Pioneering Higher Education's Digital Future:

An Evaluation of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* (1992-2012)

Anthony G. Picciano, Ph.D

Graduate Center, City University of New York

January 12, 2013

Contributors:

- Jeff Seaman (Babson College Survey Research Group)

- Christine Saieh (Graduate Center – City University of New York)

- Andrew Haiwen Chu (Graduate Center – City University of New York)

- Jennifer Stoops (Graduate Center – City University of New York)

- Kylah Torre (Graduate Center – City University of New York)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In 1992, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation established the *Learning Outside the Classroom Program.* The name was changed soon after to the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*, the purpose of which was to explore educational alternatives for people who wanted to pursue higher education but who could not easily attend regularly scheduled college classes. This exploration resulted in a promulgation of a major development in pedagogical practice commonly referred to as the asynchronous learning network or ALN. Using modern data communications technology, including the Internet and World Wide Web, ALNs allow teaching and learning to transcend time and space in order to provide access to a quality higher education. Twenty years later, ALN evolved into online learning to become a basic aspect of American higher education. (Allen & Seaman, 2013)

In June 2009, a project was conceived to examine and evaluate the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.* The purpose of this project was twofold: first, to analyze the role of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* in nurturing online learning enabling it to evolve into a major vehicle for providing higher education opportunities to millions of students; and second, to examine the historical record and to begin the process of documenting and preserving the stories of the individuals, colleges, universities and organizations that were critical players in the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. This report documents the processes, findings and conclusions of this project.

It is the opinion of these researchers that the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation had an important role in fueling the development of online learning in American higher education via its *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.   The Foundation's timing was critical by beginning this program just before the Internet was evolving as a major technological breakthrough. Starting in 1992, the Foundation funded 346 projects totaling $72 million, most of which were made to non-profit colleges and universities. Major distance and adult learning providers such as the University of Maryland University College and the Penn State World Campus were early grantees. Following on the heels of these institutions, large mainstream public university systems such as the University of Illinois, the State University of New York, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Central Florida developed substantial online learning programs. In

the early 2000s, large urban universities in New York, Chicago and Milwaukee were funded to develop and expand blended learning environments. Perhaps the most significant initiative of the grant program was the establishment of the Sloan Consortium of Colleges and Universities (Sloan-C). Originally an informal organization of Foundation grantees, the Consortium incorporated in 2008 as a non-profit, 501 (c) (3) organization. Sloan-C became the largest recipient of funding from the *Anytime, Anyplace, Learning Program*, receiving in excess of $15 million over the course of the grant program.

Summary of Findings

First, the public sector of higher education was integral to the success of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.* The vast majority of the grants awarded as part of this program went to large public university systems including community colleges. This was not an accident but by design.

Second, most individuals from institutions that have major online learning programs who were not *Anytime, Anyplace, Learning Program* grantees (public, private non-profit, private for-profit) , are not aware of the contribution of the Foundation. The awareness among this group that does exist comes more from their involvement with the Sloan Consortium.

Third, among individuals in private, for-profit institutions, awareness of the Foundation's contribution to online learning is modest at best and somewhat lower than for other non-grantee institutions. And again, the awareness that does exist comes from their association with the Sloan Consortium.

Fourth, the Sloan Consortium has made its presence known to the majority of all major online learning providers regardless of whether they are public, private, non-profit or for-profit. It is likely that the legacy of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* rests with the success of the Consortium.

In sum, a mix of online technology and pedagogical practice is rapidly reshaping instruction in our colleges and universities. The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation was at the forefront of and served as a catalyst for this movement. It will continue to grow for years to come.

I. Introduction

In 1992, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation established the *Learning Outside the Classroom Program.* The name was changed soon after to the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*, the purpose of which was to explore educational alternatives for people who wanted to pursue higher education but who could not easily attend regularly scheduled college classes. This exploration resulted in a promulgation of a major development in pedagogical practice commonly referred to as the asynchronous learning network or ALN[1]. Using modern data communications technology, including the Internet and World Wide Web, ALNs allow teaching and learning to transcend time and space in order to provide access to a quality higher education. Twenty years later, online learning and its offshoot blended learning have become a basic aspect of American higher education. (Allen & Seaman, 2013)

In June 2009, a project was conceived to examine and evaluate the Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.* The purpose of this project was twofold: first, to analyze the role of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* in nurturing online learning enabling it to evolve into a major vehicle for providing higher education opportunities to millions of students; and second, to examine the historical record and to begin the process of documenting and preserving the stories of the individuals, colleges, universities and organizations that were critical players in the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. This report documents the processes, findings and conclusions of this project.

II. The Early Years: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Online Learning and American Higher Education

The concept of digital learning predates the Internet and the World Wide Web by decades. Instructional software packages designed to be used on large mainframe computers and distributed via digital communications technology have been in existence since the 1960s. Computer-assisted instructional programs (CAI) using software such as PLATO developed at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, were developed and delivered over closed or private networks. Because publically-available digital communications were in their infancy, students were expected to go to a school's computer laboratory to use these programs which significantly limited their utilization. Furthermore, these software

---

[1] The Foundation chose the ALN acronym to indicate that its grant program would favor asynchronous access to education, that a normal class format would be favored, with a faculty member leading the class (asynchronously), over a network that is both a computer network (the Internet) and a learning network across which learners and faculty interact, examining ideas and problems relevant to the discipline. The Foundation specifically did not include under the ALN definition, self-learning for individuals using web- or other computer resources with little student to student or student to faculty interaction, or the development of expensive learning media. Today, the majority of all credit-bearing courses offered over the Internet follow the Sloan-favored ALN format.

packages followed a programmed instruction, CAI model that allowed for little if any student to faculty interaction. In the 1980s, Roxanne Hiltz and Murray Turoff at the New Jersey Institute of Technology started experimenting with virtual learning that went beyond programmed instruction and allowed for a modest level of interactivity among students and faculty. These virtual systems planted the seeds for one of the most significant developments in delivering instruction in the 20th century into what many referred to initially as the asynchronous learning network (ALN) and later as online learning.

Ralph Gomory, President of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, promoted the ALN concept in the early 1990s by establishing the *Learning Outside the Classroom Program/Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* from which the first grants were awarded in 1992.   His vision was that students could learn in their homes, places of business or just about anywhere they could connect to a digital network. Joel Hartman, Vice Provost for Information Technologies and Resources at the University of Central Florida, in an interview commented that "Dr. Ralph Gomory and the Foundation were way ahead of their time in promoting digital teaching and learning especially considering that the Internet as we know it did not exist."   The vast majority of households in the United States did not have connections to digital networks and no one was predicting that within a decade the populace would be willing to pay for high-speed communications lines to use the vast information resources of the Internet including access to online courses and degrees.

The grants during the early 1990s were mostly for experimentation and proof of concept. Major grants were made to a variety of institutions including:

> Stanford University (Patrick Suppes)
> Drexel University (Steve Andriole)
> Cornell University (Kurt Gottfried)
> New York University (Richard Vigilante)
> State University of New York (Richard Dressner)
> North Virginia Community College (Randal Lemke)

Burks Oakley, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), received one of the early grants from the Sloan Foundation in October 1993 and taught his first class using ALN technologies in January 1994. There were no online courses or programs offered by UIUC at that time. The Graduate School of Library and Information Science at UIUC began an online master's degree in Library and Information Science in July 1996 - that was really the first online program for the Urbana campus. In 1995, UIUC received a major grant from the Sloan Foundation to establish the Sloan Center for Asynchronous Learning Environments (SCALE), and this led to faculty across the campus integrating ALN approaches

into their on-campus courses. Much of this work concentrated on developing online modules that could be integrated into traditional face-to-face courses. Oakley concluded that "the visibility of SCALE led to Sloan-funded online programs on the three campuses of the University of Illinois and eventually influenced online development throughout the state."

Gary Miller, former Executive Director of the Penn State World Campus, commented that Penn State had a long history of offering for-credit courses and programs at a distance, but the focus was on correspondence study (undergraduate courses and a small number of degree programs) and video teleconferencing (graduate certificates and degrees delivered to other campuses or to industry sites via satellite or interactive video). In 1993, the Sloan Foundation funded the first two experiments with off-campus online programs—a test preparation course for the professional engineering examination, which combined online and video components, and an online version of a post-baccalaureate certificate in Acoustics Engineering, which previously had been delivered via satellite. Dr. Miller commented that the Foundation provided grants that allowed us to achieve scale and were essential to our ability to launch the World Campus. These grants signaled to the University community that the World Campus was, indeed, a University-wide commitment supported by a major Foundation—that we were leading a change movement as a University and that individual academic units would not be asked to assume the financial risk of innovation. Without Sloan Foundation support, "we may well have launched some online programs, but we would not have been able to achieve the diversity and scale that the World Campus achieved in a relatively short period of time."

