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Abstract

This study traces the implementation of change management principles in an intensive English program. Innovative policies were introduced to improve the academic linguistic competency of its students. Given that language is learned in social and academic environments and that many policies were created based on an understanding of basic organizational leadership paradigms, this study is informed by a combination of Second Language Socialization and Change Management theories. The Regional Director was interviewed for his rationale behind these cutting-edge policies in this collegiate department. Academic language ability was found to improve longitudinally, as evidenced by achievement indicators and reported by university professors. This study demonstrates that experiential-learning increases academic language acquisition. Further, it has been discovered that solving extra-academic student issues eliminates learning inhibitors. This inquiry shows that mental health awareness, conflict resolution and new life set-up are all relevant factors in international student linguistic growth. Importantly, the changes were found to be self-sustaining, as reported by a variety of stakeholders.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The past decade has witnessed waves of international students heading to English speaking countries across the globe. Their primary goal is to obtain a college degree. Many students study in academic English programs first to reach the high level of language skill required for university study.

Intensive English Programs (IEPs) equip non-native speakers of English (NNS) with English skills required for their academic success at universities. NNS arrive on student visas from all over the world to obtain undergraduate and graduate degrees in the U.S. As a prerequisite, many students attend IEPs to gain the necessary tool of academic language. As the word intensive suggests, in an IEP, students study academic English reading, writing, listening and speaking for five or more hours a day on-site. These facilities are on university campuses and across the country. In an attempt to improve academic English skills of program completers, one IEP adapted the traditionally structured enterprise situated in higher education by using leadership strategies and policies associated historically with private business.

Despite their mandate to prepare NNS for higher education, IEPs are failing in multiple aspects (Ernst, 2016; Munkdan, 2012; Ping, 2014). Once in mainstream classes, IEP graduates are failing to demonstrate academic language (Green, 1992; Roehr, 2007; Sorace, 1985). These college students claim they cannot understand the teacher or textbook. They also speak very little in class. At Miami University, more than one letter to the editor from a professor was published in the student newspaper condemning the ability of IEP completers (Belkin & Jordan, 2016; Saul, 2016). The accusation from academicians in a general sense is that the university administration admits internationals into the IEP within the university because they pay full
tuition, not because they are academically qualified (Belkin & Jordan, 2016; Lu, 2016). More importantly, mainstream professors claim that IEPs are not preparing students adequately. Internationals pay roughly three times that of in-state tuition (Miami University, 2016). Internationals students do have academic requirements for admission into mainstream classes: a minimum of 80 on the TOEFL or a 21 ACT English. Over 99% of students admitted to this school in 2017 had a composite ACT score of 22 or higher (Miami Admission, 2017). These standards are similar at state universities across the country (Texas State University, 2017; University of Cincinnati, 2017; University of Oregon, 2017; University of Maine, 2017). International students at Miami University who have a lower TOEFL (65-80) or ACT (18-20) may be considered for conditional admission through the English language program or IEP.

The Middletown campus of Miami University is a regional campus, which has open admission; students need only submit a high school or General Education Development diploma. Once international students complete all five levels of English in this IEP, with a sufficient grade point average (GPA), they may transfer to the main campus to earn a degree. Some degrees can be completed on the Middletown campus.

Upon enrollment in this IEP, students are placed into levels based on their scores on speaking, listening, reading and writing assessments along with a TOEFL PBT (paper-based test), which are administered on site. Each assessment is reviewed by three raters and given a score of 1-5 using respective rubrics based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CERF) developed by the Council of Europe (COE, 2017). To give an idea, a student placed into level three based on the results of these assessments will study 4.5 hours/day for the current semester; upon successful completion, this student moves to level four in the following semester.
Historically, behavioral issues have not been seen as the responsibility of any academic program. However, several concerns have risen across the country regarding IEP students. Serious behavior problems like physical fighting and bullying are rampant among international students on college campuses (Belkin & Jordan, 2016; Drash & Loo, 2015; Gerber, 2016; James, Miller & Wycoff, 2017). They segregate themselves from domestic students (Belkin & Jordan). For the influx of Chinese in recent years, most of their days are spent speaking Chinese. A Twitter account at one mid-west institution, since taken down, posted pictures of Chinese students in exotic cars like Lamborghinis with hateful remarks (Drash & Loo, 2015). A student at the University of Southern California was convicted of murder for bludgeoning a Chinese student “because she was Chinese” (Gerber, 2016). A Chinese student at Iowa State University killed his Chinese girlfriend in 2014 (Lu & Hunt, 2016). In a famous case, three Chinese students burned another with cigarettes and kicked her with high-heeled shoes in Los Angeles (Chang, 2016; CCTV, 2016).

These criticisms force those in leadership positions to rethink their methods and structures. IEPs need to differentiate themselves by the social behavior and academic linguistic ability of their students. This study investigates changes made by an IEP in its attempt to raise the academic language ability of those enrolled.

The following review identifies relevant forces that shape the changes that have taken place in this IEP. Second Language Socialization (SLS) is used as a theoretical paradigm due to the social nature of language learning in this IEP, as it is not defined by a single class or one teacher, rather by a matrix of activities in which the students participate. SLS is also relevant because it ties the values of any place or people to the specifics of language use. The business concept of change management is often interchanged with the term innovation, since changes to
any system are intended as ‘new and improved’. A review of other innovations in educational environments is included because this study discusses changes made to improve an educational environment. To better understand the research, both SLS and innovation in education are reflected upon together.

The ensuing inquiry analyzes the policy changes, and the rationale behind them. Many stakeholders are consulted. IEP instructors are interviewed for their perspectives on the changes. Professors of mainstream content classes (like history, Biology and others) are surveyed for their perspectives on IEP student ability. Counsel is even taken from a local law enforcement agent to see if the changes take root to the extent they are visible in the larger community. Level-exit assessments are compared longitudinally. Lastly, GPAs post-program are compared longitudinally. If the changes truly take root, not only student academic linguistic ability, but student academic performance should improve. The purpose of the study is to trace these policy changes via the above data sources to see if academic linguistic ability of the students does in fact improve.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Two theoretical paradigms combine in this study. First, given the social nature of language learning, research in SLS is reviewed. Social interactions that occur in different settings require their own linguistic elements (Halliday, 1998). Second, academic language for study at a university may be learned in a departmental unit called an IEP, but divisions of organizations are not governed by language theory- rather by administrative practices. Given that leadership decisions of the IEP in this study were made based on Change Management principles, inquiries of this doctrine applied to other educational institutions are also reviewed.

Beyond the theoretical paradigms, other aspects that relate to international student success are relevant for the current study, so they are also reviewed. For example, international students setting up life in a new country have basic needs that require advocacy and mentorship. For this reason, research into mental health of international students is discussed.

Many studies indicate that academic language is not the only roadblock to success at a university; Among others, MacGregor & Folinazzo (2017) noted academic development is also dependent on students being mentally engaged with the teachers, classes and texts. For this reason, studies specific to student involvement including service-learning and motivation are also discussed. This section is labeled extra academic considerations.

Some research exists on the management of IEPs in other countries and language programs for younger students. Although no image for best practices in IEPs has yet been developed, what research does exist (along with standards from the accrediting body) is relevant to the current study, so it is also included. As this study employs assessments, research into this area is also discussed.
Second Language Socialization

From Second Language Socialization Theory (SLS), it is known that a second or consecutive language is learned and mastered through social interactions with more proficient members of a new group or society and situated within the context of particular meaningful activities and tasks (Duff, 2010; Halic, Greenberg, & Paulus, 2009; Morita, 2009). As such, experts both implicitly and explicitly teach newcomers to think, feel and act in congruity with the value system of the group.

Two foundational aspects of SLS are discussed in detail. First, as mentioned above, one aspect of SLS is guided apprenticeship into new linguistic subculture (Nguyen, 2010; Song, 2012; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). Those knowledgeable within the context guide neophytes to a more secure understanding, not just of grammatical and semantic choices but socially, hence the term ‘socialization’. Since the driving force of an IEP is academic language utilized in an US university, courses employ several methods to build up the linguistic and social competence of students. Students are taught using texts that employ the Academic Word List (AWL), compiled from academic disciplines. Instructors all have a minimum of a master’s degree in a related field, ESL or language education. Continuing in this light, instruction is academic by academicians on a college campus. Courses by nature socialize and enculturate students into their new culture. Students read everything from news stories and research to Charles Dickens’ literature. Students write basic narratives, compare and contrast essays, argument essays etc. Most importantly, students discuss all of these concepts with each other and their teachers for 4.5 hours a day, five days per week.

The other primary tenet of SLS is social interaction in common activities (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007; van Lier, 2000). So, how is ‘common’ defined? There are a multitude of
encounters program participants engage in with native speakers of all ages. Socialization is specific to a context. However, society as a broad term encompasses more than one domain. Language and behaviors specific to any place of society require tutelage and interaction: museums, banks, pharmacies, doctor’s offices (Halliday, 2004). Interaction with many situations in this program also necessitates the use of SLS.

SLS teaches that language socialization enables students to act and think in alignment with core value systems of a culture. “Learning language goes hand in hand with learning to operate within a particular society,” (Vickers, 2007). It is not new knowledge that a community’s ideology is reflected in its language usage (Briggs, 1986). Language, written or spoken, expresses a value system. Further, language involves some type of physical embodiment of an ontology (Watson-Gegeo, 1992). By using a mouth or fingers and ears, along with gestures, language is an experience, a physical exercise within a society. Matsumura’s findings (2001) in Japan reiterate that social interactions allowed students to become accustomed to the norms of the community.

The idea that language acquisition occurs through activities in real time in which the mind interacts with its environment via its body demonstrates that this process is dynamic, not linear (Atkinson et al., 2007). Gone is the perception of a learner into which a teacher inputs knowledge and ‘bingo’, a new language is learned (Wenger, 1998). Language learning is not $\text{learner} + \text{input} = \text{ability}$. In any specific locality there is a continual negotiation or social construction of behavior. Social environs impact behavior and language choice which impacts participation in language-mediated activities. One can hope to create an environment, a social culture in which growth happens (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Vickers, 2007). What linguists used to call $\text{input}$, has become $\text{affordance}$. A more knowledgeable teacher can offer this knowledge in an
active, encouraging, engaging, relevant and optimistic manner, but that does not mean the learner will take it up and use it (Van Lier, 2000). Students are afforded this knowledge, but input would mean this information actually made it into this student’s repertoire. As seen through chaos-complexity theory, “learning is an emergent, configurational process of linguistic, social and cognitive adaptation and restructuration on various scales (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007).” One can create an ecology in which learning can happen.

Several researchers noted the impact of future goals on current engagement with language acquisition (Song, 2012; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007; van Lier, 2000). Song noted that one Korean learner of English expected to live in the US indefinitely and his language skills improved quickly. Simultaneously, another student expected to return to Korea within two years and his language skill did not develop dramatically (2012). These future communities or imagined worlds impacts motivation (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007). A learner who does not foresee himself in the current language community may not have the desire to master skills for the short-term. Holland (1998) called these figured worlds: mentally constructed realities through which significance of learning is assigned and particular outcomes valued. Said another way, not the immediately tangible environment but rather a vision of the future life influences current practice (Norton, 2001). This vision of the future provides a value on which someone’s actions are based.

Values are not only relevant in SLS. They guide any organization, including a language department in a university. In addition to understanding SLS, it is necessary to evaluate previous innovations, or intentional changes made in the administration of other educational programs in order to get to the true nature of why the policy changes were made in this IEP. These concepts of SLS and Change Management are then synthesized.
Innovation in Education

An organization’s value system is defined in a *mission statement* (Covey, 1990). The policies of an organization detail its goals vis-à-vis its mission statement. Simple review of any organization’s mission statement gives insight as to its ethics or principles. Implementation of new policies (goals) and making structural changes (in order to induce improvement) necessitates leadership. Some foundational readings in core leadership requirements are reviewed. Although not practiced in academic settings, they provide a sturdy structure for personal, departmental and organizational growth. A vague notion of ‘improvement’ does not offer enough guidance. (Covey, 1990) Enduring businesses start with a clear *mission statement*. That founding phrase along with institutional policies serve as both blue print and practical focus for individuals in the organization, guiding their daily actions. It provides a sense of purpose, or a system of values from which institutional goals stem, an ontology. Those goals reach an individual’s ‘to do’ list as actions aligned with the goals and the values statement (Adam, 2016; Giles, 2015; Johnson, 2010; Neddenriep, 2014). Table 1 is a visual representing how values lead to goals which lead to actions and how this path remains parallel for employees, students and educators.

Table 1

*Flow from internal morae to external activity in contexts relevant to the study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>Beliefs about education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>Complete English program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee tasks</td>
<td>Daily class</td>
<td>Do GDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professors in academic settings resist this type of leadership or management for several reasons (Kulati, 2001; Turnbull & Edwards, 2005). Due to expertise in a specific field, they see themselves as leaders. Being a leader in a field of study (be that Biology, psychology or Art History) does not automatically translate to organizational leadership capabilities. However, departmental chairs constitute leadership within a discipline. Departmental chairs recruit, hire and manage operations and staff, with no training in such matters. External ‘managers’ like those seen in business are considered not qualified to run discipline specific goings-on, e.g. how could a previous manager at a car rental agency understand how to govern laboratory experiments with no knowledge of procedures and dangers therein?

