THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
**Technology**

April 29, 2013

# Why Some Colleges Are Saying No to MOOC Deals, at Least for Now

By Steve Kolowich

Amherst College, known for its selectivity, is accustomed to sending rejection notices. But when the liberal-arts beacon this month turned down an invitation to join the exclusive partnership of colleges offering massive open online courses through edX, it nonetheless drew surprise from many corners of academe.

Colleges have clamored to be part of the high-profile consortiums run by edX, a Cambridge-based nonprofit, and Coursera, a Bay Area start-up—often with little input from faculty members. The pace of adoption has shocked even the founders of the MOOC platforms, who are veterans of a higher-education sector notorious for its tortoiselike reflexes.

But Amherst's rejection of edX, decided by a faculty vote, could mark a new chapter for MOOCs—one in which colleges revert to their default modes of deliberations and caution. "I think we're at the early stages of that honeymoon period coming to an end," says Richard Garrett, vice president and principal analyst of the consulting company Eduventures.

If MOOCs portend a "tsunami" of change in higher education, as observers have said, then many colleges have been willingly swept in by the undertow. In less than two years, massive online courses have grown from side projects of a few techie professors into companies fueled by tens of millions in venture capital funds and the imaginations of the entire education industry. For universities worldwide, membership in edX or Coursera has become the hottest ticket in town.

The nonprofit edX, founded last year by Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has been particularly careful about whom it lets in the door; it has 12 institutional partners but has received inquiries about membership from more than 300 colleges, according to Dan O'Connell, a spokesman. Meanwhile, Coursera has gotten so many inquiries that Daphne Koller, a co-founder, says she has lost track.

"For a while it really felt like a rocket ship, with folks desperate not to be left behind," says Peter Stokes, executive director of postsecondary innovation at Northeastern University's College of Professional Studies.

"I think that phase has passed, and the folks who are starting to do the work are starting to realize that these efforts ... have real costs for the institution," says Mr. Stokes. "And I think that's creating a little bit more sobriety about how folks view the opportunity."

Offering MOOCs through edX is hardly free. There are options available to institutions that want to build their own courses on the edX platform at no charge, but for partners who want help developing their courses, edX charges a base rate of $250,000 per course, then $50,000 for each additional time that course is offered; edX also takes a cut of any revenue the course generates.

There are also significant labor costs that come with offering MOOCs. A recent Chronicle survey found that professors typically spent 100 hours, sometimes much more, to develop their massive online courses, and then eight to 10 hours each week while the courses were in session. This commitment amounted to a major drain on their normal campus responsibilities.

Those known costs, combined with uncertainty about whether the MOOCs will make enough money for colleges to recover their investments, might be enough to deter some institutions, says R. Michael Tanner, a vice president and chief academic officer at the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities—especially public universities that are facing budget cuts.

In the debate at Amherst, which boasts a $1.64-billion endowment, money was no object, and the faculty committee devoted to weighing the pros and cons of joining edX did not seem worried about MOOCs as a distraction to teaching and service.

Rather, the committee cited a number of philosophical qualms. MOOCs run counter to Amherst's commitment to "learning through close colloquy"; they might "perpetuate the 'information dispensing' model of teaching."

On a larger scale, MOOCs might create a "new and different kind of competition" that could jeopardize more-vulnerable colleges, if not Amherst itself; they could "enable the centralization of American higher education" and "create the conditions for the obsolescence of the B.A. degree."

The committee also wondered if edX's need to bring in money to remain sustainable could lead it to do things the college would consider unsavory, like selling aggregated student data to outside companies, or putting too much emphasis on credentialing.

While joining edX might allow Amherst to fight those battles from within

the consortium, "there might, realistically, be little opportunity to shape the organization within due to the size and type of member institutions," the faculty committee wrote.

## On Their Own

In the end, the faculty vote was not close: 70 to 36 against joining edX, with five abstentions.

Tekla A. Harms, a professor of geology, was among those in favor of teaming up with edX. The risk to joining the MOOC parade was low, in her view, since the proposal limited Amherst's commitment to a trial period of four or five years. The risk to remaining on the sidelines is higher than the risks of joining up, says Ms. Harms. "If there's something at the forefront of education, Amherst College should be there," she says.