Jacquie Moloney, formerly the Dean of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Online Education, and now a Vice Chancellor at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell, initiated online programs in 1996, and received three grants from the Foundation. In an interview, she stated that:

> "UMass Lowell was the forerunner in the UMass system and in the public system in Massachusetts, numerous other campuses were encouraged by our work and built programs as a result. UMass Lowell launched its online program in 1996, the system followed with UMassOnline in 2001.
>
> The Sloan grants that UMass Lowell received encouraged us to serve as leaders and enablers of online education in numerous ways. We were engaged often by other institutions to do faculty development and to provide strategies for engaging faculty in online education.

I believe it is fair to say that the grants that the Sloan Foundation provided not only transformed UMass Lowell, but propelled us into a leadership that resulted in the growth on online programs throughout the New England region."

The development of commercial access to the Internet and the World Wide Web in the mid-1990s moved the ALN concept into widespread application as people readily bought modem-equipped personal microcomputers and contracted with ISPs to connect into the new communications technology. Although initially mostly text-based and reliant on slow-speed and dial-up communications, institutions especially those engaged in providing distance learning programs began to offer ALN options. Many of these early programs used technology that was not designed for teaching and learning. Faculty pioneers in online learning used various creative approaches to fit course material and instruction into available technologies. Course and learning management systems and other Web-based learning software were non-existent or in their infancy. In addition to colleges and universities, other organizations such as educational consortia, corporations and government agencies adopted the idea of asynchronous learning and started to develop and offer educational opportunities over the Internet. ALN remained popular as the acronym for the new learning modality but other names such as "online learning", "e-learning" and "virtual learning" evolved and gained broad acceptance. Following on the heels of the unprecedented popularity of the Internet in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the acceptance of online learning evolved into a viable instructional modality.

In 1997, the U.S. Department of Education released a report that indicated twenty-two percent of American colleges and universities were offering some form of "distance learning" using online environments. (U.S. DOE, 1997) Most of these institutions had long histories of providing distance learning programs in other delivery formats such as television, video cassettes, and printed course lab packs to geographically-dispersed students. It needs to be mentioned that the U.S. DOE had an irregular cycle for collecting data on distance learning and in 2002, the Sloan Foundation wisely decided to initiate and fund a yearly collection of data specific to online learning by awarding a grant to the Babson College Survey Research Group headed by Elaine Allen and Jeff Seaman. The first report by Allen & Seaman indicated that in the 2002-2003 academic year, eighty-one percent of all institutions of American higher education were offering online learning and were enrolling in excess of 1.6 million students. Of these, public institutions and the growing private for-profit colleges were leading the way. By 2012, almost seven million students were enrolled in online courses in American colleges and universities. (Allen & Seaman, 2013)

Perhaps the most startling aspect of the growth of online learning was the fact that it no longer was viewed as an aspect of distance learning but that it had entered into the mainstream of higher education providing access to a host of student populations. In addition to students physically living far away from a college campus, students leading busy lives in urban areas appreciated the convenience of taking online courses in their homes, students living in college dormitories enrolled in online courses because they enjoyed learning with technology, and corporate trainers looked upon online learning as a less expensive way to provide staff development to employees.

In the early 2000s, a number of online initiatives at several urban-based colleges and universities such as the City University of New York, the University of Illinois – Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee evolved and spurred the move to blended learning environments. Enrollment data on this population is difficult to come by mainly because definitions of "blended learning" are elusive and confusing as institutions adopted "blended", "hybrid', "web-enhanced" and "web-supported" learning into their course offerings. In addition, most institutions have been slow to systematically collect data on this modality of learning. It is likely that there are several million students enrolled in blended learning courses in higher education and speculation is that it is evolving into the dominant form of learning throughout all higher education with most courses integrating some aspect of online learning activity. The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation was one of the first organizations to see the importance of blended learning and was one of the first grantors to fund development and other projects based on blended learning concepts.

In sum, it is the opinion of these researchers that the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation had an important role in fueling the development of online learning in American higher education via its *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. The Foundation's timing was critical by beginning this program just before the Internet was evolving as a major technological breakthrough. Starting in 1992, the Foundation funded 346 projects totaling $72 million, most of which were made to non-profit colleges and universities. Major distance and adult learning providers such as the University of Maryland University College and the Penn State World Campus were early grantees. Following on the heels of these institutions, large mainstream public university systems such as the University of Illinois, the State University of New York, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Central Florida developed substantial online learning programs. In the early 2000s, large urban universities in New York, Chicago and Milwaukee were funded to develop and expand blended learning environments. Perhaps the most significant initiative of the grant program was the establishment of the Sloan Consortium of Colleges and Universities (Sloan-C). Originally an informal organization of Foundation grantees, the Consortium

incorporated in 2008 as a non-profit, 501 (c) (3) organization. Sloan-C became the largest recipient of funding from the *Anytime, Anyplace, Learning Program*, receiving in excess of $15 million over the course of the grant program. Sloan-C has evolved into "an institutional and professional leadership organization dedicated to integrating online education into the mainstream of higher education, helping institutions and individual educators improve the quality, scale, and breadth of online education." It provides a full range of member services including annual conferences, professional development webinars, publishing the *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, and sponsoring research initiatives. Its annual surveys of online learning conducted by Allen & Seaman and funded by the Foundation are referenced in almost every major report or study of online learning in the United States. By 2012, the Consortium had approximately 400 institutional and 700 individual dues-paying members.

III.   The Present Inquiry

It was anticipated that several themes would evolve to frame the inquiry.   These themes included:

1. The evolution of online learning in mainstream institutions of higher education including public private, large university systems and community colleges.. The inquiry would specifically examine how different types of higher education institutions benefitted from and were influenced by their involvement in Sloan's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.*

2. The importance of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* in helping to build a community of scholars, administrators and policy makers interested in moving online learning forward. Specifically, this theme would examine how this community eventually evolved into the original `Sloan Consortium, an informal group with an Advisory Board appointed by the Foundation, and then into the formally incorporated 501(c)3 Sloan-Consortium in 2008. The incorporation of the Consortium was initiated by the Sloan Foundation in order to move it into a self-sustaining operation. The evolution of the Sloan Consortium and its contribution to the success of online learning as a fundamental mode of delivering instruction would be examined as a pivotal element of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.*   The Sloan Consortium originated from the community-building effort described above and its contribution is important not only historically but as critical to the future of quality online learning in American higher education.

3. Many long-term funded programs with a strategic focus, as the Foundation's ALN program was, move forward by creating special projects and/or events that are prompted by unexpected opportunity; these might require exceptional speed and agility, special deployment of temporary ad hoc organizations, and deployment of resources, but they can play a unique role in moving the strategic program forward. Specific examples of such projects of opportunity within the *Anytime, Anyplace Program* included the implementation of the Sloan Semester for students displaced from their institutions by hurricane Katrina and the efforts spent to support the US federal government in mounting its e-Army U project. In addition, conferences and workshops that started as small information sharing activities have emerged into annual well-attended national events.

The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation funded this evaluation project over three years starting in August 2009. Phase I of this project (2009-2010) concentrated on examining historical documents and on interviewing a sample of major grantees of the early period of the program (1990s). During this phase,

the researchers set out to look for evidence that shed light on the themes. However they also anticipated that, as data were analyzed, other themes possibly related to "lessons learned" would emerge.

In 2011 and 2012, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation funded Phase II of this project. Phase II extended the process of developing a comprehensive picture of the role of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* and it allowed the researchers to probe more broadly into issues that emerged in Phase I. This project represented a unique opportunity to report comprehensively on the collaboration between American higher education and a prestigious foundation in forging and developing a significant alternative to traditional classroom instruction.

IV.   Quantitative Analyses

A.   Establishing Databases and Surveying the Field

A major task for this project was to develop an accurate record of the grants and awards made as part of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.   To do so, a database was established that summarized 346 grants awarded totaling $72,197,965. that represented the entire universe of grantees of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.   These grants were awarded to institutions represented by 190 individuals (principal investigators). Entries for this database dated as far back as 1992. An attempt was made by email and telephone to contact as many of these individuals as possible to verify contact information. In reviewing the grants for the 190 individuals, there were a number of multiple grants awarded to the same recipients. For example, John Bourne was the principal investigator for twenty-eight different grants for three different institutions (Vanderbilt University, Olin College and The Sloan Consortium). In addition some of the individuals were deceased, some had serious health issues, some had resigned or retired and no email addresses were available. Some of these individuals represented organizations not colleges/universities. Some individuals who received very small grants for travel and modest research projects remained in the database but were excluded from any follow-up.   As a result, the 190 individuals were reduced to 129 identified as representing the pool of grant recipients who would be contacted to participate in this study.