To make matters worse, identity as teacher or researcher translates into a perceived lack of need to govern or manage people. They simply instruct neophytes. They do not perceive themselves as requiring any other trait beyond those their already extensive education has afforded them (Edwards and Turnbull, 2013). Scientists and social scientists require instead freedom to follow the direction research takes them. Intellectual freedom is valued in these organizations above governance or administration (Kulati, 2003).

Sarros, Cooper and Santora (2010) offer potential solutions in their study that contrasts leadership in for-profit with not-for-profit organizations. They describe leadership as a relational process. They, along with Edwards and Turnbull (2013) and Kulati (2003), use phrases like distributed leadership or dispersed. The idea of facilitating faculty leadership, as opposed to a top-down management concept, can permit sound management principles to dovetail with traditional academic values. The demonstrative image used by Turnbull and Edwards (2005) is of hills, “cultural hills”, “some kind of bridge filling the gap, not changing each hill…” This form of leadership respects individual capabilities without one skill dominating another.
Three books detail innovations in educational environments that demonstrate commonalities of import to this context. (1) Martin Wedell wrote a book about managing educational change (2009). (2) Judith Lamie wrote about several programs in Asia designed to improve the teaching of English to future teachers of English (2009). (3) Denise Murray edited a volume of research from a multitude of countries’ English programs (including Germany, Ukraine, Singapore, Egypt, Thailand, and one study from a U.S. middle school) (2008). All note the importance of the specific locality of innovation. They state that most innovations that do not take root do so due to failure to pay attention to the teachers and administrations in the distinct setting. Wedell (2009) employed an analogy of a musical composition that summarizes the important point: the final effects of a musical symphony do not depend only on the written score, but on the expertise and skills of its interpreters. In this case, the interpreters are language educators and administrators. The entirety of personnel needs to share their understandings of the changes as they are all affected. These three authors discuss the need for professional behaviors and beliefs (or values) to thus be redefined locally.

The dyadic relationship between behavior and beliefs is explicated by both Murray (2008) and Wedell (2009). Practice changes first. Witnessing some benefit from a new action can cause an individual to rethink their personal belief. Continued success with these new methodologies builds confidence in this innovation and creates an environment for the root value system to shift. The totality of this research took place in hierarchical systems, where the attempt was to move from the transmission of knowledge (of grammar, for example) to learning how to learn, from teacher centered to student centered. Teachers expressed worry about implementing lesson plans that were open-ended and depended on learner participation. These educators needed to redefine the purpose of education for themselves, from ‘the right answer is…’ to
‘learners co-construct knowledge’. To shift beliefs, they needed to experience small gains and build confidence in their own abilities under this new paradigm.

Research into administration or leadership of IEPs is scant (Thompson, 2013; Ping, 2014). That being said, Stoller (1995) found that departments designed to prepare international students’ academic English capacity, often called English for Academic Purposes (EAP) or IEP, are organized differently than most academic departments because many times classes are not for credit. Many universities consider these classes as preparatory for university level programs. As such, they employ non-tenure-track instructors; a doctoral degree is not required to work in IEPs. Despite this difference, Stoller noted participatory management as a key facilitator to innovation specific to IEPs. Participatory management is similar to facilitated or dispersed; in all cases, leadership is not classified as top-down. Other key variables contributing to successful implementation of innovation in IEPS are the support from the upper administration along with degree-granting unit cooperation.

One study applies change management principles, innovation, specifically to English language education programs. Waters (2009), found the degree to which the initiation of innovation is accepted to be partly dependent upon a manager’s ability to recruit people to their way of thinking. Teacher trainers need to become change agents. Whether or not that happens depends on these teachers’ perceptions of the need for change. This statement parallels corporate change management’s first step of making the case for change or creating urgency for this change (Bhatt, 2017; Halkias, Santora, Harkiolakis, & Thurman, 2017; Miller & Proctor, 2016; Voehl & Harrington, 2016;). These change agents are those who are dissatisfied with the current way of doing business. Waters noted that the changes are only found to be acceptable, however, if they are perceived to be in-line with host-institution’s values (2009). There also need to be
stakeholders external to the IEP but internal to the host institution who buy-in to the changes. In the final stage, to sustain the innovation the host institution must formalize its acceptance of the IEPs changes through its own policies and procedures. Teacher beliefs also need to shift for sustenance of the change. In most locations Waters studied, innovation failed to sustain. These programs were not in the U.S.

Research in IEP results demonstrates that despite completion of these programs, and despite linguistic improvement, non-native English speaker (NNS) tertiary students are still unprepared for college-level classes (Mukundan, 2012; Ping, 2014). Greater gains are reported in the lower levels. What this means is students go from knowing nearly nothing to being able to have a social conversation quite readily. However, higher level academic linguistic gains are not as steep. Said another way: reading, writing and discussing the structure of a cell is more challenging than ordering dinner or having social conversations. Academic English with its grammatical complexity and lexical density seems elusive (Halliday, 2004). IEPs in general in the US are scrambling to bridge this gap as enrollment drops (Belkin & Jordan, 2016; Redden, 2016).

Improvement in results of the program requires heightened academic linguistic ability in students, simply put. University students need to listen to and comprehend instructors while taking effective notes. They need to read and understand academic text books, give effective oral presentations and write academic texts. In short, they need to read, write, speak and listen in a university (Yürekli, 2012). Sound leadership, it is theorized, creates results-driven policies that improve an organization. In this case, the organization is one which teaches language. So, a strong administration should produce policies and strategies to improve language ability of its students.
Best Practices in IEPs

The Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) is one organization that establishes standards by which an IEP or EAP should function, by which they must function in order to be accredited (CEA, 2011). CEA standards are developed by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) International, recognized as the leading authority in the field. These standards serve as best practices. While these standards delineate the necessity for trained staff, an appropriate curriculum and even student services, the term leadership is absent. The term ‘appropriate curriculum’ is relative to individual IEP mission statements. So, appropriate is relative. According to the Administrative and Fiscal Capacity standards, the program must have “an administrative structure and governance system that are effective in helping it achieve its mission.”

Regarding length of time of study, CEA only states that levels and progress are clearly defined by any program. Each program decides on its own admission requirements as well as advancement standards. In short, each language program defines its own goals and how to achieve them. Best practices in mission statements, goals, or curriculum are not defined, anywhere.

The goal of this study is to identify some best practices in IEP management, which represents the gap in the literature. Not even the above accrediting body, CEA, has defined best practices. A more fine-tuned way to look at this situation is to apply change management stages to the IEP. This study hopes to demonstrate the meaning in this new context of the following: (1) make the case for change, (2) plan and execute it, (3) analyze results and modify if necessary, (4) sustain it. This study investigates an IEP’s attempts to implement policies with the goal of improving academic language ability of its clients such that mainstream professors report their
competence in university classes. As such, previous research on IEPs, SLS and innovation in education has been synthesized. Three research questions are addressed in this study.

**Extra-Academic Considerations**

Recent studies have focused on non-academic arenas for international students. Mental health, individual attitude (as separate from motivation), and service-learning within the context of language education, have all been found to be relevant to student outcome.

Research shows that depression and other mental health issues can negatively impact language acquisition (Saigh, Mrouech, & Bremner, 1996). Adkins, Birman & Sample found that social and emotional support are integral components in an ESL classroom (1999). The community of practice must promote trust and collaboration for learning to occur (Wenger, 1996). The emotional state of the student impacts the class. As Krashen noted in 1982 with his Affective Filter Hypothesis, students learn better when they are free of anxiety. Finn (2011) found that pairing a refugee who had established stability in the new country with a newcomer in a language class built much needed trust and helped further the newcomer’s linguistic skill by lending emotional support. This particular pairing helped the less well adapted student to overcome affective challenges that inhibit the learning process. A study on refugees learning English highlights the importance of stability and anxiety in learning. While the current study does not concern refugees, the students are creating a new life with new banking, health care, accommodation and transportation systems. Stress from signing legal contracts (one example) in a new, incomprehensible language is relevant in this context. A student who cannot pay tuition because the bank has not issued a bank card, further compounded by the fact the student cannot understand the bank clerk, can be said to lack stability. Pertinent to the current study is the fact that newcomers require support to thrive.
Students are “not disembodied cognitive devices for processing language input,” as Medley pointed out (2012). They have mouths to be fed and hearts to be nurtured. Further, trying to produce a new language entails risk. To take a risk requires the fore-mentioned trust to be in place. (Wenger, 1996). Medley found that students, instructors and administrative staff who created a safe community flourished in this stability (2012). His study advocates the integration of language instruction with social relationship building to improve student outcomes.

Another aspect of creating a supportive community lies in mental health. Sam and Eide (1991) found that it is common for international students to feel lonely, sad, anxious and even depressed. Results here indicate that good social support is correlated with lower levels of depression and anxiety. Culture shock (and other issues, like a breakup) for international students can lead to depression. Depression is linked with heavy episodic drinking in college students in general (Healthy Minds, 2014). This same report indicates that approximately 10% of undergraduates screen positive for depression. A study by Pedersen, LaBrie and Hummer (2009) found that international students report drinking more alcohol than expected while abroad. Bathke and Kim note the importance of on-site support staff in the identification and mitigation of mental health issues (2016). Combined, this research indicates that mental health cannot be ignored in any university setting, let alone one with people from other countries who may not speak the language and be able to advocate for themselves.

A different aspect of mental concerns lies in the cognitive engagement of students. MacGreggor and Folinazzo found that professors indicate international students need to “adopt proactive behavior” (2017). Native English speakers and professors said this population needs to improve their attitude. In this study, NNS overwhelmingly report the need to join activities with domestic students. All participants say NNS pronunciation inhibits domestic professors and
students from understanding them. Domestic students report NNS need to increase their interaction. Implications are that NNS need to speak with native speakers in more contexts. As well, improving an attitude, or the adoption of more proactive behavior, requires leadership. Faculty in this study support professional development that fosters global competencies to be better prepared to have international students in their classes. The number one recommendation from this study for the institution is to host more events and activities. One more institutional recommendation is to create on-campus jobs for international students.

Another area that holds promise for academic linguistic improvement is outside the classroom, in service-learning. Research demonstrates that volunteerism promotes moral development (Askildson, Kelly, & Mick 2013; Brammer et al, 2012; Elwell & Bean, 2001). In addition to providing advanced English instruction, Askildson et al explicitly taught the concepts of community service and engagement (2013). These real-life situations require participants to actively work their way through experiences. They foster creative problem solving. As Ibrahim (2012) said, experiential learning for internationals “is an avenue for gaining new skill sets, learning to navigate in situations of uncertainty, as well as effective communication across boundaries.” Real life situations entail non-verbal communication that aids in the attainment of the spoken aspects therein. Helping people fosters empathy and personal moral growth. Post service-learning TOEFL (PBT) results in Askildson et al’s study were more than three times higher than expected. These researchers found that service-learning resulted in advanced language acquisition. Students in this study also shifted from a focus on grammar to interactive practice of language. This program documented emotional, intellectual, cultural and linguistic growth in students. In a similar vein, Brammer et al (2012) noted an increased sense of citizenship through international students’ involvement in civic engagement.
Assessment

Another aspect of this study is assessment. The summative assessments used here evaluate student progress at the end of a term (Bloom, 1971; William & Black, 1996; Harlen, 2005). The broad goal of assessment is to judge the extent of student learning and in this case to appraise a program and its practices (Taras, 2005). Student progress is defined as all students in the program, not one by one. The overarching question is rather, on average, are scores higher at the end of each successive term?

Critics of high-stakes assessment note repeated practice trains students to specific questions and assesses only familiarity with particular content (Broadfoot et al, 1998; Reay & William, 1999; Osborn et al, 2000). The assessment within this program does not meet the criteria for high-stakes, however. First, the material on all tests is unrelated to the content of any course. For example, one writing assessment had a choice of two topics. (1) What subjects at school are more important for the development and future success of a person, sciences like physics and chemistry or the humanities such as art and music? Use specific reasons to support your answer. (2) Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Money is less important than personal fulfillment in a job. It is more important to be happy doing daily work than to earn a lot. This example is consistent with all written, oral, reading and speaking assessments in that none of them appraise any specific material covered in any class.

More importantly, neither student grades nor teacher evaluations are impacted by these tests. Teachers are not accountable for student grades on this test. So, the concept of high-stakes does not apply (Harlen, 2005). The term summative refers to aggregate learning over the course of a semester in multiple classes. As well, the results were not looked at specific to any individual. The broad scope of the evaluations was: looking at all 100+ scores at the end of the
term compared with the beginning of the term, are the scores higher overall? The purpose of these assessments is to monitor the program’s efficacy.

