

# Blended Learning for Lifelong Learners in a Multicampus Context (MuLLLti)

*Blieck, Y., de Jong, M. and Vandeput, L. Leuven University College, Belgium*

*Blended Learning seems a promising concept for higher education institutions (HEI). The expectations of all stakeholders: students, lecturers and management are high. To meet these expectations Blended Learning should, unlike e-learning, not mainly focus on the technological component. It should be considered as a vehicle to evolve from a transmission model to a student centered model focused on active learning. For, successful Blended Learning environments facilitate active learning, works with authentic learning tasks that are linked to real life and work contexts and are student centered. Especially lifelong learners can benefit from Blended education in HEI. Technology can not only facilitate access to education but has the potential to provide them with tailor made instruction. Blended Learning, however, raises several new challenges for institutions.*

## 1. Blended Learning

### 1.1. What is Blended Learning?

Blended Learning, also referred to as Hybrid Learning and Technology Enhanced Learning, means different things to different people (Picciano, 2007). Based on literature review, Poon et al. (2010) found a variety of definitions (e.g. Singh, 2003; Driscoll, 2002; Collins and Blake, 2007), but no consensus for an unambiguous definition. Nevertheless, the term 'Blended Learning' is increasingly used to refer to a combination of face-to-face learning experiences and on-line learning experiences (Picciano, 2007; Poon et al., 2010). Defined in this way Oliver and Trigwell (2005) state the term describes an instructional approach rather than a learning approach, and thus conclude that the term 'Blended Learning' is misleading (Oliver en Trigwell (2005) in Poon et al. (2010)). Sloman also warns of the danger to define Blended Learning in this narrow way (Sloman (2007) in Poon et al. (2010)). He argues that Blended Learning should not simply be considered in terms of delivery and technology and comments that:

*“if the term Blended Learning is to have longevity in our trainer vocabulary we must extend its use beyond technology. It must be as much about varying learning methodology as it is about training delivery. We must understand more about what motivates learners, what support they need and how these supportive interventions can take place in practice. Only with this understanding can we get the 'blend' right “(Sloman, 2007: p.315).*

Vandeput et al. (2011) propose a pragmatic definition of Blended Learning: “a good blend is a mix of study materials, work forms and learning activities that contribute to the realization of the objectives, which motivate and challenge the students to show the best of themselves.”(Vandeput, 2011: p.1.11). This approach implies that certain Blends are

desirable for specific groups of students. The success of the Blend may be largely determined by the degree to which it meets the specific needs of the targeted group.

## **1.2. Blended Learning: Necessity or Hype?**

One might ask what considerations are being given to design Blended Learning environments: What are the advantages; to what questions does it offer a possible answer (Shea, 2007)?

Through Blended Learning an institution has the ability to **increase accessibility** to its education for students (Shea, 2007; Poon et al., 2010). If contact hours, or 'class'-time, be replaced by 'on-line'-time an institution makes two changes that increase accessibility (Shea, 2007). On the one hand, presence (classroom time) is no longer bound to fixed time and location. This allows students to give priority to commitments that are more time-and space-bound and are imposed from professional and/or family context. It facilitates the combination of study and work/family life for students (Shea, 2007; Poon et al., 2010). In addition, for students who face a timely transfer to the educational institution Blended Learning offers a solution because costly travel time can be avoided (Poon et al., 2010). Secondly, replacing 'classroom time' by 'on-line' time results in a lower occupancy of the infrastructure. Assuming that an institution offers sufficient Blended courses, capacity will increase significantly to serve additional students. Moreover the more Blended Courses an institution offers, the more accessible the program will be for students. The condition is, however, that also sufficient human capacity and technical support is provided:

*“Given enough Blended courses, it has been documented that an institution may significantly increase capacity to serve additional students, assuming the availability of human and physical resources (i.e. willing faculty, technical and pedagogical support, technical capacity to offer Blended Learning, leadership to support and sustain it in a rational manner.” (Shea, 2007, p19)*

Shea (2007) states thus that there is a need to shift investment and energy to the virtual infrastructure and to the development and sustenance of a culture of innovation.