The second major task was to design and field test a survey (see Appendix A) that would seek to collect opinions from the grant recipients as to the importance and impact of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* grants to them, to their institutions, higher education and the general development of online learning. Jeff Seaman, of the Babson Survey Research Group, assisted and supervised this aspect of the study. The survey was designed and tested in June and July 2011, and the first mailings to these 129 individuals were sent out. Four follow-up mailings were conducted. By the end of August, 88 individuals (N=88) responded for a 68.2 % response rate. The 88 respondents represented:

    248 of the total (346) grants awarded (71.7%)
    $56,060,152 of the total dollars awarded of $72,197,965 (77.6%)
    95 of 143 of the total number of institutions awarded grants (66.4%)

The above response rates were deemed sufficient enough to conduct an analysis. It needs to be mentioned that after the beginning of this study, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation awarded five additional *Anytime,*

Anyplace Learning Program grants totaling $340,000. These grants were not included in the sample. However, three of the five principal investigators of these grants by virtue of having received earlier *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* grants were in the original sample of grantees surveyed.

The third major task reflected a need to provide a comparison of the opinions of grantees to the larger universe of American colleges and universities, a decision was made to survey major online learning providers who were not Foundation grantees. A database of leading online learning providers was created using a variety of sources. *U.S. News and World Report* develops an annual list of leading online college and university programs. This list for 2010 was used to initialize the database. This list was reviewed and all Sloan Foundation grant recipients were eliminated resulting in a total of 102 database entries. The *U.S. News and World Report* list did not include any for-profit colleges or universities. However, for-profit online learning providers represented a significant subset of all online learning in American higher education. An attempt was made to add for-profit online providers to the database. No attempt was made to select the "best" of these colleges and instead entries were based on size of program as collected by reviews of websites. As a result, an additional 88 for-profit online learning institutions were added to this database for a total 190.   A survey (see Appendix B) modified and streamlined from the instrument used for Sloan Foundation grantees was designed and tested in January 2012, and the first mailings to these 190 individuals were sent out in February. Four follow-up mailings were conducted. By the end of May 2012, 108 individuals (N=108) responded for a 56.8 % response rate. These 108 responses represent:

> 87 non-profit online learning providers and
> 21 for-profit online learning providers.

It should be mentioned that the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* did not fund any for-profit higher education institutions.

B.   Results of the Survey of Foundation Grantees

Table 1 provides a frequency distribution summarizing the responses to the question: "What level of impact did the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant activity have on the success of online learning in the respondent's institution?" The majority of respondents (66.7%) indicated the Foundation had a large positive impact.

Table 2 provides a frequency distribution summarizing the responses to the question: "What level of impact did the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant activity have on the growth of online learning in

general?" The majority of respondents (65.3%) indicated the Foundation had a large positive impact. In sum, the results illustrated in Tables 1 and 2 indicated that these respondents view the *Anytime, Anyplace learning Program* as having a positive impact on their institutions and on the growth of online learning in general.

Table 1: The success of online learning at my institution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No impact	3	3.4	4.3	4.3
	Small positive impact	20	22.7	29.0	33.3
	Large positive impact	46	52.3	66.7	100.0
	Total	69	78.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	11.4		
	Does not apply	9	10.2		
	Total	19	21.6		
Total		88	100.0		

Table 2: The growth of online learning in general

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No impact	6	6.8	8.3	8.3
	Small positive impact	19	21.6	26.4	34.7
	Large positive impact	47	53.4	65.3	100.0
	Total	72	81.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	11.4		
	Does not apply	6	6.8		
	Total	16	18.2		
Total		88	100.0		

Table 3 provides the percentages of "Yes' responses to the question: "In what ways do you believe the overall activities of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation impacted online learning in higher education?" The results show that a substantive majorities of these respondents indicated that the Foundation impacted online learning across higher education in many ways. By far the largest percentage (96.1%) was for building a community for both formal and informal discussion of online learning issues. Essentially this can be interpreted as reflecting the contributions of the Sloan Consortium.

Following up on the role of the Sloan Consortium, Table 4 provides responses to the question: "What role did each of the following play for your institution's efforts with online learning (including all aspects, not just those funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation)?" The results in Table 4 show that a substantial majority (78.1%) indicated that the Sloan Consortium played a significant role. EDUCAUSE with 40.0% was next among the organizations in playing a significant role. Table 5 provides an overall summary of the impact of the Sloan Consortium on individuals, institutions, higher education and the growth of online learning in general.

Table 3: How did the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Impact Online Learning in American Higher Education?

Activity	Percentage Responded Yes
Built a community for both formal and informal discussion of online learning issues	96.1
Established major venues (e.g., conferences, workshops) focused on online learning	84.4
Funded and initiated major research projects for studying online learning	72.7
Provided publication venues for disseminating scholarship (e.g., studies, best practices).	74.0
Established quality standards and frameworks for online learning	77.9
Provided public awareness of online learning in the news media (local, regional, national	74.0
Provided print and web-based information resources on online learning	74.0
Provided social networking resources for the online learning community	55.8
Made consulting and other expertise available to institutions initiating online learning activities	62.3
Other	20.8

Table 4: Professional Organizations – Impact on Online Learning

Professional Organization	Percentage indicating Moderate or Large Impact
American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC)	7.9%
American Society for Training and Development (ASTD)	4.8%
Assoc. for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)	0.0%
Association for the Advance of Computing in Education (AACE)	6.3%
Council for Adult and Continuing Education (CAEL)	10.9%
EDUCAUSE	40.0%
eLearning Guild	3.2%
European Distance Education Network (EDEN)	4.8%
International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE)	11.3%
Penn State American Center for the Study of Distance Education	7.9%
Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)	78.1%
United States Distance Learning Association (USDLA)	19.1%
Western Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET)	25.4%
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	19.3%

Table 5: What was the Impact of the Sloan Consortium… (asked of Grantees)

	Percentage Indicating Positive or Somewhat Positive
For you	91.4
For your institution	82.8
For Higher Education	80.3
For the Growth of Online Learning	94.1

In addition to responses to specific questions, participants were free to make open-ended comments about various aspects of their experiences with the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* and Sloan-C. Starting with the grantees, below is a representative sample of comments about their grant activities:

"The original grant was very early, spring 1995, and in some sense was about whether the practices of the early pioneers on campus could be replicated more broadly. Much of the funding was allocated to internal grants for the local recipients to develop their own approach, which would vary a fair amount by discipline and size of course. We had some truly wonderful early grantees and they did some quite interesting work in Chemistry, the Life Sciences, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and Economics. Invariably these early people, would get some recognition for their work, assume an administrative capacity as a consequence and be replaced in the teaching by other people who were diligent but less creative in their effort."
-*Faculty Member from a Large Public Midwestern University*

"Have more faculty involvement at the stage of proposal development. There was widespread faculty support of blended, voiced during a campus-wide strategic planning process that pre-dated the grant. / / However, the Sloan grant proposal-writing process that took place over the summer, so the grant plan of work was decided by academic administrators along with academic technology staff. This led to political problems that slowed progress during the implementation process. Not insurmountable, but things would have gone more smoothly if faculty had a hand in proposal development. / / Another challenge had nothing to do with the grant. The project implementation began at the same time that the economy faltered. The institution was caught up in a traumatic process of budget cuts and layoffs, which led to staffing instability and morale problems that had an impact on the project. In retrospect, it is amazing what we were able to accomplish, given the turbulence of the time!"
- *Administrator from a Small Private New England College*

"I would not have changed anything. The grants were written in such a way that there was flexibility in using emerging practices and approaches in accomplishing the overall goals. / / Without these grants, U_____ would no longer exist. As a result of the grants, U____ is a thriving university even in this current recession. Year after year our online enrollments grow while the campus enrollments drop. If we did not have the online program, we would have 30% fewer students, 33% fewer credit hours offered and would have been converted from a university to a state office complex."
– *Faculty Member from a Small Public Midwestern College*

"The grant allowed us to create our first four online courses, and Connecticut now has thousands of online enrollments per year. In addition, _____ State College is now proudly branded as Connecticut's public online college. / / We could not have gotten here without seed money from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. / /"
– *President from a Medium Size New England Public College*

"Sloan supported the _____ Virtual University, of which I was CEO. The aim of the _____VU was to coordinate and enhance access to online courses and programs in _____. The program was really just underway when the _____ State University system decided to pull out. The loss of the biggest participant in the _____VU led to its immediate collapse. We returned what remained of the Sloan grant."
- *CEO from a Western Large Public University System*

"The overall project concept was fine. However, there was a change in leadership at the university and in project directors such that support (symbolic and otherwise) from the top was not what it was when the grant activity started."
– *Faculty Member from a Large East Coast Public University*

"We succeeded in fulfilling the primary aims of the grants, but the administration failed to support future grants that pushed the program to a system-wide level which would mean that a system-wide officer would have to take over the grant. If we had to do this again, I would have appealed to a higher authority (President of the University), rather than through my immediate superior, the Chancellor's office, which did not understand the Sloan initiatives fully when new persons took office in the higher administration. A system-wide approach was needed since no one campus could provide all of the distance learning courses (including hybrid courses) that would lead to a certificate or degree obtained through the University of _____ "
– *Faculty Member from a Public University on the West Coast*

The above sample of comments provided valuable insights into the nature of the grant activities as seen through the eyes of individuals (i.e. principal investigators) who were most involved in the development and implementation of ALN grants. The majority of the comments indicated that these grants were positive experiences for the individuals and their institutions. However, they also identify issues and/or concerns related to funding, change of personnel, and institutional leadership.

