

ESTABLISHING AN ACCEPTED SKILL SET AND KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR
DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS

By

MEGAN JULIE FORBES

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2012

© 2012 Megan Julie Forbes

To IEP Directors past, present and future

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their support during a period of much change in our college and departments. I would particularly like to thank my Chair Dr. Bernie Oliver whose practicality, understanding, and experience helped bring this dissertation into existence. A special thank you must also be extended to Dr. Eileen Oliver for her guidance on my committee and for demonstrating how to be a kind, fair, and passionate administrator of a university program. I would like to thank the faculty, staff and students at the University of Florida English Language Institute, who have been patient with me from the beginning. I must also thank a very special group of UCIEP directors whose experience, knowledge, support and friendship sustained me through the first eight years of directing a university intensive English program. I am eternally grateful for the help and encouragement I have received from my parents. My mother Ellen Peterson has shepherded our family through some 40 years and six countries and is the constant on which we rely. My father Dr. Hans Patrick Peterson passed in 2010, but has continued to provide me with the motivation necessary to complete this research. Finally, of course, I must thank my loving husband Jeffrey Forbes whose never-ending support allows me to pursue my dreams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	7
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
ABSTRACT	10
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	12
Limitations of the Study.....	13
Significance of the Study	14
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	21
Theoretical Framework	23
UIEP Administration.....	25
Student Services	25
Immigration.....	27
Curriculum Design	28
Testing.....	29
Budgeting	31
Enrollment, Publicity, Marketing and Recruitment	32
Institutional Linkages.....	36
Personnel and Human Resources.....	38
Program Evaluation.....	40
Change and Innovation	42
Program Directors.....	43
Leadership.....	48
Strategic Planning	49
Decision Making and Negotiation	50
Influencing Policy Formation	51
Intercultural Communication and Management	51
Ethics.....	52
Evaluation.....	53
Research.....	54
The Delphi Method	54
Conclusions	58
3 METHODOLOGY	60
The Setting	60

Participants	60
Research Design	61
Subjectivity Statement	66
Data Collection and Analysis	67
4 FINDINGS.....	73
Overview.....	73
The Participants.....	74
Findings on Survey #1	76
Findings on Survey #2	78
Skills.....	80
Knowledge.....	81
Personal Qualities	82
Findings on Survey #3	83
Skills.....	84
Knowledge.....	86
Personal Qualities	88
Synthesis	90
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	92
Summary	92
Conclusions	94
Recommendations.....	105
 APPENDIX	
A SURVEY #2.....	120
B COMPILED RESULTS OF SURVEY #2.....	132
C SURVEY #3.....	144
D COMPILED RESULTS OF SURVEY #3.....	151
LIST OF REFERENCES	163
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	170

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>page</u>
2-1	Matthies' (1984) findings	45
2-2	Pennington's (1994) findings	46
2-3	Matthies' (1984) and Pennington's (1994) findings.....	47
5-1	Combined findings of Matthies, Pennington, and Forbes	114

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAIEP	American Association of Intensive English Programs: Founded in 1988, AAIEP is a consortium of proprietary and university based intensive English programs, all of which must be hosted by an accredited university or have accreditation through other recognized accreditation agencies.
ACCET	Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training: An accrediting body from which proprietary Intensive English Programs can earn accreditation. Proprietary Intensive English programs accredited by ACCET can legally issue I-20's for Intensive English Programs and may apply for membership in AAIEP
CEA	Commission on English Language Program Accreditation: Recognized by the US Department of Education in 2003, this commission serves as the newly formed accrediting body for Intensive English Programs. Proprietary Intensive English Programs accredited by the CEA can legally issue I-20's for international students and may apply for membership in AAIEP.
ESL	English as a Second Language. English as taught to and learned by individuals with a first language other than English in the United States or other English-speaking nations.
F-1 VISA	The visa held by students studying at Intensive English Programs in the United States.
I-20	The document issued by universities, colleges and accredited proprietary Intensive English Programs to admitted students which they then present at US Consulates abroad in order to apply for a US Student Visa (F-1).
IEP	Intensive English Program: IEPs are defined as “post-secondary education programs which provide instruction in English as a second language (ESL) to nonnative speakers of English and which offer a minimum of 18 hours of instruction per week in differentiated levels of proficiency for at least 8 months per year” (Wallace, 2003, p.2).
INS	The U.S. Government Immigration and Naturalization Services. The INS is now USCIS, U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services.
NAFSA	NAFSA: Association of International Educators is a non-profit organization founded in 1948 which promotes the exchange of students and scholars to and from the United States. This organization was previously known as NAFSA: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

SEVP	Student and Exchange Visitor Program: A United States governmental program which tracks student and exchange visitors for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Homeland Security.
TESL	The field of Teaching English as a Second Language, distinct from the organization TESOL.
TESOL	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. A Global Education Association: A non-profit professional organization founded in 1966 to serve teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL).
UCIEP	University and College Intensive English Programs: The first consortium of Intensive English Programs founded in 1967. All UCIEP programs are administered by accredited universities and colleges, meet certain standards and criteria, and submit proof of doing so every 5 years.
UIEP	University Intensive English Program: A university- or college-based Intensive English Program.
USCIS	U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services. This U.S. Government agency was formerly known as the INS.

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

ESTABLISHING AN ACCEPTED SKILL SET AND KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR
DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS

By

Megan Julie Forbes

December 2012

Chair: Bernard Oliver
Major: Higher Education Administration

The purpose of this study was to establish an accepted skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal qualities necessary to be a director of a university or college based, non-proprietary intensive English program (UIEP). This research serves as a means of moving towards meeting three critical needs in the field. This research should inform the curriculum for the coursework of MA and PhD programs in the field of teaching English as a second language (TESL). It serves to capture the knowledge, skills, and talents of the most experienced UIEP directors prior to their retirement. Finally, it can provide search committees with the information necessary to make appropriate appointments, both in replacing newly-retired directors and in hiring directors for new programs.

The study was undertaken using the Delphi method. Directors of UCIEP member programs with significant experience were identified as an expert group. A survey consisting of open-ended questions was used to elicit responses on the necessary skills, knowledge, and personal qualities of directors of UIEPs. These responses were compiled into a survey returned to the expert group. The responses to the second survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Following the Delphi method, and

based upon these statistics, a third iteration of the survey was returned to the group. Responses were collected and means and standard deviation were calculated to determine the importance of each item and the expert group consensus on the importance of each item.

Conclusions can be drawn from the study which indicate there is wide-spread agreement in the expert group on the necessary skills, knowledge, and personal qualities of UIEP directors. The resulting survey items can be used to inform the creation of more specific surveys of IEP directors in the future, and to highlight the need for continued research in the field.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In fall of 2009 a quick internet search finds at least one half-dozen open positions for directors of university or college Intensive English Programs. Several have “open until filled” application deadlines because original searches for these positions failed. This phenomenon can be partially explained by the exponential increase in the number of Intensive English Programs in the United States. An increase in programs coupled with the retirement of many of the most experienced program directors, those originally hired in the 1980s and 1990s, has led to a large number of open positions (UCEIP Listserv personal communication, November 2009). These positions remain unfilled, as well, because most university and college search committees have a limited ability to determine who is best qualified to serve as director of these programs. This may be true even when committees are made up of faculty from within the Intensive English Program itself.

The first Intensive English Program was established at the University of Michigan in 1941 in order to meet the English language needs of the growing number of international students at the university (Kaplan, 1997). This same need led to the establishment of similar programs across campuses in the United States. By the mid-1950s, roughly 150 U.S. institutions of higher education had established an Intensive English Program (Kaplan, 1997). The 1970s saw another significant increase in programs and by 1980 the number of programs had more than doubled. An additional spike in enrollment led to developing more programs in the 1980s and early 1990s. By 2000 over 500 Intensive English Programs existed in the United States (Wallace, 2003). After a brief lull in the years following September 11, 2001, the number of programs

opening continues to grow. Indeed, in 2007 enrollment in Intensive English Programs in the United States increased by more than 20% from the previous year (Institute of International Education, 2009). The significance of these numbers lies in the exponential increase in the need for directors of Intensive English Programs over the past 70 years. Yet, very little research exists on who is best suited to lead these programs. The scarcity of research on the administration of intensive English programs, and the retirement or near retirement of the large number of directors hired in the 1980s and early 1990s creates a void of information at a critical time in the field. In order to attempt to remedy the lack of information on the qualifications necessary to serve as a director of an Intensive English Program, a Delphi study will be conducted.

Research Questions

1. Which skills are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
2. What knowledge is necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
3. What personal qualities are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations. First, while a few key quantitative or qualitative studies have been completed on the administration of UIEPs, the bulk of the literature is based upon only these studies or upon self-created, peer-evaluated standards or guidelines. Very little actual data has been collected in this field, outside of the pedagogical realm.

Second, this study is focused solely on the knowledge and skills of directors of university- and college-based Intensive English Programs. A possible trend for the

future is outsourcing these academic programs to proprietary institutions. It is not clear that the results of this study would have any bearing on the director position of such a program.

Third, this study compiles the responses of some of the longest established programs and most recognized directors in the field of Intensive English Programs. It may be that the knowledge and skills found necessary by directors of newer programs are quite different.

Significance of the Study

The direction of an Intensive English Program (IEP) requires a wide variety of skills and background knowledge of best practices in both pedagogical and administrative fields. Unfortunately, very little research has been done on which specific set of skills and knowledge is most crucial for the success of an IEP director in the 21st century. More has been written on the various aspects of the position of director, and how individual programs or directors have achieved success in those specific aspects. All of the research concludes by highlighting the need for more research in the field and the need for better preparation for IEP directors (Coombe, et al., 2008; Kaplan, 1997; Matthies, 1984; Pennington, 1994).

In addition, the vast majority of research in this area was conducted prior to the widespread use of the internet, e-mail, or mobile phones, prior to the changes in immigration rules and responsibilities stemming from 9/11, and prior to the general globalization of the world economy. This leaves those searching to fill an IEP director position, a position with ever-increasing responsibilities, with little data on which to make hiring decisions. It also leaves those preparing others for these positions with little information or research on which to base graduate level coursework.

In order to understand the complexity of the situation facing university and college IEPs, it is important to understand the distinctions made between different types of IEPs as well as the responsibilities of the directors of the different programs. IEPs can be divided into three broad categories. The first category of IEP is that of the original University of Michigan model: an IEP administered by and within the structure of a university. IEPs in the second category are those referred to as “for-profit” or “proprietary” which operate as stand-alone businesses and which are not located on university campuses. The third category, a more recent development, is the proprietary IEP located on a university campus through a contract signed with the university. Although these IEPs are physically located on campus, they are not administered by the host institution and the IEP staff is not employed by the university (Wallace, 2003). As the administration of a for-profit business and the administration of an academic unit within a university differ greatly, the research questions for this study shall focus on university and college based IEPs. The acronym UIEP, coined by Wallace (2003), shall be used to refer to this category of IEP.

Making this distinction is important because, as Stoller and Christison (1994) note, the administration of a UIEP is a complex task.

IEP administrators must be skilled ESL teachers, teacher educators, and often professors in graduate TESL or Applied Linguistics programs, and they must also be adept at providing immigration and academic advice, supervising admissions, designing curricula, administering standardized exams, handling budgets, scheduling classes, recruiting students, hiring and firing faculty and staff. (p. 16)

Part of the complexity of serving as this type of program administrator arises out of the fact that UIEPs never qualify as traditional academic programs within the university because they, by definition, serve non-traditional students, must hire non-

traditional faculty, have non-traditional curricula, and are locked into non-traditional administrative and budgetary structures (Eskey, 1997). The majority of UIEP students enter universities and colleges as non-degree-seeking students or conditionally admitted students working towards achieving the English language skills required for full admission to academic programs. UIEP faculty positions are often either non-tenure track or adjunct positions, and the courses offered are often non-credit-bearing. Finally, UIEPs usually receive little or no state funding, so must often be self-supporting entities while meeting the academic standards of the department to which they belong.

The lack of information on the skills and knowledge the director of a UIEP should possess poses problems for both institutions of higher education and for the directors hired to lead the IEPs at these institutions. The non-traditional profile of UIEPs often leaves the faculty administrators of these programs cobbling together research and information on academic administration from other sources. This is somewhat helpful. However, a UIEP director generally has a larger range of responsibilities than other directors on campuses, and, as Kaplan (1997) notes, "in many cases, the scope of work was more comparable to that of a divisional dean" (p. 9). This scope of responsibilities points towards the need for more extensive research on the administration of UIEPs.

While referencing the job description for an IEP assistant director position, Matthies (1984) opined that "if all those skills are required of an assistant, the director is apparently expected to be a universal genius cum diplomat and educator" (p.5). Indeed, Barrett (1982) suggested

As every IEP director knows, operating a full intensive English program has a lot in common with running a three-ring circus (with results just about as interesting sometimes, too). There are usually two or three problems occurring simultaneously, and the program staff are continually being

required to make decisions on an incredible variety of subjects, from admissions policies based on the latest INS rulings to a choice of new ESL materials for reading rate improvement. (p.3)

If these two descriptions held true in the 1980s, the role the director is intended to fill in 2012 can only be more complicated.

It is clear that the role the director of a UIEP plays is multifaceted, combining aspects of academics, business, and management. Adding to this concern is the imminent retirement of many of the UIEP directors who, after decades in their positions, have certainly come to some conclusion about the most necessary knowledge and skills for their positions (UCEIP Listserv personal communication, November 2009). Because of the search requirements of most college and universities, it is unlikely these directors have been able to mentor new directors for their particular programs. It is crucial both for those attempting to hire new directors, and for the new directors themselves, to capture the knowledge and experience possessed by these departing directors.

Based upon these observations, the recommendation could be made that distinct research on the roles in UIEP administration, particularly the role of the UIEP director, is long overdue. One model which could be followed in order to undertake this research is that of the study completed by Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, & Pierce in 2007. Lambert, et al. felt that although literature existed on the skills and knowledge necessary to complete certain functions of international education, “the requirements for successful campus senior international officers, who lead and supervise the overall international activities of institutions, are clearly very different” (p.1). They, as a NAFSA task force, decided to address this need.

In order to create a clear outline of the skills and knowledge necessary for a successful senior international officer (SIO), Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, & Pierce (2007)

undertook a survey using the Delphi method. They determined that SIOs must possess a specific skill- and knowledge-set. These sets include personal qualities, background knowledge, specialized knowledge, functional skills, and specialized skills. In the second round of their Delphi method, they were able to delineate the importance attached to each of the skills or knowledge elements in these particular sets. Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, & Pierce (2007) conclude that this information is an important and necessary addition to the field.

If, as has been suggested, UIEPs are often as large, intricate, and complex as some international centers, the importance of describing such a knowledge- and skill-set for UIEP directors should also be a priority. The possibility of such a description being transferrable to coursework in TESL graduate programs could make it doubly important. This is particularly true because, if current enrollment trends continue, quickly and efficiently finding directors with appropriate skills and knowledge to lead programs from within IEP faculty will also be a priority. In this light, more significant research in this direction is certainly recommended.

This research will serve as a means of moving towards meeting three critical needs in the field. First, it will serve to capture the knowledge, skills, and talents of the most experienced UIEP directors prior to their retirement. Second, this research will provide university and college search committees with a framework to use in filling the ever increasing number of open UEIP director positions. Finally, the findings of this research may be able to enhance the coursework of MA and PhD programs in the field of TESL, ensuring that future IEP teaching faculty are better prepared to take on

administrative responsibilities and to competitively apply for director positions within their host institutions.

In order to do so, this study will focus on the 67 members of UCIEP: a consortium of University and College Intensive English Programs. The purpose of UCIEP is “the advancement of professional standards and quality instruction in intensive English programs at universities and colleges in the United States” (UCIEPb). UCIEP was founded at a NAFSA: Association of International Educators international conference in 1967 when

directors of thirteen intensive English programs (IEPs) gathered to discuss problems facing their field. The need for IEPs was being recognized but the need for standards in those programs was not. Ignorance regarding the education and experience necessary to provide appropriate instruction was leading to programs staffed with unqualified faculty. A recognition that money could be made from ESL students was enticing academic institutions and private enterprises to maximize income and minimize standards. (UCIEPc)

What began as a few faculty guidelines has grown into an extensive set of guidelines covering everything from minimum faculty qualifications, to class size, to recruitment practices (UCIEPa).

In order for a university- or college-based intensive English program to become a member of UCIEP

Each underwent a rigorous application process, including a site visit by an external reviewer, before being accepted. Every 5 years each must submit a substantial self-study document to an evaluation committee which reviews it to verify that the program continues to meet the standards of UCIEP. (UCIEPc)

These UCIEP programs, therefore, provide the best example of the top programs in the field. Because UCIEP membership is open to any qualified UIEP, the host institutions for the UCIEP programs range from large state universities to small private liberal arts

colleges. The veteran directors of these programs will provide the data necessary to establish an accepted skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal qualities necessary to be an effective director of a university or college based, non-proprietary intensive English program.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It is critical to capture the knowledge, skills, and talents of the most experienced UIEP directors because many of the directors hired during the most recent UIEP “boom” of the 1980s (Kaplan, 1997; Wallace 2003) are at or near retirement (UCEIP Listserv personal communication, November 2009). These directors possess skills and knowledge not held by their less experienced colleagues for, as Wallace (2003) found, UIEP program size increases with the length of term of the existing program director. Program size is an extremely important element of a self-supporting program; the size of the program is often a reflection of a director’s effectiveness.

It is also important for university and college search committees to have a framework to use in filling the increasing number of open UIEP director positions. Directing a UIEP requires skills and knowledge quite distinct from other faculty and administrative positions on campus (Barrett, 1982; Kaplan, 1997; Matthies, 1984). In cases where UIEPs are being newly opened on campuses, those faculty and administrators making up the search committee have very little established information to draw upon in making the appropriate hire. In situations in which the director is retiring, the search committee is often made up of faculty from within the program or from within the director’s academic field, but who have limited administrative experience and, again, have very little established information to draw upon in recommending the appropriate hire.

Enhancing the coursework of TESL MA and PhD programs is important to ensure future UIEP administrators and directors have more appropriate preparation than the largely classroom-focused pedagogical preparation provided in these programs

currently. Based upon the responses of 177 IEP directors, Matthies' seminal 1984 study indicated the directors felt that graduate TESL programs should begin to include coursework in educational administration. Ten years later Pennington (1994) found that directors of programs still felt more coursework in IEP administration were needed. More than a decade following Pennington's work, Christison and Murray (2009) and Coombe, McCloskey, Stephenson, and Anderson (2008) noted the lack of educational leadership coursework or training within the field of TESL.

From the above it is clear that there is a lack of information about the skills, knowledge, and personal qualities necessary to direct a UIEP. The aforementioned suggests this information is not included in position searches, and is probably not offered in graduate programs within the field. A lack of information is also clearly linked to the dearth of meaningful, recent publications within the field of UIEP administration. The most used and recent resource available to UIEP administrators today is the NAFSA: Association of International Educators ESL Program Administration Participant Manual (2007b). This manual, however, is made up largely of opinion pieces, information based upon the experience of UIEP directors, and out-of-field resources often more than 20 years old. The majority of studies involving UIEP directors or administration in UIEPs which are statistically meaningful or published in blind-reviewed journals were completed more than a decade ago. The following review of literature makes the need for more current and significant research clear.

This review of literature will first examine a theoretical framework in which to view the existence and establishment of a knowledge base and how such a knowledge base informs curriculum development. The review will then cover the most recent existing

research and publications on the administration of UIEPs, the director's role within the administration of these programs, and the use of the Delphi method in research, particularly in attempting to capture knowledge in the manner in which this study hopes to. The first section will briefly examine how a knowledge base and curriculum are connected. The second section will highlight the literature in eleven recognized areas of UIEP administration in general. The third section will examine the research and literature focusing specifically on the responsibilities of the UIEP director. The final section of the review of literature will cover studies which use the Delphi method in order to create bodies of knowledge similar to the one hoped to be created with this study.

Theoretical Framework

Geltner (2007) draws upon Tyler's 1949 model to demonstrate the need for curriculum to serve as a comprehensive preparation for a particular vocation. This same framework can be applied to identifying appropriate TESL graduate curriculum that would prepare teachers with the necessary administrative skills to succeed in the field. As Geltner indicates, Tyler's model emphasizes the need to identify the specific needs the learner, and the job roles of an eventual practitioner of a vocation. Only once these needs have been identified can a meaningful curriculum be created.

This particular framework, however, only addresses the stated necessity of creating curriculum to reflect eventual learner needs, or required skill set. It does not incorporate the full necessity of establishing a knowledge base for this same eventual practitioner as well as current practitioners in the field. This distinction is important for, as Behar (1994) explains:

Knowledge bases provide a compendium of technical skills and content knowledge that suggest what practitioners and scholars should know and be able to [do] as a result of their training in a specific discipline. Knowledge bases provide a structure for making informed decisions... (p.5)

Behar (1994) notes, however, that a knowledge base drives curriculum, but is not a static entity. Just as curriculum is created from opinions and judgments on what knowledge and whose knowledge should be taught, so is a knowledge base. Behar indicates “the essence of a knowledge base requires that choices be made and judgments exercised” (p.4) and that the “development of a knowledge base is therefore an evolutionary process that will be influenced by continuing reflection and as dispositions and empirical sources of knowledge emerge” (p.4).

While this may create a feeling of an ever-moving target and a futile attempt to capture just one piece of information, it is a necessary process for “evidence, conflicting conceptions and logical propositions must be weighted, selected, and synthesized into a coherent framework that renders the knowledge base useable for practice” (Behar, 1994, p.4) and that provides a theoretical framework that is “comprised of essential knowledge, research findings, and sound practices that provide a structure for making informed decisions. A knowledge base must consist of a collectively held and systematically reinforced set of beliefs that guide program development and instruction” (p.23). In utilizing the Delphi method to capture the current “essential knowledge, research findings, and sound practices” of the skills, knowledge and personal qualities current experts in the field feel are necessary for directors of UIEP’s we can make informed decisions on the knowledge base that should, at least for this moment, both drive the curriculum of graduate TESL programs and provide a framework for further

discussion in the field on the knowledge, skills, and personal qualities which should make up this ever-changing knowledge base.

UIEP Administration

The purpose of this study is to establish an accepted skill set and knowledge base for the directors of UIEPs. In order to do so, one must first examine the existing research outlining what this skill set and knowledge base might be. While a minimal amount of research or publications exist on the role of the director per se, slightly more exists on the administration of UIEPs overall. However, the vast majority of these publications come in the form of published texts or the NAFSA program administration manual. In order to provide at least some background based in research or found in blind reviewed journals, rather dated studies are included in this review as well as the more recent, yet less stringently reviewed, publications. This section will highlight the literature in eleven areas of UIEP administration: student services; immigration; curriculum design; testing; budgeting; enrollment, publicity, marketing, and recruitment; institutional linkages, personnel and human resources; program evaluation; and change and innovation.

Student Services

The NAFSA: Association of International Educators Foundations in International Education: ESL Program Administration workshop (2007b) lists six objectives in the section addressing student services. These objectives include examining the role of student services within IEPs; identifying the kinds of information and services which students enrolled in IEPs typically need; exploring different formats for providing information, including who should provide it; becoming aware of the US Student and Visitor Exchange Program (SEVP) and where to find additional information on SEVP;

considering the evaluation of student services offered within the IEPs, and identifying best practices for student services within IEPs. These workshop objectives provide a good outline of the basic information UIEP administrators must have about student services.

The existence of student services is actually one of the key provisions that set a UIEP apart from a high-school ESL program, or a program designed for adult learners who are U.S. citizens or residents (NAFSA, 2007b). While student services fall primarily under the responsibility of the UIEP, there is “frequently an overlap of responsibility for student services among the IEP, the host institution, and the sponsoring agency (if any)” (NAFSA, 2007b, p.3). This overlap makes it crucial for the UIEP administrators to understand clearly which student services will be provided by the university as a whole, and which will be provided by specific sponsoring agencies (such as international scholarship providers). Without this information, the UEIP administration will be unable to serve the role of a safety net for international students.

Although the support provided by universities and sponsoring agencies varies, the UIEP should consider providing these minimal student services (NAFSA, 2007b): pre-departure contact, clear and unambiguous arrival instructions, living arrangement assistance, orientation to daily life and study, cultural adaptation information, health and safety information, help accessing the UIEP and university systems, assistance with college applications and enrollment, extracurricular activities, conversation partner or language exchange programs, immigration advising, academic advising, personal advising and referral, and opportunities for involvement in the program and university.

The workshop manual provides great detail on all of these areas, yet leaves specifics on how to provide these services up to individual directors.

Despite the detail provided and the variety of services offered by UIEPs, five broad areas should be taken into account in determining which student services should be provided and by whom (NAFSA, 2007b). First, budget plays a key role in what services can be provided. Second, the staffing model has an impact on how student services are provided. Third, the steps necessary for arrival and departure from that location dictate the information and support students must receive prior to their arrival and in preparation for departure. Fourth, a concrete evaluation plan should be developed to assess the effectiveness of the student services provided. Finally, a clear understanding should be shared among administrators of “where to draw the line” (NAFSA, 2007b, section 2, p.4) in providing help to students. From the twenty-five page section on student services in the workshop participant manual, it is clear that student services make up a key portion of the responsibilities of UIEP administrators.