Research Questions

1. What policy changes are made in the developing stages of an IEP and what is the rationale behind them?
2. As the IEP develops, how does linguistic competency of the student change longitudinally?
3. Do the changes take root to sustain the innovation, as reported by IEP instructors and mainstream university professors?

Chapter Summary

Research in SLS and Change Management in educational organizations come together to inform a study about policy changes made in an IEP. SLS advises the education of language; and Change Management illuminates the administration of an entire language education program. Together, recent advancements in these theories aide in understanding potential efficacy of the new policies on student outcomes.

Other aspects that relate to academic linguistic improvement of international students and institutions that house them have also been reviewed. Mental health and individual attitude have been noted to be of concern for this population and the administration of programs where they reside. Service-Learning has been shown to benefit to their success. So, recent studies in these areas that can inform the current study have been discussed.
Chapter 3

Methods

Introduction

Rather than testing a theory, the goal of qualitative research is to generate a working hypothesis from the data (Cronbach, 1975). This type of data is collected to find out what events mean to those engaged in them (Hatch, 2002). These subjective methods exist under the postpositive paradigm. It is assumed that reality can be approximated. Post positivism posits that an extant context or situation can be described. This sense of reality is disseminated by leaders and shared by members, via the words they speak, the way they act and the texts they write. Any word or concept which reappears with frequency forms a theme that reflects an aspect of their version of real world (Hatch, 2002). These patterns appear in general; they are not isolated instances. Together, they state a claim of coherence.

The text of student handbooks and perspectives of the interviewees in this study tell a collective story. Interviews help “uncover the meaning structures that participants use to organize their experiences and make sense of their world… and enable researchers to learn from the informants” (Hatch, 2002). The many words contained within these documents and transcripts from interviews are then analyzed inductively. Patterns of relationship are found. It can be said the findings stem from (or are grounded in) the data as themes that emerge; as such, the term for this type of collection and analysis is grounded theory. After these hypothetical categories are formed, data is reread to ensure that overall, they withstand scrutiny. The researcher is considered an instrument in this research paradigm because the same human abilities required to participate in a domain are the same as those a researcher uses to make sense of the intentions and beliefs of those being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).
Participants

Participant perspectives are sought in order to understand the world they have created or live in. Their beliefs can be captured by the words they speak which represent the basis for their actions. Interviews and surveys with individuals within the organization should help build a working theory as to the reasons for the existence of the structure they have built around them. This method is called grounded theory.

A wide range of personnel with vested interest in the IEP participate in this study. The Regional Director, who created all of the new policies, is interviewed for his rationale in making them. He earned a PhD in Educational Leadership (2011) and an MBA in Global Management (2000) from University of Phoenix. He owned and operated an IEP in Japan for ten years. Prior to coming to Miami University, he served as Director for Iona College’s IEP in New York. His rationale is relevant according to stage 1 of Change Management - make the case for change. Furthermore, his decades of experience in running language education programs relate directly to SLS as the other theoretical paradigm.

The Regional Director is asked open-ended questions with the assumption that he can add meaning to the practices taking place in this IEP. During the semi-structured interview, a list of preliminary questions is augmented based on his responses to previous questions. Responses are coded for emerging themes as related to the research questions. Data is reviewed and analyzed to confirm dominant generalizations (Hatch, 2002).

Three university IEP instructors are interviewed regarding the implementation of the policies. As the personnel tasked with carrying out the policies, their perspective could be a different lens to see this structure. Open-ended questions are centered around whether or not these new policies are actually being deployed by staff, which represents stage 2 of Change
As well, their interpretation or understanding of the policies themselves is questioned to see if the changes are taking root, in response to research question 3. As with the other interview, responses are coded for emerging themes as related to the research questions. Data is reviewed and analyzed to confirm dominant themes with the hypothesis that a world-view can be visualized.

In order for any innovation to take root (stage 4 of Change Management), all levels of an organization need to buy-in to the reasoning of them (Halkias, Santora, Harkiolakis & Thurman, 2017). Greaves and Sorrenson (1990) point to the lack of buy-in as barrier to innovation in higher education. IEP instructors actually following through and understanding the rationale behind the policies is key for success, according to the paradigm (Waters, 2009). Questions concerning their perspectives were asked to answer research question 3: Do the policies take root to sustain the innovation? As language educators, their understanding of the many policies that were created is also relevant under the rubric of SLS, as Watson-Gegeo discovered (2004).

Six university professors are surveyed to find out if indeed IEP student performance has improved from their perspective. Surveys contain both closed-ended Likert-scale type responses and open-ended questions. Primarily interpretative, these questions are geared towards bringing to light participant beliefs in a holistic manner. Details of the closed-ended questions are found in instruments. In general, though, they examine the social and cultural structure of the life they have created (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). These surveys help to describe the larger reality. Professors are invited to answer in their own words for open-ended questions, which encourages them to explain their unique perspectives on the situation with ELC student performance. These individuals exist adjacent to the IEP in that program completers then enroll in mainstream classes that they themselves teach. Their perspective is expected to be slightly different from those
within the IEP itself due to Munkdan’s (2012) findings that international students are in general unprepared for mainstream classes.

Further evidence as to whether or not the innovations (or changes) take root can be found if once students move on from the IEP and enter mainstream classes, their professors in fact report higher linguistic performance in mainstream classes. This data speaks to the final stage of Change Management, which concerns research question three about the ability of the changes to sustain. Wedell (2009) points to this perspective as a key to educational change.

A local law enforcement agent is asked one question. Research indicated that IEP student behavior in communities across the country had become an issue. The Regional Director’s responses about the rationale behind the new policies as well as IEP instructor responses confirmed that in fact ‘bad behavior’ had also been an issue here. So, in order to better answer research question 3, the local policeman was asked, “Have you seen improvement in IEP student behavior of the past two years?” If community members external to the university, let alone external to the IEP witness improvement, then stage 4 of Change Management (changes take root to sustain) is happening.

**Instruments**

Several instruments are employed in line with the theoretical paradigms to aid in ascertaining possible academic linguistic improvement. Since policies are laid out in student handbooks, and each year policies evolve based on organizational needs. This evolution represents stage 3 of Change Management, analyze results and modify (Giles, 2015). Successive student handbooks are analyzed via constant comparison (Hatch, 2002). The evolution of these policies determines the focus for this inquiry for the above reason. These handbooks are textual representations of the reality created in this IEP. First examination reveals potential explanatory
patterns. Rigorous revision of the documents permits depth and breadth of understanding. Repeated analysis sanctions an inductively derived theory (Hatch, 2002).

Level-exit assessment scores across two years are also compared to look for potential improvement in student English ability. Further, GPAs post program are analyzed to see if IEP completers’ performance in mainstream classes is improving.

**Student handbooks.** Policies of the IEP are detailed in student handbooks. Each semester the handbook is updated, reflecting changes. These continual adaptations are in line with stage 3 of *Change Management* (analyze and modify). Prior to publication, the university’s legal department reads the proposed changes and advises on proper wording. These handbooks are in fact legally binding documents. Policy changes over three years are analyzed via constant comparison, then coded along themes that emerge. Detailed below are sections with critical differences.

**English Language Center (ELC) levels.** In the 2017 handbook, the levels and courses have been codified and clearly delineated: (1) Reading & Writing, (2) Listening & Speaking, (3) Grammar & Integrated Skills. The 2015 handbook does not demonstrate a clear classification.

**ELC level-passing policy.** This title in the 2017 handbook corresponds to the Grades section in the 2015 book. Grading in the levels 1-4 then corresponded to traditional university grades, i.e. B- = 2.7. Then, a B- is the lowest grade to pass these 4 levels. The latter book has a level passing policy for levels 1-3; as these levels are not for any academic credit, it is not required the procedures for passing to mimic university standards. In levels 1-3, a green is given if the student attends regularly, completes assignments, is prepared and participates. A yellow is received in case the student neither comes to class on a regular basis, does not do assignments 100% of the time and participates sparingly. A red is received “if the student misses more than 5
days…, completes assignments at a quality level not reflective of the student’s current level and own potential as identified by ELC Team members (Handbook, 2017).

GDA is not defined in student handbooks but is in all syllabi templates. The essence of the meaning of this acronym is that students have goals. Instructors give assignments based on these goals. So, assignments are driven by student goals: that is, Goal-Driven Assignments (GDA). This linguistic distinction may seem semantic to the uninitiated; however, this concept puts the impetus on the student. Student needs generate assignments, not instructors.

It can be seen that one policy change is the addition of credit given for level 4 classes. Upon successful completion of this level, nine elective credits are earned; thus, traditional university grading system is followed. That students are able to earn university credit for level 4 provides incentive for students’ advancement. Students also perceive a greater value for their investment.

**Attendance.** In the 2017 version, attendance at class and events is mandatory, as opposed to encouraged in 2015. Many rules appear over time. The list of unexcused absences grows to include court dates for traffic violations, taking a friend to a doctor’s appointment and many others.

**Academic integrity.** Three sections concerning this topic exists in both editions: (1) Academic Integrity, (2) Academic Warning, Probation, Suspension at Credit-Bearing Levels, and (3) Academic Integrity/Plagiarism. If a student is suspended for lack of compliance with all of Miami University policies regarding behavior, the F-I-2o is to be terminated. Strong wording about honest behavior reflects the move towards rejection of plagiarism and other forms of inappropriate behavior. “Misunderstanding of appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse…” (Handbook, 2017).
**Student academic support.** This section is very long in the first manual, with individual, open and group tutoring sessions available. The 2017 handbook says, support programs are available. However, “student academic support services are not available to students with regularly unexcused absences and missed assignments” (Handbook, 2017).

**English-only.** This section did not exist prior to the Regional Director taking charge. By 2017, this section exists alongside a no bullying policy.

**Study Limit Policy and Dismissal.** Both documents maintain that a student may repeat a level once. After twice taking the same level, if no progress is achieved, the student is to be dismissed.

**Health insurance requirements.** In 2015, this section was one paragraph, stating that all international students are required to have insurance. In 2017, Outnu (name changed) had been chosen as the provider of student health insurance. There are now five paragraphs, including a link to the provider. It has become very detailed that the plan covers preventative care, hospitalizations, surgery, emergency care, prescriptions and major medical benefits.

**Driving on-campus.** Two sections are new to the 2017 student manual regarding driving. One delineates that all driving and parking laws must be obeyed. No one without a driver’s license may park on campus, and no one may park in a handicapped zone without legal authorization. Also, parking passes must be obtained.

**Email.** Extreme strengthening of wording can be seen between the two manuals. In 2015, the handbook states in bold that all students are to check their university email every day. In 2017, the title of the section is Check your email daily policy. Bolded are the words, “Saying that you did not know because you did not check your e-mail is not an acceptable excuse” (handbook, 2017).
**Level-exit assessments.** At the end of every semester, each student takes a series of assessments in reading, writing, listening and speaking. Students read a news story written at their level and respond to it in writing. Students read aloud from a script for raters to get a sense of their speaking ability. They engage in a conversation with the examiner, as well, to discern their ability to listen and respond appropriately. Raters assess the English level of students based on their ability to perform in these activities, guided by rubrics based on CERF standards. See appendices E through I. The scores are not related to student grades. They are used only as an internal diagnostic to gauge if students are in fact performing at the expected level. These scores are compared longitudinally as an indicator of student linguistic ability over time to answer research question two: Does student linguistic ability improve? This research question stems from SLS theory (Firth & Wagner, 1997).

**GPAs post program.** Yet another potential indicator of student academic linguistic ability could be performance in mainstream classes. If students’ academic language capacity improves, their performance in university courses should improve. GPAs post program are therefore compared longitudinally.

All of these sources together should produce an image of IEP policies and the rationale behind them. As well, student linguistic performance over two years should emerge, or at a minimum- perception thereof.

**Procedure**

**Student handbooks.** Two different editions, 2015 and 2017, were compared and contrasted using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). After first reading them, preliminary categories that relate to wording that repeatedly appears are created. During this open coding, concepts common in the books are noted. Then, with these conceptual categories in
mind, the handbooks are reread to confirm initial analysis. During this reexamination phase, axial coding, the discrete categories are compared in new ways to get a big picture. From the first to the second edition in question, new policies were created as new problems were defined. Themes emerged that related to both Change Management and SLS.

**Regional Director interview.** On September 8, 2017, P.I. sat down with this individual in his office for the purpose of asking questions regarding his policies. This interview was semi-structured. His responses to one question often led to another that was not in the initial script. His answers to these questions relate directly to research question one and are in line with stage 1 of Change Management. The conversation lasted roughly two hours. The resultant transcript represents his voice, or his belief system about the policies. In a manner similar to the procedure with the student handbooks, first perusal of the transcripts resulted in open codes, which are then revisited to reveal a broader image.

**University IEP instructor interviews.** Interview with instructor one was conducted on September 5, 2017, with instructor two on September 11, and instructor three on September 14. All three were held in P.I.’s office. The resultant transcripts were analyzed in qualitative fashion as described above. Open coding is followed by axial coding with the goal of acquiring a new understanding of the IEP.