C. Results of the Survey of Non-Sloan Grantees

Table 6 provides a summary of the responses from non-grantees to the question: Are you familiar with the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*?" A majority (59.8%) of the respondents were not familiar with the program. Table 7 follows up on this question by asking about the "impact of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* on your institution". The vast majority of these respondents indicated the program had no impact, they did not know or just did not answer the question. Table 8 indicates that similar responses were recorded when asking about the "impact of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* on Online Learning in General in Higher Education".

Table 6: Familiar with the Sloan Foundation's Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	43	39.8	40.2	40.2
Valid	No	64	59.3	59.8	100.0
	Total	107	99.1	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.9		
Total		108	100.0		

Table 7: Impact of the Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program on Your Institution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	21	19.4	24.4	24.4
	Small Positive Impact	9	8.3	10.5	34.9
	Large Positive Impact	12	11.1	14.0	48.8
	Don't Know	44	40.7	51.2	100.0
	Total	86	79.6	100.0	
Missing	0	22	20.4		
Total		108	100.0		

Table 8: Impact of the Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program on Online Learning in General in Higher Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	6	5.6	6.9	6.9
	Small Positive Impact	11	10.2	12.6	19.5
	Large Positive Impact	24	22.2	27.6	47.1
	Don't Know	46	42.6	52.9	100.0
	Total	87	80.6	100.0	
Missing	0	21	19.4		
Total		108	100.0		

However, the views of the non-grantees change when asked about their opinions of the Sloan Consortium. The Consortium was the largest recipient (more than $15 million) of grants from the *Anytime, Anyplace, Learning Program*. Table 9 provides responses to the question: "Are you at all familiar with Sloan-C?" The vast majority (85.6%) of these respondents were familiar with Sloan-C. Table 10 indicates that a majority (66.7%) were members of Sloan-C. More telling is Table 11 which indicates that the vast majority of these non-grantees indicated that Sloan-C had a somewhat or large positive impact on them as individuals, on their institutions, on higher education, and on the growth of

16

online learning in general. The conclusion here is that while these individuals were not familiar with or did not have an opinion on the impact of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*, they were positive on the impact of the Program's major funding initiative, the Sloan Consortium.

Table 9: Familiar with Sloan-C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	89	82.4	85.6	85.6
	No	15	13.9	14.4	100.0
	Total	104	96.3	100.0	
Missing	0	4	3.7		
Total		108	100.0		

Table 10: Member of Sloan-C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	68	63.0	66.7	66.7
	No	34	31.5	33.3	100.0
	Total	102	94.4	100.0	
Missing	0	6	5.6		
Total		108	100.0		

Table 11: What was the Impact of the Sloan Consortium… (asked of Non-Grantees)

	Percentage Indicating Positive or Somewhat Positive
For you	84.5
For your institution	76.4
For Higher Education	77.5
For the Growth of Online Learning	83.3

It would be helpful to compare several of the populations from the results of the two surveys. First, individuals representing institutions receiving *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* grants viewed favorably (see Tables 1, 2, 3, 4,5) the contributions of the both the Foundation and Sloan-C.   Both organizations were important for them individually, their institutions, higher education and the general development of online learning.   For non-grantees the responses tell a different story. While supportive of the Sloan-C and its activities (see Tables, 9,10,11), the non-grantees saw much less impact (see Tables 7 and 8) or did not have an opinion of the Foundation and its *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. Their association of online learning with the Sloan name is based on interactions with the Consortium not the Foundation.

Second, within the non-grantee populations, the respondents represent two different types of institutions: non-profit (public or private) and for-profit colleges and universities. It might be helpful to compare them separately with regard to their opinions of Sloan-C. Table 12 combines the data in Tables 5 (Grantees) and 11(Non-Grantees); and breaks down the non-grantees into non-profit (public or private) and for-profit institutions.   The majorities in all groups view Sloan-C has having had an impact on themselves, their institutions, higher education, and online learning in general. The grantees had the highest majorities and non-grantee/for-profits the lowest majorities.

Table 12: What was the Impact of the Sloan Consortium…

	Percentage Indicating Positive or Somewhat Positive			
		Non-Grantees		
	Grantees	All Non-Grantees	Non-Profit (Public or Private)	For-Profit
	(N=88)	(N=108)	(N=87)	(N=21)
For you	91.4	84.5	89.3	63.2
For your institution	82.8	76.4	79.5	63.2
For Higher Education	80.3	77.5	80.7	63.2
For the Growth of Online Learning	94.1	83.3	87.8	65.0

The non-grantees were also provided the opportunity to comment on the Sloan Foundation. For example:

"The research done by Sloan [Consortium] in the area of online education has provided credibility and is cited throughout various research studies across the industry."

"The Sloan Foundation has been and needs to be a strong advocate for online learning. The key is to provide the public with accurate information."

"Our involvement w/Sloan [Consortium] is growing so my responses are reflective of where the influence had been but see it getting stronger. Mostly value the reports generated from learning surveys."

"During Katrina, Sloan [Foundation] was instrumental in assisting the university. Also, various online educators here use Sloan resources on a continuing basis."

"I greatly value the Sloan Consortium and have been mostly involved via the workshops and conferences. Keep leading the change online."

"Funding the Sloan Consortium was a fantastic idea. Providing an organization where institutions could discuss the best and latest practices of online education gave a boost to the dissemination and respectability of the mode of teaching and learning."

"Excellent resource [Sloan Consortium] - keep spreading word to small community and technical colleges."

"I hear it [Sloan-Consortium] mentioned a lot on NPR/PBS"

The sample above are fairly representative of the positive opinions and impressions even these non-grantees had for Sloan Foundation and/or for Sloan-C. As indicated above, respondents meld their views of the Foundation and the Consortium together. Also of interest is the fact that most of the comments referred to Sloan-C.

V. Qualitative Analysis

A mentioned above, the central purpose of this project was two-fold: first, to analyze the role of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* in nurturing online learning enabling it to evolve into a major vehicle for providing higher education opportunities to millions of students; and second, to examine the historical record and to begin the process of documenting and preserving the stories of the individuals, colleges, universities and organizations that were critical players in the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.*

To conduct the second aspect of the project, the database and other documents at the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation were examined with the goal of determining the major grantees of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. As indicated earlier, 346 grants totaling $72,197,965 were awarded through this program. However, forty-six grants totaling $40 million were awarded to twenty-two institutions. These "major" grantees received grants of $500,000. or more over the life of the program .   Twenty-seven individuals (See Appendix C) from this population were interviewed or otherwise provided information regarding the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.   Twenty-five individuals represented thirty-two of the major grants and nineteen colleges or universities. (see Appendix D).   Two of these individuals represented the Sloan Foundation. The individuals interviewed included administrators and faculty, all of whom were involved in Sloan grant activities in their institutions. As a result of these interviews, certain patterns evolved that might be helpful for understanding the success of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. It is important to note that the analysis of these interviews provides the perspective of grantees outside of the Foundation which may or may not coincide with recollections and views of individuals in the Foundation such as Ralph Gomory and Frank Mayadas.

The findings presented in this section are based on interviews conducted through 2010. The interviewees were asked questions (see Appendix E) specifically related to their institution's goals and reasons for engaging in ALN and more importantly, whether these goals were realized. From these interviews, several themes or "lessons learned" began to emerge.

A. The Value of Funding Large Public Universities

The number of grants awarded to large public universities (and in many cases entire university systems (e.g., University of Illinois, State University of New York, City University of New York) provided a mechanism for the Foundation's funding to reach large numbers of faculty and students. The American public universities have always seen access to higher education, a major focus of the *Anytime, Anyplace*

Learning Program, as a fundamental aspect of their missions. The strategy of directing major grants to these large systems was in keeping with the Foundation's goal of providing an alternative for people who wanted to pursue higher education but who could not easily attend regularly scheduled college classes. Working with entire university systems was intended to move ALN into the mainstream of colleges and universities; well beyond traditional distance, adult, and continuing education providers, early targets of Foundation funding.   The large public university systems such as SUNY and CUNY also included a number of community colleges. The strategy of focusing on large public systems proved to be successful mainly because it was these institutions including their community colleges that regarded *access* to a higher education as central to their missions.

