

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9100442

**Identification of critical issues related to advisory committee
composition and role in four-year hospitality education programs**

Huss, James Joseph, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1990

U·M·I

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**



Identification of critical issues related to
advisory committee composition and role in
four-year hospitality education programs

by

James Joseph Huss

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Role of Advisory Committees in Education	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Study	1
Research on Advisory Committees	2
Scope of the Study	5
Need for the Study	6
Implications and Educational Significance	7
Operational Definitions of Terms	8
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Introduction and Purpose Of Advisory Committees	13
Early Research Studies of Citizen Involvement	14
Citizen Involvement in Education	15
Advisory Committees	18
Procedure for Working with Hospitality Program Advisory Committees	30
Research to Determine Advisory Committee Use in Hospitality Programs: Delphi	35
Delphi Procedure	38
Modifications to the Delphi Research Technique	42
Summary	44
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	45
Introduction and Objectives	45
Subjects	46

Instrumentation	48
Analyses for Reporting to Panel	52
Summarizing Results	52
RESULTS	54
CEO Personal Information	54
CEO Program Information	56
Advisory Committee Personal and Professional Information	58
Delphi Results	58
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
Summary	85
Conclusions	89
Recommendations	95
Future Studies	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	109a
APPENDIX A: COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE TO DETERMINE PANEL, INTRODUCE EACH ROUND AND ENCOURAGE CONTINUATION	110a
APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING EACH DELPHI ROUND AND DELPHI ROUND 2 INSTRUMENT	121
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF DELPHI PANEL COMMENTS FOR ROUNDS 1, 2 AND 3 (Tables C-1, C-2, C-3)	134
APPENDIX D: DELPHI PANEL ROUND 1, 2, AND 3 STATEMENT RATINGS BY MEAN, MEDIAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION (TABLE D-1)	152

APPENDIX E:	DELPHI PANEL ROUND 3 STATEMENTS	166
	CATEGORIED AND RANKED BY STANDARD	
	DEVIATION (Table E-1) AND MEAN (Table E-2)	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	CEOs personal demographic data	55
Table 2.	Educational hospitality program data as reported by CEOs	57a
Table 2A.	Additional hospitality program data as reported by CEOs	57b
Table 3.	Advisory Committee Members' demographic data	59
Table 4.	Composition of advisory committees	62
Table 5.	Effectiveness of advisory committee	66
Table 6.	Curriculum	68
Table 7.	Physical facilities	71
Table 8.	Financial	72
Table 9.	General activities	75
Table 10.	Industry program/faculty assistance	78
Table 11.	Program evaluation	81
Table 12.	Public relations	82
Table 13.	Recruitment, selection, and placement	83
Table C-1.	Summary of Delphi panel round 1 comments	135
Table C-2.	Summary of Delphi panel round 2 comments	141
Table C-3.	Summary of Delphi panel round 3 comments	147
Table D-1.	Mean, median, and standard deviation of 60 statements for Rounds 1-3	153
Table E-1.	Delphi panel round 3 statements categorized and ranked by standard deviation	165
Table E-2.	Delphi panel round 3 statements ranked by mean rating	172

INTRODUCTION

The Role of Advisory Committees in Education

Advisory committees within the educational community have existed since 1911, when a committee was established to advise a school board about an agriculture education program (Cochran, Phelps, and Cochran, 1980). A major impetus for citizens' advisory committees came from the national Citizens Commission for Public Schools. Prominent laymen and educators founded the Commission in 1949 to advocate citizens' involvement in public education (Coy, 1969).

The Citizen's Commission was designed to get people involved and interested in public schools and to make the public aware of its right to participate in school affairs. The White House Conference on Education in 1955 is an example of the national recognition for public participation in education.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

This study was an investigation of public participation in higher education through advisory committees, with a specific application to hospitality programs in four-year degree granting higher education institutions.

The purpose of the study was to identify and prioritize issue statements relative to the effective use of advisory committees by four-year hotel, restaurant, and institution

management and travel and tourism administration programs. The study provided a consensus of opinions of selected hospitality program Chief Educational Officers (CEOs) and members of their advisory committees regarding advisory committee functions.

Study objectives were:

1. Identify four-year hospitality programs with advisory committees;
2. Identify and rank advisory committee issue statements of importance to four-year hospitality/tourism programs where advisory committees were used;
3. Identify issue statements in which there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in level of agreement between CEOs and advisory committee panel member;
4. Recommend to hospitality program CEOs issues to which advisory committee members could most likely provide assistance, support, and consultation.

Research on Advisory Committees

More impetus for advisory committee involvement came with the passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act, which gave citizens the legal right to be involved in vocational education programs. Citizen participation was enhanced further with the passage of the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482), which required post-secondary

educational institutions requesting federal funds to consult with local advisory councils.

Advisory committees have evolved through the process of lay participation and interest in education. School boards and school administrators have responded to that process by initiating citizens' advisory committees (Trail, 1984). They have emerged as an important vehicle for citizen involvement in school affairs during the past 25 years. More than one million citizens serve in some capacity on advisory boards in the United States (Davies, Stanton, Clasby, Zerhykov & Powers, 1978). Approximately 100,000 of these citizens serve as members of vocational-technical advisory programs (Burt & Lessinger, 1970).

Numerous studies have been conducted which provide descriptive and demographic data about advisory committees in the educational setting. Fusco (1964) analyzed two surveys conducted during the 1950s on advisory committee concerns about curriculum and school policy. Stemnock (1968) determined the types of advisory committees and how they were used by school boards and individual programs. Cochran, Phelps, and Cochran (1980) identified advisory committee functions and the nature of their tasks in Michigan schools. Additional analysis by other researchers provided information on the potential uses of advisory committees, classifications of advisory committees for

further study, and descriptions of what advisory committees do.

Vocational advisory groups have been viewed as a way in which educators can communicate effectively with the community (McArtor, 1987). Even without official status but in a consultative function, a hospitality program advisory committee can be essential to the success of a local program, according to Hayes, Keefer and Cummings (1986).

Functions of hospitality program advisory groups vary. Green (1981) reported on a hospitality advisory committee's functions: To give advice, provide educators with a clear picture of what is happening in the industry and help acquire financial support as well as educational assistance. Hayes, Keefer and Cummings (1986) identified the additional tasks of acquiring travel funds, equipment, and scholarships, and promoting programs.

Hospitality program advisory committees work with the Chief Educational Officer (CEO), who may be the department head, department chair, dean, director, or other person who has administrative responsibility for the hospitality program. Hospitality program CEOs have primary responsibility for the planning, development and guidance of hospitality programs; they also have the available resources to implement those programs. They are the designated leaders most knowledgeable about all phases of the

hospitality program and the most appropriate person to interact with colleagues, administrators, and the public on the development of the program to meet the needs of students and the industry.

Scope of the Study

This study was limited to four-year baccalaureate degree-granting programs holding membership in the International Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Education (CHRIE), the professional organization and accrediting body for hospitality education.

Issue statements to be addressed in the investigation were identified by Bloom (1978); Borsenik (1980), Green (1981); and Hayes, Keefer and Cummings (1986) in studies of hospitality program advisory committees; the Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council (1984); and Trail (1984) in a study of school superintendents' advisory committee productivity indicators. The issue statements were divided into 10 categories:

Advisory Committee Composition

Advisory Committee Effectiveness

Curriculum

Facilities

Financial

General Activities

Instructional Program/Faculty Assistance

Program Evaluation

Public Relations

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

Need for the Study

Although much has been written about the use of citizen's advisory committees in secondary and vocational education programs, little or no information is available about the use of advisory committees in four-year colleges and universities. Even less information is available on advisory committee use in four-year hospitality programs. A computerized search of the Educational Resources Information Center data base for the period 1966-1986 yielded one resource on the use of advisory committees or boards in four-year hospitality programs out of 2,020 documents on advisory committees and boards.

There is a need to study advisory committees in four-year hospitality programs. Moreover, there is a need to determine if there is agreement between advisory committee members and hospitality program CEOs as to how the advisory committees should function, and the issue statements or areas of the program which committee members consider most important.

Earlier research which identified those issue statements (Bloom, 1978; Borsenik, 1980; Green, 1981; Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings, 1986; Iowa Vocational Education Advisory

Council, 1984; and Trail, 1984) were in reports filed by hospitality program CEOs, a state level advisory council, and school superintendents. Non-academic committee members were not surveyed.

In addition, Caldwell (1974), Douglas (1974), and Trotter (1977) have noted disagreement among program advisory committee members and the educator in charge on the functions of advisory councils and committees. This research answered a need to determine the importance of the identified issue statements; to determine if some issue statements were more important than others, and to verify that all issues had been identified. It also was very important to know if there was disagreement between hospitality program CEOs and advisory committee members about the importance of the issues.

Implications and Educational Significance

A hospitality program advisory committee can be essential to the success of a local program, according to Hayes, Keefer and Cummings (1986). The hospitality program CEO could be in a unique position in the university-public structure to support outside participation from business and trade through advisory committees. Hospitality program CEOs could use the research results to generate support and consultation for their program, and to initiate advisory committees.

The program CEO, because of his/her position and expertise, could be a necessary part and the initiator of these advisory committees. Better understanding of the issue statements of concern by hospitality program CEOs based on reports from their peers could provide for more effective leadership, educational management, and involvement by industry and the public.

Operational Definitions of Terms

The definitions for advisory committees, councils, hospitality programs and the people who administer them are defined as follows.

Advisory committee

Men and women selected from segments of the hospitality industry and other appropriate areas to advise program CEOs at colleges and universities regarding one or more educational programs.

Advisory committee was the term used in this paper to identify a council, board, or group which assists in the development and maintenance of a program, provide consultation, and make suggestions and recommendations to the faculty and administration of a two or four year educational institution. The committee should meet occasionally as a group.

Hospitality program

A four-year college-level course of study in hotel and restaurant management, tourism, travel and transport, country club management, and institutional food service management. The programs qualifying for this study were selected from the membership of the International Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management, the accrediting organization of four-year hospitality programs.

Chief Educational Officer (CEO)

The department head, department chair, dean, director, or other person who has administrative responsibility for the hospitality program.

Issue

A point in question or a matter in dispute; of special or public importance (Random House, 1980).

Function

The kind of action or activity proper to any person or thing (Random House, 1980).

Curriculum

The aggregate of courses of study in a four-year hospitality program, to include course subject matter, special training and developing educational objectives.

Advisory committee effectiveness

The ability to produce the desired results, such as program improvements, determine their productivity, accomplish objectives, and adequate preparation.

Advisory committee composition

The make-up of advisory committees in terms of education, experience, selection of new members, responsibilities, number of terms served, and professional station.

Physical facilities

A hospitality program building, classrooms, and instructional equipment.

Financial

The monetary resources of a hospitality program, including budgets, instructional equipment, and student loans.

General activities

Advisory committee duties which focus on trends in hospitality education, education and experience of students' employment opportunities, and meetings of advisory committees.

Instructional program/faculty assistance

Advisory committees' work with instructors, faculty visits, field trips, student awards, guest lecture, in-service training for faculty and research needs.

Program evaluation

Systematic process to determine extent to which hospitality program has accomplished objectives.

Public relations

Efforts of a hospitality program to promote good will between itself and the public.

Recruitment, selection, and placement

Advisory committee activities with students to explain and promote career opportunities, internships, graduate placement, and the hospitality program.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For this study, research on advisory committees has been grouped in three categories: Advisory committees, hospitality advisory committees, and the Delphi research technique which was the methodology selected for this investigation.

Research applicable to advisory committees commences with early research studies on advisory groups, then progresses to the use of citizens' advisory committees in education, types of citizens' advisory committees and their roles, followed by advisory groups and vocational-technical education, and productivity of advisory groups.

The review continues with reports of research on advisory committee use in hospitality education, the functions and benefits of hospitality advisory committees, the roles of hospitality advisory committees, procedures for developing and working with hospitality advisory groups, and financial support provided by a hospitality advisory committee. The section ends with a review of research on the recognition of hospitality advisory committee members.

The last part of the research review on methodology begins with procedures for collecting information about the hospitality program and advisory committee, information needed about the committee, the use of the Delphi technique to gather data, identify issues, develop and administer the

Delphi questionnaire. It concludes with a review of research about problems with future predictions, and a summary.

Introduction and Purpose Of Advisory Committees

"Advisory committee" will be the term used to identify a council, board, or group which 1) assists in the development and maintenance of an educational program; 2) provides consultation, and 3) makes suggestions and recommendations to the faculty and administration of a four-year educational institution.

The terms "advisory council", "advisory committee", and "advisory board" were used to identify citizen and industry representatives who have been organized by schools for the purpose of advising program directors about curriculum. All terms appeared to be used in the literature interchangeably, although a "council" tended to be a state level committee, a "committee" tended to identify a local program, and "board" tends to be used infrequently. Martin (Agric. Ed., Iowa State University, personal communication, 1986) defines a council as a more policy-oriented group than a committee, which is more goal-directed with a single focus.

The Iowa State Advisory Council on Vocational Education Resource Guide (1984) divides vocational councils into program advisory councils and general advisory councils. Program advisory councils work with a school board to plan,

develop, evaluate, and keep current a single program. General advisory councils assist the school administration in matters relating to coordinating all programs; they function at local, state, and national levels.

Early Research Studies of Citizen Involvement

Citizen involvement in the community began with civilization. According to Johnson and Johnson (1975), civilization began when individuals formed groups to obtain mutual benefits and find the means to improve their quality of life.

Likewise, citizens have participated in governmental affairs for centuries. In the United States, citizens participated in government even while under colonial rule. Colonists attended town meetings and frequently discussed schooling for young people. Today, citizens' advisory committees are a continuation of the need and desire of people to be involved in the government and education of its citizenry.

More than one million citizens serve in some capacity with different kinds of advisory groups in the United States (Davies, Stanton, Clasby, Zerhykov and Powers, 1978). Approximately 100,000 citizens serve as members of vocational-technical advisory programs (Burt & Lessinger, 1970). These groups have been credited with enhancing the quality of life by changing industrial processes, providing

advice for improving business procedures, influencing governmental policy, and shaping the direction of vocational programs. In addition, research has shown that vocational advisory groups provide educators with a way to communicate with the community (McArtor, 1987).

Legislation has also mandated citizen involvement in education. Passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act gave citizens the legal right to participate in decisions regarding vocational education. Citizen involvement was increased with passage of the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482), which required post-secondary educational institutions requesting federal funds to consult with local advisory councils.

Citizen Involvement in Education

The development of public schooling has occurred through citizen participation and interest. The fundamental basis for education has been through citizens who established local schools, constructed buildings, supervised instruction, and approved taxes for support (Hamlin, 1952). As a result of this involvement, citizens want to continue to participate in education because they are concerned about costs, curricula used by the schools, and the welfare of young people attending those schools. They also wanted to see the community benefit by offering a sound educational system.

However, the level of citizen participation in education is affected by the size of the educational system. Gonder (1977) found that as the educational system grew, operation of the schools became further removed from its citizenry. Boards of larger school systems hired school administrators to develop programs, carry out operations, and provide advice to the board. When citizens disagreed with decisions made by administrators, the citizens felt the school board was more responsive to its administrators than to them (Hamlin, 1952). The research showed that although board members sought advice from neighbors and friends about future decisions, citizen participation was not direct. Hamlin theorized that the educational system had become so large that the general population believed that its opinions and advice were insignificant. As an example of this diffusion of influence, Gonder (1977) estimated that a school board member represented 138 patrons in 1900, whereas in 1974, each school board member represented approximately 2,500 people.

The size of the educational system also changes the method of citizen involvement. Salisbury (1979) found that even as the school system grew in size and complexity, citizens wanted to be involved in the operation of their schools. Salisbury theorized that superintendents and program directors who ignored this desire for input found

that additional funding and new programs had little public support. Some school administrators have responded by initiating citizens' advisory committees to seek patron input in the decision-making process or public approval of a school plan or policy (Trail, 1984).

The citizens' role in school affairs also has been affected by other developments. Local policy options have been eroded by greater state and federal involvement through allocation of funds, court decisions, legislative actions, civil rights, collective bargaining, and equal employment opportunities. Lay people resented the intrusion of big government (Davies, 1981).

McArtor (1987) studied local advisory council members in Maryland and their perceptions of the importance of their functions compared with council productivity. He found that advisory committee productivity was most influenced by mandated activities, member experience, and general activities, although he noted that "other variables not revealed in the research and taken in combination had a far more profound effect on productivity" (p. 86). The number of meetings of advisory committee members per unit time was inversely related to their productivity, i.e., more meetings decreased productivity.

Committees to advise vocational and trade schools existed before the passage of the Vocational Education Act

of 1963, but the legislative status was an additional indication of public mandate. Many citizen groups were spurred to formation because of the growth in numbers of students during the 1950s. Coy (1969) estimated that 1,500 committees with 17,000 members existed in 1950. During this time, the number of school districts in the United States decreased from 84,000 to 16,900 (Tyack, 1981). Patrons with an interest in how public schools were operated and how tax dollars were spent in education sought to maintain a role in the decision-making process. It is estimated that 17 percent of American adults representing 22 million people belong to some school organization (Salisbury, 1979).

Advisory Committees

Advisory committee classifications

Citizens' advisory committees have been identified as mandated, citizen-initiated, and school board-initiated.

Mandated citizens' advisory committees are required by federal or state law and usually receive funds from a government act. These committees were reported to be rather ineffective because of the absence of clear-cut tasks, lack of a government effort to use them as social forces, and a survival mentality as funds diminished (USHEW, 1979).

Citizen-initiated advisory committees are started by persons who seek to affect educational decisions or

policies. They are considered pressure groups and are further subdivided as special interest, crisis-oriented, and school affiliated, such as parent teacher organizations (Hamlin, 1952).

School board-initiated advisory committees are the third type of citizens' advisory committees. They appear to be comparable to existing four-year hospitality advisory committees. They are initiated for two reasons: 1) to improve communication between the school board and the community; and 2) to have a mechanism for communication when the board anticipates a particular need or problem that requires citizen participation (Miller, 1975). The committee may be continuous or ad-hoc. A continuous committee has an unlimited life span, its purpose is general, and formal provision is made to replace outgoing members and elect officers. An ad-hoc committee is formed for a specific purpose with appointed members to one-time terms.

Advisory committee roles

Cochran, Phelps, and Cochran (1980) emphasized that the primary role of an advisory committee is to provide counsel. The group has no legal, legislative, or administrative status. The Institute for Responsive Education identified additional roles of advocacy and service for advisory committees (USHEW, 1979). Advocacy committees are assigned

to study, gather information and make recommendations to the school board about specific community situations, problems, or proposals that are new to the board or will receive future consideration. Advocacy committees also may promote adoption of the findings and advocate public support once the proposal has board approval. Oldham (1973) has observed that the functions of these committees tend to gradually change from consultative to operational in nature.

