. (2011). AYP, an unreliable measure of school performance. *K12 Blog*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://k12choice.com/index.php?option=com_rsblog&layout=view&cid=7:ayp-an-unreliable-measure-of-school-performance&Itemid=77.

27 K12, Inc. (2012). *K12® virtual academies academic performance trends*. Herndon, VA: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://phx.corporate-ir.net/External.File?item=UGFyZW50SUQ9MTM0MDc2fEN0aWxkSUQ9LTF8VHlwZT0z&t=1;

K12, Inc. (2013). *2013 K12® academic report*. Herndon, VA: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.k12.com/sites/default/files/pdf/2013-K12-Academic-Report-Feb6-2013.pdf.

28 State of Colorado. (2013). *School performance framework 2012: Colorado Virtual Academy (COVA)*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
https://cedar2.cde.state.co.us/documents/SPF2012/0020%20-%201752%20-%203%20Year.pdf.

29 Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2011). *Charter school performance in Pennsylvania*. Stanford, CA: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/PA%20State%20Report_20110404_FINAL.pdf.

30 Saul, S. (2011, December 12). Profits and questions at online charter schools. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/13/education/online-schools-score-better-on-wall-street-than-in-classrooms.html.

31 Carnahan, C. & Fulton, L. (2013). Virtually forgotten: Special education students in cyber schools. *TechTrends, 57*(4), 46-52.

32 Miron, G. & Urschel, J. (2012). *Understanding and improving full-time virtual schools*. Denver, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/understanding-improving-virtual.

33 Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2009). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development.

34 Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2010). *Keeping pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of state-level policy and practice*. Evergreen, CO: Evergreen Education Group. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPaceK12_2010.pdf.

35 The number of categories tested is based upon the enrollment of each of the cyber charter schools. For example, in 2010 the Michigan Virtual Charter Academy (MVCA) did not have any grade nine students, so MVCA did not report any social studies results for that grade in that year. Similarly, in 2011 the Michigan Connections Academy (MICA) did not have any grade eight students, so MICA did not report any math, reading and science results for that grade in that year.

36 Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2011). *Keeping pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of state-level policy and practice*. Evergreen, CO: Evergreen Education Group. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPace2011.pdf.

37 Hausner, L. (2004). *Estimated cost of operating a cyberschool in Colorado*. Denver, CO: Donnell-Kay Foundation. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.dkfoundation.org/sites/default/files/files/CyberschoolCostReportFeb2004CCA.pdf.

38 Watson, J. & Gemin, B. (2009). *Promising practices in online learning: Policy and funding frameworks for online learning*. Vienna, VA: International Association for K-12 Online Learning. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.inacol.org/research/promisingpractices/NACOL_PP-FundPolicy-lr.pdf.

39 Anderson, A., Augenblick, J., DeCescre, D., & Conrad, J. (2006). *20/20 costs and funding of virtual schools*. Atlanta, GA: BellSouth Foundation. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://www.apaconsulting.net/uploads/reports/9.pdf.

40 Anderson, A., Augenblick, J., DeCescre, D., & Conrad, J. (2006). *20/20 costs and funding of virtual schools*. Atlanta, GA: BellSouth Foundation. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.apaconsulting.net/uploads/reports/9.pdf.

41 Barbour, M. K. (2012). Point: Virtual schools are more cost-effective compared to traditional, brick-and-mortar schools. In K. P. Brady (Ed.), *Technology in Schools: Debating Issues in American Education* (84-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

42 Dodd, D.A. (2010, August 19). Cyber charter schools celebrate two state victories, may get more funds. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.ajc.com/news/cyber-charter-schools-celebrate-595707.html.

43 Gillis, L. (2010). *Virtual schooling*. A webinar presentation to Classroom 2.0. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.stevehargadon.com/2010/02/lisa-gillis-on-virtual-schooling.html.

44 Ohio Legislative Committee on Education Oversight. (2005). *The operating costs of Ohio's eCommunity schools*. Columbus, OH: Author.

45 Florida Tax Watch Center for Educational Performance and Accountability (2007). *A comprehensive assessment of Florida Virtual School*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

46 Florida Tax Watch Center for Educational Performance and Accountability (2007). *A comprehensive assessment of Florida Virtual School*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

47 Hassel, B. C., Ayscue Hassel, E., Hess, F. M., Butler Battaglino, T., Haldeman, M., Laurans, E., Hill, P. T., & Chubb, J. E. (2012). *Education reform for the digital era*. Washington, DC: The Thomas B. Fordham Institute. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from https://edexcellence.net/publications/education-reform-for-the-digital-era.html.

48 Butler Battaglino, T., Haldeman, M., & Laurans, E. (2012). *The costs of online learning*. Washington, DC: The Thomas B. Fordham Institute. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from https://edexcellence.net/sites/default/files/publication/pdfs/20120110-the-costs-of-online-learning_7.pdf.

49 Carr-Chellman, A. A. & Marsh, R. M. (2009). Pennsylvania cyber school funding: Follow the money. *TechTrends, 53*(4), 49-55.

