Course: Distance education (EDUC 550)
Professor: Christopher J. Devers, Ph.D.
Office: Mother Rosalie Hill Hall 245
Office hours:
Email: devers [at] sandiego [dot] edu
Office Phone: (619) 260-7671
Course Website:
Semester:
Schedule:
Location:

Course Description:
Distance Education (EDUC 550). One of the most significant developments in education in the past century has been the expansion of distance education. This course will familiarize students with the historic and conceptual foundations of distance education and will provide students with opportunities to examine theories and applications of distance education in educational and training settings. The course will introduce participants to key concepts and principles that drive the design of effective distance learning and students will experience participating in online instructional events. A variety of distance teaching technologies will be utilized to demonstrate the possibilities and implications of their use for distance instruction. The course will incorporate both synchronous and asynchronous technologies for the delivery of course content, presentations and class activities. Students will explore tools for online collaboration including blogs, wikis, e-portfolios, Web pages and open source content management systems. Topics covered include communications, technology, delivery systems, instructional development for distance education and program quality assessment.

Above all, this class is about making connections between theory, empirical research, and educational practice with regard to the use (benefits and drawbacks) of different technologies.

This course explores the relationship between learning and technology at both a theoretical and empirical level. Specifically, the course examines the process and environments in which technology can promote learning. The following questions are explored throughout the course.

1. How does learning occur?
2. In what environment can technology promote learning?
3. What is the process by which technology enhances learning?

Students will (ACE):
Academic Excellence, Critical Inquiry, and Reflection

1. Learn to critically analyze technology and the environment in which it promotes learning.

Community and Service

2. Integrate both theoretical and empirical research through research projects.

Ethics, Values, and Diversity

3. Learn from readings and discussion about the relationship between theoretical and empirical research and technology.

Activities:

1. *Class participation* (35% of grade): Students are responsible for completing the assigned readings before class. Additionally, students are expected to actively engage in critical dialogue in each class session.
    a. Summary: One student is responsible for summarizing the weekly articles (one and a half hours) -- this is not a presentation.
        i. Provide the class with thought provoking questions regarding the articles.
    b. Video: One student is responsible for finding and summarizing a video that is related to learning and/or technology (e.g., TED talk, etc.) -- students will watch the video in class.
        i. Provide the class with thought provoking questions regarding the video.
    c. Notes: One student is responsible for keeping class notes each week.
    d. Out the door paper: Following each class, students will respond to two or three questions. For example:
        i. What did you learn?
        ii. What do you need?

2. [1]*Experiment participation* (5% of grade): Students are required to participate in one experiment and to produce a short paper (250+ words) reflecting on (due within one week of participation) . . .
    a. The overall experience.
    b. What did you learn and how does it relate to what is discussed in class?

3. *Project* (40% of grade): Each week, one or two students are responsible for developing and presenting a project that is based on both the weekly theoretical and empirical readings, and incorporates technology (one hour presentation and 15 minutes of discussion) -- when applicable, projects should be posted to Connexions. Additionally, if students have trouble relating their project to the weekly readings, they may find four articles, two empirical and two technical, which support the theory(s) and their project. Students are required to meet with the instructor at least one week prior to their presentation to discuss and develop their idea and project. Each project must include a section that explains how the articles were represented in the project, as well as answer the three main questions of the course:
    a. How does learning occur?
    b. In what environment can technology promote learning?
    c. What is the process by which technology enhances learning?

4. *Reflection paper* (20% of grade): At the end of the semester each student will produce a paper (4,000+ words), reflecting on . . .
    a. What have you learned from the course?

[1] Students, who do not wish to participate in an experiment, may opt to complete an alternative assignment.

b. What is the future of the use of technology?
c. How will you apply what you learned?

Grades:
Grades are composed of four parts: class participation (35%), experiment participation (5%), semester projects (40%), and a reflection paper (20%). The standard University grade scale is utilized. Please read:

Roosevelt, M. (2009). Student expectations seen as causing grade disputes. *The New York Times*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/18/education/18college.html.

Rojstaczer, S. (2003). Where all grades are above average. *The Washington Post*, A21. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A52648-2003Jan27.