One important question was: would these large public institutions have moved into online learning without the Sloan funding.   Interviewees such as Meg Benke (SUNY Empire State College) indicated that it would have been unlikely for the university-wide network (SUNY Learning Network - SLN) to have developed without ALN funding from the Foundation. In her opinion, smaller pockets of ALN development at different colleges of SUNY would have evolved but coordination and support, as provided by Sloan Foundation funding, would have been lacking thereby slowing down ALN development across the entire university system.   Dr. Benke's comments were echoed in various ways by other interviewees. It is likely that many of the grantee institutions would either have not developed their ALN programs, or would have done so much later and at a more moderate level without the Foundation's funding.

In discussing the focus on large public universities with Frank Mayadas, it became clear that the Foundation's early attempts to work with elite institutions such as M.I.T., Cornell, and Brown did not yield tangible results with the exception of Stanford University and Johns Hopkins University. He indicated also that support for university extension, adult, and continuing education programs did not drive ALN into companion mainstream academic programs (examples include grants made to NYU and UC Berkeley). So early on, he gained the conviction that if the ALN program was to succeed, it needed to direct grant resources to academic programs at the large public university systems. These institutions were an excellent fit for the ALN program, and most (e.g., SUNY Learning Network, Penn State World Campus, UMASS Online Learning Network) formalized their grant programs into major university operations involving traditional departments.

B. Large Institutional Grants Follow Smaller Grants

Interviewees reported that large grants typically followed smaller grants to individual faculty or administrators at the system or college levels. A pattern emerged wherein individual faculty or administrators within the university system received small or modest grants initially, with an opportunity to demonstrate capability for establishing ALN projects at their institutions. When successful, they were then encouraged to apply for larger grants. Examples of this approach were evident at the University of Illinois (Burks Oakley), SUNY Learning Network (Eric Fredericksen), and University of Central Florida (Joel Hartman and Charles Dziuban). Eric Fredericksen (formerly of the SUNY Learning Network and now Associate Vice Provost at the University of Rochester) described a three-phase progression from small proof of concept projects, to larger university-wide proof of scale projects, and finally to full expansion and proof of sustainability projects. The smaller initial projects brought in "early-adopter" faculty and administrators who then formed a "grassroots" base of individuals willing to support the larger, system-wide effort. The larger system-wide efforts brought ALN to scale; and the grassroots base that supported these efforts gave credence to the overall scaling-up of ALN, and avoided the appearance and/or reality of top-down directives. Dr. Fredericksen also emphasized that the proposals submitted to the Sloan Foundation focused on "doing or accomplishing something with tangible results" more so than on study or research. Examples of funded projects typically involved designing ALN courses and programs or developing a faculty support group. Frank Mayadas corroborated many of the comments identified by Eric Fredericksen and felt that the major metric for all grants approved as part of the ALN program was a focus on developing courses and programs that subsequently would build ALN enrollments. Dr. Mayadas also mentioned that rarely were grants funded for the purpose of purchasing hardware or software.

An interesting example of large grants following individual faculty grants occurred at the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS). Ray Schroeder, a faculty member, founded the Office of Technology-Enhanced Learning in 1997 and initiated ALN with several small grants from the Foundation. In 2001, working with Burks Oakley, the executive director of the University of Illinois of Illinois Online, he developed a major grant of $500,000. to scale up ALN degree completion programs in the humanities and sciences at UIS. In 2004, UIS received a second major grant ($1.2 million) from the Sloan Foundation to expand further its ALN programs. However, a major controversy evolved when the faculty governing body took exception to the fact that it was not consulted during the development of this grant. The issue became serious enough that the provost had to leave his position in the wake of the controversy. Regardless, the grant activities were carried out effectively under Ray Schroeder's leadership. Online learning thrived at UIS, so much so, that today, more than half of the students there take at least one online class each semester and more than one-quarter of its students are distant online students living in

47 states and a dozen countries. As a result, UIS has become a model for many smaller comprehensive public institutions that want to develop online learning programs.

In summary, the early small grants were a low risk way for the Foundation to identify exceptional individuals such as Oakley, Fredericksen, Hartman and Schroeder who became key participants in driving later, larger grants.

C.   What Happens When the University Leadership Changes?

One major aspect of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* was the building of relationships between individuals at colleges and universities and the Foundation. At the colleges, university leaders in online education, such Gary Miller (Penn State), Jacquie Moloney (University of Massachusetts – Lowell), Burks Oakley (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Bob Ubell (New York University and Stevens Institute of Technology) served as important catalysts and developed long-term relationships with Sloan Foundation officers primarily with Frank Mayadas.   These relationships were critically important in moving ALN initiatives forward at their institutions.   However, when there are changes in the university online education leadership, as people move on to other institutions or retire, do grant initiatives continue, end or do they evolve into something else?   In the course of this investigation, interviewees related several examples of situations where university leadership that changed in some fundamental way could have impacted ALN development efforts. In some cases, changes in these key personnel appear to have had little adverse effect on the development and growth of ALN programs.   For example, at the Penn State World Campus, Gary Miller and Jim Ryan, two of the early champions, retired; at UMass, Jack Wilson and Jacquie Moloney moved up into positions of even greater responsibility beyond strictly online learning; at SUNY, Eric Fredericksen, a very significant figure during the early start of SUNY Learning Network, moved on to the University of Rochester. Yet there was little adverse impact in student and program growth at Penn State, UMass Online, and SUNY. They are all national leaders among larger state systems. There are exceptions. At the University of Illinois system key changes at the top leadership levels, appear to have caused a serious detour.

The University of Illinois system had been one of the earliest (first grant received in 1995) and largest recipients of grants from the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.   A system wide faculty development and support facility was established at the Urbana-Champaign campus that allowed ALN to expand and prosper within existing departments and academic units throughout the Illinois public university system. The Champaign-Urbana campus was a pioneer and respected among the early ALN practitioners; the Chicago campus, also received Sloan grants and it too is a strong participant' as is the Springfield campus

referenced earlier. In 2005, a new president was named for the system following the retirement of Jim Stukel. A signature initiative of the incoming president was the launch of a major online learning initiative---- the Illinois Global Campus (IGC)---- that had as its goal the enrollment of 70,000 new students by 2018 which would have made it the largest unit in the University of Illinois system.   A number of issues such as its planned for-profit nature, exclusive dependence on an adjunct faculty, lack of integration with existing programs, and branding of the University of Illinois name, combined to doom the IGC from the start.   Frantic changes in particular aspects of the IGC concept did not save this project, which came to an end in 2009. A loss of more than $7 million and a mere two hundred or so enrollments resulted from this experiment.   Several interviewees from the University of Illinois in this study who commented on their experiences with the IGC, reported that they had questioned the concept from the start, but they were unable to impact plans and implementation. A grant application for the IGC had been submitted to the Sloan Foundation, but it was not approved. Personnel at the Foundation advised the new president of the Illinois system that this would likely fail. In spite of a long-standing relationship with all three campuses of the Illinois system in ALN matters and the Foundation's lack of enthusiasm for IGC, this did not deter the new leadership from pushing forward towards an eventual, visible and embarrassing failure. Frank Mayadas, the Program Director for the Foundation's ALN Program, lamented that the collapse of IGC damaged, unnecessarily, the reputations of the ALN programs at each of the Illinois campuses. In substance, the IGC experiment was a set-back, and it diverted precious resources away from campus ALN projects and into a dead-end. It caused some slow-down at the campuses, but in hindsight, this set-back appears to have been temporary. The University of Illinois Springfield especially continues its vigorous growth.

In general, it is concluded that the grant-making strategy by the Foundation was sufficiently robust so as to be able to withstand key personnel losses along the way.

D. Building a Community

Interviewees were also asked questions (See Appendix F) about the Foundation's role in creating a *community* of educators, support professionals and administrators involved in the practice and in studying the new field of online learning.   The importance of community-building was that it provided many channels for the sharing of experiences, research, and best practices with colleagues from other institutions. The Sloan Foundation funded a number of these channels directly related to community building culminating in the formalization of the Sloan Consortium in 2008. A number of activities were discussed (see Appendix F for types of channels) with the interviewees. There was almost unanimous mention by the interviewees of the by-invitation only Summer Workshops funded by the Sloan

Foundation. These workshops started at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign in 1999, then were moved to Lake George, New York for three years and subsequently to other locales (Boston, Victoria Island, Baltimore).   The workshops in Urbana-Champaign and Lake George were mentioned as being especially important in the early years as knowledge-sharing and community building activities for cadres of educators experimenting with ALN.   The intimacy of these workshops, where approximately 30-35 individuals would gather for three days was seen as incredibly beneficial to understanding and moving ALN activities forward.   While these Summer Workshops required modest Foundation support, they were strikingly effective for practitioners to share knowledge and experiences, for planning of future directions, and for developing ideas for joint research and projects. They were also early breeding grounds for identifying individuals with expertise who could assist other colleges and universities embarking on online learning programs.   The Foundation as well as the Consortium developed informal and later formal consultant referral services that relied on these individuals to share their experiences and expertise. As an example, when the federal government launched its eArmy U project in 2001, a number of consultants associated with the Consortium were involved with developing and evaluating the request for proposals.

