DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 187 FL 016 026

AUTHOR	Staczek, John J,; Carkin, Susan J.
TITLE	Intensive English Program Fit in Traditional Academic Settings: Practices and Promise.
PUB DATE	Mar 84
NOTE	13p.; In: On TESOL '84. A Brave New World for TESOL. Selected Papers from the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (18th, Houston, Texas, March 6-11, 1984); see FL 016 005.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Second Language Programs; Comparative Analysis; Departments; *English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; *Governance; Higher Education; *Intensive Language Courses; Language Teachers; Organizational Climate; Policy Formation; Program Design; *School Policy; Second Language Instruction; Unions

ABSTRACT

The relationship between intensive English programs (IEPs) for international students and the American colleges and universities that design, structure, staff, and administer the programs in diverse ways is adversely affected by an absence of policy and the inability of the faculty who teach these programs to participate in the policy-making process. While professionals in English as a second language (ESL) are generally well-informed, they also find their opportunities to influence institutional policy and to contribute to the welfare and development of colleagues, international students, and themselves limited by a number of factors. IEP faculties are often isolated from the operations of the institution, including those related to placement, reporting relationships, governance, and fiscal and academic responsibility. Institutional non-policy has become a common condition for IEPs, for largely political reasons. External agencies with an interest in accreditation and in international students' and ESL teachers' welfare provide standards and services that IEPs and institutions may take advantage of. As IEPs proliferate in higher education and in private enterprise, an emerging academic and humanistic concern for program governance, quality, integrity, and continuity should be addressed. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Frank-McNeil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED274187

INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM FIT IN TRADITIONAL ACADEMIC SETTINGS: PRACTICES AND PROMISE

John J. Staczek
Georgetown University

Susan J. Carkin
Utah State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

INTRODUCTION

Within the last four or five years, our profession has witnessed the growing concern of ESOL instructors in higher education over their working conditions. The "Standard Bearer" of the *TESOL Newsletter* has featured several columns on such issues as the ESL Employment Survey, collective bargaining, and resume writing for the ESL job market. Anecdotal evidence of job dissatisfaction is also found in almost every *TN* since the 1980 convention in San Francisco, where the resolution to study employment conditions in depth was passed by the Legislative Assembly. But perhaps the most significant and revealing statement about our profession as it now exists in American universities and colleges appeared in a November 1982 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The article reported on a group of thirty ESL instructors at American University who were granted the right to unionize. During a thirteen day hearing before the National Labor Relations Board, their institution challenged their right to become a bargaining unit, citing the *Yeshiva* case – the Supreme Court's 1980 decision which "held that faculty members at that institution were not eligible for collective bargaining protection because they were managerial employees" (Perry 1982: 28). The instructors prevailed, however, arguing that "they were not managerial

FL 016 026

John Staczek is Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies in the School of Languages and Linguistics at Georgetown University.

Susan Carkin teaches in the Intensive English Language Institute at Utah State University.

employees since they took no part in the university's system of faculty governance and had no control over such matters as hiring and firing, the budget, admissions policies, grading policies or class size" (Perry 1982: 28).

The unionization of this group of ESL professionals clearly informs those of us in the profession, as well as the faculty and administrators of our institutions, that ESL is truly different from the rest of academia - a notion that many of them have held for a long time based on some easily observable distinctions between our ESL programs and other programs and departments in the academic mainstream:

(1) Perhaps the most obvious difference between ESL programs and university departments is that there is no ESL major in which the international student can graduate.

(2) Most ESL programs do not grant academic credit, unlike other academic programs in higher education. Because credit-bearing status is not an issue, there is little incentive for an institution to seek and hire staff with specialized ESL or L2 acquisition training — especially if the program is conveniently located so that professors with degrees in other fields which are experiencing declining enrollments can be used to teach ESL to international students.

(3) Because ESL instructors are usually L1 speakers of the language they teach, the profession and the qualifications for teaching in it are often viewed as gratuitous by our colleagues and administrators.

(4) ESL programs are often preadmission in the institution's view; that is, they are prerequisite for study in the student's major and so are seen as comparable to remedial or enabling programs in English and mathematics, for example, for American students.