Course Standards:

- Students are expected to be tolerant of others' viewpoints and courteous in their interaction.
- Prompt and regular attendance is expected.
- Please turn off or silence electronic communication devices (no texting).
- Laptops are not permitted.
- Please review the University's student handbook and policies regarding, student discipline, academic integrity, attendance, etc.
- Please check the course website at least once a day and email twice a day.
- All material must conform to APA standards.
- Most course readings are available through the University ereserves (http://copleylib.sandiego.edu/eres/ -- the password is:)
- Late assignments are not accepted.
- All assignments are to be emailed to the instructor before class on the due date.

Connexions:
When applicable, projects should be posted to Connexions (http://www.cnx.org), a collection of educational resources. Please create an account online and remember that anything posted online is open to the world to view.

Turnitin:
The University subscribes to a service called Turnitin.com. Turnitin.com is an online application that compares the content of submitted papers to the Turnitin.com database, and checks for textual similarities. All assignments for this course may be subject to submission to Turnitin.com for textual similarity review and to verify originality. All assignments will be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database solely for the purpose of detecting textual

similarities and verifying originality. Students may request in writing that their assignments not be submitted to Turnitin.com. However, if a student chooses this option, the student may be required to provide documentation in a form required by the faculty member to substantiate that the papers are the student's original work.

Academic Dishonesty:
Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Students are expected to adhere to all of the University policies, procedures, guidelines, and recommendations. Any form of academic dishonesty will result in:

1. automatic failure of the course
2. notification sent to the department head, the dean, and University authorities
3. other actions could involve, but are not limited to -- expulsion from the University, legal action, etc.

Disabilities:
Students with disabilities should contact the instructor and the office of disability services within the first two weeks of the semesters.

Reasonable accommodations in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act will be made for course participants with disabilities who require specific instructional and testing modifications. Students with such requirements must identify themselves to the University of San Diego Disability Services Office (619.260.4655) before the beginning of the course. Every effort will be made to accommodate students' needs, however, performance standards for the course will not be modified in considering specific accommodations.

Incompletes:
The grade of Incomplete ("I") may be recorded to indicate (1) that the requirements of a course have been substantially completed but, for a legitimate reason, a small fraction of the work remains to be completed, and, (2) that the record of the student in the course justifies the expectation that he or she will complete the work and obtain the passing grade by the deadline. It is the student's responsibility to explain to the instructor the reasons for non-completion of work and to request an incomplete grade prior to the posting of final grades. Students who receive a grade of incomplete must submit all missing work no later than the end of the tenth week of the next regular semester otherwise the "I" grade will become a permanent "F."

Note:
The instructor reserves the right to modify the policies, procedures, syllabus, or schedule as he deems necessary. Any changes made to the policies, procedures, syllabus, or schedule contained within the course will be announced either in class, email, or on the course website. By taking this course, students have agreed to follow all of the policies, procedures, guidelines, and recommendations of the University.

Required Reading: (I recommend purchasing books from: http://www.abebooks.com/)

Bonk, C. J. (2009). *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Fogarty, M. (2008). *Grammar Girl's quick and dirty tips for better writing*. New York, NY: Holt Paperbacks.

VandenBos, G. (Ed.). (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Recommended Reading:

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (2009). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Willingham, D. (2009). *Why don't students like school: A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Schedule:

Week 1 (Overview -- introduction to the course, format, expectations, etc.)

Bonk, C. (2009). Introduction to the open learning world. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 1-24). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Dillon, S. (2008). Online schooling grows, setting off a debate. *The New York Times*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/01/education/01virtual.html.

Samuels, T. (2010). Gateshead granny cloud [BBC video]. Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00ccq4w and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IXxYgpQhsrU

Week 2 (Historical Perspective)

Bonk, C. (2009). We all learn. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 25-54). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Cuoco, A., Paul Goldenberg, E., & Mark, J. (1996). Habits of mind: An organizing principle for mathematics curricula. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *15*(4), 375-402.

Harasim, L. (2000). Shift happens: online education as a new paradigm in learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *3*(1-2), 41-61.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies. *Structure*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf.

