Spring 2011

Faculty Compensation for Developing and Delivering Online Courses

Jeffrey Allen Burleson
Old Dominion University

FACULTY COMPENSATION FOR DEVELOPING AND DELIVERING ONLINE COURSES

by

Jeffrey Allen Burleson
B.A. May 1996, East Tennessee State University
M.R.C. May 1998, University of Kentucky

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OCCUPATIONAL AND TECHNICAL STUDIES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

March 28, 2011

Approved by:

Dr. John M. Ritz (Chair)

Dr. Amy B. Adcock

Dr. Walter F. Deal, III

ABSTRACT

FACULTY COMPENSATION FOR DEVELOPING AND DELIVERING ONLINE COURSES

Jeffrey A. Burleson
Old Dominion University, 2011
Director: Dr. John M. Ritz

The intent of this dissertation was to determine the most common compensation practices higher education institutions provided faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Many higher education institutions provided compensation as motivational tools to elicit faculty participation in new online learning initiatives; however, limited research was available on equitable compensation for these services. The population consisted of 263 small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters level private and state-funded not-for-profit United States higher education institutions. This population was selected using the maximum number of institutions identified by the Carnegie Classification system that met these criteria.

Data for this study were collected using a survey that contained 16 closed-ended questions and five open-ended questions. The data collected included institution demographics and current compensation practices each institution used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Frequency analyses were conducted on the data to determine which compensation practices and financial ranges were selected most often.

Fifty-eight participants (36%) were from institutions serving between 3,000-9,999 students. Eighty-three participants (51.6%) offered between zero and four online programs and 145 participants (88.4%) provided instructional design services to faculty

who developed and delivered online courses. The results of this study established that the average online course cap limit of was 25.1. The results of this study also established that 96 participants (59.6%) provided financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 for developing online courses making it the most common compensation practice provided for online course development. Seventy-seven (47.8%) of the participating institutions provided financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 for delivering online courses making it the most common compensation practice provided for online course delivery.

In addition, this study determined on average small and medium institutions most frequently provided financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 and large institutions most frequently provided financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4,000 for developing online courses. Finally, this study determined on average small and medium institutions most frequently provided financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 and large institutions most frequently provided financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4,000 for delivering online courses.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my amazing wife Becca and my four wonderful children, Wyatt, Ethan, Caleb, and Lili, without whom none of my achievements or successes would have been possible or purposeful.

Jeffrey Allen Burleson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The list of individuals who have contributed to the successful completion of this dissertation is enormous. For this reason I felt it was necessary to identify them and acknowledge how important they have been to me throughout this process.

I want to acknowledge my wife Becca for loving me when I was not very lovable and understanding me when I was not understandable. At times when I questioned my ability to complete this degree, Becca never did. She continually provided me with encouragement, pearls of wisdom, and even a few hokey puns to keep me laughing and motivated. There is no doubt that I could not have completed this demanding yet rewarding chapter of my life without her. I am grateful and blessed to be part of her life.

I would next like to acknowledge my mother, Shirley, and sister, Sharon, for supporting me through this phase of my education. They never questioned my reasons or motivation. They simply told me what they had since I was a kid, "You can do anything you set your mind to." This degree has taken a great deal of focus and has required the solicitation of their help taking care of my four wonderful children on numerous occasions. I cannot thank them enough for their support.

I would next like to thank my children, Wyatt, Ethan, Caleb, and Lili. Again they tolerated me when I was intolerable and laughed at me when I deserved it. Their existence in my life has been a motivating factor in every decision I have made. Their smiles and laughs have encouraged me to set high standards for myself in hopes that they will value the intrinsic motivation that comes from completing a task of this magnitude. In no way do I expect them to follow in my footsteps. My only expectation is for them to find their own path and follow it with passion and determination to succeed.

Next I would like to acknowledge my dissertation committee chair, Dr. John Ritz. Through his advisement and guidance I have learned more than I thought possible. Many lessons focused on content that can be derived from textbooks and lectures, but his expectation for quality and excellence taught me lessons about scholarship and professionalism that cannot be garnered from a book. This expectation was a driving force that challenged me and motivated me to succeed.

I would also like to acknowledge my committee members Dr. Amy Adcock and Dr. Walter Deal. Dr. Adcock enthusiastically provided input, support, and guidance through this process and I am thankful for her friendship, advice, and counsel. I would also like to thank Dr. Deal for his calm and reassuring support throughout my coursework and dissertation.

The list of individuals that have supported me in my educational success is too vast to include a comprehensive list in this section of my dissertation. I would like to say thank you to everyone that contributed to my educational success. I will never forget their generosity.

Jeffrey A. Burleson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii
DEDICATION iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v
LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER I, Introduction 1
Research Problem 2
Research Questions 2
Background and Significance 2
Limitations 4
Assumptions 4
Procedures 4
Definition of Terms 5
Summary and Overview 6

CHAPTER II, Review of Literature 8
Distance Learning 8
Distance Learning at the University Level 12
Online Learning 14
Faculty Compensation 18
Faculty Compensation for Distance Education 19
Summary 20

CHAPTER III, Methods and Procedures 21
Population 21
Instrument Design 22
Methods of Data Collection 27
Statistical Analysis 37
Summary 39

CHAPTER IV, Findings 40
Response Rate 40
Survey Responses 41
Further Analysis 52
Summary 55

CHAPTER V, Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 59
Summary 59
Conclusions 62
Recommendations 65

REFERENCES 69

LIST OF APPENDICES 76
Appendix A, List of Participating Institution 77
Appendix B, Final Survey 81
Appendix C, Original Survey 85
Appendix D, Letter of Introduction 89
Appendix E, Cover Letter 90
Appendix F, Follow Up Letter 91

VITA 92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Pilot recommendations	29
Financial compensation codes	37
Participant title clusters	42
Participating institution student population	43
Online course cap limits	44
Instructional design service clusters	45
Compensation communication practice clusters	46
Compensation practices for developing online courses	47
Financial compensation ranges for developing online courses	48
Compensation practices for delivering online courses	49
Financial compensation ranges for delivering online courses	50
Other compensation practices provided	51
Recommended compensation practices	52

CHAPTER I

Introduction

As higher education institutions began to offer more online courses and programs, faculty and administrators realized developing and delivering online courses was more labor and time intensive than preparing for and teaching traditional face-to-face courses (Spector, 2005). More and more higher education faculty members were being called upon to build online courses (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009), and with already demanding workloads, current compensation practices for online course development and delivery were being questioned (Santilli & Beck, 2005). As higher education faculty realized the amount of time needed to prepare for an online course was much greater than that of a traditional face-to-face course (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008), adequate compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses became a major concern (Spector, 2005).

At the time of this study limited research was available on compensation practices for **developing** and **delivering** online courses. A number of studies examined the amount of time required to **develop** and **deliver** online courses in comparison to traditional face-to-face courses (Spector, 2005). Other studies determined how to better calculate higher education faculty workload (Amiel & Orey, 2006). However, research was not conducted on a national level to determine the most common compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses. By establishing the most common compensation practices for online course development and delivery, this research provides a foundation for future research on online course development and delivery compensation policies and best practices.

Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions in the United States used for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Research Questions

This study focused on two research questions. The research questions were:

1. What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **developing** online courses?
2. What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **delivering** online courses?

Background and Significance

The past twenty years confirmed the use of the Internet as an effective tool for delivering higher education courses and programs (Wickersham, Espinoza, & Davis, 2007). Fifty-six percent of two and four year, degree-granting, postsecondary institutions offered some type of distance education with ninety percent offering online courses (D'Orsie & Day, 2006). The Sloan Consortium findings from a survey of non-profit colleges and universities reported over 60% of participating universities listed online education as critical to their institution (Haber & Mills, 2008). It was also reported that roughly 3.2 million students took at least one online course in the Fall semester of 2005 (Powers, 2009). As higher education institutions realized the demand for online learning, they began to solicit faculty participation in the development and delivery of online courses (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). Faculty quickly realized the substantial amount of time and work associated with developing and delivering online courses (Mupinga &

Maughan, 2008). Time demands not only included the time required to develop and deliver online courses, it also included time to learn online instructional methods along with time to learn to use current web-based technologies such as learning management systems and software applications for developing online course contents (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak, 2006). Due to these time demands and the lack of compensation, faculty found it difficult to meet their aspirations of developing and delivering quality online courses (Boerema, Stanley, & Westhorp, 2007). Having realized the substantial amount of work associated with developing and delivering these courses, faculty began requesting additional compensation (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008)

While Parker (2003) reported the use of stipends, reduced workload, and the purchase of new technology as enough to motivate faculty to participate in the development and delivery of online courses, research on compensation best practices for these services was not available. The findings of Haber and Mills (2008) and Shea (2007) confirmed the need to determine effective methods of calculating equitable compensation for developing and delivering online courses. However, before equitable compensation could be determined, a comprehensive list of the most frequently used compensation practices needed to be developed. This study provided higher education institutions with a valuable resource to help them effectively support their online learning initiatives by developing a list of the most frequently used compensation practices higher education institutions in the United States provided their faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Limitations

The following limitations applied to this study:

1. Due to institution policy and privacy concerns, participants may have hesitated to provide financial compensation information.
2. Participants may not have been aware of informal compensation agreements between faculty members and their immediate supervisors.
3. This study was limited to small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters degree not-for-profit higher education institutions in the United States.
4. This study was limited to online course development by full-time faculty.
5. This study was limited to online course delivery by full-time faculty.

Assumptions

The following assumptions applied to this study:

1. The researcher assumed that the participants were aware of all compensation practices implemented at their university.
2. The researcher assumed that the participating colleges and universities were building or already had an online presence.
3. The researcher assumed that additional compensation was a motivator for higher education faculty to develop and deliver online courses.

Procedures

The researcher surveyed institutions on the practices they employed for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher selected participants using the following Carnegie Foundation classifications: 1)

primarily non-residential (fewer than 25% of students reside on campus); 2) primarily residential (25-49% of students reside on campus); 3) Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts and Sciences (BAC/A&S); 4) Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields (BAC/Diverse); 5) Masters L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs); 6) Masters M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs); and 7) Masters S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs) (Carnegie, 2009). A review of the literature indicated that other research had not been undertaken on compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses. Consequently a previously used survey could not be found. Therefore a survey designed by the researcher was used to determine the most frequently used practices participating institutions used to compensate higher education faculty for delivering and developing online courses. Survey results were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the most frequently used practices of compensation for online course development and delivery.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to ensure the reader does not misinterpret their meanings:

- Compensation: Any means of remuneration to higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses including but not limited to financial compensation, release time, and staff support.
- Delivering: Teaching an online course including managing course contents and monitoring student-to-student and student-to-faculty communications.
- Developing: The structural design along with the creation and selection of materials for an online course.

- Face-to-face course: Any course in which all participants are present as instruction is delivered on campus in a "brick-and-mortar" classroom/laboratory.
- Participant: Due to the various titles used in higher education, the term participant was used in this study to refer to the individual completing the survey. The participants include but are not limited to Directors of Online Learning, Directors of Distance Education, Coordinators of Distance Education, or their counterparts.
- Online course: A course in which all instruction (100%) is offered online.

Summary and Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common compensation practices small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters degree not-for-profit higher education institutions in the United States provided their faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher surveyed colleges and universities on current practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher used descriptive statistics to determine which compensation practices were used most frequently.

The significance of this study was based upon a gap in the literature on common practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses and for determining the implications online teaching had on faculty workload such as additional investment in time required for managing online course materials and meeting student expectations for instructor availability due to the multiple modes of communication needed for online courses (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). Previous research confirmed faculty concern for lack of compensation for these services (Shea,

2007); however previous research did not produce a list of compensation best practices nor did it determine the most frequently applied compensation practices.