The type of school advisory committee tasks has evolved with the general education and social problems of the times, according to Cochran, Phelps, and Cochran (1980). Most recently, advisory committees have shared power with boards of education and addressed such issues as minority groups, teachers' unions, student dress codes, attendance policies, textbook selection, and expenditures. The committees sometimes became hostile to board efforts and were accepted reluctantly or even rejected by school authorities (Cochran, Phelps & Cochran, 1980).

McArtor (1987) studied the use of advisory councils in Maryland. Advisory councils included the State Advisory Councils on Vocational-Technical Education and "county-wide" advisory councils. He stated that typical functions of local advisory councils included the development of methods to facilitate the use of local community services and talents, and help in the establishment of more industry

support for education. McArtor saw advisory councils as a communications network between education and business or industry.

Local vocational-technical advisory groups operate subject to certain concepts and principles of social psychology which govern all groups and affect their ability to accomplish its goals (Beal, Bohlen, and Raudabaugh, 1975). McArtor (1987) measured how members of advisory councils perceive the importance of their group's functions as a major factor in determining the advisory council's productivity. He concluded that the committees work in functional areas was not a high priority with members. Functional areas listed by McArtor were student recruitment, student selection, placement, instructional programs, teacher assistance, student recognition, and public relations. Meeting the mandatory regulations carried a high priority with the members.

Length of experience on the council was a significant indicator of productivity. This finding challenges the effectiveness of a policy in which new members are appointed every three years on a rotating schedule. McArtor (1987) concluded that the more experienced members were likely to be more productive than less experienced members, as measured by their effect on the number of job placements for

vocational graduates, one of the productivity indicators selected.

Frequent meetings, beyond a minimum, also were found to have an increasingly deleterious effect on advisory council output in McArtor's research. He theorized that frequent meetings increased non-productive socialization and that busy advisory council members resented having frequent meetings in their personal schedules. Both factors led to ineffective individual participation in council functions, McArtor theorized.

McArtor's final recommendations for a productive local advisory council were to 1) conduct pre-service and in-service training for members; 2) stress mandatory functions of the committee; 3) maintain a high proportion of experienced members on the committee, and 4) give careful consideration to the interval between meetings and publish agendas and expected results of each meeting in advance.

Paul and Braden (1979) believed that the role of advisory councils is not properly defined, and that councils must depend on program administrators and program instructors for direction. Curriculum planning was an important issue for Farrah (1962) and McKune (1965), who determined in separate studies that advisory councils were ineffective in curriculum planning. McKenna (1973) concluded that members of advisory councils believed that

their groups did not effect the school's educational environment. Other researchers have noted the disagreement on the functions of advisory councils (Caldwell, 1974; Douglas, 1974; Trotter, 1977).

The Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council (1984) suggested that advisory committee members prepare lists of possible candidates for nomination to their committee. These lists would be reviewed by instructors and school administrators. The guide suggested that the instructor contact the preferred candidate regarding availability and interest in the position but that appointment be made by an official action of the chief administrator. The guide suggested terms of two and three years, but not more than six years. The guide states that professional educators should not serve as advisory council members.

Stadt, Bittle, Kenneke, and Mystrom (1974) studied the usefulness of advisory committees for development of hospitality curricula. Specifically addressing occupational advisory committees, they stated: "Occupational Advisory Committees consist of people who are aware of occupation information in their professional specialities and they are asked to pass this information on to the programs that are preparing future workers for their specific industry" (p. 27).

Advisory committee function

Bloom (1978) stated that the advisory committee's function in hospitality programs is determined by the assigned role. This role, of course, would be dictated by the hospitality program's area of specialization, the number of years the program has existed, the program size, and community needs. Bloom used advisory committees in hospitality education to promote closer cooperation and better understanding among the industry, general public, and the educational institution. An advisory committee, without official status but in its consultative function, can be essential to the success of a local program (Hayes, Keefer and Cummings, 1986). The success can be financial, as Hayes et al. (1986) stated:

It comes as no surprise to administrators in hospitality education that it has become increasingly difficult to develop and maintain a quality hospitality program if that program must operate solely on the funding supplied by the educational institution in which it is housed. . . Enrollment growth, escalating faculty salaries, and increasing costs for education goods and services have stretched already tight operational budgets to their limit. When this occurs, one is forced to seek added support either internally or externally (p. 41).

Green (1981) said the function of an advisory committee should be to give advice and provide educators with a clear picture of what is happening in the industry. Hayes et al. (1986) believed the advisory committee in a four-year hotel and restaurant program should provide for needs that cannot

be met by the institutions, such as scholarships, program promotion, travel dollars, and equipment purchases.

Borsenik (1980) identified eight functions of a hospitality advisory committee:

1. Set standards for student selection;
2. Make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the course;
3. Aid in the placement of graduates;
4. Make recommendations regarding the content of the courses;
5. Help the school obtain competent instructors;
6. Assist in the development of informational programs;
7. Secure effective management and labor cooperation;
8. Notify the schools of trends in educational requirements and employment opportunities in the hospitality industry (p. 69).

Advisory committee benefits

The benefits of using advisory committees are well documented by directors of vocational and two-year post-secondary programs. Hayes et al. (1986) identified four characteristics of four-year hospitality programs that were consistent recipients of industry support:

1. They set high standards for themselves, their students, and their faculty;
2. They viewed industry as their ally, not an adversary;
3. They were responsive to the needs of industry, their students, and their institutions;

4. They communicated their needs to advisory committees.

An advisory committee should benefit the hospitality program, the industry and the community. According to Bloom (1978):

In general, when advisory committees convene, both the program and the community benefit from the exchange between educators and professionals. A program that neglects this exchange denies its students the maximum measure of assistance that could and should be available to them--assistance that is the natural product of interaction between those who educate and train students and those who ultimately hire them (p. 46).

In most cases, according to Green (1981), the advisory committee is comprised of employers and employees in the professional aspects of the career program. He states that "...programs that use the advisory committee wisely are generally viable and successful" (p. 67). Advisory committees are established for financial support as well as educational assistance. Bloom (1978) listed 22 ways an advisory committee can help:

1. Advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupation;
2. Help develop instructional content;
3. Advise on those changes and trends in the hospitality industry that affect training and employment;
4. Help evaluate an overall hospitality education program;
5. Help determine the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires;

6. Visit the campus early in the year to welcome and encourage hospitality students;
7. Initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by the faculty;
8. Help find jobs for hospitality graduates and "interns";
9. Arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials;
10. Arrange for appropriate field trips;
11. Present panel discussions to students and civic groups;
12. Suggest news and feature stories to local newspapers and help in their publication;
13. Arrange to publicize the hospitality program in the meetings and bulletins of civic groups, chambers of commerce, and other groups;
14. Help select recipients of various awards and scholarships;
15. Participate in special hospitality career opportunity programs;
16. Help delineate the aptitudes, attitudes, education, and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry;
17. Help locate industry resource people to augment the work of the local instructors;
18. Conduct in-service programs for the faculty members;
19. Help influence local, state, and federal legislation in ways favorable to hospitality education;
20. Help identify research needed in hospitality education and in the industry;
21. Help develop an in-house philosophy and educational objectives for the program;

22. Help 'articulate' the local hospitality program with those of other schools, colleges, and universities (pp. 40-41).

Advisory committee implementation

According to Hayes et al. (1986), it is important to secure university administration approval and support for the advisory committee and have a plan for development funds within the college which will be used specifically for hospitality programs. Contributions to the program should be acknowledged with a letter from the college dean and a letter from the president of the university.

Many programs lack solid industry support simply because they do not communicate their needs, according to Hayes et al. (1986). These and other statements by administrators of hotel and restaurant programs were documented in a survey conducted by Sandler (1985) for the National Industry for the Foodservice Industry (NIFI). The survey revealed a lack of communication between educators and industry. The following quotes from hotel and restaurant management administrators were cited in Sandler's report (cited in Hayes et al., 1986):

"The problem in many cases is simply the failure of the school merely to ask";

"The state restaurant association and its board of directors have been helpful. If we in foodservice education would make our needs known, this might help. Of course, the association's finances are limited also";

"The problem does not lie solely with the industry. We are extremely understaffed and do not have warm bodies to make contact with all members of the industry in our areas. Those we have contacted have been extremely helpful" (p. 114).

Advisory committee membership

According to Bloom (1978), a general advisory committee and a single purpose committee can be used to provide information to the program head. A general advisory committee helps to develop, maintain, and coordinate entire hospitality education programs for vocational schools, two-year colleges, and four-year colleges. This committee could pinpoint educational needs that provide for a realistic and practical program, provide for a community understanding of hospitality education, and build local respect and support for hospitality education. A single-purpose committee is used to develop programs in specific areas, such as hotel management, restaurant management, institution management, dietetics, and tourism.

Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) stated that interested community people should be considered, but some will not have time and others will think their ideas will not be taken seriously. They recommended members who would provide a diversity of opinion.

Bloom (1978) determined that members should have: 1) experience in the specialized areas they will advise; 2) adequate time for committee work; 3) a sense of

responsibility, civic mindedness, and cooperative nature; and 4) recognition in the community as employers and employees, college trained and representatives of organized labor, civic and professional clubs, and media representatives.

Procedure for Working with Hospitality

Program Advisory Committees

Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) reported that program directors set the tone for an advisory committee and are responsible for using the knowledge and expertise of the advisory committee members. The letters of appointment should come from the program director, dean, or president. The hospitality department chair should appoint a first-year committee chair who is well known, respected, and committed to hospitality education. Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) suggested that the new committee chair be responsible for a meeting location and date. In addition, the new committee chair would be the first person from whom to request a contribution.

Hayes, a hospitality program department head, reported that his advisory committee was called a "Booster Board." A "Booster President" worked with the "Booster Board" much the same as an advisory committee. Continuity was provided by the hospitality program director, but the board was allowed to function as an autonomous group. The institution

assisted boosters by typing agendas, minutes, and promotional materials, and by attending committee meetings. Board members suggested and contacted potential members. According to Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986), a "Booster Board" used this plan to develop industry support:

1. The Booster Board determined the needs of the hospitality program;
2. The Booster Board secured university administration approval;
3. The Booster Board established a support group;
4. The Booster Board assisted in the group's efforts;
5. The Booster Board recognized supporters' contributions.

Bloom (1978) listed 14 suggestions for working with a hospitality education advisory committee:

1. A firm commitment between school administration and faculty must be made. Goals should be set and reviewed periodically.
2. Potential members are officially invited to serve on the committee.
3. Committee members should be oriented to the functions and objectives of the hospitality education program.
4. Periodic reports of progress should be made.
5. Committee members should be invited to department meeting, graduation, and social gathering such as noon luncheons.
6. Arrangements are made for committee members to meet students.
7. The advice of committee members is sought.

8. Committee members are not involved in menial tasks or approach tasks that require a lot of time, research, or expertise outside their area.
9. An agenda is prepared for each meeting to brief members with all the information necessary for discussion, including minutes after the meeting.
10. Give generous credit to committee members on program publications, catalogs, brochures, and press releases.
11. When committee proposals are sound, they should be adopted or told why they were not.
12. The program director must be ready to accept constructive criticism gracefully.
13. The program director must show a commitment to serving the community rather than gaining publicity for a program.
14. Meetings must be held at regular intervals and committee members consulted between meetings.

Financial support

The combination of financial support and all other kinds of support are difficult to separate. Although hospitality programs which use advisory committees state that development of quality programs is their first priority, many have as members of the advisory committee people who can provide financial support for the program (Bloom, 1978).

Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) cautioned that advisory committees should not be the first source of financial support for a hospitality program. The financial need first must be stated to administration within the college or university. Fund development offices can be of

great assistance in securing external support, but they cannot provide the same insight as the program director. "No one is more qualified to tell our story than we are", according to Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986). With a limited alumni base, Hayes used an advisory committee to develop an annual giving program which has proved most successful in generating supplementary funds for the program's scholarship, travel, and promotional budgets. Equipment donations and unrestricted funds, to be used for areas of greatest need, also are required if a program is to move from providing students with a good education to providing them with an excellent one.

Involving faculty

Getting the faculty involved in working with the advisory committee can be a challenge. Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) recommended involvement of the faculty by offering faculty a percentage of the money they helped raise for scholarships. The faculty attended "Booster meetings," talked with "Booster club" members, and solicited money for scholarships and the program. It was important for the faculty to learn how to deal with rejection, too. The "booster board" controlled the scholarship money, which was given to a department foundation and allocated as Booster scholarships.

Recognition

Hayes, Keefer, and Cummings (1986) recommended an annual "Boosters" dinner to be attended by advisory committee members, students, hospitality program faculty and spouses, and university representatives. They suggested that a speaker with a national reputation be invited to present the program. At that time, student scholarships could be awarded and plaques could be presented to booster members.

The Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council (1984) recommended the following procedures to recognize the work of the council:

1. Present the council with framed certificates.
2. Use member names in the minutes.
3. Verbally recognize member contributions.
4. Report on adoption of committee recommendations.
5. Send personal letters.
6. Invite members to observe the implementation of their recommendations.
7. Invite members to ground-breaking events.
8. Introduce members at other meetings.
9. Present certificates at a dinner.
10. Publicize council activities in newspapers.
11. Distribute brochures with council members' pictures.
12. Hang a framed picture of the council and their purpose in a conspicuous place.

13. Include the council's picture in any alumni newsletters.

Research to Determine Advisory Committee

Use in Hospitality Programs: Delphi

The Delphi technique was selected to identify the perceptions and opinions of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management department chairs, deans, and directors and selected members of their advisory committees.

A Delphi panel was identified by Dalkey (1971) of Rand Corporation as a technique based on repeated consultation with informed people. Its purpose was to solicit the panel's best judgement about when a specified event is likely to occur, which provides the researcher with systematic reports as to the judgements of the Delphi group. Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975) defined the Delphi technique as a group process which uses written responses rather than face to face contact. Linstone and Turoff (1975) identified Delphi as a "method for structuring a group process in decision making" (p. 3). Bunning (1979) reported that the goal of the Delphi procedure is to gain consensus on the various predictions or statements under consideration.

Delphi advantages

The Delphi technique was selected to identify perceptions and opinions of the target group because its primary value is to produce "a well-considered consensus of

the intuitions of a plurality of informed witnesses without injecting the bias of leadership influence, face-to-face confrontation, or group dynamics" (Hudson, 1974, p. 2). Bunning (1979) determined that Delphi will facilitate responses from advisory committee members who may be reluctant to make critical comments about the committee functions, the program, and the program chair.

Larreche and Montgomery (1977) found the Delphi technique superior to the nominal group technique because of the anonymous nature of the comments. They identified the ideal subject population for a study on the selection of advertising models as a set of knowledgeable managers. They noted that busy managers would not spend their time on lengthy questionnaires and recommended identifying experts who would have broad knowledge of a wide variety of models and their application.

Delphi was selected as a method of soliciting opinion, prediction, and knowledge not to be confused with random sampling. Linstone and Turoff (1975) found that Delphi was especially appropriate when the subject matter lends itself to "collective subjective judgement rather than precise analytical techniques, when the task requires more individuals than can effectively meet face to face, or it is desirable to preserve anonymity" (p. 3).

Enzer, Little, and Lazer (1971) identified six advantages of Delphi:

1. It focused attention on issues;
2. Individuals could work together on a problem through the framework;
3. Psychological communication barriers were minimized, such as hidden agendas and personality conflicts;
4. Persuasion was minimized;
5. Each participant had equal opportunities for influence;
6. It provided precise documentation.

Madonis (1969) cited an additional advantage that Delphi places no restrictions on the methodology used by the participants in forming their opinions.

Delphi problems and limitations

There are problems and limitations in future predictions. Enzer, Little, and Lazer (1971) identified seven:

1. Some future events are unknowable;
2. Current understanding of basic societal change is limited;
3. Incorrect estimates of future development is common;
4. The ability to foresee basic changes and goals is limited by unquestioned beliefs and values;
5. There is an inherent difficulty in imagining the future even when certain important events are assumed;

6. It is difficult to define and integrate cross-impacts among specific forecasts;
7. Important possibilities are sometimes overlooked.

Weaver (1971) noted that the Delphi technique also was limited by large amount of time required to complete the data collection.

Delphi Procedure

Hudson (1974) noted that members of the Delphi group should be experts in their fields. Bunning (1979) noted that the two critical steps in the Delphi technique are the design of the questionnaire and the selection of experts. Huber (1980) published a summary of the general procedure for the Delphi technique which is detailed in Chapter III. Huber noted that high participant motivation was necessary.

Importance of evaluation standards

Dean (1983) used a Delphi technique to ascertain the relative importance of evaluation standards for vocational/technical programs in Missouri. The rank ordering of the standards provided a framework for deriving the overall quality rating of programs and institutions.

Indices of effectiveness

Roberts (1984) identified indices of effectiveness for an accreditation process using a Delphi. Two indices of effectiveness were determined: one of instructional

effectiveness and one of administrative effectiveness. Originally, 97 effectiveness measures were obtained from criteria published by national health professional organizations and other accrediting bodies. The Delphi survey process was used to analyze, refine, weight, and select 19 measures of instructional effectiveness and 15 measures of administrative effectiveness.

Curriculum revision

Curriculum revision by advisory committees and a modification of the Delphi technique was used by Reilly (1986) to determine what programs should be eliminated in electronic engineering technology programs at six state 2-year programs in Georgia. Participants were mailed a document requiring them to rank and comment upon technical subjects and subcontent areas. A second document, which summarized the results of the first Delphi round, was mailed to the same participants, and they were asked to again rank subjects and defend rankings that were outside of group norms. After the two-round procedure, a group trend of convergence became apparent and the process was terminated. Several possible directions for future research and study were revealed during the process.

Delphi panel composition

Hines (1986) used a Delphi panel to survey educators in Texas. Hines invited 120 educators with a thorough knowledge of cooperative education to be members of a panel. She selected the panel from three groups: cooperative education coordinators, occupation/technical deans, and chief instructional officers. She noted that "a compromise is often necessary" between getting panelists whose position provides sufficiently broad knowledge, and getting panelists who are willing and have time to participate. Martino (1983) warned that panelists with higher administrative rank are less likely to have time to participate. He suggested that "the hasty opinion of a vice president is probably not worthy of as much consideration as the thoughtful opinion of someone several levels lower in the organizational structure" (Martino, 1983, p. 28).

Delphi timing of rounds

The time for the Delphi rounds varies. Martino (1983) stated that the time between rounds with a mail questionnaire is about one month.

Delphi panel size

Tersine and Riggs (1976) recommended that the Delphi panel size should be at a minimum to achieve accurate

results. No guidelines exist that describe the most appropriate number, according to Bunning (1979).