Graham and Robinson (2007) point to the fact that Technology can act as catalyst to **transform** traditional approaches of **instruction and teaching**. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) are oftend cited to point to the potential of Blended Learning has to transform instruction in higher education (Graham & Robison, 2007; Poon et al., 2010). Blended Learning gives education providers the opportunity to redefine the education they offer. And, to evolve from a transmission model to a student centered model focused on active learning (Graham & Robison, 2007). Based on literature review Poon et al. (2010) report several advantages: the ability to foster a professional learning community, ensuring social cohesion between students; improving learning outcomes and the skill of critical thinking (Twigg, 2003b in Poon, et al. (2010)); student satisfaction is higher in Blended pathways compared to only face-to-face education ((Dziuban et al., 2006; Owston et al. 2008; Twigg, 2003a) in Poon et al. (2010)).

Finally, Blended Learning also allows to, over time, enhance **cost and resource effectiveness**. Costs are cut because developed materials can be reused, contact time is reduced for the benefit of on-line time (Twigg, 2003b in Poon e.a, 2010). And, assuming that an institution offers sufficient blended courses, capacity will increase significantly to serve additional students. Different authors warn, however, that cost savings should not be the major reason to consider implementation of Blended Learning. Improved learning outcomes

should remain the reason to consider it (Mitchell and Honore, 2007; Trasler, 2002 in Poon et al. (2010)).

### **1.3. Hurdles to reach transforming Blends**

Graham and Robison (2007) report that a lot of literature exists on the potential for technology to act as a catalyst in the transformation of traditional approaches to teaching (Reigeluth and Joseph, 2002; West & Graham, 2005). Graham (2005) noticed that some blends seemed to transform instruction while others seemed to enhance existing educational practices (Bonk & Graham, 2005). But, on the other hand, technological innovations have had little impact on transforming educational practices (Graham and Robison, 2007). They define different types of Blends based on the question: 'what learner activity does the technology allow that would be difficult or impossible without the use of the technology?' If the Blend is implemented to increase access and convenience for students it is an **enabling Blend**. If the Blend aims to increase instructor or student productivity it is an **enhancing Blend**. If the Blend aims at improving pedagogy by moving from an information transmission model towards a more active learning pedagogy it is a **transforming Blend**. In detecting transforming blends. According to the authors a blend improves pedagogy, and is thus a transforming blend, if it incorporates one or more of the four fundamental characteristics of effective learning environments put forward by Roschelle et al. (2000): (1) active engagement, (2) participation in groups, (3) frequent interaction and feedback, and (4) connections to real world contexts.

Graham and Robison (2007) found three hurdles to reach the full potential of Blended Learning in education. A first barrier is 'the proliferation of superficial Blends', those Blends are not adding anything significant to the instruction. The risk lies in the fact that not enough time and costs are deployed. It can result in discouragement within faculty and undermine the willingness to explore Blended Learning further. A second stumbling block is 'a focus on the scope of a Blend'. Sometimes, when designing a Blended Learning environment, the focus lies on the scope of the Blend (e.g. 25% online and 75 face-to-face; or a reduction of x% of class time). Whereas the purpose of the Blend (improved convenience or access, increased productivity or improved pedagogy) and nature of the Blend (how the Blend is being used in an educational context) are far more important considerations. A final stumbling block is that efficiency and productivity are given too much consideration at the expense of the goal of effective pedagogy. Graham and Robison (2007) state that technology should be used exclusively to increase productivity if this in turn frees up time and energy for the faculty or students to dedicate to more active and innovative face-to-face experiences. The question if Blended Learning environments will achieve to transform higher education remains unanswered. It is however clear to Graham and Robison (2007) that faculty should be made aware of the transformational potential of Blended Learning.

## **2. Lifelong Learners and their Needs: Increased Access and Tailor made Instruction**

Blended Learning is a promising concept for higher education. It can be promising to provide education for lifelong learners. In this part we provide a definition of lifelong learning. Also, the increased demand for lifelong learning in society and participation rate of lifelong learners in higher education will be addressed. Finally, we will attempt to make up a profile of lifelong learners.

### **2.1. Lifelong Learning**

Boeren and Nicaise (2009) endorse the statement of English (2005) that lifelong learning is a vague concept that gives rise to different interpretations. They choose to describe lifelong learning as: the extra learning activities that people undertake the end of the initial learning career. This definition includes for Boeren and Nicaise (2009) three forms of learning which are documented in literature: (a) the formal learning that takes place in institutionalized contexts such as schools and training institutions. After successful completion of this training the participant receives a certificate or diploma; (b) Non-formal learning that takes place in an institutionalized context but for which no diplomas are awarded; (c) informal learning that takes place spontaneously in everyday life and often occasionally and non-intentionally.