The literature indicated a gradual increase in faculty participation in online course development and delivery (Dykman & Davis, 2008a). In spite of this fact, higher education faculty were still reluctant to participate in online learning based upon the tremendous amount of work for the negligible amount of compensation (Haber & Mills, 2008). Colleges and universities quickly realized compensation policies and procedures used for traditional face-to-face courses did not apply to online courses (Haber & Mills, 2008). A gap in literature left colleges and universities with few resources from which to gather information on this subject (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). With limited expertise and almost no literature on the subject, universities and colleges found themselves ill-equipped to determine adequate compensation for these services (Haber & Mills, 2008). Having an obvious effect on faculty morale and participation, inadequate compensation was a leading de-motivator for faculty participation in online learning (Shea, 2007).

Chapter II outlines key literature on the history of distance education and the need for faculty compensation based upon the large amount of time required for developing and delivering online courses. Chapter III explains the methods and procedures employed in this study including the population, instrument design, methods of data collection, and statistical analysis. Chapter IV reveals the findings from this study. Chapter V presents a summary and conclusions of the study and implications for future research.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

As higher education institutions began implementing online learning programs, they were faced with the dilemma of determining adequate compensation for faculty members who developed and delivered online courses. 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. Future research determined that inadequate compensation was found to have a direct effect on faculty morale and participation in online learning (Shea, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education colleges and universities throughout the United States used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses. By determining the most common compensation practices, this study provided colleges and universities with a foundation on which they could base their compensation practices for online course development and delivery. This chapter provides a review of literature concerning distance learning, distance learning at the university level, online learning, faculty compensation, faculty compensation for distance delivery instruction, value of this study, and a summary.

Distance Learning

Distance learning was originally designed to reach individuals in remote locations and was only as good as the method of delivery (Prewitt, 1998). Often seen as a smaller subset of distributed learning in which students were separated in time and space from their peers and instructors (Stella & Gnanam, 2004), distance learning was often dictated by the newest and latest technology (Anderson, 2009). Early examples of distance

learning included stenography courses offered as early as 1852 and mine safety courses offered as early as the 1890s and were delivered using the postal service for delivering course materials (Anderson, 2009). As new technologies such as radio and television were invented, new methods of distance learning evolved (Close, Dixit, & Malhotra, 2005).

In 1921 the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) granted the first educational radio licenses. The University of Salt Lake City, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Minnesota were the first higher education institutions to receive educational radio licenses. By 1946, the FCC granted educational radio licenses to over 200 colleges (Casey, 2008). The use of educational radio broadcasts allowed distant students to hear their instructors and decreased the level of dependency distant courses and instructors had on the postal system (Casey, 2008).

In 1934 the University of Iowa introduced the use of television as an instructional medium and due to the increased demand for instructional television over the next 30 years, the FCC created the Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS). The ITFS is a band of 20 television channels available to educational institutions at low costs. California State University was the first educational institution to apply for an ITFS license in 1963 (Casey, 2008).

As new technologies, specifically personal computers, web-servers, and the Internet became more accessible to colleges, universities, and individuals, distance learning took a new turn (Close et al., 2005). These technologies provided online learners with opportunities to disseminate and gather course information and communicate with instructors and peers synchronously and asynchronously across distance and time (Palvia

& Palvia, 2007). These changes drastically affected the role of both the distance instructor and student.

The invention of new technologies along with student expectations to use these technologies drastically changed the role of the distance education instructor (Casey, 2008). The role of the instructor in correspondence courses included development and dissemination of course materials, grading assignments, limited communication with students, and reporting grades. The role of the new distance education or online instructor changed from that of the traditional lecturer to that of a course facilitator, leader, and guide for self-directed learning (Berge, 2008). In this new role the online instructor was expected to integrate current technologies into their instruction in order to remain competitive and to meet both administrative and student expectations (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak, 2006).

As the role of the online instructor evolved, so too did the role and expectations of student. In early distance education courses, students received course content through parcel delivery services in the form of textbooks, text-based instructions, and videos. Their responsibility was to read or view the material, apply it to an assignment or assessment, and mail the completed work back to the instructor (Anderson, 2009). However, through the use of new technologies the role of the distant student became more inclusive and interactive thus increasing the faculty member's workload and supporting faculty concerns for adequate compensation (Bonk & Zhang, 2006).

Bonk and Zhang (2006) described the R2D2 model of online learning as reading/listening, reflecting/writing, displaying, and doing. By reviewing the R2D2 model and applying it to the latest technologies, the role of the online learner and its

effect on the role of the online instructor becomes apparent. With course materials available online, students had access to course contents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (Kadirire, 2007). Students were expected to either review the contents as it fit into their schedule and/or participate in video streaming synchronous class sessions in order to acquire new information. Their first responsibility, based upon the R2D2 model, was to either *read* the course materials or listen to a lecture, a web-cast, or a pod-cast. The student then *reflected* and applied the contents by participation in online activities such as discussion forums or blogs. The use of discussion boards as a tool for learning and community building required consistent student and instructor participation in order to construct meanings together and to integrate new knowledge into their past experiences (Baran & Correia, 2009). The third step was for the student to *display* what they learned. This activity was accomplished using online mind mapping tools, collaborative writing tools such as Google docs, web-based interactive whiteboards, animations, adventure blogging, and virtual tours. The final step in the R2D2 model was *doing*. These activities included interacting with simulations, online questionnaires, online assessments, and developing pod-cast assignments (Bonk & Zhang, 2006). The use of new technologies and new teaching strategies in distance learning provided online students with the means to interact among themselves and their instructors asynchronously. However, asynchronous delivery, by nature, increased the average time the online instructor spent per student, thus increasing the overall workload of the online instructor (Amiel & Orey, 2006).

Distance Learning at the University Level

For years higher education institutions used various technologies in their distance learning programs in order to reach larger audiences across vast geographic regions (Hinson & LaPrairie, 2005). Higher education institutions also incorporated distance learning into their programs in hopes of cutting costs, increasing enrollment, and increasing revenue (Spooner & Ya-yu, 2009).

With the invention of the personal computer and the availability of the World Wide Web (WWW) to the public, creative ideas for educational uses were realized. Educational institutions began using new media and technologies to support their distance education initiatives (Casey, 2008). Early adopters began placing course contents on web pages for easy student access. Others began to use one-way and two-way satellite video as a means to deliver instruction (Barron, 1998). As universities began to realize the potential of the WWW for educational purposes, they began developing and offering more courses on publicly accessible websites. This made it necessary for higher education faculty who developed online courses to have web development skills (Shea, 2007). This realization also helped higher education faculty who developed and delivered online courses realize the need for a secure, user-friendly, authenticated system in which faculty could place course materials, create assessments and assignments, and store grades for their classes (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008). Realization of this need influenced the creation of the earliest learning management systems (LMS), also known as course management systems (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008). Three commonly used learning management systems were Angel, Blackboard, and WebCT (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008).

Even with the use of a LMS, faculty had to overcome a steep learning curve which some researchers believe effected the quality of instruction in online courses (Lane, 2008). Faculty often developed courses by attempting to reuse course materials from the traditional classroom without modification and with limited or no understanding of online instructional design best practices (Morrison & Anglin, 2006). Higher education faculty not only needed to learn to efficiently use new hardware and software, they needed to learn quality instructional design practices in addition to understanding the shift in their role as a conveyor of information to a learning facilitator (Hardy & Bower, 2004). By participating in fundamental professional development sessions, a diverse group of committed higher education faculty successfully developed the technical and basic instructional design skills needed to begin building quality online courses. However, attending professional development sessions added one more task to their already demanding schedules (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008).

The use of the Internet as a delivery mode for higher education courses changed the skills required of the higher education faculty member and the individuals that supported distance learning (Ooms, Burke, Linsey, & Heaton-Shrestha, 2008). Instead of using administrative assistants and distance learning coordinators to support online learning, the use of the Internet and personal computers required higher education institutions to hire support personnel with the skills to manage and troubleshoot hardware, software, and network issues and to hire faculty with the prerequisite educational and technical skills needed to develop quality online courses (Jokela & Karlsudd, 2007). These individuals frequently possessed skill-sets with an educational emphasis in conjunction with excellent technical skills. Their understanding of

pedagogical concepts along with their advanced technical skills helped them develop quality online courses (Chaney, Chaney, Stellefson, & Eddy, 2008).

The latest implementations of distance education were directly linked to the newest technologies and included the use of the Internet to provide synchronous and asynchronous delivery of course contents (Anderson, 2009). New technologies supported the use of synchronous delivery methods in which face-to-face meetings through the use of satellite or Internet based streaming video allowed participants to attend from almost any location. Synchronous delivery methods required the presence of both the instructor and the student at a specific time and location (Spooner & Ya-yu, 2009). Asynchronous delivery included the use of web-based applications and instructional resources in the forms of text documents, narrated presentations, and audio and video podcasts that enhanced online instruction in such a way that the participants did not meet face-to-face. Asynchronous instructors and students typically communicated and interacted with each other online using discussion boards, online chats, and email (Kadirire, 2007).

Online Learning

Distance education delivery methods were often determined by the technology of the day. Online learning was considered a subset of distance education, was not a separate entity in and of itself, and arose due to the emergence of the Internet (Anderson, 2009). Curran (2008) defined online learning as a process in which learners and teachers communicate with one another and accessed course materials using Internet-based technologies. Internet based technologies were any number of hardware devices and software applications that provided access to the Internet or provided functionality to the user while accessing the Internet. Examples of these technologies included learning

management systems, Web 2.0 tools such as blogs, wikis, and web-based discussion boards, and web-based video-conferencing systems (Spooner & Ya-yu, 2009). Learning management systems were systems used to manage online course content and course activities (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008). Blogs, also known as weblogs, were web-based postings in which the author created a blog on a specific topic and visitors were able to post their text-based comments about the topic (Lucking, Christmann, & Wighting, 2009). The wiki was another Web 2.0 application in which multiple users could provide and edit web-based contents on topics, definitions, and articles (Matthew, Felvegi, & Callaway, 2009). Discussion boards were web-based applications, often a component of an LMS, in which participants could interact by posting comments asynchronously in the form of threads and replies (Rainsbury & Malcolm, 2003). Video conferencing systems were synchronous web-based applications in which participants could see and hear each other through the use of web-cams and microphones with an optional text based chat feature for communication (Israel, Knowlton, Griswold, & Rowland, 2009). The use of these technologies for educational purposes underwent great scrutiny. However, research on distance education theory demonstrated the effectiveness of these tools for collaboration and communication in online learning (Anderson, 2009).

The flexibility of asynchronous online delivery was a primary reason for the popularity of online instruction for students and instructors. However, coupled with this flexibility came the intense demands of teaching and learning online in which the workloads for both the student and the instructor were often more excessive than they expected (Boerema et al., 2007).

Higher education institutions embraced online learning for many reasons. Shiffman (2007) cited nine reasons higher education institutions implement online learning initiatives. The reasons are: 1) Get new students; 2) Contribute to extension efforts; 3) Enhance brand; 4) Increase on-campus student retention; 5) Provide pedagogic improvements; 6) Increase student diversity; 7) Return a surplus of profits to the institution; 8) Increase student speed to graduation; and 9) Reduce or contain costs (Schiffman, Vignare, & Geith, 2007). Unexpected fiscal demands that were placed on higher education institutions due to a failing economy also played a role in the adoption of online learning (Tuathail & McCormack, 1998). Many state funded colleges and universities were forced to find other sources of funding as the economy weakened and the state funds they received were reduced. Their solution was online learning (Dykman & Davis, 2008b). Due to the seemingly low cost of creating online courses and the large number of prospective students, universities saw online education as an opportunity to increase revenue (Anderson, 2008). However, as many institutions began developing online courses and programs, the cost of developing and delivering online courses far exceeded their expectations (ASHE, 2006). Initially institutions absorbed the cost of online course development but eventually began applying technology and electronic fees to students enrolled in these classes to help defray these costs (ASHE, 2006).

