Winter 2018

Community College Faculty Compensation for Online Course Development and Delivery

Radhika I. Prout
Old Dominion University, radhika.inaganti@gmail.com

Community College Faculty Compensation for Online Course Development and Delivery

by

Radhika I. Prout

B.S. June 2004, Temple University
M.Ed. March 2007, Drexel University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN EDUCATION

OCCUPATIONAL AND TECHNICAL STUDIES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December, 2018

Approved by:

John M. Ritz, Chair

Mitchell R. Williams

Michael F. Kosloski, Jr.

ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY COMPENSATION FOR ONLINE COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

Radhika I. Prout
Old Dominion University, 2018
Director: Dr. John M. Ritz

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine the most common compensation practices community colleges in the United States provided to faculty for online course development and delivery. Many community colleges provided compensation as an incentive for faculty participation in supporting their online learning initiatives; however, limited research was available on fair compensation for these services. The population consisted of 980 community colleges that were identified using the American Association of Community College's membership directory.

Data for this study were collected using a survey that contained 31 closed and open form response questions requesting demographic information and current practices for compensating community college faculty for online course development and delivery. Descriptive statistics using frequencies/numbers and percentages and ANOVA were used to determine most frequently used compensation practices.

Eighty-four participants (30%) were from institutions serving between 2,000-4,999 students. One hundred-sixty-four participants (58.6%) offered between zero and four online programs. Two hundred-forty participants (85.7%) provided instructional design services to faculty developing online courses, and 232 participants (82.9%) provided instructional design services to faculty teaching online courses. The results of this study established that the average online course cap limit was 30. The results of this study also established that 29 participants

(23.4%) provided financial compensation in the range of $1,000.00 - $1,499.00 for online course development making it the most common compensation practice provided for online course development. Thirty-five (31%) of the participating institutions provided financial compensation in the range of $1,500.00 - $1,999.00 for online course delivery making it the most common compensation practice provided for online course delivery. However, the majority of participating institutions expected faculty to develop and deliver online courses for no additional compensation, suggesting online course development and delivery as being part of the faculty workload.

In addition, this study determined large and very large institutions tend to compensate more than small institutions for online course development and large institutions tend to compensate more than small institutions for online course delivery. Finally, this study determined that institution size does not matter when it comes to compensation of full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my two delightful daughters, Amari and Jayani, without whom none of my achievements would have been purposeful. I love you both with all my heart. Always remember, *"Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."* – Nelson Mandela

ACKNOWLDGEMENTS

Over the course of this extended doctoral journey my dissertation committee members have challenged and changed me. It has been my pleasure and privilege to be accompanied by them in the creation of this dissertation and I owe a debt of gratitude to each and every one.

Dr. John M. Ritz, my committee chair, advisor, and guru, took on the challenge of stimulating an ordinary person to unusual effort. You are wise, accessible, and have been an unwavering mentor over the years. Thank you for the countless hours you spent reviewing drafts, believing in me when things got rough, and agreeing to stay on as my dissertation committee chair well into your retirement.

Dr. Mitchell R. Williams, my committee member (and unofficial statistics tutor), who was intrigued enough to enthusiastically join my committee and provided sage guidance throughout the process.

Dr. Mickey F. Kosloski Jr., my committee member and professor, whose humor and encouragement helped motivate and guide me, especially during some of the most difficult periods in my dissertation journey.

I would be remiss if I did not offer thanks to my family, friends, and supporters. My husband, Dorian Prout, offered unwavering encouragement over the past eight years of my doctoral journey. He cheered me on when I was discouraged, laughed at me when I was making a mountain out of a tiny hill, wiped my tears when the great prospectus defense catastrophe struck, and most importantly been 100% confident in my ability to get this thing done – thank you, my love, it is *finally* your turn. My parents and grandparents, my first teachers, who made countless sacrifices to better the lives of their future generations through education. Thank you for supporting me and instilling in me the importance of education. To my dear family and

friends (you know who you are), thank you for your extraordinary support and words of encouragement over the course of this journey. Last, but not least, thank you to the supporters of my research, Dr. Jeff Burleson for the use of your survey, and all the survey respondents who were so generous with their time and so open in their responses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A notable phenomenon occurring in higher education is distance education. It is the fastest growing mode of delivery in the world (McIsaac & Gunawardena, 2016). The growth of hybrid models of delivery and the ability to use smart devices and apps to complete assignments from anywhere and anytime makes online learning an appealing option for traditional and non-traditional students at community colleges (Smith, 2015). Along with increased educational choices, online learning may help community colleges contain costs, make college more affordable and accessible, make instruction more engaging, increase completion rates and enrollment, ease crowding, and better prepare students for college and beyond (Murphy, 2013). As reported by the U.S. Department of Education, "Educational systems are under increasing pressure to reduce costs while maintaining or improving outcomes for students" (Bakia, Shear, Toyama, & Lasseter, 2012, p. v). Therefore, online education appeals to community college institutions as a viable alternative to traditional education, and as a result online programs are expanding across the country.

As institutions began increasing their online offerings, faculty and administrators recognized online course development and delivery was far more onerous than that of traditional face-to-face (F2F) courses (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009; Concieção, 2006; Haber & Mills, 2008; Lee & Busch, 2005; Mupinga & Maughan, 2008; Sheridan, 2006; Spector, 2005). Despite an already demanding workload (Santilli & Beck, 2005), an increasing number of faculty members were being approached to support the growing need for online course development (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). As a result, questions regarding compensation practices surfaced (Santilli &

Beck, 2005), and adequate payment for developing and delivering online courses became a concern (Spector, 2005).

Limited research is available on compensation practices for developing and delivering community college online courses. Burleson (2011) examined compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses at four-year, private, and state-funded not-for-profit higher education institutions. The results of his study established that 59.6% of participating institutions provided financial compensation for online course development, and 47.8% of participating institutions provided financial compensation for online course delivery. Burleson's research did not include community colleges, yet community colleges have experienced the highest rate of growth in online learning, accounting for over one-half of the 5.8 million online enrollments (Allen, Seaman, Poulin, & Straut, 2016; Chen, 2014; Radford, 2011). It begs the question of what is occurring to compensate faculty who develop and teach online courses at the community colleges. This information is critical to community college administrators as they establish adequate compensation practices and to community college faculty as they discuss compensation for online course development and delivery. The results of this study may also aid administrators in the processes of decision making for funding of community college distance education programs. This study should add to the knowledge regarding the most frequently used online course development and delivery compensation policies and practices at the community college level in the United States. Finally, this study will provide a basis for future research on online course development and delivery compensation policies and best practices at the community college level.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the practices most frequently used by community colleges for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Research Questions

The research questions used to guide this study were as follows:

RQ_1: What compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course development?

RQ_2: What compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course delivery?

RQ_3: What significance does institution size have on faculty financial compensation for online course development and delivery?

RQ_4: What are the differences in financial compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?

Background and Significance

In 1840, Sir Isaac Pitman developed an innovative "idea for delivering instruction to a potentially limitless audience: correspondence courses by mail" (Matthews, 1999, p. 54). Pitman's concept was so well received that within a few years he was corresponding with a group of distant learners (Phillips, 1998). By the 1900s, the first Department of Correspondence Teaching was established in the United States at the University of Chicago. By the mid-1980s, more than 300,000 students were enrolled in university-taught distance education courses in the United States (Matthews, 1999).

The past quarter century has proven that the Internet is a viable tool for delivering higher education programs and courses (Wickersham, Espinoza, & Davis, 2007). Over 70% of all

currently active, degree-granting institutions open to the public have some online education offerings (Allen & Seaman, 2015). Allen and Seaman (2014) reported that 70% of all higher education institutions identify online education as being critical to their long-term strategy, an all-time high. They also stated that 33% of higher education students took at least one online course during their degree completion.

As higher education administrators recognize the need for increasing online offerings, they have sought to seek faculty participation in online course development and delivery (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). However, faculty members have realized the amount of time and effort associated with online course development and delivery, and they began requesting additional compensation (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). Van de Vord and Pogue (2012) argued that online courses encompass more instructor time in and out of the classroom. Time demands not only included the time required to develop and deliver online courses, it also included time to learn and use online instructional methods and current educational technologies such as learning management systems and software applications for online course content development (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak, 2006). Faculty found it difficult to meet their goals of developing and delivering quality online courses, with the added time demands and the lack of additional compensation (Boerema, Stanley, & Westhorp, 2007).

Parker (2003) reported that stipends, reduced faculty workload, and access to the latest technologies (extrinsic motivators) are enough to encourage faculty to partake in online course development and delivery, while Haber and Mills (2008) confirmed the need to identify effective ways to calculate fair compensation for online course development and delivery. By compiling and assessing the most frequently used compensation practices, this study aims to provide community colleges with a foundation to base their compensation practices specific to online

course development and delivery. Although Burleson (2011) reported financial compensation as being the most frequently used practice to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery at four-year institutions, his study did not include institutions at the community college level. Therefore, a comprehensive list of the most frequently used compensation practices by community colleges needs to be developed (Burleson). This study hopes to provide community college faculty and administrators with a resource to help them effectively support their distance learning initiatives by identifying the most frequently used compensation practices community colleges in the United States provided their faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The significance of this study is important to community college administrators and faculty as they move to online learning, and it is also significant to determine if faculty rewards for developing and delivering online courses differ based on institution size.

Delimitations

The following delimitations applied to this research study:

- Colleges were selected from the AACC Directory.
- Community college distance education directors were selected as participants.
- A survey instrument was used to collect data.

Limitations

The following limitations applied to this research study:

- The compensation practices identified in this study do not indicate or imply their effectiveness in rewarding faculty for online teaching.
- As participant titles varied from one institution to another, the roles of participants may have also varied between institutions.

- Participants may not have been aware of informal compensation agreements between faculty members and their direct supervisors.

Assumptions

The following assumptions applied to this research study:

- Participants were aware of most compensation practices implemented at their community college or had access to the information being requested.
- Participating community colleges were developing or had existing online courses.
- Participants provided accurate financial compensation information for developing and delivering online instruction.

Procedures

The researcher surveyed community college distance education directors on the practices their campuses used for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Participants were selected from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) member directory. A review of the literature suggested that research had been conducted on online course development and delivery compensation practices (Burleson, 2011; Schifter, 2000, 2004). Burleson conducted a study of the most common compensation practices for online course development and delivery at four-year universities in the United States. He developed an instrument to determine the most common faculty compensation practices used by not-for-profit, four-year institutions in the United States for online course delivery and development. The researcher adapted Burleson's instrument to determine the most frequently used practices community colleges in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. Participant responses were treated confidentially and reported in aggregate only. Survey results were analyzed using descriptive and comparative statistics to

determine the most frequently used compensation practices for online course development and delivery at community colleges in the United States.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to assist the reader:

Asynchronous: A course design where learning is done on a student's own time (Harasim, 2000).

Compensation: Any means of remuneration to faculty for online course development and delivery including but not limited to financial compensation, release time, and additional supports (Burleson, 2011).

Delivery: Refers to decisions about how to present the content, activities, and assessments that are designed into a course (Porto & Aje, 2004).

Development: Refers to designing the structure of a course in order to achieve a set of learning outcomes (Gagne, Wager, Golas, & Keller, 2005).

Distance Education: The technological separation of instructor and learner, freeing the student from the need to travel to "a fixed place, at a fixed time, to meet a fixed person, in order to be trained" (Keegan, 1995, p. 7).

Face-to-face Course: A method of formal education, where learners and educators meet on a regular basis in a shared physical space (Wilcox, 2013).

Online Course: A course in which all instruction is offered online (Burleson, 2011).

Online Learning: Learning via an Internet-based educational delivery system that includes software to provide a structured learning environment (Harasim, 2000).

Participant: Refers to the individuals completing the survey. Due to title variations at the various institutions, participants include, but are not limited to, Coordinators of Distance

Education, Directors of Distance Education, Directors of Online Learning, or other counterparts (Burleson, 2011).

Synchronous: A course design where students and teachers interact in real time (Harasim, 2000).

Summary and Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine the most frequently used compensation practices community colleges in the United States provided their faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The survey method was proposed for collecting these data. The researcher used descriptive and comparative statistics to determine which compensation practices were most often used.

The significance of this study was based upon a gap in the literature on the most frequently used practices for compensating community college faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Prior research yielded a list of compensation best practices and the most frequently used compensation practices at small, medium, and large, not-for-profit, four-year institutions in the United States. However, it did not produce a list of compensation best practices specific to the community college level or determine compensation practices most frequently used at community colleges (Burleson, 2011).

This study will identify the practices community colleges most frequently used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. This comprehensive list of the most frequently used compensation practices by community colleges will enable institutions to determine differences in compensation based on institution size, thus enable community college faculty and administrators to effectively support their distance learning initiatives.

Chapter II will outline key literature on the history of distance learning and the need for faculty compensation due to the time-intensive nature of online course development and delivery. Chapter III will discuss the methods and procedures used to conduct this study including study population, instrument used, data collection methods, and statistical analysis. Chapter IV reports the findings from this study. Finally, this research will draw conclusions to address the research questions and identify areas of future research needs.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

As online learning programs were implemented at higher education institutions, administrators were faced with the challenge of establishing sufficient compensation practices to motivate faculty to develop and/or teach online courses. According to Burleson (2011), "This dilemma arose based upon higher education faculty concerns for the amount of time and work needed to *develop* and/or *deliver* an online course compared to the amount of compensation received" (p. 8). Research shows that insufficient compensation directly effects faculty morale and willingness to participate in online learning (Shea, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to determine the most frequently used practices community colleges in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. By determining the most frequently used compensation practices, this study aims to provide community colleges with a foundation to base their compensation practices specific to online course development and delivery. This chapter provides a review of literature concerning distance education and online learning, including its history, distance education faculty compensation as it relates to online course development and delivery, distance education at the community college, community college institution size, higher education faculty compensation, and a summary.

Distance Education and Online Learning

Distance education is the fastest growing area of education in the world today. Since its inception, distance education has changed the playing field of traditional teaching and learning. Geographical and socioeconomic barriers, increased demand for access to education, and the rapid development of technology have all contributed to its growth over the years (Casey, 2008;

Simpson, 2013). Distance education is the technological separation of instructor and learner, freeing the student from the need to travel to "a fixed place, at a fixed time, to meet a fixed person, in order to be trained" (Keegan, 1995, p. 7).

Online learning, a descendant of distance education, is learning that takes place partially or entirely over the Internet (Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia, & Jones, 2009). A variety of technology tools may be used to support online learning. One type of online learning uses asynchronous tools (e.g., email, discussion boards, newsgroups) to allow users to contribute at their convenience. Synchronous technologies (e.g., webcasting, chat rooms, audio/video technology) are used to approximate face-to-face teaching strategies such as delivering lectures and holding meetings with groups of students. Early online programs tended to implement one or the other, but recent programs tend to combine many forms of synchronous and asynchronous online interactions as well as occasional face-to-face interactions (Means et al., 2009).

History of Distance Education and Online Learning

Although the growth of distance education is somewhat recent, its roots can be traced back through several historical generations. Correspondence study is the oldest form of distance education (Moore & Kearsley, 2011). Beginning in the early 1880s, with the advent of an affordable and reliable postal system, those wanting to study at home could do so by obtaining instruction from a distant instructor. Using this method, distance instructors utilized the postal system to send students self-directed, paper-based study materials, and then students returned their completed assignments via the postal system to their distance instructor for evaluation, grading, and feedback (Holmberg, 2005).

The Chautauqua Movement pioneered correspondence education and fostered the development of distance learning throughout North America. Teaching through the mail was

first used for higher education courses by the Chautauqua Correspondence College. Renamed the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts in 1883, it was authorized by the State of New York to award diplomas and degrees by correspondence (Bittner & Mallory, 1933). Around the same time, in nearby Scranton, Pennsylvania, Thomas J. Foster, set up the Colliery Engineer School of Mines to offer correspondence courses on mine safety. The success of the mine safety courses brought about other vocational training courses and the school was renamed the International Correspondence School (ICS) in 1891 (Benson, 1970). ICS's success is attributed to the close relationships with corporate management. It contracted with corporations to help them improve workers' skills and offered training discounts. Many employers recognized the value of schools like ICS and encouraged employees to enroll in correspondence courses by offering payroll deductions to cover tuition and using enrollment as a basis for promotion (Moore & Kearsley, 2011). By the early 20th century, there were over 200 correspondence schools like ICS offering correspondence education on a variety of topics (Moore & Kearsley, 2011).