Immigration

Immigration advising and monitoring has become a critical part of UIEP student services. Prior to the events of September 11, 2001, the knowledge of immigration and immigration policy already carried a great deal of importance for UIEP administrators. Writing four years before the tragedy that predicated sweeping changes of U.S. immigration law and enforcement, Levitov (1997) wrote that program administrators should

Be aware that noncompliance with immigration regulations not only renders a student in violation of status but also places the program (and, where it is a unit of a larger institution, the institution itself) in jeopardy of losing its approval to issue I-20 forms and enroll F-1 students. (p.301)

In spring of 2002, shortly after 09/11, Jenks wrote “U.S. federal law is clear regarding the responsibilities of institutions that issue student/scholar visas to monitor visa holders’ school enrollment.” He continues “the historical lack of enforcement, however, has made some institutions lackadaisical in their fulfillment of these responsibilities. Who cared? Now, the United States cares” (p.1). Indeed, the United States does care; and, as U.S. government approved Designated Security Officials (DSOs), UIEP administrators must be excruciatingly well trained on the documentation, tracking, and legal steps required by Homeland Security. Moving from a two-page article in a book in 1997 (Levitov, 1997), the 138 page advanced NAFSA workshop manual: F-1 Regulations: The Second Step (NAFSA, 2006) makes this change abundantly clear. Three pages are dedicated to the “legal concept of constructive knowledge” (pp.8-10) alone. Each section closes with a warning to DSOs on the implications of the slightest error for the institution as a whole.

To address the requisite knowledge and training UIEP administrators must have on U.S. immigration law and enforcement policies would require a separate manuscript. It is clear, though, that this knowledge and training is critical to the compliance of the UIEP and university with that law. UIEP administrators thus often find themselves in the unenviable position of advocating and advising international students for whom they also act as a policing unit (NAFSA, 2006). This balancing act is one which is likely to become more important, not less, for UIEP administrators.

Curriculum Design

Curriculum design can be addressed from two perspectives. The first, and most common, is from the purpose, design, and execution of the curriculum from the standpoint of the teacher or classroom. While research and literature exist to support

this endeavor, the NAFSA ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b) focuses instead on why it is important to have a well-designed, well executed, and frequently evaluated curriculum for an IEP as a whole. The manual outlines the extrinsic reasons for strong curriculum, including the twelve standards for curriculum required for UCIEP: University and College Intensive English Program Consortium membership, the five standards required by ACCET: Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training, and the four standards required by the CEA: Commission on English Language Program Accreditation.

The details of the standards of each of the above vary, but the guiding principles are the same. The curriculum should be based on the mission of the program, the curriculum should be responsive to student needs, the curriculum should be informed by research, the curriculum should be written, the curriculum should provide for a logical progression through levels, the curriculum goals and objectives should be written, observable, and measurable, and the curriculum should be reviewed and revised regularly (NAFSA, 2007b, section 3, p. 5). It is clear a UIEP with an effective administration should have all of the above.

Testing

Assessment plays a key role in the curriculum of a UIEP. Testing is often high-stakes for students because it is used to determine everything from the program level into which they will be placed, to their ability to take credit courses, to their admission status to the university, to the amount of time they can legally remain in the United States. UIEPs have access to a wide range of commercially available tests (NAFSA, 2007b, section 8, pp.4-8), depending upon the budget available and the purpose of the testing. UIEPs also have the option of creating in-house tests and assessments. The

NAFSA ESL Program Administration Workshop addresses the appropriate situations in which to adopt either testing option.

In order to make the appropriate testing decisions, UIEP administrators need to have a clear understanding of several key points. The NAFSA workshop attempts to address this through five workshop objectives (NAFSA, 2007b). First, participants must learn about the role of outcomes-based assessment in curricular/assessment design. Second, participants must be clear on the different purposes of language testing. Third, they must understand how language testing and curriculum are related. Fourth, the participants must learn about all of the testing options available and the criteria to use in selecting an appropriate test. Finally, participants must learn which elements must be present for a testing situation to replicate a real-life situation.

The assessment options available to the UIEP administrator are widely varied. The selection of which tests to use may impact not just the program, but the students, and other elements at the university dependent upon the results of the UIEP assessment. The UIEP must balance the well-reviewed validity and reliability of commercially available tests, with the ability to develop specific assessments in-house, and the assessment needs of the university. The ease of using commercial tests with large groups of students must also be balanced against the costs associated with these tests and the ethics of passing these costs onto the students. Much research and funding has been invested in language testing, but it is up to the administrators of a program to determine the best ways to utilize the results of this research and funding (NAFSA, 2007b).

Budgeting

Budgeting is critical in the responsibilities of UIEP administrators because although as “a budgetary entity, the language program places certain demands on its home institution” (Staczek, 1997, p.219), the majority of its actual budget does not derive from allocated state funding, but rather from fee-based or cost-for-services based funding (Staczek, 1997). For this reason Staczek (1997) notes that “ultimately, sound business practices must underlie the academic language enterprise” (p. 220).

This need to create enough income to run day-to-day operations is what often sets UIEP administrators apart from the majority of their administrative peers at an institution. Not much has been written on budgeting for IEPs; but, as less and less funding for higher education in general is available, it certainly needs more attention. In 1997, Eskey noted “IEPs are often burdened with oppressive budgetary arrangements. Most are required to be self supporting and many are frankly regarded as cash cows that are expected to generate large surpluses for the support of more prestigious programs” (p.25). Unfortunately, day-to-day operations and supporting various units at the university often come at the expense of other important academic elements at the UIEP.

The elements involved in determining an accurate budget supporting both operating expenses and academic quality often fall beyond the expertise of UIEP administrators (Curtis, 2008). This is particularly true of those who, in the past, have primarily served as teaching faculty. The NAFSA ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b) attempts to address this shortfall. The workshop manual leads participants through the basics of budgeting, including analyzing the definitions of budget, considering the steps, components, and personnel involved in budget planning,

identifying the type of data needed for budgeting, learning of the responsibilities and potential for negative repercussions that come from budgeting, and identifying the skills and competencies necessary for implementing a budget. In the end, however, very little concrete information can be provided to workshop participants because variables vary so widely at different institutions.

Lytle (2007) attempted to address one of the elements that impacts UIEP budget decisions in addressing the various levels and means of funding professional development in IEPs. He noted that many IEPs “do not have deep pockets, and those pockets do not always include allowance for the professional development of the faculty and staff working at the IEP” (p.1). He also noted that this professional development is becoming more and more important as the “ESL field and immigration policies continue to expand and evolve” (p.1). Lytle (2007) then outlined a workable strategy for funding IEP professional development at four different levels. In the same area, Curtis (2008) notes

Cost is a constant concern in English language education these days, especially in zero-funded, cost-recovery, income-generating units within universities, which is the category into which our School fell. Therefore, the costs and benefits of professional development must be considered. However, for most ELEs [English language educators] – whether teachers, administrators, or managers – the notion of cost-benefit analysis is an entirely unknown area. (p. 121)

Curtis then provided an overview of a cost-benefit analysis. As budgets continue to tighten, more such detailed articles such as those by Curtis and Lytle will be necessary in the field.

Enrollment, Publicity, Marketing and Recruitment

While not a great deal has been written on budgeting itself, a larger amount of literature exists addressing the best practices and most effective means of sustaining

enrollment, and hence creating the necessary funds to support a program. This is another area in which UIEP administrators are often poorly prepared, as they usually have no formal study or experience in marketing or recruiting. Indeed, this is a weakness Wallace addresses in his 2003 study as he states “the problem addressed in this study is the lack of knowledge that IEP directors and university administrators have concerning the factors that affect size and growth in enrollment in university intensive English programs” (p. 15).

NAFSA recognizes the need for IEP administrators to be better informed about marketing and recruiting practices, and addresses this in two manners. One, recognizing the interconnectedness of UIEP and university international student enrollment, is through the Marketing and Recruitment for Admissions Offices and IEPs Workshop (2005). The other recognizes the specific challenges faced by IEP administrators in international marketing and recruitment, so is addressed in the Foundations of International Education: ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b). Both of these manuals are hobbled by the same limitations facing other sections of the training: out-of-date and out-of-field sources, and opinion- or experienced-based information.

Similar limitations apply to Miller (1997), who provides ten important principles for language program administrators to follow in marketing a language program. The ten principles are the understanding that the endeavor is multidimensional and must be budgeted, that the efforts must be divided into categories such as advertisements or public relations activities, that the materials should present a unified message, that a database must be created to track and maintain contacts and outreach endeavors, that

the efficiency of processing of student inquiries must regularly be evaluated, that ongoing focus groups of current students must be created, that barriers to student application and enrollment should be eased as much as possible, that the difference between peddling and marketing must be realized, and the necessity of a 5-year marketing plan. While these are, indeed, necessary guidelines for UIEP administrators to follow, Miller does not provide details on how to pursue this endeavor, nor why he believes these principles are effective.

Brady (2008) notes “while the past decade has emphasized professional development in English language education, relatively little attention has been devoted to fundraising” (p. 154). While Brady provides a well sited overview of fundraising literature divided into the topics of justifying fundraising, the principles of successful fundraising, common types of fundraising, and fundraising principles and techniques, he does very little to directly link these techniques to the field, perhaps because his audience is made up of a variety of ESL teachers and professionals, not just UIEP administrators.

Panferov (2008) writes directly to IEP administrators about promoting IEPs. She bases her recommendations on literature in the field and her experiences as a UIEP director. She also bases the need for recruitment information from a survey she conducted of IEP administrators. Panferov suspected that as those “trained mostly in Applied Linguistics and TESOL, many English language program leaders face program promotion issues with little or no prior training” (p.178) and through her survey found that, indeed, program administrators “ranked marketing as the third most important issue in their daily operations. However, more than 65% reported that they did not have

any training in program promotion prior to starting their first administrative positions and that training in marketing continued to be the most desirable training area identified by these 'on the job' leaders. Clearly there exists a gap in our professional training about program promotion." (p. 178).

Panferov goes on to make IEP specific recommendations on program promotion. She states program administrators must understand the differences between marketing, selling, and promotion and a direct or indirect promotional approach. Panferov also outlined specific principles and recommendations for promoting an IEP. She based these recommendations on literature within the TESOL field. While Panferov, through the use of a survey, comes closer than Brady or Miller in demonstrating the need for more preparation in the area of program promotion, she does not provide any specifics about the survey she used nor how many respondents she had. Finally, the literature she cites is from the same dated, opinion- and experience-based sources cited in this review of literature.

Wallace (2003) fills these gaps through his quantitative analysis of UIEP enrollment numbers. The purpose of his study was to determine the factors that influence the size and growth of enrollment in UIEPs and to determine the extent to which they do so. He attempted to determine how three factors affect UIEP size and growth: fixed, inherent aspects of the UIEP and its university; institutional policies and practices of the UIEP and its university which provide incentives or disincentives for international students; and promotion, marketing, and student recruitment efforts. He also asks which factors UIEP directors feel most impact UIEP size and growth. Although Wallace's literature review includes many of the sources found in this review and

Panferov's (2008) article, he provides a detailed analysis of the survey responses from a simple random sample of 99 of the 290 UIEPs within professional organizations at the time of his study. The survey was divided into both factual and perceptual questions and 79% of the surveys were returned completed.

From his study, Wallace (2003) develops 13 separate findings or recommendations for UIEP administrators who wish to increase enrollment in the UIEP supported by a great deal of detail and historical data. Of these 13 findings of greatest note is #10: Program size increases as the length of term of the program director increases (Wallace, 2003).

While all of the above, with the exception of Wallace, have their individual weakness, all of the above sources provide valuable insights on the importance and guiding principles of marketing and recruitment for UIEPs. The emphasis given to marketing and recruitment in the literature highlights both its importance, and the need felt by UIEP administrators for better skills and information on the area.

Institutional Linkages

The connection UIEPs have with their universities' recruitment efforts and budget leads to the importance of the literature addressing the linkages between UIEPs and their university as a whole. Stoller and Christison (1994) wrote that "one major responsibility of IEP administrators is to liaise with senior-level administrators and boards of directors" (p. 17). They pointed out that "often, these senior-level officials have little understanding of the nature of intensive English language instruction or the nature of second language acquisition" (p. 17), and that they seldom realize that most IEP students "finish their IEP studies with a language proficiency that would exceed the language requirements for a bachelor's degree from a modern language department"

(p.17). Stoller and Christison (1994) then go on to outline several responsibilities UIEP administrators have in serving as a liaison with administrators at the university. These responsibilities are creating consciousness-raising documents through printed information on the program, keeping accurate records, meeting with higher-level decision makers, highlighting UIEP professional and academic affiliations, and maintaining a visible profile.

Jenks (1997) highlights similar responsibilities, and provides a legitimacy questionnaire as well as a list of topics of interest to higher-administration at the university. Jenks also suggests the steps to take in increasing UIEP legitimacy. These steps are: 1. Gaining governmental support; 2. Gaining non-governmental support; 3. Assisting other units within the university whenever possible; 4. Building cooperative linkages within the university; 5. Communicating clearly and regularly with different constituencies at the host university; and, 5. Promoting service linkages, such as TOEFL administration, within the university. Jenks (1997) concludes by lamenting that

Administrators of IEPs often fail to accept or confront the many subliminal and negative perceptions of the IEP mission and its students: IEP students are not often U.S. citizens and are thus not equals. IEP students do not speak English fluently and are thus targets for English-only political groups. The IEP student body is composed of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. IEP students are not considered to be fully matriculated university students even though they are enrolled in 20-30 hours of instruction per week. And there is a sentiment among provincially minded academicians that learning ESL (and learning it to a high level) is “basic” and prerequisite to academic entry. (p.118)

While Jenks (1997) focuses solely on the UIEP’s linkages with the university, UIEP administrators must also be aware of the importance of linkages with the community as a whole.

Smith Murdock (1997) and NAFSA in the ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b) emphasized both types of linkages, as well. Smith Murdock (1997) defined outreach as those activities “going beyond the visible and obvious boundaries of an organization” (p.161), and feels that regardless of the form this takes outreach efforts should “arise out of the real needs of ESL students, the institution, and the broader community” (p. 161). Smith Murdock then delineated five principle goals UIEP administrators should remember in creating linkages on campus:

- 1.Ensuring that the ESL program demonstrably participates in achieving the institution’s mission and goals;
- 2.Increasing the credibility, viability, and stability of the ESL program;
3. Creating an environment on campus wherein ESL program students, faculty, and staff are seen as essential and valuable campus resources;
- 4.Making additional and improved resources available to the ESL program;
- and 5.Becoming an integral part of efforts to internationalize the campus and the community in part by promoting cultural learning. (Smith Murdock, 1997, p.162)

Smith Murdock (1997) concluded by listing 10 possible ways in which UIEP administrators can develop outreach programs with the community.

In the ESL Program Administration Workshop, NAFSA (2007b) listed six recommendations for promoting language programs within the college or university, and four ways in which IEPs could create connections in the community. These, however, are drawn from or mirror those recommendations made by Stoller and Christoson (1994), Jenks (1997), and Smith Murdock (1997).

Personnel and Human Resources

Personnel and Human Resources are often the last aspect UIEP teaching faculty consider, but are often the first challenge UIEP administrators face. As Geddes and Marks (1997) note, “the effective management of human resources is crucial to the success of a language program” (p. 199). They continue by noting that by “dedicating

time and effort to researching, creating, and implementing personnel policies and procedures, the language program administrator greatly increases the program's ability to attract and retain quality faculty and staff" (p. 199). Geddes and Marks (1997) provide a detailed overview to the key elements of human resources, including the stages of staffing, such as job descriptions, recruitment, and interviewing; supervision and evaluation; and problem solving, changes in personnel, and professional development. The overview could serve as an important step-by-step resource for UIEP administrators.

Stoller and Christison (1994) and Soppelsa (1997) specifically address faculty development. Stoller and Christison (1994) provided eight suggestions on how to support faculty development, including encouraging professionalism, involving faculty in decision making, providing easy access to materials and the administration, rewarding faculty, and encouraging feedback, evaluation, and experimentation. Soppelsa (1997) suggests that beyond faculty development, IEP administrators need to support and advocate for the empowerment of faculty. Soppelsa (1997) explains that faculty empowerment is "based on a philosophy of academic program management that stresses a sharing of authority for decision making" (p. 123). She then continues to outline why it is important to do so, and how to accomplish this empowerment.

NAFSA chooses to address personnel and human resources at a more basic level in the ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b) and the Professional Practice Workshop: Beyond Advising: Management Basics for International Educators (2007a). In the ESL Program Administration Workshop (2007b), NAFSA outlines the administrative and fiscal responsibilities of which IEP administrators must be aware, as

well as basic elements of staffing a program, recruiting and screening applicants, interviewing, and guiding principles. In the Management Basics for International Educators Workshop NAFSA (2007a) states the basic overall objectives of understanding the importance human resources play in an organization, the importance of the role of the hiring process, the importance of writing job descriptions, advertising positions, and selecting employees appropriately. The workshop manual also briefly covers various ways to involve and motivate faculty and staff.

Program Evaluation

Outside actual curriculum, teaching methodology, and materials, perhaps the greatest amount of literature exists on Program Evaluation. Indeed, *Building Better English Language Programs: Perspectives on Evaluation in ESL*, edited by Pennington (1991), is an entire compilation of research and essays on the very topic. Maurice (1996) examined the role student evaluations play in the decisions IEP administrators make, and Skrezyna (1998) examined what information can be found based upon program evaluations. Henrichsen (1994) provided guidance on completing program self-studies. Finally, each section of NAFSA's *ESL Program Administration Workshop* (2007b) incorporated elements of appropriate forms of evaluation.

The works on evaluation of English language programs are divided into four areas in Pennington (1991). In the first, approaches to ESL program evaluation, Brown and Pennington (1991) discussed eight different procedures for program evaluation and provided suggestions on when and how to use them. Byrd and Constantinides (1991) discussed issues surrounding self-study and self-regulation of ESL programs. Eskey, Lacy, and Kraft (1991) discussed a broader form of evaluation which evaluates the

program not just with the students, faculty, and staff as a user, but with the university as a user as well.

In the second section of Pennington's (1991) *Building Better English Language Programs: Perspectives on Evaluation in ESL*, evaluating curriculum process and content, means of evaluating the program curriculum are discussed. Pennington and Brown (1991) discussed means to unify the curriculum process and evaluation with curriculum outcomes. Winskowski-Jackson (1991) covered nine ways in which the cultural components of a language program should be evaluated.

The third and fourth sections of Pennington's (1991) *Building Better English Language Programs: Perspectives on Evaluation in ESL* address assessment outside of the classroom. In the third section, assessing non-instructional aspects of the program, Middlebrook (1991) discusses the evaluation of ten components of student services. While the technology aspects are a bit dated, Ponder and Powell (1991) provide valuable guidelines for creating a statistical database for evaluation. Jenks (1991) provides information on the evaluation of program promotional materials. Finally, in part four, reviewing the performance of teachers and administrators, Pennington and Young (1991) review various procedures and instruments for personnel evaluation, and include samples of each. Fox (1991) describes the rationale for and means of evaluating an ESL program director, and Matthies (1991) describes three different approaches which can be used in evaluation by language program administrators.

Beyond the contents of Pennington's (1991) *Building Better English Language Programs: Perspectives on Evaluation in ESL* some significant research does exist in

this area. Maurice (1996) examined the role student feedback actually plays in program evaluation. In his study,

seven research questions concerning student feedback were addressed: (1) extent of use, (2) impact on administrative decision-making, (3) administrator satisfaction with use and impact, (4) benefits and worrisome issues related to feedback, (5) trends in use, (6) the relationships between the various demographic variables and the other research questions, and (7) how different types of administrators might be conceptualized in terms of an adapted version of Quinn's (1988) model of competing organizational values. (p. xviii)

Maurice (1996) surveyed the 63 directors of the IEPs in UCIEP, 56 of who responded.

Maurice (1996) concludes that while there is no single form of evaluation which is appropriate for all programs at all times, student evaluation appears to a useful, and often the most useful, means of program evaluation.

In addition to Maurice's study, Skrezyna (1998) evaluates four intensive English programs, both university-based and private enterprises, to determine what makes a successful IEP. Her findings are somewhat self-evident, determining that successful IEPs have directors and faculty who believe the resources, curriculum, faculty and administration are successful; but, the instruments used to determine the success of the IEPs could serve use in designing program evaluations. Henrichson (1994) provides a list of 20 elements IEPs should be aware of in attempting to complete a program self-study. Henrichson (1994) compiles this list from the information from 16 self-study reports, evaluations, or publications.

Change and Innovation

The results of self-studies or program evaluation often lead to the awareness of a need for change in the IEP. The role the IEP administration plays in IEP change and innovation has been addressed by Stoller (1995), Stoller (1997), Stoller (2009) Witbeck

and Healey (1997), and Mickelson (1997). Stoller (1995, 1997, 2009) dedicated the greatest amount of research to this topic. Stoller (1995) surveyed the 60 directors of IEPs in UCIEP and received responses from 43 of them. Based upon the results of this study, Stoller (1997) emphasizes that one of the crucial roles of an IEP administrator is to serve as a catalyst for innovation. She then continues to provide nine guiding principles for successfully accomplishing this. Stoller's 1997 and 2009 works both refer to this original study, but support it with more recent out-of-field research in the area of program and classroom innovation. She suggests her findings could be applied to programs in higher education outside of the IEP.

Witbeck and Healey (1997) discuss the impetus for change new technology is creating for IEPs. While the technology discussed is somewhat dated, the rapidly evolving field of academic technology and the greater and greater availability of database resources suggest that their recommendations still hold. The administration of an IEP must be willing to embrace new technology and effectively manage the change it will bring to a program (Witbeck and Healey, 1997). Mickelson (1997) looks at change and innovation in the IEP through grants and projects. He notes that traditional IEP administrators avoid pursuing grants or projects either through ignorance of the process or because of the fear they would dilute the mission of the IEP. He suggests that quite the reverse is true, and that the IEP is dependent upon the administration to pursue such grants and projects in order to help further its mission.

Program Directors

As the previous section of this literature review demonstrated, the roles within the administration of UIEPs are diverse and complicated. Therefore, it could be suggested that that the role of the individual director in a UIEP is even more intricate.

Unfortunately, because a limited amount of research exists on the general administration of UIEPs, even less has been written specifically on the role of the director in these UIEPs. Much of the literature that does exist is dated and relies heavily upon a single study, Matthies' 1984 survey of 177 IEP program directors. This provided valuable information for practitioners and researchers in the field, a basis for IEP directorship which had not existed to that date.

The results of the survey showed that directors use of managerial skills far outweighed their use of teaching, curriculum and materials design skills. Matthies (1984) highlights the potential problems these directors could face by noting that while the managerial skills were more important to their positions, the vast majority of the directors had backgrounds and experiences primarily in education.

Matthies' (1984) suggestion of difficulties is highlighted by the fact that the majority of the directors listed educators' skills as their strongest, and managers' skills as their weakest. Interestingly, despite listing managerial skills as their weakest, directors equally wished to be able to pursue more education both in managerial areas, and in educator areas. Matthies suggests that this is because they feel strongly that it is important to remain abreast of new research in the field of ESL education. She categorizes her findings according to the skills which can be considered educator skills and those which can be considered managerial skills. Table 2-1 shows the top 10 skills respondents felt were the most important, or those in which they felt they needed more training.

Table 2-1. Matthies' (1984) findings

Manager	Educator
Developing a staff team	Communicating effectively across cultures
Managing available time efficiently	Maintaining an environment conducive to learning
Evaluating the IEPs needs	Designing a comprehensive curriculum
Maintaining enrollments and student recruitment	
Computer use	
Initiating constructive criticism	

Matthies closes her recommendations on her 1984 findings with the suggestions that research should be conducted on the role directors' personalities play in their success, and that graduate TESL programs begin to incorporate classes in educational administration or business administration in order to better serve the future needs of their students. Although now a quarter of a century old, Matthies' study remains the strongest to-date on the skills and knowledge held by directors of intensive English programs.

More than a decade later, Pennington (1994) drawing on Matthies' (1984) research, makes almost the exact same recommendation regarding TESL graduate programs. She suggests that these programs are focusing solely on students who will never accept any administrative roles. As the strongest teachers often take on some administrative roles in their programs, even if they do not serve as directors, Pennington (1994) suggests that more preparation in this area is necessary.

Pennington (1994) surveyed 34 intensive English program directors to determine in which areas of their current positions they felt they had the most and least academic preparation. Pennington (1994) determined, much as Matthies (1984) had, that while the directors' favorite activities and those in which they felt most effective were very

much associated with their role as an educator, or academics, the activities on which they spent the most time were those that were managerial. These managerial activities were also those in which they felt the least effective. A summary of the top 10 skills directors felt were most important or most time consuming in Pennington's (1994) findings can be found in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2. Pennington's (1994) findings

Manager	Educator
Correspondence related to recruitment and enrollment	Meetings with students for advising or counseling
Public relations and personalized marketing	Curriculum
Telephone work	
Promotion and recruitment	
Public relations within the university and community	
Faculty hiring, supervision, and evaluation	
Program planning and management	

Interestingly, while the majority of Pennington's respondents wish they had been provided more coursework in educational or business administration in their degree programs, the majority of them also said their coursework in TESL was critical to their success. Pennington (1994) suggests this highlights the need for IEP directors to be both educators and managers. She concludes with the suggestion that while IEP directors must be well prepared in the area of TESL, supplemental coursework in management practices would be a valuable addition to graduate TESL programs.