Stephen A. George, a professor of biology and neuroscience, led the call to stay out of edX. But it was not the idea of venturing into online education so much as the thought of joining a MOOC consortium that deterred him. "The fact that Amherst needed to join this organization—that really seemed most difficult to accept," says Mr. George.

The biology professor's motion, which was passed in the vote, proposed that Amherst explore online teaching technology outside the context of the major MOOC groups. New ways of teaching that include "flipped" classrooms and online videos—"that is within reach," says Mr. George, "and that is what we really want to do."

The way the edX debate unfolded at Amherst reflects a healthy change in the way a leading institution might approach the question of how to incorporate online education into its curriculum, says Mr. Garrett, of Eduventures. Knee-jerk rejections and bandwagon-jumping are two sides of the same coin, he says.

"They thought this through," says Mr. Garrett, "in a way that they wouldn't have a few years ago."

Showing 40 of 89 comments

Sort by Oldest first Follow comments: by e-mail by RSS

Real-time updating is paused. (Resume)

**archman** 1 week ago

"Knee-jerk rejections and bandwagon-jumping are two sides of the same coin, he says."

Wow, a university actually bucking the Fad Train. Well done.

48 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 1 week ago

This makes sense for Amhearst now because they've got to fight the trend. The longer they can muddy the waters and keep people believing in their high cost, high touch service, the longer the professors will keep their jobs. But the tide is coming in...

14 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

Ben O'Dell 1 week ago

Is there any reason to believe MOOCs will significantly lower the cost of higher education? If you consider the start-up costs listed here (up to $250K) and the fact that most courses will become dated in 3-5 years, I have a hard time seeing the savings.

47 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 1 week ago

Universities routinely invest $250k in startup costs for new professors. Why bother if they're going to be obsolete in a few years.

I'm sure the MOOCs know what they're doing. They're not going to invest $250k in something that will be obsolete so quickly. They'll either update it or milk it a bit. It's possible to do, you know.

2 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**jwr12** 1 week ago

By and large a false comparison. People update themselves, and in any case perform a whole range of functions $250K of canned video won't do for you. People thought Pets.Com knew what it was doing. The huge electronic baggage system at Denver airport was once the wave of the future. Bold talk does not a visionary make.

46 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

Have you looked at the salary given to a professor? $250k will buy you one year of a full professor and only about 2-3 years of an assistant. The video is going to last longer than that. Who cares if the professors can ":update" themselves? They're always looking for a sabbatical or weaseling some way to spend more time on their research.

5 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**jwr12** 6 days ago

I work at a big r1 university in a major humanities department. We have over 40 faculty. Not a single full professor earns above 200K, only one (that I can think of) earns more than 150K. Even if you then add in benefits, you're not going to get to 250K for even a single one of the full professors. And of course, most of the faculty are not full professors. In fact, most earn less than 100K. Usually healthily less, indeed, even if you include benefits.

The rest of your argument consists of ad hominem attacks and illogical ones. It of course makes a big difference that human beings renew themselves and create new knowledge, on which new teaching also depends.

Sounds like you've been too bitter about something for too long to have a fair view.

86 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

Sounds like you're a typical R1 tenured hack who can't add when it serves your wallet. The salary is just the beginning of the game. How big is your office? Do you get secretarial support? And the benefits are often much richer than you or the IRS realize. Health care alone is $20k-30k/year. Pension contributions can be surprisingly large. Fancy professors get deferred compensation and accelerated vesting. Many schools subsidize housing. Many hire spouses just to keep one of the two around. Some schools give free tuition to the kids of the professors-- a benefit that can be close to $200k alone for each of the kids. I could go on.

And really, how often do many of the videos in the humanities need to be updated? Does Jane Austen change that much every year? Or what about ancient Greece? Besides getting a bit more ancient every year, it's still the same old gods and temples. I submit that much of the "updating" that you celebrate is fluffing the pillows on the couch and occasionally rearranging the furniture.
What is strange is that people like you, arguing for your cushy position, slander the videos. It's very easy to update web content and even video lectures. Most of the best online courses I know are just collections of 5-15 minute snippets. It's easy to replace them as necessary. The fact is that $250k doesn't buy much from the living, breathing professors. Anyone who's tried to get them to teach a new class every so often knows just how devoted they are to "updating".