Crump (1928) measured the comparative performance of correspondence students. In his experiment, traditional and correspondence students were given the same series of final examinations. The results of his research showed differences between instructional methods were insignificant in terms of achievement. Feig (1932), through "The Effectiveness of Correspondence Study," reported the results of a comparison of correspondence and traditional students. However, his results indicated higher achievement results among correspondence students. Robert E. Freeman noted,

> The more recent studies, which are in general more rigorous, reach much the same conclusions as do the bulk of the studies that correspondence methods achieve similar, if

> not superior, cognitive results when compared with conventional methods of teaching. (cited in Welch, 1993, p. 6)

In most respects, correspondence courses have compared favorably with other methods of providing education. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that summaries of the research literature done by the federal government and the Pennsylvania State University have supported the favorable comparison between correspondence education and traditional education (Welch, 1993). As the studies assert, correspondence education has been repeatedly shown to be as effective as traditional classroom-based education.

Despite the effectiveness of correspondence education, there were some challenges. It provided slow, one-to-one communication between students and instructors, and it did not provide opportunities for learner-to-learner interaction (Anderson, 2003; Taylor, 2001). To address the time delay issue, the next generation of distance education used radio broadcasting, enabling simpler and faster delivery of learning materials (Keegan, 1993).

By the 1920s, almost two-hundred American radio stations delivered distance education to the masses (Bower & Hardy, 2004). Live distance education radio broadcasts enabled learners to listen to their courses from home or work, expanding the ownership of radio stations to educational institutions**.** However, with the arrival of World War II, the increased use of airwaves for communication to those cut-off from allied countries, resulted in a decrease in the availability of airwaves for educational programming (Sorensen, 2010). Just as the postal system faced limitations, radio also faced its own set of limitations. According to Craig (2000),

> Many university stations began operations with high hopes of bringing education to the masses, but soon faltered as broadcasting costs increased, audiences diminished, and professors demonstrated that lecture-hall brilliance did not always translate into good

> radio technique. These problems were quickly reflected in an unfavorable allocation of frequency or broadcast times, sending many of these stations in a downward spiral to oblivion. (p. 68)

Ultimately, the dominance of radio as an educational medium soon gave way to its role as a vehicle for advertising and entertainment, especially as it vied for growing audiences against the television medium (Walker, 2004).

The next shift in distance education came when the University of Iowa introduced television as an instructional medium in 1934 (Lessick et al., 2013). In 1961, instructional television (ITV) was initially used to address the teacher shortage that resulted from a sudden surge in the number of students needing to be educated (Greenhill, 1964; Schramm, 1977). It also held possible solutions for the quality of teaching, geographic imbalances, the explosion of knowledge, and slow and fast students (Nylin, 1970). Thus, several early studies focused on a comparison of student achievement levels in the traditional setting with those students receiving instruction via television medium. Little difference was found between the two delivery mediums, further supporting the use of ITV as an alternative means of instruction, since students made the same or greater academic gains when using ITV (Chu & Schramm, 1967; MacLennan & Reid, 1967; Schramm, 1973, 1977; Stickell, 1963; Wetzel, Radtke, & Stern, 1994).

Stickell (1963) reviewed 250 studies that compared traditional instruction with televised instruction. Of these, only 23 were found to have adequate experimental design and deemed "partially interpretable," while only 10 were deemed to be "interpretable." Stickell's analysis of these 10 studies suggested that there was no significant difference in learning at the .05 level of significance between televised and traditional instruction. These findings corresponded to those found by Chu and Schramm (1967) in their comparison of 421 television classrooms. Their

results suggested that 308 studies indicated no significant difference in academic achievement (MacLennan & Reid, 1967; Schramm, 1973, 1977; Wetzel, Radtke, & Stern, 1994). Following an extensive review of studies, it was concluded that students learned many types of subject matter through instructional television (Schramm, 1977).

As television grew in popularity, stations realized that advertisers preferred to support entertainment programs with high ratings and viewership (Dille, 1991). Therefore, the number of educational programs on commercial networks dwindled (Flouty, 2016). In an effort to support instructional television, The Federal Communications Commission created the Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS). According to Moore and Kearsley (2011), "ITFS was a low-cost, low-power, over the air distribution system that delivered up to four channels of television pictures in any geographic area but only to a radius of 25 miles" (p. 30). The first educational institution to apply for an ITFS license was California State University in 1963 (Casey, 2008). In 1967, the Public Broadcasting Service was created to promote and expand distance education opportunities (Casey, 2008).

In the mid-20th century, educators at Stanford University and Information Business Machines Corporation (IBM) collaborated and introduced Computer-Aided Instruction (CAI) to select elementary schools. CAI is a diverse and rapidly expanding spectrum of computer technologies that assist in the teaching and learning process. Around the same time, another CAI system was developed by the Control Data Corporation (CDC) for higher learning at the University of Illinois, Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations (PLATO) (Van Meer, 2003). This system enabled students to communicate with their instructor, interact with learning materials, and access their progress through the computer. Early CAI systems were limited by the high cost and the difficulty of acquiring, maintaining, and using the computers that

were available at the time. However, computers would become another educational delivery medium (Caruth & Caruth, 2013).

Kurland and Kurland (1987) described research findings from two decades of studies of computer applications that indicated that "…the computer is no better or worse than other technologies" (p. 341). They continue, "If we learned anything from the research so far, it is that technologies do not wield their influence in the classroom independently of teachers and students" (p. 341).

Ringstaff and Kelley (2002) applied the distinction made by Reeves (1998) to examine learning from computers versus learning with computers. Learning from computers includes the use of computers to deliver instructional content directly to learners. Learning with computers includes having students use computers as a tool to explore content, including but not limited to students using spreadsheets to analyze data, using the Internet to find information, and using multimedia software to develop presentations. Ringstaff and Kelley further stated that much of the research on computers applied in educational contexts involves learning from computers. Historically, this was referred to as CAI. A computer presented lessons to individual students in the form of drill and practice, tutorials, or simulations. The computer served, in essence, as a tutor to students, guiding them through lessons. Many studies have compared learning via CAI with learning from teachers in traditional classrooms. Despite some conflicting outcomes, generally this research supports mild achievement gains by the groups that learned through CAI.

Hattie (2004) studied students who learn from CAI and students in traditional classrooms, and reported a small effect size from CAI. Kulik and Kulik (1986) studied achievement gains from CAI in a series of 99 studies of college students using CAI in classrooms and also reported a small effect size. Furthermore, a study by Kulik, Kulik, and Cohen (1980) determined the

effect size from 54 studies of CAI as a replacement for classroom instructors was remarkably similar to the small effect sizes reported in previous studies. Based on this research, CAI seems to consistently produce small achievement gains in learning outcomes when compared with traditional classroom instruction.

The Internet and local area networks in the 1980s increased opportunities to teach and learn in an interactive, engaging, online environment (Harasim, 2000). With improved Internet bandwidth and the growth of instructional technologies in the 1990s, distance education over the Internet became the next instructional frontier (Casey, 2008). These new technologies afforded individuals opportunities to connect with anyone, from anywhere, and at any time (Casey, 2008).

Online learning has become commonplace in military, business, and academic settings, and evidence surrounding its effectiveness continues to amass. Despite considerable technological advancements, the underlying pedagogy remains similar to CAI. Olson and Wisher (2002) compared the effectiveness of online learning to traditional classroom instruction and CAI. They reported a small effect size in online learning, slightly lower than some of the effect sizes found in meta-analyses of CAI. The effect sizes resemble those found in decades of CAI research that show positive but small effects on learning from computers used in this manner. In essence, online learning involves delivering instruction directly to individual learners, often in the form of tutorials or simulations, just as earlier CAI did.

Distance or online education has been used to enable learners to complete courses while separated from instructors by time and space (Keegan, 1995). Most colleges offer online courses for credit; and many offer online degree programs. Many online courses are asynchronous. Students work at their own pace to read instructional materials, possibly entering into discussions with other students and their instructors via discussion boards (Coogle & Floyd, 2015). Other

online courses use synchronous technology, in which students listen to and interact with their peers and instructor through live video-conferencing or chat sessions (Parker & Martin, 2010).

Distance education provides a flexibility afforded by few other educational methods (Hannay & Newvine, 2006). Students can take online courses without having to ever step foot on campus; they can "attend" asynchronous classes whenever they have time. They can complete a course at their own pace, and they can be "in school" from anywhere in the world with an Internet connection. In short, distance education is convenient. Perhaps that is why it has grown so rapidly. As with other technology-based teaching methods, considerable research has compared learning from distance education with learning in traditional classrooms, and it has yielded similar mixed results.

The most comprehensive analysis of this research conducted by Bernard et al. (2004) was their meta-analysis of distance education findings. Analyzing data from 232 individual studies of distance education, Bernard et al. state, "We found evidence, in an overall sense, that classroom instruction and DE are comparable…" (p. 416). However, the variability found in all measures prevented them from making any definitive statements. Cavanaugh, Gillan, Kromrey, Hess, and Blomeyer (2004) reported a meta-analyses of distance education conducted at the K-12 level. Their analysis shows that online learning can have the same effect on measures of student academic achievement when compared to traditional instruction. The results of the study indicated no significant difference in student performance between students in online and traditional classrooms.

Lou, Bernard, and Abrami (2006) investigated distance education effects in undergraduate courses using a theoretical framework to isolate the effect of media, pedagogy, and quality of individual research studies, so they could estimate the relative importance of each

of these factors. As with prior meta-analyses, no significant differences existed between the outcomes of students in distance education classes and those in traditional classes. Based on the findings of no significant difference between traditional instruction and synchronous online learning, they concluded that using technology to deliver instruction does not alter its impact or effectiveness. This is consistent with Clark's (1983) position that media are merely delivery vehicles that when used alone do not enhance instructional effectiveness.

Sheppard's (2009) study compared secondary students in rural and urban areas taking science courses using online and traditional methods. Similar to previous studies, the results revealed that when comparing achievement results of online rural students with traditional urban students, there was no statistical difference in student academic achievement. However, when comparing rural and urban students who took the traditional science courses, the urban students yielded greater academic gains. Therefore, this may support the notion of using distance education in rural areas to help bridge the achievement gap between urban and rural students.

As revealed by the Sheppard (2009) study, the outcomes when comparing distance education to traditional education are not all equal. Some studies show that traditional instruction has greater benefits than online learning alone. Carter (2012) compared post-secondary, remedial English students and found that students who took the course in the traditional format outperformed their online learning counterparts. Karatas and Simsek (2009) found that not only did traditional students outperform online learning students in initial achievement tests, they also showed greater levels of learning permanence on post-tests. Ferguson and Tryjankowski (2009) showed similar performance results among post-secondary graduate students in which traditional students did better than their online learning counterparts.

Based on the literature, achievement results comparing distance education students with traditional education students appear to be inconsistent. However, distance education and online learning are not a fad. They are evolving, and they are here to stay (Kentnor, 2015). Thus, administrators and faculty must understand the demands of developing and delivering online learning to ensure student learning needs are met.

Distance Education Faculty Compensation

Distance education course development and delivery necessitated the recruitment of faculty who were subject matter experts and willing to develop online courses (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak, 2006). However, compensation often surfaced as a barrier to increased faculty interest in adopting new educational technologies (Olcott & Wright, 1995). In order to remedy the challenge of procuring and maintaining qualified faculty, institutions began revamping their existing compensation practices to include additional compensation for online course development and delivery (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005).

Higher education institutions realized the potential of distance education in terms of reach and revenue. It would allow them to expand their reach to employees needing to enhance their skills, mothers who want to earn a college degree, students in rural areas, high school students wanting to take advanced placement courses, military personnel stationed abroad, international students, prisoners who want to earn a GED to attain a job post-release, and students with physical disabilities unable to come to campus (Mullins, 2007). To reach these populations, colleges and universities have to develop and deliver courses at a distance. However, distance education faculty compensation is a major concern.

Schneider (1999) stated many distance learning courses "are 'add-ons,' heaped onto a professor's regular teaching load without giving the faculty member additional credit or

compensation… Even if they're not an add-on, they're not considered a normal part of their teaching load" (p. A34). Although this may have been true, it is not indicative of current practices. Recognizing that online course development and delivery was grossly underestimated, institutions deemed appropriate the idea of additional compensation (Shea, 2007). Expecting a return on their investment, institutions justified providing additional compensation for online course development and delivery (Schiffman, Vignare, & Geith, 2007). They implemented a variety of compensation practices for both online course development and delivery. Some provided a one-time payment for designing an online course, while others provided a base stipend, such as $500 plus a course-delivery fee. Institutions also offered non-financial compensation, such as release time, computer equipment, travel support, and advanced recognition for promotion or tenure (Perreault, Waldman, Alexander, & Zhao, 2008).

Burleson (2011) reviewed the literature and used a content matrix to develop a survey that consisted of 16 closed-ended questions and 5 open-ended questions to gather information about the most frequently used practices four-year institutions in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. Questions were asked for participant's demographic information. Other questions were asked of the participants to identify types of compensation offered to faculty for developing and delivering online courses (Burleson, 2011; Perreault et al., 2008).

As reported by Burleson (2011) of online faculty compensation practices at not-for-profit, four-year institutions in the United States, the most frequently selected compensation practice for online course development was financial compensation. The most frequently selected financial compensation range for online course development was $l,001-2,500. The most frequently selected compensation practice for online course delivery was financial compensation. The most

frequently selected financial compensation range for online course delivery was $1,000-$2,500. Although institutions frequently exercised the use of such practices, the compensation practices most frequently used by community colleges for online course development and delivery had not been identified.

Distance Education at the Community College

Community colleges play an important role in society. They offer many types of educational programs, including those that lead to associate degrees and certificates, focusing on workforce readiness, while others prepare students for advanced degrees at four-year institutions. Often referred to as "the people's college" (Bower & Hardy, 2004, p. 8), community colleges are steadfast in their mission of ensuring all students access to educational opportunities. As a result, community colleges have emerged as leaders in providing online learning, particularly to students with limited access to educational resources (Inman, Kerwin, & Mayes, 1999). The community college commitment to serving students and willingness to provide education anytime, and from anywhere, make community colleges key contenders of leading distance learning initiatives in higher education (Bower & Hardy, 2004). In 2013-14, more than 5.5 million students enrolled in community college distance education programs, up about 5 percent from the year prior, showing modest but continued growth (Finkel, 2015; Jaschik, 2014).

Community colleges push boundaries and venture beyond predictable and comfortable limits in order to fulfill their open-door mission and tradition of service to their community's changing needs (Dillion & Cintron, 1997). They are often first to feel the impact of change because they are positioned so closely to the mainstream values in society (O'Banion, 1997). Within the higher education sector, community colleges develop more connections with business

and industry, and distance education can strengthen these ties, further bridging the gap between higher education and the private sector (Dillion & Cintron, 1997).

According to Jaggars, Edgecombe, and Stacey (2013), 97% of community colleges offered online courses in 2008, as compared to only 66% of all postsecondary-institutions. Since 2010, online college course enrollments have gone up by 29%, and approximately one-third of all college students were enrolled in online courses. Of the online enrollments, community college online enrollments made up over one-half of these (Allen & Seaman, 2008).

In the early days of online courses, a common production model was to provide faculty members with release time and/or compensation in exchange for online course development and delivery (Oblinger & Hawkins, 2006). These early online courses were developed by a group of enthusiastic faculty members who believed that technology could transform learning. These faculty members were willing and able to master the skills needed, whether that meant learning Java, HTML, a graphics package, or other technology. Often reproducing the lecture, many of the resulting courses had a unique structure and may or may not have used sound instructional design. According to Oblinger and Hawkins, being a pioneer often meant figuring things out alone, so solutions were piecemealed together with whatever resources were available to the faculty. Oblinger and Hawkins believe the legacy of those early courses is a collection of different applications, approaches, and instructional designs dispersed across a campus.