Dalkey (1969), while working with the Rand Corporation, determined that reliable results could be obtained with a group of 15 to 20 experts. Tersine and Riggs (1976) recommended a minimum of 10 and 15 respondents to generate accurate and effective results. Cochran et al. (1980) reported that the error ratio was reduced rapidly when the size of the group increased from one to 12.

Homogenous groups, such as hospitality professors and advisory committee members, may necessitate a larger number of panel members (Tersine and Riggs, 1976). Larreche and Montgomery (1977) recommended a group of 15 to 20 experts. However, they selected 51 persons in anticipation of some initial refusal to participate as well as mortality in later iterations. They finished their Delphi study of six months with 21 completed returns.

Delphi studies are usually conducted with groups of 50 or fewer panelists (Cyphert and Gant, 1971). Large populations generally have lower response rates (Sappe, 1984). Sappe achieved a 24 percent response rate of acceptance on a Delphi panel in a national study of 221 educators. Martino (1983) found that the response rate on large-scale Delphi surveys runs at 50 percent or less.

Hines (1986) invited 120 educators to participate in a Delphi study. Sixty-four percent responded to the first round and 39 accepted appointment to the panel, a 32.5 percent response rate for acceptance to the panel. Hines initiated a new approach of sending round 2 questionnaires to 56 individuals who did not respond to round 1, in addition to the 39 panel members who accepted appointment. Fifty-nine percent responded. Round 3 response rate was 98.3 percent. Cochran (1983) determined that most of the gain in accuracy is achieved from round 2 to round 3.

Modifications to the Delphi Research Technique

Modifications of the Delphi approach have been used in research. Gordon (1968) employed a Delphi study to establish research priorities among National Middle School Association members. A sample of 400 members drawn from the association's mailing list was asked to list three nominations for needed areas of research in middle school education. The initial response of 148 persons resulted in 36 topics being nominated. Two more mailings elicited 77 responses evaluating the 36 topics on a one-to-seven scale. The 36 problems were grouped into five broad research areas with means and standard deviations reported for each problem.

Delphi questionnaire

Delbecq, Van de Ven and Gustafson (1975) noted the basic procedure for Delphi is a series of questionnaires. The first questionnaire asked for individual responses to broad questions. Succeeding questionnaires build upon responses to previous rounds. The process continues until consensus is reached or enough information has been accumulated.

Bunning (1979) recommended a questionnaire be sent to experts to identify the perceived benefits of advisory committees and to determine future benefits. The two critical steps are the design of the questionnaire and the selection of experts. The number of questions should be limited, and a maximum of four lines should be provided for participant response. Usually three questionnaires, each with a 10-day turn-around time, are sent to panelists. The third questionnaire receives the fewest responses due to its complexity.

The most difficult and subjective phase of the Delphi inquiry is editing raw data from the first questionnaire. An editorial panel familiar with the specific field of inquiry may be engaged at this point. The final report, according to Bunning (1979), "contains a ranking of statements by priority, the amount of dissensus for each statement, and a listing of summary of minority opinions" (p. 181).

Summary

According to Bloom (1978), a program that neglects the use of advisory committees denies students maximum assistance that could be available to them. Advisory committees provide a unique opportunity to accumulate occupational and industrial information that can augment hospitality education programs. Their organization and function can be tailored to specific situations and needs. They can function effectively without assuming either legislative or administrative responsibility.

How to work with advisory councils is summarized by Donald Childs, a vocational instructor in Waco, Texas, whose comments were published in the report of the American Vocational Association Publications Committee (1969):

It may come as a rude shock to some educators, but the fact is that the jobs are made by industry not the schools. Too many educators isolate themselves in the classrooms and school shops and teach as they believe a subject should be taught with no consideration of industry, its changes, or its needs for training in new unit designs. Educators too often develop a "know-it-all" attitude and as a result do not communicate with industry. Also, there are those who are afraid industry will find out just how much they don't know about the subject. The very idea that more selling needs to be done to industry so they will welcome our graduates as new employees is absurd. If the school keeps in step with industry and aware of industry's needs, then industry will be waiting with open arms for all the graduates that education can produce (p. 30).

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction and Objectives

The purpose of the study was to identify issues relative to the effective use of advisory committees by four-year hotel, restaurant, institution management, and travel and tourism administration programs. The study provides a consensus of opinions of selected hospitality program directors and members of their advisory committees. The term hospitality program encompasses degree-granting programs with majors in the management of hotels, restaurants, schools, hospitals, care facilities, clubs, business and industry (contract) foodservice, and resorts. It also includes related service businesses with an emphasis on food, lodging, and travel and convention sales and marketing. In this study, CEO is a term used for a dean, department head, department executive officer, or director of a hospitality/tourism program within the department of a college or university.

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify four-year hospitality programs with advisory committees;
2. Identify and rank advisory committee issue statements of importance to four year hospitality/tourism programs where advisory committees are used;

3. Identify issue statements in which there is a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in level of agreement between the CEO and advisory committee panel members;
4. Recommend to hospitality program CEOs issues to which advisory committees members can provide assistance, support, and consultation.

Subjects

Seventeen expert hospitality program Chief Educational Officers (CEOs) and 28 expert members of their advisory committees provided the data for the study. The expert CEOs hold positions as hospitality program deans, department chairs, or program directors.

Information to determine expertise was identified by the researcher and graduate committee members, which included the Iowa State University Department Chair of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management and a Professor of Agricultural Education experienced in advisory committee work.

Selection of CEOs for panel

The researcher mailed a cover letter and questionnaire requesting personal and program information (Appendix A) to 61 four-year hospitality program CEOs, using the membership listing of the International Council on Hotel, Restaurant,

and Institution Education, the professional association of hospitality educators and the accrediting body for hospitality programs (CHRIE Communique, 1990, January). All correspondence was sent via first class mail with custom designed envelopes to accommodate the materials. All responses were returned first class, postage paid to the Iowa State University mail distribution center.

In the cover letter, the purpose of the investigation was explained along with estimated time commitment (see Appendix A). In the questionnaire, information to be used in determining the status of the CEOs as expert panel members was included. The information requested included years experience as a CEO, experience in the hospitality industry, years in present position, experience with advisory committees as a program director and member, and present use of an advisory committee. Demographic data about the hospitality program were requested, which included the school/college in which the academic program was located and undergraduate, masters and doctoral student enrollment figures. CEOs reporting use of an advisory committee were asked to identify three expert advisory committee members who were well informed about their role and who actively participated in the committee.

The completed CEO General Information questionnaires were tabulated to determine those CEOs with advisory

committee experience. The minimum number of CEOs for inclusion in the study was 16 and two advisory committee members identified by each selected CEO.

Selection of advisory committee members for panel

Seventeen expert CEOs were selected for the panel and they identified 45 expert advisory committee members. The expert advisory committee members were sent questionnaires requesting personal and program demographic information. The advisory committee experts and expert CEOs were sent an invitation letter, the Delphi instrument, instructions, and a postage paid return mail envelope (Appendix B). Twelve CEOs returned completed instruments. Completed advisory committee questionnaires and the Delphi Round 1 instrument were returned by 28 advisory committee members. An additional six expert advisory committee members returned questionnaires only and declined participation on the panel.

Instrumentation

Delphi instrument

The initial 48 statements comprising the Delphi survey instrument (Appendix B) regarding advisory committee functions were identified by six researchers and one report: Bloom (1978), Borsenik (1980), Green (1981), and Hayes et al. (1986) in studies of hospitality program advisory committee use; the Iowa Vocational Education Advisory

Council (1984); and Trail (1984) in a study of school superintendents' advisory committee productivity indicators. The statements were categorized and ten issues were identified:

- Advisory Committee Composition
- Advisory Committee Effectiveness
- Curriculum
- Facilities
- Financial
- General Activities
- Instructional Program/Faculty Assistance
- Program Evaluation
- Public Relations
- Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

The Delphi instrument was pre-tested for clarity, issues of concern, and time for completion by members of the Iowa State University hotel, restaurant, and institution management faculty and the state director of the Small Business Development Centers who participated in many advisory committees.

Panel members were asked to indicate their agreement-disagreement regarding each of the 48 statements about advisory committee functions on a Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5) Likert scale and add comments to support their positions. Additional space was provided after the 48

statements for individual panel members to add additional statements about advisory committee functions for the panel to consider.

Round 1 Seventeen expert CEOs and 45 prospective expert advisory committee panel members were sent the Delphi instrument on May 26, 1989. It is a common practice to use a pre-established set of statements in the initial round (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975). The median response and interquartile range of responses for the group were computed for each statement. Those who had not responded by June 12 were sent reminder letters and a second Delphi instrument with instructions, and another postage paid return mail envelope. In addition, the CEOs were contacted by telephone. Further non-responses were again contacted until it was necessary to tabulate the responses and initiate Round 2.

Panel members provided 385 comments to support their ratings for the issue statements, an average of eight comments per Delphi participant. A major concern emerged as the pre-determined instrument completion time of 20 minutes would be severely lengthened if panel members were to consider the 385 comments in their ratings for Round 2. The researcher, in consultation with the members of his committee, did not include the 13 pages of comments.

Round 2 Round 2 Delphi instruments were mailed July 13, 1989, to the 40 panel members (12 CEOs and 28 advisory committee). The Round 2 instrument contained an additional 12 statements added by panel members in Round 1. Brackets described the semi-interquartile range for each statement, the median panel response was shown by a black arrow below the line, and each panelist's previous response was indicated by a red arrow above the line (Appendix B). Panelists whose personal position on the second round was outside the interquartile range of the panel first round responses were asked to provide rationale to support their divergent view (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975). The use of statistical description of the group response was a way of reducing group pressure for conformity (Dalkey, 1969). The response rate for Round 2 was 11 of 12 CEOs and 27 of 28 advisory committee members, or 92.7 percent.

Round 3 Group and personal responses from Round 2 were indicated on the Round 3 Delphi instrument and each panel member was requested to re-evaluate his/her responses. The object of this round was to obtain a consensus among panel members. Consensus was determined to be the point at which the standard deviation of the mean score was less than 1. The final round was a repeat of the previous one except that the 217 comments from Round 2 were included for the panel to consider in evaluating their previous ratings.

Analyses for Reporting to Panel

Reporting to panelists

The two primary statistical applications used to report the Round 1, 2, and 3 results to the participants were the median and the interquartile range. The median has been found to be a useful statistical descriptor of group consensus in Delphi studies because it is unaffected by the extreme scores. The interquartile range was calculated to show the spread of opinions by panel members. It delineated the middle 50 percent of responses by the panelists and indicated the variability of responses on each item (Trail, 1984).

Summarizing Results

The Round 3 results were summarized by mean, median, and standard deviation. The initial 48 statements plus the 12 added by the panel members were rank ordered by mean and standard deviation. The means indicated the agreement-disagreement with the statement and the standard deviation indicated the degree of consensus.

The panel members' comments for each round were analyzed and summary responses determined for each statement (Appendix C, Tables C-1, C-2, C-3). The comment summaries were reviewed by three experts, an Iowa State University information services specialist and two members of the Iowa

State University Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution
Management Department.

Tests of significance of the 60 statement ratings by
CEOs and advisory committee members on Round 3 were analyzed
to identify significant differences in means of CEOs vs.
advisory committee members.

RESULTS

This chapter presents the demographic information of the 53 CEOs returning questionnaires, information about their hospitality program, advisory committee member personal information provided by the 28 members of advisory committees to hospitality programs who agreed to participate, the results of each round completed by the Delphi panel by issue, and the comments made by panel members to support their position on a statement.

CEO Personal Information

The personal information provided by the 53 CEOs returning questionnaires, the 34 CEOs willing to participate, and the 12 CEOs participating as expert panel members is presented in Table 1, organized by years experience in the hospitality industry, years experience in hospitality education, years as a hospitality CEO, years in present position, years served as a member of an industry advisory committee, age, and gender.

The CEOs had an average of 17.3 years of hospitality industry experience, 12.9 years of hospitality education experience, and had been a CEO for 6.7 years. Experience as a member of an advisory committee was a measure of CEO expertise for inclusion on the panel. Fourteen of the CEOs

Table 1. CEOs personal demographic data

Variable	Statistic	Surveyed (<u>n</u> = 53)	Willing (<u>n</u> = 34)	Panel (<u>n</u> = 12)
Years in hospitality industry	Range	0-40	0-40	5-32
	<u>M</u>	17.3	19.5	20.4
Years in hospitality education	Range	0-30	0-27	4-22
	<u>M</u>	12.9	13.2	13.8
Years as hospitality CEO	Range	0-22	0-18	1-18
	<u>M</u>	5.5	5.5	6.6
Years in present position	Range	0-22	0-21	0-21
	<u>M</u>	5.5	4.5	5.9
Age	Range	35-55	35-55	35-55
Gender	n (male)	47	29	10
	n (female)	6	5	2

reported an average of 7.3 years advisory committee experience. Forty-five of the CEOs were male compared to 6 females.

CEOs Program Information

Table 2 identifies the institutional hospitality program information provided by CEOs including undergraduate enrollment, graduate enrollment, school in which the hospitality program is located, and the use of advisory committees.

The average size of undergraduate enrollment reported by the 53 CEOs was 387 students. Fifteen of the 53 programs had a Master's level program and six reported a doctoral program. Thirty-seven of the programs had advisory committees, although some commented that it was new or had not met in the past year. The CEOs selected to participate as expert panel members were representative of the survey respondents and their programs with three exceptions: a) They had experience as members of an industry advisory committee; b) CEOs of four of the five programs offering doctoral degrees were on the panel; c) None of the panel participants were from programs located in the college of business, although one CEO in a business college met all the requirements for inclusion in the study, but did not return Round 1 of the Delphi study.

Table 2. Educational hospitality program data as reported by CEOs

Item	Population			Willing			Panel		
	n	Range	<u>M</u>	n	Range	<u>M</u>	n	Range	<u>M</u>
Undergrad. enrollment	53	40-1324	387	34	49-1324	356	12	40-800	302
Master's enrollment	15	6-150	38	11	6-50	28	5	6-50	11
Ph.D. enrollment	6	2-21	9	5	2-21	8	5	2-21	8

Table 2A. Additional hospitality program data as reported by CEOs

Item	Population		Willing		Panel	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
School in which hospitality program located						
Home Economics	18	34.0	14	41.2	5	41.7
Business	11	20.8	7	20.6	0	0
Independent	10	18.9	6	17.6	2	16.7
Agriculture	2	3.8	2	5.9	1	8.3
Other	8	15.1	5	14.7	4	33.3
Missing	4	7.5	0	0.0	0	0
Use Advisory committee						
Yes	37	69.8	25	73.5	12	100
No	12	22.6	9	26.5	0	
Missing	4	7.5				
Willing to participate?						
Yes	34	64.2	34	100		
No	19	35.9				

Advisory Committee Personal and Professional Information
Information provided by expert advisory committee members is presented in Table 3. Information requested was age, gender, participation, number of years service on advisory committees, occupation, and education.

The advisory committee members reported an average 9.14 years experience on advisory committees. About half had attended college; nine identified themselves as hotel and seven as restaurant executives.

Eleven of the 34 advisory committee members returning questionnaires were 45-54 years old; 30 of 34 were male.

Delphi Results

Degree of consensus and average rating

The Delphi process was initiated with a panel of 17 expert CEOs and 45 members of their advisory committees. Each round took about five weeks during June through September 1989.

In Round 1, the panel responded to 48 statements. In Rounds 2 and 3, the panel responded to an additional 12 statements. The choices were "strongly agree" (5), "agree" (4), "neutral" (3), "disagree" (2), and "strongly disagree" (1).

The mean, median, and standard deviation of responses are reported in Appendix D, Table D-1. The statistics are

Table 3. Advisory Committee Members' demographic data

	n	Percent
Age		
< 34	0	
35-44	6	.177
45-54	11	.324
> 55	8	.235
missing	9	.265
Gender		
Female	4	.117
Male	30	.883
Willing to participate		
Yes	28	.823
No	6	.177
Occupation		
Consultant	2	.059
Restaurant Executive	7	.206
Cafeteria Executive	1	.029
Club Manager	1	.029
Resort Manager	2	.059
Contract Foodservice	1	.029
Hotel Executive	9	.265
Other (e.g., Equipment company president, Association executive, Tour operator, Magazine publisher)	11	.324
Education		
Some college	7	.206
College graduate	13	.382
Post graduate	5	.147
Master's degree	9	.265
Number of Years on Advisory Committee		
Range ($\underline{n} = 23$)	0-30	
Mean	9.14	
Note: 11 respondents did not complete this question		

reported for the panel, the CEOs only, and the advisory committee members only.

The Delphi study was determined to be complete when the standard deviation for each statement was less than one, which was true for 58 of the 60 statements at the completion of Round 3. The 60 statements ranked by degree of consensus as measured by the standard deviation are presented in Appendix E, Table E-1. The rankings by standard deviation category were:

Standard Deviation	0.388 to 0.499	n = 6
	0.500 to 0.749	n = 22
	0.750 to 0.999	n = 30
	1.000 to 1.149	n = 2

The statements were also ranked by the mean score; the lowest mean score was 1.853, the highest was 4.882. The number of statements within each mean category was (from Appendix E, Table E-2):

Strong disagreement	<u>M</u> 1.0 to 1.499	n = 0
Disagreement	<u>M</u> 1.5 to 2.499	n = 4
Neutral	<u>M</u> 2.5 to 3.499	n = 15
Agreement	<u>M</u> 3.5 to 4.499	n = 35
Strong agreement	<u>M</u> 4.5 to 5.0	n = 6

Results by issue

This study focused on 10 issues that were identified as advisory committee functions. The Round 1 Delphi instrument

was comprised of 48 statements derived from the literature review addressing the 10 issues. An additional 12 statements added by panel members in round 2 were categorized by issue at the completion of the study. The results of the study are summarized by issue.

Issue one: Composition of advisory committees

(statement numbers 1-6, 51, 52, 57-60) As shown in Table 4, panel members were asked to respond to six statements regarding advisory committee composition from the literature review and an additional six statements added by panel members. Delphi panel Round 3 mean scores greater than 4.499 for two of these statements indicates that Delphi panel members "strongly agreed" with the statements. They agreed that advisory committee members should have previous advisory committee experience (statement 3) and that advisory committee members should represent a variety of hospitality program segments (statement 4).

Mean scores between 3.5 and 4.499 (statements 5, 6, 52, 59, and 60) suggest that busy members can serve, members should be responsible and cooperative, academic heads should sit on the committee, committee members can recommend new members, and students can be members of advisory committees.