**Interview with local law enforcement agent.** On September 3, 2017, one question was asked of this man. Literature demonstrated that in addition to linguistic problems, international students display behavioral problems. Gerber (2016) noted a murder of an international student by another. Drash & Loo (2015) told the story of an entire town in conflict. Interviews with the Regional Director and all three IEP instructors mimicked these results; behavioral problems existed in this population at this school.
This officer has worked closely with the IEP for the past three years. He patrols the neighborhoods and is called upon for many reasons, including domestic disturbance issues. Theoretically, if the policies have improved student behavior, as was deemed necessary by previous research, the local police officer should have fewer visits to the student residences. The police officer’s perspective could shed light on research question three, *Do the policies take root to sustain the changes?*, which is also the final stage of *Change Management*. In addition, SLS teaches that language does not change in isolation. Behavior and language go hand in hand. Again, analysis of the transcripts follows qualitative methodology as detailed in Hatch (2002).

**University professor surveys.** A six-question survey was created in Survey Monkey and invitations emailed to six mainstream professors on September 17, 2017. The last of six responses were received October 11, 2017. The Likert-style questions measured several perceptions within this population. First, perceived *improvement in classroom behavior* was inquired about. Likert scale 1 is anchored in “no improvement” and 5 = “substantial improvement. Second, perception of *improvement in academic language ability* is measured on the same scale. The final Likert-style question with the same scale measured perception of *improvement in overall academic performance* of IEP students.

Three additional questions were open-ended. If professors exhibited knowledge of any of the policies with a yes response, they are invited to write their impression thereof in the comments section. The next question invited professors to add anything they like about their experience with ELC students as different from or similar to two years ago. The final question asked if professors have any suggestions for the language program.

**Level-exit assessments.** Aggregate scores on level exit assessments without identifiers are collected from after summer semester 2015, summer 2016 and spring 2017. These numbers
relate directly to research question number 2: Does academic linguistic ability of students improve? This research question combines policy and language: if the policies have their intended effect, level-exit assessments go up longitudinally because academic linguistic ability improves. Policy is implemented as a matter of Change Management as a theory. Those policies are also based on SLS.

Appendices E and F contain sample assessments which are graded using rubrics (appendices G and H) based on the Common European Framework (CERF), appendix I. The latter also contains a graphic display of how IEP levels correspond to CERF levels. Raters all have a master’s degree in ESL instruction and a minimum of three years’ experience in the field. They are professionals who have all been aligned with the above guidelines for interrater reliability.

**GPAs post-program.** Unidentified data on 42 students from the end of fall 2015 and 66 students from end of spring 2017 already existed. GPAs between the two semesters were compared. This data represents the end of the string of data. If the policies improve academic linguistic ability of the students, it is possible their performance in mainstream classes will improve. That being said, performance in mainstream university classes also depends on other factors beyond the scope of this study.

**Chapter Summary**

Stakeholders internal and external to the IEP are interviewed and surveyed regarding policies and IEP student performance, guided by the post positivist paradigm in qualitative research with the goal of approximating this reality (Cronbach, 1975). Documents and achievement indicators are also analyzed to inform this study about innovations in an IEP and any potential improvement in student linguistic ability. Together, this matrix of participants and
materials produces an image of the IEP policies, their rationale and student performance, in line with both theoretical paradigms.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

The multiple sources of data are organized according to the research question they answer as they arise thematically. Data analysis precedes the research questions responses. The answer to research question one, concerning the policies and their rationale, rely upon the student handbooks along with Regional Director interview. This data relates directly to Change Management stage 1 (make the case for change). Academic linguistic development is measured primarily by level-exit assessments. IEP instructors as well as university professors indicate the policies are being upheld and that academic linguistic ability is improving. These pieces of data relate directly to Change Management stage 2 (implement the changes) and respond to research question two. GPAs post-program are added supplementally. Many voices throughout the surrounding community answer the question Do the changes take root? in the affirmative (research question three), which corresponds to Change Management stage 4.

Data Analysis

Within the post positivist paradigm, since it is assumed that reality can be described and approximated, this data was analyzed inductively (Hatch, 2002). Textual material from student handbooks, interviews and surveys was first read for open coding. After these themes were initially recognized, they were scrutinized in the next phase, axial coding. When themes were finalized, a picture of the IEP began to emerge along with a theory as to its meaning, just as Simon (2011) has done.

Policies and rationale. By looking the policies and rationale through a wider lens, a structure can be discerned, one that discourages non-participation and inappropriate or
disrespectful behavior. This programmatic architecture encourages speaking in real world environments. It also supports students holistically. The policies extend far beyond academics. In this sense, SLS as a theory here expands to domains of life necessity.

Values play an important role in this study. SLS mentions “the embodiment of an ontology.” Change Management mandates a mission statement. IEP policies create a value system. Members of the community live by them. These policies and their rationale are visible to, understood and appreciated by internal and external stakeholders.

In several sections of the student handbook of 2017, phrases included “misunderstanding the rules is no excuse” or “not being aware is no excuse” and other phrases with “unexcused”. Those phrases are not present in the first book. Graphical comparison of both student handbooks in table 2 testifies that the wording is stronger in the latter, including dismissed and termination of I-20.

Due to this comparison, along with the purpose of the program itself, several terms were searched in line with qualitative research methodology under the post positivist paradigm: unexcused, excuse, consequence, mandatory, permitted, encourage, academic, English, support and policy. The terms unexcused and consequence do not appear in the 2015 version, but both appear three times in the second. Excuse appears once in both, in the section ‘Examples of excused absences’. The word permitted only occurs in the context of ‘no smoking’ in both. Encourage appears three times in the latter, twice in the former. The word support appears 12 times in the latter, 9 in the first. Policy appears 35 times in the latter, 10 the former. Clearly, policy becomes an important word. Academic appears 33 times in the second, 22 in the first. English appears 28 times in the 2017 version, 18 in the 2015 one. Overall, the latter is stricter
than the first and has a stronger focus on Academic English. It is of note that both encourage and support appear significantly more in 2017’s edition.

Table 2

*Comparison of words in Student Handbooks from 2 different years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strictly enforces</td>
<td>Policies...as follows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 unexcused ...dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not being aware of the rules is no excuse.”</td>
<td>Must attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; day missed...sign document identifying consequences</td>
<td>Counted on a per class basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days in a row...meet with Regional Director</td>
<td>5-15 minutes late...late, 3 lates = 1 absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 days missed...2 more = termination of I-20</td>
<td>&gt;15 minutes late = absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tardies &lt;10 minutes = 1 absence</td>
<td>Excessive absences penalize grades (beyond 3 reduces by 1 letter grade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of results from the interview with the Regional Director yield similar results. The most common themes are strict and support. Some problems were identified upon his arrival, which mandated initial policy changes. Others became identified during the first year of his tenure, which required further policy changes. This behavior follows Change Management stage 3: analyze results and modify (Covey 1990). The rationale behind the policies is that students speak in real-life scenarios strictly speaking; and any problem that interferes with that is resolved.
Many of the policies and the rationale behind them relate directly to real-life speaking situations, guided by experts. These contexts are not isolated to academic purposes, rather they encompass many life experiences. These Change Management innovations consistently implement SLS methodologies.

**Academic language development.** A one-way ANOVA with Welch on the level-exit assessments demonstrated significant improvement in this domain. Also, qualitative analysis of interview data using grounded theory indicates that a host of stakeholder perspectives are singular that academic linguistic capability is improving. This data suggests that speaking among peers for 4.5 hours/day about a wide variety of topics in situations that mimic real world environments (as well as actual real-world environments) improves academic linguistic capacity. Level-exit assessments indicate improvement, as do university professors.

The data also suggest that extensive support around the individual is conducive to academic linguistic development. That students have a system in place responding to critical needs lends a sense of security which frees up mental space for learning. If children with housing, parenting or food insecurity do not perform well, the opposite could also be true; well supported individuals can focus on goals. On Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, those more basic must be met in order to achieve higher-level ones. In this case, the goal is to learn academic English, and students at the ELC are better able to do that now than two years ago because of their support system.

Within the guidelines set by SLS theory, students are speaking in many contexts related to life as a teenager in a new country as a college student – banks, mainstream classes, local schools and more – guided by experts. Perren, Grove & Thornton recommend this activity (2013), as does Ping (2014). All of this activity falls under the rubric of Change Management –
IEP instructors are implementing the changes. Roueche (1989) specifically recommends such all-inclusive policy making in his research about transformational leadership in community colleges. Analysis of the slight drop in GPA could indicate that language skills have not developed sufficiently. However, this piece of data could be related to a trait other than academic linguistic capacity, beyond the scope of this study.

**Roots.** Also using grounded theory, analyzed interview results among a broad range of stakeholders, both within and external to the university, indicate that the innovations have taken root. These results advance the notion that utilization of business-style leadership strategies instill policy changes deep enough that they take root in all layers of the organization. Like a chain reaction, IEP teachers are following through which impacts the students long-term enough to be witnessed by ensuing professors in mainstream classes. That the innovations appear to be taking root answers research question three, which is the final stage of *Change Management*.

**RQ1: Policy Changes and Rationale behind Them**

Expectations are clearly set out in the handbook that students do what they came here to do. Just as bumpers in a bowling alley keep the ball going in the right direction, the idea that their I-20 could be terminated for non-compliance keeps students on the right path. While *strict* is a theme that clearly emerges as a theme, along with *self-discipline*, the dominant theme of *real-life speaking* resonates a positive energy through the system.

From the literature on SLS, it is known that language externalizes a value system. *Change management* literature demonstrates that institutions embody value systems with a mission statement. *Values* have been explicitly implemented in the policies. The ELC handbook begins with a mission statement, which could also be called a statement of values (Covey, 1990). The goals of the program and hence actions of all participants are then guided by this principle.
declaration. Values are explicitly problematized during policy-mandated orientation. Students form ‘corporations’ which need a mission statement. After perusing samples from major corporations, they write their own values declarations. Stemming from their own values, they then workshop their own goals. In turn, their daily actions are reunited with both values and goals. It is, in essence an iteration of the values loop from above, brought to the student’s level.

As seen in table 1, how values become goals that hence influence actions as theory is applied to various levels of the organization. Students are explicitly taught this continuum and problematize the concept as to its meaning in their lives. One primary theme that be discerned from the policies and their rationale is one that ‘encourages’ students to turn this theory into reality. The dominant purpose of these changes could be labeled self-discipline. The Regional Director said that prior to his arrival there had been bullying, fighting and other distractions, which has all gone away since his arrival. Lack of discipline was pointed to as a problem in the literature review. All three IEP teachers responded that students operate within the guidelines set. Instructor two said, “There was just bad behavior before.” Instructor number three said, “There is a sense of discipline now.”

Mainstream professors concur. “The ELC’s current strategy is no doubt effective – students fall in line,” to quote one. The local law enforcement agent’s affirmation was emphatic that there thankfully had been no domestic disturbance calls in over a year. All sources of data point to civil comportment.

One aspect of self-discipline is personal responsibility. One policy the Regional Director discussed is GDA. The program has no homework. Instead, student goals direct (or drive) their assignments, which happen to come from instructors: goal driven assignments, GDA. Students are required in the handbook to do their GDA. If a student moans about being given an
assignment, the Regional Director said he teaches instructors to reply, “You’re welcome. This assignment will help you achieve your goal.” The idea of ‘work at home’ shifts from something given by a teacher to something that stems from their own personal goals. This is one example of a values-shift towards personal responsibility to achieve goals and honor their morals.

An important theme in the policies and the rationale behind them is real-world speaking. The ‘Up! Up! Up! Up! Up!’ policy installs a mechanism for students to speak while standing among peers without pressure for a minimum of 1.5 hours/day. During this mainstay activity, a topic based on the academic word list is briefly introduced with a small amount of vocabulary, for example, “What are the potential benefits and disadvantages of the new contact lens with an internal camera?” Students speak in a pair about this topic, with up-beat music in the background. After 10 minutes, students walk around, switch partners and repeat their conversation with someone else. Repetition of listening and saying the same words and structures builds confidence in new linguistic skills, in line with SLS. The music serves a dual purpose. (1) It brings energy into the space. Students can be seen tapping their foot or swaying their heads to the beat. (2) It recreates a more natural environment with background noise and other distractors. It makes students focus and speak louder. They cannot whisper. One instructor and the Regional Director report this exercise pushes students to speak with more confidence.

Conversations in society or business do not happen in a vacuum. Whether in a train station, a work-place or other environment, competing conversations happen at the same time. The policy and its rationale point to building confidence in real-life scenarios, which was pointed to as relevant to both SLS and in the business world.

At the end of semester, the concept of finals has been transformed into a presentation day. The event looks like a business conference in an auditorium where eight to ten groups of
two-three students stand next to their Power-Point slides on a research topic. In front of them sits an audience of up to ten other students. After listening and discussing the topic, the audience then rotates and listens to the next one. This process is repeated several times; then the audience and presenters switch places, and there is a new round of presentations. This final presentation mimics real world speaking in a dynamic environment. This policy is also consistent with the transformation of education from consumption of knowledge to co-construction thereof (Wedell, 2009).