Effective online course development and delivery requires proper integration of technology with pedagogy, and content is essential (Lee & Tsai, 2010). For example, good pedagogy implies that the instructor can develop targeted learning objectives. Online instruction is more than a group of readings posted to a website; it necessitates deliberate instructional design that focuses on connecting learning objectives to specific learning activities and

measurable outcomes. As noted by Khalil and Elkhider (2016), few faculty members in higher education have had formal education in learning theories and the science of instruction, so to expect them to build a well-designed online course would likely be unrealistic.

Instructors are being challenged to move past the notion that a course simply delivers content by way of instructor lectures to the idea of a course as constructing a series of learning environments and activities in which the instructor is no longer the sage on the stage but the guide on the side. Therefore, a first step to effective online course development and delivery is to rethink the role of the faculty member. Beyond lecturing, the faculty member may serve as an architect, consultant, resource, reviewer, or role model: a multi-faceted faculty role. With these alternative roles, the range of possible learning activities expands to include options such as authentic assessments, peer collaboration, case studies, discussions, brainstorming, coaching, journaling, and so forth (Oblinger & Hawkins, 2006).

Another significant responsibility when developing and delivering an online course is instructional technology. One of the first issues to address is the instructional technology needed to support the course, such as a learning management system to build the course and collaboration tools to enhance the course. Instructional technology concerns do not subside once the course is developed. A support system for instructional technology should be designed to facilitate the successful completion of learning tasks within the online course (Chen, 2007).

Recognizing the supplementary technical and pedagogical skills needed for online course development and delivery, institutions, administrators, and instructors expanded their professional development offerings to cover technology and pedagogy best practices for teaching in the online learning environment (Terantino & Agbehonou, 2012).

A study by Freeman (2015) empirically measured the perceptions of and actual time spent developing and teaching online courses and attempted to understand how much time it takes to teach an online course versus a face-to-face course, and how much time it takes instructors to develop an online course. He surveyed 165 instructors regarding their experiences and perceptions of developing and teaching online courses yielding a 41% response rate.

While 12% of respondents began their online course development more than 16 weeks prior to the start of a course, only 7% of the respondents began face-to-face course development more than 16 weeks prior to the start of the course. Similarly, over 70% of respondents waited to within 8 weeks of the start of the course to begin face-to-face course development, while the number is only 40% for online courses. Therefore, more faculty members began developing online courses earlier, and fewer faculty members waited as long to begin development of their online course (Freeman, 2015). These results support the claim that online course development takes more time, thereby requiring a significant jumpstart to online course development.

Forty-six percent of respondents complete online course development in eight weeks or less, and 87% complete it in 16 weeks or less. Twelve percent required more than 20 weeks. In terms of actual online course development hours, 29% needed more than 100 hours. According to Freeman (2015), a partial explanation for the time needed to develop online courses is that 53% of respondents indicated they developed 90% of the course content themselves. More than 75% developed at least half of the online course content themselves, substantiating the claim that online course development is more labor intensive than face-to-face course development.

In terms of instructor perceptions surrounding online course development, 81% agree with the statement, “it is more time consuming to develop an online course than a face-to-face course” (Course Development Perceptions section, 2015, para. 1). To compare teaching online

versus teaching face-to-face, instructors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, "it is more time consuming to teach an online course the first time than a face-to-face course the first time" (Course Delivery Perceptions section, 2015, para. 1). Similar to course development, online course delivery is perceived to be much more time consuming than teaching face-to-face. Again, this indicates that online course development and delivery are more time consuming than face-to-face course development and delivery.

To better understand the nature of the time commitment to development and delivery of online courses, Freeman (2015) asked respondents to compare specific components of the development and teaching process across online and face-to-face courses. Results revealed that content development (85%) is more time consuming for online courses than face-to-face courses. The same can be said for pre-semester setup (82%), instructor-student interaction (75%), grading and assessment (54%), and overall involvement in the class (56%). Findings support anecdotal evidence that online course development and delivery is indeed more time consuming than that of face-to-face courses.

Community College Institution Size

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2017) classifies two-year community colleges into five institutional size categories based on full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment. Very small two-year institutions have less than 500 students, small two-year institutions have 500-1,999 students, medium two-year institutions have 2,000-4,999 students, large two-year institutions have 5,000-9,999 students, and very large two-year institutions have a minimum of 10,000 students.

Although the impact of institution size on distance education faculty compensation of public community colleges in the United States has limited reference points in the literature,

when it comes to size, it matters. Institutional organization, intricacy, ethos, and funding are all impacted by institution size. Funding studies support the idea that institution size (student population) often determines the level of funding available to support quality educational programs (Katsinas, Tollefson, & Reamey, 2008). Most states establish funding based on enrollment driven formulas, thereby favoring larger institutions. During recessions, enrollments at community colleges typically go up (Fry, 2009). However, despite tremendous enrollment growth, state support for all public higher education has been dwindling steadily over the years. In 2009, state support was at the lowest level than for most years since 1980 (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2011). Although community colleges have offset state funding declines by increasing tuition rates, state and local tax cuts have placed an increased financial burden on many community colleges, just when demand for their services is at an all-time high.

Higher Education Faculty

About one-third of higher education faculty members are community college faculty. Community college faculty members directly influence students, higher education, and the broader community and workforce. They teach approximately 37% of all undergraduate students in the United States (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Furthermore, they teach nearly half of all minority and freshman students (American Association of Community Colleges, 2014), and numerous high school students through the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) program (Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

Approximately two-thirds of community college faculty members are part-time faculty (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Community college reliance on part-time faculty has grown steadily since the early 1970s (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Flexibility, unique expertise, and cost-effectiveness are leading factors that have contributed to the growth of part-time faculty at

community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Louziotis, 2000; Rhoades, 1996; Wallin, 2004). According to Mize (1998), part-time faculty "typically cost less than an equivalent full-time instructor", they "provide an important level of expertise which allows the colleges to provide up-to-date instruction from persons currently employed in the field," and enable institutions "to hire and dismiss without the extensive requirements of multiple lay-off notices and hearings" (p. 9). Although part-time faculty members outnumber their full-time faculty counterparts, they only teach about one-third of community college courses (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995).

Higher Education Faculty Compensation

Burleson (2011) describes faculty compensation as any means of remuneration, including but not limited to financial compensation, release time, and additional supports. Faculty compensation is a management tool leveraged by higher education administrators to increase productivity, improve return on investment, and boost the public appeal of an institution (Sutton & Bergerson, 2001). A variety of factors, such as level of education, professional experience, scholarship, current economic climate, and ancillary activities factor in to determining faculty compensation (Burleson, 2011; Casey, 2008). Despite enrollment growths and increasing demands placed on faculty, average salary for full-time faculty barely rose 2% during the 2011-2012 academic years (Thornton & Curtis, 2012). Low salaries, coupled with increasing responsibilities, forced higher education faculty to demand additional compensation (Perreault et al., 2008). Not having kept pace with inflation, higher education faculty compensation has been and remains a major issue for higher education faculty and administrators.

Summary

From correspondence education through the advent of broadcast mediums for educational delivery and the use of the Internet for learning online, community colleges are incessantly

seeking new and inventive ways to provide universal access to many types of learners. Technological advancements bring about additional skill requirements for faculty related to online course development and delivery.

In order to develop and deliver effective online courses, many universities require their faculty to possess instructional design and pedagogical and technological skills as they prepare for online teaching, compounding training requirements for faculty wanting to teach online. In addition to time spent on training, research suggests that online course development and delivery is not only perceived to be more time consuming, but it may indeed be more time consuming than face-to-face course development and delivery. In terms of course development, a significant amount of faculty time was spent creating online course content, while pre-semester setup, instructor-student interaction, grading and assessment, and overall involvement in the class consume substantial amounts of faculty time when delivering online courses.

The faculty training required, the development of course content, and the time spent interacting, grading, and assessing prompted faculty to want proper compensation for their time. However, due to the dearth of research on equitable and frequently used compensation practices for participation in online learning initiatives, institutions implemented compensation practices lacking information, research, and expertise, resulting in different compensation practices for online course development and delivery across institutions.

Community college institutions fall into one of five size classifications ranging from very small to very large and employ full-time and part-time faculty. Research supports that larger institutions (those with higher enrollments) typically receive more funding than smaller institutions, so when it comes to institution size, it matters. Despite overall community college

enrollment growth over the years, average faculty salaries have remained stagnant and unable to keep pace with inflation.

Chapter III describes the methods and procedures used in this study to determine the most frequently used practices public community colleges in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. It identifies the population, the instrument used, the methods of data collection, and the statistical analysis.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. The purpose of this study was to determine the most frequently used practices community colleges in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. This was a replication of the Burleson (2011) university study, and it was extended to the community college population. Using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and descriptive statistics, this study attempted to test whether institution size had any effect on faculty compensation, compare full-time faculty and part-time faculty compensation, and identify the most frequently used compensation practices currently being provided to community college faculty for their work. This chapter describes the study population, research variables, instrument used, data collection methods, statistical analysis, and a summary.

Population

The American Association of Community Colleges (2018) identified 1,103-member community colleges in the United States. Of these 1,103 community colleges, 88 were independent (private), for-profit community colleges that receive private funding, and 35 were tribal community colleges (which are federally grant funded). The private and tribal community colleges were removed, reducing the number to 980 public community colleges that are state and locally funded.

The target population for this study was public community college distance learning directors. The criterion for selection of participants was individuals currently serving as distance learning administrators at public community colleges in the United States. Census sampling was employed to identify participants from within the population chosen (Lodico, Spaulding, &

Voegtle, 2006). Participants were identified by the researcher through the AACC website without regard for any other factors (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender). A single list of distance learning administrators at 980 public community colleges in the United States was created by entering the data, available online, into an Excel™ spreadsheet. It was determined using a table based on the formula by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) that for a finite population at a 95% confidence level the researcher would need 276 completed surveys. All participants identified as distance learning administrators at public community colleges in the United States were invited to participate. Participation was voluntary and Old Dominion University's Human Subjects Committee approved data collection for this study.

Distance learning administrators at each community college were contacted to participate in the research study. The participant titles varied due to the various titles used from one institution to another. Participant titles included Director of Online Learning, Director of Distance Education, or other counterparts. Counterparts were determined during the initial collection of contact information for each community college. However, for use in this study, the term participant refers to the individuals who completed the survey as a representative of their institution regardless of their titles. The researcher assumed that the respondents were knowledgeable of frequently used compensation practices their institutions provided to faculty for online course development and delivery.

Research Variables

The independent variable for Research Questions 1 and 2 was compensation options available. The dependent variable for Research Questions 1 and 2 was compensation options selected. The independent variables for Research Question 3 were institution size, ranging from very small (1-499) to very large (Over 10,000) and compensation practices, while the dependent

variable was the difference in compensation practices between institutions of varying sizes. The independent variables for Research Question 4 were compensation practices and faculty type (full-time or part-time), while the dependent variable was the difference in compensation practices between part-time and full-time faculty.

Instrument Used

The purpose of this study was to determine the most frequently used practices community colleges in the United States used for compensating faculty for online course development and delivery. The survey used in this study was designed and validated by Burleson (2011) and contained questions that addressed the goals of this study. His survey was designed to gather information about the most common practices four-year institutions in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. The validity, usability, and reliability for the Burleson (2011) survey was reinforced by a pilot test with five community college Directors of Online Learning and five subject matter experts.

The Burleson survey consisted of 16 closed-ended questions and 5 open-ended questions (Appendix B). Since it was originally developed for use at four-year institutions, the current researcher modified the Burleson survey to be used at two-year institutions. This involved an examination of the questions in each of the sections as to the appropriateness for the community college population. Modifications of questions were necessary, as some of the questions as originally stated by Burleson (2011) pertain to four-year institutions. For example, Question 2, How many students does your institution serve, was changed to the response ranges of 1-499 (Very Small), 500-1,999 (Small), 2,000-4,999 (Medium), 5,000-9,999 (Large), and Over 10,000 (Very Large) aligned with the Carnegie Classification system. Question 3, How many online courses does your institution offer per year, was changed to include “None” as an answer choice.

Question 8, Does your institution seek online course delivery experience when hiring new faculty, was modified to include the word "teaching" to further clarify the term "delivery". Questions 13 and 17, the financial compensation ranges were modified to ranges more likely to be provided by community colleges: (a) $0-$499.00, (b) $500.00-$999.00, (c) $1,000.00-$1,499.00, (d) $1,500.00-$1,999.00, (e) $2,000.00-$2,499.00, (f) $2,500.00-$2,999.00, (g) $3,000.00-$3,499.00, and (h) $3,500 or greater (Burleson, 2011). In addition, the current researcher added two Likert-type questions to the survey to determine if practices for developing and delivering/teaching online courses are adequate to encourage faculty to develop and deliver/teach courses online.

Content Validity and Reliability

To ensure the modified survey had validity and reliability with community college populations, an analysis of the new instrument for validity and reliability was conducted. According to Briggs and Coleman (2007), "careful and appropriate" (p. 130) piloting of research instruments "weed out inappropriate, poorly worded or irrelevant items, highlight design problems and provide feedback" (p. 130) on the ease of completing the survey. The researcher presented the modified survey to three subject matters experts working in the field of community college leadership and online learning and two instrument design experts who reviewed the survey for appropriateness and applicability to the community college population (Appendix C). The experts were selected because of their experience and leadership skills in the field of community college leadership, online learning, and/or instrument design. An email request to participate in the pilot study was sent to each of the five participants (see Appendix D). Participants that expressed interest in participating in the pilot study were sent an introductory letter that included the statement of the problem, research questions (see Appendix E), a link to

the survey, and the survey rating form (see Appendix F). The survey rating form sought participant feedback on the following seven questions:

1. Were the directions for completing the survey clear?
2. Were the survey statements clear?
3. Were there statements that needed revision? If so, what were the needed revisions?
4. Were there grammatical, structure, or spelling errors? If so, what were these?
5. Are there compensation options that need to be added to the survey? If so, please list.
6. Are there other levels of financial compensation that need to be added to the survey?
7. Does the survey fulfill the data collection needs of the study as defined in the statement of the problem and the research questions? If not, please offer suggestions.

The decision to accept or decline each recommendation from the review panel was based upon the frequency of occurrence or relevance to improving the survey. The results, decision to accept or decline, and brief rationales for accepting or declining each recommendation are listed in Table 1.

The revised survey was then piloted with five community college directors of online learning to determine reliability of the survey (see Appendix G). The directors were sent an email inviting them to participate in the pilot study (see Appendix H). Those who agreed to participate voluntarily were sent a letter with a link to the online survey asking them to complete it (see Appendix I).

Approximately two weeks later the pilot group participated in a second administration of the online survey (see Appendix J). A second administration helped to establish reliability of measurement or the consistency of a measure over time (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). According to Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen (2010), one indication of the reliability of measure is its reliability

Table 1

Instrument Validity Survey

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	Accepted/Declined	Rationale
2	How many students does your institution serve?	Suggest asking how many FTEs the college has annually or specify a timeframe like per major term (fall or spring).	Declined	Does not meet the purpose of this study.
3	How many online courses does your institution offer per year?	Courses or Sections? Course would be ENGL 101 while sections would be amount of ENGL 101.	Declined	Courses was specified and further defined.
4	Does your institution limit or "cap" the number of students that can enroll in an online course?	Remove "cap".	Accepted	Agree it is redundant, removed “cap” to improve the clarity of the question.
4		Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.
7	Does your institution seek online course development experience when hiring new faculty?	Be clear about what "seek" expertise means. This seems informal. Is it a plus or a requirement?	Accepted	Replaced the word “seek” with the term “require” to improve the clarity of the question.
8	Does your institution seek online course delivery/teaching experience when hiring new faculty?	Be clear about what "seek" expertise means. This seems informal. Is it a plus or a requirement?	Accepted	Replaced the word “seek” with the term “require” to improve the clarity of the question.

