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Distance Learning is state of the art and is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in Florida community colleges. However, the present laws and policies that govern Florida's community college educational system are created based on traditional methods for delivering educational services. The potential change in faculty roles and responsibilities brought about by distance learning has raised questions about the impact distance learning will have on overall labor conditions for American faculty. In some instances, the use of alternative methods of delivering educational services has resulted in inconsistent policies. As more faculty become involved in teaching online courses, there will be a greater need to examine distance learning policy and address the issues of inconsistency in policy.

The goal of this study was to develop a resource to assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. To achieve the goal, the researcher investigated the impact of distance teaching assignments on faculty contractual agreements and how and where policy was being rewritten to address the new paradigm. Survey research methods were utilized to collect data for this study. This study attempted to answer the following questions: How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college impacted full-time faculty? What are the work conditions of distance learning faculty? What requirements are associated with the different aspects of the job? How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty?

The results of this study have added considerably to our knowledge base of distance learning policy at Florida's community colleges by providing a Web-based central repository of distance learning policy. It has added to our knowledge of the impact distance learning policy is having on faculty contracts and policies. The contribution to our knowledge base will grow as policy is added to the repository.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

State of the Art

The introduction of the Internet and the World Wide Web into every facet of our lives (Frand, 2000; Jones & Matthews, 2002) has caused community colleges, and the faculty within them, to change the way they work (Levy, 2003; Sullivan, 2001). Of the 1,171 community colleges located in the United States, over 95% are linked to the Internet (American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), 2003a). The roles that the Internet and the Web play in our society and in education will continue to grow (Brahler, Peterson, & Johnson, 1999; Duderstadt, 1997; Dyson, 1997; Frand 2000; Oblinger, Barone, & Hawkins, 2001; Sullivan, 2001). Students excluded from the introduction of this technology through their education are placed at a great disadvantage in preparing for the future (Bull, Bull, Garofalo, & Harris, 2002; Dyson, 1997; Evans, 1999; Glidden, 2003; Whitaker & Coste, 2002). Florida's community college educators are aware of this need. A commitment to the use of Internet/Web technology is evidenced by the fact that each of the 28 Florida community colleges supports a web page (Web U.S., 2003).

Since the publishing of the first web page by Tim Berners-Lee in 1991 (Zakon, 2004), distance learning via the Internet and the Web has become widespread in the postsecondary education arena (Abramson, 2000; CETUS, 1997; Feenberg, 1999; Frand, 2000; Lockwood & Godey, 2001; Oblinger et al., 2001). The U.S. Department of Education (Lewis, Alexander, & Farris, 1997) reported that in 1995, 58% of public two-
year institutions were offering courses at a distance. In a follow-up study, the U.S. Department of Education (Lewis, Snow, Farris, & Levin, 1999) reported that in 1997, 72% of public two-year institutions were offering courses at a distance, and it was predicted that 91% of public two-year institutions would be offering distance courses by the year 2000. The latest study from the U.S. Department of Education (Waits & Lewis, 2003) revealed that in the 2000-01 academic year, 90% of public two-year institutions were offering courses at a distance. These percentages include many types of distance learning, including, but not limited to, audio, video, and computer technologies. The common factor is that the student is not required to sit in class and the instructor does not use a traditional classroom.

Distance learning has become a widespread practice in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). All of Florida's 28 community colleges offer distance courses (FCCS, 2000), and enrollments in distance courses have shown a 47% increase for the 2001-02 fiscal year (FCCS, 2003). It is clear that distance education is becoming a popular choice for students attending Florida's community colleges. Many of today's students anticipate the availability of this technology when selecting their courses (Boettcher, 2001; Cotugna & Vickery, 1998; Frand, 2000; Johnstone & Poulin, 2002; Sullivan, 2001).

Distance Learning is state of the art in postsecondary education. The infusion of digital technology into every aspect of education and society has altered the way teaching and learning takes place in higher education (Abramson, 2003a; Bates, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Burgess, 1994; Farrington & Yoshida, 2000; Levy, 2003; Oblinger et al., 2001; Rogers, 2000; Willis, 2000). This has affected a change in the role of the college
professor and a change in the way postsecondary educational institutions operate.

Faculty are pressured to be open to accepting and embracing these new roles. (Abramson, 2003a; Bates, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Burgess, 1994; Farrington & Yoshida, 2000; Levy, 2003; Oblinger et al., 2001; Rogers, 2000; Willis, 2000). Online teaching makes demands upon instructors over and above that which had been required traditionally (Abramson, 2003a; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003; Johnstone, 2001).

The methods for effectively developing and teaching an online course are different than those for teaching a face-to-face course (Draves, 2002; Lazarus, 2003; Moore & Kearsley, 1996; Williams & Peters, 1997). Online courses are more time and labor intensive in terms of preparation and teaching duties (Berge & Muilenburg, 2000; Smith, Ferguson, & Caris, 2001; Teles, 2002). This significant difference in online instruction, coupled with an increase in online course offerings, has caused the role, the responsibilities, and the workplace of faculty to change (Beaudoin, 2003; Boettcher, 1999a; Ragan & Terheggen, 2003) which, in turn, has brought about a need to review such issues as proprietary rights, faculty compensation (AACC, 2003b), faculty workload, professional development, and course ownership (American Council on Education, 2000).

**Problem Statement**

Distance Learning is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in Florida community colleges (Abramson, 2000; CETUS, 1997; Feenberg, 1999; Frand, 2000; Lockwood & Godey, 2001; Oblinger et al., 2001; Waits & Lewis, 2003).

However, traditional faculty contractual requirements do not fit the gestalt of distance education. Labor issues such as intellectual property and copyright, workload,
professional development, office hours, class size, and contact hours must all be reworked within the largely anytime/anyplace online approach to learning (AACC, 2003b; Abramson, 2003b; American Council on Education, 2000).

The author's training, experience, position and education offer her the ability to explore the subject under discussion from a variety of perspectives. She has been a faculty member at Broward Community College for 15 years and has held various faculty leadership positions, including Faculty Senate President, Union Vice President, Chief Negotiator, Faculty Senator, and Bargaining Team Member. These affiliations will enable her to contact and work with various organizations. The author earned a M.S. degree and is now pursuing a Ph.D. degree thus affording her the perspective of student, as well as faculty member. While she has not taught an online course, the author is familiar with the issues regarding online instruction and is involved in the issues surrounding faculty contracts and policies.

**Goal Statement**

The goal of the researcher in this dissertation was to develop a resource to assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. To achieve the goal, the researcher investigated the impact of distance teaching assignments on faculty contractual agreements (Berg, 2000; HECAS, 2003) and how and where policy is being rewritten to address the new paradigm. For the purpose of this study, faculty members were defined as people who teach full time at a community college.
Research Questions

In an effort to study the affect distance learning is having on faculty contracts and policies at Florida's community colleges, research questions were developed. This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college impacted full-time faculty?
2. What are the work conditions of distance learning faculty?
3. What requirements are associated with the different aspects of the job?
4. How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty?
5. What new policies must be added to contracts?

Relevance and Significance

Policies and contracts are written to guide employees and employers to act appropriately. A contract is a written agreement negotiated by two or more parties in which employment rights and conditions are defined (Herman & Megiveron, 1993). A policy is a definite decision rule that guides action. Statutes and laws are policies that have been set by the government (Guthrie, Garms & Pierce, 1988). In developing a framework to study policy, King, Nugent, Eich, Mlinek and Russell (2000) define distance learning policy as "a written course of action (e.g., statutes, institutional mission, procedures, guidelines, or regulations) adopted to facilitate program development and delivery in distance education" (p. 1). Policies are not courses or syllabi.

As the introduction of distance courses causes changes in faculty roles and responsibilities, the laws, policies, and contracts that guide faculty are being reviewed,
and in some cases, revised (Berg, 2000; Carnevale & Young, 1999; Carnevale, 2000a; Carnevale, 2000b; Carr, 2000; Litman, 2001). The San Diego State University Senate (2000) created and adopted a distance education policy which covers areas such as student/faculty interaction, full-time /part-time faculty ratio, content ownership, course load, faculty compensation, and copyright issues. The University of North Texas has an established policy that provides faculty with royalty agreements and profit sharing opportunities (Young, 2001).

The present laws and policies that govern Florida's community college educational system were created based on traditional methods for delivering educational services. In some instances, the use of alternative methods of delivering educational services has resulted in inconsistent policies. For example, Florida law (Florida Statute 1012.82, 2002) requires that a full-time community college faculty member must maintain a weekly schedule that contains a minimum of 15 classroom contact hours. A classroom contact hour is defined as “a regularly scheduled classroom activity of not less than 50 minutes in a course of instruction which has been approved by the board of trustees of the community college.” Policy 8 of the Florida Community College System Guidelines and Procedures Manual (Division of Community Colleges, 1988) states that a minimum of 10 posted office hours must be added to the faculty member's weekly schedule. For a traditional faculty member, the terms classroom contact hours and office hours are clearly defined. For a faculty member teaching distance courses, these issues have yet to be defined.

In a review of the Florida Community College System implementation of laws and policies regarding faculty hours for the spring 2001 term, the Auditor General (2001)
listed four findings in which Florida community colleges were in noncompliance with Florida Statutes and Division policies in regards to minimum classroom contact hours and posted office hours. The community colleges were faulted for non compliance in the following four areas: requiring a weekly faculty workload of 15 classroom contact hours, requiring faculty to schedule a minimum of 25 classroom and office hours per week, requiring faculty to post and keep their office hours, and having a written policy regarding where and when faculty will be available to students. The report listed a fifth finding which states:

Colleges often use nontraditional methods of instruction, such as distance learning. Division of Community College policies regarding minimum classroom contact hours and faculty availability to students are silent regarding these nontraditional methods of instruction. (p. 1)

The Division of Community Colleges responded (Auditor General, 2001) with the following:

Your observation concerning nontraditional instruction is very relevant. We will reexamine our policies in light of the examples cited in your finding as well as any others that come to light during the process. (p. 7)

It is clear from these communications that the need does exist for a review of contract and policy issues that will affect faculty teaching distance courses. As more faculty become involved in teaching online courses, there will be a greater need to address these issues of inconsistency in policy.

Policy also affects accreditation. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the accrediting body for Florida community colleges, has developed a
policy statement, titled Distance Education: Definition and Principles, for the purpose of expediting the evaluation of distance education offered at accredited colleges (Commission on Colleges, 2000). Faculty issues, such as student/faculty interaction, ownership and intellectual property rights, compensation, support, and professional development are included in the criteria for accreditation.

It is important to explore policy because not only does policy define the roles and responsibilities of faculty; in time, policy can actually change the roles and responsibilities of faculty. In response to the lucrative opportunities afforded by the intellectual property policies established in 1999 at the University of North Texas (Young, 2001), some faculty are taking on the added responsibility of marketing their online courses. The college's president predicts that, in the future, faculty roles and responsibilities may be split into two separate categories: those who teach and those who develop. Provisions in the policies that extend to departments have caused the cancellation of some traditional courses in favor of offering those courses online. If this trend were to continue, hiring and retention policies would have to change to support the change in course offerings. Faculty might be obligated to teach at a distance in order to retain their positions. In this hypothetical scenario, faculty who do not teach online would be affected by distance learning.

The future of higher education is changing. This change is being brought on by the introduction of instructional technology into course and program offerings (Knowles, 2002; Oblinger et al., 2001). The widespread use of instructional technologies has changed demographics, increased competition, and globalized education. Traditional approaches to teaching, learning, and organizational structuring are becoming
increasingly irrelevant. Educational institutions are finding it necessary to revise their policies, examine their cultures and redesign their organizational structures at local, state, and national levels. (Alfred, 2003; Bates, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Duderstadt, 1997; Graves, 1997; Hanna, 1998; Knowles, 2002; Opper & Mathews, 2002; Turoff, 1997; Ubel, 2001; Van Dusen, 1997; Web-based Education Commission, 2000) Faculty, both traditional and distance, will be greatly impacted by emerging instructional technologies and will experience a major change in their roles and responsibilities (Beaudoin, 2003; Hislop, 2001; Hoffman, 2001; Oppers & Mathews, 2002).

**Barriers and Issues**

The researcher did not foresee nor did she encounter any major barriers or issues that would prevent completion of the research proposed. The success of the research hinged on the support of the community college members of the distance learning consortium who complied willingly. Two of the consortium members participated as members of the expert committee described in the study.

**Definitions and Acronyms**

*Adjunct* is a person who teaches part-time at a postsecondary educational institution (Lyons, Kysilka, & Pawlas, 1999).

*Contract* is a written agreement negotiated by two or more parties in which employment rights and conditions are defined (Herman & Megiveron, 1993).

*Community college* is a two-year, postsecondary educational institution that offers certificate programs, Associate of Arts degrees, Associate of Sciences degrees and many
other programs (Community College Web, 2003). For the purposes of this study, the definition will be restricted to include only public community colleges.

The U.S. Department of Education (Lewis et al., 1999) defines distance education in a manner that covers all applications of this study:

For the purposes of this study, distance education refers to education or training courses delivered to remote (off-campus) location(s) via audio, video (live or prerecorded), or computer technologies, including both synchronous and asynchronous instruction. Courses conducted exclusively on campus, as well as classes conducted exclusively via written correspondence, are not included in this definition of distance education (although some on-campus instruction or testing may be involved, and some instruction may be conducted via written correspondence). In addition, for the purposes of this study, distance education does not include courses in which the instructor travels to a remote site to deliver instruction in person, although courses may include a small amount of on-campus coursework or labwork, on-campus exams, or occasional on-campus meetings. (p. 2)

Distance course, as defined by the State Board of Community Colleges (2000), is a course in which “the student and instructor are separated in time and/or place during 75% or more of the instruction” (p. 53).

Distance student is a student enrolled in a distance course (Author).

Faculty, for the purposes of this study, are people who teach fulltime at a community college (Author).
*Full-time/adjunct ratio* is a comparison of the percentage of full-time faculty to the percentage of adjunct faculty. A full-time/adjunct ratio of 68/32 would signify 68% full-time faculty and 32% adjunct faculty (Author).

*Policy* is a definite decision rule that guides action. Statutes and laws are policies that have been set by the government (Guthrie et al., 1988). *Distance learning policy* is “a written course of action (e.g., statutes, institutional mission, procedures, guidelines, or regulations) adopted to facilitate program development and delivery in distance education” (King, Nugent, Eich, et al., 2000, p. 1). Courses and syllabi are not included in the definition of policy.

The terms *residential student* and *traditional student* are used interchangeably to define a student enrolled in a traditional course (Author).

AACC – American Association of Community Colleges

AAUP – American Association of University Professors

DL – Distance Learning

FCCDLC – Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium

FCCS – Florida Community College System

FDLC – Florida Distance Learning Consortium

FT/A – Full-time/adjunct

FVC – Florida Virtual Campus

HECAS – Higher Education Contract Analysis System

ITV – Instructional Television

ITV – Interactive Television

LMS – Learning Management System
Summary

Distance Learning is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in Florida community colleges (Abramson, 2000; CETUS, 1997; Feenberg, 1999; Frand, 2000; Lockwood & Godey, 2001; Oblinger et al., 2001; Waits & Lewis, 2003). However, the present laws and policies that govern Florida's community college educational system were created based on traditional methods for delivering educational services (AACC, 2003b; Abramson, 2003b; American Council on Education, 2000). The potential change in faculty roles and responsibilities brought about by distance learning has raised questions about the impact distance learning will have on overall labor conditions for American faculty (Berg, 2000; Turoff, 1997; Nobel, 2002). In some instances, the use of alternative methods of delivering educational services has resulted in inconsistent policies (Auditor General, 2001).

The goal of this study was to develop a resource to assist Florida community college leaders to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. To achieve the goal, the researcher investigated the impact of distance teaching assignments on faculty contractual agreements and how and where policy was being rewritten to address the new paradigm. In an effort to study the affect distance learning is having on faculty contracts and policies at Florida’s community colleges, the following research questions were developed: How has the proliferation of distance learning at the
community college impacted full-time faculty? What are the work conditions of distance learning faculty? What requirements are associated with the different aspects of the job? How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty?

As more faculty become involved in teaching online courses, there will be a greater need to examine distance learning policy and to address the issues of inconsistency in policy. This is important because not only does policy define the roles and responsibilities of faculty; in time, policy can actually change the roles and responsibilities of faculty.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The following topics are relevant to the dissertation and are reviewed at length in this chapter: distance learning policy, distance learning at community colleges in the United States, Florida Community College System (FCCS), FCCS governance, the state of distance learning in the FCCS, distance teaching versus face-to-face teaching, and faculty issues associated with distance learning.

Distance Learning Policy

A policy is an adopted course of action that may be written, as in the case of laws, statutes, and contracts, or unwritten, as in the case of customs, traditions, and “unspoken” or “understood” agreements. Policies are formulated to guide individuals to act appropriately. While it is understood that the existence of unwritten policy is common, the focus of this discussion will be on written policy. Contracts are agreements containing written policies that verify that the parties involved understand their rights and responsibilities, while also verifying that working conditions are clearly defined (Herman & Megiveron, 1993). Statutes and laws are written policies developed by the government to define proper conduct and guide action (Guthrie et al., 1988). Policy sets the rules, responsibilities, and roles for all of the shareholders (Berge, 1998a; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). Simonson and Bauck (2003), in a discussion on the importance of policy, state, “Policies give structure to unstructured events and are a natural step in the adoption of an innovation, such as distance education” (p. 417). The adoption of rapidly evolving technologies which allow educational institutions to offer courses at a distance is causing
those institutions to reexamine their policies and procedures (Ashery, 2001; Bates, 2000; Hanna, 1998; Knowles, 2002). Gellman-Danley and Fetzner (1998) listed consistency with union contracts as a key policy issue to be addressed. Many colleges will find that existing intellectual property policies will have to be revised to accommodate distance learning (American Council on Education, 2000).