On the average the panel appeared to be neutral on statements 1, 2, 51, 57, and 58 requiring educational

Table 4. Composition of advisory committees

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
1. Level of education	$\frac{M}{SD}$	2.588 .957	2.455 .820	2.652 1.027	-0.56	0.581	17
2. Advisory committee terms	$\frac{M}{SD}$	2.647 .884	2.727 .786	2.609 .941	0.36	0.720	13
3. Experience	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.676 .535	4.545 .522	4.739 .541	-0.99	0.331	9
4. Variety	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.824 .626	5.0 .0	4.739 .752	1.14	0.262	11
5. Busy	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.882 .729	3.727 .467	3.957 .825	-0.85	0.399	12
6. Responsibility	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.353 .691	4.364 .924	4.348 .573	0.06	0.951	4
51. Higher administrators present facts only	$\frac{M}{SD}$	2.882 .880	3.364 .924	2.652 .775	2.35	0.025*	5 ^b
52. Academic head on advisory committee	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.853 .989	3.545 1.368	4.0 .739	-1.03	0.321	2 ^b

^aSeparate variance estimate used.

^bRound 2 comment statement added by panel in round 2.

*p < .05, contrast mean scores of CEOs vs. advisory committee members.

Table 4. Continued

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
57. CEO determine members	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.294 .938	3.455 .934	3.217 .951	0.69 ^a	0.499	2 ^b
58. Committee members determine new members	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.000 .816	2.909 .701	3.043 .878	-0.44	0.660	4 ^b
59. Committee members recommend new members	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.059 .547	3.909 .701	4.130 .458	-1.11	0.276	2 ^b
60. Students on advisory committee	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.559 1.050	3.455 1.293	3.609 .941	-0.40	0.695	3 ^b

degrees for committee membership, limiting the number of terms, allowing higher administrators to participate on decision making, and allowing the CEO or advisory committee members to determine new members.

The mean number of Round 1 comments for this issue was 11 for statements 1-6 and 3 for the five statements added by panel members in Round 2. For example, the 17 round 1 comments on statement number one which asked about educational degrees for advisory committee members indicate potential for discussion. As shown in the Comment Summary, Appendix C, respondents seemed to believe that advisory committee members' degree status should be balanced with job experience in selecting advisory committee members. In addition, statement number two on length of term also generated more than ten comments. The panel Comment Summary suggests that members accept flexibility in number of terms for advisory committee members.

A relatively high number of comments was also generated by statement number 58. The Comment Summary indicates that new advisory committee members could be recommended and jointly selected by CEOs and the advisory committee members.

A statement with which the panel strongly agreed was statement number four, which inquired about including on the advisory committee members from a variety of hospitality industry segments. That statement had the second highest

mean rating of 4.824. The 11 comments supported the concern of the Delphi panel that a cross-section of the industry be included on the committee.

Although none of the issue statements suggested by the panel (49 to 60) generated more than five comments, statement number 51 resulted in the highest number, five. The Comment Summary was that higher education administrators should participate in decision-making if involved with the advisory committee. Four of the five comments supporting the involvement of higher education administrators were made by advisory committee members.

The only statistically significant difference in level of agreement ($p < .05$) when CEOs and advisory committee members were compared was number 51 regarding the higher administrators' presentation of facts but not participation in decision making during the advisory committee meeting. A CEO mean score of 3.3636 indicates that CEOs question whether higher administrators should participate in decision making; an advisory committee member mean score of 2.6522 indicates that advisory committee members support higher administrators' participation in decision making.

Issue Two: Effectiveness of advisory committees
(statement numbers 7-11) Table 5 is a summary of the results from round 3 mean scores on Issue Two. The panel

Table 5. Effectiveness of advisory committees

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			t	p	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
7. Evaluate productivity	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.121 .740	4.091 .944	4.136 .640	-0.16	0.871	5
8. Program improvements	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.324 .535	4.364 .674	4.304 .470	0.30	0.768	5
9. Orientation and training	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.500 .749	4.091 1.044	4.696 .470	-1.83 ^a	0.092	11
10. Suggestions implemented	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.441 .613	3.455 .688	3.435 .590	0.09	0.931	18
11. CEO educational preparation	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.235 .654	4.455 .688	4.130 .626	1.37	0.180	5

^aSeparate variance estimate.

was asked to respond to five statements regarding advisory committee effectiveness. They "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with four of the five statements within this issue.

Statement number nine mean score of 4.500 and the panel comment summary suggests strong agreement that new advisory committee members' expect to receive orientation as to goals, objectives and expectations, but no attempt should be made to "train" or "brainwash" them. Panel members agreed that productivity should be evaluated, program improvements should occur, and CEOs should receive educational preparation for working with advisory committees.

The panel failed to agree or disagree ($M = 3.441$) with statement number 10 regarding the implementation of advisory committee members' suggestions. A relatively high number of comments (18) were made for statement number 10 concerning the necessity for the CEO to implement advisory committee suggestions. The Round 3 mean score of 3.441 indicates the committee suggestions do not have to be implemented, but the Comment Summary (Appendix C) indicates all advisory committee suggestions should be considered, then evaluated as to their practicality and balanced with existing programs. CEOs and advisory committee members did not differ significantly on any of the five statements.

Issue Three: Curriculum (statement numbers 12-16)

As shown in Table 6, the panel was asked to respond to five

Table 6. Curriculum

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
12. Curriculum decisions	$\frac{M}{SD}$	1.853 .925	1.818 .751	1.870 1.014	-0.15	0.882	19
13. Curriculum consultation	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.265 .618	4.182 .405	4.304 .703	-0.53	0.597	8
14. Recommend subject matter	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.059 .694	3.818 .751	4.174 .650	-1.42	0.165	9
15. Special training needs	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.265 .710	3.818 .751	4.478 .593	-2.79	0.009**	7
16. Develop educational objectives	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.971 .870	3.636 1.120	4.130 .694	-1.58	0.123	6

**p < .01.

statements about the hospitality program curricula. The Delphi panel agreed or strongly agreed with four of five statements in this curriculum issue. They agreed that advisory committee members should be consulted to recommend curricula, develop educational objectives and determine special training needs. The panel disagreed with statement number 12 about advisory committee members making curriculum decisions. That statement resulted in 19 comments, more than any other statement, and received a round 3 mean score of 1.853, lowest of the 60 statements. The Comment Summary from Appendix C suggests that advisory committees can make recommendations about the curriculum, but decisions should be strictly up to the faculty and administration. Only in isolated cases should the committee become involved in curriculum decisions.

The only significant difference when CEOs and advisory committee members mean scores were compared was found for statement number 15. The mean rating by CEOs of 3.8182 indicated they were not as agreeable to having advisory committee members advising them about special training needs for the industry as were the advisory committee members. The Comment Summary (Appendix C) suggests that industry committee members are most aware of changing needs in industry and should advise on skills training for specific

occupations. However, advisory committees should not be involved in great detail with specific courses.

Issue four: Physical facilities (statement number 17)

Panel members' round 3 mean score of 4.088, Table 7, suggest agreement that advisory committee members should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program.

Issue five: Financial (statement numbers 18-20, 54-56)

As shown in Table 8, the panel was asked to respond to six statements regarding the financial issue. Three statements were from the literature review and three were added by panel members.

The panel agreed with statements 19, recommending the type and quality of facilities, and number 56, raising unrestricted funds for the hospitality program. The panel failed to agree on statements 20, 54, and 55 about loans or gifts, generating funds for exchange programs, and obtaining funds from campus resources. The panel disagreed with statement 18 about budget determination assistance. Statements 18 and 20 generated an above average number of comments.

The statement number 18 mean disagreement score of 2.235 was supported with 13 comments. The Comment Summary (Appendix C) indicated panel members saw the budget process as detailed, time-consuming, and interrelated to state and

Table 7. Physical facilities

Statement	Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments	
	Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.				
17. Physical facilities	<u>M</u>	4.088	4.0	4.130	-0.78	0.439	-
	<u>SD</u>	.452	.000	.548			

Table 8. Financial

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
18. Budget	<u>M</u>	2.235	1.909	2.391	-1.51	0.142	13
	<u>SD</u>	.890	0.539	.988			
19. Facility type quality	<u>M</u>	3.606	3.545	3.636	-0.31	0.760	6
	<u>SD</u>	.788	.688	.848			
20. Loans or gifts	<u>M</u>	2.882	3.636	2.522	2.94	0.006**	14 ^c
	<u>SD</u>	1.149	1.027	1.039			
54. Funds for exchange programs	<u>M</u>	3.324	3.727	3.130	2.12	0.041*	2 ^b
	<u>SD</u>	.806	.647	.815			
55. Campus resources for funds	<u>M</u>	2.941	2.909	2.957	-0.16	0.877	1 ^b
	<u>SD</u>	.814	.944	.767			
56. Raise unrestricted funds	<u>M</u>	3.647	4.091	3.435	2.13 ^a	0.041*	- ^b
	<u>SD</u>	.884	.539	.945			

^aSeparate variance used.

^bStatement added by panel in round 2.

^cRound two comments.

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

college policies beyond the advisory committee's control. In addition, the statement number 18 mean rating score of 2.235, indicating disagreement, was one of only two statements rated below 2.50.

Because of a failure to agree, it might be reasonable to pass over items 20, 54, and 55. However, a review of the Comment Summary and t-test of means indicates these statements should be considered for implementation. Statement 20 regarding advisory committee assistance for arranging student loans or gifts for instructional programs was one of only two statements in which consensus (standard deviation < 1.00) was not reached.

A statistically significant difference in level of agreement ($p < .01$) was found for statement 20, when CEOs and advisory committee members were compared. The round 3 mean score of 3.636 for CEOs and 2.522 for advisory committee was also the largest numerical difference in all statements. A relatively high number of comments, 14, was generated by this statement. The Comment Summary in Appendix C indicated the two divergent opinions: Advisory committees should not be required to assist with student loans or instructional gifts, although industry is an excellent source for needed funds and committee members can help in this area if they choose.

Two other significant differences in ratings ($p < .05$) were found. Statement numbers 54 and 56, addressed raising funds for exchange programs and funds for unrestricted use. CEOs supported raising the funds (\underline{M} 3.727, \underline{M} 4.901, respectively); advisory committee members' average response fell in the neutral range (\underline{M} 3.130, \underline{M} 3.435, respectively).

Statement numbers 54, 55 and 56 generated only three comments even though CEOs and advisory committee panel members differed significantly on the mean rating scores.

Issue six: General activities (statement numbers 21-27, 49, 50) The panel responses to the statements regarding General Activities are in Table 9. Seven statements are from the literature review and two statements were added by panel members. The results for each round are in Table D-1.

The panel combined mean agreement scores of 4.147 and 4.882 respectively, for statements 22 and 23, indicate that panel members agree to advise the CEO regarding educational trends and employment opportunities. Statement 23 regarding employment opportunities is an example of a statement with a high level of agreement, a mean of 4.727 for CEOs and a mean of 4.957 for advisory committee members. It had the highest combined mean rating, 4.882, of any statement. Furthermore, the advisory committee members standard deviation score of 0.209 was the lowest of any advisory committee rating.

Table 9. General activities

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
21. Select CEO	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	2.971 .627	2.818 .405	3.043 .706	-0.98	0.335	8
22. Advise educational trends	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.147 .857	4.0 1.095	4.217 .736	-0.69	0.498	7
23. Advise employment opportunities	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.882 .537	4.727 .905	4.957 .209	-1.17 ^a	0.251	7
24. Determine education and experience	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.294 .719	4.091 .994	4.391 .583	-1.15	0.261	8
25. Given recognition	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.265 .864	3.909 .539	2.957 .825	3.48	0.001**	8
26. Meet annual plus	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.382 .652	4.364 .674	4.391 .656	-0.11	0.910	11
27. Educate program faculty	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.647 .774	3.455 .688	3.739 .810	-1.00	0.323	7
49. CEO/AC speak between	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.324 .475	3.636 .505	3.174 .388	2.95	0.006**	4 ^b
50. AC chair/CEO agenda	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.176 .459	4.182 .405	4.174 .491	0.05	0.963	3 ^b

^aSeparate variance estimate.

^bStatement added by panel in round 2.

**p < .01.

The panel mean score of 4.294 supports agreement with statement 24 that advisory committees should help determine the education and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry. Panel members also agreed ($\underline{M} = 3.647$) that advisory committee members should educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with sales and equipment company representatives.

The panel agreed ($\underline{M} = 4.382$) with statement 26 that the advisory committee should meet more often than once a year and with statement 50 that the advisory committee chair and CEO should establish the agenda for meetings ($\underline{M} = 4.176$). As shown in Appendix C, the Comment Summary for statement 26 was that advisory committees will be more effective if they meet more than once a year, either in gatherings for another aspect of the program or with subcommittees.

Two statistically significant differences in level of agreement ($p < .01$) were found when CEOs and advisory committee members were compared. Specifically, the two groups differed in opinion when responding to statement 25 about recognition and statement 49 about the CEOs need to speak with advisory committee members between formal meetings. Neither statement generated panel agreement, but CEOs agreed ($\underline{M} = 3.909$) that advisory committee members should be given recognition and that CEOs should speak with advisory committee members between meetings ($\underline{M} = 3.636$).

Advisory committee members were neutral on both issues. As shown in Appendix C, the Comment Summary supported a need for recognition with the provision that it not take away from the committee's primary concern for education.

Six of nine statements in this issue were rated higher than 3.500, and only two generated an above average number of comments.

Issue seven: Industry program/faculty assistance
(statement numbers 28-36) Seven of nine statements, as shown in Table 10, were rated "agree", a mean of 3.5 to 4.499, for this issue. The seven statements (29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36) concerned assistance to faculty, interacting with faculty, maintaining a speakers' bureau, helping with field trips and panel discussions, guest lecturing, conducting inservice training, and identifying research needs. The panel neither agreed nor disagreed with statement 28 regarding advisory committee assistance with obtaining instructors. The panel disagreed ($\bar{M} = 2.441$) with statement 33 about selecting student recipients of awards and scholarships.

When CEOs were compared with advisory committee members, statements 31 and 36 were statistically significantly different ($p < .05$). Advisory committee members ($\bar{M} = 3.6957$) were not as much in agreement about statement 31, arranging field trips, as CEOs ($\bar{M} = 4.2727$). Statement 36

Table 10. Industry program/faculty assistance

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
28. Advisory obtain instructors	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.206 .946	3.545 .522	3.043 1.065	1.84 ^a	0.074	9
29. Interact with faculty	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.118 .729	4.273 .467	4.043 .825	0.85	0.399	6
30. Speaker's bureau	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.147 .784	4.273 .467	4.087 .900	0.79	0.434	6
31. Field trips	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.882 .977	4.273 .467	3.696 1.105	2.14 ^a	0.040*	7
32. Panel discussions	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.853 .821	4.0 .632	3.783 .902	0.72	0.479	3
33. Select scholarship recipients	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	2.441 .927	2.545 .820	2.391 .988	0.45	0.657	8
34. Guest lecture	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.412 .557	4.455 .522	4.391 .583	0.31	0.762	6
35. Conduct in-service	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.765 .855	3.818 .603	3.739 .964	0.25	0.805	7
36. Identify research needs	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.020 .388	3.818 .405	4.130 .344	-2.34	0.026*	5

^aSeparate variance estimate.

*p < .05.

results, regarding identifying research needs, suggests advisory committee members were more in agreement ($\bar{M} = 4.130$) than CEOs ($\bar{M} = 3.818$). The combined standard deviation for statement 36 (0.388) was the lowest of any statement.

The statement 33 mean score of 2.441 indicates disagreement with the advisory committee function of selecting recipients of awards and scholarships. Also, statement 33 generated the highest number of round 2 comments, 12. As shown in Appendix C, the Comment Summary further amplified the panel members' concern (Table C-2, SUM7F).

When an award or scholarship comes from the industry, it may be appropriate for some members of the advisory committee to help select the recipients if they are familiar with student work and feel comfortable in the selection. However, school administrators should be aware that outside participation can create political conflict. It can, however, also add credibility to the award or program.

Eight of the nine statements in this issue drew an agreement or disagreement response. One statement, 28, concerning the advisory committees assistance with obtaining instructors, was rated "neutral."

Issue eight: Program evaluation (statement number 37)

Only one statement specifically addressed the advisory

committee function of evaluating the hospitality program. The result is in Table 11. The combined mean score of 4.049 indicates the panel members agreed to the involvement of hospitality program advisory committees in evaluating the hospitality program. However, when CEOs and advisory committee members were compared, there was a statistically significant difference in scores ($p < .05$). The advisory committee members were significantly in agreement ($\underline{M} = 4.217$) than CEOs ($\underline{M} = 3.727$) that advisory committee members should evaluate the overall hospitality program.

Issue nine: Public relations (statement numbers 38-42, 53) As shown in Table 12, statement 38 regarding promoting cooperation ($\underline{M} = 4.735$) and statement 40 about influencing legislation ($\underline{M} = 4.559$) were rated "strongly agree". On the remaining statements 39, 41, 42 and 53, the panel "agreed", mean 3.500 to mean 4.499, that advisory committees should develop informational programs, suggest news and feature stories for publication, publicize the hospitality program, and improve the department visibility within the university.

Issue ten: Recruitment, selection and placement (statement numbers 43-48) The panel was asked to respond to six statements regarding recruitment, selection, and placement of hospitality program students as shown in Table 13. Delphi panel members "agreed" with statements 44, 45,

Table 11. Program evaluation

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
37. Evaluate hospitality education	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.059 .600	3.727 .647	4.217 .518	-2.38	0.023*	6

*p < .05.

Table 12. Public relations

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
38. Promote cooperation	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.735 .448	4.818 .405	4.696 .470	0.74	0.464	6
39. Develop informa- tional programs	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.912 .866	4.091 .302	3.826 1.029	0.83	0.412	4
40. Influence legislation	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.559 .561	4.727 .467	4.478 .593	1.22	0.231	9
41. Suggest news stories	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.676 .768	3.909 .539	3.565 .843	1.23	0.227	3
42. Publicize hospi- tality program	$\frac{M}{SD}$	3.941 .952	4.273 .786	3.783 .998	1.43	0.163	7
53. Improve department visibility	$\frac{M}{SD}$	4.029 .460	3.909 .302	4.087 .515	-1.06	0.298	0

Table 13. Recruitment, selection and placement

Statement		Round 3 mean scores			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Round 1 Comments
		Combined	CEO	Adv. Comm.			
43. Scholarship and loan standards	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	1.971 .904	1.909 .539	2.0 1.044	-0.33 ^a	0.740	12
44. Place graduates	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.206 .845	4.364 .809	4.130 .869	0.75	0.460	9
45. Jobs for interns	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.206 .914	4.182 1.079	4.217 .850	-0.10	0.917	7
46. Welcome students	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	3.382 .954	3.182 .982	3.478 .947	-0.84	0.405	7
47. Career programs	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	4.265 .666	4.091 .831	4.348 .573	-1.05	0.299	1
48. Student transfers	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	2.500 .788	2.364 .647	2.565 .843	-0.69	0.494	7

^aSeparate variance estimate.