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	Accepted/Declined	Rationale
9	Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing and delivering/teaching online courses?	Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.
9		I am not sure about combining both "developing" and "delivering/teaching" in one question. What if they only provide it for those faculty members developing courses?	Accepted	Agreed, separated the question into two questions, one for development, and the other for delivery/teaching (including the follow-up).
12	Which of the following does your institution offer for **developing** online courses?	Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.
12		Travel support instead of Travel Support	Accepted	Corrected as requested.

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	Accepted/Declined	Rationale
13	If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **develop** a one semester, 3-credit or similar online course from the options listed below.	Remove “Does not apply”	Accepted	Utilize skip logic in Survey Monkey.
14	Compensation to **develop** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to develop courses online.	What does adequate mean, compared to... hours spent?	Declined	Does not improve the clarity of the question.
15	Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses?	Needs a "Does not apply" option. Our institution does not compensate faculty for course development.	Declined	Utilize skip logic in Survey Monkey.
15		Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	Accepted/Declined	Rationale
16	If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **developing** online courses?	"...at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty..." It seemed helpful to me to have the clarifier there - I had to read the question a few times and read the prior question. I think it would be helpful to say it right there.	Accepted	Corrected as requested to improve the clarity of the question.
17	Which of these does your institution offer for **delivering/teaching** online courses?	Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.
17		Travel support instead of Travel Support	Accepted	Corrected as requested.

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	Accepted/Declined	Rationale
18	If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **deliver/teach** an online course from the options below.	They are typically paid the same lecture hour equivalent (LHE) as a face to face course. I do not know how meaningful this would be as LHE differs based on course size maybe you could ask per LHE but once again it is predicated on the college.	Declined	Does not meet the purpose of this study.
19	Compensation to **deliver/teach** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to **deliver/teach** online courses.	Define adequate.	Declined	Does not improve the clarity of the question.
20	Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses?	Use skip logic in Survey Monkey.	Accepted	Customizes survey based on respondent answers.

coefficient. The computation of a reliability coefficient between participants on the same test determines the extent to which they maintain the same relative position (Ary et al.). A reliability coefficient of 1.00 indicates there is agreement from participants and the test would be reliable (Ary et al., 2010; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). A reliability coefficient level of .70 or greater is deemed to be acceptable for this study. A reliability coefficient level below .60 is deemed to be unacceptable, and the researcher would need to determine whether to remove or modify the survey item based on concerns outlined in the pilot group test and retest of the instrument (Creswell, 2008).

The coefficient of reliability was calculated for twelve closed-ended items on the survey. Reliability analysis was only performed on closed-ended items to determine if a relationship existed between two sets of data. Ten items fell within the reliability coefficient level of .70 or greater, and they were deemed acceptable for this study. However, the reliability coefficient levels of Question 4 and Question 22 fell below .70. The researcher reviewed Question 4 and Question 22 to determine whether to modify or remove each of the questions. Question 4 asked participants how many online courses their institution offered per year. Question 22 (Question 29 in the Final Prout Survey) asked participants if compensation to deliver/teach an online course was adequate to encourage faculty to deliver/teach online courses. The researcher deemed both questions to be unreliable and eliminated them in the analysis.

Table 2

Pilot Study for Reliability

Question #	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Total	Coefficient
2	*	*	*	*	*	5/5	1.0
3	*	*	*	*	*	5/5	1.0
4			*	*		2/5	0.4
5	*	*		*	*	4/5	0.8
7		*	*	*	*	4/5	0.8
8	*	*	*	*	*	5/5	1.0
9		*	*	*	*	4/5	0.8
10	*	*	*	*	*	5/5	1.0
12	*	*	*	*	*	5/5	1.0
17	*		*	*	*	4/5	0.8
18		*	*	*	*	4/5	0.8
22	*		*		*	3/5	0.6

Note: "*" indicates that the person responded consistently for the item on the two administrations of the pilot survey.

Methods of Data Collection

The final survey used in this study was distributed to public community college directors of online learning (or other counterparts) in the United States. Nine hundred-eighty public community college directors of online learning were asked to participate. The researcher obtained contact information for public community college directors of online learning from the American Association of Community Colleges' (AACC) Membership Directory (2017).

The researcher employed an online tool, Survey Monkey™, a commercial product, to deploy the survey in January 2018. An email (Appendix K) invitation to participate in the research study was sent to community college directors of online learning explaining the survey (Appendix L) and ensuring participant confidentiality. Follow-up emails (Appendix M) with the link were sent to those who had not responded within two weeks of the original survey. Additional follow-up requests were done by email, LinkedIn, and phone until a sufficient number of completed surveys (minimum of 276) was received (Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, 2001; Sapsford, 2007).

Methods of Data Analysis

After the completed surveys were received, each was reviewed for completeness. The researcher reviewed the survey results to determine the most frequently used compensation practices participating institutions provided to community college faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Data were exported from the survey into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, and descriptive statistical analyses were employed to describe the data. The researcher coded the five non-financial compensation types and the financial compensation ranges for online course development and delivery numerically as described in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3

Non-Financial Compensation Codes

Types of Non-Financial Compensation	Code
Release time	0
Computer equipment	1
Travel Support	2
Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure	3
Other	4

Table 4

Financial Compensation Codes

Financial Compensation	Code
Does not apply	0
$0 - 499	1
$500 - 999	2
$1,000 - 1,499	3
$1,500 - 1,999	4
$2,000 - 2,499	5
$2,500 - 2,999	6
$3,000 - 3,499	7
Greater than $3,500	8

The researcher determined the most common type of non-financial compensation, the most common financial compensation ranges, and the average financial compensation ranges for online course development and delivery for the entire population and for each institution size. The researcher designated the compensation categories that were selected most often as the most frequently used practices for compensating community college faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Frequency analyses were used to determine if participating institutions compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate for online course development and delivery and to

determine whether full-time or part-time faculty were compensated at a higher or lower rate if they reported that their full-time and part-time faculty were not compensated at the same rate.

The researcher conducted frequency analysis on results from Question 20 and Question 28 in which participants selected the types of non-financial compensation their institution offered faculty for online course development and delivery. The researcher then compiled a list and conducted frequency analysis on results from Question 22 and Question 30 in which participants listed other compensation practices they would like to see implemented at their institution for online course development and online course delivery.

The researcher performed ANOVA using SPSS software to analyze differences among group means (very small, small, medium, large, and very large institutions) and compensation. Effect size was calculated to determine the magnitude of the significance, and post-hoc tests were run. ANOVA was also used to analyze differences among group means (institution size: very small, small, medium, large and very large) and compensation (higher or lower) of FT and PT faculty for online course development and delivery.

Summary

Chapter III presented the methods and procedures that were utilized to obtain the essential data for this study. This descriptive study surveyed 980 public community college directors of online learning or other counterparts in the United States. The researcher modified an instrument developed by Burleson (2011), a survey designed to determine the most frequently used compensation practices for online course development and delivery. The modified survey was reviewed and validated by subject matter experts and piloted by five directors of online learning to strengthen its reliability. The final survey was sent to participants in an email. Follow-up emails with the survey link were sent to those who had not participated within a week

of the original survey followed by personal phone calls to encourage participation. Data were then compiled and tabulated to determine the frequencies of response and data were examined with regard to the comparisons of public community college directors of online learning regarding compensation practices for online course development and delivery. Descriptive statistics using frequencies/numbers and percentages and ANOVA were used to determine most frequently used compensation practices. The findings of the data collected are reported in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine the practices most frequently used by community colleges for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This chapter presents data collected with the intent of answering the following research questions:

RQ_1: What compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course development?

RQ_2: What compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course delivery?

RQ_3: What significance does institution size have on faculty financial compensation for online course development and delivery?

RQ_4: What are the differences in financial compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?

This chapter presents response rates, survey responses, statistical analyses, and findings summary.

Response Rate

The population of this study included 980 (N = 980) public community colleges in the United States that were identified using the American Association of Community College's membership directory. Given the population of 980 public community colleges in the United States (American Association of Community Colleges, 2017), 276 responses were required to achieve statistical significance at the p = .05 significance level (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Of the 980 community colleges, surveys were collected from 280 community colleges for a return rate of 29%, a 95% confidence level, and a margin of error of 5%. Two hundred seventy-nine

participants (99%) completed the survey online. For the purpose of convenience and at the request of the participant, the researcher conducted one survey (<1%) using the phone.

Survey Responses

The survey consisted of 31 closed-form and open-form response questions requesting both demographic information and current practices for compensating community college faculty for online course development and delivery. Following are responses to each survey question.

Participating Institution Demographics

Question 1 asked participants to provide the name of the participating institution. The researcher grouped each participating institution into a geographic region. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania comprised the Northeast region; Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota comprised the Midwest region; Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, District of Columbia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas represented the South region; and Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington, and Northern Mariana Islands represented the West region. Of the 280 participating institutions, the majority were from the South region, with 95 (33.9%) participating institutions. The region with the least number of participating institutions was the Northeast region, with 36 (12.9%) participating institutions. Table 5 shows a summary of all participating institutions by region including number and percentage.

Table 5

Participating Institutions by Region

Regions	*n*	%
Northeast	36	12.9
Midwest	57	20.4
South	95	33.9
West	92	32.8
Totals	280	100%

Question 2 asked participants to select their title from one of the following options: (1) Director of eLearning, (2) Director of Online Learning, (3) Director of Distance Education, and (4) Other (please specify). Of the 280 participants, 58 (20%) selected titles from the provided options. Director of Distance Education was selected by 25 (8%) participants, Director of e-Learning was selected by 21 (7%) participants, and Director of Online Learning was selected least with 12 (4%) participants making this selection. The remaining 222 (79%) participants provided other titles. The researcher clustered the 222 additional titles provided by participants into seven cluster areas shown in Table 6. The largest title cluster from the additional titles participants listed was Upper Level Administrator with 72 (25.7%) titles in this cluster. Table 6 shows a summary of all participant title clusters including frequency and percentage.

Table 6

Participant Title Clusters

Titles	*n*	%
Administrative Support Staff/Faculty	4	1.6
Coordinator	35	12.5
Department Chair or Dean	61	21.7
Instructional Service Provider	12	4.2
Other Director	38	13.6
Upper Level Administrator (President, Vice President, Provost)	72	25.7
Responses to Titles Provided on Survey	58	20.7
Totals	280	100%

Question 3 asked participants to select the range of the number of students their institution served, in other words their unduplicated student headcount. The most frequently selected student population range was 2,000-4,999. Eighty-four participants (30%) selected this range. The population range that was selected least was 1-499 with 6 (2%) participants making this selection. Table 7 shows a summary for each of the student population categories including the number and percentage of participating institutions that selected each range of students.

Table 7

Participating Institution Student Population

Number of Students	*n*	%
1 - 499	6	2.1
500 -1,999	59	21.1
2,000 - 4,999	84	30.0
5,000 - 9,999	61	21.8
Over 10,000	70	25.0
Totals	280	100%

Question 4 asked participants to select the number of online courses their institution offered from the following five options: (1) None, (2) 1-9 courses, (3) 10-49 courses, (4) 50-149 courses, and (5) 150+ courses. Participants that selected None were disqualified from the study. Since this question was deemed unreliable due to a reliability coefficient level of .40, the researcher did not analyze and report the responses to this question.

Question 5 asked participants if they limited the number of students that could enroll in each online course. The majority of participants, 225 (80.3%) selected "Yes", they did limit enrollment, and 55 participants (19.6) selected "No" they did not limit enrollment.

Question 6 asked participants that selected "Yes" to Question 5, stating they do limit enrollment, to list the limit. The researcher clustered responses to this question into five clusters

shown in Table 8. Two hundred-six participants (91%) listed 1-50 as their online course enrollment limit. One participant selected the smallest cap of 18 (0.4%). The largest cap was 235 and was listed by one participant (0.4%). The average cap was 35.4, which was determined by calculating the mean of the online course limits listed by each of the 225 participants that selected "Yes" to Question 5.

Table 8

Online Course Enrollment Limits

Limit Range	*n*	%
1 - 50	206	91.0
51 - 100	16	7.0
101 - 150	2	1.6
151 - 200	0	0.0
201 - 250	1	0.4
Totals	225	100%

Question 7 asked the participants to select the number of online programs their institution offered from the following options: (1) 0-4, (2) 5-9, (3) 10-19, and (4) 20+. The majority of participants, 164 (58.6%), selected 0-4 programs, 56 (20%) selected 5-9 programs, 37 participants (13.2%) selected 10-19 programs, and 23 participants (8.2%) selected 20+ programs.

Question 8 asked the participants if their institution sought online courses development experience when hiring new faculty. The majority of participants, 238 (85%) selected "No," they did not seek online course development experience when hiring faculty. Forty-two (15%) selected "Yes," they did seek online course development experience.

Question 9 asked the participants if their institution sought online course delivery/teaching experience when hiring new faculty. The majority of participants, 237 (84.6%)

selected “No,” they did not seek online course delivery experience. Forty-three participants (15.4%) selected “Yes,” they sought online course delivery experience when hiring new faculty.

Question 10 asked the participants if their institution provided instructional design services to faculty developing online courses. Two hundred-forty participants (85.7%) selected “Yes,” they did provide instructional design services to faculty developing online courses, and 40 participants (14.3%) selected “No,” they did not provide instructional design services to faculty developing online courses.

Question 11 asked the participants that selected “Yes” to Question 10 to describe the instructional design services their institution provided to faculty developing online courses. Two hundred-forty participants (85.7%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered responses to this question into five clusters shown in Table 9. Specialists are identified as individuals skilled in areas related to course development, such as instructional designers, e-Learning specialists, academic technologists, educational technologists, or instructional technologists. Training is identified as being any act of developing skills and knowledge that relate to course development, such as workshops on advanced features of the learning management system (LMS) or application of the Quality Matters rubric. Resources are identified as hardware or software associated with course development. The cluster with the largest number of responses was access to online course development specialists. One hundred-eighteen participants (49.2%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster.

Question 12 asked the participants if their institution provided instructional design services to faculty teaching online courses. Two hundred-thirty-two participants (82.9%) selected “Yes,” they did provide instructional design services to faculty teaching online courses, and 48 participants (17.1%) selected “No,” they did not provide instructional design services to

Table 9

Instructional Design Service Clusters for Online Course Development

Service	*n*	%
Specialists	118	49.2
Training	93	38.8
Resources	16	6.7
Certificate Program	8	3.3
Technical Support	5	2.0
Totals	240	100%

faculty teaching online courses.

Question 13 asked the participants that selected "Yes" in Question 12 to describe the instructional design services their institution provided to faculty teaching online courses. Two hundred-thirty-two participants (82.9%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered responses to this question into five clusters shown in Table 10. The cluster with the largest number of responses was access to online course delivery specialists. One hundred-nine participants (47%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster. Table 10 shows the number and percentage for each instructional design service cluster for online course delivery in descending order.

Table 10

Instructional Design Service Clusters for Online Course Delivery

Service	*n*	%
Specialists	109	47.0
Training	82	35.3
Resources	20	8.6
Technical Support	16	6.9
Certificate Program	5	2.2
Totals	232	100%

Question 14 asked participants how they communicated compensation practices to faculty. Two hundred-eighty participants (100%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered responses to this question into nine clusters. The communication practice cluster with the largest number of entries was the cluster entitled During Service Negotiating/Contracting for 148 (52.8%) of the participants. Table 11 shows the number and percentage for each communication practice cluster.

Table 11

Compensation Communication Practice Clusters

Communication Practice	*n*	%
During Service Negotiating/Contracting	148	52.8
Not Communicated	37	13.2
VP AA/Dean/Department Head	36	12.9
Faculty Policy & Procedure Handbook	26	9.3
Email	13	4.6
Don't Know	10	3.6
Training	6	2.1
Website	3	1.1
Faculty Senate	1	0.4
Totals	280	100%

Research Question 1

Survey Questions 15 to 22 were asked to gather input for Research Question 1, what financial and non-financial compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course development?

Question 15 asked participants if their institution offered financial compensation for developing online courses. The majority of participants, 156 (55.7%) selected "No," they did not compensate faculty for online course development, and 124 (44.3%) selected "Yes," they did provide faculty with financial compensation for online course development.