Distance learning policy is defined by King, Nugent, Eich, et al. (2000) as a written course of action, such as a law, mission or vision statement, procedure, guideline or rule, that is adopted to facilitate program development and delivery in distance education. The rapid growth of distance education in the postsecondary educational arena is causing an increase in the attention being given to distance policy issues at federal, state and local levels (Carnevale, 2002; Jacobs & Grubb, 2003; Maitland & Rhodes, 1999; Web-based Education Commission, 2000). At the federal level, policy issues, such as copyright, accreditation, and financial aid are affected by distance learning (Larose, 2003). As these policies are modified, so, too, are the funding criteria that are attached. Legislators are interested in increasing access and see distance education as a tool. Because of this, distance education is receiving more attention in state legislatures and provisions that address distance learning are becoming more evident in state laws (Florida Statute 241.00, 2001). The most apparent level being affected, and that which is closest to faculty, is the local level. Evidence of this can be seen in the increasing number of faculty contracts that contain clauses addressing distance education issues (HECAS, 2003; Maitland & Roads, 1999) and in the development of distance learning policy statements by various educational organizations and institutions (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges,. 2000; American Association of University Professors
Policy development should take place before a distance learning program is offered. By examining and developing policy beforehand, it is possible to eliminate disruptions that could distract educators from their primary objectives, which are teaching and learning (Berge, 1998b). In short, developing policy beforehand can mitigate problems and add to the strength and quality of the program (Gellman-Danley & Fetne, 1998; Hiltz, 1997; King, Nugent, Russell, Eich, & Lacy, 2000). When considering providing online courses, it is important to carefully select which courses will be converted and to employ policies that can help cut development costs (Brahler et al., 1999). Planning is the most important stage in the implementation and delivery of distance education (Berge & Mrozowski, 2001; Care and Scanlan, 2001; Chute, Thompson, & Hancock, 1999; Levy, 2003; Robinson, 2000; Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, & Zvacek, 2000; Walton, 2001). And policy development must be included from the earliest stages of the planning phase (Berge, 1998b; Gellman-Danley & Fetne, 1998).

Many postsecondary educational institutions are rushing to offer distance learning programs before developing any policies to guide them in their endeavors (Berg, 2000; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). A study of the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (GSAMS) was conducted to explore the way distance learning policy is developed and to examine the types of distance learning policies that have been developed (McKenzie et al., 2000). GSAMS is described as a two-way videoconferencing program that "is the largest distance learning and healthcare network
in the world, with more than 370 sites as of December 1999" (p. 1). Among the sites included are K-20 public schools, prisons, hospitals, and public television. The study produced some "alarming" results. Nearly 50% of the participants reported that no written management procedures existed at their site.

An examination of the distance education policies of Nebraska's postsecondary school system (King, Lacy, McMillian, Bartels, & Fredilino, 1998) revealed that distance education course and program development is being led by faculty and administrator interest, and that policy development may or may not follow. Policy development is pragmatic, performed out of need, and usually occurs when collaboration exists. Since policy development is not systematic, gaps in development do exist. Policy areas that need attention include: courses, degrees, intellectual property, monetary issues, and faculty/student issues. Further examination (King, Nugent, Eich, et al., 2000) revealed that instead of finding written policy where it is practiced — at the academic level, it is far more likely to be found higher in the organizational structure — at the administrative level. At the departmental level, practice is leading policy; distance courses are often offered without any written policy.

The culture of an institution often influences the development of common practices (Cravener, 2002; Knowles, 2002). At Mercy College in New York, most online courses are available in the traditional format. Students can decide whether they want to try an online course and faculty develop the online courses from existing traditional courses. At New Jersey’s Fairleigh Dickinson University, the courses offered online are not offered in the traditional format. Students are required to take at least one online course a year, a policy that has been approved by the Faculty Senate. At this school,
faculty develop online courses from scratch. Both of the colleges recognize the importance of offering online courses, yet neither of the colleges has a policy covering online course development. Instead, practice was influenced by the institution’s culture (Carnevale, 2001).

Although there is abundant research in the area of distance education, little of it is in the area of distance education policy (King, Nugent, Eich, et al., 2000). Community colleges are leaders in using technology to support teaching and learning. Most of the research regarding the use of technology at community colleges focuses on classroom techniques and on ways to promote and integrate technology. Research on key issues such as faculty support, user support, and financial planning is scarce (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003). Policy issues surrounding distance education affect all the stakeholders of the community college, including students, faculty, staff, administrators, and lawmakers. Some of the major policy issues that need to be addressed include equity of access, cost and funding, accreditation and quality, copyright and intellectual property rights, faculty roles and responsibilities, as well as distance learning’s effect on organizational structures (Ben-Jacob, 2001; Lewis et al., 1999). Thus far, there has been little research on faculty issues regarding distance learning (Bradburn, 2002; Phipps & Merisotis, 1999).

The growth of digital technologies and their increasing use in postsecondary education is changing the way students learn and the way faculty teach (Bates, 2000; Burgess, 1994; Farrington & Yoshida, 2000; Oblinger et al., 2001; Rogers, 2000; Willis, 2000). As faculty roles and responsibilities change in response to new technologies, it is necessary to examine existing policy and contract language in order to develop new
language in areas that lack the necessary clarity (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2000; Alfred, 2003; Bates, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Duderstadt, 1997; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998; Graves, 1997; Hanna, 1998; Knowles, 2002; Turoff, 1997; Ubel, 2001; Van Dusen, 1997).

**Distance Learning at Community Colleges in the United States**

Many forces are working to change the role of community colleges in postsecondary education (Bailey, 2003). Prodigious advances in technology are among the most dramatic of these forces. Distance education technologies are changing the traditional geographical boundaries that once defined student markets. Continuous advances in technology have changed the work environment in most fields and workers are finding it necessary to learn new skills in order to find or keep a job (Candy, 2002; Schreiber & Berge, 1999). This has caused a change in what students want from a community college. Consequently, a college degree is no longer the primary product offered.

Since the mid-1970s, community colleges have been using television and video technologies to offer courses at a distance to students who might not otherwise have been able to participate in a traditional classroom setting (Dalziel, 2003). Rapidly evolving Internet technologies have increased distance education's popularity and the number of distance courses offered by community colleges, specifically online courses, has risen sharply. Studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Education have reported that the number of public two-year institutions offering courses at a distance has been steadily increasing from 58% in 1995 (Lewis et al., 1997), to 72% in 1997 (Lewis et al., 1999), to 90% in the 2000-2001 academic year (Waits & Lewis, 2003). In each of the three
studies, public two-year institutions were cited as being most likely to offer courses at a
distance. The latest study revealed that public two-year institutions offered the largest
number of distance courses (55,900) and had the highest percentage (48%) of the total
distance education enrollments (Waits & Lewis, 2003).

As the number of postsecondary educational institutions offering distance courses
increases (Bradburn, 2002; Hislop, 2001), the number of distance courses being offered,
the number of faculty teaching at a distance (Fink, 2002) and the number of faculty
contracts that contain language written around the issues of technology (Berg, 2000) also
increase. Nearly 63% of full-time faculty at two-year postsecondary educational
institutions are members of a collective bargaining unit (Euben & Hustoles, 2001).
Research on faculty policy issues regarding distance learning has been limited (Amey &
VanDerLinden, 2003; Bradburn, 2002; Phipps & Merisotis, 1999), but evidence of the
impact of distance learning on community college faculty contract and policy issues can
be found by examining community college policy manuals and bargaining contracts.
There are 992 public community colleges within the United States (AACC, 2003a). In the
higher education arena, community colleges are more likely than not to be unionized
(Euben & Hustoles, 2001; Maitland & Rhoades 1999; Palmer, 1999; Rhoades 1998), and
therefore, represented by a bargaining contract. While there is no central repository of
community college policy manuals, bargaining contracts are currently being collected

Of the 777 bargaining contracts contained within HECAS 2003, 532 came from
public two-year institutions. Limiting the search by employee status (contracts covering
full-time employees) and employee type (contracts covering faculty) reduced the number
to 290 contracts representing full-time faculty at public community colleges. These community college contracts were used as the basis to study the status of distance learning policy at community colleges in the United States. A document analysis of these contracts (HECAS, 2003) revealed that community colleges are including language in their faculty contracts to deal with some of the issues involved in distance learning. These issues include instructor qualifications, compensation for course development, compensation for modifying or updating a course, compensation for course delivery, class size, office hours, contact hours, workload, and intellectual property rights/copyrights.

The research is complicated by the fact that community colleges are not using the same terminology when dealing with distance learning issues in their contracts. Searches for the terms distance learning or distance education produced only 148 contracts that contained language pertaining to distance learning. Instead of the term distance learning, some colleges use the terms alternative learning or distributive learning. Southwest Wisconsin Technical College uses the term connected learning in its bargaining contract: “Connected learning encompasses those learning opportunities that are delivered with a separation of time and/or place” (Section 5.10.10, HECAS, 2003). Offered examples of connected learning opportunities included telecourse, correspondence, ITV and online learning. Fox Valley Technical College uses the term Alternative Instructional Delivery Methods. Cincinnati State Technical and Community College places its distance learning language in an article titled Electronically Purveyed Methods of Instruction. The word “distance” is not included anywhere in the contract (HECAS, 2003).
Instead, there is Web-based instruction, Internet instruction, fiber optics instruction, and non-traditional teaching. There are anytime/anywhere courses, alternative delivery courses, computer-delivered courses, web-based courses, online courses, modem-based courses, hybrid courses, and virtual courses. Lansing Community College uses the term hybrid for courses that combine face-to-face with at least 50% of the credits delivered on-line and the term virtual for online courses. Treasure Valley Community College uses the article title Alternative Methods of Instruction wherein modem-based classes is the term used for Web-based courses.

Some colleges have educational systems that house some of their distance learning courses. Gogebic Community College’s contract contains two different articles that deal with distance learning issues. In Article XIX, Internet Instruction, the following distinction is made, “The Internet is a computer-based alternate means of instructional delivery, which is separate and different from the Telecommunications Education System” (HECAS, 2003). In Article XVII, the Telecommunications Education System is defined as “an electronic educational network designed to provide an alternative means of instructional delivery to provide educational resources to students in a cost-effective and efficient manner” (HECAS, 2003). Development compensation is the same for both, but instructors are offered an additional stipend to teach the Internet courses. At Milwaukee Area Technical College, the College of the Air is an educational delivery system used to deliver three different categories of telecourses. ITV courses and online courses are not a part of the College of the Air system.

Mohawk Valley Community College uses the title Instructional Technology to identify its section on telecourses and ITV courses. In a majority of the contracts, ITV
stands for interactive television, but it is also used, as in the contracts of Los Angeles Community College District and Southwest Wisconsin Technical College, for instructional television and is included as distance learning. Compton Community College’s contract states, “Instructional television or ITV courses are not considered distance-learning courses” (Article XXVI, HECAS, 2003). County College of Morris’ contract mentions telecourses, interactive television courses, and Tele/Internet courses, the latter of which is defined as “any distance learning course where instruction and ‘lectures’ will be offered using the existing telecourse medium of playing prerecorded video lectures. However, course assignments and faculty-student contact will occur via the Internet” (Article IX.9.D.1, HECAS, 2003).

A reference of some type, to an issue related to distance learning, was included in 203 (70%) of the 290 contracts representing full-time faculty at public community colleges. Of those, 137 of the contracts (47%) had created an Article, Section, Appendix, Letter or Memo of Understanding, Side Letter, or the like, designed to deal specifically with distance learning issues. The remaining 66 contracts (23%) contained a reference to some form of distance learning; the length of the reference ranged from a sentence to multiple paragraphs (HECAS, 2003).

Eighty-seven (30%) of the 290 contracts representing full-time faculty at public community colleges did not include any reference to distance learning. While Hutchinson Community College’s contract does not contain a reference to distance learning (HECAS, 2003), the college does support a distance education Web page (http://www.hutchcc.edu/distance/) which includes interactive television, telecourses, and online classes in its course offerings. Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute’s
contract does not contain a reference to distance learning (HECAS, 2003), yet, like Hutchinson Community College, it also supports a distance learning Web page (http://planet.tvi.cc.nm.us/distancelearn/).

The growing role of distance education in community colleges is not only reflected in the literature (Lewis et al 1997; Lewis et al 1999; Waits & Lewis 2003; AACC, 2003b; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003; Bradburn, 2002); it is also reflected in language being introduced in current faculty bargaining contracts. (AAUP, 1999; Maitland & Rhoades, 1999; Rhoades, 2002) A review of current contract language reveals an increase in recognition on the part of policy makers (both faculty and administration) at community colleges of the expanding role that distance learning technology is playing in postsecondary educational institutions. Evidence of this recognition is demonstrated by Chemeketa Community College’s contract which states, “Distance learning is not just important as a learning modality of the future, but also as an emerging workplace competency” (Appendix C, HECAS, 2003) as well as in Glen Oaks Community College’s contract, which states, “The parties recognize that distance learning is a vital component of the college curriculum and necessary for continued leadership in higher education.” (ArticleXII, K, HECAS, 2003)

Organizational structures are changing as community colleges try to adapt to the demands brought about by distance learning technologies. In an effort to pool resources and lower the costs of providing distance learning courses, many community colleges have become part of a distance learning consortium or have cooperated in offering courses through a virtual college (Dalziel, 2003; Feasley, 2003; Oblinger et al., 2001). In the spring of 2002, 60% of the degree granting postsecondary institutions that offered
distance learning were part of a distance learning consortium, with public two-year participation in a state consortium being the most prevalent (Waits & Lewis, 2003). Some of these organizations are limited to two-year institutions; others include both two- and four-year institutions (Dalziel, 2003). As previously mentioned, research is complicated by the terminology used to title and describe the various organizations. Examples include: Kansas City Regional Access Consortium for Higher Education, Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium, Illinois Virtual Campus, Ohio Learning Network, Georgia Virtual Technical Institute, Electronic Campus of Virginia, Virtual College of Texas, Colorado Community College Online, Electronic Campus of the Southern Regional Education Board, Michigan Community College Virtual Learning Collaborative, and Maryland’s Faculty Online Technology Training Consortium. These organizations differ in the variety of services provided, the type of institutions included, the size of the geographic area served, and the methods used to deliver courses (Dalziel 2003; Feasley, 2003).

**Florida Community College System**

The Florida Community College System (FCCS) began in 1933 with Palm Beach Junior College, which, at that time, was the only public two-year college located in the state (The Fact Book, 2004). In 1947, Pensacola Junior College was established and St. Petersburg Junior College changed its status from private to public; both became a part of the FCCS. Since then, the FCCS has evolved to its present state of 28 public community colleges under the jurisdiction of the Florida Board of Education. (The Fact Book, 2004; Florida Statutes 1004.65, 2002; Wellman, 2002).
The FCCS was planned and built around a mission to meet the local educational needs and challenges of the state's population (Albertson & Wattenbarger, 1998; Florida Statutes 1004.65, 2002; The Fact Book, 2004). To fulfill this mission, 24 branch campuses and 115 sites have been added to the original 28 campuses, for a total of 173 sites that are within a 50-mile distance of more than 90% of the state's population. In addition, over 2000 buildings, such as shopping centers, places of worship, and community centers are utilized to increase access to a postsecondary education. Miami Dade College is the largest community college in the FCCS (and the nation), serving over 30,000 full-time students. Florida Keys Community College is the smallest community college in the FCCS, serving fewer than 1,000 full-time students (The Fact Book, 2004; Perrault, Madaus, Armbrister, Dixon, and Thuotte-Pierson, 2002).

Florida’s community colleges are authorized by statute (F.S. 1004.65, 2002) to grant associate in arts degrees, associate in science degrees, associate in applied science degrees, certificates, awards, and diplomas. In the 2002-2003 academic year, 880,064 students were enrolled in the FCCS and 55,909 degrees were awarded. Of the degrees awarded, 29,137 were associate in arts, 9,831 were associate in science, and 16,941 were vocational and college credit certificates (The Fact Book, 2004). Thirteen of the 28 community colleges made Community College Week’s list of “100 Top Associate Degree Producers;” four were included in the top ten (Borden & Brown, 2003).

Florida ranks third in the nation for conferring associate’s degrees and 47th for conferring bachelor’s degrees (Evelyn, 2003). Since 2001, when Florida’s community colleges were authorized by statute (F.S. 1004.65, 2002) to confer bachelor’s degrees, four community colleges have applied for approval (Borden & Brown, 2003; Elliott,
2003; Evelyn, 2002; Evelyn; 2003; Shek, 2002a). St. Petersburg College and Miami-Dade College have been approved to offer bachelor’s degrees. Edison Community College and Chipola College have been approved to partner with nearby universities to offer bachelor’s degrees. In order to be able to offer four-year degrees, a community college must submit an application and meet the following criteria: proof of program demand, proof of an unmet need for graduates, and proof of possession of the necessary resources and facilities to offer the programs. The programs are monitored yearly by the state in order to determine whether the program demand is being met. The United States is facing a critical teacher shortage (Bell, 2001; Brewster, 2002). Florida’s current teacher shortage is one of the most pressing issues for workforce development (Shek, 2002a). It has been estimated that Florida will need an additional 16,000 teachers each year for the next ten years. Florida universities are not able to fill this demand and the debate is on as to whether community colleges should be offering four-year degrees (Evelyn, 2003; Garmon & Wattenbarger, 2000; Shek, 2002a).