47 about placing graduates, finding jobs for interns, and assisting with career programs. The panel neither agreed nor disagreed with statements 46 about welcoming new students and 48 about assisting with student transfers among hospitality programs. The panel disagreed with statement 43 about setting standards for scholarships and loans.

The panel "agreed", mean score 3.500 to 4.499, that advisory committees should assist with placing graduates, assist with finding jobs for interns, and participate in hospitality career opportunity programs. They neither agreed nor disagreed ($\underline{M} = 3.382$) with statement 46 regarding visiting the campus early to welcome students and to statement 48, helping to determine how students could transfer from other hospitality programs ($\underline{M} = 2.500$). However, statement 48, might be considered a "disagree" in that the mean rating score of 2.500 was only 0.001 point over the determination point.

Statement 43, "advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans," $\underline{M} = 1.971$, was given the second lowest score of the 60 statements. The Comment Summary from Appendix C was that the advisory committee can suggest criteria for student scholarships and loans, but the school must set standards.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall findings of the study were discussed in the fourth section. This chapter includes an issue by issue summary of the research findings and conclusions, recommendations for application and implications for further research.

Summary

Education and industry can reap mutual benefits from cooperative efforts between hospitality/tourism programs and advisory committees. According to previous hospitality program research, advisory committees consistently provide industry support and promote cooperation among the industry, the public, and the educational institution (Bloom, 1978; Borsenik, 1980; Green, 1981; Hayes, Keefer, & Cummings, 1986). There was, also, disagreement among committee members and educators regarding the functions of advisory committees/councils, according to Caldwell (1974), Douglas (1974), and Trotter (1977).

This research of hospitality programs sought to 1) identify and rank issue statements of importance to four year hospitality/tourism programs where advisory committees are used, 2) identify issue statements in which there is statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in level of agreement between Chief Educational Officers (CEOs) and

advisory committee members, and 3) recommend to hospitality program CEOs issues to which advisory committee members can most likely provide assistance, support and consultation. The CEO is the descriptive term for the department head, department chair, dean, director, or other person who has administrative responsibility for the hospitality program.

Empirical/observational research on advisory committees was conducted with the Delphi technique, a survey design developed by the Rand Corporation (Dalkey, 1969). Delphi incorporates a series of mailed questionnaires to engage expert panelists in an anonymous debate in order to arrive at consensus on issues.

Potential panelists were members of the Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Education (CHRIE) who were also CEOs. CHRIE is the accrediting body for four-year hospitality educational programs. This researcher used program and CEO demographic information provided by CHRIE members to determine panel expertise. The demographic findings of CEOs and four-year hospitality programs are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Advisory committee member demographics are presented in Table 3.

The CEOs for 53 of the 61 hospitality programs selected for participation provided demographic information about themselves and their programs; 37 CEOs reported using an advisory committee; 34 indicated willingness to participate

in the study. The Delphi study was initiated after qualifying a panel of 12 expert CEOs and 28 expert members of their advisory committees.

The researcher identified 48 statements regarding hospitality program advisory committee functions from the research and reports of hospitality programs' authors (Bloom, 1978; Borsenik, 1980; Green, 1981; and Hayes, Keefer, & Cummings, 1986). An additional 12 functions were identified by Delphi panel members in round 1 of this study. Panel members indicated their agreement-disagreement regarding each of 60 statements about advisory committee functions on a five-point Likert scale [Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)] and were requested to add comments to support their positions.

Each panelist received individualized summary information of all data from the previous round indicating their own responses, interquartile range for the entire panel and the median value of each statement. Each panelist was instructed to indicate change or no-change of opinion on the Likert scale based on his/her own previous rating, the panel median, and the panel comments for each statement (Appendix B).

The surveys, data analyses, report-back-to-panel process continued until consensus was reached, predetermined to be when the standard deviation of the mean for each of the 60

(original 48, plus 12) statements was less than 1.000. Consensus was achieved on 58 of the 60 statements at the completion of round 3. Participant comments to support a statement rating are an important component of the Delphi process. The three rounds generated 385, 271, and 117 comments, respectively (Appendix C).

The statements rated by panel members were organized into 10 issues. A ranking of statement rating by Round 3 standard deviation and mean score are in Appendix E.

The panel members "strongly agreed" ($\bar{M} > 4.499$) with six statements about advising of employment opportunities, representing a variety of industry experience, promoting cooperation, advisory committee members industry experience, influencing legislation, and orientation and training for advisory committee members (Table E-2). The panel "agreed" with 35 statements ($\bar{M} = 3.500$ to 4.499) identifying functions of hospitality program advisory committees. Panel members "disagreed" with four statements ($\bar{M} = 1.500$ to 2.499). The four statements were about advisory committee members selecting award and scholarship recipients, assisting with determination of budget expenditures, setting standards for student scholarships and loans, and making decisions on curriculum. Strong disagreement ($\bar{M} < 1.500$) was not indicated for any of the 60 Round 3 mean scores. The Comment Summary for each of the three rounds is in

Appendix C. See Appendix E for a ranking by mean and by standard deviation of panelists' response to statements.

At the conclusion of the final round, the means of CEOs and advisory committee members were statistically compared using the t-test to determine if the two groups' responses were statistically significantly different. Ten statistically significant mean differences ($p < .05$) were identified within the following issues: Advisory committee composition (1), Curriculum (1), Finance (3), General activities (2), Industry program/faculty assistance (2), and Program evaluation (1). Panel comments were considered an important part of the Delphi process and, therefore, are incorporated by issue into the data.

Conclusions

This section states the research conclusions for each of the ten issues. See Chapter IV for a more detailed analysis of results by mean scores, panel comments, and significant differences between ratings of CEOs vs. advisory committee members.

Issue one: Composition of advisory committees (statement numbers 1-6, 51, 52, 57-60)

- o Advisory committee members should have experience in the program area they advise and represent a wide variety of resources in the hospitality industry.

- o The commitments of advisory committee members to their business and other professional interests should not be a hindrance to their involvement and participation on the committee.
- o Questions about advisory committee members' academic degrees should not be asked.
- o Advisory committee members want to make and be consulted about recommendations for new members.
- o Students and higher administrators such as the Dean or Provost should be considered for committee membership.

Issue two: Effectiveness (statement numbers 7-11)

- o Advisory committees should evaluate the committee's productivity and expect program improvements as a result of their input.
- o Advisory committee members expect orientation and training regarding their roles.
- o CEOs should have educational preparation in implementing and working with advisory committees.

Issue three: Curriculum (statement numbers 12-16)

- o Advisory committee members should be consulted about program curricula but do not want to make curriculum decisions.
- o However, advisory committees should make recommendations about course content and assist in

developing educational objectives for hospitality programs.

- o The advisory committee should advise the CEO about special training needs for hospitality occupations; CEOs significantly disagree, $p < .01$.

Issue four: Physical facilities (statement number 17)

- o Advisory committees should recommend physical facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.

Issue five: Financial (statement numbers 18-20, 54-56)

Advisory committees should:

- o Recommend the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.
- o Help raise unrestricted funds for the hospitality program. CEOs were significantly, $p < .05$, in agreement with this function than advisory committee members.
- o Be approached cautiously about arranging for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials. Note: CEO's agreed with this statement, advisory committee members did not, and the mean difference was highly significant, $p < .01$.

Advisory committees should not:

- o Be asked to assist with the determination of budget expenditures.

Issue six: General activities (statement numbers 21-27, 49, 50)

Advisory committees should:

- o Advise the CEO of educational trends, employment opportunities, and help determine education and experience students need for work in the hospitality industry.
- o Educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with allied professionals.
- o Meet face-to-face more often than once a year; the advisory committee chair and CEOs should establish the meeting agenda. Note: CEOs are significantly more in agreement than advisory committee members that CEOs should speak with all members between formal meetings.
- o The committee members need to be given recognition in the community. Note: CEOs are significantly more in agreement, $p < .01$, with this statement than advisory committee members.

Issue seven: Industry program/faculty assistance (statement numbers 28-36)

Advisory committee members should:

- o Interact with faculty.
- o Initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by faculty.
- o Facilitate arrangements for field trips. Note: CEOs were significantly more in agreement with this function than the advisory committee members.
- o Present panel discussions.
- o Locate industry people to guest lecture.
- o Conduct parts of in-service program for faculty.
- o Identify research needs.
- o Note: Advisory committee members should not be asked to help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.

Issue eight: Program evaluation (statement number 37)

Advisory committee members should help evaluate the overall hospitality program. Note: Advisory committee members were significantly more in agreement than CEOs with this committee function.

Issue nine: Public relations (statement numbers 38-42, 53)

Advisory committee members should:

- o Promote cooperation among the industry, the public and hospitality programs.
- o Assist with developing informational programs.
- o Influence local, state, and federal legislation favorable to hospitality education.
- o Assist with publicity featuring hospitality programs.
- o Improve program visibility within the institution.
- o Note: All six of the statements within this issue were rated agree or strongly agree.

Issue ten: Recruitment, selection, and placement (statement numbers 43-48)

Advisory committees should:

- o Assist with graduate placement.
- o Find jobs for interns.
- o Participate in hospitality career-opportunity programs.
- o Note: Advisory committee members do not want to set standards for student scholarship or loans nor do they want to help determine how students may transfer between programs.

There are some subtle findings which the statistical analysis fails to address. Advisory committee members expect orientation which includes goals, objectives, and

expectations of the committee. Also, they want the CEO to at least consider their suggestions in relation to practicality and balance with existing programs.

Curriculum is an issue for hidden agendas. The advisory committee members were willing to leave curriculum decisions to the CEO. However, when specific statements related to curriculum were rated by advisory committee members, indications are they want to be involved. For example, they want to be consulted ($\bar{M} = 4.304$) about curriculum, they want to recommend subject matter ($\bar{M} = 4.174$), they want to advise about special training needs for specific hospitality programs ($\bar{M} = 4.478$), and they want to develop educational objectives ($\bar{M} = 4.130$).

Recommendations

CEOs presently using or planning to implement an advisory committee should review the research results according to: advisory committee functions with "strong agreement" ratings of 4.500 or greater; the ten functions on which CEOs and advisory committee members significantly differed; the four advisory committee functions with a "disagree" rating of 2.500 or less; the 35 advisory committee functions rated "agree". Specific recommendations follow.

- 1) Review the 41 statements with a mean score of 3.5 or greater as evidence of the wide range of functions which

hospitality program advisory committee members agree to support and assist.

- 2) Implement the functions represented by the six statements listed below (#3, 4, 9, 23, 38, 40) which were rated 4.500 or higher.
 - #3 CEOs should appoint an advisory committee whose members have a variety of hospitality experience;
 - #4 Advisory committee members should represent a variety of industry segments.
 - #9 Advisory committee members should receive orientation and training regarding role expectations.
 - #23 CEOs should seek the advice of the advisory committee members regarding employment opportunities.
 - #38 CEOs should use advisory committees to promote cooperation among industry, the public, and educational programs.
 - #40 Advisory committees should promote legislation favorable to hospitality education.
- 3) Be prepared for a substantial discussion and differences of opinion on ten functions of advisory committees which were rated in statements: #15, 20, 25, 31, 36, 37, 49, 51, 54, 56. Those ten were:

- #15 Advisory committee members should advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupations.
- #20 Advisory committee members should arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials.
- #25 Advisory committee members need to be given recognition in their community.
- #31 Advisory committees should facilitate the arrangements for appropriate field trips.
- #36 Advisory committees should help identify research needed in hospitality education and the hospitality industry.
- #37 Advisory committees should help evaluate the overall hospitality education program.
- #49 CEOs should speak with all members between formal meetings.
- #51 Higher administrators should present facts to the committee but not participate in decision making.
- #54 Advisory committee members should help generate funds to facilitate the development of student exchange programs.
- #56 Advisory committees should help raise unrestricted funds for hospitality programs.

Recognition (statement #25) should be given to advisory committee members, even though the mean rating scores indicate lack of agreement about the need for recognition to committee members. The literature uniformly supports recognition for advisory committee members.

- 4) Avoid involving advisory committee members in the four functions with a "disagree" rating, nos. 12, 18, 33, and 43. Those were:
 - #33 Advisory committees should help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.
 - #18 Advisory committees should assist with determination of budget expenditures.
 - #43 Advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans.
 - #12 Advisory committees should make decisions on curriculum.

Future Studies

Future studies should be considered:

- 1) This study could be expanded to analyze the statement ratings by CEO personal and program demographics, such as industry experience, age, size of program, education; and by advisory committee members demographics, especially occupation.

- 2) The results of this study of hospitality program advisory committees could be compared with two- and four-year educational program advisory committee studies and similarities and differences noted.
- 3) There is a general tone of agreement about the positive effect of advisory committees on the hospitality program. This researcher did not attempt to identify program improvements attributable to advisory committee efforts. However, the panel agreed that advisory committee members should help evaluate the hospitality program. Measurable indicators of program improvement should be identified and then applied to a comparison between programs with and without advisory committees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Vocational Association Publications Committee.
(1969). The Advisory Committee and Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Beal, George M., Bohlen, Joe M., & Raudabaugh, J. Neil.
(1975). Leadership and dynamic group action. Ames: IA: The Iowa State University Press.
- Bloom, T. A. (1978, January). The hospitality education advisory committee. The Journal of Hospitality Education, 2(2), 39-47.
- Borsenik, Frank D. (1980, December). Committee report: Ten year planning. Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Education, Washington, D.C.
- Bunning, Richard L. (1979). The delphi technique: A projection tool for serious inquiry. 1979 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. LaJolla, CA: University Associates.
- Burt, S. M. & Lessinger, L. M. (1970). Volunteer industry in public education. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath Co.
- Caldwell, Thomas P. (1974). An assessment of perceptions of Arizona school administrators concerning school community advisory councils in educational decision making. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35.

- Cochran, Samuel W. (1983). The delphi method: Formulating and refining group judgments. Unpublished paper. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Cochran, Leslie H., Phelps, L. Allen, & Cochran, Linda Letwin. (1980). Advisory committees in action. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Education. (1990 January). "Accreditation commission program review." CHRIE Communique, 4(1), 1.
- Coy, Roger L. (1969). A study of lay participation in the public schools. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW).
- Cyphert, Frederick, & Gant, Walter L. (1971). "The Delphi technique: A case study." Phi Delta Kappan, 42(5), 272-273.
- Dalkey, Norman C. (1969). The Delphi Method: An experimental study of group opinion. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Dalkey, Norman C., & Helmer, Olaf. (July 1962). An experimental application of the Delphi process to the use of experts. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. [Also published (1963) in Management Science, I(3), 458.]

- Dalkey, Norman C. (1971). Studies in the quality of life: Delphi and decision making. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.
- Davies, D., Stanton, J., Clasby, M., Zerhykov, R., & Powers, B. (1978). Sharing the power? Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.
- Davies, Don. (1981). Citizen participation in decision making in the schools. Communities and their schools. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dean, Edward D. (1982). Standards for evaluation of vocational education programs in Missouri as perceived by a jury of experts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Delbecq, Andre L., Van de Ven, Andrew H., & Gustafson, David H. (1975). Group techniques for program planning. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.
- Douglas, C. (1974). A study to determine the perceived effectiveness of technical and vocational program advisory committees in Texas Community Colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 7649.
- Enzer, S., Little, D., & Lazer, F. (1971). Some societal changes by 1985 and their impact on time/money budget. Middletown, CT: Institute for the Future.
- Farrah, George. (1962). The roles of citizens' advisory committees in curriculum development: A special case in

- Farrington, Michigan (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1962). Dissertation Abstracts, 23, 04-A.
- Fusco, Gene C. (1964). Citizens' committees for better schools. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Gonder, Peggy O'Dell. (1977). Linking schools and the community. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.
- Gordon, Theodore J. (1968). New approaches to Delphi. In James R. Bright, ed., Technological forecasting for industry and government. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Green, H. T. (1981, Summer). The use of occupational advisory committees in developing curricula for hospitality education. The Journal of Hospitality Education, 6(1), 66-73.
- Hamlin, Herbert M. (1952). Citizens Committees in the Schools. Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers.
- Hayes, D., Keefer, M., & Cummings, P. (1986). External support for educational excellence. Paper presented at the meeting of the 1986 Annual Conference of the Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Education, Boston.
- Hines, Donna D. (1986). A Delphi study: Perception of current issues and trends of cooperative education in Texas post-secondary institutions. Unpublished doctoral

- dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas.
- Huber, George P. (1980). Managerial Decision Making. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Hudson, Ivan. (1974, September). A bibliography on the Delphi technique; Exchange bibliography 652. Monticello, IL: Council of Planning Librarians.
- Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council. (1984). A Resource Guide on Local Vocational Education Advisory Councils. Iowa Curriculum Assistance Program, Ames, IA.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1975). Joining together: Group theory and group skills. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Larreche, Jean-Claude & Montgomery, David B. (1977). A framework for the comparison of marketing models: A Delphi study. Cambridge, MS: Marketing Science Institute Research.
- Linstone, Harold A., & Turoff, Murray. (Eds.). (1975). The Delphi method techniques and applications. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Madonis, G. P. (1969). The future of the Delphi technique. In R. L. Abrams (Ed.), Technological forecasting. Edinburge: University Press.
- Martino, Joseph P. (1983). Technological forecasting for decision making. New York: North-Holland Company.

- McArtor, Bruce E. (1987). Local advisory council member's perceptions of the importance of functions compared with council productivity in the state of Maryland. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.
- McKenna, M. F. (1973). A model to determine the effectiveness of school community advisory councils of the Los Angeles Unified School District (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1973), Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 3774.
- McKune, E. J. (1965). Do educators want laymen's help? The School Executive, 65, 63.
- Miller, Leann R. (1975). Citizens advisory committees, public participation increases; Guides change in American education, current trends in school policies and programs. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center.
- Oldham, Neil B. (1973). Citizens advisory committees, public participation increases; Guides change in American education, current trends in school policies and programs. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center.
- Paul, K. P., & Braden, P. V. (1979). Aligning vocational programs with employer needs. 1980 Yearbook of the

American Vocational Association, Vol. 97. Arlington, VA: American Vocational Association.

Public Law 94-482.

Random House Dictionary. (1980). New York: Ballentine Books.

Reilly, Patrick L. (April, 1986). Curriculum revision using advisory committees and a modification of the Delphi technique for electronic engineering technology programs. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University. (EDRS Document Reproduction Service No. 143)

Ricklefe, R. (1975). Campus SOS; Colleges seek to raise record sums of money to battle inflation. Wall Street Journal, 186, 16.