Question 16 asked participants that selected "Yes" to Question 15 to select the range of financial compensation their institution provided faculty for developing a one-semester, 3-credit or similar online course. One hundred-twenty-four participant responded to this question. The most frequently selected amount of financial compensation range was $1,000.00 - $1,499.00. Twenty-nine participants (23.4%) selected this range. The financial compensation range that was selected least was $3,500.00 or greater with 5 (4.0%) participants making this selection. The average financial compensation range was $1,000 - $1,499. Table 12 shows a summary for each of the financial compensation ranges including the number and percentage of participating institutions that selected each range for developing an online course.

Table 12

Participating Institution's Financial Compensation for Developing Online Course

Amount of Financial Compensation	*n*	%
Less than $500.00	11	8.9
$500.00 - $999.00	26	21.0
$1,000.00 - $1,499.00	29	23.4
$1,500.00 - $1,999.00	13	10.5
$2,000.00 - $2,499.00	23	18.5
$2,500.00 - $2,999.00	9	7.2
$3,000.00 - $3,499.00	8	6.5
$3,500 or greater	5	4.0
Totals	124	100%

Question 17 asked participants if their institution compensated full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for online course development. One hundred-twenty-four participant responded to this question. The majority of participants, 105 (84.7%) selected "No," they did not compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for online course development, and 19 (15.3%) selected "Yes," they did compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for online course development.

Question 18 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 17 if their institution compensated full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for online course development. Nineteen participants responded to this question. The majority of participants, 16 (84.2%) selected a higher scale for online course development, so they paid their full-time faculty more than they paid their part-time faculty for online course development. Three (15.8%) participants selected a lower scale for online course development, so they paid their full-time faculty less than they paid their part-time faculty for online course development.

Question 19 asked participants if their institution offered non-financial compensation for developing online courses. Two hundred-eighty participants responded to this question. The majority of participants, 215 (76.8%) selected "No," their institution does not offer non-financial compensation for online course development, and 65 (23.3%) selected "Yes," their institution does offer non-financial compensation for online course development.

Question 20 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 19 to select all non-financial compensation methods their institution offered for online course development. Sixty-five participants responded to this question. The methods of compensation to select from included: (1) Release time, (2) Computer equipment, (3) Travel support, (4) Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure, and (5) Other (please list). The most frequently selected non-financial compensation practice for developing online courses was release time accounting for the response of 46 (70.8%) of the participants. Table 13 shows the percentage of participants that selected each non-financial compensation practice. Of the participants responding to this question, 16 (24.6%) selected "Other" compensation methods. Their responses were:

- Course development hours count towards required course load hours
- First right to refuse to teach the online course

- Assigned faculty mentor experienced in online development/delivery
- Additional opportunities/responsibilities, such as professional development or training
- Flexible time, such as the ability to work from home or remote
- Professional Development Credit

Table 13

Practices of Institutions Providing Non-financial Compensation for Online Course Development

Type of Non-Financial Compensation	*n*	%
Release time	46	70.8
Computer equipment	8	12.3
Travel support	9	13.8
Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure	10	15.4
Other (please list)	16	24.6

Question 21 asked participants if compensation (financial and/or non-financial) provided to develop online courses was adequate to encourage faculty to develop online courses from the following scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The scale option of "Agree" was selected most frequently with 93 (33.2%) participants making this selection. Eighty-seven (31.1%) selected "Neither," 47 (16.8%) selected "Disagree," 28 (10%) selected "Strongly Disagree," and 25 (8.9%) selected "Strongly Agree". There were 280 responses and the mean was 3.14, a median of 3 (Neither), and a standard deviation of 1.11 (M = 3.14, SD = 1.11).

Question 22 asked participants to list other compensation practices they would like to see implemented at their institution for online course development. One hundred-thirty-four participants (47.8%) responded to this question and the researcher clustered these responses. Table 14 shows the number and percentage for each cluster. The cluster with the largest number

of entries was higher pay. Seventy-two participants (53.7%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster.

Table 14

Recommended Compensation Practices for Developing Online Courses

Practice	*n*	%
Access to Technology/Support Services	7	5.2
Adjusted Enrollment/Course Load	11	8.2
Grants	2	1.5
Higher Pay	72	53.7
Intellectual Property Rights	4	3.0
Priority to Teach Online Course	1	0.7
Professional Development/Travel Support	10	7.5
Recognition/Promotion/Tenure	5	3.7
Release Time	21	15.7
Work from Home	1	0.75
Totals	134	100%

Research Question 2

Survey Questions 23 to 31 were asked to gather input for Research Question 2, what financial and non-financial compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course delivery?

Question 23 asked participants if their institution offered financial compensation for delivering/teaching online courses. The majority of participants, 167 (59.6%) selected "No," they did not financially compensate faculty for online course delivery, and 113 (40.4%) selected "Yes," they did provide faculty with financial compensation for online course delivery.

Question 24 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 23 to select the range of financial compensation their institution provided faculty for delivering an online course. One hundred-thirteen participant responded to this question. The most frequently selected financial compensation range was $1,500.00 - $1,999.00. Thirty-five participants (31%) selected this

range. The financial compensation range that was selected least was less than $500.00 with six (5.3%) participants making this selection. Table 15 shows a summary for each of the financial compensation ranges including the number and percentage of participating institutions that selected each range for delivering an online course.

Table 15

Participating Institution's Financial Compensation for Online Course Delivery

Amount of Financial Compensation	*n*	%
Less than $500.00	6	5.3
$500.00 - $999.00	7	6.2
$1,000.00 - $1,499.00	15	13.3
$1,500.00 - $1,999.00	35	31.0
$2,000.00 - $2,499.00	15	13.3
$2,500.00 - $2,999.00	13	11.5
$3,000.00 - $3,499.00	8	7.1
$3,500 or greater	14	12.4
Totals	113	100%

Question 25 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 23 if their institution compensated full-time versus part-time faculty at a higher or lower scale for delivering/teaching online courses. One hundred-thirteen participant responded to this question. The majority of participants, 68 (60.2%) selected "No," they did not compensate full-time at a different rate than part-time faculty for delivering an online course, and 45 (39.8%) selected "Yes," they did compensate full-time versus part-time faculty at a higher or lower scale for delivering/teaching an online course.

Question 26 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 25 if their institution compensated full-time versus part-time faculty at a higher or lower scale for delivering/teaching an online course. Forty-five participants responded to this question. The majority of participants, 42 (93.3%), selected full-time faculty were compensated at a higher rate for

delivering/teaching an online course than part-time faculty, and 3 (6.7%) selected full-time faculty were compensated at a lower scale for delivering an online course than part-time faculty.

Question 27 asked participants if their institution offered non-financial compensation for delivering/teaching online courses. One hundred-thirteen participants responded to this question. The majority of participants, 98 (86.7%), selected "No," their institution does not offer non-financial compensation for delivering/teaching online courses, and 15 (13.3%) selected "Yes," their institution does offer non-financial compensation for delivering/teaching online courses.

Question 28 asked participants that selected "Yes" in Question 27 to select all non-financial compensation methods their institution offered for delivering/teaching online courses. Fifteen participants responded to this question. The methods of compensation to select from included: (1) Release time, (2) Computer equipment, (3) Travel support, (4) Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure, and (5) Other (please list). The most frequently selected non-financial compensation practice for delivering/teaching online courses was release time, accounting for the responses of 7 (46.7%) of the participants. Table 16 shows the percentage of participants that selected each non-financial compensation practice. Of the participants responding to this question, 2 (13.3%) selected "Other" and listed preference and priority for teaching online courses.

Table 16

Practices of Institutions Providing Non-financial Compensation for Online Course Delivery

Type of Non-Financial Compensation	*n*	%
Release time	7	46.7
Computer equipment	5	33.3
Travel support	0	0.0
Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure	0	0.0
Other (please list)	2	13.3

Question 29 asked participants if compensation (financial and/or non-financial) provided to deliver/teach online courses was adequate to encourage faculty to deliver/teach online courses from the following scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. This question was also deemed unreliable due to a reliability coefficient of .60, so the researcher did not analyze and report responses to this question.

Question 30 asked participants to list other compensation practices they would like to see implemented at their institution for delivering/teaching online courses. Seventy-eight participants (28.2%) responded to this question and the researcher clustered the responses to this question into eight clusters. The cluster with the largest number of entries was higher pay. Thirty-one participants (39.7%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster. Table 17 shows the number and percentage for each cluster.

Table 17

Recommended Compensation Practices for Teaching/Delivering Online Courses

Practice	*n*	%
Access to Technology/Support Services	8	10.3
Adjusted Enrollment/Course Load	9	11.5
Higher Pay	31	39.7
Priority to Teach Future Online Offerings	2	2.5
Professional Development/Travel Support	8	10.3
Recognition/Promotion/Tenure	6	7.7
Release Time	8	10.3
Virtual Office Hours/Work from Home	6	7.7
Totals	78	100%

Question 31 asked participants to provide their emails if they wished to receive study results. Two hundred-eleven participants (75.3%) expressed interest in receiving study results and provided their email.

Further Statistical Analysis

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to provide findings to Research Question 3, what significance does institution size have on faculty financial compensation for online course development and delivery? Survey Questions 3, 16, and 24 were asked to gather input for Research Question 3. Another ANOVA was conducted to provide findings to Research Question 4, what are the differences in financial compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery? Survey Questions 17, 18, 25, and 26 were asked to gather input for Research Question 4.

Research Question 3

An ANOVA was conducted using SPSS software to analyze the differences among group means (very small, small, medium, large, and very large institutions) and compensation for online course *development*. For this a null hypothesis was developed. H_{01}: There is no difference among institution size and compensation for online course development. The assumption of homogeneity was not met because p (.025) < α (.05). This was indicated by the Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances, $F(4, 119) = 2.88$, $p = .025$. With an alpha level of .05, p (.025) < α (.05), it indicated significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (no variance difference) was rejected, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met. Since the homogeneity of variance was not met, the researcher conducted a *Welch F* test. The obtained *Welch's* adjusted *F* ratio (4.59) was significant at the .05 alpha level reported as *Welch's* $F(4, 15.35) = 4.59$, $p < .05$, so there was a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course development. Since the researcher used the *Welch's F* test, the adjusted omega squared formula was used to calculate effect size to determine the magnitude of the significance. Approximately 8% ($\omega^2 = .08$) of all variance in

compensation for online course development is attributed to institution size, *Welch's F*(4, 15.35) = 4.59, $p < .05$, est. $\omega^2 = .08$. The researcher then used the Games-Howell post hoc test since the homogeneity of variance was not met to identify how the pairs of groups differed. There were significant differences between small and large institutions and small and very large institutions in regard to compensation for online course development.

The researcher performed another ANOVA to analyze the differences among group means (very small, small, medium, large, and very large institutions) and compensation for online course *delivery*. The null hypothesis developed was H_{02}: There is no difference among institution size and compensation for online course delivery. There was a statistically significant difference between group means and compensation for online course delivery as determined by the one-way ANOVA $F(4, 108) = 3.969$, $p = .005$. Effect size was also calculated to determine the magnitude of the significance indicating eta squared or $\eta^2 = 0.128$. In other words, 12.8% of all variance in compensation for online course delivery was attributed to institution size. Since data met the assumption of homogeneity, the researcher used Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc test. The differences between means of very small, medium, and very large institutions was not statistically significant. However, there were significant differences between small and large institutions. In other words, small and large institutions appear to be the most different from the other institution sizes in regard to compensation for online course delivery. The findings imply that institution size does impact faculty financial compensation for online course development and online course delivery.

Research Question 4

An ANOVA was conducted to analyze the differences among group means (very small, small, medium, large, and very large institutions) and compensation differences (higher or lower)

among faculty type (full-time and part-time faculty) for online course *development*. With an alpha level of .05, p (.203) > α (.05), it indicated there were no significant differences among group means and compensation for online course development.

The researcher performed another ANOVA to analyze the differences among group means (very small, small, medium, large, and very large institutions) and compensation differences (higher or lower) between faculty type (full-time and part-time faculty) for online course *delivery*. With an alpha level of .05, p (.693) > α (.05), it indicated there were no significant differences among group means and compensation for online course delivery.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the practices most frequently used by community colleges for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. A survey was administered to the selected population in order to further examine this issue. The data analysis included online administrators from 280 public community colleges in the United States who participated by completing an online survey about their institution's demographics and faculty compensation practices for online course development and delivery.

Research Question 1 addressed the most frequently selected compensation practices for developing online courses. Financial compensation was the most frequently selected compensation practice for online course development, with 124 participants (44.3%) selecting it as one of their compensation practices. The most frequently selected financial compensation range for online course development was $1,000-$1,499 with an average range of $1,000-$1,499.

Research Question 2 addressed the most frequently selected compensation practice for delivering online courses. Financial compensation was the most frequently selected

compensation practice for online course delivery, with 113 participants (40.4%) selecting it as one of their compensation practices. The most frequently selected financial compensation range for online course delivery was $1,500-$1,999 with an average range of $1,500-$1,999.

Research Question 3 required analyses to determine the relationships between institution size and faculty compensation for online course development and delivery. An ANOVA was used to test whether institution size had any effect on faculty compensation for online course development and delivery. There was a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course *development*. The Games-Howell post hoc test was used to determine how the pairs of groups differed. There were significant differences between small and large institutions and small and very large institutions. There was also a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course *delivery*. Tukey's Honestly Significant Different (HSD) post hoc analyses were used to follow up the ANOVA. There were significant differences between small and large institutions.

Research Question 4 required analyses to determine whether institution size had any effect on compensation based on faculty type (full-time and part-time) for online course development and delivery. There were no significant differences among institution size and compensation practices of full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and online course delivery.

Chapter V will provide a summary of this study and conclusions based on the findings. Chapter V will also include recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the compensation practices public community colleges in the United States provided faculty for developing and delivering/teaching online courses. This chapter summarizes the study, presents conclusions based upon the findings, and provides recommendations for implementing the findings and for future research based upon the results of this study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the practices most frequently used by community colleges for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Four research questions were used to guide this study. Research Question 1 was "What financial and non-financial compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course development?" Research Question 2 was "What financial and non-financial compensation practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course delivery?" Research Question 3 was "What significance does institution size have on faculty financial compensation for online course development and delivery?" Research Question 4 was "What are the differences in financial compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?"

Committed to their mission of ensuring all students access to educational opportunities anytime, and from anywhere, make community colleges key contenders of leading distance learning initiatives in higher education (Bower & Hardy, 2004; Inman, Kerwin, & Mayes, 1999). Distance education course development and delivery necessitated the recruitment of faculty who were subject matter experts and willing to develop online courses (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak,

2006). However, compensation often surfaced as a barrier to increased faculty interest in adopting new educational technologies (Olcott & Wright, 1995). In order to remedy the challenge of procuring and maintaining qualified faculty, institutions began revamping their existing compensation practices to include additional compensation for online course development and delivery (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005). The significance of this study was to provide community college faculty and administrators with a resource to help them effectively support their distance learning initiatives by identifying the most frequently used compensation practices community colleges in the United States provided their faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Past studies have focused on four-year institutions, and there is very limited research about distance learning compensation practices at two-year institutions.

There were several limitations to this study. First, the compensation practices identified in this study do not indicate or imply their effectiveness in rewarding faculty for online teaching. Second, as participant's titles varied from one institution to another, the roles of participants may have also varied between institutions. Finally, participants may not have been aware of informal compensation agreements between faculty members and their direct supervisors.

The population of this study consisted of 980 distance learning administrators from very small, small, medium, large, and very large public community colleges in the United States as identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). The instrument used for this study was a modified survey originally developed by Burleson (2011). The researcher modified the survey by developing questions that addressed practices at the various sizes of community colleges. In order to strengthen the validity of the modified survey, a pilot study was conducted using five content experts and five randomly selected institutions that met the same criteria as the participating institutions. These institutions that participated in the pilot study did

not participate in the actual study. The researcher reviewed the feedback pilot study participants provided. The final survey includes those recommendations that strengthened or enhanced the original survey. The survey was comprised of closed-form and open-form response questions that requested demographic information, current compensation practices, and amounts of financial compensation each institution provided for online course development and delivery.