The FCCS employs 43,833 people. Faculty members (23,267) comprise 53% of the total employee headcount. The majority of faculty employed are part-time (18,211); 22% of the faculty workforce is full-time. As shown in Figure 1, the number of adjuncts as a percentage of faculty employed in the FCCS has steadily increased from 72% in 1999 to 78% in 2004 (The Fact Book, 1999-2004). While The Fact Book provides varied information on the make-up of faculty employed in the FCCS, it does not provide information regarding the number of faculty that teach at a distance.
The FCCS receives state funding from general revenue funds, student fees, and lottery funds (The Fact Book, 2004). Transferability of college credits and eligibility for federal funds, including student financial aid, depend on an institution’s accreditation status (American Council on Education, 2000; Commission on Colleges, 2001; Dalziel, 2003; Eaton, 2001; Savukinas, 2002). The Commission on Colleges of SACS is the regional body for the accreditation of Florida’s community colleges (Florida Statutes 1008.45, 2002).

**FCCS Governance**

Florida’s educational governance system recently experienced a major reorganization (Schmidt, 2002). Before the reorganization, the FCCS fell under the
jurisdiction of the State Board of Education, that was composed of the individually elected members of the state Cabinet and the Governor. The State Board of Community Colleges was established in 1983 to serve as the director of the Division of Community Colleges and to provide “statewide leadership in overseeing and coordinating the individually governed public community colleges” (Florida Statutes 240.305, 2001). At that time, the Board had the authority to develop rules and statewide policies.

In 1998, Floridians voted to amend the state constitution (S. 2, Art. IX, State Constitution, by Revision No. 8 (1998) to remove the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education from the state Cabinet, and instead, allow the Governor to appoint its seven members. The amendment also gave the State Board of Education the responsibility of appointing the Commissioner of Education. In May of 2000, the Florida legislature passed the Florida Education Governance Reorganization Act of 2000 (House Bill 2263) that repealed many of the governing bodies located within the Department of Education in order to establish a streamlined governance model for a seamless K-20 educational delivery system, with accountability as its basis. House Bill 2263 authorized the creation of the appointed Florida Board of Education (FBOE) and included a three-year timeline for phasing out the existing elected State Board of Education. Under the new system, the State Board of Community Colleges was replaced with a Chancellor of Community Colleges, who serves as the director of the Division of Community Colleges.

House Bill 2263 also called for the repeal and rewrite of the Florida School Code to reflect the changes made in the educational governance structure. The Florida School Code is defined in Florida Statutes (228.01, 2001) as the laws of Florida that govern public education. In May of 2002, the Florida legislature passed Senate Bill 20E (2002),
a 1,786-page bill in which the school code is repealed and fourteen chapters of new law, called the Florida K-20 Education Code, are added (S 20E, 2002). The effective date of the bill was January 7, 2003.

The laws and policies that govern the FCCS can be found in various places, including, but not limited to, the Florida Constitution, the Florida Statutes, the Florida Administrative Code, the Florida Community College System's Guidelines and Procedures Manual, the individual community college policy and procedures manuals, and faculty collective bargaining agreements. These laws and policies are maintained and enforced by various state and local bodies, including but not limited to the Florida Board of Education, the Division of Community Colleges, the local boards of trustees, local union chapters, and faculty governance organizations, such as a faculty senate.

The 28 community colleges are governed locally by a district board of trustees whose members are appointed by the Governor. The Board of Trustees is responsible for establishing rules and policies at the college and for the hiring and firing of all college personnel, including the college president. Administration, faculty, and staff are employees of the college, and as such, are guided by the regulations and policies established by the Board of Trustees. These regulations and policies are contained in a policy and procedures manual maintained by each of the community colleges as directed by the Administrative Procedures Act, Florida Statutes, Chapter 120. The duties and powers of the Board of Trustees are established in the Florida Statutes, Chapter 240.319 and in the Florida State Board of Education Administrative Rules, Chapter 6A-14.0247.

In September of 2003, the State Board of Education met to decide whether the four community colleges offering four-year degrees should be placed under the
jurisdiction of the Board of Governors which supervises the state universities. After much debate, it was decided that these colleges (two of which have since dropped the word "community" from their names) would remain under the jurisdiction of the local boards of trustees (Armstrong, 2003; Elliott, 2003).

There are 4,951 full-time faculty employed at Florida's community colleges (FCCS, 2002). Faculty involvement in governance at the college level varies from college to college. Eleven of the 28 community colleges are unionized. Ten of the unionized community colleges have formed local affiliates of the United Faculty of Florida (2003); one has formed a local affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers. Faculty at these unionized colleges are guided by collective bargaining agreements (Oppers & Mathews, 2002) that are negotiated yearly. Some of the community colleges have faculty governing bodies such as a Faculty Senate or, as in the case of St. Petersburg College, a Faculty Governance Organization.

The State of Distance Learning in the FCCS

Distance learning existed in Florida as early as 1919 when the University of Florida began offering correspondence courses. In the FCCS, distance learning has its roots in telecourses that were offered by some of the community colleges beginning in the 1970s. The Department of Education established the ITV office to manage the licensing and copying of telecourses. In 1974 the ITV office leased Florida's first state-wide telecourse. The ITV Consortium was formed as an informal group to provide support, share resources and information, and to determine licensing needs for telecourses. By 1998, it was estimated that approximately 28,000 students were taking telecourses (FDLC, 2000).
In 1994, St. Petersburg Junior College was the first Florida community college to offer an Internet course and program. Six years later, in the summer of 2000, the FCCDLC electronic course catalogue listed 591 Internet-based courses offered by 21 of the 28 community colleges (FDLC, 2000). In 1995, Lake City Community College used compressed video to offer interactive courses via a network. State funds were acquired in 1997 to purchase video conferencing equipment for each of the community colleges in the system. By 2000, the Florida video network connected all of Florida’s community colleges (FDLC, 2000). Since its beginning in 1919, distance learning in Florida has evolved to include a variety of modalities including telecourses, Internet courses and live broadcast courses.

The FCCS records (FDLC, 2002a) show a steady increase since 1996 in the number of distance courses offered, the number of students enrolled in the courses, and the unduplicated headcount of students enrolled in distance courses. From 1996 to 2002, community college enrollments in distance learning courses have nearly quadrupled. In the 1996-97 academic year, 1,500 courses were offered; 26,348 students were enrolled with an unduplicated headcount of 16,148 students. In the 2001-02 academic year, 7,373 distance courses were offered; 120,267 students were enrolled with an unduplicated headcount of 71,324 students. Community college distance learning course enrollments increased 42% in 2001-02. It is anticipated that this rate of growth will continue and that the number of distance learning course enrollments for 2003-04 will nearly double the 2001-02 enrollments (FCCS, 2003).

Organizational structures are changing as community colleges try to adapt to the demands brought about by distance learning technologies (Oblinger et al., 2001). Many
colleges are joining distance learning consortia as a means to share resources and increase access (Dalziel, 2003). The Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium (FCCDLC) was established by the State Board of Community Colleges in 1996 and placed under the direction of the Division of Community Colleges.

At its inception, the FCCDLC membership had 32 voting members, including one representative from each of the 28 Florida community colleges. One of the duties of the FCCDLC is to make policy recommendations. The Florida Legislature established the Florida Virtual Campus (FVC) in 1999 as a Web-based entry to Florida’s postsecondary distance learning opportunities. The FCCDLC and the FVC were merged in July of 2003 to form the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC). Membership in the newly merged FDLC was expanded to include representatives from K-20.

Technology is changing the way educational institutions and the people within them operate (Jones & Matthews, 2002; Oppers & Mathews, 2002). Educational funding is the largest part of Florida’s state budget. Existing educational funding policies are being examined in an effort to find ways to accommodate new approaches to budgeting and financing the increased use of instructional technology in the educational system. New strategies for funding in areas such as technology infrastructure, instructional and library content, faculty workload, and student support services are being explored. By pooling resources and combining the purchasing of pre-developed course content in areas of high use, the Consortium has saved individual colleges 50% of the costs involved in purchasing high use course content.

Since it is estimated that labor costs comprise over 80% of the budgets at Florida’s community colleges, budgeting issues surrounding faculty workload are a hot
issue (Oppers & Mathews, 2002). Florida statutes require faculty to provide a minimum number of faculty-student contact hours in the form of classroom hours and office hours. The online equivalent hours are fulfilled with the use of chat rooms, discussion forums and e-mail. State statutes and local bargaining contracts have not addressed the issues involved in translating these requirements into the distance learning environment.

Faculty workload policies surround issues such as course load, class size, and office hours are being examined by faculty and administration (Jones & Matthews, 2002; Oppers and Mathews, 2002).

**Distance Teaching Versus Face-to-Face Teaching**

Academic literature provides many different definitions for distance education (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2000; Bradburn, 2002; Greenberg, 1998; Lewis et al., 1999; Oblinger et al., 2001; Teaster & Blieszner, 1999; Valentine, 2002; Webopedia, 2003; Zhang, 1998). The choice of definition used is often dependent on the subject at hand. Although the definitions vary, they usually share two components: separation of instructor and learner and the use of technology that enables that separation. Moore (2003) defines distance education as “all forms of education in which all or most of the teaching is conducted in a different space than the learning, with the effect that all or most of the communication between teachers and learners is through a communications technology” (p. xiv). Gomory (2001) defines Internet learning as the attempt to reproduce the fundamentals of traditional classroom teaching outside of the classroom. The traditional course offered at a postsecondary educational institution is described as having three essential components: the instructor, the course material, and
the students. These definitions provide a good starting point for discussing the differences
between teaching at a distance and teaching in a traditional classroom.

In the traditional classroom, the instructor assumes the role of a leader and
becomes the center of attention. He teaches the class using various methods such as
lecturing, asking and answering questions, as well as providing visual or audio aids. The
instructor interacts with his students as a group, uses oral and visual cues to elicit
responses, and is able to provide instant feedback. In addition, one-to-one interaction is
sometimes provided in the form of office hours. Unlike the distance instructor (Turoff,
1999), the physical presence of the traditional instructor necessitates that he lives
somewhere geographically close to the institution.

In the distance course, the roles and responsibilities of faculty change (Amey &
VanDerLinden, 2003; Beaudoin, 2003; Beck, 2002; Berg, 2000; Berge, 1998a; Boettcher,
1999a; Brahler et al., Bradburn, 2003; Dederstadt, 1997; 1999; Dirr, 2003; Illinois Online
Network, 2001; Innovations in Distance Education, 1998; Jaffe, 1998; Johnstone &
Poulin, 2002; Klemm, 2001; Lewis et al., 1999; Phipps & Merisotis, 1999; Oblinger et
al., 2001; Palmer, Collins, & Roy, 1996; Parrott, 1995; Schifter, 2000a; Shek, 2002b;
Smith, 1997; SREB, 2001; Worley, 2000; Young, 2001; ). The instructor is no longer the
leader, the lecturer, or the center of attention. His role changes to that of facilitator,
guide, and in some cases, team member. Teaching online requires an adjustment in
mindset by the instructor. Instead of seeing his role as that of information provider, he
must now see his role as that of guide. This pedagogical shift must manifest itself in
course delivery and in the development of course materials (Hannafin, 2003). Current
teaching methods must be adapted and new methods adopted to compensate for the
limitations imposed by the technologies being used (University of Illinois, 1999).

The separation of instructor and student poses some challenges for the instructor
of a distance course (Beck, 2002; Fink, 2002; Gaud, 1999; Gomory, 2001; Moore &
Kearsley, 1996; Schifter, 2000a; Smith et al., 2001; SREB 2001; Williams & Peters,
1997). Developing and delivering a distance course requires the use of a different
pedagogical approach, in addition to strong verbal, written, organizational and
technological skills (Cyrs, 2000; Shank, 2002). A lot of time, effort and new learning are
expended to accomplish this (O’Banion, 2003; Perrin, 2002). The lecture format used in
traditional courses cannot simply be transferred to the digital format. Maintaining a high
standard of quality, one that is equal to that of a traditional course, is required in order to
obtain accreditation and thereby be able to obtain government grants and the use of
federal funds for student financial aid (American Council on Education, 2000; Dalziel,
2003; Eaton, 2001; Savukinas, 2002).

Distance education offers students access to the course 24 hours a day. Instructors cannot be expected to be available to students 24 hours a day. In the
traditional course, classroom hours and office hours are established by a predetermined
schedule. In the distance course parameters for classroom hours and office hours have
yet to be defined. At least one expert, Boettcher (1999b) suggests 24 hours turnaround
time to respond to e-mail inquires and encourages timely and personal feedback on
completed assignments. The issue of defining the term “classroom” in and of itself has
implications (Young, 2002a). The online environment has the effect of allowing
administrators more access to the classroom, thereby granting exposure to more of a
distance instructor’s teaching activities than is usually allowed by a traditional instructor.

Encouraging meaningful interaction is essential to the quality and success of a
traditional course; it is just as crucial, if not more, in a distance course (Beck, 2002;
Speck, Knowlton, & Weiss, 2000; SREB, 2001). Many of the classroom skills used to
interact in the traditional course, are obsolete in the distance course. Online instructors
cannot use oral skills or visual cues to enhance delivery, detect and solve problems, or
provide detail. Without the ability to see and use body language, the instructor cannot
take advantage of and react to the non-verbal cues often provided by students in a
traditional classroom setting. Distance instructors must rely on written communications
to deliver much of the course materials (course content, rules, assignments, directions,
etc), which means that they must convert all necessary oral communications to written
form. This conversion is time consuming and includes 100-plus hours of work that must
be accomplished before the course begins (Smith et al., 2001).

Communication patterns differ between traditional and online classes (Blum,
1999; Boettcher, 1999a; Chamberlin, 2001). In the traditional class, communication
typically flows in one direction: from the instructor to the students. The instructor uses
visual cues to determine whether the students are attentive to the lecture and
comprehending the material. Occasionally, discussions will cause the communication to
flow from student to teacher or from student to student if the students feel comfortable
enough to contribute. This type of communication pattern is easily controlled by the
instructor. In online courses, the flow of communication is more likely to travel in
different directions and to branch off into separate discussions. This type of
communication pattern is not as easily controlled by the instructor. The instructor becomes a moderator with added responsibilities that extend beyond the traditional classroom hour. As a result, instructors spend substantially more time with online courses than they do with traditional courses.

Boettcher (1999c) foresees that improvements in and increased use of Web-based management tools will make the design, development, and delivery of courses easier and less time consuming. Publishers are developing and collecting content on the Web. Instructors will adopt more content and develop less. The rapid increase in the number of technologies distance faculty must learn (Clark, 1998; Corrine, 2000; Gummess, 2002; Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz, & Marx, 1999; SREB, 2001; Valentine, 2002) will force faculty to realize that they can no longer be responsible for design, development, and delivery of courses. (Boettcher, 1999c; Brahler et al., 1999).

Distance courses, specifically online courses, are more time and labor intensive in terms of course development, course preparation, course delivery, teaching duties and course revisions than traditional courses (Boettcher, 1999d; Fink, 2002; Rumble, 2003; Schifter, 2000b; Smith, 2000; Smith et al., 2001), especially for the novice (Dalziel, 2003; Gummess, 2002; Schoech, 2000). The faculty member who develops an online course must gain a command of the various technological skills needed to effectively design a course that will not have the benefit of face-to-face interaction (Corrine, 2000; Fredrickson, Clark, & Hoehner, 2002; Gummess, 2002; Rockwell et al., 1999). These skills include, but are not limited to, choosing a delivery system, using authoring software, utilizing courseware management tools, and the utilization of various computer applications, such as such as word processing, e-mail, HTML basics, Web page editing,
and image editing. In addition, the faculty member must be prepared to assist students who are not familiar with the necessary technology (Fink, 2002; Schoech, 2000).

Since students may not be present to experience part of the course, the information provided may need to be expanded upon (Fredrickson, et al., 2002). For example, students may not have the benefit of hearing questions posed by other students, so a component called Frequently Asked Questions is commonly included in the materials offered. This component is not only useful to the students; it also saves the instructor time that would be spent answering individual questions via e-mail. When providing materials on the Web, it is not a good idea to simply take the traditional document and place it on the Web. Consideration must be given to the difficulties incurred in reading off a computer monitor; these difficulties can be mitigated by using certain design techniques. Student motivation is more complicated since the instructor must first design the motivation in a format that is suitable for the delivery mode being used before delivering it. In online courses, text is the most common format used. Extreme care must be taken to write clearly and concisely (Beck, 2002).

The ability to separate instructor and learner has many advantages for the student (Beck, 2002; Gomory, 2001; Morgan, 2000; National Education Association, 2000; Palmer et al., 1996; Schoech, 2000). Students are able to pursue an education without having to give up their part-time jobs. Parents can fit distance courses into a schedule that allows them to make the care of their children a top priority and to schedule time for coursework at their convenience. Full-time workers are able to upgrade their skills in order to advance in their professions, without interrupting their career paths. Persons with
emotional or physical disabilities that keep them from attending or participating in a
traditional class can attend a distance course from the comfort and privacy of their home.

Just as the role of the instructor changes in distance education, so too, does the
role of the student (Schoech, 2000). Students become more engaged and share more
responsibility for their learning (Hartman, Dziuban, & Moskal, 2000). In the traditional
classroom, students can interact with the instructor and with other students. They can
share experiences, assist one another, assist the instructor, request and offer clarifications,
as well as provide emotional support to one another (Beck, 2002; Gomory, 2001). This
interaction can take place both inside and outside of the classroom, and is an essential
element of the classroom experience.