The implementation of online learning initiatives in higher education institutions added many tasks to the role of the faculty member including developing online course materials in text, audio, and video format, organizing and managing the online course, establishing expectations, and communicating with online students (Dykman & Davis, 2008a). Early adopters developed online courses using html code and web-editors,

however, the introduction of the learning management system (LMS) provided faculty developers with a tool to create online courses with minimal technical skills (Ioannou & Hannafin, 2008). Software applications, such as Adobe Captivate, Audacity, and Garage Band, allowed higher education faculty to develop more advanced materials including videos and audio podcasts, wikis, and blogs for use in their online courses without special assistance from audio engineers, videographers, or programmers (HirÃ§a, 2009). Unfortunately, instead of creating a structured learning environment using quality instructional design best-practices, many course developers used the available technologies to develop course materials without understanding how to effectively incorporate them into the online learning environment (Snyder, 2009). As the technical skills of faculty members and course developers improved, and as new, easy to use technologies were introduced, the technical barrier was removed allowing higher education faculty and online course developers to focus on pedagogical concepts (Haber & Mills, 2008). Yet, even with access to new tools and resources, higher education faculty members often remained reluctant to participate in online learning (Anderson, 2008).

Research demonstrates that the amount of work required to obtain the prerequisite skills needed to develop and deliver online courses and the process of developing and delivering online courses was greater than that of a face-to-face class (Shea, 2007). Due to the extra work involved in developing and teaching online courses (Amiel & Orey, 2006), higher education faculty requested various forms of compensation for assuming these responsibilities (Perreault, Waldman, Alexander, & Zhao, 2008). As faculty quickly realized, higher education institutions were not prepared to determine suitable

compensation for these services and therefore provided inadequate compensation for these services. The increased workload in conjunction with inadequate compensation negatively affected faculty motivation prompting them to decline requests to participate in online learning initiatives (Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006). It was reported that the top faculty motivator for participating in online learning was a more flexible work schedule yet the top de-motivator was inadequate compensation (Shea, 2007).

Faculty Compensation

Higher education faculty compensation was based upon many factors including level of education, years of experience, publishing, research, current economic conditions, and acceptance of additional work responsibilities (Casey, 2008). The increasing demands placed on the higher education faculty member often included supervision of student teachers, administration of grants, participation on theses and dissertation committees, administrative assignments, and creation of tools, instruments, and software applications (Hanshaw, 2004). While higher education institutions demanded more of their faculty, the compensation rates for higher education faculty still remained lower than those provided to other professionals with equivalent levels of education (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005). With compensation levels already below the norm and new responsibilities continuously added to their workload, higher education faculty began requesting compensation in the form of merit pay and monetary stipends (Perreault et al., 2008). Research showed that merit pay plans that were made publicly available had a positive effect on higher education faculty motivation and performance (Terpstra & Honoree, 2009). Yet, many higher education institutions offering merit pay kept the specifics of these plans undisclosed (Hanshaw, 2004).

Faculty Compensation for Distance Education

Higher education institutions faced the challenge of recruiting individuals who were content experts and were experienced using web-based technologies. These individuals had to be willing and able to embrace instructional technology and online course development and delivery (Baltaci-Goktalay & Ocak, 2006). In order to acquire and maintain individuals with these skills, higher education institutions had to develop new compensation practices (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005). In return for their participation on additional tasks and due to their complex skill-sets, many higher education institutions realized the need to offer faculty a variety of compensation options (Shea, 2007).

Higher education institutions determined it was appropriate to provide additional compensation for developing and delivering online courses. This was due, in part, to the grossly underestimated amount of time it took to develop and deliver these courses (Shea, 2007). Institutions often anticipated a notable return on their investment in online learning based upon increased enrollment due to an unlimited service area. In turn they anticipated increased revenue which gave them justification for providing additional compensation to higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses (Schiffman et al., 2007).

Higher education institutions employed various compensation practices for both development and delivery of online courses. These practices included financial compensation, release time, computer equipment, travel support, and advanced recognition for promotion and tenure (Perreault et al., 2008). While these practices were frequently used, the most common practices higher education institutions used to

compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses had not been determined.

Summary

Beginning with correspondence courses through the introduction of radio and television as instructional delivery modes, and through the use of the Internet for online learning, higher education institutions continuously searched for new, innovative ways to provide education to more individuals. With these innovations came new responsibilities for higher education faculty including the development and delivery of online courses. These added responsibilities prompted faculty to request equitable compensation for their time. However, due to the lack of research on equitable compensation and common compensation practices for participation in online learning initiatives, higher education institutions developed compensation policies with limited information, limited research, and limited expertise, thus providing inadequate compensation for these services.

Chapter III describes the methods and procedures used in this study to determine the most common practices higher education institutions used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Chapter III also identifies the population, the instrument design, the methods of data collection, and the statistical analysis procedures.

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 common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This study was descriptive in nature and identified the most common compensation practices currently being provided to higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Within this chapter are described the population of this study, the instrument design, the methods of data collection, statistical analysis, and a summary.

Population

The population of this study consisted of 275 small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters level private and state-funded not-for-profit higher education institutions. The number of participants and selection of participants was determined using the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education system located on the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of teaching website at: http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/. The Carnegie Classification system classifies baccalaureate and masters degree institutions with 1,000-2,999 students as small, 3,000-9,999 students as medium, and 10,000 or more students as large. Doctoral programs were not included since not many are offering this level of degree online.

Due to the various titles used from one institution to another, the participant's title varied. Institution participant titles included Director of Online Learning, Director of Distance Education, and Coordinator of Distance Education, or their counterparts.

Counterparts were determined during the initial collection of contact information for each university. 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 participants were knowledgeable of frequently used compensation practices their institutions provided to faculty for developing and delivering online courses. A list of participating institutions can be found in Appendix A.

Instrument Design

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions in the United States used for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. At the time of this study there were no empirically validated surveys available. The instrument used in this study was a survey designed by the researcher that contained questions that addressed the goals of this study. The survey consisted of 16 closed-ended questions and five open-ended questions. To align with the research goals Questions 1 through 11 asked for participant's demographic information including their title, the number of students their institution served, the number of online courses they offered per year, did they limit the number of students in online courses, the number of online programs they offered per year, was development and delivery experience considered when hiring new faculty, what instructional design services did they offer to faculty, and how they communicated compensation practices to faculty. Questions 12 and 16 asked the participants to identify types of compensation offered to faculty for developing and delivering online courses from the following selections: 1) financial compensation; 2) release time; 3) computer equipment; 4) travel support, and/or 5) advanced recognition for promotion and tenure for developing or delivering online

courses (Perreault et al., 2008). If the participants answered "yes" to financial compensation in Questions 12 and 16, Questions 13 and 17 asked them to select the amount of financial compensation from one of nine options including: 1) $0-$1000.00; 2) $1001.00-$2500.00; 3) $2501.00-$4000.00; 4) $4001.00-$5500.00; 5) $5501.00-$7000.00; 6) $7001.00-$8500.00; 7) $8501.00; $10,000.00; and 8) $10,000.00 or greater (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). Questions 14 and 18 asked participants if full-time and part-time faculty were compensated at the same rate for either developing online courses or delivering online courses (Schneider, 2004). If the participants indicated faculty were not compensated at the same rate, Questions 15 and 19 asked participants if full-time faculty were compensated at a higher or lower rate than part-time faculty for developing and delivering online courses (Dedman & Pearch, 2004). Given that compensation practices varied from institution to institution, Question 20 asked participants to list any additional practices their institution used to compensate faculty for developing or delivering online courses (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005), and Question 21 asked participants to list other compensation practices they would like to see in place at their institution. A copy of the original survey is included in Appendix B.

Pilot Study

The researcher conducted a pilot study with the help of five Directors of Online Learning or their counterparts and five content experts. The purpose and design of the pilot study was to strengthen the validity, usability, and reliability of the instrument used in this study. Pilot participants were not included as part of the final survey group.

The five Directors of Online learning or their counterparts completed the survey and returned their responses along with recommendations to strengthen the validity of the

survey via. The researcher collected the recommendations from the pilot study participants and reviewed their responses and recommendations. The researcher reviewed the recommendations from all participants and appropriately applied recommendations that were determined to strengthen the validity of the survey.

The five content experts were asked to validate the compensation options and the levels of financial compensation listed on the survey and to provide feedback on the overall usability of the survey. The five content experts emailed their feedback to the researcher. The feedback provided by the content experts were consistent and included recommendations such as using the word teach or teaching in conjunction with the word deliver or delivering on Questions 16, 17, 18, and 19 to improve understanding. Additional feedback included recommendations that improved clarity of contents and semantics. The researcher reviewed the recommendations from the content experts and appropriately applied recommendations that were determined to strengthen the survey's usability.

The decision to accept or decline each recommendation was based upon the frequency of occurrence and relevance to this study. The researcher applied the accepted recommendations to the final survey as shown in Appendix C. The results, decision to accept or decline, and brief rationales for accepting or declining each recommendation are listed in Table 1.

Additionally, the researcher reviewed pilot participants' responses to survey questions that specifically related to the research questions that guided this study. Questions 12-15 asked participants specific information about their institutions' compensation practices for developing online courses. Question 12 asked participants to

indicate all compensation practices they provided faculty for this service. If participants selected financial compensation for Question 12 they would logically select a financial compensation range as prompted in Question 13. The participants would in-turn select yes or no to Question 14 which asked them if they compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for providing this service. If the participants selected no they do not compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for Question 14 they would logically select higher or lower for Question 15 which asked if they compensated full-time faculty higher or lower than part-time faculty for providing this service. If participants selected yes they compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for Question 14 they would logically select does not apply for Question 15.

If the participants did not select financial compensation for Question 12, participants would logically select does not apply for Question 13. In-turn participants would have not responded to Question 14 and would have selected does not apply for Question 15.

Of the pilot participants 9 (90 %) selected financial compensation for developing online courses for Question 12. Nine participants (100 %) who selected financial compensation appropriately answered Questions 13, 14, and 15 based upon their response to Question 12. One participant (100%) who did not select financial compensation appropriately answered Questions 13, 14, and 15 based upon their response to Question 12. Ten (100%) of the pilot participants reliably answered Questions 12-15.

Questions 16-19 asked participants specific information about their institutions' compensation practices for delivering online courses. Question 16 asked participants to

indicate all compensation practices they provided faculty for providing this service. If the participants selected financial compensation for Question 16 they would logically select a financial compensation range as prompted in Question 17. In-turn the participant would then select yes or no to Question 18 which asked them if they compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for providing this service. If the participants selected no they do not compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for Question 18 they would logically select higher or lower to Question 19 which asked participants if they compensated full-time faculty higher or lower than part-time faculty. If participants selected yes they do compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate or scale for Question 18 they would logically select does not apply for Question 19.

Conversely, if the participants did not select financial compensation for Question 16, participants would logically select does not apply for Question 17. In-turn participants would have not responded to Question 18 and would have selected does not apply for Question 19.

Of the pilot participants 4 (40 %) selected financial compensation for delivering online courses for Question 16. Three participants (75 %) who selected financial compensation appropriately answered Questions 17, 18, and 19 based upon their response to Question 16. One participant (25%) who selected financial compensation selected does not apply to Question 17 which asked them to select a range of financial compensation. This conflicted with this participant's response to Question 16.

Six participants (60 %) did not select financial compensation. Four participants (66.7%) of the participants who did not select financial compensation appropriately

answered Questions 17, 18, 19. Two participants (33.3%) that did not select financial compensation selected yes to Question 18 stating they compensate full-time and part-time faculty the same for providing this service. This conflicted with their responses to Question 16. Seven (70%) of the pilot participants reliably answered Questions 16-19.