14 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**jwr12** 6 days ago

In very brief, to the substance: my office is about as small as one could have, and still meet with students (at about 8x12, it's probably three times as wide and twice as long as my eventual coffin). I do not have personal secretarial support; the department has administrators, who handle some copying and scanning for me, but most of both of those tasks are done by me, and most of the rest of what our staff does has to do with the mechanics of running a big program: schedules, book orders, classrooms, etc. I have health care, for which I pay a substantial monthly amount in employee contributions. Add all of this up, and the same for most of my colleagues, and you get nowhere near $150K, much

less $250k.

I won't base my judgements of higher ed as a whole based on the deals finagled by a handful at elite private institutions, which is what most of the rest of your argument is based on.

Speaking for my own discipline, I would say that history constantly changes in ways more profound than you imply. States end (the USSR or Apartheid South Africa for example), and their archives and secrets come into view; people also ask new questions (was same sex marriage practiced in the middle ages?; how widely did the Federalist papers circulate?). Unless we want to give up on the idea that we can learn new things about our selves, we need to invest in people, first.

57 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

So some new history is created each year. The history of the Korean War and before is relatively fixed. I'm sure that any video about such a time today will still be just as valuable in twenty years. Any of these great discoveries in archives-- really just PR events by schools desperate to justify those trips to the exotic European cities holding the archives-- can be boiled down to an errata sheet.

1 person liked this. LIKE REPLY

**Sam** 4 days ago

I am from a third world country who got an opportunity to study in a US university. I have done library research on the American university's history, especially the politics that kept this (now) amazing institution in the history of humanity--this power house of almost all inventions and discoveries, this mother of most modern knowledge-making, and I could go on--from developing as it should have after President Lincoln signed the Land Grant bill in 1862 until, yes, the "market" picked up interest in the university, around 1912. Then the American university soon grew exponentially. The second boom (which I studied less extensively) was the GI bill and its aftermath (especially open enrollment).
As someone from outside the US (based on how fascinated I was by the intellectual productivity of, yes, the English department at a not very prestigious public university in the south), when I read sjhvmdkx's arguments, I really wanted to cry. Sir/Madam, I don't want to offend you, but you miserably fail to appreciate the American university and its intellectuals as one of the few fundamentals that makes America what it is. You may be right that the economics of the university has to be seriously rethought (considering the rising cost of college to students, technological advancements that must be used in order to add or enhance/not replace what is best, etc). But your visible dislike of the professoriate, especially in the humanities, in my opinion, seems to invalidate much of your argument. Here's one reason why: Professors in the humanities and social science produce knowledge of society, art, history, humanity, culture,

technology, government, and many, many areas of knowledge that are fundamental to America as a superpower. If you only have doctors and scientists and engineers--or worse if you just have a few star professors teaching thousands of students in a financially viable but humanly isolated manners--you will throw the baby with the bathwater. Even as a graduate student who got 20k/year, I produced more knowledge, created more opportunities for professional development of fellow graduate students, taught and mentored more undergraduate students, and served more local communities than people in trade and business can even imagine as to what the "lazy" professors do in the university. Your description of professors sounded like 10% true and 90% hate-filled when I remember my professors, and while some of the tendencies you describe may be there in some professors, there is something about being "American" in university professors that you will only appreciate if you compare them with other societies. American professors have that deep, cultural desire to create new knowledge; even the tenure and promotion process rewards good teaching (students don't "evaluate" their teachers in most other societies in the world); and even the professors of art and music produce generations of new professionals who take the knowledge/understanding of those more abstract fields into more concrete professions. For example, people who return to my country with American graduate degrees in English go into diplomacy, international organizations, trade and business leadership, and most importantly serve as promoters of America's intellectual leadership to the world (as do those that stay in the US--even though most of them find opportunities within the academic discipline itself). If there are problems, they need to be solved. There's no use of demonizing people. This kind of talk can be dangerous.