According to Beck (2002) and Chamberlin (2001), one of the most notable
differences between traditional courses and distance courses is the amount and type of
communication that occurs during the course. In traditional courses where the
communication is synchronous, students can, and often do, evade direct interaction with
their fellow students and their instructor. The reasons for this may be connected to
emotional, cultural, racial, or political barriers that students may consciously or
unconsciously erect. In distance courses, asynchronous communication is the norm.
This type of communication, accomplished through e-mail, chat rooms, forums, and
mailing lists, allows the student time to reflect on the issue at hand. This time for
reflection is not available in the kind of synchronous discussion that is typical in a
traditional course. Through asynchronous communication, students are able to remove
some of the emotional, cultural, racial and political barriers; therefore, they feel more
comfortable making contributions to the discussions held in distance courses than they do
in those held in traditional courses. This leads to an increase in interactions between
students, as well as between instructor and students.

In the case of online courses, once the course begins, the online instructor spends
more time "in class," than the face-to-face instructor. Creating an online classroom
presence is essential to the online student's success. Related online classroom duties
include monitoring and responding to online discussions, answering student e-mails, and
reviewing assignments. Since e-mail is used as the primary means of communication, the
online instructor spends a disproportionate amount of time using it (Beck, 2002;
Boettcher, 1999b; Smith et al., 2001). Online interaction is time intensive. Individual
communication between students and faculty is estimated to be two to three times higher
in online courses, than in face-to-face courses (Deubel, 2003; Rosenlund, Damask-
Bembenek, Hugie & Matsmura, 1999; Short, 2000).

Distance students expect instant responses to their inquiries and immediate
turnaround on assignments and tests. Instructors are often expected to be available to
students 24 hours a day. Instructors who try to meet these expectations run the risk of
experiencing burn out (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003). Distance instructors may find it
necessary to control students' expectations by utilizing time management techniques
(Dalziel, 2003). The techniques include using online discussion boards that allow
students to interact with one another and answer some of the questions being asked;
setting reasonable turnaround times for assignments, tests, and inquiries; creating and
posting a list of frequently asked questions and answers. While student-instructor
interaction is a good thing, it is possible to have too much student-instructor interaction.
Faculty Issues Associated with Distance Learning

Distance Learning is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in postsecondary educational institutions (Beagle, 2000; Feenberg, 1999; Schifter 2000). However, traditional faculty contractual requirements do not fit the gestalt of distance education. The potential change in faculty roles and responsibilities has raised questions about the impact distance learning will have on overall labor conditions for American faculty (Berg, 2000; Turoff, 1997; Nobel, 2002). Labor issues such as intellectual property and copyright, workload, professional development, office hours, class size, and contact hours are being reviewed, and, in many cases, revised, to accommodate the largely anytime/anyplace online approach to learning (HECAS, 2003; Maitland & Rhodes, 1999; Smith, 1997).

The issue of intellectual property rights is usually not included as a faculty issue but rather listed as a separate issue, one that is of importance not only to faculty, but to administrators, as well. Many of the guidelines written to assist educators in developing distance education policy suggest that policies addressing intellectual property rights should be the first to be developed (The American Council on Education, 2000; Dirr, 2003; Lewis et al., 1999; Parscal, 2000; Young, 2001). Intellectual property is one of the primary issues facing state policy makers (Carr, 2001; State Higher Education Executive Officers, 2000). Berg (2000) classifies intellectual property as indirect compensation. Gasaway (2001) defines it as "legal protection for commercially valuable products of human intellect" (p. 65). The number of faculty contracts that contain distance learning provisions addressing intellectual property is increasing (Maitland & Rhodes, 1999). In a year-long faculty seminar conducted at the University of Illinois (1999), participants
focused on pedagogical issues surrounding quality online teaching and learning and concluded that retaining intellectual property rights of developed materials ensures that high quality is maintained. In its distance education policy statement, SACS (2000) lists clear distance education policies concerning ownership of materials as one of the criteria for accreditation.

Most of the distance learning issues faced by faculty revolve around workload and compensation. Workload issues affected by distance learning include professional development and training; course design, development, and delivery; teaching load; course scheduling; class size; and office and classroom hours. Although some faculty enjoy teaching at a distance and believe it holds many advantages, many also feel that the primary disadvantage is the increased workload associated with it (Dirr, 2003; Gaud, 1999; National Education Association, 2001; Potts & Hagan, 2000; Shek, 2002b).

Workload issues are closely related to compensation issues; faculty feel they should be compensated for the increased workload involved in participating in distance learning course and program offerings (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2000; Berg, 2000; Cho & Berge, 2002; Muilenburg & Berge, 2001; Schifter, 2000a). Compensation comes in many forms, including support, access to resources, release time, supplemental pay, reduction in load, financial aid, and royalty payments. Royalty agreements, while rare, are more likely to exist in community college faculty contracts (Berg, 2000). Distance learning also raises faculty issues of recruitment, retention, accreditation, academic freedom, privacy, and governance (HECAS, 2003; Knowles, 2002; Oblinger et al., 2001; State Higher Education Executive Officers, 2000).
While most of today’s college students are accustomed to using computers and are acquainted with e-mail and the Internet, many of the professionals that are teaching them were trained at a time before computers and Internet access were common in American households. Being proficient in the use of educational technology requires a commitment to life-long learning for the instructor (Jaber, 1999; Teles, Ashton, & Roberts, 2000). This is especially true in light of the emerging widespread use of the Internet, both inside and outside of the classroom. Use of the Web is becoming commonplace in the home and office. If teachers are to meet the needs of their students, they must update their teaching skills to include the use of modern technology (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2003; Bell, 2001; Carew & Flynn, 2002; Charp, 1998; Cotugna & Vickery, 1998; Cravener, 2002; Groves & Zemel, 2000; Gullickson, 2000; Gummess, 2002; Whitaker & Coste, 2002; Wooley, 1998).

Distance course design, development, and delivery require skills that most faculty do not possess (American Council on Education, 2000; Butler & Sellbom, 2002). Bendavid and Limbach (2002) debate the question of whether senior faculty at colleges should be required to train in computers. In their collective bargaining agreement, Connecticut Community and Technical Colleges requires “all teaching faculty members shall …. (g) posses strong information literacy skills, including the ability to word process and to use spreadsheets, presentation ware, e-mail, CD-ROM, compressed video, the Internet, the World Wide Web, and other distance communication modalities …” (Article 8.3.5.1(g), HECAS, 2003). The need for professional development to facilitate teaching a distance course is acknowledged in some collective bargaining agreements, as
demonstrated in Seattle Community College’s 2000-02 contract which contains the following language:

If it becomes necessary for a full-time or part-time priority-hiring-list faculty member to teach an Online Course in order to meet a full-time load requirement or a part-time priority-hiring-list assignment, the District will provide professional development in conducting Online Courses on the first assignment of such a course. (Article I.2, HECAS, 2003)

The above-quoted contract excerpt leads to two other workload issues, namely, course scheduling and teaching load. Once the decision is made to offer distance courses or programs, policy-related questions come to light (American Council on Education, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). How many faculty members will be needed to teach the distance courses? Who will teach the distance courses? Will teaching a distance course be voluntary or mandatory? Will the faculty teaching load be lightened to accommodate for the extra time needed to prepare for and deliver a distance course? If there is no policy mandating that faculty teach distance courses, course selection becomes much more complicated because it hinges on finding faculty who are willing to teach a distance course (Kaminski, & Milheim, 2002). While established guidelines and initial contract language support voluntary distance course teaching assignments (Distance Education: Guidelines for Good Practice, 2000; HECAS, 2003; Phipps & Merisotis, 2000;), contract language is appearing that will leave the door open for what some faculty fear may become inevitable: a need to teach a distance course in order to fill an instructor’s load (Oblinger et al., 2001). Danville Area Community College’s 2001-02 contract states, “Acceptance of Internet teaching assignments shall be
voluntary unless the course is needed to make a full load” (Section 11.3.4, HECAS, 2003). Roque Community College moves closer to the reality of mandatory distance teaching assignments with the following contract language: “No more than one non-volunteer assignment per year shall be made for any non-volunteer faculty member to a distance learning course” (Article 6.A, HECAS, 2003). Antelope Valley Community College makes a similar move by including the following grandfather clause in its 2000-02 contract, “AVC will not require any faculty hired prior to January 1, 1999 to teach distance learning courses” (Article XVII.6.0, HECAS, 2003).

Charp (1998) and Boettcher (1999c) advocate hiring only teachers with strong technology skills in order to prepare educational institutions for the future. Language in some of the bargaining contracts reviewed echoed this position, as is demonstrated in the following language found in Madison Area Technical College’s, 1999-2002 contract: “It is anticipated that in the future this technology will be just one more commonly accepted methodology of delivering instruction.” And, “At present, participation in the ITV delivery system is voluntary except for all instructors hired after September 1, 2000. Positions posted after this date may specify expertise in and willingness to use ITV technology as a condition of employment” (Appendix N, HECAS, 2003).

In some cases, instructors are required to obtain technology proficiencies in order to retain their positions (Company Operations, 2000), as is the case at State Center Community College in California. Their contract contains the following language:

No later than completion of the seventh semester in contract status or prior to receiving tenure status, whichever occurs first, contract employees hired after January 1, 2001 must be knowledgeable and, be able to demonstrate
computer proficiencies, including operating a computer, using the storage devices, printer controls, essential operating system commands, browsing the internet, receiving and sending e-mail, and the basic features of word processing and spreadsheet applications. Additionally, the contract employee will be able to demonstrate proficiency as to particular computer applications designed to meet the needs of students in the employee’s teaching field or other work area, as determined by the evaluation team and department. (Article 8.1E3i, HECAS, 2003)

There is evidence of a growing concern that distance learning will cause a reduction in the faculty workforce and language written to protect faculty jobs is appearing in bargaining contracts (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2000; Rhoades, 2002). Community College of Philadelphia’s 1997-2001 contract contains the following clause, which was also included in other contracts reviewed for this study: “No Employee will be displaced because of distance learning or other educational technology” (Article XXIV.C, HECAS, 2003).

As administrators and faculty grapple with the issues presented by distance education and strive to find its place in academia, contract language is reflecting the struggle, as is demonstrated by the following clause in Rogue Community College’s, 2000-03 contract:

It is not the intent of the college to displace existing faculty by participating in distance education. As the college develops and implements new technology for the delivery of Instructional services and support, reasonable efforts will be made to retain the traditional
teacher/student interactive classroom relationship. The college will provide faculty with opportunities for professional growth, re-training, and re-assigning in the event traditional faculty positions are displaced by adoption of such new technologies. In the event it is necessary to make a reassignment of faculty as a result of participation in distance learning, there will be no reduction in salary or any other benefits of this contract.

(Article 6 A, HECAS, 2003)

Distance learning has had an impact on adjunct faculty ratios (Knowles, 2002). Adjuncts are being hired in larger numbers to replace full-time, tenured faculty, to teach distance courses, especially at community colleges (Beaudin, 1998; Dirr, 2003; Rivard, 2001; State Higher Education Executive Officers, 2000; Shek, 2001; Turoff, 1997), where adjuncts outnumber full-time faculty (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003; Feenberg, 1999). Part-time and full-time faculty will have different expectations regarding issues such as job loyalty, workload, compensation, and reward structures (Alfred, 2003). Often, part-time faculty are not afforded the same benefits and support as are full-time faculty. Some accreditation agencies require a minimum full-time/adjunct (FT/A) faculty ratio (Shea & Boser, 2001).

The increased use of asynchronous communication technologies in distance courses has caused many educators to examine class size limits, especially for the first run (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003; Boechetter, 1999; HECAS, 2003; Whitaker & Coste; Zhang, 1998). Mulligan and Geary (1999) suggest that class size be kept at a manageable level in order to obtain and maintain quality. Boechetter (1999) suggests a limit of 14 students and notes the appearance of additional policies designed to compensate faculty
members for the additional workload caused by higher class sizes. On the other side of the scale, New York’s Monroe Community College contract, which expires in 2003, contains the following clause: “For classes taught via distance education, there is no change in official maximum class size or faculty contact hour credit” (Article 59, Section A, HECAS 2002, NY132). The absence of physical boundaries in the distance environment has brought about the assumption that there are no class size limits in distance courses. This is evidenced in a communication between a prospective student and an online instructor, wherein the student asks, “I had thought that was an online course. If so how can the class be full?” (See Appendix A).

The use of Internet technologies in distance courses has provided students with alternative means of accessing the instructor which, in turn, has blurred the traditional definitions of office hours and classroom hours (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2003; Opper & Mathews, 2002). Unlike traditional students who come to class at a predetermined time, online students log on at a time that is convenient to them. Like their traditional counterparts, online students expect a prompt reply to their questions and concerns. Some educational institutions are implementing policies that define a faculty member’s acceptable response time to student inquires (Young, 2002b), as is demonstrated in Belview Community College’s bargaining contract: “Faculty are expected to reply to student e-mail within a reasonable time” (Appendix H, HECAS, 2003). The key term here is “a reasonable time.” If “a reasonable time” was defined as 24 hours, distance faculty would, in effect, be required to teach seven days a week.

Policies on office hours and classroom contact hours are being reexamined (HECAS, 2003; Oppers & Mathews, 2002) and, in some cases, rewritten to accommodate
the distance learning environment. The contract provisions vary in the flexibility afforded. Language in Bellview Community College’s contract allows faculty to fulfill their office hour obligations electronically in proportion to their workload (Section III G 3, HECAS, 2003). Faculty at Portland Community College in Oregon, are afforded the same option with the following restriction: “However, even those faculty who teach entirely by distance learning must be on campus a minimum of five (5) hours per week” (Article 6 5.211, HECAS, 2003). The Seattle Community College contract allows maximum flexibility with the following language: “No onsite scheduled office hours shall be required of the instructor” (Appendix I.1.d, HECAS, 2003).

The technologies associated with distance learning have the potential to affect, not only faculty that are involved in teaching at a distance, but all faculty (Hislop, 2001), as is demonstrated by the following excerpts taken from various community college bargaining contracts. Washtenaw Community College, in the section titled Distance Learning/Learning Technology states:

The faculty and administration support the exploration of new technology to provide quality instruction to the workplace, schools, and other community locales. The faculty is expected to review the value of new learning technology to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of instruction. (Section 19, HECAS, 2003)

Letters of Understanding are being added to contracts wherein plans are being made to study distance education issues. Language in the contract of Sauk Valley Community College (IL108 – 1998-2001) in Illinois points out the need for further clarification and guidance in matters dealing with Distance Learning:
The Board of Trustees and the Faculty Association of Sauk Valley Community College agree that Distance Learning is in a constant state of change and there are no standard parameters to provide guidance and an absolute sense of direction. The Distance Learning language incorporated within this Contract has been agreed to in good faith by both parties. However, the participants agree to review the Distance Learning language of Article 4.1 (Sections I-Q only) annually if requested by either party. (HECAS 2002, IL108, Memorandum of Understanding)

Community colleges have been noted for including provisions that require future negotiations and/or study before the implementation of instructional technology (Maitland & Rhodes, 1999). Provisions include the establishment of special taskforces, committees and teams to study the effect of distance learning on faculty workload. The Los Rios Community College District’s 1999-2002 contract states, “The parties recognize that technological change may affect the terms and conditions of employment and professional duties and responsibilities of faculty. With this in mind, the parties agree to establish a Joint Committee on the Impact of Technology” (Article 26.7, HECAS, 2003). The College of the Desert’s 2000-03 contract contains the following clause that allows for a non-penalized annual renegotiation of distance learning issues:

The parties to this agreement acknowledge that modifications to the online course provisions contained herein may be necessary after the parties have had an opportunity to examine the appropriateness of the various components of this agreement. As such, the parties agree that the content of this agreement shall be subject to modifications through the negotiation
process in subsequent academic years. Such review shall not be considered a reopener proposal by either party. (Article XXI, Section 7(i), HECAS, 2003)

Of the 203 community college contracts (HECAS, 2003) that contained language relating to distance learning, 49 (24%) contain formal language requiring future study or review of the impact of distance learning.

**Limitations**

Timeliness of the subject necessitated the use of the Internet to find the most current research in order to complete the dissertation. Inclusion of too much online research may weaken the dissertation in the eyes of the scholarly community.

As was noted in the study performed by King, et al (1998), distance learning programs exist wherein some or all of the distance learning policy is not written. In this study written distance education policy was examined. Policy that was *unwritten* or *understood* was not included in the study.

**Delimitations**

Although different laws govern community colleges in other states, the issues being addressed remain the same. The resource produced in this work will be of use to community college policy makers in other states.

**Summary**

As the number of postsecondary institutions offering distance education increases (Bradburn, 2002; Hislop, 2001; Waits & Lewis, 2003), distance learning policy is appearing at federal, state and local levels (Carnevale, 2002; Jacobs & Grubb, 2003;
Maitland & Rhodes, 1999; Web-based Education Commission, 2000). Clauses addressing
distance education issues are being included in more community college faculty contracts
(HECAS, 2003; Maitland & Roads, 1999) and various educational organizations and
institutions are developing distance learning policy statements (Academic Senate for
California Community Colleges, 2000; American Association of University Professors
(AAUP), 1999; American Council on Education, 2000; Commission on Colleges, 2000;
San Diego State University Senate, 2000).