   The Sloan Annual Conference (started in Philadelphia in 1995 as a small affair with approximately 90 attendees, mostly grantees), was also mentioned by many of the interviewees as an important venue for knowledge-sharing and community building. While lacking the intimacy of the Summer Workshops, it brought together a larger number of practitioners and scholars to share their knowledge about online learning. In 2011, over 2,000 individuals attended this conference either in person (1,483) or virtually (est. between 240-600) In sum, interviewees described a Sloan ALN community that started with a small number of grantees, but grew as individuals and groups interested in various aspects of ALN emerged.

   The advancement of online learning generated a good deal of new scholarly activity especially in effectiveness and comparison studies. The faculty interviewees in particular referred to *research* as a critical reason for their involvement with the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.* Chuck Dziuban (University of Central Florida) specifically mentioned how a book project (*Blended Learning: Research Perspectives*) and later a special edition of the Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks (JALN) had helped forge relationships. The survey work of Jeff Seaman and Elaine Allen as well as research projects resulting in publications that grew out of the Summer Workshops and the Blended Learning Workshops in Chicago had a good deal of appeal to individuals interested in the study of online learning especially with regard to administrative leadership and pedagogical practice. A blended learning group that spun off in 2003 included a number of individuals who were not necessarily major grant recipients but were

genuinely interested in the scholarship related to the implementation issues associated with blended learning environments. This group continues to hold an annual workshop/conference each year.   In 2012, approximately 900 individuals (469 in person and an estimated 200-450 virtually) attended the Sloan Blended Learning Workshop/Conference. *JALN* was frequently mentioned as the most important scholarly vehicle for disseminating knowledge about online learning and a number of interviewees mentioned collaborative scholarly projects that culminated in JALN articles.   Many individuals who were not large grant recipients participated in these activities for the chance to share and collaborate on research, experiences, and best practices.   In many ways, it appears that the Summer Workshops combined with the other activities mentioned above (ALN Conference, JALN, collaborative research projects, the Blended Learning Workshop) were the seeds of the Sloan community.

   In sum, the sub-program for community-building grants was unanimously acclaimed by interviewees as an important element of the total Sloan program. It emphasized empirical research in the new field of online education, and this in turn provided an outlet for faculty and administrators to gain scholarly recognition, and for professional collaborations, which likely would never have occurred without the availability of the Sloan community channels.

E.   The Sloan Semester and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita

The community created under the Sloan grants, demonstrated a remarkable ability to coalesce into a team with a common goal, in times of crisis.   The Sloan ALN community had its most dramatic moment of coming together in 2005 when hurricanes Katrina and Rita wreaked havoc and destruction on New Orleans and parts of Mississippi. Several of the interviewees (Ray Schroeder, Bruce Chaloux, and Chuck Dziuban) spoke passionately about the Sloan Foundation's response in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Its response was the *Sloan Semester* for affected college students who abruptly saw their education hopes literally wash away.   Colleges and universities in the impacted areas closed, lost contact with their students and in some cases did not reopen for a year or more.   The collective effort of many individuals and institutions, mainly affiliated with the Sloan *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*, combined with special funding from the Foundation (approved in a matter of days) generated a solution for thousands of displaced students. More than 3,000 students displaced by hurricanes Katrina and Rita, enrolled in the *Sloan Semester*, a one-semester virtual university that offered a choice of 1,500 courses from 150 institutions across the country---- online and free of charge to affected students. The generosity of the Foundation and the agility with which this community moved to address this national catastrophe was a defining moment that continues to permeate its sense of togetherness and community.

F. The Sloan Consortium

The Sloan Consortium, has been the largest recipient of funding from the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*. While incorporated in 2008 as a 501c(3), the Consortium had existed as an informal organization many years earlier and aspects of its operations such as publication of JALN, can be traced back to 1996. From the beginning, a major focus of the Consortium was to promote quality in the development and delivery of online learning which in its early years was viewed skeptically by many segments of higher education. As an example, the Consortium's *Five Pillars of Quality Online Learning* was the first framework to develop goals, objectives and metrics for evaluating online programs. This framework continues to be widely used and cited by a wide variety of practitioners and educaiton policy makers.

In addition to issues of quality, the Consortium played a pivotal role in providing support for many of the activities related to community building discussed earlier. The Sloan Consortium was able to function well in this informal role because of the generous funding ($700,000 to $1 million per year for the past ten years) provided by the Foundation as well as the involvement of individuals who became national leaders in the field of ALN, many of whom have served on its Board of Directors. Because of Foundation funding, the Sloan Consortium did not expend significant resources in marketing in its early years. It did not have to since institutional and individual memberships were free. It could instead concentrate on resources to nurture the evolving community of online education practitioners. Several interviewees commented on the critical support structure that the Consortium provided in coordinating the Summer Workshops, in publishing JALN, in coordinating collaborative research efforts by Jeff Seaman and others, and by creating a "home" for the fledgling Sloan community. Interviewees were also quick to comment that The Consortium's finest hour might have been the role it played in coordinating the Sloan Semester during hurricanes Katrina and Rita. In 2008, the Sloan Consortium applied for 501(c) (3) status, as a step in response to the Foundation's strategy to bring down and then end, funding for the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*.

The potential of the Sloan Consortium as a professional organization capable of generating its own funds through dues-paying membership and other revenue-generating activities is in part contingent on learning from its past. It is important to keep in mind that the beginnings of a community preceded the formal Consortium. Community-building activities such as the Summer Workshops and the Annual Conferences evolved as much from grants made to individuals and colleges such as the University of Illinois, State University of New York, and the University of Central Florida. Without a doubt, the Consortium provided important services to facilitate these activities but much of the effort including planning were performed as much by grant recipients and other individuals not directly connected to the

Consortium. As an example, the Sloan Annual ALN Conference, a Sloan Consortium activity that generates a significant profit, had a history of being organized, planned, and implemented by the University of Central Florida in concert with a voluntary planning committee of Sloan Foundation grantees. Some of the individuals (Gary Miller, Meg Benke, Jacquie Moloney, Karen Swan, Anthony Picciano) involved with planning the conferences continued to serve and work for the Consortium in their roles as members of the Board of Directors.   However, as their terms of office expire, a new generation of individuals will be needed to continue this work.   The Consortium, in order to survive beyond the period of Foundation funding which is due to end in 2013, needs to develop and expand more revenue-generating activities such as the conference. The consortium is positioning itself to do this. For example, all three of its major conferences (the Annual ALN Conference, the Blended Learning Workshop and the Emerging Technologies Conference) have all seen significant increases in the number of registrants in recent years and all are operating at a profit. Webinars and professional development workshops have also grown in participation and have begun to generate a profit. However, more needs to be done for the Consortium to survive.   In the words of John Bourne, the Executive Director of the Consortium, "we are not sure where it is all heading yet".

VI.   Summary of Major Findings

In reviewing the previous sections, certain findings would benefit from further discussion. First, the public sector of higher education was integral to the success of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.* The vast majority of the grants awarded as part of this program went to large public university systems including community colleges. This was not an accident but by design as confirmed by Frank Mayadas:

> "In discussing the focus on large public universities with Frank Mayadas, it becomes clear that the Foundation's early attempts to work with elite institutions such as M.I.T., Cornell, and Brown did not yield tangible results with the exception of Stanford University…So early on, he gained the conviction that if the ALN program was to succeed, it needed to direct grant resources to academic programs at the large public university systems. These institutions were an excellent fit for the ALN program, and most (e.g., SUNY Learning Network, Penn State World Campus, UMASS Online Learning Network) formalized their grant programs into major university operations involving traditional departments." (Frank Mayadas – November 1, 2010)

Public institutions represent approximately 76 percent of all student enrollments in American higher education and many of them especially the community colleges focus on the importance of access to higher education. The strategy of the Foundation to support the public sector enabled it to penetrate well the largest segment of American higher education. Individuals from these institutions who received grants credit the Foundation with making significant contributions to their programs and to development of online learning in American higher education in general. Many of these individuals also became leaders and provided examples to other public institutions to become active. In addition, many of the individuals who were major grantees became active in building the online community that evolved into the Sloan Consortium. All of the founding members of the Consortium's Board of Directors came from public institutions. While several of these individuals have retired or otherwise left the Board, the majority (10 of 14) of the members on the Consortium's Board of Directors today represent public institutions.