Research indicated that university professors and international students alike report an inability to speak in class (Munkdan, 2012). Those who would like to skirt the system and skip up levels are redirected by the leveling-up policy, which ensures the correct amount of time speaking in the program. The student handbook lays out the procedure for those who wish to move up, the Regional Director mentioned students wanting to move up can be a plague of IEPs because they falsely perceive they will save money. In some places, students line up outside the administrative office, trying to meet with the director to move up a level. Administrators can spend hours in these circuitous conversations. It is noted in the introduction that students are here to earn a degree. English is just a tool. So, students do not want to spend time doing it. Students try to negotiate with IEP administrators to skip levels, not based on linguistic ability but simple desire (Holland, 1998). Song (2012) noted a Korean boy who never completely learned English because he knew he was moving back to his native country, so the new language held little relevance for him.

However, if they are not able to speak in university classrooms, they need to spend more time in the IEP. Failing a university class does not save money. Two instructors mentioned the leveling-up policy is “very helpful.” If a student requests to move up, instructors say, “Yes, you
can move up, just follow the policy in the student manual.” 99% of the time students do not follow the procedure. If they cannot follow instructions, they do not need to move up.

Another way students were trying to skirt the system was found in the tutoring sessions. The Regional Director reported that a significant percentage of students were not going to class, then attending a tutoring session once a week, saying, “What did I miss?” A new tutoring policy was created. Students who attend class regularly or who have a doctor’s note from a genuine illness-related absence can have as much help as necessary. One other abuse of the tutoring system was found with the instruction of writing. After not writing for a month, the day before a paper was due, students would show up and ask for help, with very little written. So, a part of the writing tutoring policy is that the paper must not be due the next day. Corrections are made that guide the student. For example, if a student writes, “The children is happy,” the instructor notes “subject-verb-agreement error”. Working together with the instructor as a guide, the student tries to come up with the correct answer, “The children are happy.” This system redirects the impetus to the student. They may not procrastinate. They may not just skip class. Most importantly, they have to start solving their own problems, with an expert as a facilitator. In the same way that GDA directs the student to his own goal, and thus the teacher is only a guide; with writing corrections, the student is aware that the teacher does not solve his problems. The student is being scaffolded to think critically and fix his own mistakes. This policy expands the themes of self-discipline and personal responsibility. It is also in line with SLS thought, that experts guide newcomers into becoming self-confident participants. If a teacher is always doing the correcting, students do not learn to rely on themselves.

Another theme that came to light during through the policies, the interviews and surveys was strict. The student handbook states more than once, “not being aware of this rule is no
“Excuse” and explicitly uses the word *strict*. This handbook introduces rigor to the program. The Regional Director mentioned the institution of mandatory instruction and use of Modern Language Association format (MLA) by all students. He said this empowers students to follow proper citation guidelines and eliminates plagiarism. All three IEP instructors report instituting this policy. After a one-week introductory period, students are sent to the library to fix MLA problems prior to entering class.

The English-only policy and its rationale fit in with this theme because the policy is so enforced. While some literature points to student use of first language (L1) as a resource for learning, it is not relevant in this case. L1 is particularly useful for children and those just beginning to learn a language. These students have all been learning English upwards of ten years. They still do not speak the language. Whatever system they were using to learn did not have the intended effect. Learning English while speaking another language can be just a vicious circle. In this case, constantly switching to the native language has become a crutch. More importantly for the classroom and program as a whole is liability, according to the Regional Director. Not all staff speak Chinese. The university has a robust ‘no bullying’ policy. It was discovered that in class, in front of teachers, students were being bullied in Chinese. If students are being bullied in class, the university is liable for any result thereof. The English-only policy was instituted in part to rid the program of one source of bullying. Further, at the higher levels of language learning, translating back and forth between two languages becomes cumbersome, time consuming and slows processing. It is advocated by some that at the higher levels, students use only an L2 dictionary. A complete system needs to be built in the student’s mind. Students need to build from *chair* (for example) to *armchair* and *recliner*, or *biology* to *microbiology* and
bioscience, without constant mental reference to another language. Being guided by experts in multiple contexts within the target language is supported by SLS.

The student handbook says students may not go to the bathroom during class, which on the surface sounds like a draconian idea. About this policy, the Regional Director said that students were leaving class after ten minutes and never coming back. Students would arrive thirty minutes into class and say they were in the bathroom. An IEP instructor reiterated this scenario had happened in his class. He added, “If a student really needs to go, of course we let them, but we had to stem this tide.” Professors reprise their awareness of the rigorous nature of the program imploringly, “Change your tone…reduce harshness in your words and actions.”

Attendance is labeled mandatory, in class and at events. Students are bussed to these locations, if necessary, and given assignments that support the content of the event. This form of strictness is a tool to get students in real-life events speaking. SLS notes the importance of real speech events facilitated by experts. A few examples follow.

The university’s Office of Diversity & Multicultural Services hosts several events honoring African American heritage. Prior to The Taste of Soul, a luncheon serving traditional southern fare of fried chicken, collard-greens and cornbread, IEP students learn and discuss these foods. They all know how to introduce themselves and are encouraged to speak to other attendees. They arrive and after getting their food intersperse themselves among community members of all ages and cultural backgrounds at different tables. IEP instructors go from table to table helping conversations to get started. In line with SLS, students are guided by experts in real-life speaking situations. This situation also mimics a business event dinner.

The Office of Career Services offers resume writing seminars which the higher level IEP students attend. The Office of Student Activities hosts game days. All university students play
velcro-soccer, hockey-in-a-box and other recreational pursuits. IEP instructors build vocabulary prior, mingle to support students meeting others and do a post-event reflection for all festivities.

Throughout the year the IEP works closely with the town’s Salvation Army, an international volunteer organization. At Christmas, students stand at the doors of several local stores and ring bells, saying, “Merry Christmas.” The IEP is given names of children who want specific toys. For the past two years, the number of toys has been roughly 60. Also, there is no dollar limit to the toy. If a child wants a $60 toy, that is what he/she gets. Staff buy the toys and wrapping paper. IEP students are taught how to wrap the presents and put the name of the child on them. IEP students role-play talking with children: boys’ love for superheroes and girls’ preference for different princess are great conversation-starters. The IEP students carry the gifts to a Christmas party, where they set up decorations and serve over one hundred pizzas. The IEP student hands the gift to the child; they sit together, and again IEP staff circulate helping conversations to get started. This real-life scenario is repeated at Halloween, where an IEP student introduces himself to a child (guided by IEP personnel), and they eat pizza and carve a pumpkin together. Consistent involvement in the community brings SLS and the idea of a values-based curriculum to reality.

Extensive policies and programming have evolved around teenagers getting set up in a new community: phone, banking, psychological development and health insurance. In each of these areas, the Regional Director became aware of a problem. Phone companies were taking up to four hours to set up one person’s phone because the local clerks could not understand the student. First, one bank was not delivering bank cards for weeks. Students were depositing up to ~$100,000 yet were given no access to that money. Students were bringing hospital bills in the tens of thousands to him. While technically none of these matters are academic, if a student
either cannot access their money or has overwhelming medical bills, they cannot pay tuition. If they cannot pay tuition, they cannot study at the university. So, these issues became relevant to academic success. Learning to live in a new country had become a learning-inhibitor, so solutions were found. That the health insurance change occurred in the second year is an example of stage 3 in Change Management (analyze results and modify). This strict health insurance policy arose as a result of analysis of student needs.

It is arguably incumbent upon personnel in international education to advocate for their charges. If local companies appear to be taking advantage of or underserving their naive population, that is detrimental for the whole community. In each of these cases, the Regional Director negotiated with multiple companies to ensure the best service. ELC staff created worksheets for local business personnel to help them understand their new clients and started facilitating all interactions. Students are accompanied by ELC staff in the initial stages of banking, phone set up, etc. to reduce learning inhibitors.

The social aspect of SLS is not confined to academics. Teenagers’ existence extends far beyond the classroom. Extensive orientation activities developed around psychological health. Again, this field is not typically within the purview of academia, but if students fight and then start missing class, it becomes necessary to intervene. Research demonstrates fighting, bullying and depression in this population. At this particular institution, more than one physical fight started due to roommate perception of slovenliness. Students were not going to class because they had fought with their roommate. So, preventative measures have been installed to prevent students from missing class due to fighting with a roommate.

During this orientation, students meet with the counseling office and overcome their stigma of ‘help-seeking’. They are taught the warning signs of depression. They take an on-line
avatar program to identify classmates who may be at-risk for suicide. They create puppet shows that enact conflict resolution. Teenagers who have literally never washed an item of clothing or a dish actively learn that living with other peers (as opposed to a mother or grandmother who does everything for them) requires maintenance of personal items. Relevant language structure is scaffolded prior; and concepts are reviewed and revisited for repeated contact with the information. All of these real-life critical thinking processes maturate twenty-year-olds for higher level learning.

Many universities mandate students undergo some form of sexual harassment training. At Miami University, students take an on-line program called Haven. Students coming from conservative countries cannot conceive they are to discuss sexuality with adults. The idea is not only foreign to them; it is forbidden. Words like consent can be looked up in a dictionary, but their definition within this context may not be accessible without explicit instruction. IEP students’ understanding of rape, stalking, cyber-stalking, homosexuality and heterosexuality, and discrimination based on these traits is built, along with vocabulary and language structure, in a non-threatening environment before they take Haven. All college students are taught about sexual harassment today. The IEP students’ understanding of its relevance is scaffolded by this program.

This orientation has been detailed in the peer-reviewed book Promoting Ethnic Diversity and Multiculturalism in Higher Education, chapter five “Orientation in an IEP as Alignment with Core Value Systems: Creating a Convivial Climate on a Multicultural Campus,” published by IGI Global (Ashe, 2018). An English speaker who moves to Germany to study abroad needs to learn how to access services in German: from banks to hospitals. This information is relevant to any person studying in a country where they are a NNS and thus any program responsible for
international students. Prior to this study, an IEP was solely academic. However, it has been discovered here that life set-up and mental health were learning inhibitors. So, in order for students to focus on learning and improve academic linguistic capability, these factors became relevant to the Regional Director, IEP staff, professors, university administrators, and the community at large.

All university students also take a math placement test upon arrival. All university stakeholders reported international students were cheating on this test. The administration reported to the Regional Director, this population would just look at each other’s computers in order to get into the highest-level math - calculus. Once this problem was identified, a ‘Math Placement Test Policy’ was implemented. Prior to taking the test, students practice ACT word problems.

A car averages 27 miles per gallon. If gas costs $4.04 per gallon, which of the following is closest to how much the gas would cost for this car to travel 2,727 typical miles? (ACT Math Practice).

Students learn that measurements are different (gallons not liters) and that math has words. They work through many problems, in line with SLS thought. They are told that if they cheat on the upcoming test, they will automatically be placed into beginning algebra, the lowest math class. Also, they are monitored during the test to prevent cheating. The Regional Director reported this linguistic preparation along with the behavioral guidance has eliminated the problem of international students cheating on the math placement test. This policy fits within the themes of self-discipline and strict: students must behave properly and if they do not there is a punishment. This policy exemplifies leadership in that student behavior is guided in the expected direction.

While many policies relate directly to real-life speaking, others demonstrate management of a system of students. A language program builds language capability of students in multiple
contexts. An organization in charge of students must manage them, not just their speaking. SLS and business-style leadership are visible in the policies and rationale behind them.

**RQ2: Linguistic Competency Change**

Linguistic improvement is primarily measured by longitudinal level exit assessments. Table 3 shows that after summer 2017, 41 students tested at roughly a level just under 2.4, with 5 being the maximum. After spring term 2017, 48 students tested over a 3. Significant improvement of academic language skill in ELC students over the course of five semesters is demonstrated by means of level exit assessment ratings.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level exit assessments 2015 – 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using SPSS, a one-way ANOVA with Welch Test to accommodate for unequal sample sizes demonstrates that the mean of the level exit assessments was raised from 2.38 to 3.39 over the course of two years. The box plot in figure 1 displays this significant longitudinal improvement in level-exit assessments from 2015 to 2017.

The robust test of equality of means demonstrates this result is statistically significant. F(2,78) = 40.83, p < .001. Improvement in academic linguistic ability has been longitudinally established by the level exit assessments.

In addition to level-exit assessments, figure 2 displays university professors’ overwhelming desire to report improvement in classroom behavioral expectations, which was
pointed to in the literature as an issue. SLS teaches that neophytes should be instructed in proper comportment for different contexts, which informed the IEP’s explicit instruction in this matter.

Figure 1. Level-Exit Assessments Compared Longitudinally

![Box Plot of Level-Exit Scores by Year](image)

*Figure 1. A Box Plot of Level-Exit Scores by Year*

Figure 2. University professor interest in discussing their opinion of IEP students.

Is there anything you would like to add about your recent experience with ELC students as different from or similar to 2 years ago?