Distance learning is changing the way community colleges and the students and
faculty within them operate (Bates, 2000; Burgess, 1994; Farrington & Yoshida, 2000;
Oblinger et al., 2001; Rogers, 2000; Willis, 2000), and existing policy and contract
language is being reexamined in order to provide clarity (Academic Senate for California
Community Colleges, 2000; Alfred, 2003; Bates, 2000; Beaudoin, 2003; Duderstadt,
1997; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998; Graves, 1997; Hanna, 1998; Knowles, 2002;
Turoff, 1997; Ubel, 2001; Van Dusen, 1997). As community colleges try to adapt to the
demands brought about by distance learning technologies many, many have become part
of a distance learning consortium or have cooperated in offering courses through a virtual
college (Dalziel, 2003; Feasley, 2003; Oblinger et al., 2001).
Research Design

The goal of the dissertation was to develop a resource that will assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. To achieve the goal, the investigator explored the multiple effects of distance learning on faculty contractual requirements and policy issues. Survey research methods (Wiersma, 2000) were utilized to collect data. According to Krathwohl (1998), research is a creative endeavor. Research methods can and should be combined in a way that best suits the study being conducted and in a way that will ensure that the results of the study can be convincingly presented. Krathwohl warned against confining research methodology to specific approaches. Method should be determined by the research questions. The descriptive survey design of this study was structured around the following research questions.

Research Questions

1. How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college affected full-time faculty?
2. What are the work conditions of distance learning faculty?
3. What requirements are associated with the different aspects of the job?
4. How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty?
5. What new policies must be added to contracts?
A review of the literature was conducted to explore and describe distance learning as it relates to two-year postsecondary educational institutions and the faculty within them. Of specific interest was the effect the practice of distance learning is having on the overall labor conditions of community college faculty. A copy of the latest HECAS software was used to analyze the bargaining contracts of two-year postsecondary institutions. The FCCS has an active distance learning consortium. At the August 2002 meeting of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium an announcement was made and support for this study was solicited. Interest in the study was generated, and two consortium members agreed to provide assistance with the study.

Following the literature review, a questionnaire was developed to answer the research questions left unanswered by the literature review. Wiersma’s flowchart (2000, p. 168), titled Sequential Activities of a Questionnaire Survey, was used as a procedural guide. Input was solicited from administration, faculty, and staff. An expert committee of three faculty members and two administrators was utilized to assist in constructing the items for the questionnaire survey and in reviewing the associated correspondence. Members of the expert committee are educators employed at a Florida community college with a background that includes the use of distance learning technologies.

A letter containing an invitation to participate in the study (See Appendix F) was delivered to the 28 community college representative members of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium via e-mail and by U.S. postal mail. The participation letter contained a link to the Web-based survey. Survey responses were returned by Web or, in cases where technologies did not support Web submission, by U.S. postal mail.
The returned surveys were tabulated and the results were submitted in a formal
dissertation report. It is anticipated that the results of the study will be published in the
Policy area of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium Web page
(http://www.fldlc.org/consortnav/con_frame.htm). The results of this research laid the
foundation for the creation of a resource that will assist Florida community college
leaders, both faculty and administrators, in formulating distance learning policy.

Specific Procedures

An initial review of the literature was conducted to determine which of the
research questions could be answered. The literature review revealed that course and
programs offerings in a distance format are increasing at community colleges in the
United States, in general, and in Florida, in particular. While the FCCS provides detailed
data regarding faculty, both adjunct and full-time, employed in the system (The Fact
Book, 1999-2004), the data do not include any indication of the number of faculty
teaching at a distance nor the percentage of workload involved. The first research
question is quantitative in nature and required a series of survey items. The second and
third research questions regarding faculty work conditions affected by distance learning
were answered in the literature review. In regard to the fourth and fifth research
questions, the literature contains examples of instances where traditional contracts and
policies have proven to be inconsistent with the changing roles and responsibilities of the
distance faculty member. Survey items were drafted to locate other instances. The
literature review revealed that there is no central repository for distance learning policy.
The 28 Florida community colleges act individually in the development of distance
learning policy. Requests for input from members of the FDLC have been expressed in
some of the FDLC meeting minutes. The development of a central repository for distance learning policy would be a valuable tool that would allow distance learning policymakers to share policy developed at their institutions.

In August of 2002, the researcher attended a meeting of the FDLC. On this occasion, she was introduced to the members, and consequently, was given the opportunity to briefly describe her study. Several members indicated their interest in the published results of the study. Support for the study was obtained from FDLC members Russ Adkins and Celeste Beck.

On November 17, 2003, the research proposal was submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Nova Southeastern University. Approval was granted December 15, 2003. (See Appendix B).

In the fall of 2002 a committee of experts was formed to assist in creating and validating a survey instrument that would answer the research questions that could not be addressed in the literature review. The committee of experts was composed of two administrators and three faculty members. The faculty members of the committee of experts were chosen based on their experience in the following areas: faculty senate experience, union experience, and experience teaching at a distance. The members of the committee of experts included:

- Russ Adkins is the Associate Vice President of Instructional Technology at Broward Community College. He has been working at the community college level for 15 years including a stint at Daytona Beach Community College, in addition to his current position at Broward Community College. He is Broward Community College’s representative in the FDLC.
• Celeste Beck is the Provost for Palm Beach Community College, South Campus, in Boca Raton. She has been working at the community college level for 23 years. She is in charge of distance learning college wide and is Palm Beach Community College’s representative in the FDLC.

• Robert Buford is an Associate Professor of Speech and Drama. He is an active union member, and the Instructional Technology Handheld Technology Associate at Broward Community College. His teaching career at Broward Community College spans 21 years and he has taught Educational Technology for Florida Atlantic University as an adjunct for the past 18 years.

• Sharon Rifkin is an Associate Professor of Social/Behavioral Sciences/Education and the Instructional Technology E-Learning Associate at Broward Community College. Her experience at the community college level experience includes 11 years as an adjunct and 13 years as a full-time faculty member. She has been a member of the faculty senate for 10 years. Sharon has developed online courses and has taught fully-online, Web-assisted, and hybrid-model courses.

• Mary Tellow is the program Manager for the Health Information Management (Medical Records) Program. Her experience at the community college level includes 15 years as a full-time instructor and 2 years as an adjunct. Her courses are at least web-enhanced with some being fully online. The Health Information Management Program is an early adopter of the Palm initiative; first and second year students, as well as adjuncts, are participating.

The initial survey instrument was developed by the researcher. A meeting with Eileen Holden, Academic Vice President, and Theodore Wright, Institutional Research
director, was arranged to discuss the initial survey items. The initial survey items were examined, the vocabulary reviewed, and survey items were revised. Lesley Higgins, Director of Personnel Operations, reviewed the survey and made suggestions on the content, specifically the vocabulary, in an effort to make the survey easier to understand and to complete and thereby increase the response rate (Wiersma, 2000). The modified survey and accompanying cover letter were then submitted to the expert committee for content validation, which resulted in further revisions.

A Web-based version of the survey was developed by David Shulman, Director of Learning Technology at Broward Community College. The survey is professional in appearance, easy to read, and attractive. These are traits which, according to Dillman (2000) and Wiersma (2000), will increase the response rate.

The Web-based survey was alpha tested by a variety of administrators, faculty members, and staff members. In an effort to assure platform, browser and e-mail system compatibility, the alpha tests were conducted on computers located in the home and in the office. Both MAC and PC platforms were used in the alpha tests. Netscape and Internet Explorer browsers were employed with AOL, Groupwise, and Yahoo e-mail systems. These alpha tests proved useful in that some common human-computer interface issues were identified and the problems were resolved.

The survey was beta tested by an FDLC member from one of Florida’s smallest community colleges and by a staff member from one of Florida’s largest community colleges. The beta testers were asked, via e-mail (see Appendix C), to complete the survey and to answer questions regarding their experience. Beta testing revealed the need to provide a back-up method for submitting the survey in instances where browser
versions do not support the submission of the web-based survey. To solve this problem, the survey design was reprogrammed to direct the participant to print the survey before submitting. Instructions were added to the survey to direct the participant to use the self-addressed, stamped envelope sent in the cover letter received via U.S. mail in the event electronic submission was unsuccessful. Beta testers reported that while they had to wait a week or two for the requested information, they were able to gather the information needed to complete the survey. The beta testers found the survey directions and the questions asked to be clear and easy to understand (see Appendix D).

The validity of survey research is greatly affected by response rate and quality of response. The minimum acceptable response rate for surveying a professional population is 70% (Wiersma, 2000). In addition to developing a well designed survey, there are other things that can be done to improve response rate, including, precontacting participants with a non-personalized pre-letter prior to sending the questionnaire. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2000, p. 377) and Wiersma (2000, p. 173) the participants are much more likely to respond if the study is endorsed by someone who is associated with the participants. John Opper, Executive Director of the Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium, was asked to send a pre-letter and thereby show endorsement for the study. The researcher sent a second pre-letter three days later (See Appendix E).

The survey cover letter (See Appendix F) has been designed for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval by using a standard research protocol (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; Krathwohl, 1998; Wiersma, 2000). Participants were informed why they had been selected, what was to be done with the information provided, how their confidentiality
would be assured, the deadline for participation, how to contact the researcher for further information, directions for participation, and an offer to share the results of the study. The cover letter was delivered to the 28 community college representative members of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium via e-mail and by U.S. postal mail. Content for both versions was the same; both contained a link to the Web-based survey. Survey responses were returned by the Web. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided in the event that technologies did not support Web submission.

Following standard guidelines for follow-up procedures ((Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; Wiersma, 2000), a follow-up letter (See Appendix G) was sent to non respondents to arrive a few days after the deadline date specified in the cover letter. The suggestion was made by an expert committee member to remove from the cover letter the request for a printed submission. The request for a printed submission and the response deadline were omitted from the follow-up letter and the letter was sent via e-mail only. Subsequent contacts were made to non respondents by e-mail and by phone in an attempt to increase the response rate.

Participants

Wiersma (2000) suggested using a purposeful sample in cases where there is no assumption that members of the population are equivalent data sources. In purposeful sampling, also known as purposive sampling (Parker, 1997), the researcher uses judgment to select participants who are deemed to be knowledgeable in the subject area being researched. The 28 community college representatives of the FDLC were selected to participate in this study because they are believed to possess the most knowledge about the subject at hand. The positions and experiences of these participants varied greatly.
They include, but were not limited to, provost, instructor, dean, and director. The common factor was that each representative is the spokesperson for the distance learning initiatives occurring at their institution.

**Instrumentation**

Since the review of the literature did not yield any studies regarding the effect of distance learning on faculty contract and policy issues, a survey instrument was developed specifically for this study (See Appendix H). The survey instrument includes 13 items that were developed using the literature review and suggestions from the expert committee. Both open-ended and selected-response formats were utilized, and general guidelines for item construction (Wiersma, 2000) were followed.

Items one through eight were developed to explore how many faculty members are teaching at a distance and the percentage of faculty workload comprised of distance courses. Since adjunct/fulltime faculty ratios are mentioned in the literature as a faculty contract and policy issue affected by distance learning, (Beaudin, 1998; Dirr, 2003; Knowles, 2002; Rivard, 2001; State Higher Education Executive Officers, 2000; Shek, 2001; Turoff, 1997) items were added that allowed for the inclusion of adjunct professors.

Items nine and 10 were designed in an attempt to discover whether, and if so, in what way distance learning is affecting the hiring practices for future community college instructors. The literature suggested that this might be a future development for community colleges, in general (Boettcher, 1999c; Charp, 1998; HECAS, 2003), and for at least one Florida community college, in particular (FDLC, 2002b).
Item 11 was designed to explore where faculty issues are discussed at the individual colleges. Item 12 was designed to explore where distance learning policy resides at the individual colleges. The responses to these items will aid in determining the steps that are necessary to develop a resource to assist community college policy makers to effectively address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. The responses will also be of aid in future research.

Item 13 was designed to determine how traditional contracts and policies are inconsistent with the changing roles and responsibilities of the distance faculty member. The first step in designing this item was to conceptualize and organize policy issues that have a direct affect on faculty. To do this, the works of Gellman-Danley and Fetzner (1998), Berge (1998), and King, Nugent, Russell, et al., (2000) were utilized to compile a list of policy issues and then to extrapolate those directly affecting faculty contracts and policies. For each policy issue listed, the survey participants were asked to indicate (using yes, no, or uncertain) whether policy exists for traditional delivery, whether policy exists for distance learning delivery, and whether policy for traditional delivery is the same as that for distance learning delivery. Areas of inconsistency will be indicated in instances where a separate policy has been developed for distance learning that is different than the policy developed for traditional learning.

Validity indicates the degree to which a particular measurement presents data that relate to conventional connotations of a specific concept (Babbie, 1995; Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000; Wiersma, 2000). Content validity was established by the expert committee members: Input was also solicited from Eileen Holden, Academic Vice President, and Theodore Wright, Institutional Research Director. Lesley Higgins, Director of Personnel
Operations was contacted to insure that the proper vocabulary, vocabulary familiar to those in the field, was used. Common procedures used for filling out surveys were discussed. Green et al (in Wiersma, 2000) found that response rates for populations consisting of educators were as much as a 30% higher than those of the general public. These higher response rates were attributed to a higher level of education and an experience with questionnaires. Higgins mirrored those findings with her assessment that it is common procedure for survey participants to forward surveys to relevant departments for information not in the original recipient’s field (Lesley Higgins, personal communication, March 15, 2002). Responses to questions asked of the beta testers (See Appendix D) revealed that survey participants were able to locate the appropriate persons in order to gather the necessary data.

**Resource Requirements**

The following resources were required to complete this study:

- Cooperation from members of the FDLC
- Cooperation of an Expert Panel
- Cooperation of a technician capable of designing a Web-based version of the survey instrument
- Space on a website to host the survey and the accompanying software necessary to submit and format the results
- Cooperation from Florida community college administrators
- Cooperation from Florida community college faculty
- A computer with Microsoft® Office 2003 installed
Summary

The methodology for this descriptive survey study followed the guidelines outlined by Wiersma (2000) for survey research. In this chapter, the first three steps in conducting a survey (planning, development and construction) were described. In the planning step, the research problem was defined and the cross-sectional survey design was developed. A review of the literature was conducted to explore and describe distance learning as it relates to two-year postsecondary educational institutions and the faculty within them. Of specific interest was the effect the practice of distance learning is having on the overall labor conditions of community college faculty. A copy of the latest HECAS software was used to analyze the bargaining contracts of two-year postsecondary institutions.

In the development step, the population was defined and a purposeful sample was selected. This sample consists of the 28 community college representative members of the FDLC. In the construction step, the questionnaire items were developed to answer the research questions left unanswered by the literature review. Wiersma’s flowchart (2000, p. 168), titled Sequential Activities of a Questionnaire Survey, was used as a procedural guide. Input was solicited from administration, faculty, and staff. A committee of experts was utilized to assist in constructing the items for the questionnaire survey. A Web-based version of the survey (See Appendix I) was developed. Alpha and beta tests were conducted (See Appendix E). The survey was sent via U.S. postal mail and e-mail to the 28 participants. The remaining steps (data collection, translation of data, analysis, and reporting the results) are discussed in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

This chapter contains a report of data collection, data translation, data analysis, and the findings derived through analysis. It also includes a brief explanation of how the data were collected. In addition, the techniques used for analyzing the data are described and the findings derived from the analysis are discussed.

As stated previously, the goal of this dissertation was to develop a resource that will assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. Based on the findings derived from analysis, a Web-based repository of distance learning policy has been developed. This chapter includes a description of the repository and ends with a brief summary of the results.

Data Collection and Translation

The survey instrument was located on the Web (http://209.15.105.158/legrand/index.html) for a period of ten weeks. The location was made available through a hyperlink contained in email and U.S. mailings sent to intended participants. Responses were submitted via the Web and received through email. Once received, the survey responses were reviewed by this researcher. In cases where data were missing or imprecise, respondents were contacted by phone and/or email in an attempt to collect missing data or to clarify existing data. Respondents, in turn, used the
phone and email to provide missing data, to clarify existing data, and, in some cases, to correct erroneous data they had provided. Of the 28 community colleges invited to participate, 25 responded, 19 of which were fully completed surveys, which resulted in response rates of 89% and 67%, respectively. These are acceptable response rates for surveying a professional population (Wiersma, 2000). Once received, the data were compiled, translated, and manually entered into an Excel spreadsheet file (See Appendix I) in preparation for analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Data collected from this survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics. There were six cases of item non-response. Cases of item non-response are expected in survey research and there are methods for coping with it (Kent, 2001). All of the surveys were entered into the data matrix (See Appendix I). To compensate for cases of item non-response, where necessary, the surveys were excluded from the calculations and the dataset size \((n)\) was adjusted and noted. An explanation of the nature and amount of item non-response and the procedures used to deal with it follows.

The first section of the survey (See Appendix H) contained eight open-ended questions. These questions were developed to explore the impact of distance learning on full-time faculty workload. In most cases, the respondents had to contact the appropriate person(s) for the information requested. Six cases of item non-response occurred in this section of the survey. Three of the respondents did not provide any of the information requested; therefore their responses were excluded from analysis in this section of the survey. For the remaining three cases, where appropriate, corresponding data was excluded from the particular calculations and the dataset size \((n)\) was adjusted and noted.
The second section of the survey contained a series of select-response questions. These questions were developed to explore policy issues related to distance learning. All of the respondents were able to provide the information requested (n=25) and there were no apparent cases of item-non response. A composite list of the responses is contained in the data matrix (See Appendix I).