As was demonstrated in the literature covering the general administration of a UIEP (Barrett, 1982; Christison & Stoller, 1997; NAFSA 2007b) and in the above two studies, the direction of an IEP requires a wide variety of skills and background knowledge of best practices in both pedagogical and administrative fields. A comparison

of Matthies' 1984 findings and Pennington's 1994 findings highlight the importance of skills considered managerial in the IEP director role. A comparison of the findings of the top 10 skills in both surveys can be found in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3. Matthies' (1984) and Pennington's (1994) findings

Manger Role	Educator Role	Matthies (1984)	Pennington (1994)
Developing a staff team		X	
Managing available time efficiently		X	
Evaluating the IEPs needs		X	
Maintaining enrollments and student recruitment		X	X
Computer use		X	
Initiating constructive criticism		X	
Public relations and personalized marketing			X
Telephone work			X
Faculty hiring, supervision, and evaluation			X
Program planning and management			X
	Communicating effectively across cultures	X	
	Maintaining an environment conducive to learning	X	
	Designing a comprehensive curriculum	X	X
	Meetings with students for advising or counseling		X

Unfortunately, very little research has been done on the specific set of skills and knowledge or of which aspects of all of the above are most crucial for the preparation of

and success of a UIEP director in the 21st century. The literature that does exist is reviewed below and is divided into the specific skills or knowledge bases addressed.

Leadership

The NAFSA (2007b) participant manual for the Foundations of International Education: ESL Program Administration dedicates a section to leadership, and the role of the UIEP director as a leader. The workshop states that the learner will

1. Investigate different statements about leadership, management and administration: the influence of the leader on the organization, the necessity of the leader to know self and others, and the traits of leaders.
2. Explore ways to examine paradigms in order to see oneself and others more clearly.
3. Be introduced to a selection of articles, chapters, and books that synthesize research about effective leadership. (p.1)

Unfortunately, the statements about leadership date from 1974 to 2001, with the vast majority dating from the 1970s and 1980s. A similar gap exists in the paradigms and research presented in the workshop. Only two of the articles cited relate directly to IEPs. The other articles and research focus purely on business leadership in general and date from the 1960s and 1970s, with one exception from 2001. Skills as a leader must surely be critical to the success of an IEP director. However, the most up-to-date training manual on ESL administration can provide barely the minimum background for new or aspiring directors. This points to a need for updated research or interdisciplinary research in the field.

This need has been partially met by two publications within the last 5 years. The first, Coombe, McCloskey, Stephenson, and Anderson's (2008) *Leadership in English Language Teaching and Learning*, looks at developing leadership skills in the field of

English as a second or foreign language in general. The chapters are written to apply to everyone from a teacher in a 3rd grade classroom to the manager of a for-profit language company outside of the United States. The book is divided into sections on leadership theory, interpersonal and communication strategies, personal organizational skills and strategies, program organizational skills and strategies, and leadership issues in U.S. public schools. Although the various authors do a commendable job of supporting their recommendations with recent sources from within the field of leadership, few of the chapters directly relate to the administration of a UIEP. The second publication, Christison and Murray's (2009) *Leadership in English Language Education* does provide some UIEP specific chapters, and these are reviewed under the appropriate subheading within this review of literature. As a whole, the publication does well to draw upon more recent research within the field of leadership, but most of the IEP resources are the same dated sources found in this literature review.

Strategic Planning

Klinghammer (1997) discusses the need for UIEP directors to be strategic planners. She points out that all too often; they instead find themselves spending time putting out unnecessary fires. She also emphasizes that to "be effective leaders, language program administrators must realize that although individual vision is important, strategic planning requires that administrators recognize patterns that are emerging inside and outside of language programs" (p.72). Klinghammer (1997) acknowledges, however, that strategic planning, from vision, to plan development, to implementation can be an overwhelming prospect for many directors.

In order to aid in this effort, Klinghammer (1997) provides a detailed case study of how a UIEP director does create a vision for, develop, and implement a strategic

plan. Klinghammer (1997) highlights how this thus ensures continued maintenance, evaluation, and revision of the UIEP's strategic plan. This case study can provide a valuable framework for other UIEP directors in developing their skills in strategic planning. However, as the case study was of Klinghammer's own program, one also must question if bias exists in the study.

Decision Making and Negotiation

Alexandra Rowe Henry (1997) believes skills in decision making and negotiation are essential for UIEP directors. She notes, however, that to be "an effective negotiator and decision maker, administrators must have expertise in a wide variety of areas, both academic and nonacademic, including instruction, materials development, recruitment, program research, budgets and finances, employment conditions, interpersonal relations, interdepartmental politics, and global events". (p. 77). This seems an overwhelming amount of knowledge to maintain in order to utilize these skills. Rowe Henry acknowledges this and indicates that in addition to the knowledge necessary, the skills necessary for effective decision-making and negotiation are also complex. She delineates the six greatest challenges a UIEP director will face in building these skills, and the detailed considerations which need to be taken into account in facing each of these challenges: scope and diversity of decisions and negotiations, process of decision making and negotiating, clarifying the difference between deciding and negotiating the time factor of deciding and negotiating, the need to make decisions or negotiate in the midst of crisis or conflict management, and IEP directors as servant leaders. Rowe Henry (1997) concludes by reassuring new or potential IEP directors that becoming an effective decision maker and negotiator is a long process based upon continuous experience and learning. While detailed, Rowe Henry's information is based upon the

sources reviewed here as well as her own, albeit significant, experience as a UIEP director. It does, however, highlight again the need to capture the skills and knowledge of experienced directors before they leave their positions or the field.

Influencing Policy Formation

Rawley (1997) suggests that because the United States does not have national policy, outside of immigration regulations, regarding international students in higher education, “IEPs play a central role in the educational experience of students attending, or preparing to attend, U.S. colleges and universities” (p. 93). She therefore designed a study to “determine how IEP directors at institutions with substantial international student populations view the ways in which their institutions define and provide for the needs of these students on campus” (p.94). Rawley (1997) conducted formal interviews with the directors of four UIEPs in order to learn their views on the formation of policy at their host institutions.

Rawley (1997) determined that none of the institutions had formulated policy and that at all four locations policy regarding international students seemed to happen “by accident” (p.95). For this reason, Rawley and all four directors feel that it is essential for UIEP directors to become familiar with institutional policy-making procedures, to create contacts throughout the university in order to stay current with this process, and to strike a balance between being an international student advocate, and knowing which battles to fight. Finally, they all agree that “one of their most important administrative functions is to educate the college or university community” (p.100).

Intercultural Communication and Management

Carkin (1997) writes of UIEP directors as advocates for the marginalized. She believes that UIEP students, as other international students are, are marginalized

because they are linguistic and ethnic minorities. She believes that UIEP programs are marginalized because they are seen as remedial, and that their faculty and administration are marginalized because they do not fit neatly within the existing structure of the university. She suggests that the role of UIEP administrators should be integrating the program and its students within the institution. She suggests ten ways this can be accomplished by the UIEP director and program serving as a bridge spanning the boundaries between the established and the marginalized. She suggests that in order to do this effectively, the UIEP director should “be a skillful intercultural manager who has knowledge of institutional discourses, who knows how to communicate across cultures and hierarchies, and who is able to negotiate from multiple perspectives” (p.50). While Carkin relies on her own experiences for the UIEP aspect of her writing, she does cite recent research on intercultural management and the nature of higher education as a whole.

Ethics

Stoynoff (1993) cautions of the large number of ethical decisions UIEP administrators face on a regular basis. Most frequently, these decisions involve access to information and the right to privacy, personal and professional integrity, and complying with recognized standards and practices. He notes that administrators are “regularly faced with choosing between competing and often equally legitimate courses of action, none of which may represent a completely acceptable resolution” (p.4) and that because of the nature of UIEPs, they may “be forced to choose between conflicting priorities: fulfilling fiscal or academic responsibilities” (p.4). He concludes by recommending UIEP administrators clearly delineate values, principles and policies prior to needing to make difficult decisions.

Evaluation

While not necessarily a skill or knowledge set a UIEP director must possess, both Fox (1991) and Matthies (1991) discuss the evaluation of the UIEP director. Fox outlines the ten attributes on which UIEP directors should be evaluated, as well as the skills on which they must be evaluated. Matthies discusses both the importance of regular evaluation of program directors, and the best means and instruments with which to conduct those evaluations.

Fox (1991) believes the UIEP director should be evaluated on vision, establishing goals and communicating those goals, continuous assessment of the program, professional involvement and activity in the field, time management, team building, professionalism, providing a secure working environment, effective decision making, and the ability to keep work and professional life in perspective. Fox (1991) also suggests that the director must “combine the professional technical skills of the field with those of a business manager” (p.233). Because the role of the UIEP director is so varied, Fox (1991) believes the three types of skills required can be summarized as human, conceptual, and technical. He concludes by suggesting any evaluation of the director needs to incorporate the ten attributes and three skills sets.

Matthies (1991) laments that “there are almost no suitable instruments designed to measure an ESL program administrator’s effectiveness in any standardized way” (p.244). She feels that too often the UIEP administrator is evaluated on the role s/he plays at the larger institution as a whole, rather than against national standards or the role they play within the UIEP. Matthies suggests that UIEP directors should seek to be evaluated by all with whom they work, including the students of the UIEP. She also suggests that directors use the results of the evaluations to take courses or pursue

studies in the areas in which they feel they are the weakest. Establishing an accepted skill set and knowledge base for UIEP directors would perhaps help address the concerns of both Fox and Matthies.

Research

Munsell (1982) suggests that not only is there a need for directors to pursue research in addition to their administrative duties, but that many desire to do so. He suggests the lack of research in the field could be attributed to several factors, including administration and scholarship making opposite demands, an administrator's need for an overall picture and research focusing on details, and the need for an administrator to be practical, while a researcher must be speculative. Munsell (1982) concludes by providing nine suggestions on how UIEP directors can pursue research while serving as administrators, and five areas in which research in UIEPs is necessary. It is interesting that only one article, written in 1982, discusses the role research should play in an IEP director's position. Perhaps this helps explain the relative lack of current research in the field.

The Delphi Method

The preceding sections of this review of literature highlight the need for more research in the area of UIEP administration in general. Specifically, this study hopes to establish a skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal qualities of UIEP directors accepted by experts within the field. Given the wide variety of possible items to be included and the large number of diverse opinions on the importance of these items, it may be beneficial to approach the problem in a manner other than using a standard pre-developed survey. After reviewing the work of Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, and Pierce (2007) it seems one way of accomplishing this would be to use the Delphi method.

Indeed, the framework for their entire study is based upon their perceived need, and attempt to fill the need, of an established skill- and knowledge-set for the Senior International Officers (SIOs) on U.S. university campuses. For this reason, the bulk of this section of the review shall focus on their research. However, two other studies using the Delphi method are also discussed in order to provide more information on the possible applications of the Delphi method in higher education.

According to Lambert, et al. (2007), the Delphi method is a “method for gaining input from recognized sources of expertise, and for developing a consensus or confluence of views” (p.2). They decided to use the method because it

is typically used to elicit information, suggestions, and judgments from a dispersed and heterogeneous group of specialists on an issue of interest to all of them, but where there may not yet be a clear agreement on the shape of the issue (p. 2).

The method also “works well when the factors surrounding the problem are not well understood, controversial, or subjectively weighted” (p.2). In using the Delphi method an initial set of questions is sent to a preselected list of expert respondents. These responses are summarized, and more detailed questions are sent in a second round. If more elaboration is yet still required, a third round can be undertaken, although the authors did not feel it was necessary to do so in this case (Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, & Pierce, 2007).

For the above reasons, Lambert, et al. (2007) chose to use the Delphi method to create a specific skill- and knowledge-set for SIOs. They felt that through the Delphi method they could capture the skills and knowledge of existing SIOs and then discover what importance the group attached to each of the identified areas of skill or knowledge. They felt that the study was important to conduct in order to

Generate a snapshot of where the international education leadership is right now, from the perspective of SIOs themselves;

Better understand what SIOs possess in the way of skills and knowledge, and what importance they attach to these.

Be able to better meet the needs of senior managers for training and other professional development activities.

Provide information to presidents, provosts, search committees, accrediting bodies, and academic search firms to help them draft better job descriptions.

Provide information to SIOs and others to help them restructure and/or improve campus operations. (p.2)

Lambert, et al. (2007) identified 35 expert SIOs based upon three qualities. Their participants were SIOs, their participants had enough experience to be able to provide strong responses, and their participants were willing to participate. In the first round, they asked the participants to share what they needed to know in order to do their jobs and what they needed to do in order to do their jobs. They categorized the responses from the first round and then, in the second round, asked the participants to attach a level of importance to each identified area. After weighting the responses to the second round, the researchers determined that a third round was not necessary in order to provide the field with the information they sought.

A second Delphi study is Geltner's (2007) research on the curriculum components necessary for the preparation of school counselors. Geltner identified a roughly equal number of school counselors and school counselor practitioners to total 35 participants. For the first round of her Delphi study Geltner created a survey based upon the existing literature on curriculum components for school counselor education. She then sent it to the participants and asked them to indicate the importance of each item. Geltner then eliminated items that were not rated of high enough importance by

either group. For the second round, Geltner sent the abbreviated survey back to the participants. She repeated this process for the third round. While when using the Delphi method this would have provided Geltner with the study results, she then also decided to analyze her results using independent t-tests and ANOVA analysis. Given the limited number of participants this was neither necessary nor fruitful.

A third study undertaken using the Delphi method which provides a good possible model is Deardorff's 2004 study. The purpose of Deardorff's study was to create a definition of intercultural competence and to develop a means of assessing this competence. Deardorff used the Delphi method to survey a panel of 23 internationally recognized experts in the field. Deardorff used three rounds of the Delphi method in order to allow this panel of experts to define the key terms of intercultural competence.

The first round of Deardorff's study involved sending two open-ended questions. The second round was a survey created from the responses to the open ended question, and the third round was an abbreviated survey based upon the responses to the second round. What perhaps makes this Delphi study stronger than the other two aforementioned studies is that Deardorff then validated the results of the survey by sending it to a group of 24 educational administrators in positions in which they would work with students or faculty gaining intercultural competence at universities recognized for their achievements in internationalization.

Studies utilizing the Delphi method exist in fields as diverse as political science to nursing. The above three studies, all within higher education, seem to indicate the Delphi method can be a successful tool in creating a unified opinion from a diverse group of experts. Lambert, Peterson, Nolan, and Pierce (2007) could have completed

the third round of the Delphi in order to help validate the results, and Geltner (2007) perhaps should not have attempted a statistical analysis of her Delphi results. Deardorff, however, seems to present a strong model which could be followed in the future.

Conclusions

It is clear that a diverse array of literature exists on the administration of Intensive English Programs and the role directors play in this administration. Four key observations can be made from this literature. The first is to note that only a few quantitative or qualitative studies have been completed on the administration of UIEPs. The bulk of the literature is based upon these few studies or upon self-created, peer-evaluated standards or guidelines. Very little actual data has been collected in this field, outside of the pedagogical realm.

The second observation focuses on the timeline of the existing literature. The first UIEP was founded over seventy years ago. After a flurry of publications in the 1980s, the research and literature based upon these IEPs seems to have reached a peak in the mid-1990s. Very little has been published since that time. We could speculate that this is tied to the enrollment decrease experienced by UIEPs, first because of the Asian economic crisis in the late-1990s and then caused by the events of 9/11. This decrease in enrollment likely led to more administrator-scholars focusing time and funding on the day-to-day operations of the IEP, leaving less time and funding for research and publication. We could also speculate that by the mid-1990s most existing UIEPs were well-enough established within their universities, that administrators had less of a pressing need to maintain a high profile through publications. The veracity of either speculation, however, remains to be determined.

Finally, it is clear from the literature that the role the director of a UIEP plays is multifaceted, combining aspects of academics, business, and management. The elements included in this literature review are by no means an exhaustive list. It is clear, however, that more, and more current, research is sorely needed in the field. Undertaking a Delphi study in order to establish an accepted skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal characteristics for UIEP directors will certainly help fill this void and will provide the necessary framework to guide hiring practices and graduate coursework within the TESL field.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The Setting

The purpose of this study is to establish an accepted skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal qualities necessary to be an effective director of a university or college based, non-proprietary intensive English program (UIEP). This research will serve as a means of moving towards meeting three critical needs in the field. It will serve to capture the knowledge, skills, and talents of the most experienced UIEP directors prior to their retirement. Additionally, it will provide search committees with the information necessary to make appropriate appointments both in replacing newly-retired directors and in hiring directors for new programs. Finally, this research should add to the coursework of MA and PhD programs in the field of teaching English as a second language (TESL). This study attempts to capture this accepted skill set, knowledge base, and overview of personal qualities utilizing the Delphi method. This study attempts to fulfill these three needs by capturing information about the knowledge and skills held by the most expert directors in the field.

Participants

This study attempts to capture information about the knowledge, skills and personal qualities of expert UIEP directors in the field. In order to find a suitable group of expert directors, the determination was first made to include the top programs in the field by limiting the study to UCIEP member programs. The 67 directors of each of these programs must meet, at minimum, the qualifications for director provided by the UCIEP guidelines including holding a Masters' or PhD in TESL or a related field. Of these 67 directors, approximately 29 have had ten or more years of experience directing a

university or college intensive English program within the United States. Approximately 15 of these 29 directors have had twenty or more years of experience directing a university or college intensive English program within the United States. Approximately 29 UCIEP program directors with 10 or more years of experience made up the population of the study. This meets the recommended 11-30 participants when using the Delphi method.

Of the 29 potential participants approximately 13 were male and 16 female. At the beginning of the study, of the 15 directors with 20 or more years of experience, 14 expected to retire within the next five years. Of the 29 directors with 10 or more years of experience, 25 expected to retire within the next five years (UCIEP Listserv personal communication, November 2009). Seven of the 29 directors had served as President of UCIEP, and almost all had served on the boards of UCIEP, AAIEP, TESOL, NAFSA, or other professional organizations.

The participants all responded to a request for retirement information on the UCIEP Listserv, so it was expected using email as a means of distributing the questions and following surveys would be successful. In addition, UCIEP members are required to attend one of two annual multi-day conferences and the participants, in general, attend both. Because of the timing of the research, the initial questions were able to be distributed and then collected during the meeting timeframe.

Research Design

The Delphi method has been used since the first half of the 20th century in order to create consensus among a diverse group of experts (Stewart, 2001). Since that time, it has been adapted to many uses in many fields. It is an appropriate methodology for this study for, as Stewart (2001) explains, "Its capacity to capture those areas of

collective knowledge that are held within professions but not often verbalized makes it enormously useful in the field of professional education” (p.922).

The Delphi method is not without controversy, however. A Delphi study can be seen as either a qualitative or quantitative methodology. Because the first round of the Delphi method traditionally begins with open-ended questions, to which opinions are often sought, it has often been labeled a qualitative method (Stewart, 2001). However, as Dalkey (1969) originally indicated, the Delphi method creates “a well-defined process that can be described quantitatively” (p. 409). Stewart (2001) indicates that the Delphi method could be used in either quantitative or qualitative research, but that what is most important in determining which it is, is to consider what will drive the analysis of the results of the different rounds, indicating that the Delphi method is “fundamentally reductionist in nature” and that although different meanings are collected, the researcher “reduces them to amalgamate ‘alike’ statements” (p. 922). In reality, it is examination of reliability and validity and the role consensus plays in the Delphi method, that best highlights its applicability to quantitative research.

Before beginning a discussion of the validity of the Delphi method, its reliability must be established. Hasson, Keeney, and McKenna (2000) delineate one of the strongest critiques of the Delphi method, that if two or more panels of experts were to approach the same questions, the same results would not be obtained. They go on to suggest that this problem of reliability can be resolved by applying the criteria used for reliability in qualitative studies. This, itself, would likely only add to the dispute for most quantitative researchers. Interestingly, the Delphi method was originally established to obtain a reliable consensus of opinion (Landeta, 2006). Under closer inspection, it is not

the Delphi method itself which has issues of reliability, but poorly designed and undertaken Delphi studies which lead to unreliable results (Dalkey, 1969; Jones & Hunter, 1995; Landeta, 2006). If the research design closely follows the classic or conventional Delphi method and the expert panel is carefully selected, the method is, indeed, reliable.

Ludlow (1975) first demonstrated the most basic form of reliability when he determined that, using the Delphi method, three groups of experts came to the same conclusions as measured by statistical summaries. Deardorff (2004) indicates the use of a monitoring team is a common method to protect against bias in responses, and hence increase reliability. However, by far the greatest focus on reliability came from Dalkey (1969). Dalkey examined the reliability of the Delphi method both based upon group size, and upon the importance the role consensus plays in this reliability. Dalkey's first approach to the problem of reliability was to approach the problem of opinion. The Delphi method, by definition, solicits opinions. The problem with opinion, according to Dalkey, is that by definition there is a reasonable probability of it being false. He notes that the basis of the Delphi method is that "two heads are better than one", or, more specifically, "n heads are better than one" (p. 411). However, the Delphi method does more than simply develop a basic aggregate of opinion, as this would not necessarily be reliable. Dalkey notes:

Another important consideration with respect to the n-heads rule has to do with reliability. The most uncomfortable aspect of opinion from the standpoint of the decision maker is that experts with apparently equal degrees of expertness are likely to give quite different answers to the same question. (p. 412)

He goes on to note that, for a researcher using a method employing expert opinion, it is "clearly desirable for a study that another analyst using the same approach (and

different experts) arrive at similar results” (p. 413). Dalkey demonstrates that a simple increase in the number of experts responding to a single questionnaire increases reliability somewhat, but that the reliability could be increased even more by more direct pooling of information. This is where the idea of consensus emerges as key to the reliability, and hence validity, of the Delphi technique.

Dalkey (1969) references a study in which groups of 15 were asked to determine the correct answer to questions with factual responses unknown to the group. This study involved 11 experiments with 5000 answers to about 300 questions. With iteration and feedback from the first round, the responses on the second round became more accurate. This is explained by consensus, wherein those with outlying incorrect responses moved closer to the group mean. Dalkey describes the iteration and consensus phenomenon in terms of “swingers” and “holdouts”, or those who did or did not change their responses. The “holdouts” tend to have the correct answer, so when the “swingers” move towards them, the general mean also moves in the direction of the correct answer. Therefore, with each iteration the mean will move closer and closer to the truth. As this happens, the results become more and more reliable.

With the potential of the Delphi method providing reliable results having been established, assuming studies are carefully crafted, it is possible to turn to the issue of validity of the Delphi technique. If reliability is assumed, there appears to be far less concern with validity in the literature. As Mitroff and Turoff (1975) explain, validity is often measured in “degree of consensus” (p. 22). Scheele (1975), follows this same thought process in that pooled responses will have a greater validity than that of any individual. Because of this, as Okoli and Pawlowski (2004) note, the Delphi technique

lends itself greatly to increasing construct validity as participants validate their original responses.

That is not to say careful design is not also important in establishing the validity of a Delphi study. In most studies in which final responses are determined by consensus and pooling, there are several threats to validity. Most specifically, the influence of dominant individuals and the group pressure for conformity can lead to less accurate decisions or information in face-to-face group discussion, than simply taking the median of individual opinions would have (Dalkey, 1969). The Delphi method controls for this, however, through the written collection of data and the feedback provided with the next iterations. Confidentiality also helps control for manipulation or coercion, and for feedback without the meaningless noise created with normal pooling techniques (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Clayton (1997) notes that because consensus through the Delphi method is achieved through refinement and feedback it is much more valid than other methods.

If a large part of the Delphi method's reliability and validity arises out of the consensus of experts, it stands to reason that the selection of these experts is a critical part of study design. Indeed, Clayton (1997) indicates that all panel members must have expertise related to the field of the Delphi survey. This is what sets the Delphi method apart from other survey research. He notes that the critical issue in structuring a valid and reliable Delphi survey is the careful selection of experts. Gupta and Clarke (1996) note that selecting experts without a basis for selection is one of greatest potential weaknesses of the Delphi technique. With careful selection of the expert panel,

however, the technique can have advantages over other survey methods and can be applicable in the field of higher education administration.

The recent research of Geltner (2007), Deardorff (2004), and Lambert, Nolan, Peterson and Pierce (2007) demonstrates the applicability of the Delphi method to higher education. Although each take a slightly different approach to the Delphi method, from Geltner's attempt to statistically analyze 30 responses, to the decision by Lambert, Nolan, Peterson and Pierce not to utilize the traditional second round of the Delphi, they show the versatility and applicability of the method. The current research therefore well supports adopting a quantitative methodology in using the Delphi method to first solicit qualitative responses to open-ended questions and then to objectively categorize the responses and ask for the participants to rate them in a quantitative manner.

Subjectivity Statement

The subjectivity of this study could be called into question based upon the author's own position as a comparatively new director of an intensive English program. However, it is clear from the literature that the need for more information on the skills, knowledge, and personal qualities of administrators of intensive English programs, and directors of these programs in particular is well established and not merely a construct of the author's perceived need. The subjectivity of this study could also be called into question because the author is a director of a UCIEP-member intensive English program and therefore may not be objective in determining which directors are experts. This concern is allayed, however, by making that determination solely upon the number of years of experience each director holds.

The same possible threats to subjectivity represent the researcher's strength in experience with UIEPs, and her extensive background and experience may add to the

quality of the study. In addition to serving as the Director of a UIEP for eight years, the researcher has served in the capacity of a volunteer, a student assistant, a graduate teaching assistant, a program assistant, a substitute fiscal assistant, a student welfare coordinator, a program coordinator, and a curriculum coordinator, all at a UIEP for a career total of 14 years. She served for two years as elected chair of the Florida Intensive English Consortium and three years as one of two elected members-at-large on the UCIEP Steering Committee. In addition she has completed the NAFSA training academy for international educators.