However, lifelong learning is not just a simple summing up or integration of traditional education programmes and modern learning opportunities. The lifelong learning approach includes fundamental differences in educational content and perspectives: while traditional educational institutions have been primarily concerned with transmitting knowledge, modern learning opportunities and the lifelong learning approach put emphasis on the development of individual capabilities and personal learning competencies. At the heart of the lifelong learning concept is the idea of enabling and encouraging people 'to learn how to learn' (CEC, 2002). Lifelong learning focuses on the development of individual capabilities and the personal capacity to learn; it implies a shift from traditional education institutions to a diverse field of traditional and modern learning opportunities that are more process and outcome oriented and have a modular structure; responsibility for education and learning shifts to the individuals' themselves (Badescu and Saisana, 2009).

### **2.2. Increasing Demand for Lifelong Learning and Participation Rate in Higher Education**

Our society is characterized by an increasing demand for lifelong learning (Couttenier, 2007; Brown et al., 2007), several causes illustrate this: our rapidly changing knowledge society demands a growing need for retaining knowledge and skills through education; an initial diploma quickly loses value by the erosion of knowledge; a diploma no longer offers lifelong guarantee for proper functioning in the labour market, but is rather a start qualification (Baert, 2000 in Couttenier, 2007). Due to a shortage of human capital, because of aging in society, certain jobs fail to be filled in (De Lathouwer et al., 2006 in Couttenier, 2007). Due to this growing demand for continuing education various organisations have placed lifelong learning high on the agenda e.g. the Ministry of Education in Flanders (Belgium), UNESCO, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Vlaamse onderwijnsraad (VLOR), European Union (EU), World Bank and the International Labour Organization (ILO) (Couttenier, 2007). A key challenge for the EU in the upcoming period is to face the mismatch between skills levels and jobs requirements and the opening up of flexible learning pathways to ensure that the work population gets up skilled. Higher Educational Institutes (HEI's) are encouraged to reform themselves in order to adapt their learning provision. The

2012 Annual Growth Survey stresses that education and training systems have to be modernized to reinforce their efficiency and quality and to equip people with the skills and competences they need to succeed on the labour market (Fillex consortium, 2012).

Higher Educational Institutes play an important role in implementing the strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020). The first strategic objective in ET 2020 “Making lifelong learning and mobility a reality”, for example, not only calls for “a lifelong approach to learning and for education and training systems which are more responsive to change and more open to the wider world” but also for “the establishment of more flexible learning pathways — including better transitions between the various education and training sectors, greater openness towards non-formal and informal learning, and increased transparency and recognition of learning outcomes. In order to do this, HEI’s need to be open for cooperation on all levels; with national government, with other HEI’s and other educational levels (VET) and with social partners, particularly employers.

Different bodies have stressed the importance of lifelong learning in our society. However, effective participation of adults in various forms of lifelong learning Belgium remains low (De Rick, 2003 in Couttenier, 2007; Boeren & Nicaise, 2009). Table 1 below outlines key statistics in relation to education and training in Belgium<sup>1</sup>: adult participation in Belgium for lifelong learning was 6.8% in 2008, the EU average at that moment was 9.5%. Belgium is one of the few countries in the European Union where participation rates in lifelong learning have declined significantly in the last few years (Fillex consortium, 2012).

**Table 1: Key statistics in relation to education and training in Belgium (Fillex consortium, 2012).**

	Belgium		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
<b>Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)</b>	13.8%	12.0%	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
<b>Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)</b>	35.2%	42.9%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
<b>Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)</b>	8.6% <sup>2</sup>	6.8%	8.5%	9.5%	12.5%	15%
<b>Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)</b>	6.0% <sup>3</sup>	6.0%	4.91%	5.05% <sup>4</sup>	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

<sup>1</sup> Please note that levels of Participation in Lifelong Learning are measured at European level through the Labour Force Survey and breakdown of performance among the three communities in Belgium is not given.