50 McCorry, K. (2013, December 2). Despite dismal record of Pa. cybercharter schools, six more apply to open. *NewsWorks*. Retrieved from http://www.newsworks.org/index.php/local/item/62384-despite-dismal-record-of-pa-cybercharter-schools-six-more-apply-to-open.

51 Pennington, M. (2013, December 2). Cuts proposed for cyber charter schools: Pa. Senate legislation would reduce funding by up to 10 percent. *Pocono Record*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.poconorecord.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20131202/NEWS90/312020324/-1/NEWS.

52 Bouder, J. R. (2013, December 5). Why cyber schools deserve fair treatment in PA. *Mainline Media News*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://mainlinemedianews.com/articles/2013/12/05/main_line_times/opinion/doc52a0d8241f58d592396655.txt;

Hanak, J. (2013, December 3). State Senate should reject misnamed "charter school reform" bill. *The Patriot News*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.pennlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/12/state_senate_should_reject_misnamed_charter_school_reform_bill_james_hanak.html.

53 DiPetro, M., Ferdig, R. E., Black, E. W., & Preston, M. (2008). Best practices in teaching K-12 online: Lessons learned from Michigan Virtual School teachers. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 7*(1). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/pdf/7.1.2.pdf.

54 Barbour, M. K. (2005). Perceptions of effective web-based design for secondary school students: A narrative analysis of previously collected data. *The Morning Watch, 32*(3-4). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/win05/Barbour.htm;

Barbour, M. K. (2007). Principles of effective web-based content for secondary school students: Teacher and developer perceptions. *Journal of Distance Education, 21*(3), 93-114.

55 Barbour, M. K. & Hill, J. R. (2011). What are they doing and how are they doing it? Rural student experiences in virtual schooling. *Journal of Distance Education, 25*(1). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/725.

56 Black, E. W., Ferdig, R. E., DiPietro, M. (2008). An overview of evaluative instrumentation for virtual high schools. *American Journal of Distance Education, 22*(1), 24-45.

57 Ferdig, R. E. & Cavanaugh, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Lessons learned for virtual schools: Experiences and recommendations from the field*. Vienna, VA: International Association for K-12 Online Learning.

58 Irvin, M. J., Hannum, W. H., Farmer, T. W., de la Varre, C., & Keane, J. (2009). Supporting online learning for Advanced Placement students in small rural schools: Conceptual foundations and intervention components of the Facilitator Preparation Program. *The Rural Educator, 31*(1), 29-36.

59 de la Varre, C., Keane, J., Irvin, M. J., & Hannum, W. H. (2011). Dual perspectives on the contribution of on-site facilitators to teaching presence in a blended learning environment. *Journal of Distance Education, 25*(3). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/751.

60 Barbour, M. K. (2013). The landscape of K-12 online learning: Examining what is known. In M. G. Moore (Ed.). *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 574-593). New York: Routledge.

61 Espinoza, C., Dove, T., Zucker, A., & Kozma, R. (1999). *An evaluation of the Virtual High School after two years in operation*. Arlington, VA: SRI International. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://ctl.sri.com/publications/downloads/evalvhs2yrs.pdf;

Kozma, R., Zucker, A., & Espinoza, C. (1998). *An evaluation of the Virtual High School after one year in operation*. Arlington, VA: SRI International. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://ctl.sri.com/publications/downloads/evalvhs1yr.pdf;

Kozma, R., Zucker, A., Espinoza, C., McGhee, R., Yarnall, L., Zalles, D., et al. (2000). *The online course experience: Evaluation of the Virtual High School's third year of implementation, 1999-2000*. Arlington, VA: SRI International. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://ctl.sri.com/publications/downloads/VHS_Online_Experience.pdf;

Zucker, A. & Kozma, R. (2003). *The Virtual High School: Teaching generation V*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

62 Elbaum, B., McIntyre, C., & Smith, A. (2002). *Essential Elements: Prepare, Design, and Teach Your Online Course*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing;

Yamashiro, K. & Zucker, A. (1999). *An expert panel review of the quality of Virtual High School courses: Final report*. Arlington, VA: SRI International.

63 Liu, F. & Cavanaugh, C. (2011). High enrollment course success factors in virtual school: Factors influencing student academic achievement. *International Journal on E-Learning, 10*(4), 393-418.

64 Also supported by:

Barbour, M. K. & Mulcahy, D. (2004). The role of mediating teachers in Newfoundland's new model of distance education. *The Morning Watch, 32*, 1–2. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/fall4/barbourmulcahy.htm;

Barbour, M. K. & Mulcahy, D. (2009b). Beyond volunteerism and good will: Examining the commitment of school-based teachers to distance education. In I. Gibson et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education* (779–784). Norfolk, VA: AACE;

Roblyer, M. D., Freeman, J., Stabler, M., & Schniedmiller, J. (2007). *External evaluation of the Alabama ACCESS initiative phase 3 report*. Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education.

65 Johnson v. Burmaster, 744 NW2d 900 (Wis. App. 2007). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.wicourts.gov/ca/opinion/DisplayDocument.html?content=html&seqNo=31069.