35 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

"Does Jane Austen change that much every year? Or what about ancient
Greece? Besides getting a bit more ancient every year, it's still the same old gods and temples. I submit that much of the "updating" that you
celebrate is fluffing the pillows on the couch
and occasionally rearranging the furniture."

Is it so surprising that professors of ancient greek tragedy or philosophy don't want to relinquish control to people who view their subject-matter as "the same old gods and temples"? Your staggering anti-intellectualism is precisely why most
faculty are utterly suspicious of MOOCs and their MEd-wielding Silicon
Valley cheerleaders.

77 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

Ah the old "anti-intellectualism" argument. Sounds ad hominem to me.

Perhaps I'm just as intellectual, I just don't agree with putting so many people and their governments into an outrageous amount of debt just so the professoriate can work on their personal version of intellectualism.

4 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**tbobrowicz** 6 days ago

Then great ... you can choose to learn through MOOCs. They seem to be the perfect setting for you. And for students who learn best without human interaction they can choose to learn online. And since you made the comments about Jane Austin and Ancient Greece, I am guessing that Liberal Arts is not your area of interest either. So much of the study on ancient Greece and Rome takes place through the Socratic method of learning. You learn through organic spontaneous discussion which is pretty much impossible in a MOOCs session.

17 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

It's quite implausible that academic research is the major expense that has been putting tuition-paying students and families into debt. At the super-scale, stagnation of middle class incomes has been far more important. At the university scale, expensive new sports facilities, student centers, and condo-style dormitories have been a massive money hole -- and quite unlike those pesky tenured professors with their 1-1 teaching loads (this is only in the sciences btw; in the humanities, professors can expect 2-2 at best) the new comfort-oriented facilities don't result in new research, publications, grants, or a rankings boost.

9 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**teachfordamasses** 6 days ago

And "...old hack..." isn't?

LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

You call yourself an academic? When you use quotation marks, make sure you actually quote the person correctly.

1 person liked this. LIKE

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

"Ad hominem"? How?

Do you know what ad hominem means? Oh, let me guess: you "learned" it in a MOOC.

9 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**laurelin** 11 hours ago

The debt is somewhat the student's choice. I see most students driving vehicles that are two or three times as expensive to purchase and operate as mine. They have smart phones with data plans three times what I pay, and often have other devices (newer laptops or tablets; my institution does not provide any mobile devices to faculty. I'm an IS prof, so I'm not an old fogy with respect to technology). They appear to eat out and spend a lot more on entertainment than I did as a student.

Students sometimes don't make wise financial choices, spending $100K on a degree in a field with jobs that will never be able to pay that off. I would like to have been an English major or an anthropology major, but I knew I wouldn't be able to make the salary I wanted. My ComSc degree has paid off nicely, and I've enjoyed that field, too.

Some of this debt responsibility needs to fall on the student.

LIKE REPLY

**wademg** 6 days ago

Thanks to all who tried to bring some reflection to the issue, but the person to whom you are responding already believes that he/she knows everything, and is not susceptible to evidence, reason, or countervailing argument. This person prefers certainty, even when it is prejudiced, and will not allow you to "confuse" her/him in that way.

17 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**commentarius** 6 days ago

Seems like sjhvmdkx might be a flack for the Texas Public Policy Foundation. Anti-education, anti-intellectual, run-universities-like-businesses, degrees-are-worthless, faculty-are-overpaid-liberal-lazy-nest-protectors, humanities-are-waste-of-time, blah blah blah. Notably these types haven't set foot in a university since their own frat-house days, and they make a killing in business and think they know everything. Sick of it.

24 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

Actually, I'm speaking in defense of the poor students and parents who are overburdened by the tuition and public debt that's paying for these 1:1 teaching loads at R1 universities.

And gosh, it's been just about 72 hours since I was last in a

university. It was incredibly fancy-- much fancier than it needed to be. Much fancier than the law offices I was in last week.

I like the humanities but I can't afford them at the price you want to charge. Nor can 99% of society. So go on, keep hating on your customers. Keep pretending that your customers (and taxpayers) are stupid. That's the arrogance I get from the university. When you get criticism it's so much easier to dismiss it or label it "bitter" than to act upon it.