<sup>2</sup> = 2004

<sup>3</sup> = 2001

<sup>4</sup> = 2006

### **2.3. Life Long Learners in Higher Education: who are they?**

We refer to lifelong learners here as students in formal HEI's who often combine work and study. It is difficult to draw up a clear profile of students with a job in Flanders because of differences in background and motivation (Couttenier, 2007). There is a large variation in age (basically from 18y to 65y). Students with a job are often very motivated and strongly interested. But, the origin of their motivation can be quite different. Generation students often study to obtain a diploma or to refresh their knowledge while older students with a job study more out of interest. Furthermore, there is a big difference in workload. Certain students with a job have full-time jobs while others take a career break. Some have children, others don't. Some have no diploma of secondary education while others already have a master's degree. Usually they have to finance their studies themselves and therefore realize what they have to lose. They are, because of their higher age, often more self-confident than generation students. Because they also have other social roles, they organize their study more strategically. Time management is essential to succeed (Couttenier, 2007). Unlike some generation students they focus primarily on studying rather than on other e.g. social activities. Their professional experience leads them to approach learning content in a more critical and in a more practical way (Van de Mosselaer et al., 2006 in Couttenier, 2007). Rates for study-success are often higher among students with a job (Hartley and Trueman, 2003 in Couttenier, 2007).

However, students with a job also face problems. Participation in higher education is often 'an assault on the identity' (Couttenier, 2007). For some, it is a challenging experience. The problems situate themselves at an economic, educational and/or social level. Firstly, the financial situation is crucial, for students who are responsible for direct costs (e.g. tuition fees and study material) and indirect costs (e.g. childcare and reduction of working hours). On an educational level they are sometimes confronted with courses that seem irrelevant or contradict their own professional experiences. Courses can also be very theoretical with little practical examples from the working atmosphere. Furthermore, inconveniences can occur due to the limited opening hours of administrative services and libraries. Especially older students can be faced with a lack of ICT knowledge. Students with a job often have little time for tasks and group assignments. Pride may sometimes prevent students from searching for help e.g. in connection with study choice, learning skills. Thirdly, the combination of work, studying and family and social life can be very challenging. Lack of time can lead to drop out, social isolation or relation and health problems (Bowl, 2003 in Couttenier, 2007). Students with a job are forced to cope with new and changing roles which is a stress factor (Goodman et al., 2006 in Couttenier, 2007) Also relationships with friends and family change due to studying. Shown support by friends and family might be less than expected or entirely missing.

These findings are supported by a recent survey of working students in professional higher education in 8 European countries (FLLLEX 2012): The students are (rather) satisfied with the personal contact with students (90%) and teachers (81%) as well as with the professional knowledge of the teachers (80%). However, the respondents would like to have more flexibility when job-related requirements increase, as well as timetable adaptations for employed students (40% each).

### **2.4. Blended Learning, Life Long Learners and Multicampus Education**

By offering Blended Learning courses, HEI's could contribute to a solution to the above mentioned problems that part-time (working) adult students face when participating in formal

higher education. If less presence (classroom time) is required of students and if this is no longer bound to fixed time and location it allows them to better combine their study with other commitments which are imposed by a professional and/or family context. Blended Learning for this target group is consequently aimed to more flexibility for students in planning their learning activities. This increase of flexibility may cut drop-out rates and provide better accessibility to higher education for non-traditional students.

It is important to stress however that Blended Learning can only be successful if sufficient Blended courses are offered in an institution and when the learning environment is designed to meet educational and/or social needs of lifelong learners., as reflected in the broader definition of Blended Learning: *a good blend is a mix of study materials, work forms and learning activities that contribute to the realization of the objectives, which motivate and challenge the students to show the best of themselves.*"(Vandeput, 2011: p.1.11). This description implies a full blown re-design of the learning environment.

However, designing such a tailor-made Blended Learning environment involves a lot of effort (know-how as well as time and costs) for the HEI. Given the low participation rates of lifelong learners in higher education in Flanders, it is unlikely institutions will consider redesigning any, if enough, courses to increase accessibility for lifelong learners. *Multicampus education*, an important spearhead of KU Leuven Association policy, might provide an answer to his. Institutions can choose to combine resources (staff and infrastructure) to design tailor made learning environments for lifelong learners. Several institutions could through collaboration provide entire curricula for lifelong learners. This cooperation can be both national and international, since the e-learning part of Blended Learning accounts for distance education.