The researcher emailed each institution a letter of introduction to introduce the researcher and the study and to request their participation in January 2018. Approximately two weeks later the researcher emailed participants a cover letter with a survey link that included how to complete the online survey. Two weeks after sending the cover letter the researcher sent a follow-up email requesting participation from non-responders. Two weeks later the researcher contacted non-responders via telephone to encourage participation and offer assistance in completing the survey, and this was done until a sufficient number of survey responses was received. There were 280 responses (n = 280) for a return rate of 29% and a confidence level of 95%.

To address Research Question 1 and Research Question 2 frequency analyses were conducted on current compensation practices and financial ranges each participant's institution provided faculty for online course development and delivery. To address Research Question 3, two ANOVAs were conducted to test whether institution size had any effect on faculty compensation for online course development and delivery. To address Research Question 4, two ANOVAs were conducted to analyze differences among group means (institution size: very small, small, medium, large and very large) and compensation (higher or lower) of FT and PT faculty for online course development and delivery. The data collected were reported in aggregate and analyzed using SPSS software.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn after analyzing the findings as they relate to the research questions. Research Question 1 was to determine the most common financial and non-financial compensation practices public community colleges across the United States used to compensate faculty for online course development. Of the 280 participating institutions, the majority of participants, 156 (55.7%) selected "No," they did not financially compensate faculty for online course development. One hundred-twenty-four (44.3%) participants selected "Yes," they did provide faculty with financial compensation for online course development, and frequency analysis of these responses confirmed the most common financial compensation range for developing an online course was $1,000.00 - $1,499.00 with 29 respondents (23.4%) reporting. Of the 280 participating institutions, the majority of participants, 215 (76.8%) selected "No," their institution does not offer non-financial compensation for online course development. Sixty-five (23.3%) participants selected "Yes," their institution does offer non-financial compensation for online course development, and frequency analysis of these responses confirmed the most common non-financial compensation practice for online course development was release time with 46 participants (70.8%). This is the first time this has been reported in the literature, and no other similar research exists to support these conclusions.

Research Question 2 was to determine the most common financial and non-financial compensation practices public community colleges in the United States used to compensate faculty for online course delivery. Of the 280 participating institutions, the majority of participants, 167 (59.6%) selected "No," they did not financially compensate faculty for online course delivery. One hundred-thirteen (40.4%) participants selected "Yes," they did provide faculty with financial compensation for online course delivery, and the frequency analysis of

these responses confirmed the most common financial compensation range for delivering an online course was $1,500.00 - $1,999.00 with 35 participants (31%) reporting. This supported existing research confirming that the majority of institutions do not provide faculty with financial compensation for delivering online courses (Burleson, 2011). Of the 280 participating institutions, the majority of participants, 98 (86.7%) selected "No," their institution does not offer non-financial compensation for online course delivery. Fifteen (13.3%) participants selected "Yes," their institution does offer non-financial compensation for online course delivery, and frequency analysis of these responses confirmed the most common non-financial compensation practice for online course delivery was release time with seven participants (46.7%) reporting. This is the first time this has been reported in the literature, and no other similar research exists to support this conclusion.

Research Question 3 was to determine what significance institution size has on faculty financial compensation for online course development and delivery. The first null hypothesis (H_{01}) stated, there is no difference among institution size and compensation for online course development. The findings show the assumption of homogeneity was not met because p (.025) < α (.05). This was indicated by the Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances, $F(4, 119) = 2.88$, $p = .025$. With an alpha level of .05, p (.025) < α (.05), it indicated significance. Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis, H_{01}, indicating the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met. Since homogeneity of variance was not met, the researcher conducts a *Welch F* test. The *Welch's* adjusted *F* ratio (4.59) was significant at the .05 alpha level reported as *Welch's* $F(4, 15.35) = 4.59$, $p < .05$, so the researcher concludes that there is a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course development. The data suggests that large and very large institutions tend to provide larger amounts of

financial compensation than small institutions for online course development. This supported existing research confirming institution size often determines the level of funding available to support quality educational programs (Katsinas et al., 2008). The researcher also used ANOVA to analyze differences among institution size and compensation differences between faculty type for online course *development*. With an alpha level of .05, p (.203) > α (.05), indicated the data provided insufficient evidence to make any conclusions. The second null hypothesis (H_{02}) stated there is no difference among institution size and compensation for online course delivery. The findings show there was a statistically significant difference between group means and compensation for online course delivery as determined by the one-way ANOVA $F(4, 108) = 3.969$, $p = .005$. Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis, $H_{02,}$ and the researcher concludes that there is a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course delivery. The data suggests that large institutions tend to provide larger amounts of financial compensation than small institutions for online course delivery. This also supported the assertion by Katsinas et al. (2008) that when it comes to supporting educational programs, size matters. The researcher also used an ANOVA to analyze differences among institution size and compensation differences between faculty type for online course *delivery*. With an alpha level of .05, p (.693) > α (.05), indicated the data provided insufficient evidence to make any conclusions.

Research Question 4 was to determine the differences in financial compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and online course delivery. There was no difference among institution size and compensation practices of full-time and part-time faculty for online course development. With an alpha level of .05, p (.203) > α (.05), indicated that the data provided insufficient evidence to accept or reject the null hypothesis. There was

also no difference among institution size and compensation practices of full-time and part-time faculty for online course delivery. With an alpha level of .05, p (.693) > α (.05), indicated that the data provided insufficient evidence to accept or reject the null hypothesis. The researcher concludes that institution size does not matter when it comes to compensation practices of full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and online course delivery.

Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to determine the practices most frequently used by community colleges for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The findings of this study have led the researcher to make both recommendations for implementing these findings and recommendations for further research.

It is recommended that community college administrators review the findings of this study to evaluate their institution's compensation practices as compared to other institutions across the United States. Based on this review, each institution should identify ways to adjust their online course development and delivery compensation practices to be competitive with institutions of similar size to attract and retain highly qualified online faculty to effectively support their distance learning initiatives, if appropriate. However, the majority of participating institutions indicated an expectation of their faculty to develop and deliver online courses for no additional compensation. It was suggested that this was part of their teaching responsibility. Therefore, it is recommended that survey research should be conducted to determine whether online course development and online course delivery should be part of the faculty workload.

It is further recommended that survey research should be conducted to determine whether intrinsic or extrinsic rewards motivate community college faculty to develop and deliver online

courses. The results of this study will provide community college administrators with a resource for encouraging participation in online course development and delivery.

This study confirmed there was a statistically significant difference among group means and compensation for online course delivery. A study should be conducted to determine if and why institutions of different sizes provide different amounts of financial compensation and what funding sources and practices they use along with cost per credit hour. The results from this study will provide community college administrators with a valuable resource of funding sources and practices that can be used to support their online learning programs. Also, given the fact that small community colleges tend to compensate faculty at lower rates, they may want to consider collaborating through a shared services model for their distance learning initiatives to compete with larger institutions.

The data from this study showed there was no statistically significant relationship between compensation practices and faculty type for online course development and delivery. A study should be conducted to determine if and why institutions provide different amounts of financial compensation to full-time and part-time faculty types for online course development and delivery. Each institution should use the results from this study to identify ways to adjust their online course development and delivery compensation practices to attract and retain highly qualified online faculty, if appropriate.

A future study should be undertaken to determine if community college faculty believe distance education can provide similar results to face-to-face instruction. The results of this study may help community college administrators glean insight into faculty motivations and perceptions concerning distance education and face-to-face courses.

Another study should be conducted to compare compensation practices of union and non-union institutions for online course development and online course delivery. The results of this study may help community college administrators understand the differences in compensation practices among institutions of similar size and/or geographic region.

To address the limitations of this study, a future study should be undertaken to determine the effectiveness of compensation practices for online course development and online course delivery on student outcomes. Also, a study should be conducted to determine the informal compensation agreements between faculty and their direct supervisor for online course development and online course delivery. For example, a supervisor may informally compensate a faculty member with compensatory time for rendering online course development and/or online course delivery services.

As technology evolves and the demand for online learning increase, community college faculty will need to continuously develop their online course development and delivery skills. As instructors and course developers improve their knowledge and skills, their compensation requirements will change, and additional compensation may be required in order for an institution to remain competitive in hiring. With the increase in demand for online learning opportunities, coupled with the anticipated shortage of education professionals, analyses like this one will become more important to the higher education community.

REFERENCES

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2008). *Staying the course: Online education in the United States.* Retrieved from http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/staying-the-course.pdf

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2014). *Grade change: Tracking online education in the United States.* Retrieved from www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradechange.pdf

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2015). *Grade level: Tracking online education in the United States.* Retrieved from www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradelevel.pdf

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J., Poulin, R, & Straut, T. T. (2016). *Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States.* Retrieved from http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2014). *Students at community colleges.* Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages/studentsatcommunitycolleges.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2017). *2017 membership directory*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/pages/memberdirectory.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges. (2018). *2018 fact sheet*. Retrieved from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/2018-Fast-Facts.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Academic, 2*. Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/news/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf

Anderson, T. (2003). Getting the mix right: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 4*(2). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/149/708

Aranda, N. (2006). *A brief history of computer based training.* Retrieved from http://ezinearticles.com/7A-Brief-History-of-Computer-Based-raining &id=287273

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bakia, M., Shear, L., Toyama, Y., & Lasseter, A. (2012). *Understanding the implications of online learning for educational productivity.* Jessup, MD: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology.

Baltaci-Goktalay, S., & Ocak, M. A. (2006). Faculty adoption of online technology in higher education. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 5*(4), 37-43.

Bartlett, J., Kotrlik, J., & Higgins, C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 19*(1), 43-50.

Benson, J. (1970). The motives of 19th century colliery owners in promoting day schools. *Journal of Educational Administration & History*, *3*(1), 15-18.

Berge, Z. L. (2008). Changing instructor's roles in virtual worlds. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, *9*(4), 407-414.

Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Wallet, P. A., Fiset, M., & Huang, B. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(3), 379-439.

Bittner, W. S., & Mallory, H. F. (1933). *University teaching by mail: A survey of correspondence instruction conducted by American Universities.* New York: Macmillan.

Boerema, C., Stanley, M., & Westhorp, P. (2007). Educators' perspective of online course design and delivery. *Medical Teacher, 29*, 758-765.

Bolliger, D. U., & Wasilik, O. (2009). Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Distance Education, 30*(1), 103-116.

Bower, B., & Hardy, K. P. (2004). From correspondence to cyberspace: Changes and challenges in distance education. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 128*, 5-12.

Briggs, A. R. J., & Coleman, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burleson, J. A. (2011). *Faculty compensation for developing and delivering online courses*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3455287)

Carter, L. (2012). *Determining if instructional delivery model differences exist in remedial English.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3503393)

Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Distance education in the United States: From correspondence courses to the Internet. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 14*(2), 141-149.

Casey, D. M. (2008). A journey to legitimacy: The historical development of distance education through technology. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning, 52*(2), 45-51.

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

Chen, G. (2014, July 16). *Online community college classes*. Retrieved from http://www.communitycollegereview.com/blog/online-community-college-classes

Chen, Sue-Jen. (2007). Instructional design strategies for intensive online courses: An objectivist-constructivist blended approach. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 6*(1), 72-86.

Chu, G. G., & Schramm, W. (1967). *Learning from television: What the research says.* Washington, DC: National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

Clark, R. E. (1983). Reconsidering research on learning from media. *Review of Educational Research, 53,* 445-459.

Clark, R. L., & d'Ambrosio, M. B. (2005). Recruitment, retention, and retirement: Compensation and employment for higher education. *Educational Gerontology, 31*(5), 385-403.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. *The American community college.* (4th ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Concieção, S. C. (2006). Faculty lived experiences in the online environment. *Adult Education Quarterly, 5,* 26-45.

Coogle, C., & Floyd, K. (2015). Synchronous and asynchronous learning environments of rural graduate early childhood special educators utilizing Wimba and Ecampus. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 11*(2), 173-187.

Craig, D. B. (2000). *Fireside politics: Radio and political culture in the United States, 1920-1940.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Crump, R. E. (1928). *Correspondence and class extension work in Oklahoma.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (301772567)

Dille, B. K. (1991, December 1). Identification of high risk telecourse students utilizing locus of control and learning style. Texas Tech University. Retrieved from https://repositories.tdl.org/ttu-ir/handle/2346/10405

Dillion, C. L., & Cintron, R. (1997). Distance education and the community colleges: From convention to vision. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 99*, 93-102.

Feig, C. A. (1932). *The effectiveness of correspondence study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Ferguson, J., & Tryjankowski, A. M. (2009). Online versus face-to-face learning: Looking at modes of instruction in Master's-level courses. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 33*(3), 219-228.

Finkel, E. (2015). Online education enters the mainstream. *Community College Journal*, *86*(1), 26-30.

Fishman, R. (2015). *Community college online*. Washington, DC: New America.

Flouty, R. (2016). *Centralized, decentralized, distributed: Disruptive technology in distance education from "Sunrise Semester" to present-day MOOCs.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (10111389)

Freeman, L. (2015). Instructor time requirements to develop and teach online courses [Electronic version]. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 18*(1). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring181/freeman181.html

Fry, R. (2009). *College enrollment hits all-time high, fueled by community college surge.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://pewsocialtrends.org/assets/pdf/college-enrollment.pdf

Gagné, R. M., Wager, W. W., Golas, K. C., & Keller, J. M. (2005). *Principles of instructional design* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Greenhill, L. (1964). A review of some trends in research on instructional films and instructional television. In D. W. MacLennan and J. C. Reed, *Abstracts of research on instructional television and film* (ED003805) (pp. 1-32). Stanford, CA: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University.

Haber, J., & Mills, M. (2008). Perceptions of barriers concerning effective online teaching and policies: Florida community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 3*, 266-283.

Hannay, M., & Newvine, T. (2006). Perceptions of distance learning: A comparison of online and traditional learning. *Merlot Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *2*(1), 1-11.

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

Hattie, J. (2004). Meta-analysis: The process and interpretation [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from www.cem.org/attachments/publications/ CEMWeb011%20Meta%20Analysis%20Presentation.pdf

Holmberg, B. (1986). *Growth and structure of distance education.* London: Croom Helm.

Holmberg, B. (2005). *The evolution, principles and practices of distance education.* Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universitat Oldenburg.

Inman, E., Kerwin, M., & Mayes, L. (1999). Instructor and student attitudes toward distance learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23*, 581-591.

Jaggars, S. S., Edgecombe, N., & Stacey, G. W. (2013). *What we know about online course outcomes.* New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/what-we-know-online-course-outcomes.html

Jaschik, S. (2014, April 7). *Online at community colleges.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/07/study-finds-slower-online-growth-community-colleges-growth-nonetheless

Karatas, S., & Simsek, N. (2009). Comparisons of Internet based and face-to-face learning systems based on "equivalency of experiences" according to students' academic achievement and satisfaction. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 10*(1), 65-74.

Katsinas, S. G., Tollefson, T. A., & Reamey, B. A. (2008). *Funding issues in U.S. community colleges: Findings from a 2007 survey of the national state directors of community colleges.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/Reports/Documents/fundingissues.pdf

Keegan, D. (1993). *Theoretical principles of distance education.* New York: Routledge.

Keegan, D. (1995). *Distance education technology for the new millennium: Compressed video teaching*. ZIPP Papiere. Hagen, Germany: Institute for Research into Distance Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 931).

Kentnor, H. E. (2015). Distance education and the evolution of online learning in the United States. *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue, 17*(1/2), 21-34.

Khalil, M. K., & Elkhider, I. A. (2016). Applying learning theories and instructional design models for effective instruction. *Advances in Physiology Education, 40*(2), 147-156.

Krejcie, M. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610.

Kulik, C., & Kulik, J. (1986). Effectiveness of computer-based education in colleges. *AEDS Journal, 19*, 81-108.

Kulik, J., Kulik, C., & Cohen, P. (1980). Effectiveness of computer-based education in college teaching: A meta-analysis of findings. *Review of Educational Research, 50*(4), 525-544.

Kurland, D. M., & Kurland, L. C. (1987). Computer applications in education: A historical overview. *Annual Review of Computer Science, 2*, 317-358.