The researcher is still a learner in the field of higher education administration, with her independent research experience limited to class projects. However, she has jointly participated in data collection with faculty, has experience as a presenter and workshop coordinator, and has been invited to speak in the fields of TESL and international education.

Data Collection and Analysis

The Delphi method was used to capture information on the skills, knowledge and personal qualities of expert directors in the field. By definition, the Delphi method requires data to be analyzed throughout the collection process and survey instruments are created through this process. This study was no exception.

From the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 it is clear that many techniques can be used to define, prioritize, and eliminate criteria using the Delphi method. The original round can include open-ended questions, or not. The method can include from two to four, or more, rounds. The data can be analyzed using numerous scales and according to measures of consensus or stability. The element of greatest importance is carefully choosing which of the above methods are the best suited for a given problem or task.

The problem this study seeks to address is the lack of an established skill set or knowledge base for the directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs, or UIEPs. In addition, it attempts to answer the questions about the importance of personal characteristics raised in the largest survey of IEP directors undertaken to-date, Matthies' 1984 study. The Delphi method seems well suited to this research problem as it is a "widely used and accepted method for gathering data from respondents within their domain of expertise" (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p1). The Delphi method has also already been used to establish other knowledge bases or skill sets and competencies with the field of education (Deardorff, 2004; Gupta & Clarke, 1996; Landeta, 2006). However, from the literature, it is clear that in order to be reliable and valid, the study must be well constructed and have a clear process for defining and prioritizing key concepts elicited from the respondents.

The first step to this process was determining if the first round should consist of open-ended questions or closed items available for ranking or editing. At the heart of the problem is the lack of research on the skills, knowledge or personal characteristics of IEP directors, therefore the open-ended question format is the best option for this study. This allowed the selected panel of experts to create their own lists, comments, opinions, and narratives without being influenced by the bias of the researcher or others. The drawback of this method is the creation of a large amount of data, and hence potentially a large initial survey for round two. This was a concern, as the strength of the Delphi method depends upon the willingness of the experts to participate in an already lengthy process. However, as the group of experts in this study was drawn from a consortium which has strongly voiced the need for such an established skill set

and knowledge base, and was made up of individuals who have already demonstrated their willingness to participate in sometimes lengthy surveys for the good of the field, this was not a significant concern. Therefore, three open-ended questions were presented in round one:

1. Which skills are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
2. What knowledge is necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
3. What personal qualities are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Greater thought had to be given to determining how the responses to round one would be categorized and how the experts would be asked to respond to the questionnaire. The answers to these questions are necessary to establish what criteria are used for eliminating and prioritizing responses for future rounds. As seen in Chapter 2, there are multiple options, each with strengths and weaknesses.

First, although there was some overlap, the responses from round one were categorized according to the question to which they were a response. Duplicate items were eliminated and the original verbiage of the response was preserved as much as possible. Based upon the responses, it was also possible to provide sub-categories within each question, such as “teaching skills”, “knowledge of curriculum design”, “technology”, etc. Such subcategories potentially made a lengthy questionnaire easier to digest.

Secondly, given the success of her research in the field of international education, the relevance of her scale to the questions being asked, and the lack of a null value and positive “slant” to her Likert scale, this study was modeled largely on

Deardorff's (2004) response analysis for rounds two and three. In order to do this, the experts were asked to rank each of the items on the round-two questionnaire according to a 4-point Likert scale as indicated below:

- 1= Least important/relevant
- 2= Somewhat important/relevant
- 3= Important/relevant
- 4= Very important/relevant

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each item. As a mean of 2.5 would represent a neutral opinion about the inclusion of an item, any item with a mean value of 2.5 or higher was retained for round 3. The expert respondents also had the option of writing in any additional items they felt were omitted. Although none were provided, these items would also have been added to the questionnaire for round three, with an indication that they were new items.

Although Deardorff (2004) moved directly to an accept/reject model for round three, Dalkey (1969) clearly indicates that reliability and validity of the Delphi method increases with at least two rounds of actual rating of items. As the first round in this study consisted of open-ended questions, it was important for the expert respondents to have the opportunity to re-rate the items having received the feedback of the other members of the expert group. This is, indeed, the essence of the Delphi method, so to omit it, regardless of seemingly large agreement on all items, presents risk.

Given this, for round three, the experts were provided with a questionnaire modified from round two. Any item with a mean value below 2.5 was dropped. The mean value of each item on the questionnaire was indicated on the new version, thus providing the experts with anonymous feedback from the group. Also on the modified survey, in a separate section, were included the dropped items and their mean values.

The experts were asked to, once again, rate each item based upon the Likert scale provided above.

The results for round three were compiled and the means of each item were recalculated using the new responses. As before, any item with a mean value below 2.5 was dropped. Had a fourth round been required, the remaining items would have been compiled within their categories and re-distributed to the experts with the mean value of each item indicated on the questionnaire. For round four, however, rather than being asked to rate the items using the Likert scale, the experts would instead have been asked to either accept or reject each item. Presumably, based on the previous two iterations, all items would have been accepted by the majority of the experts. If, however, any item was rejected by more than 30% of the experts, it would have been dropped. The remaining items would comprise what the experts in the field concur is a necessary skill set and knowledge base for the directors of university and college based IEPs, as well as the personal characteristics important to such directors. Although this accept/reject round was planned for the study, because the level of consensus was great for rounds two and three, it was determined there was no need to undertake a fourth round of the survey.

Based upon the literature and the research to date using the Delphi method in the field of education, the above prioritizing process for defining the necessary skill set and knowledge base of IEP directors is appropriate. The described Delphi method follows the classic Delphi method closely enough to yield results which may be reliable and valid. The resulting skill set and knowledge base will prove valuable both for developing curriculum for graduate TESL programs and for serving as a resource for

novice IEP directors, university administrators attempting to establish new IEPs, and search committees.

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to establish an accepted skill set and knowledge base for directors of university and college Intensive English Programs. The study was undertaken using the Delphi method, in which iterative surveys are used to try to achieve consensus among a group of experts. The study was largely exploratory in nature and simple descriptive statistics were used to analyze and organize the findings. In Chapter 4 an overview of the methodology and intended audience for the study is provided. This is followed by a brief description of the participants and the justification for their inclusion in the Delphi expert group. Next, an outline of the procedure and findings of each of the three iterations of the survey is provided. Finally, Chapter 4 concludes with a synthesis of the findings of the three iterations of the survey.

Overview

As described in Chapter 3, the Delphi method requires an identified group of experts to respond to three or more iterations of a survey with the intended outcome of arriving at some convergence or consensus of responses. For this study, an expert group of 29 directors of university or college intensive English programs was identified. This number falls within the generally accepted size of 11 – 30 participants for a Delphi study (Dalkey, 1969). In the first entirely qualitative step of the Delphi method, this group of experts was provided the first iteration of the survey, consisting of three open-ended questions to which they were asked to respond. Twenty-three of the 29 experts responded and indicated a willingness to participate in the study. The text elicited by these open ended questions was developed into the second iteration of the survey which included, whenever possible, the verbatim responses of the expert group. This

second iteration of the survey was then sent back to the group of experts with a request that they rate the importance or relevance of each item on a Likert-type scale.

Seventeen of the 23 surveys were returned. These results were developed into a third iteration of the survey in which items receiving below a minimum mean were dropped. Finally, this third iteration of the survey, which included information on group means, was sent to the expert group. Fifteen of the 17 participants returned the third iteration of the survey, which was the final survey of the study.

As seen in the overview in Chapter 2, literature exists on the skills and knowledge required of directors of UIEPs; however, only two surveys have been completed to determine what these skills are and what knowledge might be required. Although meaningful, the results of these surveys by Matthies (1984) and Pennington (1994) cannot necessarily be expected to hold true some 20-30 years later. In addition, their survey items were drawn from previously published recommendations on what may be required, lending the possibility of researcher bias. This leaves TESL teacher-educators, university administrators, and IEP directors without a field-accepted skill set or knowledge base on which to draw.

This group of educators, administrators, and directors is the intended audience for the results of this study. It is hoped that this study will provide the framework which can, perhaps with further research, inform curriculum for graduate programs in TESL, establish requirements for searches for directors of UIEPs, and assist new UIEP administrators in effectively serving their programs.

The Participants

Critical to the success of a Delphi study is the selection of the “expert group” used to solicit responses (Clayton, 1996). In the case of this study, the expert group

was made up of directors of university or college intensive English programs within the UCIEP consortium. UCIEP is the oldest consortium of intensive English programs in the United States, and member programs are required to meet standards beyond those of programmatic accreditation (UCIEPb, 2009). Those directors with ten or more years of experience were asked to participate. In January 2011, this included 29 directors, 23 of whom agreed to participate in the study, for a participation rate of 79%.

In January 2011, the 23 directors in the expert group had a combined total of 436 years of experience. The participant with the greatest number of years of experience had been director for 31 years. Of the participants, 13 had over 20 years of experience, including five with 25, or more, years of experience. Only one participant had the minimum of 10 years of experience; however, four had only 11 years of experience.

Of the directors who agreed to participate, 11 were male and 12 were female. The UIEPs included programs in six private colleges or universities, 15 public colleges or universities, and two colleges or universities which receive public funding but are considered private. The size of the student body of the institutions ranged from fewer than 2,000 to more than 40,000. The UIEP enrollment ranged from under 100 per session to over 500 per session. The directors therefore appear to represent a variety of the UIEPs across the US and clearly meet the potential requirements to be considered experts in the field.

The 15 directors who completed all iterations of the survey had a combined total of 366 years of experience and represented the same diversity of programs described above. Of the directors who did not complete all three iterations of the survey, three were male and five were female, so the approximate gender balance remained the

same. Of the eight who did not complete all three iterations of the survey, three retired or semi-retired and two were hospitalized, highlighting the importance of collecting this data while it is available. It should be noted that, due to the nature of the Delphi method, all 23 original participants provided responses to the open-ended prompts, so their original participation should not be discounted.

Findings on Survey #1

The first survey consisted of three open-ended questions:

1. Which skills are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
2. What knowledge is necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
3. What personal qualities are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

First, University of Florida IRB approval and consent documents were sent via email to the 29 UCIEP directors who met the requirements to be included in the expert group.

This email, and all subsequent email messages, was sent to individuals rather than the group in order to preserve anonymity. The first iteration of the survey was then sent via email to the 23 program directors who had agreed to participate. The participants were asked to send responses via email or fax by February 24, 2011. In addition to being emailed, hard copies of the survey were provided to the participants on February 11, 2011 at the annual UCIEP business meeting. Those participants who wished to do so could return hard-copies of the completed survey. Of the 23 surveys distributed, 23, or 100%, were returned.

The responses to the open-ended survey ranged from short lists to long narratives. Once all identifying information was removed and all irrelevant comments

deleted, the compiled responses resulted in 24 pages of text comprised of over 7000 words. It was then necessary to assemble these responses into the second iteration of the survey. As Linstone and Turoff (1975), Behar (1994), and Deardorff (2004) all indicate that the benefit of using open ended questions is to reduce researcher bias and to allow the responses to “reflect the cultural attitudes, subjective bias, and knowledge of those who formulate them” (Linstone and Turoff, 1975, p.232), it was important to retain the original text of the responses as much as possible. Due to the length of the replies to the open-ended questions, the actual text of the responses is not included in this document, although the original responses are stored on a secure server and the anonymously compiled responses are stored in several back-up locations.

In order to retain as much of the original response text as possible, yet still allow for a manageable survey, the responses were grouped into items under which the specific text of replies was included whenever possible. In some cases the responses were near-identical to other responses and could stand alone as an item, “Consensus building skills,” for example. In other cases the responses were varied enough to necessitate a significant amount of text in the item. For example, within “Ability to listen,” direct quotes from 4 different responses were included. This method resulted in 58 items under skills, 54 items under knowledge, and 109 items under personal qualities. The resulting survey was 12 pages, with a total of 221 items (Appendix A). Because the 221 items on the survey were clearly different from the three open-ended questions, additional IRB approval was required and obtained.

Of the responses elicited by the open-ended questions, many were what would be anticipated based upon previous publications and research. A few responses

seemed out of place or inappropriate; however, they were retained for the survey. The two most prominent examples of this are under “skills” in which individual responses included the “Ability to herd cats” and “Parenting skills.” It should also be noted that some items appeared in more than one category. For example, “the ability to say no” was provided as a response to both a skill and a personal characteristic. In order to avoid bias, the researcher did not make any decisions on which category different responses should be placed. The survey was created with the responses as they were provided in each of the categories. It was hoped that the responses to the second survey would eliminate those placed in the “incorrect” category.

Also of interest were the responses to the question regarding personal characteristics. Although the main purpose of this study was to establish an accepted skill set and knowledge base which could be used to inform curriculum, inform search committees, and inform new administrators, the personal characteristics question was included based upon the recommendations from the Matthies 1984 survey. Surprisingly, this question elicited the greatest response from participating directors and resulted in twice as many items in the personal qualities category as in the skills or knowledge categories. The researcher had some concern that the length of the survey would hurt response rate, so consideration was given to dropping the category, as personal characteristics are not likely to inform curriculum. However, given the number of items the question generated, and the excellent return rate on the first survey, the decision was made to retain the category.

Findings on Survey #2

The second survey was sent to the original participants via email on February 8, 2012 with a request that the survey be returned by February 23, 2012. Hard copies of

the survey were also provided to those participants who attended the annual UCIEP business meeting on February 10, 2012. Of the 23 surveys distributed, 17 were returned, for a 74% response rate. Of the six which were not returned, two of the original directors had retired, and one had been hospitalized. The other three participants simply did not return the survey.

On this second iteration of the survey, the respondents were asked to rate each item on a 4-item Likert-type scale. Based upon Deardorff's (2004) study, a null value was intentionally not an option. Presuming that each item would have some importance to someone, as they had originally been suggested by the participants themselves, the Likert scale ranged from 1 (Least Important) to 4 (Most Important). Although participants were asked only to mark a number on the scale, five of the 17 participants also wrote comments in the margins. These comments were not included in the third iteration of the survey.

The data from the responses was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. Because the third iteration of the survey would require individual responses be returned to the participants, the data was entered with the identifying participant information. This original compilation of data was stored on a secure server. In order to share the responses in the future, and in order to have back-up storage measures for the data, the identifying information was removed in additional copies of the spreadsheet.

The mean and standard deviation was calculated for the responses to each item on the survey (Appendix B). The overall mean and median of responses was also calculated for each category of the survey. The results of the second iteration of the survey indicated that a high level of importance was placed on almost all items. The

participants had been informed that any items receiving a score below a certain mean would be eliminated in the third survey. In tabulating the results, 13 items were dropped because they received below a neutral rating of 2.5. The retained and eliminated items from each category will be examined below.

Skills

Of the 58 items under the skills category, four were dropped because they received a mean score below 2.5. These four items were: “Ability to herd cats” (2.47), “Ability to speak at least one foreign language well – Ability to understand/speak/read/write at least one language other than native language” (2.06), “Basic statistics and graphing” (2.47), and “Parenting Skills” (1.76). While two of these were likely rejected by the expert group because they were seemingly originally offered half in jest, the other two, the ability to speak a foreign language and basic statistics and graphing, were legitimate suggestions from individual participants. Of the remaining 54 items in the skills category, the lowest rating was given to “Ability to meditate” (2.59). The only other items receiving below a 3.0 rating were “Ability to respond quickly” (2.76), “Ability to understand L2 research – and/or carry it out” (2.94), “Conflict resolution skills – To be able to face and resolve conflicts” (2.76), and “Make time for reflection” (2.88).

Once the eliminated items were removed, the standard deviation on each of the items ranged from 0 to 1.37. The response mean on these remaining items was 3.48 with a median score of 3.59, indicating that the expert group considered the remaining items, as a whole, to be very important. The highest rating (4.0) went to “Integrity.” It is interesting that the “skill” the group rated as the most important would likely be considered a personal quality in the literature. Therefore, the expectation that skills,

knowledge, and personal qualities would be sorted out through the ratings did not prove to be the case.

The second highest ratings were for three items receiving a score of 3.94: “Decision making skills,” “Leadership skills,” and “Managerial skills.” The next highest mean, at 3.88, was for “Effective communication skills.” From the above results, it appears as though, similar to the findings of Matthies (1984) and Pennington (1994), directors of UIEPs may find administrative/leadership skills more important or relevant to their positions than research or teaching skills.

Knowledge

Of the 54 items under the knowledge category, seven were dropped because they received a mean score below 2.5. These seven items were: “Doctorate degree” (2.47), “Familiarity with decision-making models and advantages/disadvantages or each” (2.41), “Great ‘savoir faire’” (2.24), “History of language” (1.71), “Management information systems” (2.47), “Psychology” (2.35) and “Questionnaire design” (1.82). While at first “Questionnaire design” seems as if it could be a remark about the lengthy survey the participants received, it did come from a response to the open ended questions before the participants received the survey. The knowledge item with the second lowest mean was “Course scheduling” (2.65). Four items received scores of 2.76, “Course design,” “Computer skills,” “Knowledge of one or more other languages” and “Knowledge of the various facets of international education.” One other item received a mean score of below 3.0, and that was “Living overseas.” Of greatest note among these items is that, despite appearing in responses to the first iteration of the survey in both knowledge and skill categories, “the ability to speak a second language”

was dropped from the skill category, and “knowledge of a second language” received one of the lowest scores in the knowledge category.

Once the eliminated items were dropped, the response mean on all other items was 3.26 with a median score of 3.24, both slightly lower than the ratings given to the skill items provided in the survey. The standard deviation on the items overall was also greater, ranging from .39 to 1.62. Unlike the skill category, no item in the knowledge category received a rating of 4 by all of the participants. The highest rating of 3.82 was given to “Institutional Knowledge” and “Knowledge of the financial structure of the program and how it fits financially with the institution.” Five other items received a score of 3.71, including “Common sense,” “How the IEP is perceived/valued within the university,” “Knowledge of how to plan strategically and build a team,” “Knowledge/acceptance of other cultures,” and “Second-language teaching/knowledge of second-language acquisition.” From the above items, it seems as though, at least in the knowledge category, some weight is also given to pedagogical knowledge. However, the balance still leans in the direction of administrative knowledge and knowledge of the UIEP’s institution.

Personal Qualities

Of the 109 items under the personal qualities category, only two were dropped because they received a mean rating below 2.5. These two items were: “Ability to resist the need to ‘get it off my desk’” (2.47), and “Sacrificial” (2.24). In this category, 11 items received a mean rating of below 3.0, and one received a rating of 4.0: “Ability to make difficult decisions.” One item also received a near-perfect rating of 3.94: “Ethical presence.” This could reflect the high score received by “Integrity” in the skills category.

Once the eliminated items were dropped from the personal qualities category, the average mean score for all items was 3.45 with a median score of 3.47, which is higher than the ratings given to all items in the knowledge category, and just under the ratings given in the skills category. The standard deviation for these items is between 0 and 1.34, similar to the standard deviation found on the skills items and less than that in the knowledge category. It is not possible to say that this finding means that the expert group values skills and personal qualities over knowledge, but it does provide an interesting possibility for further research.

Findings on Survey #3

The third iteration of the survey was created by dropping the 13 items from the second iteration which received mean ratings below 2.5. The comments and exact text were also dropped, leaving only the items. As the survey was being returned to the same group of experts, each survey indicated how that particular expert had rated the items on the second iteration, as well as the group mean for each item. Listed separately on the survey were the dropped items, noting the individual's rating and group mean for each item. The resulting survey was seven pages and consisted of 208 items (Appendix C).

The third iteration of the survey was sent to the 17 participants who had returned the second iteration of the survey. The survey was sent by email on August 2, 2012 with a request that it be returned by August 16, 2012 via email, fax, or parcel post. As the UCIEP business meeting was not scheduled until February 2013, it was not possible to deliver hard copies of the survey, as in the past. Of the 17 directors, 15 returned the survey. One of the directors who did not return the survey was retiring and the other had retired from the director's position.

The responses from the 15 participants were entered into an Excel spreadsheet and the means and standard deviation for each item calculated. The mean and median rating for each category was also calculated. The expert group moved toward consensus on the requisite skills, knowledge and personal qualities, as fewer items were dropped, the mean of the responses was higher, and the standard deviation for each item was less. Again, while the original data was stored on a secure server, additional copies with identifying information removed was stored elsewhere and is provided here (Appendix D).

Skills

Of the 54 remaining items under the skills category, one additional item was dropped because it received a mean rating below 2.5. This item was “Ability to meditate” (2.47). This item had received the lowest rating of the remaining items on the second iteration of the survey. On this item, although one director increased the item rating from 1 to 2, three other directors shifted their scores down, moving closer to the group mean. Of the remaining items, ten other items had a lower mean rating than on the second iteration of the survey. None of the items dropped from above a mean of 3.0 to below a mean of 3.0. Of the items with lower ratings, four had a lower mean only because the scores from the two non-responding directors were dropped.

The means for the six other items dropped because participants lowered their ratings of the items. On “The ability to say ‘no’ with grace,” two respondents changed their ratings from a 4 to a 3 and one respondent changed the item rating from a 3 to a 4. On “Conflict resolution skills,” two participants changed their responses from a 4 to a 3, while one shifted from a 4 to a 3 and one shifted from a 3 to a 4. Only one item retained a mean of below 3.0 and also dropped in overall mean. This item, “Technological skills,”

dropped from 2.76 to 2.73 because three directors lowered their rating. One director lowered the rating from a 4 to a 3 and the other two lowered their ratings from a 3 to a 2. One director also increased the rating from a 2 to a 3.

The remaining three items with lower means saw their mean ratings drop .05 or more. “ESL teaching skills” dropped from a mean of 3.12 to a mean of 3.07 because two participants lowered their rating from a 4 to a 3. One participant did also increase the rating from a 2 to a 3. The item “Mentoring skills” dropped from 3.41 to 3.27 because two participants dropped their rating from a 4 to a 3. One participant did increase the item rating from a 3 to a 4. The remaining item which saw a drop in the mean rating was “Enrollment management” which dropped from 3.12 to 3.00. One participant dropped the rating from 4 to 3 and another from 3 to 2. The latter was one of only six cases in which a respondent shifted a rating away from the mean. Although the mean for the second iteration of the survey for this item was 3.12, the respondent, who had rated the item as a 3 on the second survey, dropped below this to give the item a rating of 2 on the third iteration of the survey.

With the exception of “Integrity” which retained a perfect score of 4.0, the other 43 items all saw an increase in the group mean. Two additional items on the third iteration of the survey received a score of 4.0 from all participants. “Decision making skills” increased from 3.94 to 4.0 because one director changed the rating from 3 to 4. The second, “Effective communication skills,” increased to 4.0 because two directors increased their ratings from 3 to 4. Two items saw the group mean increase from below 3.0 to above 3.0. “Make time for reflection” increased from 2.88 to 3.07 because one director changed the rating from a 1 to a 2 and another from a 2 to a 3. “Ability to

understand L2 research” increased from 2.94 to 3.07 because the participant who had given it a rating of 1 did not return the third survey. One participant, however, did change the rating on this item from a 4 to a 3. Two items saw an increase in the group mean, yet did not receive a mean rating above 3.0. “Ability to respond quickly” increased from 2.76 to 2.93 because two participants increased their ratings from 2 to 3 and one of the participants who did not return the survey had given it a rating of 2. One participant, however, did decrease the rating from 4 to 3. “Boundless energy” increased from 2.47 to 2.87 because one director changed the rating from a 2 to a 3.

Of the remaining items, eight had a mean increase of less than .05. The other 30 items all saw increases of more than .05 and two of the items received almost perfect ratings of 3.93. “Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals” saw a mean increase because the director who rated it as 2 did not return the third survey. The second item, “Interpersonal/interpersonal communication skills,” increased from 3.82 to 3.93 because one director increased the rating from 3 to 4 and one of the directors who did not return survey three had given it a rating of 3. Overall, once the single item receiving a mean score of below 2.5 was removed, the mean for the responses to skills on the third iteration of the survey was 3.6, the median response was 3.73, and the standard deviation ranged from 0 to .92.

Knowledge

None of the 47 remaining items under the knowledge category dropped below a mean rating of 2.5, so no additional items were dropped. Of the remaining items, eight saw a decrease in the group mean. Three of these items had a drop in the mean of less than .05. However, five saw a decrease of .05 or greater. Two items dropped to a mean below 3.0. “Advertising/marketing” saw a decrease from 3.24 to 2.93. The two directors

who did not participate in the third round of the survey had given it ratings of 3 and 4. Additionally, four directors lowered their ratings from 4 to 3. "Immigration regulations" fell from 3.0 to 2.93 because three participants lowered their ratings from 4 to 3. One participant increased the rating from 2 to 3. The two participants who dropped out had given ratings of 2 and 3.

Of the remaining items with a lower mean than the second iteration of the survey, "Living overseas" saw the greatest decrease going from a mean of 2.94 to a mean of 2.73. One director lowered the rating from 2 to 1, one lowered the rating from 4 to 3, and the two directors who did not return the third iteration gave ratings of 4 and 3 on the second iteration. "Options for professional development" dropped from 3.35 to 3.27 because one director dropped the rating from 4 to 3 and because the two participants who did not return the survey provided ratings of 3 and 4 on second iteration. "Business acumen" dropped from 3.18 to 3.13 because two participants lowered their ratings from 4 to 3, and one lowered the rating from 3 to 2. Finally, "English grammar" fell from 3.12 to 3.07. Although one participant increased the rating from 2 to 3, one participant decreased the rating from 4 to 3, and two participants decreased their ratings from 3 to 2. Interestingly, the two directors who decreased their ratings from 3 to 2 did so even though it was moving them farther away from the group mean.