Second, most individuals from institutions that have major online learning programs who were not *Anytime, Anyplace, Learning Program* grantees (public, private non-profit, private for-profit) , are not aware of the contribution of the Foundation. The awareness that does exist comes more from their involvement with the Sloan Consortium. As the Consortium developed and evolved, it became an attraction for a number of individuals and higher education institutions that had invested in online

29

education. The Consortium's annual reports, research publications (i.e. JALN, Allen & Seaman studies), conferences, workshops and webinars have attracted many professionals active in online learning not just Foundation grantees.   JALN generates tens of thousands of downloads each year. Attendance at Consortium conferences, workshops and webinars is in excess of 5,000 individuals per year. As a result, whereas the Foundation seeded and gave life to the Consortium, the Consortium is now the vehicle that provides exposure for the Foundation among the broader online learning providers.

Third, private for-profit colleges and universities never received any grant funding from the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*, however, they are an important and growing sector of online learning in American higher education. While representing about 11 percent of all enrollments in American higher education, they represent a large percentage (as much as 33 percent) of the total online population.   Data on this percentage are difficult to verify since some of these institutions do not participate in federal financial aid programs and as a result, are not required to disclose enrollment information.   They also do not appear on major contact lists such as the IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) database maintained by the U.S. Department of Education that is used for conducting surveys and other data collection activities. Their awareness of the Foundation's contribution to online learning is modest at best and somewhat lower than for other non-grantee institutions. And again, the awareness that does exist comes from their association with the Sloan Consortium.

Fourth, the Sloan Consortium has made its presence known to the majority of all major online learning providers regardless of whether they are public, private, non-profit or for-profit. It is likely that the legacy of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* rests with the success of the Consortium. As the largest recipient of funding from this program, it continues to provide a host of services to the online learning community. Funding for the Consortium from the Foundation ends in 2013 and its future remains to be seen. Most important metrics especially revenue and membership have indicated that the Consortium continues to grow but there is no way of telling where it is on its growth cycle.   Online learning and blended learning will surely continue to grow and the need for the Consortium and the kinds of services it provides will likewise grow.

While no one can predict the future, there is one aspect of online learning that virtually ensures its continuing influence on the delivery of education at all levels. By virtue of its connection to digital communications, online learning evolves as this technology evolves. The online learning that was introduced to instructional programs in the 1990s and early 2000s is not the same today and will not be the same five to seven years from now. Policies at the federal and state level are being scrutinized and

amended to address and incorporate the inclusion of online learning. At the same time, educators and policymakers around the world continue to work to meet the pedagogical challenges and opportunities that online learning environments present. International educational collaborations which were modest at best a few years ago are blossoming. This incredible mix of online technology and pedagogical practice is reshaping instruction in our colleges and schools. The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation was at the forefront of and served as a catalyst for this movement. It will continue to grow for years to come.

Appendix A – Survey Sent to Grantees

<Addressee>

Welcome,

You have been selected to participate in this survey as a past recipient of a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program. This study is funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and conducted by researchers at City University of New York and Babson Colleges. All responses are held in strictest confidence and at no time will individual responses be published. There are no known risks associated with participation, only the researchers will have access to the data, which will be stored at City University of New York for a minimum of three years.

If you received more than one grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, please consider all such grants in responding to these questions.

Respondents may skip any questions they wish. We sincerely thank you for your participation.

Dr. Anthony G. Picciano, City University of New York
Dr. Jeff Seaman, Babson College

Information about you, your institution, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant(s) that were received.

What was the intended scope of the Alfred P. Sloan grant activity? (Check all that apply.)

- ❑ Portion of a school (department, division, etc.)
- ❑ Entire campus
- ❑ Multiple campuses (e.g., system –wide)
- ❑ Regional or national.

What was the PRIMARY scope of the Alfred P. Sloan grant activity?

- ◯ Portion of a school (department, division, etc.)
- ◯ Entire campus
- ◯ Multiple campuses (e.g., system –wide)
- ◯ Regional or national.

What was the primary focus of the Alfred P. Sloan grant activity?

- ◯ Proof of concept – new program or activity - to show that a particular approach was viable.
- ◯ Begin program or activity – proof of concept already complete or not required.
- ◯ Grow an existing approach and/or program.
- ◯ Other (please explain): _____

How would you rate the success of the grant activity:

- ○ Not successful, we did not achieve what we had hoped for.
- ○ Somewhat successful, we achieved some/most of what we hoped for.
- ○ Successful, we achieved all of what we hoped for.
- ○ Very successful, we achieved success beyond what the grant proposal had envisioned.

If you had it all to do over again, what changes (if any) would you make and why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Impact of the Alfred P. Sloan grant activity on your institution.

How likely was your institution to pursue online learning if it had not received grant funding from the Alfred P. Sloan foundation?

- ◯ Very Unlikely
- ◯ Unlikely
- ◯ Somewhat Unlikely
- ◯ Undecided
- ◯ Somewhat Likely
- ◯ Likely
- ◯ Very Likely

What were the general attitudes to the grant activity from within your institution?

	Antagonistic	Neutral	Somewhat supportive	Very supportive	Does not apply
During the proposal planning and submission process	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
During the grant activity	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
After the completion of the grant	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

What role do you believe that the Alfred P. Sloan-funded activity had on the following at your institution?

	A negative impact	No impact	Small positive impact	Large positive impact	Does not apply
Attitudes of administrators towards online learning	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Attitudes of faculty towards online learning	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Progress of my institution in embracing online learning	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

How important were each of the following as barriers to the project at your institution?

	Not at all important/no impact	Little importance	Somewhat important	Very Important	Critical barrier
Match of project direction to your institution's academic goals	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Availability of institution-based resources	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Institutional skepticism towards online education	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Insufficient funding provided in grant	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Online education not accepted by faculty	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Lack of instructional support personnel	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Students apathy to online learning	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Institution has moved away from fully online learning to blended and web-enhanced learning	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Federal, state or other policies that limited online learning in our setting	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Collective bargaining and/or union issues	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

What do you believe was the most critical barrier that you faced?

What level of impact did your Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant activity have on?

	A negative impact	No impact	Small positive impact	Large positive impact	Does not apply
The success of online learning at my institution	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The growth of online learning in general	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The overall well-being of my institution	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Impact of the Alfred P. Sloan grant activity on other institutions.

In what ways (if any) did the Alfred P. Sloan-funded activities at your institution impact other institutions beyond your own. Please check all that apply.

- ❑   Informal discussion with peers from other institutions
- ❑   Presentation at conference(s)
- ❑   Presented in academic journal article(s)
- ❑   Coverage in local press
- ❑   Coverage in regional press
- ❑   Coverage in national press
- ❑   Site visit by members of other institutions
- ❑   Invited to present at other institution(s)
- ❑   Other _____

In what ways (if any) do you believe that the overall activities of Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (not just those at your institution) impacted online learning in American higher education? Please check all that apply.

- ❑   Built a community for both formal and informal discussion of online learning issues
- ❑   Established major venues (e.g., conferences, workshops) focused on online learning
- ❑   Funded and initiated major research projects for studying online learning
- ❑   Provided publication venues for disseminating scholarship (e.g., studies, best practices) in online learning.
- ❑   Established quality standards and frameworks for online learning
- ❑   Provided public awareness of online learning in the news media (local, regional, national
- ❑   Provided print and web-based information resources on online learning
- ❑   Provided social networking resources for the online learning community
- ❑   Made consulting and other expertise available to institutions initiating online learning activities
- ❑   Other _____

Larger academic community of scholars and practitioners of online learning.

What role (if any) did each of the following play for your institution's efforts with online learning (including all aspects, not just those funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation)?

	No role	Small impact	Moderate impact	Large impact
American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC)	❍	❍	❍	❍
American Society for Training and Development (ASTD)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Association for the Advance of Computing in Education (AACE)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Council for Adult and Continuing Education (CAEL)	❍	❍	❍	❍
EDUCAUSE	❍	❍	❍	❍
eLearning Guild	❍	❍	❍	❍
European Distance Education Network (EDEN)	❍	❍	❍	❍
International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Penn State American Center for the Study of Distance Education (ACSDE)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)	❍	❍	❍	❍
United States Distance Learning Association (USDLA)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Western Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	❍	❍	❍	❍

What level of involvement was there for you and your institution with the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)?

	None	Little	Some	Considerable
You	❍	❍	❍	❍
Your institution	❍	❍	❍	❍

What was the impact (if any) of the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)?

	Negative	Neutral/None	Somewhat positive	Positive	NA/ Does not apply
For you	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
For your institution	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
For Higher Education	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
For the growth of online learning	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

What impact (if any) did each of the following Sloan Consortium activities have on you and/or your institution?