Ten pilot participants (100%) accurately completed Questions 13-15 based upon their response to Question 12. Seven pilot participants (70%) accurately completed Questions 17-19 based upon their response to Question 16. Based upon the purposeful design of the question structure and sequence of questions, the reliability of the survey used in this study was established by the accurate completion of Questions 12-16 and Questions 16-19 by the pilot participants.

Methods of Data Collection

Beginning on July 17, 2010, the researcher collected demographics for each Carnegie identified institution including mailing address, the name of the participant, the participant's office telephone number, mobile telephone number if available, and email address. The researcher gathered this information from each institution's website and by contacting each institution by telephone to request the name and contact information of the individual most responsible for online learning. On September 8, 2010, the researcher mailed a letter of introduction to the individual that each institution identified as being responsible for online learning. The letter of introduction described the purpose of this study and requested their participation. The letter of introduction also introduced the researcher as a Ph.D. candidate at Old Dominion University and stated that this study will be used for the researcher's dissertation. The letter expressed the importance of each institution's participation in order for the researcher to determine a valid set of the most

common compensation practices provided to higher education faculty for developing and delivering college and university online courses. A copy of the letter of introduction can be found in Appendix D.

The researcher labeled each survey with a number in order to identify which survey was sent to each institution. This step was necessary to confirm which participants responded and which participants did not. The researcher ensured confidentiality and protection of human subjects during the study by keeping all responses and numerical identifiers confidential. On September 12, 2010, the researcher mailed the survey and a cover letter (Appendix E) to each participant identified earlier.

Within the cover letter were instructions requesting the participants to complete the survey and return it to the researcher using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by September 26, 2010. On September 27, 2010, the researcher mailed each participant who had not responded to the initial request, a follow-up letter (Appendix F) with an additional copy of the survey requesting their return no later than October 11, 2010.

Table 1

Pilot recommendations

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
Introduction	(See Appendix B)	Add "This is being undertaken as a part of my graduate work" in the introduction.	1%	Declined	This statement was included in the cover letter.
Introduction		Define "online courses" in the introduction.	1%	Declined	The definition of online courses was provided in parenthesis in the survey questions.
Introduction		Italicize "common".	1%	Declined	"Common" does not need additional emphasis.
Introduction		Add or send to chief information officer.	1%	Declined	The researcher sent the survey to the individuals that were typically most responsible for online learning.
1	What is your title?	Remove Question 1.	1%	Declined	Question 1 requested the participant title. This information adds to the credibility of the study.
2	How many students does your institution serve?	Lower ranges for number of students.	1%	Accepted	Very few institutions will have 50,000.

(Continue to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
2		Include "unduplicated headcount".	1%	Declined	This question asked for the institution student population.
3	How many online courses does your institution offer per year? (Online course refers to course in which all components are offered 100% online.)	Use "unique courses".	1%	Declined	Does not meet the purpose of this study.
3		Use "all components" instead of "all instructions".	1%	Declined	All instructions does not include all contents.
4	Does your institution limit or "cap" the number of students that can enroll in an online course?	"Answers will vary."	1%	Declined	The justification for using a survey is the understanding that participant responses will vary.
4		Suggested question. "If cap is exceeded is overload pay provided?"	1%	Declined	This is a good question and would be useful in future studies on this topic.
4		Responses should include option to select "some".	1%	Declined	If any courses are capped the selection is yes.

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
5	If you selected "yes" to the previous question what is the limit?	Add question "Is there a limit to number of online courses an instructor can teach in a semester?"	1%	Declined	A good question for a future study but unnecessary for this study.
6	How many online programs does your institution offer per year?	What about completion programs in which all courses are not offered?	1%	Declined	This study focused on 100% online courses only.
6		What about schools offering more than 20 online programs?	1%	Declined	Schools offering more than 20 programs can select the fourth choice (20+).
7	Does your institution require online course development and delivery experience when hiring new faculty?	Separate into 2 questions.	1%	Accepted	Some institutions may not seek both development and delivery experience.
8	Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing and delivering online courses?	Don't use open ended questions. Include choices.	2%	Declined	The potential list of instructional design services was too lengthy to offer as a multiple select question.

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
9	If you answered yes to the previous question, briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides.	Seems vague. Include rates, frequency, contracts, and requirements.	1%	Declined	Does not improve the clarity of the question.
10	How does you institution communicate compensation practices to faculty?	Use the word "incentives".	1%	Declined	Does not improve the clarity of the question.
10		Add "None of the Above".	1%	Accepted	Some institutions do not offer compensation for these services.
11	Which of the following does your institution offer for developing online courses?	No recommendations			

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
12	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-credit or similar online course from the options listed below.	Add "semester".	1%	Accepted	The original question did not clarify whether it was referencing semester hours, quarter hours.
12		Add "Does your institution compensate part-time faculty for developing online courses?"	1%	Declined	Responses to Question 13 indirectly answer this question.
12		Add "Does your institution provide additional compensation for developing online courses?	1%	Declined	Responses to Question 13 indirectly answer this question.
13	Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for developing online courses?	No recommendations			

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	
14	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?	No recommendations.			
15	Which of the following does your institution offer for delivering online courses?	Use the word "incentives".	1%	Declined	Does not improve the clarity of the question.
15		Add "teaching".	2%	Accepted	By adding the word "teaching" after delivery the understanding of the question was improved.
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 deliver an online course from the options below. (Circle One)	Change "Circle One" to "Select One".	1%	Accepted	Corrected appropriate action requested for this question.

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
16		Add "teach".	2%	Accepted	By adding the word "teach" after delivery the understanding of the question was improved.
17	Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for delivering online courses?	Change "Circle One" to "Select One".	1%	Accepted	Correction to the appropriate action to take for this question.
17		Add "teach".	2%	Accepted	By adding the word "teach" after delivery the understanding of the question was improved.
17		Include "Lecturers".	1%	Declined	Lecturers may be guest speakers and not directly affiliated with the participating institutions.
18	If you answered yes to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for delivering online courses?	Change "Circle One" to "Select One".	1%	Accepted	Correction to the appropriate action to take for this question.

(Continued to next page)

Question #	Question Text	Recommendation	%	Accepted or Declined	Rationale
18		Add "teach".	2%	Accepted	By adding the word "teach" after delivery the understanding of the question was improved.
19	In the space provided, please list the other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for developing and/or delivering online courses.	Add "teach".	2%	Accepted	By adding the word "teach" after delivery the understanding of the question was improved.
20	Please list other development or delivery compensation practices you would like to see implemented.	No recommendations.			

After the follow-up return date, the researcher contacted the participants by telephone offering assistance in completing the survey. The researcher created an identical online version of the survey to meet the needs of participants who expressed their willingness to participate, but due to time constraints preferred to complete it online.

Statistical Analysis

The researcher collected surveys from the participants asking them to identify the most common practices their institutions used to compensate higher education faculty for developing and/or delivering online courses. The researcher coded financial ranges for development and delivery compensation numerically as described in Table 2. The researcher reviewed the survey results to determine the most common compensation practices participating institutions provided to higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher entered the data from the survey into the statistical package entitled *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS®).

Table 2

Financial Compensation Codes

Financial Compensation	*Code*
Does not apply	0
0-$1000.00	1
$1001.00-$2500.00	2
$2501.00-$4000.00	3
$4001.00-$5500.00	4
$5501.00- $7000.00	5
$7001.00-8500.00	6
$8501.00-$10,000.000	7
$10,000.00 or greater	8

The researcher then conducted descriptive analyses on the data for the entire population and for each institution size to determine the most common compensation practices, the most common financial compensation ranges, and the average financial

compensation ranges provided for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher designated the compensation practices that were selected most frequently as the most common practices for compensating higher education faculty for developing and/or delivering online courses.

The researcher continued by conducting frequency analyses to determine if participating institutions compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher then conducted frequency analyses of the results from institutions reporting that full-time and part-time faculty were not compensated at the same rate to determine whether full-time or part-time faculty were compensated at a higher or lower rate.

The researcher compiled a list and conducted a frequency analysis on the results from Question 20 in which participants listed additional compensation practices provided by their institution for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher then compiled a list and conducted a frequency analysis on the results from Question 21 in which participants listed other compensation practices they would like to see implemented at their institution.

The researcher conducted a series of Pearson's r correlation analyses to determine the relationship between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation provided and the relationship between the number of online courses participating institutions offered and each compensation practice institutions provided for **developing** and **delivering** online courses.

Summary

This chapter described the methods and procedures used to conduct this study and collected the data to answer the research questions. The population of this study included 275 small, medium, and large, baccalaureate and masters degree, not-for-profit institutions. A survey consisting of 21 questions was mailed to each participant. The survey was designed to determine the most frequently used compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses. The survey was first pilot tested and refined to strengthen its validity. The results were analyzed using SPSS® to determine which compensation practices where most frequently selected, which range of financial compensation was most frequently selected, and what level of relationship existed between institution demographics and compensation practices. The results were analyzed for the entire population and separately for each institution size. Results received from the participants are presented in Chapter IV, Findings.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions in the United States used for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This chapter presents the data that were collected with the intent of answering the following research questions:

1. What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **developing** online courses?
2. What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **delivering** online courses?

This chapter presents the response rate, survey responses, further analyses, and a summary of findings.

Response Rate

The population of this study included 275 (N=275) higher education institutions that were identified using the Carnegie Classification System. During the data collection process the researcher discovered that 10 of the original 275 higher education institutions held "for-profit" status and two no longer offered online courses. These institutions did not meet the criteria for participation and were removed from the study. From the remaining 263 institutions, 161 surveys were collected for a return rate of 61%, a 95% confidence level and a margin of error of 4.8%. Thirty-four participants (21%) completed the paper survey and returned it through the United Postal System. One hundred-ten participants (68%) answered survey questions over the telephone. For the purpose of convenience and at the request of several participants, the researcher created an identical

copy of the paper survey in digital format that could be completed online. The remaining seventeen participants (11%) completed the online survey.

Survey Responses

The survey consisted of 21 closed-ended and open-ended response questions requesting demographic information and current practices for compensating higher education faculty for **developing** and/or **delivering** online courses. A frequency analysis was conducted for each survey question using SPSS®. Following are the responses to each survey question.

Question 1 asked participants to select their title from one of the following options: 1) Director of E-Learning; 2) Director of Online Learning; 3) Director of Distance Education; and 4) Other. Of the 161 participants, 46 (29%) selected titles from the options provided on the survey and 115 (71%) provided other titles. The researcher clustered the 115 additional titles provided by the participants into the following seven clusters:

1. Administrative Support Staff
2. Coordinator
3. Department Chair or Dean
4. Faculty
5. Instructional Service Provider
6. Other Director
7. Upper Level Administrator

The title participants most frequently selected from options on the survey was Director of Distance Education with 10 (6%) participants making this selection. The largest title cluster from the additional titles participants listed was Other Director with 21 (9.3%) titles in this cluster. The Other Director cluster included 1) Academic Product Director; 2) Assistant Director of Distance Education; 3) Director of Distributed Learning; 4)

Director of Continuing Education; 5) Director of E-Learning; 6) Director of Independent Learning; 7) Director of Instructor Services and Support; and 8) Director, Center for Instructional Technology. Table 3 shows a summary of all participant title clusters including frequency and percentage.

Table 3

Participant title clusters

Title	Frequency	%
Administrative Support Staff	7	4.4
Coordinator	19	11.8
Department Chair or Dean	21	13
Faculty	11	6.8
Instructional Service Provider	11	6.8
Other Director	31	19.3
Upper Level Administration (President, Vice President, Provost)	15	9.3
Responses to Titles Provided on Survey	46	28.6
Totals	161	100%

Question 2 asked participants to select the range of the number of students their institution served. The most frequently selected student population range was 3,000-9,999. Fifty-eight participants (35%) selected this range. The population range that was selected least was 25,000-30,000 with 8 (5%) participants making this selection. Table 4 shows a summary for each of the student population categories including the number and percentage of participating institutions that selected each range of students.