Of those items which saw an increase in the group mean, five saw an increase of less than .05. Of the remaining items, two saw an increase, but remained below a mean of 3.0. "Course design" increased from 2.59 to 2.67, but solely because the two participants who dropped out had given it a rating of 2. "Course scheduling" saw an increase from 2.65 to 2.8. This is largely because the two non-participants had given it a

rating of 2, although one director did increase the rating from 1 to 2. The highest rated item became “Knowledge of the financial structure of the program and how it fits financially with the institution.” This item had a mean of 3.82 on the second survey and increased to a mean of 3.93. One director changed the rating on this item from a 3 to a 4, meaning that, of the remaining respondents, only one gave the item a rating of below 4. Overall, the group mean for the knowledge category on the third iteration of the survey was 3.35 and the median rating was 3.33. The standard deviation ranged from .26 to .88. While this mean and median are slightly higher than the knowledge category on the second survey, they are not as high as the skills category on the third survey.

Personal Qualities

Of the 107 remaining items under the personal qualities category, none dropped below a mean of 2.5, so no additional items were removed for that reason.

Unfortunately, because of a data-entry error, one item, “An interest in and liking of (sometimes extensive) international travel,” was falsely noted to have a mean score of 4.0 when it did not. Therefore, all of the participants would have thought the mean was much higher than it really was (2.82). Those who had originally indicated a rating of 4 would be unlikely to change their responses. Those who gave a rating below 4 and did not catch the obvious error would have been more likely to give a higher rating. Two people did increase their rating, but it is impossible to know if it was because of the incorrect mean. Overall, without the mean for the international travel item, the group mean for all items in the personal qualities category was 3.57, the median rating was 3.6 and the standard deviation for each item ranged from 0 to .88. The mean and median were much higher than the personal quality category on the second iteration of the survey, and higher than the knowledge category on the third iteration of the survey.

Of the 106 remaining items, six retained a mean rating of below 3.0, and one, “Friendly,” dropped from a mean of 3.0 to a mean of 2.87 because three directors dropped their ratings from 4 to 3. The item “Clear personal convictions” increased from 2.34 to 2.93 largely because two directors who had left it blank in the second survey gave it a rating of 3. Two other participants also increased their rating, moving it from 2 to 3, and one returned a lower rating, moving from 3 to 2. The item “Generous” increased from 2.71 to 2.73. Although four directors dropping their ratings from 4 to 3 and one from 3 to 2, one participant who had not responded on the second survey gave it a rating of 3. The item “Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors” received lower ratings on the third survey with the mean dropping from 2.88 to 2.80. Two participants gave it a rating of 3 instead of 4, and one lowered the rating from 3 to 2. The mean on “Outgoing personality” increased from 2.82 to 2.93 only because the scores from the directors who dropped out were eliminated. None of the other participants changed their ratings on this item. The item “Sociable” increased from 2.88 to 2.93 also because of the dropped responses. Finally, “Willingness to help anyone who comes into the office” also retained a mean below 3.0, falling from 2.71 to 2.60 because of the dropped ratings and because one participant changed the rating from 4 to 3.

Six of the remaining items received a lower mean rating than they had on the second survey. However, five of these saw their mean rating drop less than .05. The exception was “Pride in the field and what we do,” which dropped from 3.88 to 3.80. This drop was explained by the removal of the two non-replying participants, both of whom had given this item a rating of 4, and by one participant who changed the rating

from 3 to 2, even though this moved his rating farther away from the group mean on the item.

Of the 93 remaining items, two received a perfect rating of 4 from all participants. “Ethical presence” received a mean rating of 4, contrasted with 3.94 in the second iteration of the survey, because one director changed the rating from 3 to 4. The mean rating for the item “Honest” moved from 3.71 to 4.0 because the score of one of the participants who dropped out of the study was eliminated and because one director increased the rating from 3 to 4. Two other items had the next highest mean of 3.93. One, “Ability to work with others/be a team player and lead at the same time” had the mean rating shift from 3.76 to 3.93 because two of the participants increased their scores from 3 to 4. The mean rating for the item “Fair” shifted from 3.76 to 3.93 both because one of the dropped scores was a 2, and because one participant increased the rating from 3 to 4. All of the remaining 89 items had an increase in the rating mean, although six of those were increases of less than .05.

Synthesis

The purpose of this study was to attempt to establish the skills and knowledge necessary for directors of university or college intensive English programs as accepted by experts in the field. The participants in the study were defined as experts by program quality as demonstrated by UCIEP membership and by years of experience directing UIEPs. Twenty-three of these expert directors provided responses to the open ended questions of the first survey and 15 of the directors returned all three iterations of the survey.

Using the Delphi method allowed for the large amount of text and ideas elicited from these experts to be organized in a quantifiable manner. The Delphi method also

allowed for the experts to move towards consensus on which items should be included in such a knowledge base or skill set. The inclusion of the question on personal qualities necessary for directors of UIEPs was based upon the recommendations of a previous survey of UIEP directors (Matthies, 1984).

While the original intention of the study was to establish an accepted knowledge base and skill set, the number of items generated by the question regarding personal qualities was double that of either the skill category or the knowledge category. In addition, participants provided responses regarding skills, knowledge, or personal qualities which seemed to appear in the incorrect category. Finally, despite the 221 items on the second iteration of the survey, by the final round of the survey, only 14 items had been dropped.

Although some of these results were unexpected, the Delphi method did allow for the group of experts to create the items included and come to an agreement on them. Although a potential fourth iteration of the survey had been proposed, offering the participants the opportunity to accept or reject items, the high means of the responses overall and the low standard deviation on the items indicated that this fourth iteration was unnecessary. With means of greater than 3.0 in each category and a standard deviation of less than 1.0 on each item, it was expected that the expert group would accept all of the items.

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to establish an accepted skill set and knowledge base for directors of intensive English programs. In addition, it attempted to determine which personal qualities played a role in directing IEPs, a question posed by Matthies in her 1984 study. This research is most necessary for two reasons. First, a large number of educators who became directors in the 1980s are retiring, and with them will depart decades of experience. Second, the majority of the research in the field was conducted by these same directors in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Given the changes in higher education and international relations in the past two to three decades, such research findings may be out of date. This study attempted to capture information on the knowledge and skills experienced directors thought were important or relevant and, at the same time, provide a means of updating the information available on the necessary skills and knowledge of UIEP directors.

The directors serving as the expert group in this Delphi study all are directors in university- or college-based intensive English programs, or UIEPs. The programs in which they serve are all part of the consortium of University and College Intensive English Programs, or UCIEP. In order to hold membership in UCIEP these programs must meet standards higher than those of other consortium or accrediting bodies in the field. The directors selected to serve as experts all had a minimum of 10 years of experience directing UIEPs. It was hoped that through three to four iterations of a survey, following the Delphi method, these directors would be able to provide information on the requisite skills, knowledge and personal qualities for their positions.

Establishing such an accepted skill set and knowledge base can serve three potential audiences. First, it can help inform the curricula of graduate level TESL programs. Second, it can help inform search committees and program and university administrators as they attempt to replace retiring directors or fill the position in newly opened intensive English programs. Finally, it can serve novice UIEP directors as they attempt to build the necessary skill set and knowledge base to be effective in their positions. Capturing this information and data from expert directors, perhaps soon to retire, will support the endeavors of all three of these audiences.

It was hoped that the final survey resulting from this Delphi study would be ready for distribution to a wider and differing audience in order to see if the findings held true for newer directors, younger programs, or perhaps even proprietary IEPs. While the information gathered from the three iterations of the survey can, indeed, serve as an accepted skill set and knowledge base, the repetition of some items elicited, and the questionable categorization of some of the items means that significant refinement of the survey will be necessary before it is used with a larger population. Nonetheless, the information gathered from the survey indicates that, as Matthies (1984) and Pennington (1994) noted, administrative and managerial skills are often seen as more necessary or relevant than the teaching or research skills directors learned in TESL graduate programs. It also appears there is great agreement among directors on the importance or relevance of the items solicited. Finally, personal qualities do appear to be important or relevant based upon the overwhelming response of the directors in this category. Below, the findings will be highlighted and the need and suggestions for continued research in this area discussed.

Conclusions

This study began by posing three open-ended questions to the expert group:

1. Which skills are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
2. What knowledge is necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?
3. What personal qualities are necessary for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Although there was overlap in the responses to the categories, these three questions eventually provided 206 items agreed upon by a group of experts in the field. The Delphi method was used in order to develop consensus among the experts without allowing any one opinion to dominate the discussion. By using the Delphi method and starting with open-ended questions, it was hoped the study would control for researcher bias and the bias potentially provided if survey items were automatically drawn from existing literature. Although a possible four iterations of the survey were planned, the experts were close to consensus on the second iteration of the survey. The few outliers that existed in the results of the second iteration had largely moved towards the mean by the end of the third iteration. With the exception of the dropped items, the majority of items received higher ratings in the third iteration than in the second. The overall means increased, and the standard deviation for items decreased. For this reason it was determined there was no need to pursue a fourth iteration.

Despite the success of the Delphi method in eliciting the information and items sought, a few unexpected outcomes arose. It was expected that during the iterations of the survey any items which appeared to be in an inappropriate category would be dropped because, for example, the participants would give a high rating to “integrity” in

the personal quality category, but a low rating to “integrity” in the knowledge category in which it did not logically belong. This did not appear to happen, however. The expert group appeared to rate each item on importance or relevance regardless of the category in which it was placed. Secondly, it was expected that a large number of items from the second iteration of the survey would be dropped before the third iteration and that even more would be dropped after the third iteration. However, only 14 items were dropped between the original open-ended survey and the final, third iteration of the survey. This resulted in a compiled survey too long and cumbersome to use successfully with other populations without significant refinement. Finally, although there was an extremely high response rate, indicating the interest of the field in the results of the survey, because the researcher took over one year to complete it, three of the expert group directors retired before the final iteration of the survey was completed.

One other item of note in the findings is that the two participants who completed the second iteration of the survey, but not the third, were remarkably different from each other. One of them tended to rate items lower than the mean and the other higher. If they had continued to participate in the study, it may be that the means would be less and the standard deviation greater on the third iteration of the survey.

Despite these setbacks, after the third and final iteration of the survey, once the items with a mean below 2.5 were dropped, there appeared to be enough consensus on the items to eliminate the need for a fourth iteration and to be able to draw conclusions from the responses of the expert group. These conclusions, however, cannot necessarily be generalized beyond this group without careful consideration. The conclusions drawn from this study can be examined according to those items which

received the highest and lowest mean responses on the final survey and those items with the greatest standard deviation. In addition, it may be possible to draw parallels between the survey results and skills and knowledge already identified in the literature. Finally, although further refinement of the survey is necessary, the study has made available findings which could be used in the field at the present time.

On the final iteration of the survey, seven items received a mean rating of 4, indicating both 100% consensus on the importance or relevance of the items and also that they were considered “Very Important/relevant.” Of these items, four appeared in the skills category, none appeared in the knowledge category, and three appeared in the personal qualities category. One of these items in the skills category and one of these items in the personal qualities category also received a mean rating of 4 in the first iteration of the survey.

The four items in the skills category to receive a mean rating of 4 in the third iteration of the survey were “Decision making skills,” “Effective communication skills,” “Managerial skills,” and “Integrity.” One of these, “Integrity,” had also received a mean rating of 4 on the second iteration of the survey. Three of these four items are broad categories which would likely be generally accepted as skills. However, the fourth item, integrity, could arguably be in the personal qualities category. However, as demonstrated by the mean rating of 4 as early as the first iteration of the survey, participants did not rate the item any lower based upon the category in which it was located. It could be, however, that no participant wanted to indicate that integrity was not important to them as an individual. Although the participants knew they would not see each other’s responses, they were aware that the researcher would see their

responses. However, although five of the participants chose to make comments in the margins or “other items” sections of this survey, none of them chose to remark upon whether or not integrity was a skill.

The three items in the personal qualities category on the third iteration of the survey to receive a mean rating of 4.0 were “Ability to make difficult decisions,” “Ethical presence,” and “Honesty.” Of these, “Ability to make difficult decisions” received a mean rating of 4 as early as the second iteration of the survey. Although not as remarkable as in the skills category, there does appear to be some overlap in possible skills and personal qualities categories with this item. In looking at all seven items receiving mean ratings of 4 on the third iteration of the survey, there also appears to be potential overlap or connection between the three items “Integrity,” “Ethical presence,” and “Honesty.”

Of the 206 items retained after the third and final iteration of the survey, 18 items had a mean rating of below 3.0. Although all of these items received mean ratings above the neutral rating of 2.5, it does indicate they may be relatively less important or relevant to the participants. Three of these items fell in the skills category, eight were in the knowledge category, and seven were found in the personal qualities category. It is of note that the majority of the lower rated items were in the knowledge category, particularly if the number of possible items is taken into account.

The three items in the skills category with ratings below 3.0 were “Ability to respond quickly,” “Boundless energy,” and “Technological skills.” Again, one of these items, boundless energy, could potentially be considered a personal quality, not a skill. While the mean ratings for the ability to respond quickly and boundless energy went up

between survey iterations two and three, the mean rating went down for technological skills. It is possible that a fourth iteration would have lowered the rating even more, but if the item were presented as accept/reject, it is likely that at least 80% of the respondents would accept it based upon both the mean, and the standard deviation of .46 on this item.

The eight items in the knowledge category which received a mean rating below 3.0 were “Advertising/marketing,” “Course design,” “Course scheduling,” “Higher education system,” “Immigration regulations,” “Knowledge of one or more other languages,” “Knowledge of the various facets of higher education,” and “Living overseas.” All eight of these items seem to fit into the knowledge category, rather than being a skill or personal quality. Four of the items, advertising/marketing, course design, course scheduling, and immigration regulations are elements of an IEP which may be delegated to faculty or staff in the program other than the director. While this may be why these items received lower mean ratings, it is not possible to know without asking follow-up questions.

Seven items received mean ratings of below 3.0 in the personal qualities category of the survey. These items included “Clear personal convictions,” “Friendly,” “Generous,” “Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors,” “Outgoing personality,” “Sociable,” and “Willingness to help anyone who comes into the office.” The item “Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors” could potentially be considered both a skill and a personal quality, or a skill instead of a personal quality. However, the other six items would likely be accepted as personal qualities.

Of the seven personal quality items receiving a mean rating below 3.0 on the third iteration of the survey, three received lower ratings on the third iteration than the second iteration. It is possible, therefore, that they would get even lower ratings on a fourth iteration. All three of them had slightly higher standard deviations than the item in the skills category. However, if the items were presented as accept/reject, given the mean ratings on the items, it is likely the expert group would accept the items as important or relevant.

The purpose of a Delphi study is to bring a group of experts into agreement on diverse items. Calculating the standard deviation of the item ratings indicates the level to which this consensus has been achieved. On the third and final iteration of the survey, no item had a standard deviation of 1 or greater. This indicates that there is general agreement among the experts on the items. For the purpose of comparison, however, we can highlight the 19 items on the third iteration of the survey which had standard deviations of .70 or greater. Five of these items were in the skills category, 12 were in the knowledge category, and seven were in the personal qualities category. In some cases these items were the same as those with the lowest means, and in some cases they were not.

In the skills category, five items had standard deviations greater than .70: “Ability to comprehend people not speaking good English” (.74), “Boundless energy” (.92), “Budget management skills” (.83), “ESL teaching skills” (.70), and “Good basic intelligence is a required skill” (.82). Only one of these items, boundless energy, also received a mean rating below 3. The standard deviation of this item, .92, is also the highest of any item remaining on the third iteration of the survey. This could potentially

indicate confusion on whether it is a skill or a personal quality, but it is impossible to know without some sort of follow-up survey or questions. This also indicates the possibility that if a fourth iteration were undertaken, the rating for the item could fall below 2.5. A Delphi study, however, also allows for outliers, so it may be that the item rating would stay the same and the standard deviation would remain higher than other items.

The twelve items in the knowledge category with standard deviations of .70 or higher were “Ability to use all this knowledge in order to develop a vision for the program and a strategic plan to get there” (.83), “Budgeting” (.74), “Course design” (.82), “Curriculum design and development” (.80), “English grammar” (.80), “Immigration regulations” (.88), “Is knowledgeable about avenues for collaboration and contributions to the greater community” (.74), “Knowledge of human dynamics” (.70), “Knowledge of one or more languages” (.88), “Knowledge of the various facets of international education” (.80), “Living overseas,” (.88) and “Outcomes based learning and assessment” (.80). Of these items, five also received mean ratings below 3.0: “Course design,” “Immigration regulations,” “Knowledge of one or more other languages,” “Knowledge of the various facets of international education,” and “Living overseas.” The first two of these items might, once again, indicate delegation of responsibilities within the IEP. The final two, however, likely indicate a difference in opinion in general among the expert groups. Again, though, without follow up questions, it is impossible to conjecture. It does, however, seem likely, based upon the means, that these items would still be accepted in an accept/reject fourth iteration of the survey.

The personal qualities category included seven items which had standard deviations above .70. One of these, "Willingness to help anyone who comes into the office" had the second highest standard deviation of the third survey at .91. As it also received a mean rating below 3.0, it is possible that this item would have a mean rating of below 2.5 in a fourth iteration of the survey. Of the other six items, the following four also had mean ratings below 3.0: "Clear personal convictions" (SD.70), "Friendly" (SD.74), "Generous" (SD.70), and "Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors" (SD.77). Although the standard deviation on these items is slightly higher than other items on the survey, it is low enough that, combined with the mean ratings of the items, they also would survive an accept/reject iteration of the survey. The final two items in the personal quality category with standard deviations above .70 were "Committed" (.83) and "People person" (.77). These items, however, had mean ratings above 3.0, so would very likely survive an accept/reject iteration of the survey.

In synthesizing the above information, it is possible to create short digestible lists of those items clearly considered most important by the expert group in each category. Although certain items on these lists may at first appear to be in an illogical category, that they continued to have high means indicates, to a certain extent, the importance directors' give to the items despite the category in which they are listed. Although further refinement of these lists is necessary before they can serve as a survey for larger populations, they do allow for a starting point.

The skills category had the highest overall mean (3.60) of the three categories, and lowest overall standard deviation (.45). This could indicate that the expert group considered skills more important than knowledge or personal qualities. However, in

examining those items with the highest means in the skills category, not all would necessarily be considered skills. Nonetheless, it can be stated that they are all considered important. The fourteen items with the highest ratings in the skills category are:

- Decision making skills (4.0)
- Effective communication skills (4.0)
- Managerial skills (4.0)
- Integrity (4.0)
- Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals (3.93)
- Interpersonal/Interpersonal communication skills (3.93)
- Leadership skills (3.93)
- Ability to deal effectively with the needs/goals of the director's superior(s) and those of staff and instructors under the director (3.87)
- Ability to interact and collaborate with many different constituencies (3.87)
- Listening skills (3.87)
- Multi-tasking skills (3.87)
- Personnel skills (3.87)
- Problem-solving skills (3.87)

From the above list, it is clear that the most important items are directly related to leadership and management in general and not specific to the field of TESL or the role of a UIEP director. This would suggest that a search committee hoping to fill a UIEP director position would likely already take these under consideration. It also, however, suggests that it is highly unlikely any of these areas are included in the curriculum of most graduate TESL programs.

The knowledge category had the overall lowest mean (3.35) and highest standard deviation (.58) of the three categories. However, with an overall mean of 3.35, there is still the indication that the majority of items were considered between important/relevant and very important/relevant by the expert group. Again, as in the skills category, some items may not be considered knowledge items. Overall, although the means were somewhat lower than the skills or personal qualities categories, the following nine knowledge items were considered the most important by the expert group:

- Knowledge of the financial structure of the program and how it fits financially with the institution (3.93)
- IEP standards (3.87)
- Institutional knowledge (3.87)
- Knowledge/acceptance of academic bureaucracy (3.87)
- Knowledge/acceptance of other cultures (3.87)
- Common sense (3.80)
- How the IEP is perceived/valued within the university (3.80)
- Knowledge of how to plan strategically and build a team (3.80)
- Understanding that a director is continually dealing with competing values (3.67)

Once again, a few of the items could be generalized to many leadership positions. In addition, three of the highest rated items are specific to institutions, so it may not be possible to include them in searches or curriculum. However, they certainly could guide a new director towards that information most important to obtain. Finally, unlike the top items in the skills category, two of the items are specific to the IEP and TESL fields.

The personal qualities category had a slightly higher overall mean and slightly lower overall standard deviation than the knowledge category, and a slightly lower overall mean and slightly higher overall standard deviation than the skills category. However, since several of the highest rated items in the knowledge and skills categories would likely logically be considered personal qualities, and because one or two of the highest personal qualities would likely be considered skills, this may not be meaningful. However, in looking at the top ten items in the personal qualities category, they do have means higher than all but one of the top items in the knowledge category, and all but seven of the highest rated items in the skills category. The ten items in the personal qualities category with the highest means are:

- Ability to make difficult decisions (4.0)
- Ethical presence (4.0)
- Honest (4.0)
- Ability to prioritize tasks (3.93)
- Ability to work with others/be a team player and lead at the same time (3.93)
- Able to deal well with people at all levels of the university (3.93)
- Cultural awareness/sensitivity (3.93)
- Fair (3.93)
- Interpersonal skills (3.93)
- Listener (3.93)

All of the above would likely be required of any leader or administrator at a university, and would likely not be specific to UIEP directors. Depending upon the university setting, however, it could be that cultural awareness/sensitivity might be more necessary for a UIEP director than others on campus.

If the above highest rated items from the skills and knowledge categories are examined and compared to the existing studies, there do appear to be parallels. The three skill areas with the highest mean rating and lowest standard deviation are all administrative or managerial in nature, as opposed to pedagogical. This study did not

ask, as Matthies (1984) did, what the directors would prefer to be doing. It is possible that the responses would be quite different if that question was included. Nor did this study ask, as Pennington (1994) did, how prepared the directors were in these skill or knowledge areas. However, given the number of years these directors have been serving in their positions, it is possible the answers would have been similar, and even possible that some of these directors were participants in Pennington's 1994 survey.

Four items appear as very important or relevant for directors of UIEPs both in this study, and in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Decision making skills, communication skills, leadership and ethics all received, in some fashion, the highest ratings of the group in this study, and are already considered important skills or knowledge for directors of IEPs. It is interesting, however, that considering the very little which has been written about the ethics required of an IEP director, some form of this received the highest ratings be it as "integrity," "honesty," or "ethical presence." All three of these items received mean ratings of 4. Several skills covered in the existing research were not as evident in the results of this survey. These skills include strategic planning, influencing policy formation, evaluation, and, most notably, research. Although these items are highlighted in the existing literature on directing IEPs, the directors in the expert group did not rate them as highly as would be expected from reading the literature. This could point to the importance of the Delphi method in creating survey items without drawing directly from existing literature.

Recommendations

This study was a first step in establishing an accepted skill set and knowledge base for directors of university or college intensive English programs. The items included on the survey were created with limited researcher bias as they were drawn

directly from the panel of experts, not from existing literature. Nor did the researcher eliminate or edit items. This, however, also led to a cumbersome list of items in the categories of skills, knowledge, and personal qualities, as well as some items repeated in more than one category. All of the participants seemed willing to give the items strong ratings, regardless of the category in which they were placed. In the future, an examination of existing literature in the field of educational leadership could help place them in the appropriate categories and hence eliminate some of the repetition in further adaptations of the survey.

If the survey were to be revised with fewer repetitions across categories, it could be sent either as a Likert-type scale or an accept/reject survey to all 67 UCIEP member program directors. Until this is done, the results of the study cannot be generalized outside of the expert group. However, this would still have limited application to the field as a whole; as the skills, knowledge and personal qualities necessary to direct an established UIEP may be very different from those required to direct a newly established UIEP or a proprietary IEP of any sort. It is important to recognize the need to expand this survey to these groups.

One of the main purposes of conducting this research was to help inform the curriculum of graduate programs preparing students for the TESL field. However, the results of this study, even if expanded to all UCIEP directors, would only apply to directors of university or college governed programs. With the explosion of private, for-profit English language programs, as well as the increasing number of universities and colleges outsourcing intensive English instruction, it would eventually be important to elicit responses to the survey items from all IEP directors, and then to examine if there

is a difference in the skill set or knowledge necessary to serve as a director of a private enterprise rather than a university or college program.

The students of our graduate TESL programs will be eventually be teaching and leading in all varieties of programs. Just as it is a disservice to them now not to include coursework on language program administration, it would be a disservice to them in the future to only provide coursework relevant to directors of university or college programs. In addition, just as university and program administrators are seeking guidance on position descriptions, search committees, and job postings, so is private enterprise. Finally, the results from such a survey could prove an invaluable resource for new directors in the field who are still turning to information from the 1980s in attempting to update their skills and knowledge. We cannot much longer expect young academics or professionals to be served by recommendations such as “successful programs (in terms of enrollment and longevity) would benefit from the computerization of their data” (Ponder and Powell, 1991, p.164).

Towards informing the curriculum of TESL programs, now that a group of experts has agreed upon the knowledge and skills necessary to be a director of a UIEP, it would benefit the field to conduct a survey of courses offered and texts currently used in graduate TESL programs in order to determine how much of this knowledge is being directly provided to students today. In 1984 Matthies indicated that the directors surveyed had not been prepared enough for their positions, and Pennington found the same in 1994. Will the situation be any different in 2014?