Roberts, M. Diane. (February 1984). Development of indices of effectiveness: A quantification of the accrediting process. Journal of Allied Health, 13(1), 13-21.

Salisbury, Robert H. (November 1979). Modes of participation and policy impact in American education. International Journal of Political Education, II, 301.

Sandler, C. (1985). Cooperation between the food service industry and hotel, restaurant, and institutional management programs at colleges and universities--a national survey. Chicago: National Institute for the Foodservice Industry.

- Sappe, John H. (1984). A national study of selected terminology used by curriculum specialists in vocational education. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia.
- Stadt, Ronald, Bittle, Raymond, Kenneke, Larry, & Mystrom, Dennis. (1973). Managing Career Education Programs. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Stemnock, Suzanne K. (1968). Citizens' Advisory Committees, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 031 811.
- Tersine, Richard J., & Riggs, Walter. (1976). "The Delphi technique: A long-range planning tool." Business Horizons, 19(2), 51-56.
- Trail, Thomas R. (1984). Opinions of selected Missouri school superintendents concerning citizens' advisory committees. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Trotter, S. M. (1977). Perceptions of selected members of vocational education advisory committees in Pennsylvania area vocational-technical schools. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 1512.
- Tyack, David B. (1981). "Historical perspectives on public education." In Don Davies, (ed.), Communities and their schools. New York: McGraw-Hill.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
(1979). Four short papers highlighting aspects of a
study of citizens organizations: Citizen participation
in educational decision-making. Washington, D.C.:
Educational Resources Center.

Weaver, W. Timothy. (1971, January). The delphi
forecasting method. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 267-271.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to Dr. Tom Walsh for his continued personal and professional support and to Dr. Larry Ebbers, for the "good, great, go-for-it" professional guidance and direction through the many revisions.

The author acknowledges Dr. Mary Huba for her assistance with the revisions of the third, fourth, and fifth sections at a critical time. A special thanks to Dr. Irene Beavers, who has assisted the author through 12 years of graduate study. Dr. Robert Martin's expertise with advisory committees was very helpful to the author, especially in developing the direction and purpose of the research.

This dissertation was made possible through the encouragement of my wife, Joann, who also provided expertise in survey research and critical review. Our adult children, John, Patricia, and Susan, have followed and supported the author's progress through their high school and college degrees.

A final tribute goes to the hospitality program CEOs and members of their advisory committees for completing the Delphi rounds and providing the author with close to a 90 percent response.

Financial support for this study by the National Restaurant Association through the Educational Foundation is gratefully acknowledged.

APPENDIX A: COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE TO DETERMINE
PANEL, INTRODUCE EACH ROUND AND ENCOURAGE CONTINUATION

	Page
Correspondence to determine panel:	
March letter	110b
April letter	111
CEO questionnaire	112
Round 1 introduction and follow-up correspondence:	
May round 1 letter	114
Advisory committee questionnaire	115
June round 1 reminder	116
Round 2 introduction and follow-up correspondence:	
July round 2 letter	117
August round 2 reminder letter	118
Round 3 introduction and follow-up correspondence:	
August round 3 letter	119
September round 3 reminder letter	120

March 29, 1989

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear GREET:

Because of your position as the administrative head of a leading hospitality program, we are asking your assistance in a doctoral dissertation study of the composition, effectiveness, and activities of advisory committees serving four-year hospitality programs. One objective of the study is to compare the views of academic unit leaders with persons who presently serve or have served on advisory committees.

You can help in two important ways. One is to serve as an expert educator panelist and the other by suggesting at least three present or former advisory committee members who you believe have a good understanding of advisory committees. Each suggested committee member will be contacted and asked to participate in this study. We are especially interested in having women and minorities represented.

As a participant, you will receive a series of three questionnaires. Each questionnaire should require not more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential. A copy of the study's results will be provided to you.

Please complete and return the enclosed, short questionnaire which will provide some general information about yourself and your hospitality program, your willingness to participate, and the names of at least three lay advisory committee members who you suggest should be invited to participate. A stamped, addressed envelope is provided.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact either of us by mail or telephone. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

James "Jim" Huss
Principal Investigator
(515) 294-3527

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D.
Department Head
(515) 294-1730

Enclosure

April 11, 1989

To: L. Baltzer, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Hotel,
Restaurant, and Institution Management
N. Brown, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Hotel,
Restaurant, and Institution Management
S. Gilmore, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Hotel,
Restaurant, and Institution Management
D. Kelly, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Hotel,
Restaurant, and Institution Management
R. Manning, Director, Small Business Development
Center, Ames, Iowa

From: Jim Huss

I need some professional assistance. I'm going to use the enclosed survey instrument with a Delphi research technique to resolve identified issues pertaining to hospitality program advisory committees. The issues will be resolved through a consensus of opinion of 16 expert hospitality program Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and 32 members of their advisory committees.

I want to "check out" my instrument and procedure for data analysis. Would you take "some time" to complete the enclosed questionnaire? If so, please assume you are an expert CEO in HRIM (now that's not hard to do, is it!). Please note the time it took for completion.

That's it. However, if you have a few more minutes, please go back and make notes on the instrument about any items you found confusing, annoying, redundant, irrelevant, and so on.

Thanks. Please return by April 20. Always in a hurry, it seems.

CEO General Information Questionnaire
ISU Hospitality Advisory Committee Study

A. Personal Information

1. _____ Number of years in hospitality industry.
2. _____ Number of years in hospitality education.
3. _____ Number of years as a hospitality education CEO.
4. _____ Number of years in present position.
5. _____ Number of years that you have served as a member of an industry advisory committee (if none use zero).
6. Age:
_____ under 35; _____ 35-44; _____ 45-54; _____ 55 and above
7. Gender:
_____ M; _____ F

B. Program Information

8. Enrollment numbers, Fall 1988 (approximate):
 _____ Undergraduates
 _____ Master's degree students
 _____ Doctoral students
9. College/school in which hospitality program is located (check one):
 _____ Agriculture
 _____ Business
 _____ Home Economics or related
 _____ Independent college/school
 _____ Other, please specify: _____
10. Does your program have an industry advisory committee?
 _____ Yes
 _____ No

(over)

ISU Hospitality Advisory Committee Study

C. Names and addresses of lay advisory committee members who you suggest should be invited to participate in this study.

- 1. _____

- 2. _____

- 3. _____

D. Address to which future mailings of materials should be sent you (if different from label):

Name _____
 Street/building _____
 City, state, zip _____

Please check one and sign below:

- _____ Yes, I would be willing to serve as an expert panelist.
- _____ Sorry, I am unable to participate.

Signature _____

Please return by April 7, 1989, in self-addressed postage paid envelope.

May 22, 1989

NAME
TITLE
ADDRESS

Dear GREET:

Because of your valued experience as a member of a hospitality education advisory committee, [CEO] has recommended that you be invited to participate in a research project related to the composition, effectiveness, and appropriate activities of advisory committees serving four-year hospitality programs. You are one of only 46 persons in the United States selected to participate.

One objective of the study is to compare the views of a group of selected academic unit leaders with the group of advisory committee members who presently serve or have served on advisory committees. <CEO> has also been selected and has agreed to serve as a member of the academic leader group.

We are asking you to serve as a panelist on the advisory committee group. If you are willing, please complete the enclosed questionnaire and brief personal information sheet and return in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. The 47-item questionnaire can usually be completed in 15 to 20 minutes. Instructions are provided on the questionnaire.

Your responses and those of all members of the advisory committee group will be tallied. You will then receive another questionnaire showing how your responses compared to other members of the group and then be asked to reconsider your responses and return the questionnaire. The process will be repeated once more to see how your adjusted responses compare with the group's adjusted responses. You will then be asked to reconsider a final time and return the questionnaire. A similar process will be used with the academic unit leader panelists.

All responses are confidential. Only group results will be reported. The control number on the questionnaire is only used to record returned questionnaires. For your participation, you will receive a copy of the final results.

We hope that you are interested in participating in this important project and will complete and return the questionnaire and information sheet. If you have questions or concerns, please contact either of us. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D.
Department Head

June 19, 1989

<NAME>
<ADDRESS>

Dear <GREET>:

We are writing to follow-up our May 23 letter to you concerning a doctoral dissertation research study of the role of advisory committees to hospitality education programs. We have not received a response from you.

Because it is possible that the materials did not get to you, enclosed is another copy of the letter, questionnaire, instructions, survey instrument and return envelope.

As mentioned in the enclosed earlier letter, you were recommended to participate by an academic program leader. Only 17 leaders of hospitality programs were selected and all have agreed to participate. Your participation is needed.

Even if you are not able to participate, we would appreciate your completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire about you. We would like to hear from you no later than June 25.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator
(515) 294-3527

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D.
Department Head
(515) 294-1730

July 13, 1989

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear GREET,

Thank you for your superb work. We have excellent response and support for the hospitality program advisory committee research project. The panel is composed of 10 selected hospitality program deans, directors, and department heads (CEO's) and 28 recommended members of hospitality program advisory committees.

Your continued participation is very important through rounds two and three. There is quite a difference in the scores between hospitality program CEO's and advisory committee members on some of the items.

The instructions and Delphi instrument for round 2 are enclosed. Note that 10 statements specified by panel members in round one have been added to the instrument for your consideration.

Please complete and return the survey instrument in the enclosed, stamped envelope by July 28. A short response time is vital to the success of this project.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator
(515) 294-3527

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D.
Department Head
(515) 294-1730

August 4, 1989

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear GREET:

I am writing to you to follow-up the July 13 letter to you concerning a doctoral dissertation research study of the role of advisory committees to hospitality education programs. I have not received a response from you.

To date, I have received completed instruments from 30 of the 37 panel members, which is excellent. However, responses from the remaining seven are very important in a research project such as this. You are one of 27 expert advisory committee members and 10 program directors across the United States selected for inclusion in this study.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator

August 24, 1989

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear GREET,

The end is in sight. Thank you for the excellent response to the first two rounds. As you can see on the instrument, you are very close to consensus on most of the statements. We do not anticipate that a fourth round will be necessary.

Your continued participation is very important through round three, especially because of the ten additional statements added in round two by the advisory committee members.

The instructions, round two comments, and Delphi instrument are enclosed. Please complete and return only the survey instrument in the enclosed, stamped envelope by September 8. A short response time is vital to the success of this project. You may want to keep the comments for your information.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D.
Department Head

September 14, 1989

NAME
ADDRESS

Dear GREET:

We are writing to follow-up our August 24 Delphi panel instrument concerning a doctoral dissertation research study of the role of advisory committees to hospitality education programs. We have not received a response from you.

Only 40 expert advisory committee members or hospitality program CEO's in the United States were selected for this research project, so your response is especially important.

Thank you for you continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

James J. (Jim) Huss
Principal Investigator
(515) 294-3527

Thomas E. Walsh, Ph.D
Department Head
(515) 294-1730

APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING EACH DELPHI
ROUND AND DELPHI ROUND 2 INSTRUMENT

	Page
Instructions for completing each Delphi round:	
Delphi round 1 instructions	122
Delphi round 2 instructions	123
Delphi round 3 instructions	124
Delphi round 2 instrument	125

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ROUND ONE OF THE IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
HOSPITALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE RESEARCH PROJECT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this Delphi study on the composition, effectiveness, and activities of hospitality program advisory committees. This first round has 47 statements describing various aspects of hospitality program advisory committees. Please respond as follows:

- A. Circle the number on the scale that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement. A circle around "5", for example, would indicate that you agree strongly with the statement made.
- B. The Delphi works best when participants present arguments supporting their opinions. On the items where you have strong reasons for your rating, please write these reasons in the "comment" space provided by each item. You are not expected to write about all items.
- C. If you have a statement about hospitality program advisory committees that you would like the panel to consider, please write it out and indicate that you want it added for the next round. Space is provided on the last page of the survey form for this purpose.
- D. The phrase "advisory committee" as used in this study, refers to those committees that are initiated and organized to advise and report directly to the hospitality program dean, department head, department chair, or director.

Please complete and return the survey instrument in the enclosed, stamped envelope by June 7. A short response time is vital to the success of this project.

Thank you for your cooperation.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ROUND TWO OF THE IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
HOSPITALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE RESEARCH PROJECT**

Since the primary intent of the Delphi process is to encourage the development of an accurate group consensus regarding the issues being considered, feedback regarding the panel's round one responses on each Delphi item is included for your consideration during this round of the process. This feedback includes the following:

Median Group Response. The median is the middle point of the panelists' scores. Half scored above and half scored below the median. The median is indicated by a checkmark below the scale. (✓)

Interquartile Range. The area on the scale where the middle 50% of the responses fell for each item is called the interquartile range. This range is the area enclosed in brackets [] on the survey scale.

Round One Responses. Your round response to each item is indicated with a checkmark above the scale. (✓)

This information has been presented to you in as convenient a form as possible. Please consider it as you complete round two.

Round Two Instructions:

- A. Based on the feedback from round one and your best judgment, please circle the number on the scale that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement. A circle around "5" for example, would indicate that you agree strongly with the statement made.
- B. If your round two rating falls outside the area on the scale enclosed in brackets, you must briefly state your rationale for this rating. If your response falls within the bracket, no written response is necessary.

Please complete and return the Delphi form within ten days. The enclosed mailer does not need postage.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ROUND THREE OF THE IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
HOSPITALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE RESEARCH PROJECT**

Round two went extremely well thanks to your excellent cooperation. We are very close to completing this Delphi study.

Since the primary intent of the Delphi process is to encourage the development of an accurate group consensus regarding the issues being considered, feedback regarding the panel's round two responses on each Delphi item is included for your consideration during this round of the process. This feedback includes the following:

Comments. All written comments requested of panel members who scored a statement outside the round two brackets (the Interquartile Range).

Median Group Response. The median is the middle point of the panelists' scores. Half scored above and half scored below the median. The median is indicated by a checkmark below the scale. [✓]

Interquartile Range. The area on the scale where the middle 50% of the responses fell for each item is called the interquartile range. This range is the area enclosed in brackets [] on the survey scale.

Round Two Responses. Your round response to each item is indicated with a checkmark above the scale. [✓]

This information has been presented to you in as convenient a form as possible. Please consider it as you complete round three.

Round Three Instructions:

- A. Based on the feedback from round two and your best judgment, please circle the number on the scale that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement. A circle around "5" for example, would indicate that you "agree strongly" with the statement made.

Please complete and return the Delphi form within ten days. The enclosed mailer does not need postage.

Hospitality Advisory Committee Questionnaire: Round 2
 Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management
 Iowa State University

Instructions: Circle the number on the scale that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement. A circle around "5", for example, would indicate that you agree strongly with the statement made.

ISSUE 1: Advisory Committee Composition

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
A. Educational degrees should be a consideration in selecting advisory committee members.	1	(2)	3	4	5
B. The number of terms an advisory committee member can serve should be limited.		(2)	3	4	5
C. Advisory committee members should have experience in some aspect of the program they will advise.	1	2	3	(4)	5
D. Advisory committee members should represent a wide variety of the hospitality industry segments.	1	2	3	4	(5)
E. Advisory committee members who are busy with their profession/business will be effective committee members.	1	2	(3)	4	5
F. Members should have a sense of responsibility, civic mindedness, and cooperative nature to be effective.	1	2	3	(4)	5

125

ISSUE 2: Advisory Committee Effectivness

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committee members should be asked to evaluate the committee's productivity.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1
B. There should be program improvements attributable to advisory committee efforts.	1 2 3	(4 5) 1
C. New advisory committee members should be oriented and trained regarding expectations of them.	1 2 3	(4 5) 1
D. Advisory committee suggestions should be implemented.	1 2	(3 4) 5 1
E. Implementing and working with an advisory committee should be a part of hospitality program directors educational preparation.	1 2 3	(4 5) 1

126

ISSUE 3: Curriculum

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should make decisions on curriculum.	(1 2 3)	4 5 1
B. Advisory committees should be consulted for curriculum advice.	1 2 3	(4 5) 1

ISSUE 3: Curriculum (Continued)

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
C. Advisory committees should make recommendations regarding the subject matter content of the courses.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1
D. Advisory committees should advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupations.	1 2 3	(4 5) 1
E. Advisory committees should help develop educational objectives for the program.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1

ISSUE 4: Facilities

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1

127

ISSUE 5: Financial

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should assist with determination of budget expenditures.	(1 2 3)	4 5 1

ISSUE 5: Financial

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
B. Advisory committees should recommend the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.	1	2	[3	4]	5
			1		
C. Advisory committees should arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials.	[1	2	3	4]	5
			1		

ISSUE 6: General Activities

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should provide criteria for selection of the administrative head.	1	[2	3	4]	5
			1		
B. Advisory committees should advise the school of trends in educational requirements.	1	2	[3	4	5]
				1	
C. Advisory committees should advise the school of employment opportunities in the hospitality industry.	1	2	3	4	[5]
					1
D. Advisory committees should help determine the education and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry.	1	2	3	[4	5]
				1	

ISSUE 6: General ActivitiesCOMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
E. Advisory committee members need to be given recognition in their community.	1 2	(3 4) 5 1
F. Advisory committees should meet face-to-face more often than once a year.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1
G. Advisory committee members should educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with allied professionals, such as sales and equipment company representatives.	1 2	(3 4) 5 1

ISSUE 7: Industry Program/Faculty AssistanceCOMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should assist the school to obtain instructors.	1 2	(3 4) 5 1
B. Advisory committees should interact with faculty.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1
C. Advisory committees should initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by the faculty.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1
D. Advisory committees should facilitate the arrangements for appropriate field trips.	1 2	(3 4 5) 1

ISSUE 7: Industry Program/Faculty Assistance

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
E. Advisory committees members should present panel discussions to students and civic groups.	1 2	3 4 5 ↑
F. Advisory committees should help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.	1	2 3 4 5 ↑
G. Advisory committees should help locate industry resource people to occasionally guest-lecture.	1 2 3	4 5 ↑
H. Advisory committees should be asked to conduct parts of in-service programs for the faculty members.	1 2	3 4 5 ↑
I. Advisory committees should help identify research needed in hospitality education and the hospitality industry.	1 2 3	4 5 ↑

130

ISSUE 8: Program Evaluation

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should help evaluate the overall hospitality education program.	1 2 3	4 5 ↑

ISSUE 9: Public Relations

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should promote cooperation among the industry, general public, and the hospitality programs.	1	2	3	(4 5) ↑
B. Advisory committees should assist in the development of informational programs.	1	2	(3 4)	5 ↑
C. Advisory committees should help influence local, state, and federal legislation in ways favorable to hospitality education.	1	2	3	(4 5) ↑
D. Advisory committees should suggest news and feature stories to local newspapers and help in their publication.	1	2	(3 4)	5 ↑
E. Advisory committees should arrange to publicize the hospitality program through exhibits, bulletins and meetings of civic groups, Chambers of Commerce, and other groups.	1	2	(3 4)	5 ↑

131

ISSUE 10: Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
A. Advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans.	(2	3)	4 5 ↑

ISSUE 10: Recruitment, Selection, and Placement (Continued)

COMMENTS or SUPPORT of your position

Statements:	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
B. Advisory committees should assist in the placement of graduates.	1	2	3	(4)	5
C. Advisory committee members should help find jobs for "interns."	1	2	3	(4)	5
D. Advisory committee members should visit the campus early in the academic year to welcome and encourage hospitality students.	1	2	(3)	(4)	5
E. Advisory committee members should participate in special hospitality career opportunity programs.	1	2	3	(4)	5
F. Advisory committee members should help determine how students could transfer from the hospitality program of other schools, colleges, and universities.	1	(2)	(3)	4	5

132

NEW STATEMENTS ADDED BY PANEL MEMBERS:

49. CEO's should speak with all members between formal meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Advisory committee chair and program director should establish the agenda for meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Higher administrators should present facts to the committee but not participate in decision making.	1	2	3	4	5

Statements:	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
52. The Dean/Provost/Academic head of the institution should sit on the advisory committee.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Advisory committees should help to improve the department visibility within the college or university.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Advisory committee members should help generate funds to facilitate the development of student exchange programs.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Advisory committee members should assist in obtaining resources from on-campus sources.	1	2	3	4	5
56. Advisory committees should help raise unrestricted funds for hospitality programs.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Advisory committee members should be determined by the program CEO.	1	2	3	4	5
58. New advisory committee members should be selected by current committee members.	1	2	3	4	5
59. Advisory committee members should recommend colleagues for membership on the advisory committee.	1	2	3	4	5
60. Students of various academic levels should be on the advisory committee.	1	2	3	4	5

133

Please return in stamped, addressed envelope to
 Jim Huss, Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Institution Management
 Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF DELPHI PANEL COMMENTS FOR
ROUNDS 1, 2 AND 3 (Tables C-1, C-2, C-3)

Table C-1. Summary of Delphi panel round 1 comments	135
Table C-2. Summary of Delphi panel round 2 comments	141
Table C-3. Summary of Delphi panel round 3 comments	147

Table C-1. Summary of Delphi panel round 1 comments

SUM1: Practical; on the job experience is equally as important. Many industry people do not have degrees, but are highly experienced and qualified. Number of comments = 17.