Baraniuk, R. (2006). Open-source learning [TED talk]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/richard_baraniuk_on_open_source_learning.html

Week 3 (Gaming)

Bonk, C. (2009). To search and to scan. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 55-90). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Chi, M. T. H., De Leeuw, N., Chiu, M.-H., & Lavancher, C. (1994). Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding. *Cognitive Science, 18*(3), 439-477.
Squire, K. (2006). From content to context: Videogames as designed experience. *Educational Researcher, 35*(8), 19-29.
Gee, J. P. (2005). Learning by Design: Good video games as learning machines. *E-Learning, 2*(1), 5-16.
Bainbridge, W. S. (2007). The scientific research potential of virtual worlds. *Science, 317*(5837), 472-476.

Week 4 (Gaming)

Bonk, C. (2009). E-demand around the globe. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 91-138). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Son, J. Y., & Goldstone, R. L. (2009). Contextualization in perspective. *Cognition and Instruction, 27*(1), 51-89.
Delwiche, A. (2006). Massively multiplayer online games (MMOs) in the new media classroom. *Educational Technology & Society,* 9 (3), 160-172.
Steinkuehler, C. (2004). Learning in massively multiplayer online games. *Proceedings of the 6th international conference on learning sciences* (pp. 521-528). Santa Monica, California: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
Gee, J. (2008). Games for learning institute [Vimeo video]. Retrieved from: http://vimeo.com/4513412

Week 5 (Gaming)

Bonk, C. (2009). It's free software world after all. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 139-162). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Gentner, D., Loewenstein, J., & Thompson, L. (2003). Learning and transfer: A general role for analogical encoding. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(2), 393-405.
Barab, S., Scott, B., Siyahhan, S., Goldstone, R., Ingram-Goble, A., Zuiker, S., et al. (2009). Transformational play as a curricular scaffold: Using videogames to support science education. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *18*(4), 305-320.
Squire, K., Barnett, M., Grant, J., & Higginbotham, T. (2004). Electromagnetism supercharged!: Learning physics with digital simulation games. *Proceedings of the 6th international conference on learning sciences* (pp. 513-520). Santa Monica, California: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
Gaudiosi, J. (2009). Video games take bigger role in education. *Reuters News*. Retrieved from http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5B92DW20091210.

Week 6 (Gaming)

Bonk, C. (2009). MIT in every home. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 163-182). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Craig, S. D., Chi, M. T. H., & VanLehn, K. (2009). Improving classroom learning by collaboratively observing human tutoring videos while problem solving. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(4), 779-789.

Nardi, B., & Harris, J. (2006). *Strangers and friends: Collaborative play in World of Warcraft*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work, Banff, Alberta, Canada.

Oliver, M., & Carr, D. (2009). Learning in virtual worlds: Using communities of practice to explain how people learn from play. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 40*(3), 444-457.

Robinson, K. (2006). Schools kill creativity [TED talk]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity.html

Week 7 (Virtual Worlds)

Bonk, C. (2009). Portals for the people. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 183-202). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, C. S., Lehman, J. F., & Koedinger, K. R. (1999). Goals and learning in microworlds. *Cognitive Science, 23*(3), 305.

Barab, S., Thomas, M., Dodge, T., Carteaux, R., & Tuzun, H. (2005). Making learning fun: Quest Atlantis, a game without guns. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 53*(1), 86-107.

Jarmon, L., Traphagan, T., Mayrath, M., & Trivedi, A. (2009). Virtual world teaching, experiential learning, and assessment: An interdisciplinary communication course in Second Life. *Computers & Education, 53*(1), 169-182.

Herrera, L. (2011). In Florida, virtual classrooms with no teachers. *The New York Times*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/18/education/18classrooms.html.

Week 8 (Virtual Worlds)

Bonk, C. (2009). Making a contribution. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 203-248). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Ainsworth, S., & Th Loizou, A. (2003). The effects of self-explaining when learning with text or diagrams. *Cognitive Science, 27*(4), 669-681.

Roussos, M., Johnson, A., Moher, T., Leigh, J., Vasilakis, C., & Barnes, C. (1999). Learning and building together in an immersive virtual world. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments, 8*(3), 247-263.

Petrakou, A. (2010). Interacting through avatars: Virtual worlds as a context for online education. *Computers & Education, 54*(4), 1020-1027.