Joint development of Blended Learning in a multicampus context will not only cut costs but may provide valuable good practices across institutions and strengthen partnerships. This is in line with the EU-policies on lifelong learning (e.g. as proposed in the Erasmus for all programme - <http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all>) that explicitly call for .." *Institutional cooperation between educational institutions, youth organisations, businesses, local and regional authorities and NGOs, to encourage the development and implementation of innovative practices in education, training and youth activities, and to promote employability, creativity and entrepreneurship.*" (<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/818&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>)

Multicampus education within KU Leuven Association is defined as 'education that is designed, offered, supported and/or assessed between two or more geographical sites'.

### **3. Some implications for Blended Learning for Lifelong Learners in a Multicampus Context**

Considering implementation of Blended Learning has a lot of implications for lecturers and institutions. Covering all falls beyond the scope of this article, we would, however, like to highlight three implications of Blended Learning in a multicampus context: new teaching roles for lecturers, open educational resources (OER) and the issue of quality control.

### 3.1. New teaching roles for lecturers

Kaleta, Skibba & Joosten (2007) indicate that implementing Blended Learning has implications for the role of the lecturer. They interviewed lecturers who implemented a Blended Course in their learning environment and asked if this changed their role compared to the role they had in a traditional learning environment (classroom context). The responses fall within the developed framework of Bergé (1995). Table 2 gives an overview of the changing roles based on that framework. Teachers will not only be forced to fulfill new roles, the roles they will have to perform will also vary as one progresses through the courses. New teaching roles imply that institutions should adapt job profiles accordingly.

In a multicampus context it is important to determine to what extent you will create or achieve collaboration: e.g. will lecturers combine efforts only to design courses? And, will the developed course be implemented in each of the collaborating institutions or will they organize and manage the implemented courses in a joint effort.

**Table 2: Overview of the different roles for lecturers in a Blended Learning environment (Kaleta, Skibba & Joosten (2007), based on Berge (1995))**

<b>lecturers roles in a Blended Learning environment</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Components</b>
<b>Pedagogical</b>	Course design and teaching	Design the course structure, create learning activities, integrate face to face and online activities, facilitate discussion, provide content and resources, offer guidance and constructive criticism, ask questions, conduct assessments
<b>Social</b>	Develop a collaborative community of learners	Personalize communication, provide timely feedback, build a climate of trust, provide confidentiality guidelines, display empathy, humanize instructor-student and student-student interactions, use humor
<b>Managerial</b>	Oversee course structure and coordinate tasks	Schedule activities and class meetings, set due dates, coordinate assignments, assign group and student roles, present clear expectations and instructions, manage grading, and clarify course policies
<b>Technological</b>	Manage and support course technology	Utilize a course management system to organize course content and learning activities, assist students with technology issues, orient students to course technology



### 3.2. Copyright, Creative Commons and Open Educational Resources<sup>5</sup>

The growing demand for higher education and the on-going rollout of ICT infrastructure have created unique challenges and possibilities for HEI's in an era of tight resources. It has become increasingly important for educational institutions to support, in a planned and systematic manner:

- development and improvement of curricula and learning materials;
- on-going programme and course design;
- organisation of interactive contact sessions with and among students;
- development of quality teaching and learning materials;
- design of effective assessment tools for diverse environments; and
- links with the world of work.

Open educational resources can make a significant contribution to these processes. Open educational resources (OER) are materials used to support education that may be freely accessed, reused, modified and shared. When HEI's decide to cooperate in designing learning environments, copyright issues are likely to emerge: e.g. who will hold intellectual rights over developed courses, who will be allowed to adapt course materials. Open licences have emerged in an effort to protect authors' rights in environments where content (particularly when digitised) can easily be copied and shared without permission. Open licences seek to ensure that copying and sharing happen within a structured legal framework that is more flexible than the automatic all-rights-reserved status of copyright. They allow permissions to be given accurately, while releasing the restrictions of traditional copyright. OER are part of this process. They allow for more flexibility in the use, reuse and adaptation of materials for local contexts and learning environments, while allowing authors, and institutions, to have their work acknowledged.

However, OER do not automatically lead to quality, efficiency and cost-effectiveness; much depends on the procedures put in place. The transformative educational potential of OER depends on:

1. improving the quality of learning materials through peer review processes;
2. reaping the benefits of contextualisation, personalisation and localisation;
3. emphasising openness and quality improvement;
4. Building capacity for the creation and use of OER as part of the professional development of academic staff;
5. serving the needs of particular student populations such as those with special needs;
6. optimising the deployment of institutional staff and budgets;
7. serving students in local languages;
8. involving students in the selection and adaptation of OER in order to engage them more actively in the learning process; and
9. using locally developed materials with due acknowledgement.