4 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**tbobrowicz** 6 days ago

My kids go to a Charter school in a poor district. 65% of the students are Hispanic from low income families (low meaning they make less than $50,000 per year). Our board, in part because Microsoft is giving us so much money, in part because they feel technology is the way of the future, is moving to an online learning environment this year. Teachers will basically proctor and trouble shoot. This is where the problem is for these kids though. The way they begin to even care about an education is through the relationship they have with a dedicated and talented teacher. Someone who can inspire them and mentor them and show them that education is the way out of poverty. Many of these kids have learning issues as well and what we are seeing is that online learning disengages kids from the learning experience. So I do believe you care about poor students and their parents who are burdened by the cost of college. And indeed many of these kids, while they graduate from high school and go on to college, end up dropping out because the cost. Online learning can help, but it is not the solution to a much larger problem. What we need are more good teachers who see the profession as a vocation; who are dedicated to changing lives. I have seen teachers like this and they can do in one year what MOOCs will never be able to do. Maybe things are different at the college level, but I certainly won't be shelling out and financing and education that costs $150,000 over four years if all they're going to be doing is sitting in front of a computer.

24 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

Near as I can tell, your "defense of the poor students and parents who
are overburdened by the tuition and public debt that's paying for these
1:1 teaching loads at R1 universities" amounts to "don't send the poor to R1 universities."

4 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

Well, if by "R1 University" you mean a plush place with big labs, low teaching loads, loads of

grad students on stipend and fat pensions, well, the answer is that no one can afford those things except, perhaps, a few rich fools. The smart ones are already skipping college like the head of that Preston Gates law firm.

But we can do research on an affordable scale. The schools used to do it in the 1950s before the universities figured out how to blackmail the middle class.

1 person liked this. LIKE

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

This is in response to your "R1 University"/1950s comment below.

We're in total agreement that universities' balance of costs made more sense in the 1950s. I'd also argue that there was more pathbreaking research getting done during the whole 30s-60s period, in most disciplines.

However, it's hardly the case that universities in the 1950s were embracing anything like a "MOOC" model of education! Quite the opposite. NOW is the MOOCification era, not then.

The other part of your comment smacks of libertarian thinktank drivel.

6 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**professormo** 6 days ago

Yes, you are bitter. I suggest you start looking at the real salary drains in universities..... Administrators. In the few years I have worked at my university, the number of administrators has proliferated, all to no real value added to the education. The salaries of administrators easily outweigh the salaries of the faculty. And, I'm not sure what they all do, except attend many meetings, to no good outcome, and do not add any positive effects to the education of students.

15 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 3 days ago

Sure. Go ahead and dismiss someone as "bitter". It's easy for the tenured who are determined to protect their privilege, all supported by dumping trillions of dollars of debt on the shoulders of the next generation.

But sure, I'll agree that the administrators are a drain too. But if we get MOOCs, we'll be able to get rid of both the administrators and the cushy 1:1 teaching loads.

1 person liked this. LIKE

**renprof** 4 days ago

One reason I object to some of the way online universities are being structured is that it won't save the students money. It doesn't save money if students are forced to buy computer materials from a specific textbook company. (As an English professor, many of the textbooks I assign are five-dollar paperbacks.) I was stunned to learn that some projected online universities--public universities, using public funds--plan to charge 2,000 per course! That is not saving money.

1 person liked this. LIKE REPLY

**tbobrowicz** 6 days ago

Sounds like you love your technology. I am afraid we are throwing out the baby with the bath water. Kids learn best when they connect with a teacher. So much of their lives are now an online experience, they all have ipods, ipads, laptops .. and the use of this technology is ubiquitous. But for things like learning, most of the kids that I work with every single day hate online learning. They work best with a teacher. Online learning has its place, and we love the technology so much that we might replace our teachers and professors with it but I am curious about where this social experiment is leading us.