SUM2: Length of term depends upon type of position, commitment and productivity. Long-term board members bring background/knowledge to the committee, but new ideas are important, too. Would consider reappointment on individual basis. Number of comments = 13.

SUM3: Industry experience should be a prerequisite for advisory committee members (and instructors) but perhaps some provision could be made to include legislators/community leaders in some capacity. Number of comments = 9.

SUM4: Advisory committee members should be diverse, representing a variety of areas to get a good cross-section of the industry, possibly touching in the travel and tourism industry, too. Number of comments = 11.

SUM5: Look for commitment, not degree of busy-ness, when selecting advisory board members. However, busy-ness is sometimes a good indicator of effectiveness but there's a risk that a busy person may not have time to come to meetings. Number of comments = 12.

SUM6: Responsibility is important, but not necessarily cooperation and civic-mindedness. Number of comments = 4.

SUM7: Advisory committee members should do a self-evaluation, especially when the committee wants to implement change. More specifics needed. Number of comments = 5.

SUM8: Advisory board members must feel their involvement has a positive influence on the program, although this isn't always true. Number of comments = 5.

SUM9: New advisory board members should receive orientation as to goals, objectives, expectations, but no attempt should be made to "train" or brainwash them. Number of comments = 11.

Table C-1. Continued

SUM10: All advisory board program suggestions should be considered, then evaluated as to their practicality, validity, and balance with existing programs, before implementing them in the program. Number of comments = 18.

SUM11: Program directors should be taught how to work with an advisory committee in the areas of group dynamics, management, and communication. Number of comments = 5.

SUM12: The advisory committee can make recommendations about the curriculum but decisions should be strictly up to faculty/administration. Only in particular cases should committee become involved in curriculum decisions. Number of comments = 19.

SUM13: Advisory committee members should be consulted for advice because they have experience and practical skills that complement academic learning. However, committees should be used in only an advisory capacity. Number of comments = 8.

SUM14: Advisory committees should review all courses, course additions, or those courses which don't meet industry needs, and make suggestions or formal recommendations. Number of comments = 9.

SUM15: Advisory committee members are most aware of changing needs in industry and should advise on skills training for specific occupations. Advisory committees should not be involved in great detail with specific courses. Number of comments = 7.

SUM16: Educational objectives should be determined by the faculty; however, the advisory committee could be consulted for new programs or if members are very committed to the program. Number of comments = 6.

SUM17: Advisory committees can make recommendations for physical facilities and equipment only if they make recommendations for funding, are willing to commit financial resources, they are familiar with state-of-the-art equipment, or their recommendations are needed in the budgetary process. Number of comments = 9.

Table C-1. Continued

SUM18: Advisory committees should not make budget recommendations because the process is too detailed, too time-consuming, requires an understanding of state and college policies, and is not part of an advisory committee's function. However, committees can assist if members understand budget restraints. Number of comments = 13.

SUM19: Advisory committee members may know what equipment and facilities are needed in industry, but they should not recommend the type and quality needed for educational use unless they also seek a source of funding. Number of comments = 6.

SUM20: Advisory committees should not be required to assist with student loans or instructional gifts although industry is an excellent source for needed funds and committee members can help in this area if they choose. Number of comments = 14.

SUM21: Advisory committees can provide criteria in an advisory capacity for selection of an administrative head, however, their recommendations may reflect special interests and a lack of understanding for attributes of an educator. Faculty, higher administration, and student recommendations should also be sought. Number of comments = 8.

SUM22: Advisory committees can advise the school of trends in the industry and educators can develop educational requirements to meet those needs. Number of comments = 7.

SUM23: Advisory committee members know about employment opportunities in the industry and can keep schools informed of them. Number of comments = 7.

SUM24: Advisory committee members know the education and experience necessary for working in their industry and can help schools develop curriculum, co-operative programs and internships to meet those needs. Number of comments = 8.

SUM25: Recognition of advisory committee members in the community promotes good relations with committee members and the school, but it shouldn't take away from committee's primary concern for education. Number of comments = 8.

Table C-1. Continued

SUM26: Advisory committees will be more effective if they meet more than once a year, either in gatherings about another aspect of the program or with subcommittees. Number of comments = 11.

SUM27: Advisory committees should educate the faculty on working with allied professionals, or include these people on the advisory committee. Advisory committees should not be concerned with allied professions, or work directly with faculty. Number of comments = 7.

SUM28: It is the school's job to recruit faculty; however, the administration should not overlook the advisory committee as a possible resource or contact. Number of comments = 9.

SUM29: Members of the advisory committee and the faculty should meet occasionally in an informal setting. Number of comments = 6.

SUM30: The school should organize a speaker's bureau with the help of the advisory committee. Number of comments = 6.

SUM31: Advisory committees could suggest to faculty possible field student trips and offer to help arrange or facilitate access. Number of comments = 7.

SUM32: Advisory committee members should present panel discussions to students to provide a practical view of the industry. Number of comments = 3.

SUM33: Advisory committees should not select recipients for student awards and scholarships except by special request. Number of comments = 8.

SUM34: Advisory committee members should help locate industry resource people to occasionally guest-lecture and possibly be a resource themselves. Number of comments = 6.

SUM35: Advisory committee members can bring an important perspective to faculty in-service programs; however, their need to participate in such programs will depend on the faculty and quality of the curriculum. Number of comments =

Table C-1. Continued

SUM36: Although research should be directed by the school, the advisory committee can provide an excellent perspective which should be considered whenever applicable. Number of comments = 5.

SUM37: The advisory committee should help evaluate the hospitality education program, especially from the perspective of employing graduates of the program. Number of comments = 6.

SUM38: A good advisory committee will promote cooperation between education and industry to provide a broad base of support of the educational program. Number of comments = 6.

SUM39: The advisory committee can be a resource for the school in developing an informational program but not have general responsibility for such a program. Number of comments = 4.

SUM40: Advisory committees can and should influence favorable local, state and federal hospitality legislation through informal contacts and in a unified way. Number of comments = 9.

SUM41: Advisory committee members can work directly with the media for feature stories; however, members may not have time to do so. The job is best handled by the faculty. Number of comments = 3.

SUM42: Advisory committee members can offer to help publicize events to increase enrollment at the school, however, this is the school's job. Number of comments = 7.

SUM43: The advisory committee can suggest criteria for student scholarships and loans, but the school must set standards. Number of comments = 12.

SUM44: Advisory committee members are very important in placing and referring graduates, although this is the job of the placement office. Number of comments = 9.

SUM45: Advisory committees can be an invaluable help in placing student interns; however, this should be the placement officer's job. Number of comments = 7.

Table C-1. Continued

SUM46: Having people from the industry meet and greet new hospitality students is important and could involve the advisory committee if desired, but it may not be a good use of committee members' time. Number of comments = 7.

SUM47: Advisory committees can participate in special career opportunity programs to recruit new hospitality students. Number of comments = 1.

SUM48: Advisory committees should not advise students how to transfer from the hospitality program to other schools, colleges, or universities unless a member has specific knowledge in that area. Number of comments = 7.

Table C-2. Summary of Delphi panel round 2 comments

SUM 1A Knowing the education level could make for a balanced mix. Must have a degree for curriculum being advised. Trade experience (foodservice operator, for example) can be just as important as an education degree! Comments = 9.

SUM 1B - Unlimited terms are okay for advisory committee members as long as members remain productive because it builds knowledge. Rotation of terms ensures fresh ideas and prevents undesirable coalitions and power issues. Comments = 5.

SUM 1C: Experience in a program (at least in the area of hiring) will help advisory members but so will a good understanding and appreciation of the program. An outside view could be valuable, too. Comments = 3.

SUM 1D: The advisory committee should represent a good balance of business management experience, not necessarily from the target program area. Comments = 4.

SUM 1E: A busy professional may have less time for committee work but may be a better manager. Comments = 2.

SUM 1F: The professional ethic means they are responsible to society. We want people who will challenge us, but cooperate with committee decisions. Comments = 3.

SUM 2A: Advisory committee should not be self-regulated and evaluate its performance and productivity whenever possible. Comments = 2.

SUM 2B: The advisory committee may not see changes in the program that are a direct result of its efforts. Comments = 2.

SUM 2C: An informal orientation, possibly by letter, is helpful for a new advisory committee member. New members, however, should feel free not to fit a certain role. Comments = 4.

SUM 2D: Advice does not mean that the program will always follow committee recommendations; however, the advice should at least be considered when implementing programs or advisors won't stay around long! Comments = 5.

Table C-2. Continued

SUM 2E: The hospitality director can learn "on the job" how to work with advisory groups. It does not need to be a part of the director's formal education. Comments = 6.

SUM 3A: Advisory committee members with experience in the industry know what students will need to prepare themselves for work, however, the committee should only make recommendations about curriculum. Comments = 3.

SUM 3B: Advisory committees should advise about curriculum as a system of "checks and balances" -- to balance industry's needs and practical skills with educational theories and a broad overview. Comments = 5.

SUM 3C: The advisory committee can provide curriculum "direction," but to get into the details of course content invades the educator's responsibility. Comments = 3.

SUM 3D: Advisory committees should not expect hospitality programs to provide specific skills training that industry would normally provide. Comments = 2.

SUM 3E: Advisory committees may recommend educational objectives for new programs, but they should not get involved in established programs. The committee's lack of academic experience makes members less effective. Comments = 2.

SUM 4A: The advisory committee knows best what facilities and equipment are needed for a hospitality program and should work to secure necessary donations or funds. Comments = 4.

SUM 5A: The advisory committee should be actively involved in financial matters and make budget recommendations and watch for frivolous spending toward impractical goals. Comments = 3.

SUM 5B: Advisory committee members are asked to join because of their close working relationship and knowledge of the "hardware" needed for a successful program and should offer practical recommendations about facilities and equipment needed for the program. Committee should avoid infringing on educator's domain. Comments = 7.

Table C-2. Continued

SUM 5C: The advisory committee can help arrange for student loans or gifts, but it is not the committee's responsibility to do so. Comments = 3.

SUM 6A: This belongs to the school. Comments = 1.

SUM 6B: Unless they are educators, members of the advisory committee should not advise the school about educational trends. Comments = 4.

SUM 6C: The advisory board is not a placement service and members do not have the responsibility to advise the school of employment opportunities in the hospitality industry. The school should attract recruiters on its own merit. Comments = 2.

SUM 6D: Advisory committees should be interested in the quality of hospitality program graduates as a means to strengthen the industry; however, committee members should not determine the school's education and experience requirements. Comments = 4.

SUM 6E: Recognition of advisory committee members is not necessary per se, but it is good public relations for the program in the community. Comments = 7.

SUM 6F: Advisory committees should meet at least twice a year. Comments = 3.

SUM 6G: It's important for school faculty to recognize and know how to deal with allied professionals in the field; the advisory committee may or may not be an appropriate resource for that in-service education. Comments = 8.

SUM 7A: Although it is the school's responsibility to recruit and hire instructors, the advisory committee may be a good resource to find people with practical business experience. It is inappropriate, however, for the committee to formally assist or recruit instructors. Comments = 9.

7B: No comments.

SUM 7C: Advisory committee members can participate in a school speaker's bureau, but they should not be asked to assume responsibility for such activities. Comments = 2.

Table C-2. Continued

SUM 7D: Advisory committee members can be a resource or initiate ideas for school field trips, but arrangements should be made by the school unless an advisory member's organization is to be visited. Comments = 2.

SUM 7E: Advisory committee members can participate in panel discussions to students and civic groups but they should not plan or organize the discussions. Comments = 2.

SUM 7F: When an award or scholarship comes from the industry, it may be appropriate for some members of the advisory committee to help select the recipients if they are familiar with student work and feel comfortable in the selection. However, school administrators should be aware that outside participation can create political conflict but can add credibility to the award or program. Comments = 12.

SUM 7G: It is not the advisory committee's role to find guest-lecturers for the school. Comments = 2.

SUM 7H: Too much of an imposition. Comments = 1.

SUM 7I: Those working in the industry are well qualified to identify needs. Educators can provide the "broader" picture and are best qualified to determine the type of research necessary to meet industry needs. Comments = 6.

SUM 8A: Advisory committees can constructively comment on the overall hospitality education program from an industry perspective, but they seldom are trained to properly evaluate academic performance. Comments = 4.

SUM 9A: Advisory committees can help with this communication. Comments = 1.

SUM 9B: Advisory committees can determine what's needed in an informational program but members are not qualified to develop such a program; that is the school's responsibility. Comments = 5.

Table C-2. Continued

SUM 9C: Yes, regarding legislation that is favorable to the hospitality industry...and also impacts hospitality education; legislation favorable to education in general...yes, with some indirect effect. I am hard pressed to think of legislation that is uniquely favorable to hospitality education and if I could, I am not sure that it should be the highest priority vis a vis the industry in general or education in general. Comments = 2.

SUM 9D: News and feature story ideas are better accepted by local media when they come from an industry source, such as an advisory board member, or from a source outside the school public information department. Comments = 3.

SUM 9E: Advisory committees can help promote and publicize hospitality program exhibits, bulletins and meetings with civic groups, but members should not be responsible for such activities. Comments = 4.

SUM 10A: Advisory committees can help oversee student scholarships and loans wherever possible; however, financial aid should be the school's responsibility. Comments = 2.

SUM 10B: On an informal basis, advisory committee members can help place graduates by providing "leads" to jobs; however, graduate placement is the school's responsibility. Comments = 4.

SUM 10C: It is the school's responsibility to place its own student interns. Advisory committee members have neither the time, qualifications, nor the responsibility to set up intern programs. Comments = 4.

SUM 10D: Advisory committee members can be good role models for new hospitality students and their presence on campus can boost a program's image. However, committee members are busy people and they shouldn't be expected to "show off the flag" during student orientation. Comments = 9.

SUM 10E: The board is representative. Comments = 1.

SUM 10F: Although it is the school's responsibility to advise students about transfer from hospitality programs of other institutions, members of the advisory committee may have specific knowledge about certain school programs and can help "feed" graduates from one to the other. Comments = 6.

Table C-2. Continued

SUM 49: As needed, CEO's should try to speak with all advisory committee members between formal meetings. Comments = 4.

SUM 50: A meeting agenda should be developed by advisory committee chair and program director and mailed to members for prior review and possible additions. Comments = 3.

SUM 51: Higher administrators should participate in decision making if involved with the advisory committee. Comments = 5.

SUM 52: Although it depends on the school, the academic head of the program should be a member of the advisory committee though not necessarily present at every meeting. Comments = 2.

SUM 53: No comments.

SUM 54: Advisory committee could help generate funds for student exchanges if it fits the college or university mission. Comments = 2.

SUM 55: If possible, advisory committee should assist in obtaining on-campus resources. Comments = 1.

SUM 56: No comments.

SUM 57: New advisory committee members should be recommended by current committee members, selected jointly by the CEO and the committee. Comments = 2.

SUM 58: New advisory committee members should be recommended by current committee members, selected jointly by the CEO and the committee. Comments = 4.

SUM 59: New advisory committee members should be recommended by current committee members, selected jointly by the CEO and the committee. Comments = 2.

SUM 60: Students of various academic levels should observe advisory committee meetings to hear the issues, but participating in the decision-making process is an inappropriate role for students. Comments = 3.

Table C-3. Summary of Delphi panel round 3 comments

SUM 1A: It is helpful for advisory committee members to have educational degrees, but not all qualified persons have higher degrees; the mixture of backgrounds will help the committee be more effective. Don't overlook the logistics of verification of educational backgrounds. Comments = 6.

SUM 1B: The number of terms an advisory committee member can serve should be limited only if they don't attend meetings or participate; the committee should decide. On the other hand, one respondent wrote that set terms are good because new people bring fresh ideas to the committee. Comments = 5.

SUM 1C: I am concerned about legislators and consumers. Comments = 1.

SUM 1F: Advisory committee members should be willing to cooperate to be effective members. Comments = 1.

SUM 2C: To increase a new member's effectiveness, new advisory committee members should be informed of their responsibilities and the committee's common goals. Comments = 3.

SUM 2D: Not all suggestions from the advisory committee can be implemented in the academic program but changes should be implemented when feasible. Comments = 2.

SUM 2E: Part of a hospitality program director's orientation should be how to work with an advisory committee. One respondent said the question wasn't clear about what type of further education/orientation would be required. Comments = 3.

SUM 3A: An advisory committee's field experience can be helpful in recommending curriculum, but the committee's recommendation should not be the final decision. Comments = 3.