(5) The isolation of the ESL instructors from the policies and procedures which apply to other academic departments was explained in the *Chronicle* article as being the result of "a relatively young field" that "has yet to gain the status of the established disciplines" (Perry 1982: 28).

We could perhaps more easily list the ways in which the field of ESL is like others in the academy, but we would not be any closer to an explanation of the discipline for those unfamiliar with it, or to working toward solving the problems peculiar to the profession at this point in its history. Nevertheless, we feel that some kind of statement about the ESL field as it is perceived by higher education is important in order to inform the policymakers — all those who teach and have the managerial status the Supreme Court referred to in its *Yeshiva* decision. More than informing the uninformed, we believe there is evidence now available to provide a perspective on our profession as it is esteemed by our institutions. Some recent studies have dealt with the relationship between American higher education and the international students it serves. These studies provide a view of ESL programs as one of many in which international students participate. We think this larger context brings more light to the academic and professional concerns peculiar to our field. And, although we could select any one issue affecting our professional livelihood as a point of entry for our discussion, we have chosen to look at intensive English programs (IEPs) within the institution. While the structure and goals of IEPs vary widely among institutions, their similarities allow us an objective point of departure for the discussion of some of the broader issues as we noted in the beginning of our paper. To understand the relationship between IEPs and the administering institutions, it is necessary to step back even farther and look at the institutions and their accomodation of international students and international education in general, a viewpoint resulting from studies sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE) (1982) and the Institute of International Education (IEE) (Goodwin and Nacht 1983).

Practices

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between intensive English programs (IEPs) and the American colleges and universities which design, structure, staff and administer them in diverse ways. While we have tried to review this relationship in terms of "practice," that is, the formulation and application of policies at the institutional level, we have more often found it necessary to consider the effects of the absence of policy and the inability to participate in the policy-making process, two not-unrelated issues that have a major impact on the IEP and ESOL professionals who teach in them. Two reports have recently been published which are critical of American higher education for its lack of policy on a number of issues which deal with the education of increasing numbers of international students. While we consider how institutional policy and its absence have consequences for all levels of programs, personnel and curricula, including both international and American students, we pay special attention to how policy formulation or the lack of it affects IEPs and ESL professionals working in them.

In 1982 the ACE published the report of its specially-appointed committee headed by Richard Berendzen. Titled *Foreign Students and Institutional Policy*, and subtitled, *Toward an Agenda for Action*, it is often referred to as the Berendzen report. The committee studied numerous publications and documents, among them the IIE's *Open Doors 1979/80* and various National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) publications, in order to arrive at their findings and recommendations. They determined that international students have a major impact on the "fabric of higher education" (ACE 1982: viii), an impact that will probably escalate given the increasing numbers of international students who study at the post-secondary level in American schools. The United States, unlike other leading host countries in which international students pursue their higher education, does not have a central, national mechanism which can exercise control over international student admissions into our educational institutions. The ACE Report described our country's national posture toward international students as "the aggregate of actions taken by the several state systems of higher education and individual institutions" (1982: 50). Based on enrollment trends alone, there is a clear need for our institutions to decide how they will address these increasing numbers, to study how the education of these students is related to the central mission of the institution, and to determine the effect of these matriculated students on the academic and fiscal policies of the institutions. In short, our absence of educational policy toward international students at the national level requires that the educational institutions accept the responsibility for "thinking through sound strategies for dealing with international students" (1982: 27).

The committee's recommendations were aimed at two different sectors of the "higher education enterprise" (1982: 6): national associations and agencies, including professional organizations, and individual institutions and university systems. At the institutional level, one of the committee's findings was that a wide range of policy exists in admitting, providing curricula for and accomodating international students, "ranging from the comprehensive to the non-existent, and programs from the carefully-designed and well-administered to the ad hoc and expedient" (1982: 3). Their first recommendation was that institutions serving international students should develop sound policies to guide the institution and the students toward a "constructive and productive relationship" (1982: 7). The recommendation also called for a formal statement of institutional commitment to a program of self-regulation such as that advocated by NAFSA in its *Principles of International Educational Exchange* (1983). (NAFSA has developed a mechanism for voluntary self-study by institutions which is in its pilot year of testing.)