Brown, J. (2008). Tinkering as a mode of knowledge production [YouTube]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9u-MczVpkUA

Week 9 (Virtual Worlds)

Bonk, C. (2009). Collaborate or die!. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 249-274). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Carney, R. N., & Levin, J. R. (2002). Pictorial illustrations still improve students' learning from text. *Educational Psychology Review, 14*(1), 5-26.
Taylor, R., & Chi, M. (2006). Simulation versus text: Acquisition of implicit and explicit information. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 35*(3), 289-313.
Dickey, M. D. (2005). Three-dimensional virtual worlds and distance learning: Two case studies of Active Worlds as a medium for distance education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36*(3), 439-451.
Rogers, L. (2009, December 6-9). *Simulating clinical experience: Exploring second life as a learning tool for nurse education.* Paper presented at the Same places, different spaces (ascilite), Auckland, New Zealand.

Week 10 (Textual Communication)

Bonk, C. (2009). Who are you?. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 275-292). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Aleven, V. A. W. M. M., & Koedinger, K. R. (2002). An effective metacognitive strategy: learning by doing and explaining with a computer-based Cognitive Tutor. *Cognitive Science, 26*(2), 147.
Kim, P., Hong, J.-S., Bonk, C., & Lim, G. (2009). Effects of group reflection variations in project-based learning integrated in a Web 2.0 learning space. *Interactive Learning Environments, 14*(3), 1-17.
Xie, Y., Ke, F., & Sharma, P. (2008). The effect of peer feedback for blogging on college students' reflective learning processes. *The Internet and Higher Education, 11*(1), 18-25.
Brown, J. (2008). Teaching 2.0: Doing more with less [Vimeo video]. Retrieved from http://vimeo.com/7650988

Week 11 (Textual Communication)

Bonk, C. (2009). U-learning?. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 293-326). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Banks, J. a. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 129-139.
Merryfield, M. (2003). Like a veil: Cross-cultural experiential learning online. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 3*(2), 146-171.
Kim, K.-J., & Bonk, C. J. (2002). Cross-cultural comparisons of online collaboration. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 8*(1), 0. Retrieved from: http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol8/issue1/kimandbonk.html
Rushkoff, D. (2008). Digital nation: Life on the virtual frontier [PBS video]. Retrieved from: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/digitalnation/view/ (part one to four)

Week 12 (Textual Communication)

Bonk, C. (2009). Learning at your service. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 327-354). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Schnotz, W., & Bannert, M. (2003). Construction and interference in learning from multiple representation. *Learning and Instruction, 13*(2), 141-156.
Lapadat, J. (2002). Written interaction: A key component in online learning. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 7*(4).
Sins, P., Savelsbergh, E., Joolingen, W., & Hout-Wolters, B. (2010). Effects of face-to-face versus chat communication on performance in a collaborative inquiry modeling task. *Computers & Education*, *56*(2), 379-387.
Rushkoff, D. (2008). Digital nation: Life on the virtual frontier [PBS video]. Retrieved from: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/digitalnation/view/ (part five to nine)

Week 13 (Mobile Learning)

Bonk, C. (2009). The treasures and traps of this open learning world. In C. Bonk, *The world is open: How web technology is revolutionizing education* (pp. 355-408). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.
Kumar, A., Tewari, A., Shroff, G., Chittamuru, D., Kam, M., & Canny, J. (2010). An exploratory study of unsupervised mobile learning in rural India. *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 743-752). New York, NY: ACM Press.
Librero, F., Ramos, A. J., Ranga, A., Triñona, J., & Lambert, D. (2007). Uses of the cell phone for education in the Philippines and Mongolia. *Distance Education*, *28*(2), 231-244.
Thornton, P., & Houser, C. (2005). Using mobile phones in English education in Japan. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *21*(3), 217-228.
Bonk, C. (2006). Low risk, low cost, low time activities and frameworks for utilizing technology [YouTube]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cpG2nis0gJk
Bonk, C. (2006). Low risk, low cost, low time activities and frameworks for utilizing technology [YouTube]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7THiwLwCSJc

Week 14 (Reflection)

Reflection paper due