![Bar Chart](image)

*Figure 2. University professors want to engage with the IEP.*
The reason they want to talk to the IEP is because of the improvement in they have witnessed in this student population. Figure 3 demonstrates development in alignment with college behavioral expectations is seen in mainstream classes. It is also relevant that not one professor said, “No behavioral improvement.” Eighty percent noted improved behavior, the other 20% simply did not speak, which carries very different implications from negative feedback.

Figure 3. Mainstream professor responses to question about ELC student improvement in ability to \textbf{behave appropriately} in university classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attend class. Talk to domestic students. Take notes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017 1:49 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The students seem to be more comfortable with American culture and expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2017 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>see comments above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2017 8:14 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students seem to be more aware of appropriate behavior in the classroom (less cheating, better attendance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2017 8:53 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Mainstream professors perceive ELC students are taking notes, doing homework and participating in class more in 2017 than in 2015.

More important than behavior in accordance with expectations by professors is student linguistic performance in class. Professors also report that academic linguistic capacity has improved since these policies have been implemented, as can be seen in figure 4. Once again, 80% of professors surveyed report improvement in IEP student performance.

One program that could be impacting this academic linguistic ability is a story telling and performance program. Middletown is underserved, ranking six on \textit{The Worst Places to Live in Ohio}, due to its high crime and poverty (Census, 2018). The privileged international students are taken into a local elementary school.
They read with the children, everything from *Where the Wild Things Are?* by Maurice Sendak to *Papa, Please Get the Moon for Me* by Eric Carle. Over the course of the semester, they develop relationships with these children. Eventually, they build puppet theaters together. The culmination is a pizza party with all students performing these stories together to other classes. IEP students report they were not scared to speak with the children. “This experiential learning built my confidence in reading and speaking,” to quote one. *StudyTravel* Magazine requested an article to be written about the program due to its large impact on the community as well as its potential efficacy in other locations across the globe (Ashe, 2017). Literacy and community are being constructed together as a matter of policy. This study confirms what Askildson et al (2012) discovered; service-learning increases academic linguistic ability.
Another potential indicator of improvement in academic linguistic capacity is GPA post-program. If students’ language ability has truly improved, performance in mainstream academic courses could improve. As such, GPAs are compared longitudinally.

Fall of 2015, 42 students were congruently level 5 in their last semester of the program and taking other classes. The average GPA at the end of this term, which includes mainstream university classes was 3.152. Summer GPAs were not compared because often in summer, students only take one class – English. GPA concerning only English would not be representative of how students are faring in mainstream classes. Five semesters later (summers can be included in this sense because the program runs with full numbers), after spring 2017, the average GPA of 66 students was 3.115. So, GPA did not go up. Academically, students are not necessarily performing better. However, content courses have many challenges beyond language. Research has shown that students at colleges without entrance criteria are not ready for college classes in general. Domestic students do not all perform well in college classes. The reasons why students’ GPA did not improve is beyond the scope of this study.

That notwithstanding, multiple sources of data indicate positive movement in collegiate behaviors as well as academic linguistic ability. Level-exit assessments indicate a statistically meaningful move in the right direction. University professors report progress in these areas. That both behavior developed with language ability fits in line with SLS, language is a physical embodiment of values; learning to speak in a new environment involves learning to act like others in the setting. Behavior and language go hand in hand.

For clarification, a stark sample in opposition can be given. In a bank, particular statements are said, “It appears your account is overdrawn,” (Halliday, 2004). Common behaviors can be witnessed, such as quietly standing in line or sitting outside an office, waiting.
It would be highly irregular to see a customer or an employee dancing and shouting. The same could be said of library actions and language. People speak quietly and behave similarly. No one is doing aerobics and shouting about hamburgers in a bank or a library. So, it is not surprising that in this IEP, both behaviors and language are developing concurrently.

**RQ3: Do the changes take root?**

Change management principles are employed by the Regional Director to improve student outcome. Although the IEP is an academic department within a university, it is an entity that requires management or leadership. The final stage in this process is *sustain the change*. The response to whether or not this happened could best be found in whether or not stakeholders internal and beyond the organization itself witness the changes. IEP instructors are actually implementing the policies. All three instructors said they do instill the strict attendance policy, ‘*Up! Up! Up! Up! Up!*’ and English-only. “Students are ejected if they speak Chinese,” said one. Further, university professors notice the changes, as do community members.

A major component of behavior in this context is appropriate classroom actions: taking notes, asking questions. Five out of six mainstream professors report ELC finishers “attend class, are more aware of appropriate behavior in the classroom, and are more comfortable with American culture and expectations.” Figure 3 demonstrates professors’ perceptions of ELC student behaviors in class.

Another term for ‘take root’ is *sustain*, from change management principles. Table 4 demonstrates the innovations in relation to these principles. It is the teachers who implement many of the policies. Because they do so, the changes should have taken root and thus be sustainable.
Table 4

*Corporate Change Management Stages applied to this IEP context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Innovation</th>
<th>IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Make the case for change.</td>
<td>Students are unprepared for mainstream tertiary classes. Behavior problems inhibit learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Implement changes.</td>
<td>Increase contact hours. Introduce volunteerism. Introduce student-centered activities. Introduce conflict resolution strategies. Reduce stigma of counseling and help-seeking. Increase student contact with community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Analyze results and modify.</td>
<td>Behavior problems have been eliminated. Students language ability has improved. Enrollment is still dropping, possibly due to external factors. Performance in tertiary classes has not improved. Some professors perceive program is too strict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Sustain innovation</td>
<td>Instructors are indeed implementing the changes and report contentment with the policies. External stakeholders in general report the policies are having the intended effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the teachers are indeed implementing the policies to the extent that mainstream professors are aware of some, success is accumulating. According to Murray (2008) and Wedell (2009), as practices slowly change and success is witnessed, inner beliefs modify in acceptance of the new methods, which reinforces the behavior. Figure 5 demonstrates this cycle. There
appears to have been a shift in values of the instructors which supports the changes, due to their success.

Figure 5. Values impact behavior which impacts success

Figure 5. By witnessing small successes to new behaviors, inner values shift in favor of this new behavior. Those new values reinforce actions. The cycle continues and the change takes root.

An IEP instructor said the leveling-up policy was “brilliant” because if a student asks to move up, the instructor response is, “Yes, of course you can move up, just follow the procedure in the student handbook,” and 99% of the time, the student does not get the required references etc. This is yet another policy that is indeed being implemented, more evidence that the changes are taking root.

All three IEP teachers responded that students operate within the guidelines set. Instructor two said, “There was just bad behavior before.” Instructor number three said, “There is a sense of discipline now.” These instructors have bought in to the reasoning behind the policies. They all express an understanding of and an appreciation for the changes. According to research
in *Change Management*, all layers of an organization have to understand and actually implement the policies. That this is happening is further evidence that the changes have taken root.

Mainstream professors concur. “The ELC’s current strategy is no doubt effective – students fall in line,” to quote one. The local law enforcement agent’s affirmation was emphatic that there thankfully had been no domestic disturbance calls in over a year. All sources of data point to civil comportment.

Even a mainstream professor was aware of the *English-only* policy. Another mentioned the “rigorous intensity of English”. Yet another professor mentioned that ELC completers speak with domestic students. Figure 3 displays professor perceptions that ELC student’s academic linguistic ability has improved.

All together these surveys indicate improvement in mainstream class-time behavior. Looking at the numbers of choices is optimistic. Regarding all types of possible improvement, the category of *not really* was selected a total of two times out of a potential sixteen throughout the survey. *No* was chosen twice also. So, negativity was chosen ¼ of the time. *Some* (improvement) was chosen ten times, 62%. And *substantial* was also chosen twice. Adding up the positive comments comes to 12/16, 75%. It can be said there is a perception of improvement among mainstream university professors. The question that received the most positive feedback was *academic language ability*. So, it can also be said there is a perception of improvement here.

The fact that all 5 respondents only chose to respond to the open-ended questions indicates a desire to speak. The one professor with heavy criticism did not respond to likert-style questions whether or not they had noticed improvement in academic ability, linguistic ability or ability to follow norms. But, this person had a lot to say. Analysis of this professor’s statements could be summarized as improvements with a negative impression of methods to obtain it.
This idea harkens back to the image of the bowling bumpers. Ejection from class is unexcused which could in theory lead to a canceled I-20, so students speak English. “Shy students are forced to talk because it’s 1 on 1,” to quote another instructor. IEP instructors are participating in the end of semester mandatory level transition policy. Students write final papers in MLA (according to instructors) and turn those papers into presentations. All instructors’ report their presence at the presentations as final exams. It should be noted that the Regional Director reported not one I-20 had been canceled. So, the idea of canceling an I-20 remains at the periphery of student attention.

According to university professors, students are volunteering in local events. One said, ELC students are “voluntold to get involved with the community.” Authentic speaking experiences are vital within SLS. Volunteering is foundational for building values of any organization. Building community in real-life speaking engagements makes the policy changes visible to those beyond the IEP classroom and even beyond the campus. Another professor said, “The focus and intensity brought on by the new director is commendable.”

In conclusion, university professors, IEP instructors and a local police officer all indicate the policies are taking root. According to these sources, the changes are being sustained.

**Chapter Summary**

Policy changes are overarching into nearly every aspect of students’ lives. According to the Regional Director, this extra-academic skeleton is necessary to improve basic behavior in order to increase academic linguistic capacity of students. Students are being managed with business-style leadership. Additionally, consistent with SLS theory, achievement indicators and internal stakeholders indicate that behavioral improvement has paralleled linguistic development.
due to guided apprenticeship in speaking in real-world environments. The final stage of *Change Management* is witnessed by external stakeholders; the positive changes are taking root.
Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusion

Many sources of data traced innovation implementation in an IEP. Specific policy changes were made, in line with Change Management Theory, in order to increase the academic language production of its clients, following from SLS. Sarros, Cooper and Santora (2011) noted the need for leaders in academic settings to be willing to approach solutions in a more dispersed manner, to be less hierarchical. Stoller’s study (1995) of leadership in an IEP found the need for business-style innovations explicitly. Firth and Wagner’s inquiry in SLS (1995) found the need for socialization in a wider range of contexts beyond just content areas. Perren, Grove and Thornton also found curricular innovations within SLS for English language programs (2013). While some policies may seem unrelated to academics or language learning, the system as a whole achieved its goal. Mainstream international college students who complete this IEP now are better off than those who completed it two years ago.

Studying a foreign language at an intensity to be able to read university text books and understand a professor to the extent that one can participate and write intelligible analyses requires not only dedication and determination, but substantial stability. It is not sufficient to take academic English classes in writing, reading, speaking, listening and grammar. A newcomer to any country has to recreate an entire life: a new support system, new housing, health care and transportation. This entire matrix surrounding any human has to be built in an unknown language. Historically this has not been perceived to fall under the purview of the academic institution. However, it has been demonstrated that exorbitant medical bills, a lack of accessibility to money and behavioral problems had become learning inhibitors. Phone companies, banks and other community businesses are unprepared to deal with NNS. A
multitude of essential life needs can become problematic enough to inhibit learning. It is in the best interest of an IEP to ensure that this support system is in place so students can indeed study at the high level expected of them. The current study confirms Pedersen et al’s findings that students require social support to succeed (2010).

Domestic eighteen-year-olds are at the cusp of independence as well. While they may not have difficulty in negotiating with a cell-phone carrier, they are also in the process of maturation. They are aware of services like counseling, and many have a prior understanding of what it means to live with others of a similar age. Conversely, any awareness of counseling or disability services of international students specific to this institution carried stigma preventing engagement with them. Drash and Loo (2015) noted a high rate of depression in international students relative to domestic students. Gerber (2016) studied a case of aggression in Chinese students in the US that had gone all the way to murder. Conflict mitigation, depression and suicide awareness represent other basic life skills that need to be explicitly and deliberately taught in order for these international students to adapt to this new culture and have enough peace of mind to truly construct a mental image of academic English. The current study confirms Bathke and Kim’s findings that international students require mental health support to be successful (2016).

Harkening back to SLS, the social nature of language learning seems to be inclusive of all of life areas (Duff, 2007; Firth & Wagner, 1997). In order to become socialized in academic English, one also needs mentorship in other life situations. These policies were implemented with business leadership perspective to improve the organization (Bhatt, 2017; Covey, 1990; Edwards & Turnbull, 2013; Giles, 2015).
Language and age aside, personal mental and emotional growth require leadership. If the primary reason for a lack of increase in GPA is that these students are on a campus with no admission criteria (which means students had no admission criteria), then these students need basic leadership. Munkdan’s research noted that international students simply are not prepared for university study (2012). Norton noted their lack of participation (2001). Milam claimed students were being admitted for the wrong reasons (2014). Low grades and college entrance exam scores indicate the need for increased college preparedness. Teaching principles of how values relate to goals and hence to daily actions, time management, and personal responsibility could be creating a foundation for personal growth. Given that international students in general are not among the poor, this particular population has had access to English instruction for many years. Many claim they have studied English for ten years or more. The fact that they do not speak English after so many years of studying also implies the need for study skills and personal responsibility. Business-style management practices, informed by SLS, serve as a form of leadership for students.