Question 3 asked participants to select the number of online courses their institutions offered from the following four options: 1) 0-9 courses; 2) 10-49 courses; 3) 50-149 courses; and 4) 150+ courses. The range of 150+ was selected most frequently with 83 (51.6%) participants making this selection. Forty-seven (29.2%) selected 50-149 courses, 22 (13.7%) selected 10-49 courses, and nine (5.6%) selected 0-9 courses.

Table 4

Participating institution student population

Number of Students	Frequency	%
1,000-2,999	35	21.7
3,000-9,999	58	36
10,000-14,999	18	11.2
15,000-19,999	9	5.6
20,000-24,999	12	7.5
25,000-30,000	8	5
over 30,000	21	13
Totals	161	100%

The average range of courses participating institutions offered was 50-149.

Question 4 asked participants if they "capped" or limited the number of students that could enroll in each online course. The majority of participants, 105 (65.2%) selected "yes", they did cap enrollment, and 56 participants (34.8%) selected "no" they did not cap enrollment.

Question 5 asked participants that selected "yes" to Question 4, stating they do cap enrollment, to list the cap limit. Thirty-two participants (19.9%) listed 25 as their online course enrollment cap and 14 (8.7%) listed 20 as the cap. The smallest cap limit of 15 (2%) was listed by three participants. The largest cap limit was 50 and was listed by one participant (.6%). The average cap limit was 25.1. See Table 5.

Question 6 asked the participants to select the number of online programs their institutions offered from the following options: 1) 0-4 programs; 2) 5-9 programs; 3) 10-19; and 4) 20+. The majority of the participants, 79 (49.1%), selected 0-4 programs, 29 (18.0%) selected 5-9 programs, 25 participants (15.5%) selected 10-19 programs, and 28

participants (17.4%) selected 20+ programs. The average range of online programs participating institutions offered was 5-9.

Table 5

Online course cap limits

Limit	Frequency	%
Do not cap.	88	54.7
15	2	1.2
16	1	.6
17	1	.6
18	2	1.2
20	14	8.7
23	1	.6
24	3	1.9
25	32	19.9
26	1	.6
27	3	1.9
29	1	.6
30	6	3.7
35	2	1.2
40	3	1.9
50	1	.6
Totals	161	100%

Question 7 asked the participants if their institution sought online course **development** experience when hiring new faculty. The majority of participants, 87 (54%) selected "no" they did not seek online course **development** experience when hiring faculty. Seventy-four (46%) selected "yes" they did seek online course development experience.

Question 8 asked the participants if their institution sought online course **delivery** experience when hiring new faculty. The majority of participants, 85 (52.8 %) selected "yes" they did seek online course **delivery** experience. Seventy-six participants (47.2%)

selected "no" they did not seek online course development experience when hiring faculty.

Question 9 asked the participants if their institution provided instructional design services to faculty for **developing** and **delivering** online courses. One hundred forty-two participants (88.2%) selected "yes" they did provide instructional design services for developing and delivering online courses and 19 participants (11.8%) selected "no" they did not provide instructional design services for developing and delivering online courses.

Question 10 asked the participants to describe the instructional design services their institution provided. One hundred eighteen participants (73%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered responses to this question into 11 clusters shown in Table 6. The cluster with the largest number of responses was access to an instructional designer. Forty-two participants (35.6%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage for each instructional design service cluster in descending order.

Table 6

Instructional design service clusters

Service	Frequency	%
Access to Instructional Designer	42	35.6%
Training on Course Management System	18	15.3
Training on Course Design	14	11.9
Online Pedagogy Training	10	8.5
Certificate Program	8	6.8
Course Content Development	8	6.8
Technical Support	8	6.8
Access to Course Builders	7	5.9
Access to a Faculty Mentor	1	.8
Online Course Management	1	.8
Training from Vendor's	1	.8
Totals	118	100%

Question 11 asked participants how they communicated compensation practices to faculty. The researcher clustered the responses to this question into six clusters. Eighty-two participants (51%) responded to this question. The communication practice cluster with the largest number of entries was the cluster entitled During Service Negotiating/Contracting accounting for 34 (41.5%) of the participants. Table 7 shows the frequency and percentage for each communication practice cluster.

Table 7

Compensation communication practice clusters

Communication Practice	Frequency	%
During Service Negotiation/Contracting	34	41.5
Department Head	19	23.1
Email	12	14.6
Faculty Handbook	12	14.6
Webpage/s	4	5
Training Sessions	1	1.2
Totals	82	100

Question 12 asked participants to select all compensation methods their institution offered for online course **development**. The methods of compensation to select from included: 1) Financial, 2) Release Time, 3) Computer Equipment, 4) Travel Support, 5) Advanced Recognition for Promotion and Tenure, 6) Online Course Development is Part of the Faculty Workload, 7) We Do Not Offer Compensation for This Service, or 8) Other. The most frequently selected compensation practice for developing online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 96 (59.6%) of the participants. Table 8 shows the percentage of participants that selected each compensation practice. Of the participating institutions 3.1% selected "Other" compensation methods. Their responses were:

- Allow faculty to use developed content in their on-campus course.
- CEUs, Certificates of Achievement.

- Training
- Development of online program courses is financially compensated.

Table 8

Compensation practices for developing online courses

Compensation	Frequency (Yes)	% (Yes)	Frequency (No)	% (No)
Financial	96	59.6	65	40.4
Release Time	37	23	124	77
Computer Equipment	37	23	124	77
Travel Support	6	3.7	155	96.3
Advanced Recognition for Promotion and Tenure	6	3.7	155	96.3
Part of Faculty Workload	55	34.2	106	65.8
We Do Not Offer Compensation for This Service.	24	14.9	137	85.1
Other	5	3.1	156	96.9

Question 13 asked the participants that selected "Financial Compensation" in Question 12 to select the amount of compensation their institution provided for **developing** online courses from the following ranges: 1) Does not apply; 2) 0-$1,000.00; 3) $1,001.00-$2,500.00; 3) $2,501.00-$4,000.00; 4) $4,001.00-$5,500.00; 5) $5,501.00-$7,000.00; 6) $7,001.00-$8,500.00; 7) $8,501.00-$10,000.00; or 8) $10,000.00 or greater. Of the institutions that provided financial compensation for developing online courses, the most frequently selected range was $1,001-$2,500 with the average range also being $1,001-$2,500. Table 9 shows a summary of participant selections of financial compensation ranges for developing online courses.

Question 14 asked the participants if their institution compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses. The majority of participants, 122 (75.8%) selected "yes", they did compensate full-time and part-time

faculty at the same scale or rate. Thirty-nine participants (24.2%) selected "no", they did not compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate.

Table 9

Financial compensation ranges for developing online courses

Compensation range	Frequency	Percent
does not apply	68	42.2
$0-1,000	16	9.9
$1,001-2,500	44	27.3
$2501-4,000	24	14.9
$4,001-5,500	5	3.1
$5,501-7,000	2	1.2
$7,001-8,500	1	.6
$10,000 or greater	1	.6
Totals	161	100

Question 15 asked the participants who answered "no" to Question 14 stating they did not compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same rate for **developing** online courses, if they compensated full-time faculty higher or lower than part-time faculty. Twenty-one participants (13%) selected higher stating they compensated full-time faculty at a higher rate or scale and two participants (1.2%) selected lower stating they compensated full-time faculty at a lower rate than part-time faculty.

Question 16 asked participants to select all methods of compensation their institution offered for **delivering** online courses. The methods of compensation to select from included: 1) Financial, 2) Release Time, 3) Computer Equipment, 4) Travel Support, 5) Advanced Recognition for Promotion and Tenure, 6) Online Course Development is Part of the Faculty Workload, 7) We Do Not Offer Compensation for This Service, or 8) Other. The most frequently selected compensation practice for delivering online courses was financial compensation with 77 participants (47.8%)

making this selection. Table 10 displays the percentage of participants that selected each compensation practice.

Table 10

Compensation practices for delivering online courses

Compensation	Frequency (Yes)	% (Yes)	Frequency (No)	% (No)
Financial	77	47.8	84	52.2
Release Time	15	9.3	146	90.7
Computer Equipment	16	9.9	145	90.1
Travel Support	6	3.7	155	96.3
Advanced Recognition for Promotion and Tenure	4	2.5	157	97.5
Part of Faculty Workload	68	42.2	93	57.8
We Do Not Offer Compensation for This Service.	32	19.9	129	80.1
Other	4	2.5	157	97.5

Of the participating institutions, 3% selected other compensation practices. Responses listed as other included:

- Additional teaching workload credit.
- Access to graduate grading assistance.
- Faculty who have more than 25 students in an online class are paid $100 per student from 26 to 50. Beyond 50 the stipend is negotiated. For example I am paying someone an extra $6500 to teach 180 students. Another received $5000 to teach 120.

Question 17 asked the participants that selected financial compensation in Question 16 to select the amount of compensation their institution provided for **delivering** online courses from the following ranges: 1) Does not apply; 2) 0-$1,000.00; 3) $1,001.00-$2,500.00; 3) $2,501.00-$4,000.00; 4) $4,001.00-$5,500.00; 5) $5,501.00-

$7,000.00; 6) $7,001.00-$8,500.00; 7) $8,501.00-$10,000.00; or 8) $10,000.00 or greater. Of the institutions that provided financial compensation for delivering online courses, the most frequently selected range was $1,001-$2,500 with the average range of $1,001-2,500. Table 11 shows a summary of participant selections of financial compensation ranges for developing online courses.

Table 11

Financial compensation ranges for delivering online courses

Compensation range	Frequency	%
Does not apply	107	65.2
$0-1,000	13	7.9
$1,001-2,500	17	11.0
$2501-4,000	14	9.1
$4,001-5,500	9	5.5
$5,501-7,000	2	1.2
$7,001-8500	0	0
$8,501-10,000	0	0
$10,000 or greater	0	0
Totals	161	100

Question 18 asked the participants if their institution compensated full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering** online courses. The majority of participants, 102 (63.4%), selected "yes", they did compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate. Fifty-nine participants (36.6%) selected "no" they did not compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate.

Question 19 asked the participants who answered "no" to Question 14 if they compensated full-time faculty higher or lower than part-time faculty. Thirty-eight participants (23.6%) selected higher stating they compensated full-time faculty at a higher rate or scale and two participants (1.2%) selected lower.

Question 20 asked the participants to list other compensation practices their institution provided faculty for developing and delivering online courses. Of 161 participants, 11 (6.8%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered the responses to this question into the following four categories:

1. Additional Staff
2. Adjusted Workload
3. Flexible Work Location
4. Sliding Financial Scale

Eight (73%) of the 11 participants who responded to this question listed sliding financial scale. Table 12 shows the frequency and percentage for each compensation practice cluster.

Table 12

Other compensation practices provided

	Frequency	%
Adjusted Workload	1	9
Additional Staff	1	9
Flexible Work Location	1	9
Sliding Financial Scale	8	73
Total	11	100

Question 21 asked the participants to list other development or delivery compensation practices they would like to see implemented. Twenty-five participants (15.5%) responded to this question. The researcher clustered the responses to this question into the following five clusters:

1. Adjusted Workload
2. Consistent Practices Institution Wide
3. Focus on Quality
4. Higher Pay
5. Recognition for Promotion and Tenure

The cluster with the largest number of entries was higher pay. Eight participants (32%) provided responses that were placed in this cluster. Table 13 shows the frequency and percentage for each cluster.