The transformative potential of OER also includes the benefits of sharing and collaborating among institutions and countries, and the creatively disruptive role of OER in opening up new educational models.

---

<sup>5</sup> This part is a derivative of "Guidelines for Open Educational Resources (OER) in Higher Education" by Commonwealth of Learning (COL) (2011) [http://www.col.org/PublicationDocuments/Guidelines\\_OER\\_HE.pdf](http://www.col.org/PublicationDocuments/Guidelines_OER_HE.pdf) CC-BY-SA (share alike with attribution) <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0>

### **3.3. Quality Control**

Blended Learning can be considered for several reasons: increasing accessibility, cost effectiveness and improved pedagogy. Shea (2007) stresses that if the quality of education after implementation is not equivalent, or better, than the quality before all efforts have been in vain. The Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C) aims to support organisations in their effort to continually improve the quality of the education provided. To achieve this a framework that can be taken as a starting point to look at Blended Learning environments was elaborated (Moore, 2005). It can be used by HEI's or quality assurance and quality improvement. The system is based on five pillars of quality: (1) learning effectiveness, (2) student satisfaction, (3) faculty satisfaction, (4) Access, and (5) cost-effectiveness and institutional commitment. Institutions are challenged to choose what indicators can be used and how they can be measured for purposes of quality control of the provided education.

### **4. Summary and Conclusion**

It seems that research has been unable to provide a sound and widely accepted definition of Blended Learning. Nevertheless the term 'Blended Learning' is increasingly used to refer to a combination of face-to-face learning experiences and on-line learning. Defined this way the term describes an instructional approach rather than a learning approach and is seen primarily to facilitate access to education. Technology should not merely be seen as a tool for accessing and disseminating information. Nor should it be considered just for cost and resource effectiveness purposes. Technology should be used to allow learning experiences that would be difficult or impossible without the use of technology. Only then can Blended Learning reach its full potential to transform education and evolve from a transmission based model towards a more active learning pedagogy. Faculty should be made aware of the transformational potential of Blended Learning and to view technology not merely as a tool for accessing and disseminating information.

Changes in our society have increased demand for lifelong learning. Blended Learning seems promising to meet the needs (educational, economic and social) of (adult) lifelong learners. By implementing sufficient Blended Learning courses institutions can enhance access to education. Moreover institutions can enhance cost and resource effectiveness. However, technology should be used exclusively to increase productivity if it in turn frees up time and energy for faculty or students to dedicate to more active and innovative face-to-face experiences.

Within the MuLLLi-project (Multicampus education for lifelong learners) a framework will be developed to redesign existing courses into appropriate blends to meet the needs of lifelong learners and the current vision on learning. Blended Learning will only be truly successful if it aims at improving pedagogy by moving from an information transmission model towards a pedagogy tailored to meet the needs of (lifelong) learners. Hence, it should meet the fundamental characteristics of effective learning environments: (1) active engagement, (2) participation in groups, (3) frequent interaction and feedback, and (4) connections to real world contexts.

Participation rates for lifelong learners are low in Belgium and Flanders. It is therefore unlikely that HEI's will be able to redesign any, if enough, courses to increase accessibility for lifelong learners. Multicampus education can provide an answer to this. In a multicampus approach for Blended Learning design, HEI's cooperate and combine resources to design tailor made courses or even provide entire curricula for lifelong learners.

Within MuLLLTi four institutions of higher education will join resources. Three departments will be involved: Business Management, Social Work and Teacher Education. Teaching staff within each of these departments from will collaborate to redesign three courses into blends for lifelong learners.

Beside the advantages of multicampus education, HEI's will also face new challenges, three of them are highlighted in this article: the changing roles in teaching for lecturers, the need for creative commons and open educational resources to solve copyright issues and ways of quality control of the implemented Blend. Each of these challenges will have to be addressed within MuLLLTi.

## References

Badescu, M. & Saisana, M. (2009). *Participation in lifelong learning in Europe: What can be measured and compared*. JRC Scientific and Technical Reports 23511 and [http://composite-indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Document/Badescu\\_Saisana\\_EUR23511.pdf](http://composite-indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Document/Badescu_Saisana_EUR23511.pdf)

Baert, H., Kusters, W., Scheeren, J. & Van Damme, D. (2000). *Voorstellen voor een samenhangend en doortastend beleid van levenslang leren in Vlaanderen*. K.U. Leuven, Centrum Sociale Pedagogiek Leuven; R.U. Gent.