	No role	Small impact	Moderate impact	Large impact
Regular email newsletters (Sloan-C View, Sloan-C Now)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Professional Relationships and Collaborations	❍	❍	❍	❍
Conferences/Symposia/Workshops (Orlando, San Francisco, Chicago)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Journal (JALN)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Online Webinars	❍	❍	❍	❍
Annual Online Learning surveys	❍	❍	❍	❍
Invitation Only Summer Workshops	❍	❍	❍	❍

Please let know any other thoughts you may have related to the Alfred P. Sloan foundation and its role in promoting online learning.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B – Survey Sent to Non-Grantees

<addressee>

You have been selected to participate in this survey because you and your institution are leaders in the world of online learning in higher education.   We are conducting this short, eight-minute survey as part of the evaluation of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning* grant program. This program which was administered from 1993 through 2010, funded over three hundred projects totaling almost $80 million for the development of online learning programs and courses. The purpose of this survey is to determine the impact of this grant program on the development of online learning in American higher education.   All data collected from this survey will only be used in aggregate form and there will be absolutely no disclosure of individuals who respond.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at your convenience.

We sincerely thank you for your participation.

Dr. Anthony G. Picciano

Question 1: Please verify that your institution offers online learning programs and/or courses.

○   Yes

○   No

Question 2: Are you familiar with the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program*?

○   Yes

○   No

Question 3: Have you or has your institution ever applied for or received a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan's *Anytime, Anyplace Program*?

○   Our institution has received a grant from the Sloan Foundation for online learning.

○   Our institution has never received a grant from the Sloan Foundation for online learning.

○   Our institution applied for a grant from the Sloan Foundation but was not funded.

○   I received a grant from the Sloan Foundation while I was employed at another institution.

Question 4a: In your opinion, what level of impact did the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* have on?

○	○ A negative impact	○ No impact	○ Small positive impact	○ Large positive impact	○ Don't know
The success of online learning at your institution	○	○	○	○	○
The growth of online learning in general in American higher education	○	○	○	○	○

Question 4b: If you indicated that the Sloan Foundation had an impact on your institution or in higher education in general, please explain *how* in your own words in the space provided below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 5: One of the major projects of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation's *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program* was to establish the Sloan Consortium of Colleges and Universities (Sloan-C), an organization of professionals and institutions dedicated to promoting quality in online learning. Are you at all familiar with Sloan-C?

○ Yes

○ No

Question: 6: Have you or has your institution ever been a member of Sloan-C?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 7: What role (if any) did each of the following organizations play for your institution's efforts with online learning?

○	○ No role	○ Small impact	○ Moderate impact	○ Large impact
American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC)	○	○	○	○
American Society for Training and Development (ASTD)	○	○	○	○
Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)	○	○	○	○
Association for the Advance of Computing in Education (AACE)	○	○	○	○
Council for Adult and Continuing Education (CAEL)	○	○	○	○
EDUCAUSE	○	○	○	○
eLearning Guild	○	○	○	○
European Distance Education Network (EDEN)	○	○	○	○
International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE)	○	○	○	○
Penn State American Center for the Study of Distance Education (ACSDE)	○	○	○	○
Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)	○	○	○	○
United States Distance Learning Association (USDLA)	○	○	○	○
Western Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET)	○	○	○	○
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	○	○	○	○

Question 8: Please measure the level of involvement of the Sloan Consortium on you or your institution?

◯	◯ None	◯ Little	◯ Some	◯ Considerable
You	◯	◯	◯	◯
Your institution	◯	◯	◯	◯

Question 9: What was the impact (if any) of the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C)?

◯	◯ Negative	◯ Neutral/ None	◯ Somewhat positive	◯ Positive	◯ NA/ Does not apply
For you	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
For your institution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
For Higher Education	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
For the growth of online learning in general	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Question 10: What impact (if any) did each of the following Sloan Consortium activities have on you and/or your institution?

◯	◯ No role	◯ Small impact	◯ Moderate impact	◯ Large impact
Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks (JALN)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Conferences/Symposia/Workshops (Orlando, San Francisco, Chicago)	◯	◯	◯	◯
Online Webinars	◯	◯	◯	◯
Annual Online Learning surveys	◯	◯	◯	◯
Invitation Only Summer Workshops	◯	◯	◯	◯

Please share any other thoughts you may have related to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and its role in promoting online learning.

_____

_____

_____

Appendix C
Interviewee List

Interviewee	Current Institutional Affiliation	Study Activity
Benke, Meg	Empire State College	Interview
Bishop, Tana	Winchester University	Paper Interview
Bourne, John	Babson/Olin College - Sloan C	Interview
Carnevale, Carol	Empire State College	Interview
Chaloux, Bruce	SREB	Interview
Dziuban, Charles	U of Central Florida	Interview
Fredericksen, Eric	U of Rochester	Paper Interview
Hartman, Joel	U of Central Florida	Interview
Hislop, Greg	Drexel U	Paper Interview
Jaffe, David	U of Northern Florida	Paper Interview
Miller, Gary	Penn State	Paper Interview
Moloney, Jacquie	U Mass Lowell	Statement - Video
Monaco, Sal	Western Governors U	Documentation
Niemiec, Niemiec	U of Illinois Chicago	Interview
Oakley, Burks	U of Illinois Urbana Champaign	Interview
Otte, George	City University of New York	Interview
Picciano, Anthony	City University of New York	Interview
Pickett, Alexandra	SUNY Learning Network	Interview
Ragan, Larry	Penn State	Interview
Schroeder, Ray	U of Illinois Springfield	Interview
Seaman, Jeff	Babson/Olin College - Sloan C	Paper Interview
Swan, Karen	Kent State University	Interview
Ting, Evelyn	Georgia Perimeter College	Interview
Ubell, Bob	New York University	Interview
Vignare, Karen	Michigan State U	Paper Interview
Gomory, Ralph	Sloan Foundation	Interview
Mayadas, Frank	Sloan Foundation	Interview

Appendix D - Characteristics of Major Interviewees/Grant Recipient Institutions

Public/Private[a]:   12 Public Institutions   7 Private Institutions

Region[a]:   11 East;   1 South;   3 Midwest;   4 West

Size[a] [b]:   4 Small;   3 Medium;   12 Large

a.   Represent the 19 Colleges/Universities
b.   Definitions of Small < 5,000 students; Medium 5,000 to 10,000 students; Large > 10,000 students.

Appendix E
Interview Questions for Grant Recipients

1. Please briefly describe the nature of the grant project at your institution funded by the Sloan Foundation as part of the *Anytime, Anyplace Learning Program.*

2. What were your or your institution's specific goals for engaging in ALN?

3. Were your goals directed more for off-campus, on-campus or both types of students?

4. What role did the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation funding play in helping you or your institution realize its goals regarding learning and ALN?

5. Would you have moved ahead with your goals regardless of Sloan Foundation funding? If yes, when? (within a year, two years, five years, etc.)

6. What was the most important aspect of the Sloan Foundation relationship?

7. In looking at your institution today (2009), has ALN progressed as much as you envisioned when you first received Sloan Funding? If yes, explain/provide further details (number of programs, courses developed? Faculty teaching via ALN? Students enrolled in ALN?

8. In looking at higher education in general: has ALN progressed as much as you would have envisioned when you first received Sloan Funding? What do you base your impression on?

9. Do you have any comment that provides some important insight/story into the importance of Sloan Foundation's funding of your ALN Program?

Interview Questions for Community Building

1. Have you had any relationship with the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation or The Sloan Consortium not directly related to grantsmanship?

2. Have you participated in any Sloan Consortium activities (e.g., conferences, workshops, publications, research)?

3. Do you consider yourself actively involved in the Sloan Consortium?

4. How important has your involvement with the Sloan Consortium been to your institution? Provide concrete examples.

5. How important do you think the Sloan Consortium has been in moving forward online learning in American higher education?   Provide examples.

6. Below are a list of activities of the Sloan Consortium. Please rank the following from 1 to 8:

Rank	Activity/	Have Used/Participated
___	Membership	_____
___	Professional Relationships and Collaborations	_____
___	Conferences/Symposia/Workshops(Orlando, San Francisco, Chicago)	_____
___	Publications (JALN, Sloan View, Books)	_____
___	Online Webinars	_____
___	Research (Allen & Seaman Studies)	_____
___	Invitation Only Summer Workshops	_____
___	Other_____	_____

7. Do you have any comment that provides some important insight/story into the importance of Sloan Foundation's efforts at building a community of scholars and practitioners of online learning.

8. What do you see as the Sloan Consortium's role for the future of American online learning?

References

Allen, I. E. & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. 2013. http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/changing_course_2012
Accessed January 10, 2013.

Kolowich, S. (September, 2009). What doomed Global Campus?. Inside Education.
http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/09/03/globalcampus
Accessed: January 15, 2010.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (1997*). Distance education in higher education institutions*, NCES 97-062. Washington, D.C.