Findings

The survey was designed to answer the research questions that could not be answered by a review of the literature. How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college impacted full-time faculty? How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty? The findings of this study guided the researcher in developing a resource that will assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to effectively address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning.

Characteristics of Responding Institutions

Responses were received from 25 of the 28 community colleges contacted. Both small and large institutions were represented. North Florida Community College and Florida Keys Community college are the smallest institutions in the FCCS in terms of student headcount reported for the Fall 2003 term (1,120 and 1,283, respectively) and number of full-time faculty (32 and 26 respectively). Miami Dade College is the largest institution with 58,490 students and 713 full-time faculty members. Broward Community College and Florida Community College follow with student headcounts of
32,030 and 25,692, respectively and full-time faculty of 330 and 353, respectively (The Fact Book, 2004, pp 18, 72). Eight of the 10 colleges with faculty unions responded.

_The Impact of Distance Learning on Faculty Workload_

The first survey question asked for the number of classes offered at the college for the Fall 2003 term, beginning August 2003 and ending December 2003. _Class_ was defined in the survey instructions as any course section for which a course reference number is assigned. A total of 38,638 classes were offered by the responding community colleges (n=19) for the Fall 2003 term. Pasco-Hernando Community College (PHCC) does not assign reference numbers to classes and provided the following comment: “Section numbers are assigned to credit (college and technical), continuing education, high school dual enrollment and GED/ABE courses. Therefore, the count of sections includes all of these.” PHCC’s classes were included in the total of 38,638.

A total of 2,830 classes were offered by 23 of the responding community colleges in a distance learning format for the Fall 2003 term. After excluding six surveys to compensate for item-non response, 6% of the classes at the responding community colleges (n=19) were offered in a distance learning format (2,346 divided by 38,638). The percentages varied widely from college to college. Brevard Community College had the highest (25%) with 300 of its 1,200 classes offered in a distance learning format. Pensacola Junior College had the lowest (2%) with 48 of its 2,400 classes offered in a distance learning format.

The third survey question asked how many full-time faculty members were employed at the institution. The fourth survey question asked how many adjunct faculty members were employed at the institution. These questions were developed to determine
the fulltime/adjunct faculty ratios at the community colleges. A total of 3,622 (28%) fulltime faculty and 9,365 (72%) adjunct faculty were employed by the responding community colleges (n=20) in the fall of 2003. The FT/A ratio reported by the FCCS (n=28) for the same period was 78/22 (The Fact Book, 2004).

The fifth survey question asked how many full-time faculty members were teaching distance learning classes. The sixth survey question asked how many adjunct faculty members were teaching distance learning classes. These questions were developed to determine the FT/A faculty ratios for faculty teaching in the distance learning format. A total of 1,366 faculty were teaching distance courses (n=22) with a FT/A ratio of 66/34. In order to compare the distance learning FT/A ratio with the aggregate FT/A ratio mentioned above, two surveys were excluded to compensate for item non-response, bringing the FT/A to 68/32 (n=20). This distance learning faculty ratio of 68/32 differs widely from the aggregate faculty ratio of 28/72 (See Figure 2).

Figure 2- Comparison of Aggregate and Distance Learning FT/A Ratios (n=20)
While there were four colleges that reported distance learning FT/A faculty ratios with a greater number of adjuncts (Brevard Community College, 40/60; Florida Keys Community College, 35/65; Lake City Community College, 45/55; Lake-Sumter Community College, 40/60), the remaining 18 colleges reported distance learning FT/A faculty ratios with a greater number of full-time faculty with FT/A ratios varying from 100/0 at North Florida Community College, Polk Community College, and St. John’s Community College to 53/47 at Florida Community College @ Jacksonville.

Of the 3,622 fulltime faculty employed at the responding community colleges (n=20), 762 are teaching distance courses. Distance Learning has a direct affect on 21% of the fulltime faculty employed at Florida’s community colleges. That number climbs as high as 85% and 68% at Gulf Coast Community College and Chipola College, respectively, and as low as 8% and 6% at Lake-Sumter Community College and Miami-Dade College, respectively.

The seventh survey question asked how many distance learning classes (as reported in the second question) were being taught by full-time faculty. The eighth survey question asked how many distance learning classes (as reported in the second question) were being taught by adjunct faculty. Of the 2,791 distance learning classes offered by the responding community colleges (n=22) in the Fall 2003 term, 1,773 (64%) were taught by full-time faculty, 860 (31%) were taught by adjuncts, and 134 (5%) were taught by persons that were not classified as adjunct or full-time. Daytona Beach Community College reported: “55 people teaching the courses are not full-time instructors nor adjuncts. They are full-time employees classified as administrators, career employees, or professionals who are not considered adjuncts or full-time instructors.”
PHCC reported: “79 Internet sections are taught by ed2go. These continuing education sections have PHCC section numbers, but students pay a fee which PHCC uses to purchase the services of ed2go. It handles the instruction and orientation. Therefore, the instruction is conducted by neither PHCC’s full-time nor its adjunct faculty.”

After excluding three surveys to compensate for item non-response (n=22), 903 full-time faculty members were teaching 1,773 distance learning classes, for an average workload of 1.96 distance learning classes per full-time faculty member teaching distance courses. This workload varied by college from a reported high of 4.17 at Florida Keys Community College to a low of 1.0 at Gulf Coast Community College.

The average workload for adjunct faculty teaching distance courses was slightly lower. The 860 distance classes offered were taught by 463 adjunct faculty members, resulting in an average workload of 1.86 distance learning classes per adjunct faculty member (n=22). This workload varied by college from a high of 3.83 at Okaloosa-Walton Community College to a low of 1.0 at Chipola College, Gulf Coast Community College, and PHCC and 0 at North Florida Community College, Polk Community College and St. John’s Community College.

The Impact of Distance Learning on Faculty Policy Issues

The second section of the survey contained questions dealing with policy. The questions were select response with, in some cases, an opportunity to clarify. There were no instances of item non-response in this section of the survey.

Survey Questions nine and 10 asked if the job descriptions (minimum qualifications and experience) used for hiring faculty changed as a result of adding
distance learning course delivery to the course delivery options offered by the institution.

Thirteen answered no. Seven answered yes with the following explanations:

“Knowledge of [Learning Management System] LMS is essential”

“Faculty teaching online must have training in online teaching (as a student through LERN and a course on learning management system) to be certified for online teaching.”

“Require ability to use technology instructionally”

“Our faculty evaluations now include a criterion for appropriate use of technology. This is in response to a general increase in technology, not just to distance learning.”

“We require all faculty to present a teaching lesson using technology”

“And future faculty hired must be able and willing to teach via distance learning.”

Five answered “under consideration” with four giving the following explanations:

“New approaches to meeting state requirements first and then student needs”

“Individual departments are requiring those skills according to their needs in that area”

“Just beginning to formalize many issues surrounding DE”

“Technology skills have been included in some requirements and a very few have included skills in distance ed. It is often talked about, but not often really implemented.”

When asked where faculty issues were discussed within their institution, 17 of the responding community colleges listed a faculty senate or faculty council; eight listed a faculty union. Four of the responding community colleges were represented by both a faculty senate and a faculty union. Four of the responding community colleges’ faculty were represented by neither a faculty senate nor a faculty union, but by the following:
"technology committee and in faculty negotiations", "college senate", "college wide council", and "faculty meetings."

Participants were asked in what publication(s) would policy relating to distance learning be located at the institution. Twenty-three of the community colleges indicated at least one source for written distance learning policy. The remaining two offered the following comments: "Very little to find -- currently in the process of being codified in a DE Handbook" and "There is almost no written policy re distance ed."

Seventeen of the respondents indicated that distance learning policy would be found in the Policy and Procedures Manual. Five indicated that the distance learning policy would be found in the union contract. (Compare to eight colleges that reported having a faculty union in the previous question). Eight indicated that the distance learning policy would be found in an employee or faculty handbook. Other sources provided included: a virtual college handbook or policy manual (2), a distance learning plan (2), a distance learning handbook or policy manual (3), and a distance education website. Brevard, where it was reported that 25% of its classes are offered in a distance learning format, had the highest number (four) of sources listed for distance learning policy. Miami-Dade, Okaloosa-Walton, and Palm Beach each listed three sources for distance learning policy.

Survey Question 13 consisted of a list of 17 policy issues and a space for respondents to type in a policy issue. Survey participants were directed to select the appropriate response (Uncertain, Yes, or No) to indicate whether or not policy in the area listed exists at their institution for traditional delivery and/or for distance learning.
delivery and whether policy for traditional delivery was the same as policy for distance learning delivery (See Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy exists for traditional delivery</th>
<th>Policy exists for distance learning delivery</th>
<th>Policy for traditional same as policy for distance learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Rewards (e.g., stipends, promotion &amp; tenure, merit increases, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Opportunities to learn about technology and new applications (e.g., release time, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 Intellectual property (e.g., ownership of materials, copyright, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3– Survey Question No. 13

Responses to Question 13.1 – 13.17 were coded and recorded in the data matrix (See Appendix I) for analysis. “Yes” was entered for a selection of yes; “no” was entered for a selection of no; “un” was entered for a selection of uncertain. The responses for whether “policy exists for distance learning delivery” were counted and tabulated and are presented in Table 1, sorted by highest number of yes responses.

The responses for distance learning policy were compared to the responses for traditional policy and the response for traditional same as distance. The data matrix was examined for response combinations showing policy for distance delivery that is the same as policy for traditional (yes/yes/yes) and they were color coded. The yes/yes/yes response combinations were counted and tabulated and are presented in Table 1 Response combinations showing policy for distance delivery that is different from policy for traditional delivery (yes/yes/no or no/yes/no) would indicate areas wherein policy has been modified or new policy has been created to accommodate the new roles and
responsibilities of distance learning faculty. The data matrix was examined for response combinations of yes/yes/no and no/yes/no. These combinations were color coded (See Appendix I). They were then counted and tabulated and are presented in Table 1.

### Policy Exists for Distance Learning Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q #</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
<th>n = 25</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>Class Size Limits</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Office Hour Definition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Course Development Compensation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Faculty Training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Intellectual Property/Copyrights</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Faculty/Student Interaction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Professional Development Rewards</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>Course Delivery Compensation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Testing Requirements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>New-Hire Requirements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>Response Time Limits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>Course Update Compensation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>DL Program Offering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Policy Exists for Distance Learning

When asked whether distance learning policy regarding class size limits exists, 18 of the responding community colleges (n=25) answered yes, meaning the policy for distance learning does exist at their institution. Three answered no, meaning the policy for distance learning does not exist at their institution. Four answered they were uncertain whether the policy for distance learning exist at their institution. Six indicated that the policy that existed for distance learning was different than the policy that existed for
traditional delivery and seven answered that the policy that existed for distance learning was the same as the policy that existed for traditional delivery.

An examination of the data in Table 1 reveals where traditional policy is being used for distance learning policy and where policy is being changed or created to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance learning faculty. The policy areas at the top of the list with the most activity are: class size limits, office hour definition, rewards, workload and course development compensation. In these areas, a majority of the responding community colleges have created written policy and 25% have either created policy or modified existing policy to accommodate distance learning.

There are two policy areas where traditional policy is being used in the distance learning arena. Fourteen of the respondents have distance learning policy for intellectual property/copyrights. Twelve of those report that the distance learning policy is the same as the traditional. Thirteen of the respondents have distance learning policy for professional development rewards (defined as opportunities to learn about technology and new applications, such as, release time, etc). Twelve of those reported that the distance learning policy is the same as the traditional policy.

While there were only six responding community colleges claiming to have distance learning policy for response time limits (for faculty to respond to student inquires), four of them reported that their policy for distance learning delivery was different than the policy for traditional delivery. This is clearly an area where policy is being rewritten to address the new paradigm.

While Table 1 shows in what areas policy for distance learning delivery has been created, it does not show what the policy is or which of the institutions created it. This
information would be useful in assisting community college leaders to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. In an effort to provide such a resource, the researcher has developed a Web-based repository for distance learning policy. This central repository would allow policymakers to share policy developed at their institutions.

**Designing the Repository**

The repository website was designed using the Microsoft® Office 2003 Suite. The design is that of a data matrix with 28 columns and 34 rows. The column headings consist of the names of Florida's 28 community colleges. The row headings consist of distance learning policy questions (See Appendix J) that were designed based on the results of the survey and a review of the literature. The expert committee members were contacted for input and changes were made based on their recommendations. The revised repository was submitted to the expert committee and final approval was received.

The repository website is currently located at [www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository](http://www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository). This website consists of a welcome page (See Appendix K) and the repository (See Appendix L). The welcome page contains an introduction to the site, instructions for using the repository, and a link to the repository ([www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository](http://www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository)). The FDLC will host the repository once the information contained in it has been verified by the responding consortium members.

The information provided in the repository can be shared among the community colleges and thereby provide a valuable resource. The first three questions are demographic in nature: date of last update, contact name and email address, and location (a link, if possible) of actual policy. In some cases, where short answers can be provided
and are useful, requests for policy are made. In cases where policy would be too long to post, the question of whether distance learning policy exists is asked. If policy exists and a policy link provided, viewers could access the link and view the actual policy.

**Summary**

In this chapter, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data collected from the survey. Surveys were sent to the 28 Florida community colleges; responses were received from 25 for an acceptable response rate of 89% (Wiersma, 2000). The objective of the survey was to answer the research questions that could not be answered in the literature review and to use that information to design a resource that addresses faculty policy and contractual issues related to distance learning. The research questions being addressed by the survey were: How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college impacted full-time faculty? How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty? What new policies must be added to contracts?

The proliferation of distance learning at the community college is evidenced by the fact that 6% of the classes offered at Florida’s community colleges in the Fall 2003 term were offered in a distance learning format. The percentage at the individual colleges ranged from 2% to as high as 25%. The impact on full-time faculty is that in the Fall 2003 term, 21% of the full-time faculty at Florida’s community colleges taught a distance course. At some of the individual colleges, the impact was even greater, with 85% and 68%. Distance learning has also had a noticeable effect on faculty workload. The average distance course load was 1.96 (40% of the required course load) for the full-time faculty member and 1.86 for the adjunct. On a statewide basis, the impact can be
seen in the differing FT/A ratios. The FT/A ratio for distance courses was 68/32 compared to 28/72 for all courses.

Faculty policies and contracts are being impacted by distance learning. As a result of adding distance learning courses, some of the colleges surveyed have made or are considering making changes to the job descriptions used for hiring faculty. Distance learning policy is appearing in policy and procedures manuals, and faculty handbooks. Some of the colleges have created distance learning policy manuals and distance learning faculty handbooks. In addition, language on distance learning issues is appearing in union contracts.

Some of the colleges are still in the process of creating distance learning policy. For these colleges and for colleges modifying existing policy, the central repository of distance learning policy will provide an opportunity to explore how others are dealing with the impact that distance learning is having on policy and contract issues.
Chapter 5
Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations, and Summary

In this chapter the conclusions of this study are stated, implications are discussed, and recommendations for further research are presented. The chapter ends with a summary of the entire study.

Conclusions

The purpose of the researcher in this study was to investigate the impact of distance learning on faculty contracts and policies in Florida community colleges in order to develop a resource to assist Florida community college leaders in addressing faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning. To achieve this goal, the researcher investigated the impact of distance teaching assignments on faculty contractual agreements, as well as how and where policy was being rewritten to address the new paradigm. A repository (www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository) was created as a resource to assist Florida community college leaders (both faculty and administration) to address faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning.

Based on the findings reported in this study, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. Distance learning course offerings have become widespread in the FCCS; 6% of the classes offered by the FCCS are in the distance learning format. The percentage ranged from 25% to 2% at the individual colleges.
2. A large number of faculty members are directly impacted by distance learning. Survey responses established that 21% of the full-time faculty employed at Florida community colleges are teaching distance courses.
3. The majority of faculty teaching distance courses are full-time. The survey responses established a distance faculty FT/A ratio of 68/32 compared to an aggregate faculty FT/A ratio of 28/72.

4. The majority of the distance learning classes offered in the FCCS are taught by full-time faculty. The average workload for full-time faculty members teaching distance courses is 1.96 distance learning classes per term. Adjunct faculty members showed a slightly lower workload of 1.86 distance learning classes per term.

5. Job descriptions (minimum qualifications and experience) used for hiring new faculty are changing in response to the addition of distance learning course offerings.

6. Existing policy and contract language is being examined and new language is being developed to accommodate distance learning. Distance learning policy is contained in over 50% of the surveyed colleges' policy and procedures manuals. Policy language is also being added to faculty union contracts. Some of the colleges are developing policy manuals specifically for distance learning.

7. Policy areas showing the highest impact by distance learning are: class size limits, office hour definition, rewards, workload, and course development. Survey responses established that in these policy areas, a majority of the responding community colleges have created written policy and 25% have either created policy or modified existing policy to accommodate distance learning.

8. Response time limits (for faculty to respond to student inquiries) is clearly an area where distance learning policy is being rewritten to address the new paradigm.

9. Currently, there is no central repository for distance learning policy at the community colleges.
Strengths, Weaknesses, and Limitations of the Study

The largest strength of this study was the support of the FDLC. Executive Director John Opper endorsed the study by sending a pre-contact letter (See Appendix E) to the survey participants. At two of the consortium meetings, Susie Henderson, Associate Executive Director, afforded the researcher the opportunity to briefly describe the study to the members. Two of the members, Celeste Beck and Russ Adkins, agreed to serve on a committee of experts to oversee the development of the survey instrument and the Web-based repository. Staff Assistant, Heather O’Connor, provided the names, phone numbers, addresses and e-mail addresses of the survey participants. Twenty-five of the 28 community college members of the FDLC responded to the survey.