Another factor uncovered here is the single-child policy (Kleinman, 2011). Each Chinese child has had the attention of four grandparents, who wash every dish and piece of clothing. Their needs have been catered to. They have not done chores. Neither have they had to share space/resources with a sibling. Suddenly they need to learn to do laundry and live with a roommate, with no prior experience therein. Conflict resolution/mitigation, which means here “your roommate has the right to a clean space”, can be removing a learning inhibitor. It is difficult to concentrate if continually embroiled in a fight over piles of pizza boxes and fast food containers (Kulati, 2003; Lu, 2016).
Beyond the number of children in a house, having the financial ability to study abroad for more than four years requires substantial financial backing. By nature, international students are privileged. They come from wealthy families and have not prior been introduced to the value of money. Putting them out in the midst of a poor community, reading with children, carving pumpkins, building houses, etc. teaches not only the value of money, but values in general. Interacting with values (awareness building of one’s own socio-economic status relative to others) may indeed create the impetus within the individual to achieve these goals and to build academic linguistic ability. Again, the theme of values that this IEP brings to life is informed by a combination of Change Management Theory (Halkias, Santora, Harkiolakis & Thurman, 2017; Johnson & Rundle, 2010) and SLS (James, Miller & Wykoff, 2017; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007).

Holland’s notion of figured worlds (1998) may play a role in the lack of improvement in GPA. Song also found that students returning to their native countries learned less English (2012) as they were focusing on their long-term future. Students may not participate in mainstream classes to the extent required for actualized improvement if they do not see themselves continuing to live in the US long-term. As noted in the introduction, getting a degree is the primary goal of these students. Since learning English is merely a tool, it is possible that they are not focusing on English enough to truly get to the level required to maintain a substantial GPA in chosen area of concentration.

Implications

Theoretical. Two paradigms converged for this study; so, implications in both domains are discussed. Within SLS, the idea that experts guide newcomers into academic English in a university setting has been expanded. Local experts, not just academic language experts, should
guide international students in a new country to navigate aspects of setting up a life. Even proficient speakers are not likely to understand the legalese in a ten-page document asking if they have received funding from ISIS, one of the forms to be completed by other country nationals when opening a bank account here. Bank language is specifically mentioned by Halliday (2004) as a unique context with singular hurdles and pressure. This is just one example. Helping these young adults acculturate to life services, including the meaning of signing contracts (like leases), builds an entire repertoire of language requirements for habitation in a new society. This orientation is a reminder of what Watson-Gegeo taught: producing language “is a physical embodiment of an ontology” (1992). A person is not simply a mind. A mind cannot study academic language: an entire person must take on the responsibility. This program addresses the entirety of a person, not just the mind. This social structure that naturally exists around any person, supports the complete person such that higher-level learning can take place (Matsumura, 2001). Nguyen and Kellogg (2010) advocate for building social competencies in language students.

These innovations are also called Change Management strategies (Miller & Proctor, 2016). Waters found (2009) that management in academia requires basic leadership. Stoller found that leadership within IEPs should be more inclusive of organizational aspects (1995) beyond the classroom. While management may be considered a business concept, good leadership guides any quality organization. Greaves and Sorrenson suggest outdated views on leadership in education are actually a barrier to progress (1999). In the initial stages of this IEP, new problems are defined. Although they were previously considered outside the realm of academics, this program found through this process, in order to achieve a goal, these other dimensions required management. Following through with all stages of change management, the
case for change was made to IEP and university staff, who all demonstrated buy-in. Teacher beliefs shifted. The system is sustaining.

Of significant note, many departments of the host university shifted- a necessity within the underlying paradigm, as noted by Waters (2009). Ernst, Wonder and Adler also found importance in developing a community around the language learner (2016). Halkias et al (2017) also note the importance of not only the internal department change but those with whom the department works must adapt. The Office of Diversity and Multiculturalism at this university started including materials for NNS. The Office of Advising developed training manuals for its personnel based on IEP activities. The Office of Student Activities created a series of programs called Adulting based on new student needs. The Head of Counseling traveled to China to study mental health methodologies in that country. Nearly every campus office has altered its methods based on the IEP’s holistic approach. The comprehensive IEP policies were taken up by the whole university campus.

Further involvement within the institution is student employment. Following from MacGragor and Folinazzo (2017), the campus library and dining facilities are two major departments who are now employing international students. International students can be seen making lattes and other coffees, taking orders and serving drinks to students and faculty. They are helping staff and students find resources in the library. International students are involved via employment throughout campus.

Beyond the campus, positive collaborations were built with many organizations throughout the city. Positive relationships have been built with the hospital, the Salvation Army, a local farm, banks, stores, restaurants. The city transit authority adjusted its routes and schedules based on recommendations from the IEP. Apartment complexes developed linguistically
scaffolded applications for the same reason. Transportation companies adapted methods based on the needs of the organization. The changes took root throughout the entire community due to deliberate far-reaching efforts of the change agents. Perren, Grove and Thornton advocate service-learning in ESL programs (2013) as a curricular innovation to empower students. Van Lier promotes interaction within the community for language learning (2000). Wenger called for an expansion of student communities of practice (1998). An entire field of study is dedicated to the inherent value of experiential service learning for both linguistic purposes and character building.

   Both theories mention value systems. Murray traced the dyadic relationship of beliefs and behavior (2009). This program reached its goal in all likelihood because its value system was firmly in place and relayed to anyone with a potential vested interest. The program itself embodied its value system as did the individuals in it. In line with Wenger (1998) language and behavior are here socially constructed. Following from Firth and Wagner (1997), an environment has been created in which growth can happen.

   Methodological. Because this study is based on a wide range of policies that are not all academic, numbers alone cannot demonstrate improvements in academic linguistic performance. Dialogue with a cast of stakeholders renders an image of integrated growth. Qualitative research with interviews and surveys creates a picture of this community and the meanings carried within it (2002). Many ties were created between the internationals, domestic students, university campus departments and the wider community. Hundreds of pictures of happy IEP students interacting with domestic students, university staff, and local residents show engagement with the program and imply a willingness to go along with it. That in the current term, five students transferred from other nearby IEPs because they heard it was the best, may be a sample
expression of program improvement. Grounded in this data is the theory that students require an entire community for academic linguistic advancement.

Educational research that limits itself to only the academics, could be missing valuable data regarding the why of student performance. Achievement of students of any age is not solely due to some academic initiative. Students are people that have families or support systems of some sort. Inquiries that cast a wider net, like this one, by capturing perspectives of a broad range of stakeholders, could reveal as of yet unknown factors at play. This method could prove exceptionally valuable for students of younger ages.

**Pedagogical.** IEP instructors have been trained in the teaching of English. Writing classes focus on correcting sentence formation and improving coherence in essays (Vorobel & Kim, 2011; Wang, 2016). Speaking classes often consist of listening to deliberately structured audio with a specific projected outcome (Vickers, 2007). This IEP uses 22.5 hours per week quite differently as a tool to figure in as many natural speaking engagements as possible, in line with SLS theory and practice. Instructors are trained that the most important characteristic in working here is *flexibility*. If the Office of Career Services announces a session on “Signing a Lease”, class is waylaid in favor of a real-world speaking and listening exercise and lesson plans are spontaneously built around it. Vickers found that socialization through team interaction aids in language learning (2007).

Because this study confirms what Askildson et al (2013) found, namely that service-learning improves academic English in international students, it is recommended to incorporate this practice into the curriculum. Instructors need to explicitly be made aware that flexibility in teaching methodologies is in the best interest of the student. Both that study and this one found changing from a focus on grammar to interaction to be beneficial to language development.
Called “backward design”, a lesson is built with a particular end in mind. Instead of approaching the classroom with a head filled with prior conceptions of requirements, instructors are prepared to take a new direction. A university Art History professor said that international students were having difficulty with content concepts. The IEP mined a local museum’s website for details of its current exhibitions and created vocabulary and language structure lessons from the information. Within a week, IEP students were roaming the exhibit halls on a scavenger hunt for appropriate terms and artifacts, taking selfies. After the adventure, students reflected on the deeper meaning of art within a time-period. Finally, IEP students are shown the Art History textbook and introduced to a course they will likely take. All campus mainstream classes are approached the same way. For Botany, Latin terminology for plants is taught to IEP students. Then, they walk around campus, touching different leaves, talking about this new terminology. The process is repeated. Language is co-constructed in myriad contexts as advocated by SLS (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

This program can inform other teachers to be more flexible with their methodologies, mining local opportunities. Research into educational innovations demonstrated that most fail to take root due to a lack of taking into account the specifics of any locality (Lamie, 2009; Murray, 2008; Wedell, 2009). Language is, after-all, always evolving. It is not static. Real-life language experiences should be incorporated into more language classes, at all costs.

Wedell (2009) called for educators to redefine education from consumption of knowledge to learners and teachers co-constructing knowledge. In this case, educators and students of many ages are constructing new lives, literacy tools (puppet theaters) and language.

Administrative. Waters found the degree to which educational innovations sustain themselves depends on the ability of the host institution to take up the changes (2009). One of
this host institution’s values is global competency. Therefore, supporting success of internationals fit in with its value system, a predictor of successful change implementation according to Miller and Proctor (2016). Institutions around the country are admitting international students. Are these populations encouraged to mingle? Many universities report micro-aggressions against internationals (Gomez, Khurshid, Freitag & Lachuk, 2011; Halleck, 2008; Sair, Marginson, Forbes-Mewett, Nyland, & Ramia, 2012). Self-isolation of the populations is also reported (Halic, Greenberg, & Paulus, 2009; James, Miller, & Wycoff, 2017). Finding unique ways of uniting divergent cultures is relevant not just on college campuses in the US, but for the modern world. The current study confirms Medley’s report that administrations must support social interaction for student success (2012).

In MacGregor and Folinazzo’s findings, professors reported the need for ‘global competency training’ (2017). Professors of mainstream classes need and want support in adapting to classes filled with students from varying classes.

IEP and university administrators are encouraged to look beyond the historically defined demarcation boundaries of academics to improve student outcomes. Promoting programming with internal and external stakeholders can improve linguistic capacity of participants, and also aligns with sound business recommendations (Bhatt, 2017; Voehl & Harrington, 2016). As stated in the introduction, studying in an IEP is not the goal of students. Getting a college degree is their goal. Putting IEP students in mainstream classes places them physically, mentally and socially closer to their goal, which can be motivational (Holland, 1998; Song, 2012).

It is common knowledge that universities around the country have issues with binge drinking and other unhealthy student habits (Healthy Minds). This deleterious behavior leads to needless deaths every year, but academics perceive themselves to have no need to concern
themselves with the student beyond the classroom (Greaves & Sorrenson, 1999; Turnbull & Edwards, 2005). International or not, eighteen-year-olds still need support (Yoo, 2016). It is not enough to say, “They are adults.” Anyone on their own for the first time in a new city requires people around them willing to accept them and acculturate them to the new environment. Students are not only minds. They need to learn how to take care of their minds, hearts and bodies. It is also not enough to say, “Parents should have raised them to be responsible.” Parents spend thousands of dollars each year to send their children to college to get an education to learn to become independent. The university is a bridge to independence. One does not simply turn eighteen and magically know how to deal with fender benders and breakups without guidance. In a broad sense, universities would be wise to create more holistically supportive programming and ties with surrounding community organizations. This finding is consistent with previous research.

IEP instructors need support in adapting to these measures (Greaves & Sorrenson, 1999). Not every English teacher will naturally be willing to forgo class at a moment’s notice for students to attend a seminar on resume writing, for example. It is important to get buy-in from instructors by helping them understand the ‘why’ of policies (Turnbull & Edwards, 2005; Waters, 2014). Regular instructor workshops help them understand that in addition to language structure, students need to have close contact with domestic students and their own future goal. If universities want their students to succeed, sound leadership in the form of business management can illuminate previously hidden areas for improvement. MacGregor and Folinazzo’s recommendation that institutions should find on campus employment opportunities for international students (2017) is confirmed by this study.
**Recommendations.** As can be seen by the book chapter detailing the extensive orientation (Ashe, 2018), IEPs should consider extra-academic life aspects in their design in order to improve student outcomes. As well, instituting collaboration with other university departments and classes by policy requires flexibility on the part of instructors; however, the exposure of IEP students to native speakers and natural university environments is beneficial for all involved (Duff, 2007; Ernst, Wonder & Adler, 2016; Gladwell, 2011). Acculturating instructors to this system is worth it for the program as a whole.

Further, uniting international students with the community as a matter of policy creates a system of real-life speaking opportunities and an attractive, intangible sense of community (Ashe, 2017). This recommendation is relevant for any location instituting international education and is also consistent with previous research.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

This study is primarily qualitative. Due to the size of the program, quantitative data is limited. As well, the full extent of the changes’ impact on academic linguistic ability of its participants will not be known until five years after implementation. So, these results are a preliminary indication of full potentiality. Level-exit assessments should continue to be collected to monitor program efficacy.