Table 13

Recommended compensation practices

	Frequency	%
Higher Pay	8	32
Adjusted Workload	6	24
Recognition for Promotion and Tenure	4	16
Consistent Practices Institution Wide	5	20
Focus on Quality	2	8
Total	25	100

Further Analysis

The researcher conducted cross tabulations to determine the most frequently selected compensation practices based upon the size of the institution. Institution sizes were based upon the total number of students served and were classified as small (1,000-2,999 students), medium (3,000-9,999 students), and large (10,000 students and over). The most frequently selected compensation practice small institutions selected for **developing** online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 22 (68%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for small institutions was $1,001-$2,500. The most frequently selected compensation practice medium institutions selected for **developing** online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 30 (52%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for medium institutions was $1,001-$2,500. The most frequently selected compensation practice large institutions selected for **developing** online courses was financial compensation

accounting for the response of 46 (67%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for large institutions was $2,501-$4,000.

The most frequently selected compensation practice small institutions selected for **delivering** online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 15 (43%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for small institutions was $1,001-$2,500. The most frequently selected compensation practice medium institutions selected for **delivering** online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 24 (42%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for medium institutions was $1,001-$2,500. The most frequently selected compensation practice large institutions selected for **delivering** online courses was financial compensation accounting for the response of 38 (56%) of the participating institutions of this size. The average financial compensation range for large institutions was $2,501-$4,000.

A Pearson's r correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between institution size and the amount of financial compensation faculty received for **developing** online courses. The Pearson's r correlation showed a slight positive correlation between institution size and the amount of financial compensation faculty received for developing online courses, $r(161) = +.210$, $p = <.01$. This indicated a tendency for the amount of compensation faculty received for **developing** online courses to increase as the size of the institution increased.

The researcher also conducted a series of Pearson's r correlations to assess the relationship between the number of online courses offered and types of compensation provided for **developing** online course. There was a moderate positive correlation

between the number of courses offered and the use of financial compensation for **developing** online courses r(161) = +.358, p = <.01. There was a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and release time, r(161) = +.150, p = <.05. There was a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and the use of computer equipment for compensation, r(161) = +.150, p = <.05. This indicated a tendency for the number of online courses offered to increase as the use of financial compensation, release time, and computer equipment as compensation for **developing** online courses increased.

A Pearson's r correlation was also conducted to assess the relationship between institution size and the amount of financial compensation faculty received for **delivering** online courses. There was a slight positive correlation between the two variables, r(161) = +.131, p = <.01. This indicated that as the institution size increased the amount of financial compensation for **delivering** online courses also increased.

A final Pearson's r correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between the number of online courses offered and types of compensation provided for **delivering** online courses. There was a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and financial compensation provided for **delivering** online courses, r(161) = +.186, p = <.01. There was a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and the use of computer equipment as compensation, r(161) = +.156, p = <.05. There was a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and recognition for promotion and tenure, r(161) = +.130, p=<.05. This indicated a tendency for the use of financial compensation, computer equipment, and recognition for

promotion and tenure as compensation for **delivering** online courses to increase as the size of the institution increased.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions in the United States used for compensating faculty for developing and delivering online courses. The researcher collected demographic information along with current practices higher education institutions used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Of the 263 surveys mailed to participants, 161 completed the survey for a return rate of 61%. Thirty-four (21%) completed the paper survey, 110 (68%) answered survey questions over the telephone, and 17 (11%) completed the survey online. The title of participants who most frequently completed the survey was Director of Distance Education with 10 (6%) making this selection. The largest title cluster created from the additional titles participants listed was Other Director with 21 (9.3%) titles in this cluster. The range of students participating institutions most often served was 3,000-9,999 with 58 (36%) of the participants making this selection. The average range of students served was 3,000-9,999. The range of courses offered by institution that participants most frequently selected was 150+ with 83 participants (51.6%) making this selection. The average range of online courses selected was 50-149. One hundred-five participants (65.2%) capped the enrollment of online courses. The average course cap limit was 25.1. The range of online programs participants most frequently selected was 0-4 with 79 participants (49.1%) making this selection. The average range of online programs participating institutions offered was 5-9. When asked if they sought online course

development experience when hiring new faculty, 87 participants (54%) selected "no". When asked if they sought online course **delivery** experience when hiring new faculty, 85 participants (53%) selected "yes". One hundred forty-two participants (88.2%) selected "yes" they did provide instructional design services for **developing** and **delivering** online courses. Forty-two participants (35.6%) listed access to an instructional designer as a service they provided faculty who **developed** and **delivered** online courses. Thirty-four participants (21%) listed service negotiation/contracting as their method of communicating compensation practices to faculty.

The most frequently selected compensation practice for **developing** online courses was financial compensation with 96 participants (59.6%) listing it as one of their compensation practices. The most frequently selected financial compensation range for **developing** online courses was $1,001-$2,500 with an average range of $1,001-$2,500. One hundred twenty-two participants (75.8%) selected "yes" when asked if they compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **developing** online courses. Twenty-one participants (13%) selected higher when asked if they compensated full-time faculty at a higher scale or rate.

Seventy-seven participants (47.8%) selected financial compensation as one of their compensation practices for **delivering** online courses making it the most frequently selected **delivery** compensation practice. The most frequently selected financial compensation range for **delivering** online courses was $1,001-$2,500 with an average range of $1,001-$2,500. One hundred-two participants (63.4%) selected "yes", they compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering** online courses. Thirty-eight participants (23.6%) selected higher when asked if they

compensated full-time faculty at a higher scale or rate. The most frequently listed compensation practice participants provided that was not included on the survey was a sliding financial scale accounting for 8 (73%) of the 11 responses to this question. The compensation practice participants listed most frequently as a practice they would like to see implemented was higher pay accounting for 8 (32%) of the 25 responses to this question.

The researcher conducted cross tabulations and determined on average small and medium institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500, and large institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4,000 for **developing** online courses. The researcher also determined on average small and medium institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 and large institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4,000 for **delivering** online courses.

The researcher also conducted a series of Pearson's r correlation analyses and determined the following: 1) There was a slight positive correlation between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation provided for **developing** online courses, $r(161) = +.210$, $p = <.01$. This implies that as the institution size increased the amount of financial compensation increased. 2) There was a moderate positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of financial compensation for **developing** online courses, $r(161) = +.358$, $p = <.01$. This implies as the use of financial compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased. 3) There was a slight positive correlation between the number of courses

offered and release time as compensation for developing online courses, r(161) = +.150, p = <.05. This implies as the use of release time as compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased. 4) There was a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of computer equipment as compensation for **developing** online courses, r(161) = +.150, p = <.05. This implies as the use of computer equipment as compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased. 5) There was a slight positive correlation between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation provided for **delivering** online courses, r(161) = +.131, p = <.01. This implies as the institution size increased the amount of financial compensation increased. 6) There was a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and financial compensation provided for **delivering** online courses, r(161) = +.186, p = <.01. This implies as the use of financial compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased. 7) There was a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of computer equipment as compensation for **delivering** online courses, r(161) = +.156, p = <.05. This implies as the use of computer equipment as compensation increased the number of online courses offered also increased. 8) There was a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of advanced recognition for promotion and tenure for **delivering** online courses, r(161) = +.130, p = <.05. This implies as the use of advanced recognition for promotion and tenure increased the number of online courses offered also increased. Chapter V includes a Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations based upon these findings.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This study examined the compensation practices higher education institutions provided faculty for **developing** and **delivering** online courses. This chapter summarizes the study, presents conclusions based upon the findings, and provides recommendations for future studies based upon the results of this study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions in the United States used for compensating faculty for **developing** and **delivering** online courses. Two research questions were used to guide this study. Research Question 1 was What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **developing** online courses? Research Question 2 was What were the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **delivering** online courses?

To reach distant populations and in order to increase enrollment, higher education institutions began developing and delivering online courses (Schiffman et al., 2007). Higher education institutions often called upon faculty members to provide these services (Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). In order to meet this expectation faculty needed to develop new skills through professional development and in-service training sessions while simultaneously continuing to manage their current workload (Poore-Pariseau, 2009). The addition of these responsibilities prompted faculty to request equitable compensation for their time (Perreault et al., 2008). Studies compared the amount of time required to

develop and deliver online courses versus the amount of time required to develop and deliver traditional face-to-face courses (Anderson, 2008; Spector, 2005), while others determined how to better calculate higher education faculty workload (Amiel & Orey, 2006; Mupinga & Maughan, 2008). However, research was not conducted on a national level to determine the most common compensation practices for developing and delivering online courses.

There were several limitations to this study. First, due to policy and privacy concerns, institutions may have hesitated to participate or provide financial compensation information. Second, while participants in this study were the authority on compensation for these services for their institution, they may have been unaware of informal compensation agreements between other faculty and their supervisors. The researcher addressed this limitation by providing participants sufficient time to collect the information needed to proficiently complete the survey. Third, this study was limited to small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters degree not-for-profit higher education institutions in the United States. Institutions were selected using the Carnegie Foundation Classification System (Carnegie, 2009). For this reason, caution should be taken when attempting to project the results of this study to institutions that do not meet these criteria. Finally, this study was limited to online course development and delivery by full-time faculty. Caution should be taken when attempting to project the financial compensation findings from this study to part-time faculty who develop and deliver online courses.

The population of this study initially consisted of 275 directors of distance learning or their counterparts from small, medium, and large baccalaureate and masters

level private and state-funded not-for-profit higher education institutions in the United States. The instrument used for this study was a survey developed by the researcher and was guided by the research questions of this study and research literature. In order to strengthen the validity of the 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 did not participate in the actual study. The feedback provided by the pilot participants was reviewed by the researcher. The final survey includes those recommendations that strengthened or enhanced the original survey. The survey was comprised of closed-ended and open-ended response questions that requested demographic data, current practices, and amounts of financial compensation each institution provided for the development and delivery of online courses.

The researcher mailed each institution a letter of introduction to introduce the researcher and the study and to request their participation. Approximately two weeks later the researcher mailed the participants the cover letter and survey that included instructions on how to complete the survey. During the data collection process the researcher discovered 10 of the 275 institutions held "for-profit" status and two no longer offered online courses. These institutions did not meet the selection criteria for participation in this study and were removed. The final population for this study was 263. There were 161 responses (n = 161) for a return rate of 61% and a confidence level of 95%. Two weeks after sending the cover letter the researcher mailed the follow-up letter requesting participation from the non-responders. Two weeks later the researcher contacted non-responders by telephone to offer assistance in completing the survey.

Thirty-four participants (21%) completed and returned the paper survey through the United Postal Service. One hundred-ten participants (68%) answered survey questions over the telephone. The remaining seventeen participants (11%) completed an online version of the survey.

To address Research Question 1 frequency analyses were conducted on current compensation practices and financial ranges each participant's institution provided faculty for developing online courses. The researcher reported analyses for the entire population and then conducted further analyses to determine the most common development compensation practices and financial ranges of small, medium, and large institutions. To address Research Question 2 frequency analyses were conducted on current compensation practices and financial ranges each participant's institution provided faculty for delivering online courses. The researcher reported results for the entire population and then conducted further analyses to determine the most common delivery compensation practices and financial ranges of small, medium, and large institutions. The data collected from all collection methods were reported in aggregate and analyzed using SPSS®.

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 practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **developing** online courses. The frequency analysis of responses confirmed the most common compensation practice for developing online courses was financial compensation with 96 participants (59.6%) selecting this practice. This supported current

research confirming faculty members were most frequently compensated using financial compensation for participating in online learning initiatives (Perreault et al., 2008). The most frequently selected financial compensation range for developing online courses was $1,001-$2,500. The average range was $1,001-$2,500. On average small and medium institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 and large institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4000 for developing online courses.