A second report, published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1983 and titled *Absence of Decision: Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities* (Goodwin and Nacht 1983), corroborated most of the findings and recommendations of the ACE report, but viewed them as issues which require study and attention at the institutional, and in some cases, national and professional levels. The authors, Goodwin and Nacht, interviewed approximately 183 administrators, faculty members, government officials and others involved with international students and higher education. They conducted most of their college and university interviews in three states which have large and rapidly increasing numbers of international students: Ohio, Florida and California. They also visited two institutions outside these states which "have" a well-known commitment to international programs: Columbia and Michigan State universities" (1983: v). What they found was that "while some institutions have a superb command of the human and organizational requirements essential to serve the needs of the foreign student, they are in a clear minority" (1983: 36). The IIE report identified issues for which individual institutions should formulate policy, including numbers, quotas, pricing, special fees and programs for international students.

The authors of *Absence of Decision* interviewed only three people in IEPs, two of them program directors. The only mention of the role of such programs in higher eduction was in the context that IEPs are one type of special program provided for international students exclusively, with the implication that this type of program should be related to the central mission of the institution. The authors noted that "significant numbers of foreign students require special language training — either standard ESL or some more sophisticated device for improving communication skills" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 31). Although the perspective of the ESL professional is conspicuously absent from their study, Goodwin and Nacht did conduct numerous interviews with other faculty and administrators on campuses. With their journalistic style of inquiry, they were able to investigate and offer brief explanations for the attitudes toward international students expressed by administrators and faculty members—the policy-makers in higher education. While the study does not have quantifiable data, the information on the attitudes is extremely valuable and warrants further study by ESL professionals, for these are the attitudes that are often brought to bear on the discussion of policy issues by those who are in a position to effect policy.

Goodwin and Nacht reported that university presidents in general had not thought much about the presence of international students in their colleges and universities. It was a concern that the chief executive officer delegated to other administrators, namely, the provost or vice-president for academic affairs and the deans. Administrators who were involved in admission, registration and the bursar's office "tended to regard foreign students as a time-consuming and demanding procedural and statistical irritant" (1983: 8). However, those administrators involved with the student affairs side of administration were generally highly enthusiastic advocates of international students on campus.

Among faculty members interviewed, the authors identified three groups, each with generally distinctive attitudes toward the international students in their classrooms and programs. Faculty who were involved in technical assistance programs with overseas extension and those who were former Peace Corps volunteers were committed to international educational exchange. A second group of faculty perceived their own areas of expertise to be dependent on international student enrollments in their programs. Some of this group of faculty worked in programs such as agriculture and hotel management which had grown beyond the U. S. demand for them. They also welcomed the international students. In other areas such as engineering, physics and computer science, the international students were appreciated as educational consumers and as laboratory or research assistants, but they were often regarded as "fillers" in a temporarily depressed program which was expected to recover and eventually become "re-Americanized." Within this group the authors reported that some of the faculty "seemed to feel shame at their dependence on foreign students, and that having to recruit abroad dented morale" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 9). A third group of faculty was that having no real self-interest in international students, even though some taught in programs of international studies. The authors noted, to their surprise, that "there was a prevailing apathy, and, in some cases, hostility to the foreign presence" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 9). It was frequently observed by faculty that foreign students "retard the educational process and are an annoyance to be minimized" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 9). When questioned about their reasons for negative feelings toward the international students in their classrooms, faculty usually referred to the amount and types of additional help needed by the students and the "inscrutability" of such students, citing examples of passive classroom behavior, negotiating behaviors with grades, and obsequious attitudes toward authority. Goodwin and Nacht concluded that there were strong feelings behind some of the complaints and unflattering comments about international students in American classrooms which emphasize the need "for accurate information about and reasoned attention to the subject from all concerned" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 10).

It is tempting to speculate that the negative attitudes of some of the faculty might be favorably affected by the process of policy-formulation which should be an educational experience involving the expertise from academic and administrative units of the university. The ACE Report, which did not investigate faculty attitudes directly, nevertheless noted the effect of not involving faculty in policy formulation toward international students: When "faculty members are presented with international students who are deficient in English or whose credentials have been misevaluated, they will react negatively. If they find teaching a growing number of international students begins to consume disproportionate amounts of time, their reaction will be obvious" (1982: 53). It seems clear to us that negative faculty attitudes toward international students in the university classrooms can be seen as a reaction to an enrollment or standards situation in which the faculty are not involved. The solution proposed by the ACE Report, with which we concur, is for concerned faculty and administrators to participate in every step of policy formulation and implementation.