GPAs post-program should be collected again at the five-year mark: the point at which the Regional Director said the expected result will be achieved. Further study into other factors that produce success in university study for international students is required. In other words, the reason students’ language skill improved but their tertiary performance did not needs to be researched.
Educational research that includes perspectives of non-academic stakeholders could uncover as of yet unknown factors at play in student performance. More research that delves into student support systems as a whole is recommended.

**Chapter Summary**

A broad base of innovations applied to the academic unit of an IEP discovered hitherto unrealized areas of danger and solved many problems previously considered not related to academics. Business-style leadership of an organization with hundreds of teenagers opened opportunity for not only academic linguistic improvement but much needed behavioral development, including emotional and mental maturation. The extensive orientation around life set-up and mental health awareness carries significance for the field of international education in any country. Uniting international students with local children in literacy activities carries the potential to unite diverse populations while increasing literacy. Thus, this project could be important for any multicultural community. Sound management of an IEP, informed by business leadership theory and SLS, increases student performance.
References


Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (2011). *CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions*. Alexandria, VA.


77


Nguyen, H.T., & Kellogg, G. (2010). “I had a stereotype that Americans were fat”: Becoming a speaker of culture in a second language. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1).


Appendix A

Regional Director Interview Questions

1. What is the benefit to increasing student contact hours?
2. Why did you lengthen and add programming to orientation?
3. Why do ELC students now participate in local volunteer activities?
4. What is ‘Up! Up! Up! Up! Up!’ and why does this increase academic linguistic ability of non-native speakers?
5. Describe your mandatory attendance policy and how that increases academic linguistic ability.
6. Why did you change what classes are often and when?
7. Why do you make so many field trips?
8. Why is this program English-only?
9. Why did you have a semester-long weather broadcasting program?
10. Why did you do away with tutoring sessions?
11. Tell me about the leveling up policy.
12. Why did the health care section of the student handbook become so detailed?
13. One of the instructors mentioned an ‘end of semester level transition week’. What’s wrong with final exams?
14. What are the biggest challenges you’ve faced in this implementation?
15. What policies will you change next?
16. What have been the repercussions of any students who reached the limit of absences?
17. Have an I-20s been canceled?
Appendix B
University IEP Instructor Interview Questions

1. ‘Up! Up! Up! Up! Up!’ is one example of a policy change at the ELC. What do you think specifically about this piece of the curriculum? Do you think it is effective in teaching academic English to international students, and why?

2.Officially, attendance is mandatory. What is your experience with implementing this policy? Do you report excessive absences or tardies? Are you aware of any consequences from these absences?

3. I believe you are aware of the ENGLISH-ONLY policy. In reality, are students always speaking English in class? What are the consequences if students are not speaking English?

4. Can you think of any other policy changes that have been implemented in the past 2 years? And, are they (is it) effective?

5. As an instructor implementing these policies, what is your personal opinion of them? For example, are they difficult or easy to use?

6. Do you think students completing our program are more prepared for mainstream classes than they were 2 years ago?
Appendix C

Local Law Enforcement Agent Interview Question

Have you noticed any difference in behaviors of this population over the past two years?
Appendix D

Mainstream University Professor Anonymous Survey Questions

1. Since 2015, have you noticed improvement of ELC students' ability to follow classroom norms and rules? (i.e. take notes, do homework and participate)

2. Since 2015, have you noticed any improvement of overall academic performance of ELC Middletown students?

3. Since 2015, have you noticed improvement in academic language ability specifically of ELC Middletown students in your classes?

4. Are you aware of any of the ELC's policies that you think may have contributed to your opinion? If yes or maybe, in the 'comments' section, please write your idea of what this policy might be called. (i.e. English only)

5. Is there anything you would like to add about your recent experience with ELC students as different from or similar to 2 years ago?

6. Do you have any suggestions for the ELC?
Appendix E

Sample Speaking Assessment

1. Read the first three sentences of the article out loud. Please read clearly and loudly.

2. Read the article, answer questions A and B below.

A. What is the main idea of the article?

Mark Zuckerberg and his wife’s daughter was born last week, but the couple announced some other interesting news. They say that they will give away 99% of their Facebook shares to a new charity. With this money, they want to help make the world a better place.

The shares are worth around 45 billion dollars. The couple are now on their maternity and paternity leave at the moment – they will announce more details when they return to work.

B. If you were to give away billions of dollars, to what kind of charity would you give the money? Who would you help?
Appendix F

Sample Writing Assessment

Exit Writing
Level 3

Please note: Cell phones, translators, portable electronic players such as iPods, or websites are NOT permitted during the writing session.

You will have **one hour and ten minutes** to complete this essay.

Instructions

You are going to write a response paper. As you write, please try to convey your ideas in the highest quality manner possible.

1. Read the attached article, “Flying cars might sound crazy but some say they are right down the road” based by Scientific American taken from Newsela.com.

2. Answer the question at the end in your own words. Be sure to provide strong supporting details from the article and from your own experience. Take care to USE YOUR OWN WORDS unless you are quoting directly from the text, in which case you must use quotation marks.

3. Please type your essay in **MLA format**, as well as possible.

4. Don’t forget to give your essay a title.

5. To submit your essay, please **save the prompt on your computer** as a Word file and **upload** into your personal folder on the Drive.

When you are finished, please return **these instructions and the article** to one of the exam proctors. **If any of the materials are missing, your work will not be counted.**

Good luck!
Flying cars might sound crazy but some say they are right down the road

The dream of flying cars might not get off the ground just yet. Rising in its place is the dream of self-flying drones big enough to carry people around town. Drones are small planes without pilots that are controlled by computers. Several companies are now developing passenger drones.

Passenger drones are different from flying cars. They are autonomous, which means they operate themselves. They do not need a trained pilot. Last month, the Chinese company EHang announced that it would launch its passenger drone service in July. The company built a drone called the EHang 184. It looks like a large quadcopter with a space on top for passengers.

Last October, the Uber company publicized its Elevate program for air transportation in cities. It announced its support for companies building drones like the 184. Uber also hired Mark Moore, a scientist at NASA. Moore is an expert in vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) aircraft designs. VTOL aircraft do not require the long runways that airplanes need. As a result, they can land in busy places such as cities.

Drones Are Lighter And Cheaper To Run

Passenger drone designs use something called "distributed electric propulsion." This means that instead of having one large propeller, they have several smaller ones. Each of these has its own motor. This design makes the drones lighter, which could make them cheaper to run. But there are still some unanswered questions. It remains to be seen how much weight such a drone could lift, and for how long.
With any of these vehicles, safety is the biggest concern. That extends to both the drones and the computer systems flying them. To fly many drones without crashing them, artificial intelligence (AI) is needed. Examples of AI include computers and computer programs able to think on their own. Carrying people from point A to point B might seem simple. But even the best AI struggles with surprises.

For example, what happens when a drone's landing area is not available? What should the drone do? Those are questions asked by Sanjiv Singh, a scientist at Carnegie Mellon University. Singh believes the AI needs to be fully tested before people start using passenger drones.

**Rules Of The Road – Or Sky**

Still, some experts are hopeful about this technology. The problems can be solved, says Marilyn Smith, a scientist at Georgia Institute of Technology. The "big roadblock" is the safety guidelines that need to be put into place first, Smith says.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is in charge of the nation's skies. It has not made any rules for passenger drones yet. However, the FAA is working with NASA on ways to manage smaller drones. These rules might also apply to larger drones in the future.

NASA would like drone operators to send flight information to a central system. This would be like the air-traffic control system used for airplanes. It would track the location of drones, NASA scientist Parimal Kopardekar says. The system would show what is going on in the skies. This would make sure that drones avoid flying into each other.

**Writing Assignment:**

Referring to the article and your own experience, write about the challenges with flying cars in today’s world. What are the advantages and disadvantages to this new technology? What is the future of flying cars and what will happen to current cars that are on the ground?
# Appendix G

## Writing Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization and Structure</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexical Choices</th>
<th>Mechanics (spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Demonstrates or suggests incompetence in writing</strong></td>
<td>Sentences not related to each other and/or not related to topic</td>
<td>Inadequate organization or development</td>
<td>At least a small degree of grammatical accuracy and sentence complexity (e.g., connected clauses)</td>
<td>Limited vocabulary, repetitions of simple vocabulary</td>
<td>Serious difficulties with basic spelling, punctuation and capitalization errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Demonstrates some developing competence in writing, but remains flawed on either the rhetorical or syntactical level</strong></td>
<td>Topic not successfully or only somewhat successfully divided into non-overlapping sub-points</td>
<td>Failure to support or illustrate generalizations with appropriate or sufficient detail</td>
<td>Common errors: tense mix-ups, SV agreement</td>
<td>Word form errors</td>
<td>Frequent spelling, punctuation and capitalization errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Demonstrates minimal competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels</strong></td>
<td>Addresses the writing topic adequately</td>
<td>Adequately organized with a clear objective</td>
<td>Some control of sophisticated grammatical structures and sentence complexity</td>
<td>More varied vocabulary, synonyms</td>
<td>Some spelling, basic punctuation and capitalization errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Demonstrates competence in writing on both rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it will have occasional errors</strong></td>
<td>Complex, sophisticated development of ideas supporting the topic</td>
<td>Clear objective with well-organized main points and multiple supporting details</td>
<td>Sufficient control of complex grammatical structures with occasional language difficulties still a distraction</td>
<td>Demonstrates variety and range of vocabulary with some academic vocabulary</td>
<td>In frequent spelling errors, some errors in more sophisticated punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Demonstrates higher level of competence in writing on both rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it will have occasional errors</strong></td>
<td>Well-structured essay with a clear thesis representing the writer’s purposes, abundant supporting evidence from both personal and non-personal content</td>
<td>Clear, logical and well-organized supporting information and ideas</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent time frames through appropriate use of verb tenses</td>
<td>In frequent word form errors</td>
<td>Occasional surface errors occur as a surprise amid otherwise smooth writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

English Language Center Writing Assessment Rubric
Adapted with permission from the 2013 Ohio Program of Intensive English, Ohio University. Adapted from the TOEFL Test of Written English.
## Appendix H

### Listening and Speaking Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1 Beginner</th>
<th>Level 2 Low Intermediate</th>
<th>Level 3 Intermediate</th>
<th>Level 4 High-Intermediate</th>
<th>Level 5 Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Speaking Production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very hard to understand</td>
<td>Hard to understand</td>
<td>Somewhat hard to understand</td>
<td>Usually intelligible</td>
<td>Native-like, natural speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple isolated phrases</td>
<td>Simple sentences, simple descriptions</td>
<td>More detailed answers, some variation in sentence structure</td>
<td>Developed speech with a number of details, various sentence structures used</td>
<td>Well-developed descriptions on complex subjects, variety of sentence structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, frequent pauses and hesitations</td>
<td>Pauses often to search for appropriate sentence structure, grammar and vocabulary</td>
<td>Infrequent pauses</td>
<td>Speaks relatively fluently</td>
<td>Speaks fluently</td>
<td>Shows good control of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Listening Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped listening skills impede on communication</td>
<td>Weak listening skills slow down communication</td>
<td>Some issues with listening comprehension</td>
<td>Good listening skills</td>
<td>Developed listening skills make communication easy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very hard to understand</td>
<td>Hard to understand (repeats occasionally to be understood)</td>
<td>Somewhat hard to understand</td>
<td>Usually intelligible (seldom needs to repeat to be understood)</td>
<td>Enunciates clearly with appropriate rate, volume, and intonation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited vocabulary</td>
<td>Basic vocabulary</td>
<td>More varied vocabulary</td>
<td>Sufficient vocabulary to express ideas</td>
<td>Adjusts vocabulary according to topic and purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited grammar</td>
<td>Uses basic grammar</td>
<td>Distinguishes between tenses</td>
<td>Common errors: word forms confused (e.g. adj/noun), missing articles</td>
<td>Grammar errors do not interfere with understanding</td>
<td>Insignificant grammar errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common errors: uses one tense, verb omissions, SVO</td>
<td>Common errors: tense mix-ups, SV agreement,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

**Common European Reference Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL OF EUROPE LEVELS</th>
<th>GLOBAL ABILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 Basic user</strong></td>
<td>Breakthrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday Expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 Basic user</strong></td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1 Independent user</strong></td>
<td>Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 Independent user</strong></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand the ideas of complex text on concrete and abstract topics, including discussions in his/her field of specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1 Proficient user</strong></td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2 Proficient user</strong></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarize information from spoken and written sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IEP levels and corresponding CERF Global Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEP levels</th>
<th>CERF Global Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Beginner</td>
<td>A1 Basic Breakthrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 High Beginner / Low Intermediate</td>
<td>A2 Basic Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Intermediate</td>
<td>B1 Independent Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 High Intermediate, Conditional Admission</td>
<td>B2 Independent Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Advanced, Full Admission</td>
<td>C1 &amp; 2 Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>