Research Question 2 was to determine the most common practices higher education institutions across the United States used to compensate faculty for **delivering** online courses. A frequency analysis of responses confirmed the most common compensation practice for online course delivery was financial compensation with 77 participants (47.8%) making this selection. This also supported the assertion by Perreault et al. (2008) that faculty members were most frequently compensated using financial compensation for their participation in online learning initiatives. Based upon the responses the most frequently selected financial compensation range for delivering online courses was $1,001-$2,500 with an average range of $1,001-$2,500. On average small institutions and medium institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $1,001-$2,500 and large institutions most frequently selected financial compensation in the range of $2,501-$4000 for delivering online courses.

Due to differing levels of compensation for developing and delivering online courses, it was apparent that a systematic method of calculating equitable compensation for these services was not being used. This confirmed current research in which the need

for a new approach to calculate faculty compensation for additional services was established (Allison & Scott, 1998).

Further analyses using Pearson's r correlations confirmed a slight positive correlation between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation existed, a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and the use of financial compensation existed, a slight positive correlation between the number of courses and the use of release time as compensation existed, and a slight positive correlation between the number of courses offered and the use of computer equipment as compensation existed for developing online course. This implies that as the institution size increased the amount of financial compensation increased, as the use of financial compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased, as the use of release time as compensation increased the number of online courses increased, and as the use of computer equipment as compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased.

Further analyses also confirmed a slight positive correlation between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation existed, a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of financial compensation existed, a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of computer equipment existed, and a slight positive correlation between the number of online courses offered and the use of recognition for promotion and tenure as compensation for delivering online courses existed. This implies that as the institution size increased the amount of financial compensation increased, as the use of financial compensation increased the number of online courses offered increased, as the

use of computer equipment increased the number of online courses offered increased, and as the use of recognition for promotion and tenure increased the number of online courses offered also increased.

These findings support current research which confirmed institutions often engaged in online learning for reasons that were related to their demographics and unique characteristics (Schiffman et al., 2007). These findings also confirmed current research which established that motives of faculty members who taught online courses where based upon many factors including faculty rank and tenure, interest in using and acquiring new technology, financial benefit, and flexibility in working environment and hours (Conrad & Pedro, 2009).

Recommendations

As new technologies are developed and greater expectations for online learning increase, higher education faculty will regularly need to update their technical skill-set (Haber & Mills, 2008). The expectation for tenured higher education faculty to maintain an effective skill-set in order to develop and deliver quality online courses will not come without a cost (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005). Based upon the findings of this study the following recommendations are offered:

1. A new challenge for higher education institutions is recruiting and retaining highly qualified full-time faculty with the skills to develop and deliver online courses (Clark & d'Ambrosio, 2005). Due to the complex nature and the significant amount of time required to develop and deliver online courses, it is recommended that higher education institutions review the findings of this study to assess their compensation practices as compared to others across the nation. Based upon their findings, each

institution should determine how to bring their compensation practices in line with the national average of institutions of similar size to attract faculty to this teaching mode.

2. Faculty satisfaction is considered a key factor affecting the quality of online courses (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). Survey research with faculty should be conducted to determine whether intrinsic or extrinsic rewards motivates higher education faculty to develop and deliver online courses. The results of this study will provide higher education faculty and administrators with a resource for encouraging participation in online learning course development and delivery.
3. The data from this study showed that 34.2% of the participating institutions included online course development as part of the faculty workload. The most common measure of faculty workload was based upon the number of credits faculty taught. This did not take into consideration the complexity of developing and delivering online courses (Amiel & Orey, 2006). Further research should be conducted to determine equitable workload adjustment for faculty who provide this service. Due to the various complexities of higher education courses, it is logical that development requirements would differ. The development demands of various types of courses should be determined to equitably adjust faculty workload for developing online courses. A survey should be conducted to determine the types of media needed to teach various types of courses online. A second survey of instructional technologists, media developers, and faculty course developers should be conducted to determine the length of time it takes to develop the various types of media. The results should be

compared to the amount of time it typically takes to develop the same face-to-face course in order to determine equitable workload adjustments.

4. This study also determined that 142 (88.2%) of the participating institutions offered instructional design services to faculty who developed and delivered online courses. Further research should be conducted to determine how faculty perceived the impact of instructional design services, or lack thereof, affected the quality and number of online courses higher education institutions offered and how the provision of instructional design services effects the willingness of faculty to participate in online course development and delivery. Follow-up should be made to faculty members at the institutions that participated in this study to determine the number of faculty whose decision to develop and deliver online courses was contingent upon access to instructional design support.
5. Further analysis of these data confirmed the relationship between the size of the institution and the amount of financial compensation provided for developing and delivering online courses. This implied that institutions of different sizes provided different amounts of financial compensation for developing and delivering online courses. 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 online learning administrators with a valuable resource of funding sources and practices that can be used to support their online learning initiatives.
6. Further analysis also confirmed the relationship between the number of courses offered and the use of financial compensation, release time, and computer equipment

as compensation for developing online courses. A survey should be conducted to determine why this relationship existed by asking faculty from the participating institutions in this study what methods of compensation they prefer. Emphasis should be placed on unique environmental, geographical, or institution-based compensation requests and/or suggestions. The results from this study will provide online learning administrators with an institution specific resource that will help them determine specific compensation practices that best motivates faculty at their institution to develop online courses.

7. Finally, further analysis confirmed the relationship between the number of courses offered and the use of financial compensation, release time, computer equipment, and advanced recognition for promotion and tenure as compensation for delivering online courses. Further research should be conducted to determine why this relationship existed by asking faculty from the higher education institutions in this study what methods of compensation they prefer. Emphasis should be placed on unique environmental, geographical, or institution-based compensation requests and/or suggestions. The results from this study will provide online learning administrators with an institution specific resource that will help them determine exclusive compensation practices that best motivates faculty at their institution to deliver online courses.

REFERENCES

Allison, R. D., & Scott, D. C. (1998). Faculty Compensation and obligation: The necessity of a new approach triggered by technology integration. [Article]. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 1998*(101), 69.

Amiel, T., & Orey, M. (2006). Do you have the time? Investigating online classroom workload. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 35*(1), 31-43.

Anderson, C. (2008). Barriers and enabling factors in online teaching. *International Journal of Learning, 14*(12), 241-246.

Anderson, C. (2009). A rose by any other name: Still distance education--A response to D.R. Garrison: Implications of online and blended learning for the conceptual development and practice of distance education. *Journal of Distance Education, 23*(3), 111-116.

ASHE. (2006). Research on the elements of online learning. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 32*(1), 15-36.

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.

Baran, E., & Correia, A. (2009). Student-led facilitation strategies in online discussions. *Distance Education, 30*(3), 339-361.

Barron, A. (1998). Designing web-based training. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 29*(4), 155.

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

Boerema, C., Stanley, M., & Westhorp, P. (2007). Educators' perspective of online course design and delivery. *Medical Teacher, 29*(8), 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.

Bonk, C., & Zhang, K. (2006). Introducing the R2D2 Model: Online learning for the diverse learners of this world. *Distance Education, 27*(2), 249-264.

Carnegie. (2009). Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching, from http:// www.carnegiefoundation.org/

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.

Chaney, J. D., Chaney, E. H., Stellefson, M. L., & Eddy, J. M. (2008). Strategies for designing a distance education course/program. *Health Education Monograph Series, 25*(1), 18-22.

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

Close, A. G., Dixit, A., & Malhotra, N. K. (2005). Chalkboards to cybercourses: The Internet and marketing education. *Marketing Education Review, 15*(2), 81-94.

Conrad, D., & Pedro, J. (2009). Perspectives on Online Teaching and Learning: A Report of Two Novice OnlineEducators. [Article]. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 3*(2), 1-17.

D'Orsie, S. M., & Day, K. (2006). Ten tips for teaching a web-based course. *Tech Directions 55*(2), 18-20.

Dedman, D., & Pearch, W. J. (2004). Perspectives on adjunct and other non-tenure faculty. *Community College Enterprise, 10*(1), 23-33.

Dykman, C. A., & Davis, C. K. (2008a). Online education forum: Part Two - Teaching online versus teaching conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 19*(2), 157-164.

Dykman, C. A., & Davis, C. K. (2008b). Part one: The shift toward online education. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 19*(1), 11-16.

Haber, J., & Mills, M. (2008). Perceptions of barriers concerning effective online teaching and policies: Florida community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 32*(4-6), 266-283.

Hanshaw, L. G. (2004). Value-related issues in a departmental merit pay plan. *Professional Educator, 26*(2), 57-68.

Hardy, K. P., & Bower, B. L. (2004). Instructional and work life issues for distance learning faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2004*(128), 47-54.

Hinson, J., & LaPrairie, K. (2005). Learning to teach online: Promoting success through professional development. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 29*(6), 483-493.

HirÃ§a, N. (2009). From the teachers' perspective: A way of simplicity for multimedia design. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning & Teaching, 10*(1), 1-10.

Houston, D., Meyer, L. H., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28*(1), 17-30.

Ioannou, A., & Hannafin, R. D. (2008). Course management systems: Time for users to get what they need. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning, 52*(1), 46-50.

Israel, M., Knowlton, E., Griswold, D., & Rowland, A. (2009). Applications of video-conferencing technology in special education teacher preparation. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 24*(1), 15-25.

Jokela, P., & Karlsudd, P. (2007). Learning with security. *Journal of Information Technology Education, 6*, 291-309.

Kadirire, J. (2007). Instant messaging for creating interactive and collaborative m-learning environments. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning, 8*(2), 1-14.

Lane, L. M. (2008). Toolbox or trap? Course management systems and pedagogy. *Educause Quarterly, 2*, 4-6.

Lucking, R. A., Christmann, E. P., & Wighting, M. J. (2009). Podcasts and blogs. *Science Scope, 33*(3), 64-67.

Matthew, K. I., Felvegi, E., & Callaway, R. A. (2009). Wiki as a collaborative learning tool in a language arts methods class. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 42*(1), 51-72.

Morrison, G. R., & Anglin, G. J. (2006). An instructional design approach for effective shovelware. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 7*(1), 63-74.

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

Ooms, A., Burke, L., Linsey, T., & Heaton-Shrestha, C. (2008). Introducing E-developers to support a university's blended learning developments. *ALT-J: Research in Learning Technology, 16*(2), 111-122.

Palvia, S. C. J., & Palvia, P. C. (2007). The effectiveness of using computers for software training: An exploratory study. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 18*(4), 479-489.

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.

Poore-Pariseau, C. (2009). Should faculty members be exempt from a mandate to receive instructional design training because of their rights under academic freedom? *Journal of Academic Ethics, 7*(3), 223-230.

Powers, E. (2009). Growing popularity of E-learning. *UMASS Online in the News.* Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed website: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/11/10/online

Prewitt, T. (1998). The development of distance learning delivery systems. *Higher Education in Europe, 23*(2), 187.

Rainsbury, E., & Malcolm, P. (2003). Extending the classroom boundaries- an evaluation of an asynchronous discussion board. *Accounting Education, 12*(1), 49-61.

Santilli, S., & Beck, V. (2005). Graduate faculty perceptiosn of online teaching. *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.

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

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.

Snyder, M. M. (2009). Instructional-design theory to guide the creation of online learning communities for adults. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning, 53*(1), 45-57.

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

Spooner, F., & Ya-yu, L. (2009). Synchronous and asynchronous distance delivery experiences from two faculty members in special education at UNC Charlotte. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 28*(3), 23-29.

Stella, A., & Gnanam, A. (2004). Quality assurance in distance education: The challenges to be addressed. *Higher Education, 47*(2), 143-160.

Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2009). Merit pay plans in higher education institutions: Characteristics and effects. *Public Personnel Management, 38*(4), 55-77.

Tuathail, G. O., & McCormack, D. (1998). The technoliteracy challenge: Teaching globalisation using the Internet. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 22*(3), 347-361.