Lee, J. A., & Busch, P. E. (2005). Factors related to instructors' willingness to participate in distance education. *Journal of Education Research, 99*(2), 109-115.

Lee, M., & Tsai, C. (2010). Exploring teachers perceived self efficacy and technological pedagogical content knowledge with respect to educational use of the world wide web. *Instructional Science, 38*(1), 1-21.

Lessick, S., Rumsey, E., Pearson, D. S., Roksandic, S, Gillum, S., Garcia-Milian, R., & Samsundar, D. R. (2013). Moving beyond the bookshelves. *Journal of the Medical Library Association, 101*(4), 239-243.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. T. (2006). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lou, Y., Bernard, R., & Abrami, P. (2006). Media and pedagogy in undergraduate distance education: A theory-based meta-analysis of empirical literature. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 54*(2), 141-76.

Louziotis, D. (2000). The role of adjuncts: Bridging the dark side and ivory tower. *Review of Business, 27*(3/4), 47-52.

Lynch, M. M. (2004). *Learning online: A guide to success in the virtual classroom.* New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

MacLennan, D. W., & Reid, J. C. (1967). *Research in instructional television and film.* Washington, DC: United States Office of Education.

Matthews, D. (1999). The origins of distance education and its use in the United States. *The Journal: Technological Horizons in Education, 27*(2), 54-67.

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

Mize, R. (1998). *Full-time part-time faculty: A proposal for perspective.* Community College League of California. Sacramento, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 427800).

Moore, M. G, & Kearsley, G. (2005). *Distance education: A system view* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Mullins, C. (2007). Community colleges. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 491-500). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mupinga, D. M., & Maughan, G. R. (2008). Web-based instruction and community college faculty workload. *College Teaching, 56*(1), 17-21.

Murphy, K. (2013 February 23) *Online education transforming college*. Retrieved from http://www.marinij.com/general-news/20130223/online-education-transforming-college

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2011). *State funding for higher education in FY 2009 and FY 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/documents/fiscal/HigherEdFundingFINAL.pdf

Nylin, D. W. (1970). TV or not TV: What is the question? *Educational Leadership*, *28*(2), 137.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Oblinger, D. G., & Hawkins, B. L. (2006). The myth about online course development. *Educause Review, 41*(1), 14-15.

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). *Educating the net generation*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE.

Olcott, D. Jr., & Wright, S. J. (1995). An institutional support framework for increasing faculty participation in postsecondary distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 9*(3), 5-17.

Olson, T. M., & Wisher, R. A. (2002). The effectiveness of Web-based instruction: An initial inquiry. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 3*(2), 1-17.

Parker, A. (2003). Motivation and incentives for distance faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 6*(3), 1-6.

Parker, M. A., & Martin, F. (2010). Using virtual classrooms: Student perceptions of features and characteristics in an online and a blended course. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 135-147.

Patten, M. L. (2007). *Understanding research methods*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Perreault, H., Waldman, L., Alexander, M., & Zhao, J. (2008). Comparing the distance learning-related course development approach and faculty support and rewards structure at AACSB accredited institutions between 2001 and 2006. *Journal of Educators Online, 5*(2), 1-15.

Phillips, V. (1998). Virtual classrooms, real education. *Nation's Business, 86*(5), 41-44.

Porto, S., & Aje, J. (2004). A framework for operational decision-making in course development and delivery. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 7*(2), 1-6.

Radford, A. W. (2011). *Learning at a distance: Undergraduate enrollment in distance education courses and degree programs* (NCES Report No. 2012-154). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.

Reeves, T. C. (1998). *The impact of media and technology in schools. A research report prepared for the Bertelsmann Foundation.* Athens: The University of Georgia. Retrieved from http://treeves.coe.uga.edu/edit6900/BertelsmannReeves98.pdf

Rhoades G. (1996). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(6), 626–659.

Ringstaff, C., & Kelley, L. (2002). *The learning return on our educational technology investment: A review of findings from research*. San Francisco: WestEd.

Santilli, S., & Beck, V. (2005). Graduate faculty perceptions of online teaching. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 6*(2), 155-160.

Schiffman, S., Vignare, K., & Geith, C. (2007). Why do higher-education institutions pursue online education? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11*(2), 61-71.

Schifter, C. C. (2000). Compensation models in distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 3*(1), 1-7.

Schifter, C. C. (2004). Compensation models in distance education: National survey questionnaire revisited. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 7*(1), 1-14.

Schneider, A. (1999). AAUP seeks greater faculty role in distance-learning decisions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(42), A34.

Schneider, J. M. (2004). Employing adjunct faculty from an HR perspective. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 84*(4), 18-19.

Schramm, W. (1973). *Big media, little media: A report to the Agency for International Development*. Stanford, CA: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University.

Schramm, W. (1977). *By media little media: Tools and technologies for instruction.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers.

Seaman, J. (2009). *Online learning as a strategic asset. Volume II: The paradox of faculty voiced: Views and experiences with online learning.* Washington, DC: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities and Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/online-learning-strategic-asset.pdf

Shea, P. (2007). Bridges and barriers to teaching online college courses: A study of experienced online faculty in thirty-six colleges. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11*(2), 73-128.

Sheppard, P. B. (2009). *Determining the effectiveness of web-based distance education in mitigating the rural-urban achievement gap.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (57462)

Sheridan, R. (2006). Reducing the online instructor's workload. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly, 29*(3), 65-67.

Simpson, O. (2013). Student retention in distance education: Are we failing our students? *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 28*(2), 105-119.

Smith, A. A. (2015, April 21). *The increasingly digital community college.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/04/21/survey-shows-participation-online-courses-growing

Sorensen, A. L. (2010). *Serving students from a distance: A content analysis of persistent characteristics in distance learners.* The College of William and Mary. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2171/pqdtglobal/docview/527966209/BA7522F648754180PQ/1 ?accountid=12768

Spector, M. J. (2005). Time demands in online instruction. *Distance Education, 26*(1), 5-27.

Stickell, D. W. (1963). *A critical review of the methodology and results of research comparing televised and face-to-face instruction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (6401419)

Sutton, T. P., & Bergerson, P. J. (2001). *Faculty compensation systems: Impact on the quality of higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28*(2). *Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, J. (2001). Fifth generation distance education. *e-Journal of Instructional Science & Technology, 4*(1), 1-14. Retrieved from http://eprints.usq.edu.au/136/

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (2017). *Size and setting classification*. Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/size_setting.php

Thornton, S., & Curtis, J. W. (2012). A very slow recovery. *Academe, 98*, 4-15.

Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. K. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need to know. *Community College Review, 36*(1), 5-24.

Van de Vord, R., & Pogue, K. (2012) Teaching time investment: Does online really take more time than face-to-face? *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 13*(3), 132-146.

Van Meer, E. (2003). PLATO: From computer-based education to corporate social responsibility. *Iterations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Software History, 2*, 1-22.

Walker, J. (2004). *Rebels on the air: An alternative history of radio in America.* NYU Press. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/225729006?accountid=15533

Wallin, D. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 28*(4), 373-392.

Welch, S. R. (Ed.) (1993). The effectiveness of the home study method. *National home study council occasional paper number 9*. [Online]. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED407557.pdf

Wetzel, C. D., Radtke, P. H., & Stern, H. W. (1994). *Instructional effectiveness of video media.* Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wickersham, L. E., Espinoza, S., & Davis, J. (2007). Teaching online: Three perspectives, three approaches. *AACE Journal, 15*(2), 197-211.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2009). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (9th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Wilcox, B. R. (2013). *Student perceptions of online course quality: A comparison by academic discipline.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3574563)

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A

Survey Permission Letter

From: Jeff Burleson <jburleson@tusculum.edu>
Subject: Re: Seeking Permission for Doctoral Research
Date: January 25, 2016 at 6:25:09 AM EST
To: Radhika Prout <rprout@dtcc.edu>

Yes. Please accept this email as permission to use the requested survey instrument.

Dr. Jeff Burleson
School of Education
Human Resource Development
Tusculum College
423-367-8083
jburleson@tusculum.edu

Get all the school you can from life!

Sent from my iPhone 6+. Please excuse brevity and tpyos.

On Jan 24, 2016, at 10:32 PM, Radhika Prout <rprout@dtcc.edu> wrote:
Dr. Burleson,

I am a Ph.D. student in the same program you graduated from at Old Dominion University (and Dr. Ritz is my chair too). I am writing to obtain permission to use the survey instrument you developed for your dissertation for my study. I wasn't able to locate a section in your study related to recommendations for future research — but I was interested in replicating your study at the community college level. As you may already know, I work at a community college, and I have been since 2011. As an instructional designer, I work very closely with faculty and the development of programs/courses — so it's no surprise that your research piqued my interest. Please let me know your thoughts, and if permission would be granted. I look forward to hearing from you, and thank you in advance for your time and support.
--
Radhika Prout
rprout@dtcc.edu
(302)657-5141
Instructional Designer
Center for Creative Instruction & Technology (CCIT)
Wilmington Office: E301

Appendix B

Burleson's Original Survey

The purpose of this survey is to provide information about your institution's current practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This information will be used to determine the most frequently used compensation practices implemented by Colleges and Universities throughout the United States for developing and delivering online courses. Please ensure this survey is completed by the individual at your institution that is most responsible for online learning.

Please answer the following questions by placing an "x" in the checkbox next to your selection.

Section1: Background Information

1. What is your title?
   - ☐ Director of E-learning
   - ☐ Director of Online Learning
   - ☐ Director of Distance Education
   - ☐ Other: (please specify) _____

2. How many students does your institution serve? (Select one)
   - ☐ 0-999
   - ☐ 1,000-2,999
   - ☐ 3,000-9,999
   - ☐ 10,000-15,000
   - ☐ 15,000-20,000
   - ☐ 20,000-25,000
   - ☐ 25,000-30,000
   - ☐ Over 30,000

3. How many online courses does your institution offer per year? *(Online course refers to courses in which all components are offered 100% online.)* (Select one)
   - ☐ 0-9
   - ☐ 10-49
   - ☐ 50-149
   - ☐ 150+

4. Does your institution limit or "cap" the number of students that can enroll in an online course?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

5. If you selected "yes" to the previous question what is the limit? _____

6. How many online programs does your institution offer per year? *(Online program refers to programs in which all components of the program and program course contents are offered 100% online.)* (Select one)
   - ☐ 0-4
   - ☐ 5-9
   - ☐ 10-19
   - ☐ 20+

7. Does your institution seek online course development experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

8. Does your institution seek online course delivery experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

9. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing and delivering online courses?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

10. If you answered "yes" to the previous question, briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides.
    _____
    _____

11. How does your institution communicate compensation practices to faculty?
    _____
    _____

Section 2: Online Course Development

12. Which of the following does your institution offer for **developing** online courses? (Select all that apply)
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel Support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course development is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify

13. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **develop** a 3 semester credit or similar online course from the options listed below. (Select one)
    - ☐ Does not apply
    - ☐ 0-$1000.00
    - ☐ $1001.00-$2500.00
    - ☐ $2501.00-$4000.00
    - ☐ $4001.00-$5500.00
    - ☐ $5501.00-$7000.00
    - ☐ $7001.00-$8500.00
    - ☐ $8501.00-$10,000.00
    - ☐ $10,000.00 or greater

14. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

15. If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **developing** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower
    - ☐ Does not apply

Section 3: Online Course Delivery

16. Which of these does your institution offer for **delivering/teaching** online courses? (Select all that apply)
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel Support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course delivery is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify _____

17. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **deliver/teach** an online course from the options below. (Select one)
    - ☐ Does not apply
    - ☐ 0-$1000.00
    - ☐ $1001.00-$2500.00
    - ☐ $2501.00-$4000.00
    - ☐ $4001.00-$5500.00
    - ☐ $5501.00-$7000.00
    - ☐ $7001.00-$8500.00
    - ☐ $8501.00-$10,000.00
    - ☐ $10,000.00 or greater

18. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

19. If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower
    - ☐ Does not apply

20. In the space provided please list other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for <u>developing and delivering (teaching)</u> online courses.

    _____
    _____

21. Please list other development or delivery compensation practices you would like to see implemented.

    _____
    _____

    (If you would like to receive the results from this study please provide your email address in the space below.)

    _____

Appendix C

Prout Modified Survey

The purpose of this study is to gain information about your institution's current practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering/teaching online courses. This information will be used to determine the most frequently used compensation practices implemented by community colleges in the United States for developing and delivering/teaching online courses. Please ensure an individual at your institution most responsible for online learning completes this survey.

Please answer the following questions by choosing the checkbox next to your selection.

Section 1: Background Information

1. What is your title?
   - ☐ Director of E-learning
   - ☐ Director of Online Learning
   - ☐ Director of Distance Education
   - ☐ Other: (please specify) _____

2. How many students does your institution serve? Select only one.
   - ☐ 1-499 (Very Small)
   - ☐ 500-1,999 (Small)
   - ☐ 2,000-4,999 (Medium)
   - ☐ 5,000-9,999 (Large)
   - ☐ Over 10,000 (Very Large)

3. How many online courses does your institution offer per year? *(Online course refers to courses in which all components are offered 100% online.)* Select only one.
   - ☐ None (if selected, participant will be thanked for their willingness to participate, informed that they did not meet the requirements for this study population and removed from the pilot study.
   - ☐ 1-9
   - ☐ 10-49
   - ☐ 50-149
   - ☐ 150+

4. Does your institution limit or "cap" the number of students that can enroll in an online course?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

5. If you selected "yes" to the previous question, what is the limit? _____

6. How many online programs does your institution offer per year? *(Online programs refer to programs in which all components of the program and program course contents are offered 100% online.)* Select only one.
   - ☐ 0-4
   - ☐ 5-9
   - ☐ 10-19
   - ☐ 20+

7. Does your institution seek online course development experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

8. Does your institution seek online course delivery/teaching experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

9. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing and delivering/teaching online courses?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

10. If you answered "yes" to the previous question, briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides.

    _____

11. How does your institution communicate online compensation practices to faculty?

    _____

Section 2: Online Course Development

12. Which of the following does your institution offer for **developing** online courses? Select all that apply.
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel Support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course development is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify _____

13. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **develop** a one semester, 3-credit or similar online course from the options listed below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Does not apply
    - ☐ 0-$499.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

14. Compensation to **develop** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to develop courses online.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

15. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses? Select only one.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

16. If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **developing** online courses? Select only one.
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower
    - ☐ Does not apply

Section 3: Online Course Delivery/Teaching

17. Which of these does your institution offer for **delivering/teaching** online courses? Select all that apply.
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel Support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course delivery is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify _____

18. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **deliver/teach** an online course from the options below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Does not apply
    - ☐ 0-$499.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

19. Compensation to **deliver/teach** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to **deliver/teach** online courses.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

20. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses? Select only one.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

21. If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses? Select only one.
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower
    - ☐ Does not apply

Section 4: Other Compensation Practices

22. Please list other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for developing and delivering/teaching online courses.
    _____

23. Please list other compensation practices you would like to see implemented at your institution for developing and delivering/teaching online courses.
    _____

If you would like to receive the results from this study, please provide your email address: _____

Appendix D

Letter to Subject Matter Experts Requesting Participation in Pilot Study

Dear <Participant Name>:

You are being invited to participate in a research pilot study because of your expertise. The purpose of this pilot study is to receive feedback from subject matter experts working in the field of community college leadership and online learning on community college faculty compensation for online course development and delivery. Your expertise will provide insight regarding a survey that will be deployed to community college directors of online learning and their counterparts to determine the most frequently used compensation practices public community colleges in the United States use to compensate faculty for *online course development* and *online course delivery*. This pilot study will be used to validate an instrument I will use in my dissertation research at Old Dominion University.