66 Connections Academy. (2004). *Learning without boundaries: How to make virtual schooling work for you?* Baltimore, MD: Author;

Kanna, E., Gillis, L., & Culver, C. (2009). *Virtual schooling: A guide to optimizing your child's education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

67 Ohanian, S. (2004). *The K12 virtual primary school history curriculum: A participant's-eye view*. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/EPSL-0404-117-EPRU.pdf.

68 Klein, C. (2006). *Virtual charter schools and home schooling*. Youngstown, NY: Cambria Press.

69 Halser Waters, L. (2012). *Exploring the experience of learning choices in a cyber charter schools: A qualitative case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Mānoa, HI.

70 Borup, J., Graham, C. R., & Davies, R. S. (2013). The nature of parental interactions in an online charter school. *American Journal of Distance Education, 27*(1), 40-55.

71 Lui, F., Black, E., Algina, J., Cavanaugh, C., & Dawson, K. (2010). The validation of one parental involvement measurement in virtual schooling. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 9*(2). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.ncolr.org/issues/jiol/v9/n2/the-validation-of-one-parental-involvement-measurement-in-virtual-schooling.

72 Barbour, M. K. & Reeves, T. C. (2009). The reality of virtual schools: A review of the literature. *Computers and Education, 52*(2), 402–416.

73 Barbour, M. K. (2013). The landscape of K-12 online learning: Examining what is known. In M. G. Moore (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 574-593). New York: Routledge.

74 Knittle, A. (2013, December 30). Millions in state aid go to online charter schools in Oklahoma. *The Oklahoman*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://newsok.com/millions-in-state-aid-go-to-online-charter-schools-in-oklahoma/article/3919201.

75 Belsha, K. (2014, January 13). Nonprofit seeks charter legislation support from school boards. *The Courier-News*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://couriernews.suntimes.com/news/24940471-418/nonprofit-seeks-charter-legislation-support-from-school-boards.html.

76 Herold, B. (2014, January 29). Pa. rejects cyber charter applicants, citing for-profits' role. *Education Week*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/DigitalEducation/2014/01/pa_rejects_cyber_charter_applicants.html.

77 Downey, M. (2014, January 7). Online schools: Wired for failure under current conditions? *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.ajc.com/weblogs/get-schooled/2014/jan/07/online-schools-wired-failure/.

Saul, S. (2011, December 12). Profits and questions at online charter schools. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/13/education/online-schools-score-better-on-wall-street-than-in-classrooms.html.

78 Tonks, D., Weston, S., Wiley, D., & Barbour, M. K. (2013). "Opening" a new kind of high school: The story of the Open High School of Utah. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 14*(1). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1345/2419.

79 Utah State Office of Education. (2014). *Public school data gateway*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from https://psdreports.schools.utah.gov/Gateway/;

The Mountain Heights Academy report card is available at
https://psdreports.schools.utah.gov/Gateway/Report/Display?schoolYear=2013&districtID=186113&schoolID=1
86113&schoolNumber=600&rc%3AParameters=Collapsed&rc%3AToolbar=False&ReportPath=%2FGateway%2F
GradingSchools%2FFrontPage;

The Utah Virtual Academy report card is available at
https://psdreports.schools.utah.gov/Gateway/Report/Display?schoolYear=2013&districtID=186006&schoolID=
186006&schoolNumber=700&rc%3AParameters=Collapsed&rc%3AToolbar=False&ReportPath=%2FGateway%
2FGradingSchools%2FFrontPage;

The Utah Connections Academy report card is available at
https://psdreports.schools.utah.gov/Gateway/Report/Display?SchoolYear=2013&ReportPath=/Gateway/Gradin
gSchools/FrontPage&districtID=186182&schoolID=186182&schoolNumber=101.

80 Molnar, A. (Ed.); Miron, G., Huerta, L., Cuban, L., Horvitz, B., Gulosino, C., Rice, J. K., & Shafer, S. R. (2013).
Virtual schools in the U.S. 2013:Politics, performance, policy, and research evidence. Boulder, CO: National
Education Policy Center. Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/virtual-schools-annual-2013/.

81 Roblyer, M. D. (2005). Who plays well in the virtual sandbox? Characteristics of successful online students and
teachers. *SIGTel Bulletin,* (2). Retrieved February 28, 2014, from
http://web.archive.org/web/20060930130650/http://www.iste.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Membership/SI
Gs/SIGTel_Telelearning_/SIGTel_Bulletin2/Archive/2005_20067/2005_July_-_Roblyer.htm;

Roblyer, M. D. (2006). Virtually successful: Defeating the dropout problem through online school programs. *Phi
Delta Kappan. 88*(1), 31-36;

Roblyer, M. D., Davis, L., Mills, S. C., Marshall, J., & Pape, L. (2008) Toward practical procedures for predicting
and promoting success in virtual school students. *American Journal of Distance Education, 22*(2), 90–109;

Roblyer, M. D. & Marshall, J. C. (2002-2003). Predicting success of virtual high school students: Preliminary
results from an educational success prediction instrument. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education,
35*(2), 241-255.