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

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: List of Participating Institutions

Appendix B: Original Survey

Appendix C: Final Survey

Appendix D: Letter of Introduction

Appendix E: Cover Letter

Appendix F: Follow-up Letter

Appendix A

List of Participating Institutions

Adelphi University
Alverno College
Amberton University
American Intercontinental University
Argosy University
Arizona State University
Arkansas State University
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Athens State University
Auburn University
Augusta State University
Austin Peay State University
Avila University
Baker College of Auburn Hills
Baker University School of Prof and Graduate Studies
Bellevue University
Benedictine University
Bloomfield College
Bluefield State College
Boise State University
Briarcliffe College
Brigham Young University
Brown College
California Polytechnic State University
California State University
Cambridge College
Cameron University
Cardinal Stritch University
Carlow University
Central Connecticut State University
Chapman University
Chicago State University
City University
Clayton College and State University
Cleveland State University
College of Mount Saint Joseph
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Colorado State University
Colorado Technical University
Columbia College Chicago
Columbus State University
Concordia University
Coppin State University
Dalton State College
Davenport University
DePaul University
Dixie State College of Utah
Dowling College
D'Youville College
East Central University
Eastern Michigan University
Eastern Washington University
Edgewood College
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University
Emporia State University
Evergreen State College
Excelsior College
Farmingdale State University
Faulkner University
Felican College
Five Towns College
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International University
Florida Metropolitan University
Florida State University
Fontbonne University
Fort Hays State University
Friends University
George Mason University
Georgia Southern University
Georgia State University
Georgian Court University
Golden State University
Governors State University
Great Basin College
Gwynedd Mercy College
Harris-Stowe State University

(Continued to next page)

Participating Institutions

Hawaii Pacific University
Humboldt State University
Idaho State University
Immaculata University
Indiana University
Jacksonville State University
Kean University
Kennesaw State University
Keystone College
Lake Superior State University
Lakeland College
Lamar University
Lawrence Technological University
LeTourneau University
Lewis-Clark State College
Long Island University
Louisiana State University
Macon State College
Madonna University
Marshall University
Marygrove College
McNeese State University
Medaille College
Mercy College
Mesa State College
Metropolitan College of New York
Metropolitan State College of Denver
Metropolitan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Midway College
Midwestern State University
Minot State University
Mississippi State University
Missouri Baptist University
Missouri Southern State University
Missouri State University
Missouri Western State College
Montana State University
Montana Tech of the Univ. of Montana
Mount Aloysius College
Mount Mary College
Mount Olive College
Mountain State University
New Jersey City University
New Mexico State University
New York Institute of Technology
Newman University
Nicholls State University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northeastern State University
Northern Kentucky University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Nova Southeastern University
Oakland University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma Panhandle State
Old Dominion University
Oregon Institute of Technology
Our Lady of Holy Cross College
Peirce College
Peru State College
Pittsburg State University
Point Part University
Polytechnic University
Portland State University
Purdue University
Ranken Technical College
Rogers State University
Roosevelt University
Rutgers University
Saginaw Valley State University
Saint Augustine College
Saint Cloud State University
Saint John's University

(Continued to next page)

Participating Institutions

Saint Josephs College
St. Petersburg College
Saint Thomas University
Saint Xavier University
Salem State College
San Diego State University
San Francisco State University
San Jose State University
Shawnee State University
Shepherd University
Siena Heights University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southern Oregon University
Southern Polytechnic State University
Southern University at New Orleans
Southern Utah University
Southern Wesleyan University
Southwest Minnesota State University
Spalding University
Spartan College of Aeronautics and Technical School
Strayer University
Suffolk University
Sullivan University
SUNY College at Buffalo
SUNY Empire State College
SUNY Institute of Technology
Tarleton State University
Temple University
Texas A & M University
Texas Southern University
Texas State University
Texas Tech University
Texas Wesleyan University
Texas Woman's University
Thomas Edison State College
Thomas More College
Touro College
Towson University
Trinity University
Troy University
Union Institute and University
University of Akron
University of Alabama
University of Alaska
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Baltimore
University of California
University of Central Arkansas
University of Central Florida
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
University of Guam
University of Hawaii
University of Houston
University of Houston
University of Illinois
University of Kansas
University of Louisiana
University of Louisville
University of Maine
University of Massachusetts
University of Memphis
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Mobile
University of Montana
University of Nebraska
University of Nevada
University of New Mexico
University of New Orleans
University of North Alabama
University of North Carolina
University of North Florida
University of North Texas
University of Oregon

(Continued to next page)

Participating Institutions

University of Rio Grande
University of Sacred Heart
University of St. Thomas
University of South Alabama
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Southern Maine
University of Texas
University of the District of Columbia
University of the Incarnate Word
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Washington
University of West Florida
University of Wisconsin
Upper Iowa University
Ursuline College
Utah State University
Utah Valley University
Valdosta State University
Virginia College
Virginia Commonwealth University
Washburn University
Wayland Baptist University
Wayne State University
Weber State University
Webster University
West Texas A & M University
West Virginia University
Western Governors University
Western International University
Western Michigan University
Western Oregon University
Westwood College-Denver North
Wichita State University
William Carey College
William Paterson University of New Jersey
Wilmington College
Woodbury University
Worcester State College
Wright State University
Youngstown State University

Appendix B

Final 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 common 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 the following 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/teaching is part of the faculty workload.
    - ☐ None. 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

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 common compensation practices implemented by Colleges and Universities throughout the United States for developing and delivering online courses.

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
   - ☐ 1000-2999
   - ☐ 3000-9999
   - ☐ 10,000-49,000
   - ☐ 50,000-149,000
   - ☐ 150,000-249,000
   - ☐ 250,000 or more
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 require online course development and delivery experience when hiring new faculty?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No
8. Does your institution provide instructional design services to faculty developing and delivering online courses?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No
9. If you answered "yes" to the previous question, briefly describe the instructional design services your institution provides.

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

    _____
    _____
    _____

Section 2: Online Course Development

11. 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
    - ☐ Others. Please specify_____
12. 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-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

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

15. Which of the following does your institution offer for **delivering** online courses? (Select all that apply)
    a. Financial compensation
    b. Release time
    c. Computer equipment
    d. Travel Support
    e. Advanced recognition for promotion and tenure
    f. 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 **deliver** 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
17. Does your institution compensate full-time and part-time faculty at the same scale or rate for **delivering** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

18. If you answered "no" to the previous question, are full-time faculty compensated at a higher or lower scale or rate for **delivering** online courses? (Select one)
    - ☐ Higher
    - ☐ Lower
    - ☐ Does not apply
19. In the space provided please list other compensation practices your institution provides faculty for <u>developing and/or delivering</u> online courses.

    _____

    _____

20. 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 D

Letter of Introduction

Date

[Recipient address]

Dear _____:

We are working to determine the most common compensation practices higher education institutions across the United States use to compensate higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. In approximately two weeks we will ask you to complete a survey that will help us determine the following information:

- What practices are most frequently used to compensate higher education faculty for **developing** online courses?

- What practices are most frequently used to compensate higher education faculty for **delivering** online courses?

Your response will help us provide higher education institutions with information on the most common practices currently being used to compensate faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This information could affect future best practices for faculty compensation in online learning. Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential. All participants who return the survey in the allotted time frame will have a chance to win one of two, 2 gigabyte, 4th generation iPod Shuffles.

We anticipate your help in determining the most common practices currently used to compensate higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Burleson
Old Dominion University, Ph.D. Candidate
Telephone: 423-367-8083
email: jburl008@odu.edu

Dr. John M. Ritz
Professor and Graduate Program Director
Old Dominion University

Appendix E

Cover Letter

Date:
[Recipient address]

Dear_____:

Approximately two weeks ago we sent you a letter stating that we would be sending you a survey to complete on the subject of faculty compensation for developing and delivering online courses. The information collected from the enclosed survey is crucial to our goal of determining the most common compensation practices higher education institutions across the United States use when compensating higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. This study will help us determine future best practices and could help higher education institutions justify appropriate compensation practices.

Your contribution as a representative of your institution is vital to the success of this study. We ask that you complete the enclosed survey and return it using the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than _____. Please realize your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from this study at any time. Completing this questionnaire indicates that you have been informed of the purpose of this study and your role and you allow the researcher to use your responses in this study if you choose to respond.

The data will be collected using a survey designed by the researcher. All surveys will be collected and treated confidentially. All surveys will be marked with an identifying number code in order to determine which institutions responded. The survey and the key for the number codes will remain confidential and will be stored in a locked filing cabinet during the duration of the study. After data are aggregated, the surveys will be destroyed in order to protect the subjects and data. Data will be aggregated and reported in groups by the type of Carnegie Foundation university responding, e.g., residential university, medium-sized masters, etc. Number codes will not be recorded in the study and upon completion of the study the coding key will be shredded. All participants who return the survey in the allotted time frame will have a chance to win one of two, 2 gigabyte, 4th generation iPod Shuffles.

Thank you for your sharing your time and expertise.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Burleson
Old Dominion University, Ph.D. Candidate
Telephone: 423-367-8083
email: jburl008@odu.edu

Dr. John M. Ritz
Professor and Graduate Program Director
Old Dominion University

Appendix F

Follow Up Letter

INSERT DATE

[Recipient address]

Dear_____:

Roughly three weeks ago I mailed you a survey requesting your participation in a research study to determine the most common practices higher education institutions use to compensate higher education faculty for developing and delivering online courses. As of the date of this mailing I have not received your completed survey. With your busy schedule I am sure this is just an oversight. I have enclosed the survey again for your convenience and ask that you return it to me by _____.

Please realize your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from this study at any time. The researcher has coded each survey to identify which institutions have responded. While data is being collected all completed surveys will be housed in a locked filing cabinet and upon completion of the study will be destroyed by shredding. All data will be kept confidential and reported in aggregate. By responding you are agreeing to participate in this study.

In the event that you have already mailed your completed survey, I thank you for your support and for sharing your time and expertise. If you have any questions regarding the survey or this study, please contact me through email or telephone as you prefer.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Burleson
Old Dominion University, Ph.D. Candidate
Telephone: 423-367-8083
email: jburl008@odu.edu

Dr. John M. Ritz
Professor and Graduate Program Director
Old Dominion University

VITA

Jeff Burleson
1014 Radcliffe Avenue
Kingsport, TN 37660

ACADEMIC DEGREES

MASTERS OF REHABILITATION COUNSELING (1998)
University of Kentucky: Rehabilitation Counseling: Emphasis in assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (1996)
Comprehensive Special Education: (Severe Disabilities K-12), East Tennessee State University

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

PRESENT
Director of E-Learning: Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee

2003-2008
Instructional Technologist/Blackboard Administrator: Mountain Empire Community College

2000-2003
Internet Program Support Coordinator: East Tennessee State University

2000-2003
Instructor: East Tennessee State University, Vocational Preparation for Teachers of Individuals with Disabilities

1999-2000
Teacher of students with severe disabilities: Colleton Middle School, Walterboro, SC

1998-1999
Division of Protection and Advocacy: Public Defender's Office, Frankfort, KY

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

"Verifying Student Identity in Online Courses" given at the Appalachian College Association Annual Summit in Abingdon, Virginia, in October of 2009.

"Securing Online Assessments in Online Courses" given at the Pedagogy and Technology Workshop at Lees-McRae College in Banner Elk, North Carolina in July, 2010.

CERTIFICATIONS

- Assistive Technology Practitioner, Rehabilitation Engineering Society of North America (RESNA)
- Comprehensive (Severe Disabilities K-12) Special Education, Tennessee
- Learning Disabilities (K-12), Kentucky

MEMBERSHIPS

- Iota Lambda Sigma, Workforce Development Honor Society
- Tennessee Distance Learning Association
- United States Distance Learning Association
- 2010 Leadership Kingsport Graduate