Although the question regarding personal qualities was somewhat peripheral to the original purpose of this study, the inclusion of the question proved to be both

fortuitous and problematic. The personal qualities question on the first iteration of the survey elicited more text and items than the other two questions. As the means, medians, and standard deviations of each item were calculated, and then the means and medians for each category calculated, it began to beg the question “which category do experts feel is most important?” Although outside of the purview of this study, questions came to mind regarding the higher means for personal qualities than for knowledge. While a different research question altogether, it may be worth pursuing.

Another purpose to this study was to update the information provided in current reference texts, seminars, and workshops regarding the necessary skills and education for directors of IEPs. Although two extensive studies had been completed, one was from 1984 and the other from 1994. It was concerning that decisions were being made in 2011 based upon information available in the early 1990s. However, based upon the preliminary findings and answers to the open ended questions, it may be that not much has changed. Other than the addition of technological skills and knowledge and the increasing complexity of a few items such as immigration, much of the requisite knowledge and many of the skills may be the same. However, another possibility is that because these experts have so many years of experience, many of them were the ones undertaking the research in the 80s and therefore provided the same responses as available in that literature. Indeed, several members of the expert group are either cited in Chapter 2, or were taught or mentored by those cited in Chapter 2. It may be that if a similar survey were distributed to the younger directors or those newer in their director positions, that very different answers would be elicited.

Despite the weaknesses described above, the results of this Delphi study can be revised to serve as an immediate resource for the field. Although the refinement and further research described is a necessary next step, it will of course take time. As no up-to-date information currently exists in this area, it may be useful to compile the results of this Delphi study into a digestible and simplified form for immediate use. In order to do so, three important elements must be recognized.

The first element to be taken into consideration is that although the previous section of Chapter 5 notes the top 9-13 items in each category, many more items in each category received mean ratings of at least “important/relevant.” Many of the items given the most importance, do not appear to be specific to UIEP directors. However, as soon as the number of items is expanded, those items specific to the field make an appearance. For this reason, it would be recommended to recognize or make note of all items with a mean of 3.0 or higher. Using the current items, however, would provide a list of 188 items, which would be unmanageable.

The second element to consider is the categories into which the items are placed. Further research could be conducted into which categories each item should actually fall, and how those items and categories could inform curriculum, search committees and UIEP directors. However, it may be that for immediate use, if the categories are ignored, enough duplicate items can be eliminated to allow for the creation of a digestible and useable list of desired skills, knowledge and personal qualities for a UIEP director.

The third element which must be recognized is that although this research included the question on the personal qualities of UIEP directors, this information is

much less likely to guide curriculum or new directors than the information on skills and knowledge. If, for expediency's sake, we accept that the actual category into which items are placed is less important than the items themselves, and that the information gathered on personal qualities needs to be examined separately in further detail, a more usable description of these findings can be created.

Indeed, by eliminating the responses to the personal qualities question for the time being, the list of skills and knowledge drops to 100 items. If additional items with a mean response below 3.0 are dropped, the list decreases to 89. By synthesizing information gathered from these 89 items, eliminating duplicates and personal qualities, a much more workable list of 65 items emerges. The following 65 items and accompanying means could serve as a basis for informing the curriculum of TESL graduate programs, search committees, and new UIEP directors:

1. Decision making skills (4.00)
2. Effective communication skills (4.00)
3. Managerial skills and knowledge of management principles (4.00)
4. Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals (3.93)
5. Leadership skills and knowledge of effective leadership qualities, traits, and practices (3.93)
6. Institutional knowledge (3.93)
7. Ability to interact and collaborate with many different constituencies (3.87)
8. Listening skills (3.87)
9. Multi-tasking skills (3.87)
10. Problem-solving skills (3.87)
11. Knowledge of IEP standards (3.87)
12. Knowledge/acceptance of other cultures (3.87)

13. Ability to be objective (3.80)
14. Ability to create a positive environment (3.80)
15. Ability to effect change (3.80)
16. Ability to execute tasks under pressure (3.80)
17. Ability to represent the program in a professional way (3.80)
18. Ability to think strategically (3.80)
19. Advocacy skills (3.80)
20. Organizational and planning skills (3.80)
21. Political astuteness (3.80)
22. Time Management skills (3.80)
23. Writing skills (3.80)
24. Ability to be inspirational (3.73)
25. Ability to delegate/designate (effectively) (3.73)
26. Negotiating skills (3.73)
27. Team-building skills (3.73)
28. Second-language/ESL teaching skills and knowledge of second-language acquisition (3.73)
29. Ability to find the positive (3.67)
30. Ability to remain calm and focused in many different, demanding situations (3.67)
31. Cross-Cultural communication skills (3.67)
32. Understanding that a director is continually dealing with competing values (3.67)
33. Ability to see opportunities (3.60)
34. Consensus building skills (3.60)
35. Budgeting (3.60)
36. Knowledge of the goals and aspirations of typical IEP students (3.60)
37. TESOL--ESL--IEP issues and priorities (3.60)

38. Knowledge of trends in the field (3.60)
39. Knowledge of where and how to find resources in the field (3.60)
40. Knowledge of customer service issues (3.53)
41. Ability to be a good reader of people and situations (3.47)
42. Knowledge of language assessment (3.47)
43. Ability to evaluate (3.40)
44. Conflict resolution skills (3.40)
45. Knowledge of institutional systems (3.33)
46. Knowledge/acceptance of academic bureaucracy (3.33)
47. World economic and political knowledge (3.33)
48. Ability to say “no” with grace (3.27)
49. Ability to direct productive meetings (3.27)
50. Mentoring skills (3.27)
51. Curriculum design and development (3.27)
52. Faculty development and review, models and practice (3.27)
53. Knowledge of human dynamics (3.27)
54. Knowledge of other programs and innovations in those programs (3.27)
55. Knowledge of program design (3.27)
56. Knowledge of outcomes-based learning and assessment (3.27)
57. Public-speaking skills (3.20)
58. Ability to comprehend non-native English speakers (3.13)
59. Business acumen (3.13)
60. Knowledgeable about avenues for collaboration and contributions to the greater community (3.13)
61. Knowledge of learning styles (3.13)
62. Ability to understand L2 research (3.07)

63. Knowledge of English grammar (3.07)
64. Knowledge of and skills in enrollment management (3.00)
65. Computer skills (3.00)

From this list it is clear that a large number of these items would be applicable to many leadership positions in many fields. It therefore, in this form, may not be particularly useful to search committees or others attempting to fill UIEP positions. It does, however, speak to the need to include both educational leadership and basic management and business information in TESL graduate programs. It also could serve as a useful resource for new UIEP directors as they learn more about what they need to know or do. The list also reflects the findings of Matthies (1984) and Pennington (1994). While some specific skills have changed, “telephone work” for example, all three studies highlight that managerial aspects of the positions are just as important as the pedagogical. A comparison of the top ten requisite knowledge areas and skills, as identified by the 2012 directors, with those identified in 1994 and 1984 can be found in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Combined findings of Matthies, Pennington, and Forbes

Manger Role	Educator Role	Matthies (1984)	Pennington (1994)	Forbes (2012)
Developing a staff team		X		
Managing available time efficiently		X		X
Evaluating the IEPs needs		X		
Maintaining enrollments and student recruitment		X	X	
Computer use		X		
Initiating constructive criticism		X		
Public relations and personalized marketing			X	
Telephone work			X	
Faculty hiring, supervision, and evaluation			X	
Program planning and management			X	X
Decision making skills				X
Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals				X
Leadership skills and knowledge of effective leadership qualities, traits, and practices				X
Institutional knowledge				X
Listening skills				X
Problem solving skills				X
	Communicating effectively across cultures	X		X
	Maintaining an environment conducive to learning	X		
	Designing a comprehensive curriculum	X	X	
	Meetings with students for advising or counseling		X	

The above synthesis provides an overview of both the administrative and pedagogical skills and knowledge deemed to be necessary for IEP directors over the past 30 years. The lack of overlap in findings could be because of changing responsibilities of IEP directors. The lack of overlap could also be explained by the survey items Matthies (1984) and Pennington (1994) created. As this survey began with open ended questions, it provided for a greater variety of responses. Regardless, all three studies show the significance of the importance of administrative skills and knowledge to the position of IEP director. The synthesis of the three studies, however, does not touch at all upon the importance the directors gave to personal qualities in their responses to the 2012 survey.

Matthies' recommendation to study the personality of IEP directors proved well founded. The directors in this 2012 study provided twice as many responses to the question of personal qualities as either skills or knowledge. While some of the more recent language program leadership publications have touched upon the topic, it would be recommended that in the future the findings of this survey be framed by the existing research on educational leadership in general.

The new text by Pennington and Hoekje (2010) touches briefly on this literature in the chapter on the leadership of language programs. In this chapter, Pennington and Hoekje provide a brief overview of leadership literature and how it can be applied to language program leadership. Of particular interest regarding the personal qualities of IEP directors is their outline of the differences between skills and traits. They draw upon the works of Graham's 1982 "Boy Scout Theory of Leadership" (Pennington and Hoekje, 2010, p.170), Ghiselli's 1971 work, and Katz's publications from 1955 through

1983. In particular they highlight the problems of the traitist models, including the problem that any of these personal traits “have the potential for becoming, if taken to the extreme, negative characteristics” (Pennington and Hoekje, 2010, p 171). They also note that the research on traits which has tried to “match supposedly inborn traits, such as intelligence or energy level, or personality traits, such as agreeableness or extraversion/introversion, to leadership has not found consistent relationships of these to effective leadership” (p. 175). For this reason, Pennington and Hoekje (2010) draw largely on Katz’s skills model “reconceptualized as a *functional model* focused on the functions and actions needed to be a successful leader” (p.180). They then examine how this model could inform frameworks of leader style, situational leadership, people-centered leadership, servant leadership, vision-led leadership, and transformational leadership. They also note the differences culture and gender may play in leadership. They close by indicating that a synthesis of these models indicates that the language program leader “is one who possesses the multiple skills needed to perform practical, interpersonal, and conceptual aspects of the job and who is tuned to relationships, to local and global contexts, and to change” (p. 215).

Indeed, as Pennington and Hoekje indicate, any number of educational leadership models or theoretical frameworks could be applied to language program leadership, and hence the leadership role of the IEP director. In the future, the importance personal qualities play in the role of the IEP director could be examined under any number of these frameworks. As McGee Banks (2007) indicates, “there are radically different views on the status of leadership as a discipline” (p. 301). She goes on to highlight that historically research on leadership has not included gender or race

as important factors. In 2009, Cunningham and Cordeiro differentiate between administration, management and leadership and go on to provide an overview of more than a dozen paradigms, theories, surveys, matrices, and measurements which could be used to examine leadership qualities, including, in some cases, personal qualities. Personal qualities, indeed, appear to play a key role in leadership, as the 2004 president of National Council of Professors of Educational Administration notes in his introductory message to Carr and Fulmer's (2004) text that leaders "must be humble, under the authority of others, accountable for their actions, have high moral character and see the value of those around them" (p.3). This is not a definition which could be summarized with lists of skills or knowledge items.

While it is clear there are numerous, and perhaps controversial theories and frameworks in which the results of this survey of IEP directors could be examined, it is important to do so in some manner in the future. If personal qualities play as an important role in directing and IEP as skills or knowledge, this should be included in TESL curriculum and inform the field in general. However, it will be important to synthesize the findings in such a way that they can be applied to the needs in the field.

One possibility way to synthesize the findings would be to follow the model used by Presswood (2011) to create a profile of IEP directors. Presswood created such a model for deans and directors of enrollment management and registrar offices at higher education institutions in the US. She was able to include personal qualities in doing so by using the model developed with the 2005 FuturesLeaders – Assessments Technologies Group of Jacksonville, Florida. This group created an overview of managerial, professional, personal, and entrepreneurial qualities of deans and directors

based upon the Work Profiling Model of the SHL Human Resources Management System (2000). If a similar undertaking were attempted for the profile of directors of intensive English programs, it could prove invaluable to the field.

Not only this author, but the field as a whole has come to the realization that continued research is necessary in this area. The background research was originally undertaken for this study in 2009, and since that time, two important books cited in this research have been published in the field. One is the second edition of *A handbook for language program administrators* (Christison and Stoller) which was published in 2012. The new edition updates several of the chapters in the 1997 edition and provides additional sections by authors not included in the first edition. The second text recently published is *Language program leadership in a changing world: An ecological model* by Pennington and Hoekje (2010). While the focus of neither text is specifically on the director position, that they were both published within the past two years indicates an acknowledgement from the field that updated references are necessary, and perhaps that some administrative topics should be included in graduate TESL courses.

While the information resulting from this Delphi study may need additional refinement, it served the purpose of capturing information about the skills, knowledge, and personal qualities the most experienced directors in the field felt was important. It also supported the possibility, originally posed by Matthies (1984), that personal qualities play a larger role than previously demonstrated. Further research in all of the above areas is clearly crucial.

This researcher recognized the importance of capturing the knowledge and information held by expert IEP directors when she found herself suddenly in the role of

Interim Director at a UIEP. In scrambling to learn as much as possible as quickly as possible, she scoured books and attended workshops. However, she soon came to realize that the most practical professional development opportunities came at UCIEP conferences and meetings. The most important information she gained came from sharing dinner or a drink with the most experienced of directors and just listening. Unfortunately, it soon was obvious that more and more of these experienced directors were retiring. When their replacements were turning to this researcher for advice, despite the fact that she had only two or three years of experience at the time, it became clear that the problem was urgent. Indeed, since determining the need for this study and actually completing it, decades of knowledge and experience have been lost to programs as the most experienced directors retire. It is this researcher's hope that the results of this Delphi study will serve to preserve this knowledge for the next generation of UIEP directors.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY #2

1. How important/relevant are the following skills for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs? Please mark only one column.

- 1=Least important/relevant
2=Somewhat important/relevant
3=Important/relevant
4=Very Important/relevant

Skills	1 (Least Important)	2	3	4 (Very Important)
Ability to be inspirational - <i>faculty need to be urged to continue to do their best at all times and to continue to develop professionally in the field. Staff need to feel that they are vital to the program and appreciated. Students must feel that they are part of a whole, the program and the host university.</i>				
Ability to be objective - <i>separate his or her personal goals from positive and negative development in the IEP</i>				
Ability to comprehend people not speaking good English - <i>We serve as intermediaries between students and other people, "translating" the student's broken English into English the non-skilled outsider can understand.</i>				
Ability to create a positive environment - <i>for faculty, staff & students/Ability to foster a demanding yet caring school environment for students.</i>				
Ability to deal effectively with the needs/goals of the director's superior(s) and those of staff and instructors under the director				
Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals - <i>Ability to have and articulate a vision of the goals/missions of the IEP internally and externally</i>				
Ability to delegate/designate (effectively) - <i>'Trust and verify'/'delegation with support, you have to delegate but offer the person the support they need especially when they first start out.</i>				
Ability to effect change - <i>and prepare colleagues to accept change/Ability to plan for, foster, and respond to change/Ability to proactively seek change when necessary</i>				
Ability to evaluate				
Ability to execute tasks under pressure				
Ability to find the positive - <i>positive attitude/"Yes, working together, we can overcome this obstacle."/Ability not to let negativity get you down/waste your time</i>				
Ability to herd cats				
Ability to interact and collaborate with many different constituencies - <i>Ability to work with faculty and administrators across campus</i>				

Ability to meditate				
Ability to remain calm and focused in many different, demanding situations				
Ability to represent the program in a professional way				
Ability to respond quickly				
Ability to say “no” with grace				
Ability to see opportunities				
Ability to speak at least one foreign language well - Ability to understand/speak/read/write at least one language other than native language				
Ability to think strategically				
Ability to understand L2 research - and/or carry it out				
Able to direct productive meetings				
Advocacy skills - for faculty, students, program, etc./An ability to build allies across campus and within the community in support of the IEP/Ability to advocate for the program on campus/Ability to build linkages to the campus and community organizations/Salesmanship skills: ELI directors must constantly sell their programs, not only to students, but also to administrators and faculty/adjuncts. Selling ideas is just as important as selling goods. Directors must “sell” new teaching techniques, programs, changes, accreditation requirements, and many other issues to both administrators and faculty.				
Basic statistics and graphing				
Boundless energy - There is always a coffee pot that needs to be taken somewhere or a late meeting that needs to be attended.				
Budget management skills - budget development and analysis/Money management skills/Ability to create/understand financial reports/Math (working with budgets)/ability to oversee a budget; provide financial oversight				
Conflict resolution skills - To be able to face and resolve conflicts				
Consensus building skills				
Cross-Cultural communication skills - Cross-cultural understanding/communication skills/sensitivity/Ability to communicate effectively with people from many cultures/language backgrounds = excellent intercultural skills.				
Decision making skills - Ability to make difficult decisions/Not too fast or ill-considered and not so slow that analysis paralysis sets in/know when to make a decision and when to consult				
Effective communication skills - both in speaking and writing, with Americans as well as non-American)/Articulation skills – Ability to interpret the work of the IEP to university/college administrators, faculty, and staff as well as to local civic groups, visiting dignitaries, etc/communicate very well verbally and in writing/IEP directors must be able to work up and down the hierarchy of a university. IEP’s never fit into the university administrative structure and must continually be explained. The director must be clear and willing to adapt the IEP to administrative structural requirements/Ability to deal with various constituencies—prospective students, embassies, parents, sponsors, enrolled students				
Enrollment management - student recruitment/Marketing/promotional/ market research skills/ability to develop effective marketing/				

<i>recruitment strategies/ability to promote/market program</i>				
ESL Teaching skills - Ability to teach ESL him or herself				
Good, basic intelligence is a required skill				
Interpersonal/Interpersonal communication skills – Ability to interact collegially and professionally with a variety of administrators, faculty, and staff across the university/college campus/people skills/ Emotional connection capabilities/ability to work with sensitive people, peace-corps types/People skills - being able to relate to and work with an extremely wide variety of people is important/Directors should be friendly, open-minded and sociable people who feel at ease at any social event or gathering/To be tactful and not reactionary/To be able to deal with difficult people/The ability to appreciate people for who they are and what each individual brings to the program/ Empathy!/Ability to value and respect widely varying types of individuals				
Leadership skills – Ability to create an atmosphere of collegiality and teamwork among IEP faculty and staff/ability to inspire, motivate, build positive morale/Ability to lead a group of people and obtain buy in from them/The ability to be inclusive and be sure everyone is involved in decision making as appropriate/Ability to take the lead and take responsibility even in bad times/Ability to foster a collegial, cooperative work environment among faculty and staff. Be a team builder				
Listening skills - ability to be a good listener/the ability to LISTEN, don't think you have to have the answer to everything./Ability to listen, and if necessary say 'no '/Ability to really listen to people.				
Make time for reflection				
Managerial skills – Ability to manage and deal with (i.e., not become overwhelmed by) many different kinds of tasks, including administrative, curricular, promotional, budgetary, record keeping, counseling/advising, delegating, supervising, etc/ability to ask relevant questions/Ability to oversee day to day operations/Manage/schedule people (staff & faculty) and “assets” (e.g. classrooms)/Management specific to university settings				
Mentoring skills - Ability to recognize and cultivate talent/Ability to see and tap into specific strengths of staff and instructors/Ability to supervise, mentor, coach/ Ability to motivate/teach				
Multi-tasking skills – Ability to deal with day-to-day business, including interruptions and emergencies, and to prioritize and act accordingly/ability to do revolving prioritization (have priorities but in such a way that the list changes)				
Negotiating skills - Good ELI directors must be able to negotiate and compromise. Negotiating, (specially with administrators!) is not only an art, but a craft that must be honed./Negotiation skills—win/win/Ability to cooperate/compromise (within the IEP, campus-wide)				
Organizational skills – Ability to organize tasks, projects, people, etc, in a manner that is productive as well as conducive to the well being of the program and the stakeholders/Prioritization skills/efficient/ effective filing system				
Parenting skills				
Patience - (regarding the endless “education” we must provide our university colleagues who move into new positions every few years and really have a hard time understanding IEPs)				
Personnel skills – Ability to evaluate prospective employees, hire those who will be most effective, and supervise their work				

<i>appropriately/Human Resource skills: hiring, supervision, performance evaluation, nurturing professional growth, resolving conflict, etc./ Ability to identify, hire, and retain great people.</i>				
Planning skills – Ability to engage effectively in short-term and long-term planning/strategic planning skills/Ability to plan strategically for short term and long term/To be able to study a situation and come up with various scenarios and plan accordingly/Basic planning skills in management / curriculum / etc., e.g., needs assessment/analysis, SWOT analysis/ Physical planning oversight				
Political astuteness - (University politics are so petty, but we must deal with them!)/Assertiveness yet care in dealing with university entities/ politicking/ Diplomatic Skills				
Problem-solving skills – Ability to deal effectively with problems that arise and resolve them satisfactorily/ability to develop contingency plans/Ability to deal with problems instantly/The director must respond to these problems fairly, consistently and personably so that students develop a trust in both the director and the program itself/The ability to think outside the box and not be afraid of change/Quick thinking/fast on one’s feet/ those that can quickly react to solve problems will do better than those who simply want to maintain the current status and who avoid change or risk				
Public-speaking skills – Ability to speak effectively to groups, including IEP students, IEP faculty, university/college faculty, university/college administrators, prospective students, sponsors, etc/ conciseness, academic register, anticipation of others’ objections, strategic concession, qualification, and humor, vocal projection and phrasing, very limited, but focused use of technology, ability to paraphrase questions from the audience.				
Supervisory skills				
Team-building skills - To ensure that the faculty / staff can do their work as part of the larger program.				
Technological skills – Ability to handle basic computer functions and utilize standard software (e.g., word processors, spreadsheets, databases), as well as the ability to recognize the need for and usefulness of technology in various facets of the IEP and to provide the necessary support and resources/ Computer programs				
Integrity - known to be trustworthy in his given opinions. The director must also be trusted by the students, staff and faculty to be dedicated to the program and fair in judgments				
Time Management skills – Ability to manage demands on the director’s time productively/ability to implement effective time management strategies				
To be a good reader of people and situations				
Writing skills – Ability to write formally and effectively in a variety of contexts, such as writing proposals, grants, reports, and letters, conciseness, academic register, anticipation of others’ objections, strategic concession, qualification, and humor/Ability to put together well-written proposals, from small to large projects/ Grant writing skills				

Additional skills not listed above:

2. What knowledge is important/relevant for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs? Please mark only one column.