3 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**11134078** 6 days ago

In fact both Jane Austen and ancient Greece are constantly changing. Do a little bibliographical searching; try JStor or an OPAC of a major library—or better still, both. It depends, among other things, on the questions one asks of the past and of literature and music and art and all of those other things that are in danger of being ignored in the flood of enthusiasm for STEM, a set of categories which, not so by the way, involves a confusion of categories since engineering is a subset of technology.

10 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 6 days ago

The scholarship is more or less the same. What you see as groundbreaking, the poor, overburdened taxpayer and tuitionpayer see as hairsplitting. I've read these papers and I've ploughed through the courses. I'm sure a 10 year old or a 20 year old video on Jane Austen will be just as valuable to a student as a new one.

LIKE REPLY

**jcee71** 6 days ago

No video can adequately take the place of either an in-person discussion with a group of engaged

individuals or a demonstration of a technical topic where students can ask spontaneous questions.

6 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**803861337** 6 days ago

Even if I believed you that Jane Austen and Ancient Greece are constantly changing, I should care... why?

LIKE REPLY

**laurelin** 12 hours ago

Bitter, much? Myopic much?

The actual main source of the increase in college costs other than inflation is that the states have withdrawn their funding so that institutions had to increase tuition to stay solvent. (State funding contributions to pay what it costs to educate students has gone from 70% or so in the 1970's to 40% now in my state.) And some institutions decided to add country-club-like amenities.

Very few faculty make $250K, even with benefits and office costs. Most of us just get, at most, matching funds for our retirement accounts (no pensions, these days; most of what goes into my retirement account is my choice of deduction from my paycheck). We pay a lot to cover our family on the health plan (which has a high deductible and high co-pays for doctor visits and medications, with lots of treatments excluded). The exception is faculty of medical schools who supplement their salaries with funds from clinic and hospital work in caring for actual patients. (Now administrator salaries, that's a story for another day.)

As for R1 schools, where do you think we are going to train the next set of scientists, MDs and PhDs? That isn't cheap. R1 faculty are doing much more than is apparent to an undergraduate student (or even a master's level student). And do you want all of the research done (and hoarded) by private corporations? If we follow your suggestions, I think we'll end up a third-world country within a generation.

Clearly, all you want to learn is what fits in 5-15-minute snippets. I recommend Guido Sarducci's 5-minute MBA.

LIKE REPLY

**sjhvmdkx** 11 hours ago

Oh myopic? I love how you cite a statistic that makes it seem like the states are slicing funding in half. Wrong. State funding is declining only slightly but the schools are boosting tuition dramatically. So sure, states are paying a smaller percentage of the overall cost, but only because the overall costs are dramatically higher. It's a slimy way to manipulate the statistics. The colleges can have their cake and eat it too. Simply by boosting tuition and boosting spending, they can claim that the states are paying a smaller percentage.

And sure, "very few faculty" make that much, if you include all of the adjuncts doing the work but plenty do. Why in

California, more than 2100 ex-professors get a PENSION that's larger than $100,000. http://www.fixpensionsfirst.co..., you can't have it both ways. First you claim that professors don't make much. THen you claim that research "ain't cheap." Well, which is it? Are the professors cheap or are they expensive?

LIKE REPLY

Mikey 5 days ago

These courses can be launched for much, much less.
Excluding for faculty salary, which is already a given, it can be easily done for less than a tenth of $250k.
Even the Edx platform is open code and can be launched independently or on another low cost or free platform such as Canvas.

LIKE REPLY

**TA4EVA** 6 days ago

You do realize that "weaseling some way to spend more time on their research" is part of the POINT, right? The researcher/teacher model has been the centerpiece of the university for many generations. I'm not saying it's a perfect model -- but what's going to make this MOOC model so much better? All it seems to do is massively undermine BOTH teaching AND research.

17 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**miskatonicu** 6 days ago

MOOCs aren't sentient beings. A (human) professor runs and monitors each MOOC. Did you read the part of the article where it says they spend 10 hours a week doing so? The start up cost of each MOOC is in addition to what (little) the professor makes.

5 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

**teachfordamasses** 6 days ago

Could you please tell me where the open position for a full professor at $250K is? I'd like to apply!

20 people liked this. LIKE REPLY

LOAD MORE COMMENTS

1255 Twenty-Third St, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037