Another strength was the initial enthusiasm with which the Web-based repository has been received by the FDLC. The repository currently resides at www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository. Upon viewing the repository, the FDLC has agreed to provide a link to the repository from the FDLC website.

The survey instrument used was developed specifically for this study. It was tested for content validity by the committee of experts. Alpha and beta tests were performed and internal validity was established. The survey responses revealed areas where clarification could be provided and the external validity of the instrument thereby strengthened.

The participants in this study were selected because they are believed to possess the most knowledge about the subject at hand. Each is a representative of the FDLC and the spokesperson for the distance learning initiatives occurring at their institution. The
positions and experiences of these participants varied greatly, as did their knowledge of the distance learning policy existing at their institution.

The usefulness of the results of this study, and the resulting Web-based distance learning repository, are limited by time. As the policy environment changes, the results will become outdated. To accommodate this inevitability, a recommendation will be made to the FDLC to repeat the study in a year and to encourage the community college members to update the data in the repository.

Implications

This study and the resulting Web-based distance learning repository have contributed to the knowledge of distance learning policy at community colleges, in general, and at Florida’s community colleges, in particular. It has contributed to the knowledge about the impact distance learning is having on faculty contracts and policies. The results of this study have indicated the institutions where distance learning policy has been developed and published. While too numerous to include in this report, the results have been assembled in a Web-based repository of distance learning policy existing at Florida’s community colleges. The repository is a resource that will allow policymakers to share their work and will assist community college leaders, both faculty and administrators, in formulating distance learning policy at their respective institutions.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Future Research

This research focused on the impact of distance learning on faculty contracts and policy in the community college setting. The scope was broad and included only policy
that has been developed and published. There are many areas of distance learning policy
development that warrant a closer look. Recommendations for further research include:

1. A follow-up study conducted yearly: What are the trends? How many distance
learning courses will be offered in the future? How many faculty members will be
needed? What type of faculty will be needed, adjunct or full-time?

2. Research on policy regarding class size limits set for distance courses: Are class size
limits different for the distance course? How should class limits be assessed? Does
class size affect quality? What are the issues to be considered?

3. Research on policy regarding classroom hours, student contact hours, and instructor
office hours: How will these units of measurement be defined in the distance
environment?

4. Research on teacher education: Should distance learning be an added component of
the curriculum for education majors?

5. Research on student perceptions regarding distance courses: How do students view
distance courses? What is a student’s definition of office hours and classroom hours?
What is the student’s perception of and views on class size in the distance course?

6. Research on how distance learning is changing the teaching profession in the post
secondary educational arena: Will distance teaching experience be a requirement for
new hires? What technological skills will be required of new hires? Will existing
faculty be able to maintain their positions as traditional instructors? Will voluntary
distance course scheduling be phased out in the next five or ten years? What
technological skills will be required of existing faculty in the next five or ten years?
community college faculty member must maintain a weekly schedule that contains a minimum of 15 classroom contact hours. A classroom contact hour is defined as "a regularly scheduled classroom activity of not less than 50 minutes in a course of instruction which has been approved by the board of trustees of the community college."

Policy 8 of the Florida Community College System Guidelines and Procedures Manual (Division of Community Colleges, 1988) states that a minimum of 10 posted office hours must be added to the faculty member's weekly schedule.

The potential change in faculty roles and responsibilities brought about by distance learning has raised questions about the impact distance learning will have on overall labor conditions for American faculty (Berg, 2000; Turoff, 1997; Nobel, 2002). In some instances, the use of alternative methods of delivering educational services has resulted in inconsistent policies (Auditor General, 2001). Labor issues such as intellectual property and copyright, workload, professional development, office hours, class size, and contact hours are being reviewed, and, in many cases, revised, to accommodate the largely anytime/anyplace online approach to learning (HECAS, 2003; Maitland & Rhodes, 1999; Smith, 1997). The adoption of rapidly evolving technologies which allow educational institutions to offer courses at a distance is causing those institutions to reexamine their policies and procedures (Ashery, 2001; Bates, 2000; Hanna, 1998; Knowles, 2002). Gellman-Danley and Fetzner (1998) listed consistency with union contracts as a key policy issue to be addressed.

Although there is abundant research in the area of distance education, little of it is in the area of distance education policy (King, Nugent, Eich, et al., 2000) or faculty issues regarding distance learning (Bradburn, 2002; Phipps & Merisotis, 1999). The goal
The results further indicated that faculty policy and contracts have been modified and developed to accommodate distance learning. Policy and contractual language pertaining to distance learning is appearing in policy and procedure manuals, union contracts, and faculty handbooks. In some cases, separate policy manuals are being developed specifically for distance learning.

Distance learning is affecting the hiring practices for future community college instructors. When asked whether job descriptions (minimum qualifications and experience) used for hiring new faculty are changing in response to the addition of distance learning course offerings, PHCC responded (See Appendix J) with “Any future faculty hired must be able and willing to teach via distance learning.” The literature suggested that this might be a future development for community colleges, in general (Boettcher, 1999c; Charp, 1998; HECAS, 2003) and for at least one other Florida community college, in particular (FDLC, 2002b). While established guidelines and initial contract language support voluntary distance course teaching assignments (Distance Education: Guidelines for Good Practice, 2000; HECAS, 2003; Phipps & Merisotis, 2000;), contract language is appearing that will leave the door open for what some faculty fear may become inevitable: a requirement to teach a distance course in order to fill an instructor’s load (Oblinger et al., 2001).

The policy areas receiving the most attention are: class size limits, office hour definition, rewards, workload and course development compensation. In these areas, a majority of the responding community colleges have created written policy and 25% have either created policy or modified existing policy to accommodate distance learning. In the policy areas of intellectual property/copyrights and professional development
rewards, over 50% of the respondents reported policy existed; and nearly 100% of those reporting the existence of policy reported that the distance learning policy was the same as the traditional policy. The policy area of response time limits (for faculty to respond to student inquiries) is an area for which policy is being rewritten to accommodate distance learning.

The literature review and the results of the survey were used to design a Web-based distance learning policy repository (www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repository). The repository is a dynamic collection of distance learning policy developed at the 28 community colleges. The repository includes policy collected from the survey results, as well as policy culled from the literature review. The dynamic nature of the Web allows the design and the content of the repository to be changed as warranted. The repository will be a useful resource for community college leaders addressing faculty policy and contractual issues as they relate to distance learning.

This study has contributed to our knowledge of distance learning policy at community colleges, in general, and Florida’s community colleges, in particular. The repository will allow the contribution to continue to grow as policy is added and shared among colleges in Florida and colleges in other states.
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Student Correspondence

From: <thayes@broward.cc.fl.us>
To: <thayes@broward.cc.fl.us>
Date: 2/17/2002 10:23:40 PM
Subject: Information

I would like to register myself for the CGS1061C ref # 252049.
When I've tried to enroll for this course I've got the message that the Class is full.
It got me lost once I had thought that was an online course. If so how can the class be full?
If you could please be so kind and let me know anything about I'd appreciate it.
I thank you in advance.

From: Terri Hayes
To: <thayes@broward.cc.fl.us>
Date: 2/18/2002 8:05:08 AM
Subject: CGS1061C Ref #252049

The class is full as you discovered. Online courses, like traditional face-to-face-classes, have class limits. This is to the students' benefit to assure that online students receive the same feedback and attention from the instructor as traditional students.

Prof. Theresa Hayes
Office Systems Technology
Broward Community College
954-963-8843
Appendix B

Institutional Review Board Research Protocol Submission and Approval

Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (IRB) Submission Form

To be completed by IRB/Center/College Representative:

Date Received ____________________________
Representative _______________________________________________________

*Protocol Number ___________________________________________________________________________
*(To be assigned by the Office of Grants & Contracts)

Protocol Qualifies for: Full Review ___ Expedited Review ___ Exemption ___

Instructions: In order to comply with federal regulations as well as to conform with
guidelines of the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB), the principal investigator
is required to complete all of the following items contained in the Submission Form and
the IRB Protocol. Upon completion of all information, the principal investigator must
submit the original Submission Form and one copy of the IRB Protocol, including all
consent forms and research instruments (questionnaires, interviews, etc.) to the
appropriate IRB College/ Center Representative for review and action. Once reviewed
and signed off by the Center Representative, the principal investigator is responsible for
submitting the original Submission Form along with 22 copies of the Submission Form,
IRB Protocol, and consent forms to the Office of Grants and Contracts. In addition, one
copy of all research instruments (questionnaires, interviews, etc.) must be submitted to
the Office of Grants and Contracts. The completed package must be received by the
Office of Grants and Contracts by the last business day of the month prior to the next
scheduled IRB meeting. The Office of Grants and Contracts' web site should be consulted
for IRB meeting dates. Incomplete forms may delay review by the IRB. For further
information, refer to the Policy and Procedure Manual for Research with Human
Subjects.

I. General Information

A. Project Title The Impact of Distance Learning on Faculty Contracts and Policies
in Florida Community Colleges

New Yes Continuation/Renewal_____ Revision_____
Proposed Start Date January 10, 2004
Proposed Duration of Research Two Months
Performance Site(s) A survey packet containing a cover letter explaining the
study and the research questionnaire will be sent to the participants. The same will
be sent via e-mail.
B. Principal Investigator Kate LeGrand
   Faculty _____ Staff _____ Student Yes
   Center/College/Department SCIS
   Home Mailing Address 5409 Jackson Street
   City Hollywood State FL Zip 33021
   Home Phone Number 954-983-1163
   Office Phone Number 954-201-8966
   Co-Investigator(s) None

Principal Investigator's Signature Kate LeGrand Date November 17, 2003

II. Funding Information
If this protocol is part of an application to an outside agency, please provide:
   A. Source of Funding ________________________________
   B. Project Title (if different from above)____________________
   C. Principal Investigator (if different from above)___________
   D. Type of Application:
   E. Grant _____ Subcontract _____ Contract _____ Fellowship_____ 
   F. Date of Submission ________________________________

III. Cooperative Research
Cooperative research projects are those that involve more than one institution and can be designed to be both multi-site and multi-protocol in nature. Each participating institution is responsible for safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects and for complying with all regulations. If this proposal has been submitted to another Institutional Review Board please provide:
   Name of Institution ________________________________
   Date of Review ________ Contact Person __________________
   IRB Recommendation __________________________________

IV. Subject/patient Information
   A. Types of Subjects/Patients (check all that apply)
      Fetus in Utero/non-viable fetuses/abortuses
      Newborns/Infants
      Children (aged 2-12)
      Adolescents (aged 13-18)
      Adults (over 18)
      Pregnant Women
      Special populations (e.g., prisoners, mentally disabled)
      Specify ____________
   B. Other (Check all that apply)
      Use of investigational drugs or devices
Information to be collected may require special sensitivity (e.g. substance abuse, sexual behavior)

C. Number of Subjects/Patients  28

D. Approximate time commitment for each subject/patient  15-20 minutes

E. Compensation to subjects/patients : Yes_____ No X

F. Form (e.g. cash, taxi fare, meals) _____ Amount_____ 

V. Continuation or Renewals

A. Attach a copy of the original IRB protocol

B. Indicate all proposed changes in the IRB protocol affecting subjects

C. Progress Report

• Indicate the number of subjects entered in the study, including their group status, whether they are active or completed, the number of subjects still pending, and the time frame of subject participation.

• Indicate adverse or unexpected reactions or side effects that have occurred or are expected. If none, state none.

• Summarize the results of the investigation to date (in terms of subjects entered, in process, completed, and pending).

Attach consent form(s) to be used and indicate if any changes have been made.
Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (IRB)

Research Protocol

Description of Study

Purpose and Potential Benefits: Distance Learning (DL) is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in Florida community colleges. However, traditional faculty contractual requirements do not fit the gestalt of distance education. Labor issues such as intellectual property and copyright, workload, office hours, class size, and contact hours must all be reworked within the largely anytime/anyplace online approach to learning. The purpose of this investigation is to explore the multiple effects of distance learning on faculty contractual requirements and policy issues. By doing so, faculty and administrators can establish a proactive role and attempt to resolve issues before they adversely affect faculty work conditions and college funding.

Location of Study: A survey packet containing a cover letter explaining the study, the research questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire, will be mailed to the participants. Participants will also receive the cover letter via e-mail and will have the option of completing the survey online.

Dates of Study: January 10, 2004 - March 10, 2004

Subjects: The target population for this study will be faculty members and administrators working within Florida's Community Colleges.

Methods and Procedures: The following procedures outline the format to be used to design and distribute the survey instrument for this inquiry.

1. Determine which research questions cannot be answered by a review of the literature. The data needed to answer some of the research questions might not be accessible through a review of the literature. While the Florida Community College System does provide general information in its yearly publication of the Fact Book, detailed information regarding distance courses as a percentage of faculty workload will have to be gleaned elsewhere.

2. Develop a survey instrument to address the research questions. Once it has been determined which questions cannot be addressed by the literature review, a survey instrument will be developed. The expert committee will be utilized to help determine what areas need to be addressed. The survey instrument will be validated by the expert committee.

3. During the second week of January, 2003, the survey instrument will be sent to the appropriate person(s) within Florida's 28 community colleges. The expert committee will be utilized to help select the survey participants and the method for delivering the survey. Survey participants will be given two weeks to complete the survey.

4. Once the surveys have been completed, data will be collected and the results will be analyzed.

Participant Payments or Costs: None
Subject Confidentiality: Strict confidentiality will be maintained at all times. All reporting will be in the aggregate; names or colleges will not be used to identify individuals. The names of the subjects will not be used in reporting of information in publications or conference presentations. Subject anonymity and confidentiality will be protected at all times.

Potential Risks to Subjects: This research presents no foreseen risk to the subject for participating in this study.

Risk/Benefit Ratio (if required for funded project): Not applicable to this project

Informed Consent: By completing and returning the questionnaire, the participants will consent to participate in this study. This will be clearly stated in the cover letter that accompanies the questionnaire. Participants will be given the opportunity to contact the researcher if they have any questions about the study. Participants will be under no obligation to participate in this study, and will be able to withdraw at any time.
Kate,

After reviewing your IRB Submission Form and Research Protocol I have approved your proposed research for IRB purposes. Your research has been determined to be exempt from further IRB review based on the following conclusion:

Research using survey procedures or interview procedures where subjects' identities are thoroughly protected and their answers do not subject them to criminal and civil liability.

Please note that while your research has been approved, additional IRB reviews of your research will be required if any of the following circumstances occur:

1. If you, during the course of conducting your research, revise the research protocol (e.g., making changes to the informed consent form, survey instruments used, or number and nature of subjects).

2. If the portion of your research involving human subjects exceeds 12 months in duration.

Please feel free to contact me in the future if you have any questions regarding my evaluation of your research or the IRB process.

Dr. Cannady

-----------------------------------
James Cannady, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Graduate School of Computer and Information Sciences
Nova Southeastern University
954.262.2085
404.312.2374 (mobile phone)
<mailto: cannady@nova.edu> cannady@nova.edu

PGP public key fingerprint:
8169 6D03 680E EF6C 899C 8C42 B4A3 DC9F 9F6B 4075

-----------------------------------
Appendix C

Solicitation for Beta Test Participation

Dear ,

Thank you for offering to help (via Russ Adkins) with the beta testing of this survey. The survey instrument has been alpha tested and found to be mechanically sound. At this point, the survey instrument needs to be beta tested for internal validity. What I am requesting of you is the following:

Click on the link below, complete the survey and submit it.

Once you have submitted the survey, I am interested in knowing the following:

How much time did you spend completing the survey?
Did you experience any difficulties understanding any of the questions?
Did you experience any difficulties obtaining the information needed to complete the survey?

To begin the survey, click on the following hyperlink or copy the address into your web browser: http://209.15.105.158/legrand/index.html

If you have any questions about this request or the study involved, you can contact me by phone at 954-201-8966 (work), 954-937-1163 (cell), or by email klegrand@broward.edu.

Your help is greatly appreciated,

M. Kate LeGrand
Doctoral Candidate
Nova Southeastern University
Computing Technology in Education
From: [Redacted] >
To: 'Kate LeGrand' <klegrand@broward.edu>
Date: 10/27/2003 2:18:41 PM
Subject: RE: Dis. Lerng. Issues

Hi, Kate ...

I completed the survey today, but when I clicked the "submit" button, I kept getting a screen telling me that I need to complete all of the questions and it kept taking me back to the survey. I answered them all. Help?

To answer your questions below: I spent about 10 minutes actually completing the survey, but it took awhile for me to gather the information. I had to contact our Institutional Research person for help and it took her about a week to get back to me. Currently, we do not have any distance learning policies in place, but we are working on that this academic year. Therefore, most of my responses to that area were "no" or "uncertain." I understood the questions okay. The only minor thing I noticed was under the directions, you mentioned the "definitions above" and it should have been "definitions below." I didn't have any difficulties obtaining the information - it just took a little while.

I hope this helps! Good luck with your survey.
Hi Kate -

Hurray! The survey is submitted! Ultimately, I ended up speaking to HR, BG in Curriculum, and Eileen (on policy matters). FYI, the term policy was somewhat problematic. Sometimes there are procedures that are followed which may be approved by administration but which aren't necessarily part of the procedure manual. Hence, we took a rather broad definition of the term "policy".