- 1=Least important/relevant
- 2=Somewhat important/relevant
- 3=Important/relevant
- 4=Very Important/relevant

Knowledge	1 (Least Important)	2	3	4 (Very Important)
Ability to use all this knowledge in order to develop a vision for the program and a strategic plan to get there.				
Advertising/marketing - Knowledge of effective marketing tools and strategies/Marketing skills---basic/ Knowledge of effective student-recruitment practices/ Knowledge of marketing—internationally, and on campus/Knowledge of how to recruit in an international environment/Knowledge of marketing principles				
Budgeting - business operations (budget, personnel, marketing) and the operational policies and procedures of their universities/How budgets work and what the expectations and procedures for them are/Knowledge of how to develop a budget/Budgeting process/Financial planning/Ability to create and understand financial reports.				
Business Acumen - Business (management, accounting, HR)/“business sense”/A rudimentary awareness of business practices/ Knowledge of running a small business....budgeting, marketing, sales, hiring and firing personnel, etc/HR = privacy, discipline, documentation				
Common sense - in being aware of many different approaches to achieving the same goal				
Computer skills				
Conflict resolution - Knowledge of conflict resolution techniques				
Context - This overlaps with much of the above. Whatever the facts of the moment are, there is a need to understand broader issues that impact that. Those who know that can improve their and their program's standing in the university. Those who do not risk appearing naïve/Knowledge of changing markets, technologies, global and campus politics—all of the changing forces that might impact the IEP in the short and long term				
Course design				
Course scheduling				
Curriculum design and development - Extensive knowledge of and experience with curriculum design, the development of SLOs, assessment				
Customer service issues - with international students. From understanding visa issues to culture shock to what the IEP can or should do to welcome students and alleviate stress.				
Doctorate Degree – An advanced degree in the field, preferable a PhD/ We must interact with many university citizens, many of whom hold a doctorate, which is a degree they respect./Knowledge that arms the				

<i>Director with sufficient expertise and credibility to be taken seriously (I would say that from 2010 onwards, that has meant having a doctorate)</i>				
English grammar				
Faculty development and review models and practice				
Familiarity with decision-making models and advantages/disadvantages of each				
Great “savoir faire”				
Higher Education System - Knowledge of general principles and practices regarding the system of higher education in the host country and, to some degree, in the home countries of the IEP students/The higher education system in general and particularly of administrative organization				
History of language				
How the IEP is perceived/valued within the university - Knowledge of the goals and aspirations of the home institution/department and an ability to articulate the role of the IEP in terms that makes sense to such stake holders/The fit of the program within the mission of the institution				
IEP standards				
Immigration Regulations - Knowledge of specific policies related to international student study (SEVIS regulations)/legal mandates/visa requirements for international student studying in the U.S./Immigration regulations and/or university and government contacts to check/At least basic knowledge of requirements for issuance of I-20s and maintenance of F-1 status/U.S. government policies and regulations that pertain to international students and IEPs				
Institutional Knowledge - Knowledge of university structure/ “climate”; awareness of how individual university departments and support units interact with one another; clear understanding of the greater university vision, goals, and objectives; awareness of admissions policies of university; knowledge of policies and procedures of campus; and awareness of university role in relationship to greater community/how the institution is organized/how reporting lines work/how support structures work and designate priority (computing services, testing, facilities management, etc.)/how HR works and how payroll, benefits, etc. are decided upon and processed/how Access and Equity works with the specific institution/how hiring is done and contracts written/how students are "tracked" within the institution/mission of institution/governance structure/role of IEP within the institution/budgeting requirements/ opportunities for collaboration/Stakeholders---Who the key university stakeholders are/The cultural and political climate in academe, especially at his/her own institution/thorough grasp of university or college system director is working in to form internal partnerships and networks for academic, financial and operational purposes/Knowledge of who the players are and how to interact with them in an appropriate manner (upper administrators, the international office, admissions, the business office, departments, advisers, the housing office, the registrar, classroom scheduling, government relations)/Knowledge of who the university gate keepers, potential advocates, and potential adversaries are/Ready knowledge of the work of and access to staff and compliance officers on campus - Visa compliance, Psych Services, Public Safety, Medical				

<i>Services, Copyright and Intellectual Property, Affirmative Action, Disabilities, etc.</i>				
Is knowledgeable about avenues for collaboration and contributions to the greater community.				
Knowledge of effective leadership qualities, traits, and practices				
Knowledge of how to plan strategically and build a team				
Knowledge of human dynamics				
Knowledge of institutional systems - (university and/or college)				
Knowledge of language assessment				
Knowledge of learning styles				
Knowledge of one or more other languages - Knowledge of foreign languages as well as the process of studying and acquiring a foreign language/Knowledge of a second language (preferably learned as an adult).				
Knowledge of other programs and innovations in those programs				
Knowledge of program design				
Knowledge of the financial structure of the program and how it fits financially with the institution				
Knowledge of the goals and aspirations of typical IEP students				
Knowledge of the various facets of international education				
Knowledge/acceptance of academic bureaucracy				
Knowledge/acceptance of other cultures - Cultural differences/ Knowledge and understanding of the culture of both the host country as well familiarity with the home cultures of the IEP students/Knowledge of and sensitivity to multiple cultures/knowledge of various cultural issues/ample knowledge of intercultural relations/Knowledge of the cultures of students in the program and countries where one recruits/Knowledge of other cross-cultural issues, culture shock/Deep Cultural Awareness/Knowledge of other cultures, particularly in terms of how it impacts learning/Wide-ranging cross-cultural understanding/ Intercultural communication				
Living Overseas - What it is like to spend extensive time living and studying in a foreign language speaking environment				
Management information systems				
Management principles - effective managerial qualities, traits, and practices/Administration/management concepts, from accounting and budgeting to human resource management to strategic thinking				
Options for professional development				
Outcomes-based learning and assessment				
Program specific knowledge - the IEP's history/program model options/staffing/instructional models/technology options and possibilities/curricular options/effective, program-specific recruitment strategies/effective supervisory and evaluation strategies				

<i>and approaches/IEP faculty and staff (Who is on the team, how talented they are, what are their views about the program and needs to be addressed, etc.)</i>				
Psychology - Knowledge of psychology/Group Psychology				
Questionnaire design				
Strategic communications: branding, messaging, cc'ing and blind cc'ing, etc.				
Second-language teaching/knowledge of second-language acquisition - Knowledge of second language teaching (and experience)/Must know what their faculty must know: TESOL body of knowledge, as CEA defines it, which means at least an MA in TESOL or Linguistics/Knowledge of and training in TESL ("TESL training" assumes knowledge of and familiarity with the standard subjects and topics typically included accredited graduate TESL programs in the US.)/ESL Teaching methodology/SLA theory & practice/Background coursework in the areas of second language acquisition, curriculum design, second language pedagogy, applied linguistics, language assessment, and sociolinguistics/ TESL/TEFL, classroom management strategies, etc./have to have been in a classroom to understand the demands, not only of preparation but of the actual classroom experience/ Solid academic grounding in English L2 acquisition/Principles of language acquisition/ knowledge of TESL and the culture of the professionals who populate the field/ Knowledge of the field – current and broad/applied linguistics/evaluation and assessment techniques/ First and foremost, knowledge of the TESL profession of how second languages are learned and acquired/TESOL best practices, methods, materials, etc.				
TESOL--ESL--IEP issues and priorities - What our field says, how ESL teaching and administration works, etc.				
Testing - Knowledge of tests such as TOEFL, IELTS, etc.				
Trends in the field				
Understanding that a director is continually dealing with competing values (from university, faculty, staff, students, director's vision...) and must find satisfactory ways to balance those competing needs.				
Where/how to find resources in the field - Knowledge of professional resources				
World economic and political knowledge - Knowledge of world geography/Trends in international political economy/Marketing knowledge, in particular in emerging economies/Political science/ International patterns, developments, trends, events which could impact IEP operations, e.g., currency rate changes, government policies (overseas and in US), economic developments, perceptions about safety, etc./Geo-political knowledge/Some understanding of world affairs as related to international education/Knowledge of the world...political, religious/Knowledge of world affairs/current events/World cultures, politics, geography, languages (i.e., knowledge about world languages, not necessarily language proficiency)				

Additional knowledge not listed above:

3. What personal qualities are important/relevant for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs? Please mark only one column.

- 1=Least important/relevant
- 2=Somewhat important/relevant
- 3=Important/relevant
- 4=Very Important/relevant

Personal Qualities	1 (Least Important)	2	3	4 (Very Important)
Ability to make difficult decisions – <i>i.e what is best for the institute rather than for a particular individual/Ability to make final decisions in the face of opposition/Willing to make difficult decisions/One has to be a decision maker/Decisive</i>				
Ability to negotiate the line between leading and managing				
Ability to prioritize tasks				
Ability to recognize one’s own emotions in the face of others- and then to act or NOT ACT on those feelings				
Ability to resist the need to “get it off my desk”				
Ability to say “I don’t know”				
Ability to say no - <i>to be firm in the face of anger or opposition. To have a “the buck stops here” attitude.</i>				
Ability to take time off for family, friends, oneself				
Ability to work with others/ be a team player and lead at the same time				
Able to concede if necessary				
Able to deal well with people at all levels of the university				
Able to motivate				
Able to see all sides of an issue				
Able to think on your feet				
Accepts challenges and challenges others				
Accessible				
An entrepreneurial mindset				
An interest in and liking of (sometimes extensive) international travel				
Appreciation of diversity				
Approachable				
Articulate				
Attentiveness to detail				
Caring - <i>Caring nature - It can come across in various ways, but faculty, staff, and students want to feel respected and cared for/Compassionate - Caring, considerate, thoughtful</i>				
Clear personal convictions				
Comfortable with ambiguity/uncertainty				
Committed - <i>Committed to program (1st), students (2nd), institution</i>				

<i>(3rd)/Committed/loyal to program/faculty/students</i>				
Committed to professional development, own, that of staff and all instructors				
Common sense				
Composure/Grace under fire - <i>Cool, calm and collected – keeping your head while all about you are losing theirs/Calm - in the face of a crisis/balanced and calm</i>				
Consistency – <i>Being consistent</i>				
Creative - <i>Creativity</i>				
Cultural awareness/sensitivity				
Dependable - <i>Reliable</i>				
Determined — <i>willing to be the faculty and students' best advocate, sustaining the fight even when faced by obstacles and denials/Willing to fight/advocate for program</i>				
Diplomatic – <i>Tact/diplomacy</i>				
Educator at heart				
Empathetic - <i>empathy</i>				
Encouraging - <i>willing to give others credit for program successes and to give something to colleagues that often means more than pay, i.e., praise</i>				
Energetic - <i>Energy</i>				
Enthusiastic/passionate - <i>about her position, role and program potential/Passionate—believing enough in the mission of the IEP and the work of its faculty and staff to instill in others (within and outside of the program) a similar excitement</i>				
Ethical presence - <i>What is ethical to one might be unethical to another, but some adherence to good behavior as noted in TESOL, NAFSA, most university policy books, etc</i>				
Evenhanded				
Fair - <i>fairness</i>				
Firm when necessary				
Firmness tempered with kindness				
Flexible – <i>extreme flexibility is a must/flexible - open to change both pursued and imposed/Flexible & versatile (change on a dime)/Flexibility; ability to try different things or think in different ways/Adaptability - for things that come up within the program and within the university</i>				
Foresight				
Forgiving				
Friendly				
Generous				
Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors				
Hard working - <i>A strong work ethic and ability to work long hours/Ability to work long and hard enough to get the task done</i>				
Honest – <i>Trusted/Honesty/integrity/Strong sense of integrity/trustworthy/Absolute integrity</i>				
Initiative				
Inspirational - <i>helping students believe in their dreams, faculty believe their work is noble and effectual, and administrators that this is a program worth supporting</i>				

Interest and willingness to learn and adapt - Is a lifelong learner				
Interested in how second languages are learned				
Interested in international education – dedication/commitment to international education/Passion for internationalism and international education in general and ESL in particular/A strong personal commitment to the field of post-secondary ESL teaching and international education				
Interested in international issues/cultures/people - Interested in diversity and world cultures/ Interest in other cultures, people				
Interpersonal skills				
Listener – good listening skills/active listening				
Multi-tasking				
Objective				
Open to constructive criticism - A “thick skin” goes a long way!				
Open-minded - Open-minded and inclusive: listening to the program’s stakeholders, risking being wrong and being set straight, risking a detour from one’s well-articulated plan, scouring for creative solutions from every corner of the program				
Openness - open				
Organized				
Outgoing personality				
Patient – patient but demanding/patience/Patience to listen to students who can’t verbalize well, to listen to instructors or others, etc. etc.				
People Person				
Perseverance				
Persistent				
Pleasant				
Politically astute – aware of the “lose the war, win the battle” point of view				
Positive attitude - toward life in general/Optimistic attitude				
Pragmatism				
Preference for facts and thorough-going protocols over conjecture and extrapolation from limited data				
Pride in the field and what we do				
Pro-active				
Professional				
Public relations				
Realistic				
Resourcefulness				
Responsive - able to turn the program on a dime in the face of new threats and opportunities				
Sacrificial - willing to sacrifice a normal life to spend long days, many weekends, and few vacations to meet the short and long term goals of the program				
Sees big picture without losing sight of the details - Ability to see the forest from the trees – ability to see the big picture while				

<i>putting out brush fires/ the ability to step back and see the whole picture</i>				
Self-confident - confidence in yourself/secure in own position/Self-confident so that competition is not a factor				
Self-motivation				
Sense of humor - Ability to see humor/Possesses a sense of humor and ability to laugh at self/A sense of humor to get past all those people who think anyone can do this job/good humor/ a very strong sense of humor				
Sensitive				
Sincere				
Sociable				
Stamina				
Taking “me” out of the center – allowing others to use their voices/Ability to include others in decision making/Ability to lead yet not to dominate/Someone who recognizes the effort and accomplishments of others/Someone who sees the enterprise as a group endeavor/Supportive – of growth and productivity of others				
Tenacious				
Thoughtful – sensitive to diverse needs/thoughtfulness				
Time management				
Tolerance for ambiguity - as some things we deal with are not as clear as we might prefer--and never will be.				
Tolerance of different attitudes, opinions etc				
Toughness - (have to make hard decisions and have difficult conversations)				
Understanding of generational differences in the workplace				
Visionary - "The vision thing"/capability to have a vision for the program				
Willing to change				
Willing to delegate - able to delegate...and move on ability to let go and delegate projects				
Willing to take responsibility				
Willingness to allow others to take risks and make mistakes - Trusting – in talents and capabilities of co- workers and students/supportive/ Trusting				
Willingness to help anyone who comes into the office				
Willingness to take risks and make mistakes - Willingness to take risks to make change/gutsy - willing to take risks, call a bluff, stand firm/A risk-taker – willing to go out into sometimes turbulent waters while also being expected to be the rudder that steadies the ship.				
Willingness to try new things - Willingness to learn				

Additional personal qualities not listed above:

APPENDIX B
COMPILED RESULTS OF SURVEY #2

Skills

Name	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	S16	S17	S18	S19	S20
A	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	3
B	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	0	3	1	3	4	2	3	3	2
C	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	4	1
D	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
E	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	4	2
F	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	0	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	1
G	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	2
H	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	1	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	2
I	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	4	1
J	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	1
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
L	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	2
M	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	2
N	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	1
O	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	0	3	4	4	3	4	3	1
P	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
Q	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	1	4	4	3	3	4	4
Mean	3.76	3.59	3.12	3.82	3.65	3.82	3.59	3.76	3.12	3.59	3.47	2.47	3.41	2.59	3.47	3.71	2.76	3.29	3.59	2.06
SD	0.44	0.62	0.70	0.39	0.49	0.53	0.51	0.56	1.17	0.62	0.72	1.18	1.00	1.06	0.72	0.59	0.75	0.47	0.62	1.03

Skills

Name	S21	S22	S23	S24	S25	S26	S27	S28	S29	S30	S31	S32	S33	S34	S35	S36	S37	S38	S39	S40
A	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
B	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	1	4
C	4	1	2	4	3	1	3	2	3	3	4	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	1	4
D	3	3	4	4	3	1	3	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	4
E	4	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4
F	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4
G	4	3	4	4	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	0	4	4	4	3	4
H	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
I	4	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	3	4
J	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	4
K	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4
M	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
N	4	3	3	4	3	4	1	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
P	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4
Mean	3.71	2.94	3.24	3.82	2.47	2.76	3.47	3.41	3.53	3.65	3.94	3.88	3.12	3.12	3.24	3.82	3.94	3.76	2.88	3.94
SD	0.47	0.75	0.66	0.39	0.62	1.03	0.80	0.71	0.51	0.49	0.24	0.33	0.49	0.86	1.03	0.39	0.24	0.44	0.86	0.24

Skills

Name	S41	S42	S43	S44	S45	S46	S47	S48	S49	S50	S51	S52	S53	S54	S55	S56	S57	S58	
A	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	
B	3	4	3	4	1	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	0	4	
C	4	2	2	4	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	2	4	2	1	2	
D	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	
E	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	
F	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	
G	3	3	4	4	1	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	
H	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	0	3	4	4	3	3	
I	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	
J	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	
K	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	
L	3	4	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	
M	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	
N	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	
O	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	
P	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	
Q	3	4	4	4	0	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	
Mean	3.41	3.71	3.65	3.71	1.76	3.24	3.76	3.71	3.59	3.76	3.18	3.47	3.41	2.76	4.00	3.65	3.00	3.59	3.48
SD	0.51	0.59	0.61	0.47	1.03	0.56	0.56	0.47	0.71	0.44	0.53	0.80	1.00	0.56	0.00	0.61	1.37	0.62	0.62

Knowledge

Name	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10	K11	K12	K13	K14	K15	K16	K17	K18	K19	K20
A	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	0	2	1	4
B	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	2	3
C	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	4
D	0	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	3
E	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
F	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	4	0	3	3	3	1	3
G	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	4	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	4
H	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	4
I	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	4
J	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	4	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	3	3	1	3
K	0	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
L	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	3
M	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	4	2	2	2	4	2	4	3	2	3	4	2	4
N	0	4	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	2	3	3	1	3	2	2	4	0	1	4
O	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	4
P	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	2	2	3	2	4
Q	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	0	3	2	4
Mean	3.00	3.24	3.53	3.18	3.71	2.76	3.18	3.59	2.59	2.65	3.06	3.37	2.47	3.12	3.06	2.41	2.24	2.76	1.71	3.71
SD	1.62	0.75	0.72	0.73	0.47	0.56	0.64	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.97	0.62	1.07	0.93	0.97	0.87	1.20	1.03	0.77	0.47

Knowledge

Name	K21	K22	K23	K24	K25	K26	K27	K28	K29	K30	K31	K32	K33	K34	K35	K36	K37	K38	K39	K40
A	4	3	3	2	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
B	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	2
C	0	2	4	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	2	2	3	3	2
D	3	1	4	1	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	1
E	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	0	4	4	3	3	4	3	3
F	0	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
G	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2
H	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	0	3	4	2	2
I	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
J	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	2	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
L	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	3	3
M	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3
N	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	1	1
O	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
P	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	2
Q	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3
Mean	3.41	3.00	3.82	3.00	3.24	3.71	3.18	3.24	3.35	3.06	2.76	3.29	3.00	3.82	3.53	2.76	3.24	3.71	2.94	2.47
SD	1.33	1.00	0.39	0.87	0.75	0.47	0.73	0.66	0.79	0.75	0.83	0.77	1.00	0.39	0.51	1.03	0.56	0.47	0.83	0.72

Knowledge

Name	K41	K42	K43	K44	K45	K46	K47	K48	K49	K50	K51	K52	K53	K54	
A	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
B	2	3	3	4	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	
C	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	
D	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	
E	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	0	3	3	4	
F	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	
G	4	3	3	4	1	1	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	3	
H	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	
I	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	
J	3	2	1	3	4	2	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	
K	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
L	3	3	3	4	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	
M	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	
N	3	4	4	0	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	
O	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
P	4	3	4	4	3	1	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Q	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	
Mean	3.29	3.35	3.18	3.29	2.35	1.82	3.29	3.71	3.53	3.24	3.35	3.65	3.47	3.29	3.26
SD	0.59	0.61	0.95	1.16	0.93	0.64	0.59	0.47	0.80	0.90	1.06	0.49	0.80	0.77	0.77

Personal

Name	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15	P16	P17	P18	P19	P20
A	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
B	4	3	4	3	0	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	4
C	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	1	1	1	3	4	4	2	3
D	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3
E	4	4	4	0	3	4	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
F	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4
G	4	3	4	2	2	4	2	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4
H	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
I	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	1	4	3
J	4	3	4	2	3	0	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	4	2	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3
M	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	4
N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	4
O	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
P	4	3	4	4	1	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4
Q	4	3	4	4	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	4.00	3.47	3.76	3.18	2.47	3.06	3.29	3.41	3.76	3.53	3.82	3.47	3.53	3.47	3.41	3.59	3.29	2.82	3.65	3.71
SD	0.00	0.62	0.44	1.24	1.28	1.14	1.21	0.62	0.44	0.62	0.39	0.51	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.62	0.77	0.88	0.61	0.47

Personal

Name	P21	P22	P23	P24	P25	P26	P27	P28	P29	P30	P31	P32	P33	P34	P35	P36	P37	P38	P39	P40
A	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
B	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3
C	2	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	3	3
D	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	3	0	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
G	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4
H	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
I	3	3	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
J	3	2	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
M	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
N	4	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
P	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Mean	3.59	3.29	3.18	2.59	3.35	3.53	3.76	3.76	3.71	3.47	3.24	3.71	3.71	3.76	3.59	3.53	3.41	3.82	3.35	3.65
SD	0.62	0.85	1.01	1.33	0.79	1.01	0.44	0.44	0.59	0.87	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.44	0.80	0.80	0.87	0.39	0.49	0.49

Personal

Name	P41	P42	P43	P44	P45	P46	P47	P48	P49	P50	P51	P52	P53	P54	P55	P56	P57	P58	P59
A	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
B	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
C	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	0	4	3	2	1	2	3
D	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4
E	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
F	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
G	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3
H	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
I	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4
J	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
M	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3
N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	2
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
P	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.94	3.47	3.76	3.59	3.53	3.59	3.29	3.12	3.00	2.71	2.88	3.76	3.71	3.71	3.53	3.65	3.18	3.18	3.47
SD	0.24	1.07	0.56	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.77	1.11	1.00	1.26	0.86	0.44	0.99	0.47	0.62	0.61	0.81	1.01	0.62

Personal

Name	P60	P61	P62	P63	P64	P65	P66	P67	P68	P69	P70	P71	P72	P73	P74	P75	P76	P77	P78	P79
A	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
B	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	3
C	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	2
D	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3
E	4	3	4	4	0	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	3
G	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	3	2	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	4	4
H	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3
I	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4
J	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4
M	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3
N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
P	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
Q	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.71	3.71	3.29	3.71	3.29	3.76	3.47	3.47	2.82	3.47	3.18	3.18	3.06	3.18	3.41	3.47	3.47	3.35	3.88	3.53
SD	0.59	0.59	0.85	0.77	1.16	0.75	0.94	0.51	0.73	0.62	0.81	1.13	1.14	0.64	0.62	0.72	1.01	0.61	0.33	0.62

Personal

Name	P80	P81	P82	P83	P84	P85	P86	P87	P88	P89	P90	P91	P92	P93	P94	P95	P96	P97	P98	P99
A	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
B	4	0	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	0	3	4
C	3	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	3	2
D	3	3	3	3	3	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	4	0	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
F	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
G	4	3	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4
H	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4
I	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4
J	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4
M	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
N	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4
P	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	0	3	4	1	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.76	2.88	2.94	3.29	3.29	2.24	3.65	3.41	3.47	3.35	2.71	3.47	2.88	3.35	3.41	3.12	3.47	3.29	3.47	3.65
SD	0.44	1.32	1.34	1.16	1.05	1.15	0.49	0.51	0.62	0.79	1.26	0.80	0.78	0.79	0.62	0.86	0.51	0.99	0.51	0.61

Personal

Name	P100	P101	P102	P103	P104	P105	P106	P107	P108	P109	
A	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
B	3	1	3	4	4	4	3	1	3	3	
C	4	1	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	
D	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	
E	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	
F	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	3	
G	2	2	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	4	
H	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	
I	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
J	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
L	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	
M	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	
N	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
P	4	3	4	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	
Q	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
Mean	3.35	2.76	3.59	3.35	3.65	3.82	3.59	2.71	3.59	3.53	3.45
SD	1.06	0.90	0.51	1.00	0.49	0.39	0.51	0.99	0.51	0.51	0.74

APPENDIX C
SURVEY #3

4. How important/relevant are the following skills for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Indicated below are:

1. your previous response (a “0” indicates no response, or an illegible response);
2. the group mean;
3. items dropped from the survey because they received a mean score of below 2.5

After reviewing this information, please complete the survey again. Please mark only one column.

- 1=Least important/relevant
2=Somewhat important/relevant
3=Important/relevant
4=Very Important/relevant

Skills	Mean response	Your previous response	1	2	3	4
Ability to be inspirational	3.76					
Ability to be objective	3.59					
Ability to comprehend people not speaking good English	3.12					
Ability to create a positive environment	3.82					
Ability to deal effectively with the needs/goals of the director’s superior(s) and those of staff and instructors under the director	3.65					
Ability to define and articulate vision, mission, goals	3.82					
Ability to delegate/designate (effectively)	3.59					
Ability to effect change	3.76					
Ability to evaluate	3.12					
Ability to execute tasks under pressure	3.59					
Ability to find the positive	3.47					
Ability to interact and collaborate with many different constituencies	3.41					
Ability to meditate	2.59					
Ability to remain calm and focused in many different, demanding situations	3.47					
Ability to represent the program in a professional way	3.71					
Ability to respond quickly	2.76					
Ability to say “no” with grace	3.29					

Ability to see opportunities	3.59					
Ability to think strategically	3.71					
Ability to understand L2 research	2.94					
Able to direct productive meetings	3.24					
Advocacy skills	3.82					
Boundless energy	2.76					
Budget management skills	3.47					
Conflict resolution skills	3.41					
Consensus building skills	3.53					
Cross-Cultural communication skills	3.65					
Decision making skills	3.94					
Effective communication skills	3.88					
Enrollment management	3.12					
ESL Teaching skills	3.12					
Good, basic intelligence is a required skill	3.24					
Interpersonal/Interpersonal communication skills	3.82					
Leadership skills	3.94					
Listening skills	3.76					
Make time for reflection	2.88					
Managerial skills	3.94					
Mentoring skills	3.41					
Multi-tasking skills	3.71					
Negotiating skills	3.65					
Organizational skills	3.71					
Patience	3.24					
Personnel skills	3.76					
Planning skills	3.71					
Political astuteness	3.59					
Problem-solving skills	3.76					
Public-speaking skills	3.18					
Supervisory skills	3.47					
Team-building skills	3.41					
Technological skills	2.76					
Integrity	4.00					
Time Management skills	3.65					
To be a good reader of people and situations	3.00					
Writing skills	3.59					

The following items have been dropped:

	Mean response	Your previous response
Ability to herd cats	2.47	
Ability to speak at least one foreign language well	2.06	
Basic statistics and graphing	2.47	
Parenting Skills	1.76	

5. What knowledge is important/relevant for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Indicated below are:

1. your previous response (a “0” indicates no response, or an illegible response);
2. the group mean;
3. items dropped from the survey because they received a mean score of below 2.5

After reviewing this information, please complete the survey again. Please mark only one column.