Among the best-informed professionals working in colleges and universities are those who are trained in second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and English composition, who teach and advise international students on a daily basis, and who understand the cultural implications of international student behavior: the ESL professional. Within the academy, however, with its traditional hierarchical structure of departments and tenured ranks, the ESL professionals generally find their opportunities to influence institutional policy and to contribute to the development and welfare of colleagues, international students and themselves severely limited by a number of factors which isolate them from the functioning of the institution but which are inherent in the composition of nearly all IEPs.

Let us examine what the implications would be when a college or university decides to open its programs to international students and develops an ESL program to prepare them for further academic study. First, let us define what we mean by "program". A program is not a course or courses, is not an instructor or instructors, is not an unstructured curriculum without a mission, a set of goals or objectives. Nor is it a collection of textbooks, tapes and films. A program, as we define it, is an administrative and academic enterprise with a comprehensive mission to provide ESL training, using qualified professionals in a logical and developing sequence of courses to guide the student to a level of mastery of the English language that will lead to eventual success in a degree or certificate program in an academic institution. This applies equally to ESL as it does to any other discipline: foreign language, English, history, accounting, chemistry. To offer less is to demean all disciplines, all professions and all practitioners. The unusual aspect of the ESL program is that it consists of professionals who use the medium of English to teach the English language for mastery. It is unlike chemistry in that chemistry uses the medium of English to teach about chemical processes and the metalanguage of the discipline.

We assume, for this paper, that the IEP we describe is one that has been judged to be a college or university program that exists within the accepted hierarchical structure. Before any decision can be made with regard to its placement in an existing academic program or department, there is a need for decision about its existence as a budgetary entity. As a budgetary entity it places certain demands on the university in terms of faculty, facilities and support mechanisms. We accept as given the fact that, almost universally, IEPs generate dollars from tuition in much the same way as do regular academic programs whether or not the IEPs are credit-bearing. Specific differences relate to (a) whether the student should have to pay tuition at a rate equivalent to the hourly rate of regular students (out-of-state tuition rates for public universities and the standard fees in private universities), (b) whether dollar generation follows a standard FTE (full-time equivalency) formula, and (c) whether tuition charged produces a per capita or program surplus. The question of surplus is of greater concern in the non-credit mode in which fees are usually charged on the basis of cost for services, overhead and what is loosely called "program development". These costs are all built into a program. However, following the established rate structure within a university, a program need not concern itself with costs and surpluses because a budget will have been provided for the entity. In many non-credit, quasi-academic, and even independent programs, it is the surplus generated that provides for program and faculty development. If the IEP is a line item in a general university budget, one consideration is surely to be how the program competes with others for additional resources. That is an issue of administration. Suffice it to say that with a line item IEP budget in the general university budget, there are certain expectations with regard to the number of administrative positions, faculty positions and other staff positions. Enrollment and budget projections generally provide the operational guidelines for assignment of resources on an annual basis. New positions, whether they are full or part-time, must be requested, with justification, and ultimately negotiated with the senior academic officer of the institution.