In general, the survey was easy to fill out, however getting accurate info may be a challenge if person answering the survey does not have detailed knowledge about policies for traditional courses.

I forgot to check the box, but yes, I would appreciate getting a copy of the survey results when you are finished.

Good luck with the project.
Appendix E

Pre Contact Letters

Dear Friends,

We have been asked for our assistance and participation in a study of the policy implications of distance education for community colleges. Kate LeGrand, faculty member at Broward CC, is a PhD candidate at Nova working on a dissertation about the impact of distance education on faculty policies. Kate wishes to administer a web-based questionnaire to gather data. Her target is all 28 community college FDLC representatives. As she developed her survey, she used an "expert committee" that included Celeste Beck, Jessica Web and me. Her dissertation committee just gave her the green light to proceed with survey administration.

Your participation will have the benefit of assisting one of our faculty members in completing the requirements for the doctorate and helping everyone understand some of the outstanding policy problems we face as technology penetrates more and more of our instructional activity.

Attached to this message is a short abstract of the study's purpose. I hope you will take a few minutes and complete the forthcoming survey in support of Kate and contribute to a better understanding of these issues.

John H. Opper, Jr.
Executive Director
Florida Distance Learning Consortium
1753 W. Paul Dirac Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32310
Dear FDLC Member,

This email message is a follow-up to the email message sent by John Opper on April 12. In a few days you will receive an invitation, via e-mail and U.S. mail, to participate in an on-line survey regarding the impact of distance learning on faculty policy and contract issues in Florida community colleges. The purpose of this research is to explore how faculty policies and contracts are changing to accommodate distance learning. You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a member of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium, and as such, are in a position to provide the information requested.

This survey is part of a doctoral research project at Nova Southeastern University. While compensation cannot be offered for your participation, you may find the results of the survey to be of some value to you and your institution. A higher participation rate will increase the value of the study. I hope you will take the time to participate when you receive the survey.

Would you please reply to this email (no message needed) so that I can verify your email address and that you received this message.

Thank you in advance,

M. Kate LeGrand  
Doctoral Candidate  
Nova Southeastern University  
Computing Technology in Education
Appendix F

Survey Cover Letter

Dear FDLC Member:

As a doctoral student of Nova Southeastern University, I am conducting a study of the impact of distance learning on faculty contracts and policies in Florida community colleges. You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are a member of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium, and as such, are in a position to provide the information requested.

The purpose of this research is to explore how faculty polices and contracts are changing to accommodate distance learning. The focus of this study will be on the changes taking place and not on the pros or cons of those changes. Your participation is essential to this research. The enclosed survey consists of 13 questions. Once the requested information is gathered, it should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All responses will remain anonymous. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from this study.

This survey is part of a doctoral research project at Nova Southeastern University. While compensation cannot be offered for your participation, you may find the results of the survey to be of some value to you and your institution. A copy of the results will be provided at the participant's request. A higher participation rate will increase the value of the study. I hope you will take the time to participate.

This letter is being sent to you by e-mail and by U. S. mail. The contents of the letters are the same. The U. S. mail version includes a self-addressed stamped envelope to use for mailing a hardcopy of your completed survey as a backup to cover software/hardware configuration problems that may prevent electronic submission of your completed survey.

To begin the survey, click on the following hyperlink or copy the address into your Web browser: http://209.15.105.158/legrand/index.html. You may not have all the answers and may need to contact the appropriate persons for the information requested. Once you have completed the survey, you will be directed to print a hardcopy before electronically submitting the survey. Place the hardcopy in the enclosed envelope and place the envelope in the U.S. mail. After printing the survey, use the submit button to electronically submit your responses. Please submit the completed survey by May 15, 2004. If you have any questions about this study, contact Kate LeGrand, 954-201-8966 (work) or klegrand@broward.edu.

Thank you for your participation,

M. Kate LeGrand
Doctoral Candidate
Nova Southeastern University
Computing Technology in Education
Appendix G

Follow-up Letters

Dear FDLC Member:

This is a follow up to an email I sent you several weeks ago inviting you to participate in a study on the impact of distance learning on faculty contracts and policies in Florida community colleges, which is part of a study that I am conducting as a doctoral student at Nova Southeastern University. If you have not completed the survey, would you please take the time to do so. Your participation is important. I would like to have a response from each of the 28 community college consortium members. For this reason, the requested completion date has been extended. The survey will not take long to complete. If you are currently in the process of collecting the requested information, please reply to this email (work in progress) so that I can remove your name from the follow-up list.

To begin the survey, click on the following hyperlink or copy the address into your Web browser: http://209.15.105.158/legrand/index.html The survey includes a print option which was included to cover any technical difficulties that may have prevented a successful electronic submission and to give you the opportunity to retain a copy of your answers. If your electronic submission is successful, it is not necessary to send a printed copy to me.

If for some reason you are unable to complete the survey, I would appreciate it very much if you could let me know, so that I can attempt to find another source for the information requested.

Thank you,

M. Kate LeGrand
Doctoral Candidate
Nova Southeastern University
Computing Technology in Education
Dear [Name],

I am preparing to write the final report for my dissertation. If you have started work on the survey but are waiting for answers from HR on the first 8 open-ended questions, please go ahead and submit the partially completed survey. The remaining select-response questions (9-13) should take no more than 5 minutes to complete. The response deadline is Friday, July 16.

The survey can be located at: http://209.15.105.158/legrand/index.html

Thank you for your support,

M. Kate LeGrand  
Doctoral Candidate  
Nova Southeastern University  
Computing Technology in Education
Appendix H

Survey Instrument

The Impact of Distance Learning on Faculty Contracts and Policies in Florida Community Colleges

Research Survey

(Please submit completed survey by May 15, 2004)

Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions:
Answer the following questions based on the definitions below and the current status at your institution for the Fall 2003 term (beginning August 2003 and ending December 2003).

**Distance learning:** The community college system has defined distance learning as "instruction in which "the student and instructor are separated in time and/or place during 75% or more of the instruction."

**Class:** any course section for which a course reference number is assigned.

**Policy:** any document that includes a written course of action regarding education, such as statutes, procedures, missions, guidelines, regulations, contracts, written agreements.

Enter numbers only, no commas or separators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How many classes are being offered at your institution this term?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How many of those classes are being offered in a distance learning format?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many full-time faculty are employed at your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many adjunct faculty are employed at your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many full-time faculty are teaching distance learning classes this term?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How many adjunct faculty are teaching distance learning classes this term?  

7. How many distance learning classes (as reported in item 2) are being taught by full-time faculty?  

8. How many distance learning classes (as reported in item 2) are being taught by adjuncts?  

9. Have the job descriptions (minimum qualifications and experience) used for hiring faculty changed as a result of adding distance learning course delivery to the course delivery options offered by your institution?  
   - Yes  
   - Under consideration  
   - No  

10. If you answered "Yes" or "Under consideration" to question No. 9, please explain.  

11. Where are faculty issues represented and discussed within your institution? Check all that apply.  
   - Faculty Senate  
   - Faculty Union  
   - Other (please specify below)  

12. In what publication would one find policy relating to distance learning at your institution? Check all that apply.  
   - Union Contract  
   - Policy and Procedures Manual  
   - Employee Handbook  
   - Other (please specify below)  

13. For each of the Issue/Policy Areas listed below, please select the appropriate response in each of the three columns to the right of the Issue/Policy Area to indicate whether or not policy exists at your institution.  
   Keep in mind that for the purpose of this survey, policy is defined as any document that includes a written course of action regarding education, such as statutes, procedures, missions, guidelines, regulations, contracts, written agreements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy exists for traditional delivery</th>
<th>Policy exists for distance learning delivery</th>
<th>Policy for traditional same as policy for distance learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Rewards (e.g., stipends, promotion &amp; tenure, merit increases, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Opportunities to learn about technology and new applications (e.g., release time, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 Intellectual property (e.g., ownership of materials, copyright, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 Offering an entire program in a particular delivery mode</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 Interactivity requirements (e.g. faculty interacting with students to comment on or critique student participation or student work)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 Testing requirements</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 Contact hour definitions</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8 Office hour definitions and or requirements</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Policy Area</td>
<td>Policy exists for traditional delivery</td>
<td>Policy exists for distance learning delivery</td>
<td>Policy for traditional same as policy for distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 9 Compensation for course development</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 10 Compensation for course delivery</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 11 Compensation for course updating</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 12 Workload</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 13 Class size limits (either minimum or maximum)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 14 Response time limits for faculty to respond to student inquiries</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 15 Faculty training</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 16 Hiring requirements for new faculty (online teaching experience, technology readiness, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 17 Faculty scheduling for classes (adjunct vs. full-time faculty, seniority, etc.)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 18 Other distance learning policy area not listed above. Type</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have any questions regarding this survey or the related study, feel free to contact Kate LeGrand by email: klegrand@broward.edu or by telephone at 954.201.8966.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study check this box □

When you have completed the survey, click on the print button below for your hardcopy and then the submit button below. Thank you for participating in this study. STOP! Before submitting the survey ▸ print this page for a hardcopy record.
## Appendix I

### Data Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brevard</th>
<th>Broward</th>
<th>Central Florida</th>
<th>Cocoa</th>
<th>Daytona</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>FCCJ</th>
<th>Flagler</th>
<th>Halifax</th>
<th>Indian River</th>
<th>Lake Okeechobee</th>
<th>Lake Sumter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Classes</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3414</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>5045</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># DL Classes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># FT Faculty</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Adj Faculty</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># DL FT Fac</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># DL Adj Fac</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># DL Clas per FT Fac</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># DL Clas per Adj Fac</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Description</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Desc. Explain</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>New Faculty</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Leadership</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Techno College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Publication</td>
<td>Union Contract</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Manual</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Handbook</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Distanc</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Distanc</td>
<td>Distanc</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Rewards</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Professional Development</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 DL Program Offering</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 Faculty/Student Interaction</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 Testing Requirements</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 Contact Hour Definition</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 # Classes</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>9761</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 # DL Clas</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 # FT Fac</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 # Adj Fac</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 # DL FT Fac</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 # DL Adj Fac</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 # DL Clas per FT Fac</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 # DL Clas per Adj Fac</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Job Description</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Job Desc. Explain</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Faculty Online</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Faculty Leadership</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Contract</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Handbook</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Policy Publication</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>There is</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Rewards</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Professional Development</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 DL Program Offering</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 Testing Requirements</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 Contact Hour Definition</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Daytona</td>
<td>Edenton</td>
<td>FCU</td>
<td>Rehoboth</td>
<td>Outer Banks</td>
<td>Outer Banks</td>
<td>Outer Banks</td>
<td>Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 Office Hour Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9 Course Dev Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10 Course Delivery Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11 Course Update Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12 Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13 Class Size Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14 Response Time Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 Faculty Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.16 New-Hire Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.17 Faculty Class Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.18 Other Policies (write-in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of results</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8 Office Hour Definition</td>
<td>Marvin,</td>
<td>McShan,</td>
<td>North FL</td>
<td>Oldeview</td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>PFAOC</td>
<td>Ponchatoula</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>St. John's River</td>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9 Course Dev. Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10 Course Delivery Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11 Course Update Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12 Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13 Class Size Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.14 Response Time Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 Faculty Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.16 New-Hire Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.17 Faculty Class Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.18 Other Policies (write-in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of results</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Repository Questions

1. Last Updated:
2. For more information contact:
   Email:
3. Where does printed DL policy reside at your institution? If possible, provide a link.
4. Are faculty at your institution represented by a union and/or by a collective bargaining contract?
5. If so, does the contract contain any DL language? If possible, provide a link.
6. Is faculty participation in DL voluntary?
7. Professional Development - Are opportunities offered to faculty to learn about technology and new applications (e.g. release time)?
8. Does DL policy regarding Intellectual property (e.g. ownership of materials, copyright, etc exist?)
9. Who owns distance learning classes and course materials?
10. Can the college provide part of or an entire course to other faculty members for their use?
11. Is there a difference in rights/ownership between part-time and full-time faculty?
12. Does your institution offer any degree or certificate programs at a distance?
13. Does DL policy re: offering an entire program in a particular delivery mode exist?
14. Does DL policy re: interactivity requirements (e.g. faculty interacting with students to comment on or critique student participation or student work) exist?
15. Does DL policy re: testing requirements exist?
16. Does DL policy re: contact hour definitions and or requirements exist?
17. Does DL policy re: office hour definitions and or requirements exist?
18. Are faculty required to hold virtual office hours? If so, how many?
19. Do these hours count toward the required 10 office hours?
20. Are faculty paid or offered incentives for DL course development? If so, how much?
21. Does original faculty developer have first right of refusal to teach the course she/he developed?
22. Are faculty paid differently for DL course delivery? If so, how?
23. Does DL policy re: compensation for DL course updating exist?
24. Does DL policy re: faculty workload exist?
25. If so, is it the same as traditional policy re: faculty workload?
26. What is the minimum DL class size?
27. What is the maximum DL class size?
28. Are class sizes for DL courses different from those of the same courses taught on campus?
29. Does DL policy re: response time limits for faculty to respond to student inquiries exist?

30. Does DL policy re: faculty training exist?

31. Have the job descriptions (minimum qualifications and experience) used for hiring faculty changed as a result of adding DL course delivery?

32. If so, explain

33. Does DL policy re: faculty scheduling for classes (i.e. adjunct vs. full-time faculty, seniority, etc) exist?

34. Do adjunct faculty teach DL classes? If yes, how many?

35. What LMS is used at your institution? Is its use mandatory by DL faculty?

36. Do you currently have a full-time faculty member with a 100% distance course load?
Appendix K

Repository Welcome Page

Welcome to the Florida Community College Distance Learning Policy Repository

Introduction

Distance Learning is state of the art and is fast becoming a primary instructional delivery method in Florida community colleges. However, the present laws and policies that govern Florida's community college educational system are created based on traditional methods for delivering educational services. The potential change in faculty roles and responsibilities brought about by distance learning has raised questions about the impact distance learning will have on overall labor conditions for American faculty. In some instances, the use of alternative methods of delivering educational services has resulted in inconsistent policies. As more faculty become involved in teaching online courses, there will be a greater need to examine distance learning policy and address the issues of inconsistency in policy.

In response to this need, a study was conducted. The study included a literature review and the development of a survey. The survey was sent to the 28 Florida community colleges, and responses were received from 25 for a response rate of 89%. The objective of the survey was to answer the research questions that could not be answered in the literature review and to use that information to design a resource that addresses faculty policy and contractual issues related to distance learning. The research questions being addressed by the survey were: How has the proliferation of distance learning at the community college impacted full-time faculty? How must traditional contracts and policies be modified to accommodate the new roles and responsibilities of distance education faculty? What new policies must be added to contracts?

The proliferation of distance learning at the community college is evidenced by the fact that 6% of the classes offered at Florida’s community colleges in the Fall 2003 term were offered in a distance learning format. The percentage at the individual colleges ranged from 2% to as high as 25%. The impact on full-time faculty is that in the Fall 2003 term, 21% of the full-time faculty at Florida’s community colleges taught a distance course. At some of the individual colleges, the impact was even greater, with 85% and 68%. Distance learning has also had a noticeable effect on faculty workload. The average distance course load was 1.96 for the full-time faculty member (40% of the required course load) and 1.86 for the adjunct. On a statewide basis, the impact can be seen in the differing full-time/adjunct (FT/A) ratios. The FT/A ratio for distance courses was 68/32 compared to 28/72 for all courses.

Faculty policies and contracts are being impacted by distance learning. As a result of adding distance learning courses, some of the colleges surveyed have made or are considering making changes to the job descriptions used for hiring faculty. Distance learning policy is appearing in policy and procedures manuals, and faculty handbooks. Some of the colleges have created distance learning policy manuals and distance learning faculty handbooks. In addition, language on distance learning issues is appearing in union contracts.
Until now, there has been no central repository for distance learning policy at Florida’s community colleges. Some of the colleges are still in the process of creating distance learning policy. For these colleges and for colleges modifying existing policy, the distance learning policy repository will provide an opportunity to explore how others are dealing with the impact that distance learning is having on policy and contract issues.

In some cases, where short answers can be provided and are useful, requests for policy are made. In cases where policy would be too long to post, the question of whether distance learning policy exists is asked. If policy exists and a policy link provided, viewers can access the link and view the actual policy.

**Instructions for Use**

**Viewers:**

The repository is located at www1.broward.edu/~klegrand/repositor.htm. The design is that of a data matrix with 28 columns and 34 rows. The column headings consist of the names of Florida’s 28 community colleges. The row headings consist of distance learning policy questions that were designed based on the results of the survey and a review of the literature. The data contained in the remaining cells were obtained through a review of the literature and from the results of the survey.

The first two questions ask for the date of when the information was last updated and for a contact name and email address. If those cells are empty, the remaining information contained in the column for that community college has not been verified as being correct.

**Contributors:**

The community college representatives of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium can contribute to the repository by contacting klegrand@broward.edu. To assist you in this endeavor, you will receive a list of the repository questions and the answers for your institution that are currently posted in the repository. Add to or change the current answers and return the revised list. Your additions and/or changes will be posted to the repository. Wherever possible, please add a link to the policy.
## Appendix L

### Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Brevard CC</th>
<th>Brevard CC</th>
<th>Central Florida CC</th>
<th>Chipola CC</th>
<th>Daytona Beach CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more information contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>First Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Campus Faculty Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are faculty at your institution represented by a union and/or by a collective bargaining contract?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, does the contract contain any DL language? If possible, provide a link.</td>
<td>Collective Bargaining Contract, Sec 7.70.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is faculty participation in DL possible?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**For more information contact:** First Last flast@college.edu
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