Bergé, Z. L. (1995). Facilitating computer conferencing: Recommendations from the field. *Educational Technology*, 35(1), pp.22-30.

Boeren, E. & Nicaise, I. (2009). Onderwijs voor volwassenen: wie neemt deel en waarom? in L. Vanderleyden, M. Callens & J. Noppe (red.), *De Sociale Staat van Vlaanderen 2009*, pp. 315-333. Brussel: Studiedienst van de Vlaamse regering 466 p., ISBN 9789018179106 publicatienr. 1277

Bonk, C. J. & Graham, C. R. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs*, Pfeiffer, San Francisco.

Bowl, M. (2003). *Non-Traditional Entrants to Higher Education: "They Talk About People Like Me"*. England, Trentham Books

Brown, G., Smith, T., & Henderson, T. (2007). Student Perceptions of Assessment Efficacy in Online & Blended Learning Classes. In A. Picciano, & C. Dziuban, (EDs.) *Blended Learning: Research Perspectives* (pp.145-161). United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Commission of the European Communities (CEC) (2009). *Commission Staff Working Document: Progress towards the Lisbon Objectives in Education and Training: Indicators and Benchmarks 2009*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/report09/report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/report09/report_en.pdf)

Collins, K. & Blake, R. M. (2007). Blended Learning: Embracing Individualism. *Chief Learning Officer*, 6(2), pp.32-37.

Commission of the European Communities (CEC) (2000). *A Memorandum of Lifelong learning*, Commission Staff working paper (SEC 2000 1832, 30.10.00). Brussels: CE

Commonwealth of Learning (COL) (2011). Guidelines for Open Educational Resources (OER) in Higher Education.

[http://www.col.org/PublicationDocuments/Guidelines\\_OER\\_HE.pdf](http://www.col.org/PublicationDocuments/Guidelines_OER_HE.pdf) CC-BY-SA (share alike with attribution) <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0>

Couttenier, M. (2007). OOP Project Niet-traditionele studenten in het onderwijs: Tussentijds rapport Hoofdstuk 8: Werkstudenten. KU Leuven.

De Lathouwer, L., Cantillon, B., Augustyns, M. & Dillen, H. (2006). Levenslang leren en de terugkeer van volwassenen naar het hoger onderwijs. Een exploratieve studie. Antwerpen: Centrum voor Sociaal Beleid Herman Deleeck, Universiteit Antwerpen.

De Rick, K., Van Valckenborgh, K. & Baert, H. (2003). Naar een positiever leerklimaat in Vlaanderen. onderzoek in opdracht van de Vlaamse minister van Werkgelegenheid en Toerisme, in het kader van het VIONA-onderzoeksprogramma

Driscoll, M. (2002). Blended Learning: Let's get beyond the hype. LTI Newline: Learning and Training Innovation. Retrieved on 14th December 2009 from <http://www.ltinewline.com/ltimagazine/article/articleDetail.jsp?id=11755>

Dziuban, C., Hartman, J., Juge, F., Moskal, P. & Sorg, S. (2006). Blended Learning enters the mainstream. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.) Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs, Pfeiffer, San Francisco, pp.195-206.

English, L. (2005). International encyclopedia of adult education. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Flllex consortium (2012). *FLLLEX: Towards an institutional strategy for lifelong long learning in professional higher education (in press)*.

Goodman, J., Schlossberg, N., Anderson, M. (2006). Counseling Adults in Transition: Linking Practice With Theory. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Garrison, R. & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended Learning: Uncovering it's transformative potential in higher education. The internet and higher education. 7(2), pp.95-105.

Graham, C. R. (2005). Blended Learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.) The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs, Pfeiffer, San Francisco, pp.3-21.

Graham, C. & Robison, R. (2007). Realizing the Transformational Potential of Blended Learning. In A. Picciano, & C. Dziuban, (EDs.) Blended Learning: Research Perspectives (pp.83-111). United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Hartley, J. & Trueman, M. (2003). 'What's the Bottom Line? How well do Mature Students do at University?' In P. Sutherland (Ed.) (2003). Adult Learning: a reader. Great Britain: Clays, LTD (London).