At this point it is essential, within a traditional academic setting, to discuss placement, reporting relationships, fiscal and academic responsibility. We need only look around universities to marvel at the variety of placements of IEPs in academic and non-academic programs: IEPs tend to be found in departments of continuing education, departments of English or linguistics, foreign language departments, international programs or may even be established as units with autonomy, such as centers or institutes, reporting to deans and even to vice presidents, sometimes the vice president for academic affairs and sometimes to the vice president for student affairs. The question to be raised about an IEP and its fit in a university relates to the program as an academic enterprise. Is an IEP, in fact, a continuing academic enterprise much as any degree program? We would argue that it is inasmuch it is continuing rather than occasional, it is dynamic rather than static, it has measurable and sequential goals, it develops a mastery of necessary skills and it involves the cognitive and intellectual development of the student. Moreover, its outcomes are applicable to other fields of academic endeavor. For these reasons, we believe that an IEP belongs either in an academic department or within its own autonomous unit. We are saying, in effect, that the IEP is not a program that belongs to a department of continuing education for the IEP's activities are not those associated with continuing education, nor do we believe that it belongs to the office of international programs for those programs are not academic but supportive and facilitative. This leaves us with the need for a conclusion about placement: We believe that a department of English is not the most appropriate because the IEP activity is a second language activity with which departments of English are not usually associated; a department of linguistics is inappropriate for the same reason and because linguists normally do not teach language but linguistic theory and its applications. The fact that a department of linguistics has an *applied* component in ESL or EFL teacher training is an asset to any IEP, but that fact alone is not a necessary and sufficient condition for IEP placement in the department. For obvious reasons, a foreign language department is also inappropriate and less attractive: it runs a risk of reinforcing the L1 in its environment and the majority of its faculty are usually involved in the teaching of literature and culture as ends in themselves. We are left, it seems, and not by default, with an IEP as an autonomous unit, that is, independent of another academic department but certainly responsible to an academic officer of the university, be it a dean or a vice president for academic affairs. This kind of organizational relationship contributes to an image that an IEP is a legitimate organization within a university and is bound by the same policies and standards as are other programs or departments. As such an autonomous unit, its budget may then be expected to be internal to the university, generated by formula, or external to the university, generated by a comprehensive fee for services that covers all academic, administrative, support and overhead costs. Any surpluses would be used by the program for its development of curriculum, faculty and resources.

Parenthetically, we would add that one of the disadvantages of placement of an IEP in an academic department is that surpluses which *only* the IEP generates may be "gobbled up" by those who have tenure, sabbatical privileges, texts to write, and the like. Their first citizen status sets up an artificial barrier between the ESL professional and the other academic department specialist. The ESL professional then becomes, through the fiat of legitimate privilege, ineligible for the monetary rewards that contribute to his professional and academic development. In essence, the two professionals are not allowed to compete on an equal basis.

Certainly once the issue of placement is determined, and this decision should ideally be academic and not political, the program must then begin to deal with the status of its faculty as academic professionals. In the 1980's there is no question that the field of ESL/EFL is a professional field with standards for instructor training and, in some areas, licensing at the state level. The acceptable terminal degree for practitioners is generally the M. A. or M. S. degree in ESL/EFL or applied linguistics. This is not to say that others are not qualified by experience or even training in areas such as English, foreign language, reading and even speech pathology. However, just as it is in the university's best interest to hire the most qualified applicant for a position in any field, the practice should also apply in an IEP. In the 1980's we have the luxury of ESL and EFL being a professional field whose practitioners have gained experience in the U.S. and abroad. These same practictioners have contributed to the development of the field as a profession as they have done research, developed materials, made conference presentations, conducted workshops, published articles in scholarly journals and published textbooks. These professionals are not unlike other academic professionals. The argument that the master's level terminal degree is not equivalent to the standard terminal degree for an academic position is untenable. Certainly the performing and creative arts do not require the doctorate and their practitioners are recognized as legitimate members of a university faculty with all the same rights and privileges.

As a faculty of professionals engaged in an academic enterprise, the IEP faculty need to be able to determine their course of development, their program governance and their mission, so long as the priorities and goals of their mission are consonant with those of the university. Academic freedom, advancement, tenure, merit evaluation and opportunity for faculty development ought to be among the rights and privileges of the faculty. Moreover, the IEP faculty should have the right to nominate, select and evaluate its leadership within the existing governance structure of the university in which it operates. For a university to provide less and to allow its faculty to do less is once again to demean the profession.

The university, on the other hand, has the right to expect measurable and qualitative productivity in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. For the IEP program faculty and leadership to ignore these expectations is to deny the very essence of affiliation with a university. Participation by IEP faculty in the governance of the university through committee memberships, consultations, and other service obligations is a right of all faculty members in a university. All the rights and privileges must come within the context of delegated authority and within a system of moral and ethical responsiblity and accountability.