- 1=Least important/relevant
- 2=Somewhat important/relevant
- 3=Important/relevant
- 4=Very Important/relevant

Knowledge	Mean response	Your previous response	1	2	3	4
Ability to use all this knowledge in order to develop a vision for the program and a strategic plan to get there.	3.00					
Advertising/marketing	3.24					
Budgeting	3.53					
Business Acumen	3.18					
Common sense	3.71					
Computer skills	2.76					
Conflict resolution	3.18					
Context	3.59					
Course design	2.59					
Course scheduling	2.65					
Curriculum design and development	3.06					
Customer service issues	3.53					
English grammar	3.12					
Faculty development and review models and practice	3.06					
Higher Education System	2.76					
How the IEP is perceived/valued within the university	3.71					
IEP standards	3.41					
Immigration Regulations	3.00					
Institutional Knowledge	3.82					
Is knowledgeable about avenues for collaboration and contributions to the greater community.	3.00					
Knowledge of effective leadership qualities, traits, and practices	3.24					

Knowledge of how to plan strategically and build a team	3.71					
Knowledge of human dynamics	3.18					
Knowledge of institutional systems	3.24					
Knowledge of language assessment	3.35					
Knowledge of learning styles	3.06					
Knowledge of one or more other languages	2.76					
Knowledge of other programs and innovations in those programs	3.29					
Knowledge of program design	3.00					
Knowledge of the financial structure of the program and how it fits financially with the institution	3.82					
Knowledge of the goals and aspirations of typical IEP students	3.53					
Knowledge of the various facets of international education	2.76					
Knowledge/acceptance of academic bureaucracy	3.24					
Knowledge/acceptance of other cultures	3.71					
Living Overseas	2.94					
Management principles	3.29					
Options for professional development	3.35					
Outcomes-based learning and assessment	3.18					
Program specific knowledge	3.29					
Strategic communications:	3.29					
Second-language teaching/knowledge of second-language acquisition	3.71					
TESOL--ESL--IEP issues and priorities	3.53					
Testing	3.24					
Trends in the field	3.35					
Understanding that a director is continually dealing with competing values	3.65					
Where/how to find resources in the field	3.47					
World economic and political knowledge	3.29					

The following items have been dropped:	Mean response	Your previous response
Doctorate Degree	2.47	
Familiarity with decision-making models and advantages/disadvantages of each	2.41	
Great "savoir faire"	2.24	
History of language	1.71	
Management information systems	2.47	
Psychology	2.35	
Questionnaire design	1.82	

6. What personal qualities are important/relevant for directors of university- or college-based Intensive English Programs?

Indicated below are:

1. your previous response (a “0” indicates no response, or an illegible response);
2. the group mean;
3. items dropped from the survey because they received a mean score of below 2.5

After reviewing this information, please complete the survey again. Please mark only one column.

1=Least important/relevant

2=Somewhat important/relevant

3=Important/relevant

4=Very Important/relevant

Personal Qualities	Mean response	Your previous response	1	2	3	4
Ability to make difficult decisions	4.00					
Ability to negotiate the line between leading and managing	3.47					
Ability to prioritize tasks	3.76					
Ability to recognize one’s own emotions in the face of others- and then to act or NOT ACT on those feelings	3.18					
Ability to say “I don’t know”	3.06					
Ability to say no	3.29					
Ability to take time off for family, friends, oneself	3.41					
Ability to work with others/ be a team player and lead at the same time	3.76					
Able to concede if necessary	3.53					
Able to deal well with people at all levels of the university	3.82					
Able to motivate	3.47					
Able to see all sides of an issue	3.53					
Able to think on your feet	3.47					
Accepts challenges and challenges others	3.41					
Accessible	3.59					
An entrepreneurial mindset	3.29					
An interest in and liking of (sometimes extensive) international travel	2.82					
Appreciation of diversity	3.65					
Approachable	3.71					
Articulate	3.59					
Attentiveness to detail	3.29					
Caring	3.18					
Clear personal convictions	2.59					
Comfortable with ambiguity/uncertainty	3.35					
Committed	3.53					
Committed to professional development, own, that of staff	3.76					

and all instructors						
Common sense	3.76					
Composure/Grace under fire	3.71					
Consistency	3.47					
Creative	3.24					
Cultural awareness/sensitivity	3.71					
Dependable	3.71					
Determined	3.76					
Diplomatic	3.59					
Educator at heart	3.53					
Empathetic	3.41					
Encouraging	3.82					
Energetic	3.35					
Enthusiastic/passionate	3.65					
Ethical presence	3.94					
Evenhanded	3.47					
Fair	3.76					
Firm when necessary	3.59					
Firmness tempered with kindness	3.53					
Flexible	3.59					
Foresight	3.29					
Forgiving	3.12					
Friendly	3.00					
Generous	2.71					
Good at making connections, bartering, doing favors	2.88					
Hard working	3.76					
Honest	3.71					
Initiative	3.71					
Inspirational	3.53					
Interest and willingness to learn and adapt	3.65					
Interested in how second languages are learned	3.18					
Interested in international education	3.18					
Interested in international issues/cultures/people	3.47					
Interpersonal skills	3.71					
Listener	3.71					
Multi-tasking	3.29					
Objective	3.71					
Open to constructive criticism	3.29					
Open-minded	3.76					
Openness	3.47					
Organized	3.47					
Outgoing personality	2.82					
Patient	3.47					
People Person	3.18					
Perseverance	3.18					

Persistent	3.06					
Pleasant	3.18					
Politically astute	3.41					
Positive attitude	3.47					
Pragmatism	3.47					
Preference for facts and thorough-going protocols over conjecture and extrapolation from limited data	3.35					
Pride in the field and what we do	3.88					
Pro-active	3.53					
Professional	3.76					
Public relations	2.88					
Realistic	2.94					
Resourcefulness	3.29					
Responsive	3.29					
Sees big picture without losing sight of the details	3.65					
Self-confident	3.41					
Self-motivation	3.47					
Sense of humor	3.35					
Sensitive	2.71					
Sincere	3.47					
Sociable	2.88					
Stamina	3.35					
Taking “me” out of the center	3.41					
Tenacious	3.12					
Thoughtful	3.47					
Time management	3.29					
Tolerance for ambiguity	3.47					
Tolerance of different attitudes, opinions etc	3.65					
Toughness	3.35					
Understanding of generational differences in the workplace	2.76					
Visionary	3.59					
Willing to change	3.35					
Willing to delegate	3.65					
Willing to take responsibility	3.82					
Willingness to allow others to take risks and make mistakes	3.59					
Willingness to help anyone who comes into the office	2.71					
Willingness to take risks and make mistakes	3.59					
Willingness to try new things	3.53					

The following items have been dropped:	Mean response	Your previous response
Ability to resist the need to “get it off my desk”	2.47	
Sacrificial	2.24	

APPENDIX D
COMPILED RESULTS OF SURVEY #3

Skills																			
Name	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	S16	S17	S18	S19
A	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4		4	2	3	4	4	3	4
B	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4		4	2	3	4	3	3	3
D	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	2	3	3
E	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4		4	1	4	4	3	3	4
F	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3		4	2	3	4	3	3	3
G	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4		4	3	4	3	3	3	4
H	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4		4	2	4	4	3	4	4
I	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4		4	2	4	4	2	3	4
J	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	2		4	3	3	3	3	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		3	2	4	4	3	4	4
N	4	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4		4	4	4	4	2	4	3
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3		4	2	4	4	3	3	3
P	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	3	3	4
Q	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	1	4	4	3	3	4
Mean	3.73	3.80	3.13	3.80	3.87	3.93	3.73	3.80	3.40	3.80	3.67		3.87	2.47	3.67	3.80	2.93	3.27	3.60
SD	0.46	0.41	0.74	0.41	0.35	0.26	0.46	0.41	0.51	0.41	0.62		0.35	0.99	0.49	0.41	0.59	0.46	0.51

Skills

Name	S20	S21	S22	S23	S24	S25	S26	S27	S28	S29	S30	S31	S32	S33	S34	S35	S36	S37	S38	S39
A		4	3	3	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
B		3	3	3	3		2	3	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	2
D		3	3	4	4		1	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3
E		4	3	3	4		4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
F		4	3	3	3		3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
G		4	3	4	4		2	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	4	4	4	3
H		4	3	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3
I		4	3	3	4		2	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
J		3	2	2	3		2	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3
K		4	3	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L		4	3	3	4		3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
N		4	3	3	4		4	1	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	4
O		4	4	3	4		3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
P		4	4	3	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3
Q		4	3	4	4		3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3
Mean		3.80	3.07	3.27	3.80		2.87	3.53	3.40	3.60	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.07	3.33	3.93	3.93	3.87	3.07
SD		0.41	0.46	0.59	0.41		0.92	0.83	0.63	0.63	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.70	0.82	0.26	0.26	0.35	0.46

Skills

Name	S40	S41	S42	S43	S44	S45	S46	S47	S48	S49	S50	S51	S52	S53	S54	S55	S56	S57	S58	
A	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
B	4	3	4	3	4		3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	2	4	4
D	4	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4
E	4	3	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
F	4	4	4	4	3		3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
G	4	3	3	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	4
H	4	3	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3
I	4	3	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	4	4
J	4	3	4	3	3		3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
K	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	3	4	3	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	4
N	4	3	4	4	4		4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
P	4	3	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Q	4	3	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	4.00	3.27	3.87	3.73	3.80		3.33	3.87	3.80	3.80	3.87	3.20	3.67	3.73	2.73	4.00	3.80	3.47	3.80	3.60
SD	0.00	0.46	0.35	0.46	0.41		0.49	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.35	0.41	0.49	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.41	0.64	0.41	0.45

Knowledge

Name	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10	K11	K12	K13	K14	K15	K16	K17	K18	K19
A	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3		3	3				2
B	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3		3	3				3
D	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3		3	4				2
E	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4		3	4				3
F	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	3		4	3				3
G	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	3	4		2	3				3
H	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4		3	3				2
I	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4		2	3				3
J	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	1	2	2	3		2	3				2
K	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4				4
L	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	3		3	3				3
N	4	3	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	2	4	4		2	3				3
O	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3		4	3				3
P	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4		4	3				3
Q	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4		4	4				3
Mean	3.53	2.93	3.60	3.13	3.80	3.00	3.20	3.60	2.67	2.80	3.27	3.53		3.07	3.27				2.80
SD	0.83	0.59	0.74	0.52	0.41	0.38	0.56	0.51	0.82	0.68	0.80	0.52		0.80	0.46				0.56

Knowledge

Name	K20	K21	K22	K23	K24	K25	K26	K27	K28	K29	K30	K31	K32	K33	K34	K35	K36	K37	K38	K39
A	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3
B	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	4	4	4	3	4	3
D	3	3	1	4	1	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
E	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3
F	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3
G	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	1
H	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	2
I	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3
J	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	1	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	2
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
L	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	3
N	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	1
O	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
P	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	4
Q	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
Mean	3.80	3.87	2.93	3.87	3.13	3.60	3.80	3.27	3.33	3.47	3.13	2.73	3.27	3.27	3.93	3.60	2.93	3.33	3.87	2.73
SD	0.41	0.35	0.88	0.35	0.74	0.51	0.41	0.70	0.49	0.64	0.64	0.88	0.59	0.59	0.26	0.51	0.80	0.49	0.35	0.88

Knowledge

Name	K40	K41	K42	K43	K44	K45	K46	K47	K48	K49	K50	K51	K52	K53	K54	
A		3	3	3	3			3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	
B		2	3	3	4			2	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	
D		3	3	3	3			4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	
E		3	4	4	4			3	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	
F		3	3	3	3			3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	
G		4	3	3	4			3	3	3	2	4	4	4	3	
H		3	3	3	4			3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	
I		4	3	4	4			3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	
J		3	2	1	3			4	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	
K		4	4	4	4			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
L		3	3	3	4			3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	
N		4	4	4	4			4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	
O		3	4	4	4			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
P		3	3	3	4			3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	
Q		4	4	4	4			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	
Mean		3.27	3.27	3.27	3.73			3.33	3.73	3.60	3.20	3.60	3.67	3.60	3.33	3.35
SD		0.59	0.59	0.80	0.46			0.62	0.46	0.51	0.68	0.51	0.49	0.51	0.49	0.58

Personal

Name	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15	P16	P17	P18	P19
A	4	4	4	4		3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4
B	4	3	4	3		3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	4
D	4	3	3	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4
E	4	4	4	3		3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
F	4	4	4	3		4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
G	4	3	4	3		4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4
H	4	3	4	3		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
I	4	3	4	4		3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	1	4
J	4	3	4	3		3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3
K	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
N	4	4	4	4		4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
O	4	4	4	4		3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
P	4	3	4	4		3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Q	4	3	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	4.00	3.47	3.93	3.60		3.27	3.67	3.47	3.93	3.73	3.93	3.53	3.73	3.60	3.53	3.53	3.27	2.93	3.87
SD	0.00	0.52	0.26	0.51		0.46	0.49	0.64	0.26	0.46	0.26	0.52	0.46	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.59	0.88	0.35

Personal

Name	P20	P21	P22	P23	P24	P25	P26	P27	P28	P29	P30	P31	P32	P33	P34	P35	P36	P37	P38	P39
A	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
B	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4
D	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3
G	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3
H	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
I	3	3	3	4	3	4	1	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
J	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	3	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
N	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
O	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
P	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Q	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Mean	3.80	3.67	3.53	3.33	2.93	3.60	3.60	3.87	3.87	3.80	3.67	3.27	3.93	3.87	3.87	3.73	3.73	3.40	3.80	3.33
SD	0.41	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.70	0.51	0.83	0.35	0.35	0.41	0.62	0.46	0.26	0.35	0.35	0.46	0.46	0.63	0.41	0.49

Personal

Name	P40	P41	P42	P43	P44	P45	P46	P47	P48	P49	P50	P51	P52	P53	P54	P55	P56	P57	P58	P59
A	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
B	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
D	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4
E	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
F	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
G	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
H	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
I	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4
J	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
P	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.73	4.00	3.87	3.93	3.73	3.60	3.80	3.47	3.40	2.87	2.73	2.80	3.87	4.00	3.80	3.53	3.80	3.33	3.27	3.60
SD	0.46	0.00	0.35	0.26	0.46	0.51	0.41	0.52	0.51	0.74	0.70	0.77	0.35	0.00	0.41	0.64	0.41	0.49	0.59	0.51

Personal

Name	P60	P61	P62	P63	P64	P65	P66	P67	P68	P69	P70	P71	P72	P73	P74	P75	P76	P77	P78	P79
A	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
B	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3
D	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3
E	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
F	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
G	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	4
H	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3
I	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
J	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	2	3
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4
N	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
P	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4
Q	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.93	3.93	3.47	3.80	3.53	3.87	3.60	3.53	2.93	3.53	3.20	3.60	3.40	3.20	3.60	3.60	3.73	3.33	3.80	3.67
SD	0.26	0.26	0.52	0.41	0.52	0.35	0.51	0.52	0.59	0.52	0.77	0.51	0.63	0.56	0.51	0.63	0.46	0.62	0.56	0.49

Personal

Name	P80	P81	P82	P83	P84	P85	P86	P87	P88	P89	P90	P91	P92	P93	P94	P95	P96	P97	P98	P99
A	4	4	4	4	4		3	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
B	4	2	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4
D	3	3	3	3	3		4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
E	4	3	3	3	4		4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4
F	3	3	3	3	3		4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
G	4	3	4	4	4		4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
H	4	3	3	4	4		4	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	4
I	4	3	3	4	4		4	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
J	4	3	3	3	4		3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
K	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
L	4	3	3	3	4		4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
N	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
O	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4
P	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4
Q	4	4	3	3	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.87	3.33	3.40	3.53	3.80		3.80	3.40	3.60	3.47	3.20	3.60	2.93	3.40	3.47	3.20	3.60	3.53	3.60	3.87
SD	0.35	0.62	0.51	0.52	0.41		0.41	0.51	0.51	0.64	0.56	0.51	0.59	0.51	0.52	0.68	0.51	0.52	0.51	0.35

Personal

Name	P100	P101	P102	P103	P104	P105	P106	P107	P108	P109	
A	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
B	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	1	3	3	
D	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	
E	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	
F	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	
G	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	4	
H	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	
I	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
J	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	
K	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
L	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	
N	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	
O	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	
P	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	
Q	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	
Mean	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.73	3.60	3.87	3.67	2.60	3.67	3.60	3.57
SD	0.62	0.65	0.49	0.46	0.51	0.35	0.49	0.91	0.49	0.51	0.48

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Arnold, M. (2004). President's Message. In Carr, C. S., & Fulmer, C. L. (Eds.). *Educational Leadership: Knowing the Way, Showing the Way, Going the Way* (pp. 2-3). Oxford, UK: Scarecrow Education
- Barrett, R.P. (1982a). *The administration of intensive English language programs*. Washington DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Barrett, R.P. (1982b). Introduction. In Barrett, R.P. (Ed.), *The administration of intensive English language programs* (pp. 1-5). Washington DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Behar, L.S. (1994). *The Knowledge Base of Curriculum: An Empirical Analysis*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.
- Brady, B. (2008). Development, aka fundraising: A neglected element of professional development. In C. Coombe, M.L. McCloskey, L. Stephenson, & N. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership in English language teaching and learning* (pp.154-166). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brown, J. D., & Pennington, M. C. (1991). Developing effective evaluation systems for language programs. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 3-18). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Byrd, P., & Constantinides, J. C. (1991). Self-study and self-regulation for ESL programs: issues arising from the associational approach. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 19-35). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Carkin, S. (1997). Language program leadership as intercultural management. In Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators*(pp. 49-60). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Carr, C. S., & Fulmer, C. L. (Eds.). (2004). *Educational Leadership: Knowing the Way, Showing the Way, Going the Way*. Oxford, UK: Scarecrow Education.
- Christison, M. A., & Murray, D.E. (Eds.). (2009). *Leadership in English language education: Theoretical foundations and practical skills for changing times*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.). (1997). *A handbook for language program administrators*. Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.). (2012). *A handbook for language program administrators*. Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.

- Clayton, M.J. (1997). Delphi: a technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision-making tasks in education. *Educational Psychology*, 14(4), 373-386. doi: 10.1080/0144341970170401
- Coombe, C., McCloskey, M. L., Stephenson, L., & Anderson, N.J. (Eds.). (2008). *Leadership in English language teaching and learning*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Cunningham, W.G., Cordeiro, P.A. (2009). *Educational Leadership: A Bridge to Improved Practice* (4th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Curtis, A. (2008). The seven principles of professional development: From A to G. In C. Coombe, M.L. McCloskey, L. Stephenson, & N. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership in English language teaching and learning* (pp.117-127). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Dalkey, N. (1969). An experimental study in group opinion: The Delphi method. *Futures*, September 1969, 408-426.
- Deardorff, D.K. (2004). *The Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States* (Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University).
- Educational Leadership (2007) (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eskey, D. E. (1997). The IEP as a nontraditional entity. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 21-30). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Eskey, D. E., Lacy, R., & Kraft, C. A. (1991). A novel approach to ESL program evaluation. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 36-50). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Fox, R. P. (1991). Evaluation the ESL program director. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 228-240). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- FuturesLeaders - Assessments Technologies Group (2005). *Work Profiling System*. Jacksonville, Florida.
- Geddes, J. M., & Marks, D. R. (1997). Personnel matters. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 199-218). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Geltner, J. A. (2007). *Curriculum Components of Classroom Management Training for School Counselors: A Delphi Study* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida). Retrieved from <http://www.uflib.ufl.edu.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/>

- Gupta, U.G, & Clarke, R.E. (1996). Theory and application of the Delphi technique: A bibliography (1975-1994). *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 53, 185-211.
- Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(4), 1008-1015.
- Henrichsen, L. (1994). Conducting an ESL program self-study: 20 lessons from experience. *TESOL Journal*, 3(4), 8-13.
- Hsu, C.C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation*, 12(10), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=12&n=10>
- Institute of International Education (2009). *Open Doors 2008*. Retrieved from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=131574>
- Jenks, F. L. (1991). Designing and assessing the efficacy of ESL promotional materials. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 172-188). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Jenks, F. L. (1997). The quest for academic legitimacy: building for language program entry into institutional and community infrastructures. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 107-121). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Jenks, F. L. (2002). Intensive English programs: enrolment repercussions. *TESOL Matters*, 12(2), 1-2.
- Jones, J., & Hunter, D. (1995). Qualitative research: Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 376-380. Retrieved from <http://www.bmj.com/ip.hscl.ufl.edu/content/full/311/7001/376>
- Klinghammer, S. J. (1997). The strategic planner. In Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 61-76). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1997). An IEP is a many-splendored thing. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 3-19). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Lambert, L., Nolan, R., Peterson, N., & Pierce, D. (2007). Critical skills and knowledge for senior campus international leaders. NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

- Landeta, J. (2006). Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 73, 467-482. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2005.09.002
- Levitov, P. S. (1997). Immigration principles for the language program administrator. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 301-303). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Application*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Ludlow, J. (1975). Delphi inquiries and knowledge utilization. In H. A. Linstone, & M. Turroff (Eds.), *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Application* (pp. 102-123). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Lytle, A.D. (2007). Funding IEP Professional Development. *IEP Newsletter*, 27(1), 1-4.
- Matthies, B.F. (1984). The director's job skills in intensive English programs. *American Language Journal*, 2(1), 5-16.
- Matthies, B. F. (1991). Administrative evaluation in ESL programs: how'm I doin'. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 241-251). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Maurice, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of administrators regarding student feedback and its impact on decision-making of intensive English program administrators. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 9700273)
- McGee Banks, C. A. (2007). Gender and Race as Factors in Educational Leadership and Administration. In *Educational Leadership* (pp. 299 – 338). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mickelson, C. (1997). Grants and projects (as if you don't have enough to do already). In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 219-234). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Middlebrook, G. C. (1991). Evaluation of student services in ESL programs. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 135-154). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Miller, B.D. (1997). Marketing principles for the language program administrator. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 309-312). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.

- Mitroff, I. A., & Turroff, M. (1975). Theoretical and methodological foundations of Delphi. In H. A. Linstone, & M. Turroff (Eds.), *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Application* (pp. 17-36). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Munsel, P.E. (1982). An ESL administrator looks at research. In Barrett, R.P. (Ed.), *The administration of intensive English language programs* (pp. 99-105). Washington DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2005). Marketing and recruitment for admissions offices & IEPs participant manual.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2006). F-1 regulations: the second step participant manual.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2007a). Beyond advising: Management basics for international educators participant guide.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2007b). Foundations of international education: ESL program administration participant manual.
- Panferov, S. (2008). Promoting intensive ESL programs: Taking charge of a market. In C. Coombe, M.L. McCloskey, L. Stephenson, & N. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership in English language teaching and learning* (pp.178-185). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Pennington, M. C. (Ed.). (1991). *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Pennington, M.C. (1994). Advice from the front lines: what every ESL program director needs to know that they didn't teach you in graduate school. Retrieved from sunzi1.lib.hku.hk.
- Pennington, M. C., & Brown, J. D. (1991). Unifying curriculum process and curriculum outcomes: the key to excellence in language education. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 57-74). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Pennington, M. C., & Hoekje, B. J. (2010). *Language Program Leadership in a Changing World: An Ecological Model*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Pennington, M. C., & Young, A. L. (1991). Procedures and instruments for faculty evaluation in ESL. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 191-205). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

- Ponder, R., & Powell, B. (1991). Creating and operating a statistical database for evaluation in an English language program. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 155-171). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Presswood, K. R. (2011). *Leadership Attributes of Enrollment Managers in Higher Education Institutions in the United States. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida)*. ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing (UMI No. 3467586).
- Rawley, L. A. (1997). The language program administrator and policy formation at institutions of higher learning. In Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 91-103). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Rowe Henry, A. (1997). The decision maker and negotiator. In Christison, M. A., & Stoller, F. L. (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 77-90). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Scheele, D. S. (1975). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In H. A. Linstone, & M. Turroff (Eds.), *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Application* (pp. 37-71). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Skrezyna, J. B. (1998). What makes a successful intensive English program? *Masters Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 1389707)
- Smith Murdock, R. (1997). Outreach on and off campus. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 161). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Soppelsa, E. F. (1997). An Empowerment of Faculty. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 3-19). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Staczek, J. J. (1997). The language program budget: financial planning and management of resources. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 219-234). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Stewart, J (2001). Is the Delphi technique a qualitative method? *Medical Education*, 35(10), 922-923.
- Stoller, F. L. (1995). Innovation in a non-traditional academic unit: the intensive English program. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19(3), 177-195.
- Stoller, F. L. (2009). Innovation as the hallmark of effective leadership. In M.A. Christison & D. E. Murray (Eds.), *Leadership in English Language Education: Theoretical foundations and practical skills for changing times* (pp. 73-84). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Stoller, F. L. (1997). The catalyst for change and innovation. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 33-48). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Stoller, F. L., & Christison, M.A. (1994). Challenges for IEP administrators: liaison with senior-level administrators and faculty development. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 16-20.
- Stoyhoff, S. (1993). Ethics and intensive English programs. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 4-6.
- UCIEPa (2009). Retrieved from www.uciep.org
- UCIEPb (2009). Retrieved from www.uciep.org/about.php
- UCIEPc (2009). Retrieved from www.uciep.org/mission.php
- Wallace, B. (2003). Factors affecting the size and growth of enrollment in university-governed intensive English programs in the United States. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 3101780)
- Winskowski-Jackson, C. (1991). Evaluation of culture components in ESL In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Building better English language programs: perspectives on evaluation in ESL* (pp. 98-117). Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Witbeck, M., & Healey, D.. (1997). Technology and the language program administrator. In M.A. Christison & F.L. Stoller (Eds.), *A handbook for language program administrators* (pp. 253-273). Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Megan Forbes holds a Ph.D. in higher education administration from the University of Florida, an M.Ed. in curriculum and instruction from the University of Florida, and a B.A. in English and government from the College of William and Mary in Virginia. She has lived in Jamaica, the Yemen Arab Republic, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Switzerland, and, in addition to other world travels, was a member of the Rotary District 6970 GSE Team to Northern India in 2000. She has been teaching ESL at the university level since 1995. She first joined the UFELI team in 1994 as a conversation partner. She has held the positions of Interaction Leader (Language Assistant), Assistant Activities Coordinator, Student Life Advisor, Listening/Speaking Coordinator, Cultural Immersion Program Coordinator, and Interim Director at the UFELI and is currently serving as Director. She actively volunteers in the local and global community, including being Past-President of the Rotary Club of Downtown Gainesville and a Paul Harris Fellow.