If you are willing to participate in the pilot study, please reply to this email. Your participation is voluntary, and you will not individually benefit by participating. I will then send an email that will include the (1) statement of the problem, (2) research questions, (3) 23-question survey, and (4) survey rating form. It should take you about 10 minutes to complete this review for validity.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout, M. Ed.
Old Dominion University
Ph.D. Candidate, Occupational & Technical Studies
Telephone: 215-69four-0524
Email: rinag001@odu.edu

Appendix E

Letter to Subject Matter Experts Participating in the Pilot Study

Dear <Participant Name>:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research pilot study on the most frequently used compensation practices public community colleges in the United States use to compensate faculty for *online course development* and *online course delivery*. The information below will provide more information about the study.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the most frequently used compensation practices public community colleges in the United States use to compensate faculty for *online course development* and *online course delivery*.

Research Questions

RQ$_1$: What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course development?
RQ$_2$: What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course delivery?
RQ$_3$: What significance does institution size have on faculty compensation for online course development and delivery?
RQ$_4$: What are the differences in compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?

Survey:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BXDSKq3jssFR2ZNTzBOM1p3QWc/view?usp=sharing

Survey Rating Form: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ccpilotstudy

Upon completion, please return your survey rating form to me at rinag001@odu.edu. I look forward to receiving your survey feedback.

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout, M. Ed.
Old Dominion University
Ph.D. Candidate, Occupational & Technical Studies
Telephone: 215-69four-0524
Email: rinag001@odu.edu 1.

Appendix F

Pilot Study Rating Form for Subject Matter Experts

Please use this form to evaluate the survey (attached). Answer each of the following questions with as much detail as possible.

1. Were there statements that needed revision? If so, what were the needed revisions?
2. Were there any grammatical or spelling errors? If so, what were these?
3. Was there any language that could possibly be offensive to any study participant?
4. How long did it take you to complete the instrument?
5. Were there any other compensation options that need to be added to the survey? If so, please list.
6. Are there any other levels of financial compensation that need to be added to the survey? If so, please list.

   _____

Using a scale of 1 to 5, please select the survey rating that best represents each question. Be sure to include any additional comments that would add to the efficiency in respondents' completion of the survey, clarity of content, and visual symmetry.

1. To what extent does the survey fulfill the data collection needs of the study as defined in the statement of the problem and the research questions? If not, please offer suggestions in the comments.

   a. Not Acceptable b. Poor c. Fair d. Good e. Very Good

   Comments: _____

2. To what extent were the directions for completing the survey clear?

   a. Not Acceptable b. Poor c. Fair d. Good e. Very Good

   Comments: _____

3. To what extent were the statements clear?

   a. Not Acceptable b. Poor c. Fair d. Good e. Very Good

Your input towards the validity of the survey is critical and greatly appreciated. Please save this form with your ratings and comments, and return it to me via email at rinag001@odu.edu.

Appendix G

Prout Survey

The purpose of this study is to gain information about your institution's current practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering/teaching online courses. This information will be used to determine the most frequently used compensation practices implemented by community colleges in the United States for developing and delivering/teaching online courses. Please ensure an individual at your institution most responsible for online learning completes this survey.

Section 1: Background Information

1. Institution Name: _____

2. What is your title?
   - ☐ Director of E-learning
   - ☐ Director of Online Learning
   - ☐ Director of Distance Education
   - ☐ Other: (please specify) _____

3. How many students does your institution serve? Select only one.
   - ☐ 1-499 (Very Small)
   - ☐ 500-1,999 (Small)
   - ☐ 2,000-4,999 (Medium)
   - ☐ 5,000-9,999 (Large)
   - ☐ Over 10,000 (Very Large)

4. How many online courses does your institution offer per year? *(Online course refers to courses in which all components are offered 100% online.)* Select only one.
   - ☐ None (if selected, participant will be thanked for their willingness to participate, informed that they did not meet the requirements for this study population and removed from the pilot study.
   - ☐ 1-9
   - ☐ 10-49
   - ☐ 50-149
   - ☐ 150+

5. Does your institution limit the number of students that can enroll in an online course?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

6. What is the maximum number of students that can enroll in an online course?
   _____

7. How many online programs does your institution offer per year? *(Online programs refer to programs in which all components of the program and program course contents are offered 100% online.)* Select only one.
   - ☐ 0-4
   - ☐ 5-9
   - ☐ 10-19
   - ☐ 20+

8. Does your institution require online course development experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

9. Does your institution require online course delivery/teaching experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

10. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

11. Briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides to faculty for developing online courses.

    _____

12. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty delivering/teaching online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

13. Briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides to faculty for delivering/teaching online courses.

    _____

14. How does your institution communicate online compensation practices to faculty?

    _____

Section 2: Online Course Development

15. Which of the following does your institution offer for **developing** online courses? Select all that apply.
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course development is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify _____

16. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **develop** a one semester, 3-credit or similar online course from the options listed below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Less than $500.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

17. Compensation to **develop** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to develop courses online.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

18. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

19. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale or rate for **developing** online courses than part-time faculty?
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower

Section 3: Online Course Delivery/Teaching

20. Which of these does your institution offer for **delivering/teaching** online courses? Select all that apply.
    - ☐ Financial compensation
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Online course delivery is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None of the above. We do not offer additional compensation for this service.
    - ☐ Others. Please specify _____

21. If you selected financial compensation as one of your answers to the previous question, select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **deliver/teach** an online course from the options below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Less than $500.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

22. Compensation to **deliver/teach** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to **deliver/teach** online courses.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

23. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

24. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale or rate for **delivering/teaching** online courses than part-time faculty?
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower

Section 4: Other Compensation Practices

25. Please list other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for developing online courses.

    _____

26. Please list other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for delivering/teaching online courses.

    _____

27. Please list other compensation practices you would like to see implemented at your institution for developing online courses.

    _____

28. Please list other compensation practices you would like to see implemented at your institution for delivering/teaching online courses.

    _____

To receive study results, please provide your email address: _____

Appendix H

Letter to Directors of Online Learning Requesting Pilot Study Participation

Dear <Participant Name>,

You are invited to participate in a research pilot study on the most frequently used compensation practices public community colleges in the United States use to compensate faculty for *online course development* and *online course delivery*. The purpose of the pilot study is to receive feedback from community college directors of online learning to determine the understandability and reliability of a survey that will be used in my dissertation research at Old Dominion University.

Participants will be asked to complete: (a) the 28-question electronic survey, which will eventually be administered to public community college directors of online learning. I will use the data from the inter-rater reliability of the survey to assess the instrument's reliability.

Your participation is voluntary and your input will be confidential. If you are willing to participate in this pilot study, please reply to this email and I will forward an email with the link to the electronic survey.

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout, M. Ed.
Old Dominion University
Ph.D. Candidate, Occupational & Technical Studies
Telephone: 215-69four-0524

Appendix I

Directors of Online Learning Pilot Study Instrument

Dear <Participant Name>,

Thank you for participating in the pilot study for my dissertation study, *Community College Faculty Compensation for Online Course Development and Delivery*. The purpose of this study is to determine the most frequently used practices community colleges in the United States use for compensating faculty for online course development and delivery. To address these issues, this study will survey public community college directors of online learning. As a community college director of online learning outside of the sample population, you will play an integral role in providing input about the survey, which will ultimately be administered to 900+ directors of online learning.

To participate in this inter-rater reliability pilot study:

- Click on this link to complete the 28-question survey – LINK.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout
Old Dominion University
Ph.D. Candidate, Occupational & Technical Studies
Telephone: 215-69four-0524

Appendix J

Pilot Group Survey Instrument for Retest

Dear <Participant Name>,

Thank you for agreeing to complete the retest of the pilot study for my dissertation study entitled *Community College Faculty Compensation for Online Course Development and Delivery*.

Several weeks ago, you provided input to improve the survey instrument to be administered to community college directors of online learning. As step two of the test-retest pilot study model, the retest results will provide data toward the reliability of the instrument. Your completion of the survey again will provide this important second test. Once survey reliability is established, your previously provided feedback regarding survey content and clarity will be considered.

To participate in this test-retest pilot study:

- Click on this link to complete the 28-question survey – LINK.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout
Old Dominion University
Ph.D. Candidate, Occupational & Technical Studies
Telephone: 215-694-0524

Appendix K

Email Invite to Director of Online Learning to Partake in Study

Dear Director of Online Learning,

I am working to determine the most frequently used compensation practices community colleges across the United States use to compensate community college faculty for online course development and delivery. This is part of my dissertation research at Old Dominion University. Your response will help me determine the following information:

- What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course **development**?
- What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course **delivery**?
- What significance does institution size have on faculty compensation for online course development and delivery?
- What are the differences in compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?

Your response will help me provide information on the most frequently used practices currently being used to compensate faculty for online course development and delivery. Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential. There are minimum risks to your participation. All responses will be reported in aggregate. There are also no direct benefits to you. However, your responses could affect future best practices for faculty compensation in online learning.

I anticipate your help in determining the most frequently used practices currently used to compensate community college faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

If you agree to participate, please click the survey link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ccfac

If you prefer to complete this survey via phone, please feel free to contact me at 215-69four-0524 or via email (rinag001@odu.edu) to schedule a time to do so. Thank you in advance for participating and contributing to the success of my research!

Sincerely,

Radhika I. Prout
Ph.D. Candidate
Old Dominion University
STEM Education & Professional Studies

Dr. John Ritz
Professor
Old Dominion University
STEM Education & Professional Studies

Appendix L

Final Prout Survey

The purpose of this study is to gain information about your institution's current practices for compensating higher education faculty for **developing** and **delivering/teaching** online courses. This information will be used to determine the most frequently used compensation practices implemented by community colleges in the United States for **developing** and **delivering/teaching** online courses. Please ensure an individual at your institution most responsible for online learning completes this survey. As you complete the survey, please keep in mind that **development** is the process through which a course is created/built, while **delivery/teaching** is the method in which the course is taught.

Please answer the following questions by choosing the checkbox next to your selection.

1. Institution Name:

2. What is your title?
   - ☐ Director of E-learning
   - ☐ Director of Online Learning
   - ☐ Director of Distance Education
   - ☐ Other: (please specify) _____

3. How many students does your institution serve? Select only one.
   - ☐ 1-499 (Very Small)
   - ☐ 500-1,999 (Small)
   - ☐ 2,000-4,999 (Medium)
   - ☐ 5,000-9,999 (Large)
   - ☐ Over 10,000 (Very Large)

4. How many online courses (total number of course sections) does your institution offer per year? *(Online course refers to courses in which all components are offered 100% online.)*
   - ☐ None (if selected, participant will be thanked for their willingness to participate, informed that they did not meet the requirements for this study population and removed from the pilot study.
   - ☐ 1-9
   - ☐ 10-49
   - ☐ 50-149
   - ☐ 150+

5. Does your institution limit the number of students that can enroll in an online course?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

6. What is the maximum number of students that can enroll in an online course? If it can vary, please explain. _____

7. How many online programs does your institution offer per year? *(Online programs refer to programs in which all components of the program and program course contents are offered 100% online.)* Select only one.
   ☐ 0-4
   ☐ 5-9
   ☐ 10-19
   ☐ 20+

8. Does your institution require online course **development** experience when hiring new faculty?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

9. Does your institution require online course **delivery/teaching** experience when hiring new faculty?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

10. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty **developing** online courses?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

11. Briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides to faculty **developing** online courses.
    _____

12. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty **delivering/teaching** online courses?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

13. Briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides to faculty **delivering/teaching** online courses.
    _____

14. How does your institution communicate online compensation practices to faculty?
    _____

15. Does your institution offer financial compensation for developing online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

16. Select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **develop** a one semester, 3-credit or similar online course from the options listed below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Less than $500.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

17. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for **developing** online courses? Select only one.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

18. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale for **developing** online courses than part-time faculty?
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower

19. Does your institution offer non-financial compensation for **developing** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

20. Which of the following types of non-financial compensation does your institution offer for **developing** online courses? Select all that apply.
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Other (please list)

21. The compensation (financial and/or non-financial) provided to **develop** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to **develop** online courses.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

22. Please list other compensation practices you would like to see implemented at your institution for **developing** online courses.

    _____

23. Does your institution offer financial compensation for **delivering/teaching** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

24. Select the amount of financial compensation your institution provides to **deliver/teach** an online course from the options below. Select only one.
    - ☐ Less than $500.00
    - ☐ $500.00-$999.00
    - ☐ $1,000.00-$1,499.00
    - ☐ $1,500.00-$1,999.00
    - ☐ $2,000.00-$2,499.00
    - ☐ $2,500.00-$2,999.00
    - ☐ $3,000.00-$3,499.00
    - ☐ $3,500.00 or greater

25. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale than part-time faculty for **delivering/teaching** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

26. Does your institution compensate full-time faculty at a higher or lower scale for **delivering/teaching** online courses than part-time faculty? Select only one.
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower

27. Does your institution offer non-financial compensation for **delivering/teaching** online courses?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

28. Which of the following types of non-financial compensation does your institution offer for delivering/teaching online courses?
    - ☐ Release time
    - ☐ Computer equipment
    - ☐ Travel support
    - ☐ Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    - ☐ Other (please list)

29. Compensation (financial and/or non-financial) provided to **deliver/teach** online courses is adequate to encourage faculty to **deliver/teach** online courses.
    - ☐ Strongly Agree
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Neither
    - ☐ Disagree
    - ☐ Strongly Disagree

30. Please list other compensation practices you would like to see implemented at your institution for **delivering/teaching** online courses.

---

31. To receive study results, please provide your email address:

Appendix M

Follow-Up Email

Dear Director of Online Learning,

About _____ days ago you were sent an invitation to participate in a research study designed to determine the most frequently used compensation practices public community colleges in the United States use to compensate faculty for *online course development* and *online course delivery*.

I am sending this letter re-inviting you to participate in this study. Your response will help me determine the following information:

- What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course **development**?
- What practices are most frequently used by community colleges to compensate faculty for online course **delivery**?
- What significance does institution size have on faculty compensation for online course development and delivery?
- What are the differences in compensation between full-time and part-time faculty for online course development and delivery?

Your response will help me provide community college institutions with information on the most frequently used practices currently being used to compensate faculty for online courses development and delivery. Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential. There minimum risks to your participation, since your individual responses will be reported in aggregate with others. There are also no direct benefits to you. However, your responses could affect future best practices for faculty compensation in online learning. Stored data will also be password protected.

I anticipate your help in determining the most frequently used practices currently used to compensate community college faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

If you have not completed the survey previously, please click this link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ccfac

If you prefer to complete this survey via phone, please feel free to contact me at 215-69four-0524 or via email (rinag001@odu.edu) to schedule a time to do so. Thank you in advance for participating and contributing to the success of my research!

Radhika I. Prout
Ph.D. Candidate
Old Dominion University
STEM Education & Professional Studies

Dr. John Ritz
Professor
Old Dominion University
STEM Education & Professional Studies

VITA

Radhika I. Prout
Darden College of Education
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23529
rinag001@odu.edu

EDUCATION

- Old Dominion University | Norfolk, VA | Doctor of Philosophy | Education – Occupational & Technical Studies | 2018
- Drexel University | Philadelphia, PA | Master of Science | Education - Learning Technologies | 2007
- Temple University | Philadelphia, PA | Bachelor of Science | Information Science & Technology | 2004

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Senior Instructional Designer | City and County of Denver | Denver, Colorado | May 2018 – Present
- Instructional Technology/Design Consultant | Various Clients | Remote | Mar 2011 - Present
  - Chester Upland School District
  - Northcentral University
  - Colorado Community Colleges Online
  - Thomas Edison State University
- Instructional Designer | Delaware Technical Community College | Dover, DE | Aug 2013 – Aug 2016
- Academic Technologist | Salem Community College | Carney's Point, NJ | Oct 2011 – Jul 2013
- Instructional Technology Teacher | School District of Philadelphia | Philadelphia, PA | Feb 2005 – Jun 2009

MEMBERSHIP/AFFILIATIONS

- Philadelphia Teaching Fellow | 2005
- Research in Engineering for Teachers Fellow | 2006
- Iota Lambda Sigma Honorary Professional Workforce Development Society | 2011– Present
- National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity | 2016 – Present
- Adams 12 Five Star School District's District Accountability Committee | 2017 – Present

PRESENTATIONS

- Presenter | North Carolina Association of School Administrators | Infusing Technology in Classrooms | Raleigh, NC | 2010