This system of responsibility and accountability is in place in universities, represented by mission, role and scope statements, peer review processes, and the faculty code. It is generally used to set the standards of performance for those eligible for professorial rank and tenure. According to the ESL Employment Survey (TESOL Newsletter: February, 1983), only 15% of the respondents in higher education held professorial rank. About 60% had position titles of "lecturer" or "instructor" and less than one third had any promotional opportunity in their positions. For the most part, we cannot know what system of accountability is used in each IEP, but we do know that the academic and professional rewards are not like those of our colleagues who work in what the *Chronicle* article termed the more "established disciplines" (Perry: 1982).

Whether we believe that faculty privileges are denied to ESL instructors because of program status, budgetary priorities, our international student clientele, enrollment uncertainties, the terminal degree issue, teaching in our native language or perhaps because of our student-centered classes, it is nonetheless abundantly clear to those of us who participate in TESOL that we *are* members of an established profession, however late, which has its own body of research, refereed journals, and professional standards like those our of our colleagues who also teach in higher education.

The IIE (Goodwin and Nacht: 1983) and ACE (1982) reports offer us another possible explanation for our failure to become fully enfranchised citizens of our colleges and universities: our institutions are, in general, not acknowledging the presence or addressing the influence of the international students who attend them; and although we do not have figures, there does not appear to be enough interest or concern from faculty members who are in a position to initiate policy on behalf of these students and their own institutions.

By failing to engage in the study of the issues surrounding international students and that information to formulate needed policies, the institution is risking its own welfare and credibility, including that of its staff and all the students it serves. Goodwin and Nacht reported on the "decision-making process and institutional response" (1983: 21) after interviewing college personnel on issues of recruitment, demand projections for U.S. education, the development of special courses and programs for international students, the need for cooperative services among institutions and national organizations such as IIE and NAFSA, and the role that institutional leadership could take in stifling or encouraging the internationalization of their campuses. The authors summarized their findings on admission policies only, which is often the most developed area of policy relating to international students in any given institution. We cite from *Absence of Decision:*

> One of the principal assumptions underlying this study was that there was no national policy concerning foreign students. Rather, the aggregate

> condition reflected thousands of decisions made by many individuals in colleges and universities across the country. In fact, we found the actual scene marked more by an absence of decision than by any distinctive pattern of decision making within or across institutions. In the course of our interviews we were told that the number of foreign students found on a particular college campus was the consequence of "cumulative incrementalism," "ad hocism," "designed ambiguity," "the virtues of non-policy," the philosophy that "long-range planning is where you are now," the judgment that "our greatest reason for our present condition is independent of reason," a process that is "just sort of going on," "no policy, no direction, no administration, no staff," or being caught "with our policy pants down."
>
> Nonetheless, it was widely held that much more careful attention in strategic planning should be devoted to formulating an institutional response to the foreign demand for U.S. higher education (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 21).

The authors determined that one of the reasons for the absence of policy surrounding admissions as well as other issues, included the need to keep a low profile for the state legislature. But they felt more strongly that the real, if underlying reason was that the issues surrounding the education of international students were perceived as being "insufficiently urgent to warrant (the policymakers') attention in the face of other seemingly more critical issues, including, in some cases, the stark problem of institutional survival" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 27).

Not all university officials agreed that non-policy was a virtue; some argued persuasively for the careful inquiry into the relationship between American higher education and the international students it serves. They noted that the state of international affairs—from wars to changes in a country's educational policies and needs—affects the institution which is best able to react to such changes when it is prepared for them. These same university officials also pointed out the need for public institutions to inform and educate state legislatures and boards of regents. These governing bodies are capable of demanding a "reversal of institutional policy without a moment's delay and certainly without time for careful self-study or additional opportunities for reasoned counterarguments" (Goodwin and Nacht 1983: 27). Such a reversal of policy or change in admissions or tuition could have a dramatic negative impact on an institution with even a 5-10% international student population, resulting in losses of revenue which could affect the education of all its students. This is institutional survival.