Kaleta, R., Skibba, K., & Joosten, T. (2007). Discovering, Designing and Delivering Hybrid Courses. In A. Picciano, & C. Dziuban, (EDs.) Blended Learning: Research Perspectives (pp.111-145). United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Moore, J. C. (2005). The Sloan Consortium Quality Framework and the Five Pillars. United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Mitchell, A. & Honore, S. (2007). Criteria for successful Blended Learning. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(3), pp.143-149.

Owston, R., Wideman, H., Murphy, J. & Lupsheyuk, D. (2008). Blended teacher professional development: A synthesis of three program evaluations. *Internet and Higher Education*, 11, pp.201- 210.

Picciano, A. (2007). Introduction. In A. Picciano, & C. Dziuban, (EDs.) Blended Learning: Research Perspectives (pp.5-19). United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Poon, J., Royston, P. & Fuchs, W. (2010). Examination of the Critical Factors for Developing a Successful Blended Learning Teaching Method for RICS and CIOB Accredited Courses. In: The Construction, Building and Real Estate Research Conference of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, Dauphine Université, Paris, 2-3 September 2010 ([www.rics.org/cobra](http://www.rics.org/cobra))

Reigeluth, C. M. & Joseph, R. (2002). Beyond technology integration: The case for technologic transformation. *Educational Technology*, 42(4), pp.9-13.

Roschelle, J. M., Pea, R. D., Hoadley, C. M., Gordin, D. N. & Means, B. (2000). Changing how and what children learn in school with computer-based technologies. *Children and computer technology*, 10(2), 76-101.

Shea, P. (2007). Towards a Conceptual Framework for Learning in Blended Environments. In A. Picciano, & C. Dziuban, (EDs.) Blended Learning: Research Perspectives (pp.19-37). United States of America: the Sloan Consortium.

Singh, H. (2003). Building effective Blended Learning programs. *Educational Technology*, 43(6), pp. 51-54.

Sloman, M. (2007). Making sense of Blended Learning. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(6), pp.315-318.

Trasler, J. (2002). Effective learning depends on the blend. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(5), pp.191-193.

Twigg, C. A. (2003a). Improving learning and reducing costs: New models for online learning. *EDUCAUSE Review*, September/ October, pp. 28-38.

Twigg, C. A. (2003b). Improving Learning and Reducing Costs: Lessons Learnt from Round 1 of Pew Grant Program in Course Redesign. New York, The National Centre for Academic Transformation.

Van de Mosselaer, H., Van Petegem, P., Donche, V. & Ottoy, W. (2006). *Welke eerstejaars doen het beter? Instroom-Doorstroom-Uitstroomproject (IDU) van Plantijnhogeschool - In: Delta: tijdschrift voor hoger onderwijs*, 11(2006), p. 37-44.

Vandeput, L., Tambuyser, L. & De Gruyter, J. (2011). Van e-learning naar geïntegreerd Blended Learning. Leuven: KHLeuven, Kernproject ENW-School of Education.

West, R. E. & Graham, C. R. (2005). Five powerful ways technology can enhance teaching and learning in higher education. *Educational Technology*, 45(3), pp. 20-27.

### About the authors

**Yves Blieck (University College Leuven):** holds a masters degree in Psychology and a degree in Teacher Education KU Leuven. He is working part-time at Leuven University College (Education and innovation) as project assistant on the MuLLLti-project. And he is working as Teacher Educator at KU Leuven and CVO De Oranjerie. e-mail: [yves.blieck@khleuven.be](mailto:yves.blieck@khleuven.be)

**Margriet de Jong (University College Leuven):** holds a masters degree in Applied Educational Sciences (University Twente). She is working at Leuven University College (Education and innovation) as project assistant on the FLLLex-project. e-mail: [margriet.dejong@khleuven.be](mailto:margriet.dejong@khleuven.be)

**Luc Vandeput (University College Leuven and KU Leuven):** holds a masters degree in Educational Sciences (KU Leuven) and is working as a staff member at Leuven University College (Education and innovation). He is coordinator of MuLLLti. e-mail: [luc.vandeput@khleuven.be](mailto:luc.vandeput@khleuven.be)



Any part of this document may be reproduced without permission but with attribution to the authors.

Except otherwise noted, this report is © 2012 MuLLLti (Blieck, De Jong and Vandeput) under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.

---