Many ESL professionals are involved in their institution's non-policy, and, for the most part, left out of the governing bodies which inform and create policies which could alleviate the situation and be of great benefit to all who participate in higher education. It is a responsiblity that fellow educators cannot be depended on to perform, for their attitudes toward international students in their classrooms vary from receptive to hostile. The international student advisor and staff are, by virtue of their positions in the university structure, unable to influence policy, even though they have special insight into "the relative importance of psychological, cultural, and academic pressures on the student" (Goodwin and

Nacht 1983: 19). Goodwin and Nacht view the international student office as "powerless" in the institution, because it offers a "service," and "in academe today there is minimal interaction between those in service and those in academic roles" (1983: 19). Finally, the international students themselves cannot be expected to question university policy or non-policy, or changes in policy. They perceive their stay as temporary and their behavior to have a direct influence on their visa.

There are, of course, agencies external to our institutions which have an interest in international students' welfare. Most notable among them is NAFSA which has published numerous documents and position papers, often in liaison with other interested agencies, on standards for equitable admission, ethical recruitment, guidelines for intensive and semi-intensive ESL programs, and English language proficiency. NAFSA has also initiated a program of self-study, in which any institution enrolling international students may participate. Within NAFSA, the Consortium of Intensive English Programs (CIEP) evaluates IEP's when invited to do so. Membership in CIEP amounts to a kind of private accreditation. There is also a national accrediting agency for proprietary IEP's and for those in continuing education. All these agencies provide services and publish standards which institutions and IEP's may embrace.

In the U.S., institutional accreditation is voluntary, but accreditation by the regional agencies is critically important to the reputation and financial support of the institution. It is especially significant to find a section in the *Handbook of Accreditation* (1982) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) on international students. Briefly, it states that institutions that recruit and enroll international students should provide the services and programs for them, and that when large programs are provided, they should be taught by persons specifically qualified to do so. It remains to be seen what kind of impact this will have on institutions with IEP's. It is worth noting that, within the WASC standards for accreditation, the section on faculty and staff deals with the terminal degree issue in this way: "The terminal degree in the teaching field is the primary index of quality" (1982: 41). We hope the relationship between quality teaching and quality programs can be explored through the regional accrediting agencies now that there is at least one statement on international students from one accrediting body.

The ESOL professionals have TESOL and its committees and interest groups to consult on their professional concerns. But there is often no closure since many of the same professionals are having the same experiences. These experiences have been reflected in the *TESOL Newsletter* and are the subject of discussion in the Committee on Professional Standards. Many institutions, also, are unable to come to terms with the professional concerns peculiar to our field for many reasons, including a lack of knowledge about the professional preparation necessary for teaching ESL, and the academic nature of the field. Some institutions are at best reluctant to develop policies for any aspect of international student education and to involve the necessary college personnel in the effort. We who teach in IEP's are not usually in a position to participate in policy-formulation which serves our students and our institution, nor to participate in the academic organizations and privileges which promote professional development and recognition of our work unless we force ourselves, the institution and our professional organization to listen to our concerns. We believe IEP's to be problem-solving entities with regard to their own development. The IEP's do not generally look to the institution to solve their problems. Unfortunately, for some of our institutions, the avenues for solving problems have to be created by using symptoms—employment status, budgetary resources, surplus allocations, faculty evaluation and merit, employment conditions and general university support—to get university decision-makers to focus attention on the English language needs of international students and the professionals who provide their instruction.

If there is a single conclusion to be reached from our remarks, it is that, as IEP's proliferate in American colleges and universities, and in private commercial enterprises, there is an academic and humanistic concern that the professionals in these programs have access to decision-makers and that quality, integrity, and continuity of programs and personnel be issues of continued debate toward that most noble and realistic goal of dignifying the professionals and the programs on our campuses.

REFERENCES

Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Colleges and Schools. 1982. *Handbook of accreditation*. Oakland: Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Colleges and Schools.

American Council on Education: Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy. 1982. *Foreign students and institutional policy: toward an agenda for action*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Goodwin, Craufurd D. and Michael Nacht. 1983. *Absence of decision*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Institute for International Education. 1980. *Open doors: report on international education exchange*. New York: Institute for International Education.

Kreidler, Carol J. and Paul Edmondson. 1983. The ESL employment survey: a report. *TESOL Newsletter 17* (1):6.

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. 1983. *NAFSA's Principles for International Educational Exchange*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. 1981. *Standards and responsibilities in international educational exchange*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Perry, Suzanne. 1982. A new union presses its case and finds a whole lot of things you can do. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 3: 27-28.