SUM 3B: Advisory committees should be consulted for curriculum advice. Comments = 1.

SUM 3C: Advisory committees can recommend subject matter of program courses, but not demand that something be taught. A second respondent said subject matter should be determined by the educator. Comments = 2.

Table C-3. Continued

SUM 3D: Advisory committee members know what's really needed in the area of training for specific occupations and should advise the school in this area. Comments = 2.

SUM 4A: Based on what they currently see in the field, advisory committees should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program. Comments = 2.

SUM 5A: Advisory committees should not assist with determination of budget expenditures; that responsibility is with the Board of Trustees, faculty, and administration. If a company donates money, it may be okay for company to be involved in budget process. Comments = 3.

SUM 5C: Advisory committees don't have the responsibility to arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials, but they can help fund-raising efforts where practical. Comments = 5.

SUM 6A: Advisory committees can recommend criteria for selection of the administrative head, but whether it is used or not should be determined by the school. Comments = 3.

SUM 6D: Advisory committees should communicate the type of education and experience job applicants need in the industry to help the school determine the education and experience required by graduates of the program. Comments = 1.

SUM 6E: Some respondents felt that advisory committee members don't need public recognition for their work on the committee, while others said members should be recognized for their volunteer work. Comments = 3.

SUM 6F: Advisory committees cannot advise if they don't meet more than once a year. Comments = 2.

SUM 6G: Many faculty members have little experience with allied professions in the field and advisory committee members can help provide in-service in this area for the faculty. Comments = 3.

SUM 7A: Advisory committees should help the school obtain instructors who have some practical experience. Others said committee members should help only when asked, that faculty recruitment is the school's responsibility. Comments = 6.

Table C-3. Continued

SUM 7B: Advisory committees should interact with faculty to become a more effective committee. Comments = 1.

SUM 7C: Advisory committees may want to initiate a speaker's bureau or at least participate in one organized by the school to provide experts on topics specified by faculty. Comments = 2.

SUM 7D: Advisory committee members can facilitate arrangements for field trips by special request. Comments = 1.

SUM 7E: Advisory committees are best qualified to present panel discussions to students about the industry. Comments = 1.

SUM 7F: Advisory committees should not help select student recipients of awards and scholarships because they don't see students on a day-to-day basis. On the other hand, some respondents felt that advisory boards should participate in the selection process. Comments = 5.

SUM 7G: Advisory committees can be a resource for locating people from industry to occasionally guest-lecture at the school. Comments = 2.

SUM 7H: Advisory committee members may choose to help conduct parts of in-service programs for faculty by request, but too much time would be required to do this on a regular basis. Comments = 2.

SUM 8A: One of the advisory committee's most important contributions is to help evaluate the overall hospitality education program. Comments = 1.

SUM 9B: Advisory committees overstep their advisory function when members help develop informational programs about the hospitality program. Comments = 1.

SUM 9C: Only if located in the state through business ownership, subsidiary or franchise. Comments = 2.

SUM 9D: Advisory committee members have good contacts with local media to suggest news and feature story ideas about the hospitality program. Comments = 2.

Table C-3. Continued

SUM 9E: Advisory committee members can use other community contacts to promote the hospitality education program, but whether or not they do so should be an individual decision. Comments = 2.

SUM 10A: Advisory committees should not set standards for student scholarships and loans. Other respondents said committees should participate in the decision by request. Comments = 1.

SUM 10B: Advisory committees can share industry opportunities with school placement office, but any effort to place graduates should be an individual decision of the committee member. Comments = 1.

SUM 10C: Advisory committees should not help find jobs or place student interns, although members can help recruit companies interested in the program. Committee members are too busy to get this involved; students should have some of the responsibility, too. Comments = 4.

SUM 10D: Advisory committee members may wish to meet students when they attend committee meetings or attend special meetings early in the academic year as a way to encourage students and establish role models. One respondent, however, objected because committee members "don't generally meet with students." Comments = 4.

SUM 10F: Student transfer from other hospitality programs is strictly an academic function, although some advisory committee members may be able to offer contacts/opportunities in specific instances, or for interns working at their company. Comments = 4.

SUM 49: Communication with advisory committee members and the CEO between meetings is very important. Comments = 1.

SUM 50: Advisory committee chair and program director should work together to establish an agenda for meetings. Comments = 1.

Sum 51: They must participate if they will be making decisions. Comments = 2.

Table C-3. Continued

SUM 52: The dean/academic head of the institution is encouraged to attend advisory committee meetings to answer questions or offer advise but not participate in decisions. One respondent said this was inappropriate. Comments = 5.

SUM 53: Respondents disagreed on whether the advisory committee should help improve the department's visibility within the college or university. One commented that this is the job of the department; another said this would be an important function of the advisory committee. Comments = 2.

SUM 56: Advisory committees are not eager to get involved in fund-raising activities, especially if unrestricted for general use. Comments = 3.

SUM 57: Advisory committee members and the CEO should determine committee members. Comments = 3.

SUM 58: New advisory committee members should be selected by current committee members with input from the faculty and administration. Comments = 3.

SUM 59: Advisory committee members and the CEO should recommend colleagues for membership on the advisory committee. Comments = 1.

SUM 60: Students of various academic levels should be participants or guest participants on the advisory committee to learn about the industry and bring student opinions to the committee. Comments = 2.

APPENDIX D: DELPHI PANEL ROUND 1, 2, AND 3 STATEMENT
RATINGS BY MEAN, MEDIAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION
(TABLE D-1)

	Page
Table D-1. Delphi panel round 1, 2 and 3 statement ratings by mean, median and standard deviation	153

Table D-1. Mean, median, and standard deviation of 60 statements for rounds 1-3

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
1. Educational degrees should be a consideration in selecting advisory committee members.									
mean	2.575	2.658	2.588	2.333	2.364	2.455	2.679	2.778	2.652
median	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	1.130	1.047	.957	1.231	.924	.820	1.090	1.086	1.027
2. The number of terms an advisory committee member can serve should be limited.									
mean	2.50	2.526	2.647	2.917	2.727	2.727	2.321	2.444	2.609
median	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
SD	1.261	1.084	.884	1.379	1.104	.786	1.188	1.086	.941
3. Advisory committee members should have experience in some aspect of the program they will advise.									
mean	4.325	4.553	4.676	4.167	4.273	4.545	4.393	4.667	4.739
median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
SD	1.095	.724	.535	1.193	1.009	.522	1.066	.555	.541
4. Advisory committee members should represent a wide variety of the hospitality industry segments.									
mean	4.725	4.816	4.824	4.917	5.0	5.0	4.643	4.741	4.739
median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
SD	.599	.563	.626	.289	.00	.0	.678	.656	.752
5. Advisory committee members who are busy with their profession/business will be effective committee members.									
mean	3.650	3.816	3.882	3.417	3.364	3.727	3.750	4.0	3.957
median	4.0	4.00	4.0	3.50	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.167	1.062	.729	1.084	1.120	.467	1.206	1.0	.825

Table D-1. Ccontinued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
6. Members should have a sense of responsibility, civic mindedness, and cooperative nature to be effective.									
mean	4.10	4.237	4.353	4.167	4.364	4.364	4.071	4.185	4.348
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.778	.786	.691	.718	.924	.924	.813	.736	.573
7. Advisory committee members should be asked to evaluate the committee's productivity.									
mean	3.895	4.135	4.121	4.0	4.182	4.091	3.846	4.115	4.136
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.085	.713	.740	.953	.874	.944	1.156	.653	.640
8. There should be program improvements attributable to advisory committee efforts.									
mean	4.350	4.395	4.324	4.333	4.364	4.364	4.357	4.407	4.304
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.736	.679	.535	.888	.924	.674	.678	.572	.470
9. New advisory committee members should be oriented and trained regarding expectations of them.									
mean	3.975	4.289	4.500	3.333	3.545	4.091	4.250	4.593	4.696
median	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
SD	1.250	.956	.749	1.303	1.368	1.044	1.143	.501	.470
10. Advisory committee suggestions should be implemented.									
mean	3.425	3.50	3.441	3.417	3.455	3.455	3.429	3.519	3.435
median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.50	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	.903	.762	.613	1.084	1.279	.688	.836	.700	.590

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
11. Implementing and working with an advisory committee should be a part of hospitality program directors educational preparation.									
mean	4.125	4.237	4.235	4.50	4.455	4.455	3.964	4.148	4.130
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.822	.675	.654	.674	.688	.688	.838	.662	.626
12. Advisory committees should make decisions on curriculum.									
mean	2.308	2.053	1.853	2.75	1.818	1.818	2.111	2.148	1.870
median	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
SD	1.280	1.064	.925	1.603	.874	.751	1.086	1.134	1.014
13. Advisory committees should be consulted for curriculum advice.									
mean	4.175	4.158	4.265	4.083	4.0	4.182	4.214	4.222	4.304
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.984	.916	.618	.900	.775	.405	1.031	.974	.703
14. Advisory committees should make recommendations regarding the subject matter content of the courses.									
mean	3.850	3.895	4.059	3.417	3.545	3.818	4.036	4.037	4.174
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.075	.924	.694	.996	.688	.751	1.071	.980	.650
15. Advisory committees should advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupations.									
mean	4.225	4.263	4.265	4.167	3.909	3.818	4.250	4.407	4.478
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	4.0	5.0
SD	.920	.724	.710	.835	.831	.751	.967	.636	.593

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
16. Advisory committees should help develop educational objectives for the program.									
mean	3.90	3.842	3.971	3.833	3.545	3.636	3.929	3.963	4.130
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.081	1.079	.870	.366	1.214	1.120	1.016	1.018	.694
17. Advisory committees should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program.									
mean	3.875	3.868	4.088	4.0	3.909	4.0	3.821	3.852	4.130
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.966	.741	.452	1.128	.539	.000	.905	.818	.548
18. Advisory committees should assist with determination of budget expenditures.									
mean	2.308	2.289	2.235	1.727	1.636	1.909	2.536	2.556	2.391
median	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
SD	1.173	1.113	.890	1.009	.809	.539	1.170	1.121	.988
19. Advisory committees should recommend the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.									
mean	3.525	3.541	3.606	3.583	3.50	3.545	3.50	3.556	3.636
median	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
SD	1.062	.900	.788	1.165	.527	.688	1.036	1.013	.848
20. Advisory committees should arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials.									
mean	2.80	2.676	2.882	3.917	3.6	3.636	2.321	2.333	2.522
median	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
SD	1.506	1.270	1.149	1.311	1.265	1.027	1.335	1.109	1.039

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
21. Advisory committees should provide criteria for selection of the administrative head.									
mean	3.026	2.973	2.971	3.0	2.5	2.818	3.037	3.148	3.043
median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	.932	.799	.627	.853	.527	.405	.980	.818	.706
22. Advisory committees should advise the school of trends in educational requirements.									
mean	3.923	3.946	4.147	3.917	3.80	4.0	3.926	4.0	4.217
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.085	1.026	.857	1.165	1.398	1.095	1.072	.877	.736
23. Advisory committees should advise the school of employment opportunities in the hospitality industry.									
mean	4.750	4.838	4.882	4.667	4.70	4.727	4.786	4.889	4.957
median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
SD	.588	.553	.537	.888	.949	.905	.418	.320	.209
24. Advisory committees should help determine the education and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry.									
mean	4.275	4.297	4.294	4.167	4.1	4.091	4.321	4.370	4.391
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
SD	.816	.845	.719	.937	.994	.994	.772	.792	.583
25. Advisory committee members need to be given recognition in their community.									
mean	3.275	3.263	3.265	4.0	3.909	3.909	2.964	3.0	2.957
median	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	1.086	.828	.864	.739	.539	.539	1.071	.784	.825

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N = 40</u>	<u>N = 38</u>	<u>N = 34</u>	<u>N = 12</u>	<u>N = 11</u>	<u>N = 11</u>	<u>N = 28</u>	<u>N = 27</u>	<u>N = 23</u>
26. Advisory committees should meet face-to-face more often than once a year.									
mean	4.20	4.297	4.382	4.417	4.273	4.364	4.107	4.308	4.391
median	4.50	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.966	.777	.652	.793	.905	.674	1.031	.736	.656
27. Advisory committee members should educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with allied professionals, such as sales and equipment company representatives.									
mean	3.50	3.711	3.647	3.182	3.545	3.455	3.630	3.778	3.739
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.109	.802	.774	1.168	.688	.688	1.079	.847	.810
28. Advisory committees should assist the school to obtain instructors.									
mean	3.275	3.316	3.206	3.833	3.656	3.545	3.036	3.185	3.043
median	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	1.198	.989	.946	.577	.505	.522	1.319	1.111	1.065
29. Advisory committees should interact with faculty.									
mean	4.075	4.053	4.118	4.417	4.364	4.273	3.929	3.926	4.043
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.944	.957	.729	.669	.674	.467	1.016	1.035	.825
30. Advisory committees should initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by the faculty.									
mean	3.949	4.053	4.147	4.417	4.182	4.273	3.741	4.0	4.087
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.213	.957	.784	.669	.751	.467	1.347	1.038	.900

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
31. Advisory committees should facilitate the arrangements for appropriate field trips.									
mean	3.675	3.895	3.882	4.083	4.182	4.273	3.50	3.778	3.696
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.385	1.060	.977	1.084	.603	.467	1.478	1.188	1.105
32. Advisory committees members should present panel discussions to students and civic groups.									
mean	3.675	3.895	3.853	4.167	4.182	4.0	3.464	3.778	3.783
median	3.50	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.071	.924	.821	.835	.751	.632	1.105	.974	.902
33. Advisory committees should help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.									
mean	2.590	2.605	2.441	3.0	2.818	2.545	2.407	2.519	2.391
median	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
SD	1.163	1.054	.927	1.128	.874	.820	1.152	1.122	.988
34. Advisory committees should help locate industry resource people to occasionally guest-lecture.									
mean	4.375	4.395	4.412	4.50	4.545	4.455	4.321	4.333	4.391
median	4.50	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.750	.638	.557	.674	.522	.522	.723	.679	.583
35. Advisory committees should be asked to conduct parts of in-service programs for the faculty members.									
mean	3.615	3.842	3.765	3.833	3.818	3.818	3.519	3.852	3.739
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.184	.945	.855	1.115	.982	.603	1.221	.949	.964

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
36. Advisory committees should help identify research needed in hospitality education and the hospitality industry.									
mean	4.025	4.079	4.020	4.0	3.818	3.818	4.036	4.185	4.130
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.698	.428	.388	.603	.405	.405	.744	.396	.344
37. Advisory committees should help evaluate the overall hospitality education program.									
mean	4.100	4.053	4.059	3.833	3.636	3.727	4.214	4.222	4.217
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	.841	.695	.600	1.115	.809	.647	.686	.577	.518
38. Advisory committees should promote cooperation among the industry, general public, and the hospitality programs.									
mean	4.60	4.605	4.735	4.667	4.727	4.818	4.571	4.556	4.696
median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
SD	.744	.679	.448	.142	.467	.405	.836	.751	.470
39. Advisory committees should assist in the development of informational programs.									
mean	3.590	3.632	3.912	3.090	3.909	4.091	3.464	3.519	3.826
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0
SD	.910	.883	.866	.302	.302	.302	1.036	1.014	1.029
40. Advisory committees should help influence local, state, and federal legislation in ways favorable to hospitality education.									
mean	4.275	4.474	4.559	4.50	4.545	4.727	4.179	4.444	4.478
median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.50	5.0	5.0
SD	.905	.647	.561	.674	.522	.467	.983	.698	.593

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
41. Advisory committees should suggest news and feature stories to local newspapers and help in their publication.									
mean	3.667	3.553	3.676	3.917	3.090	3.909	3.556	3.407	3.565
median	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
SD	.927	.760	.768	.793	.539	.539	.974	.797	.843
42. Advisory committees should arrange to publicize the hospitality program through exhibits, bulletins and meetings of civic groups, Chambers of Commerce, and other groups.									
mean	3.575	3.658	3.941	4.333	4.273	4.273	3.250	3.407	3.783
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
SD	1.279	1.146	.952	.985	.786	.786	1.266	1.185	.998
43. Advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans.									
mean	2.050	1.974	1.971	2.167	1.090	1.909	2.0	2.0	2.0
median	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
SD	.876	.822	.904	.718	.539	.539	.943	.920	1.044
44. Advisory committees should assist in the placement of graduates.									
mean	3.974	4.289	4.206	4.167	4.364	4.364	3.889	4.259	4.130
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.246	.802	.845	1.267	.809	.809	1.251	.813	.869
45. Advisory committee members should help find jobs for "interns."									
mean	4.128	4.184	4.206	3.833	4.0	4.182	4.259	4.259	4.217
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.128	.955	.914	1.467	1.183	1.079	.944	.859	.850

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
46. Advisory committee members should visit the campus early in the academic year to welcome and encourage hospitality students.									
mean	3.40	3.459	3.382	3.167	3.182	3.182	3.50	3.577	3.478
median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.50	3.0	3.0
SD	1.215	1.016	.954	1.267	1.079	.982	1.202	.987	.947
47. Advisory committee members should participate in special hospitality career opportunity programs.									
mean	4.150	4.289	4.265	4.333	4.091	4.091	4.071	4.370	4.348
median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.50	4.000	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
SD	1.051	.802	.666	.888	.944	.831	1.120	.742	.573
48. Advisory committee members should help determine how students could transfer from the hospitality program of other schools, colleges, and universities.									
mean	2.40	2.50	2.500	2.250	2.273	2.364	2.464	2.593	2.565
median	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
SD	.982	.952	.788	1.138	.647	.647	.922	1.047	.843
49. CEOs should speak with all members between formal meetings.									
mean		3.306	3.324		3.818	3.636		3.080	3.174
median		3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0		3.0	3.0
SD		.710	.475		.603	.505		.640	.388
50. Advisory committee chair and program director should establish the agenda for meetings.									
mean		4.132	4.176		4.091	4.182		4.148	4.174
median		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
SD		.623	.459		.539	.405		.662	.491

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
<u>N</u> Higher administrators should present facts to the committee but not participate in decision making.									
mean		2.784	2.882		3.100	3.364		2.667	2.652
median		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
SD		1.004	.880		1.101	.924		.961	.775
52. The Dean/Provost/Academic head of the institution should sit on the advisory committee.									
mean		3.838	3.853		3.455	3.545		4.0	4.0
median		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
SD		1.093	.989		1.508	1.368		.849	.739
53. Advisory committees should help to improve the department visibility within the college or university.									
mean		4.079	4.029		4.0	3.909		4.111	4.087
median		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
SD		.587	.460		.632	.302		.577	.515
54. Advisory committee members should help generate funds to facilitate the development of student exchange programs.									
mean		3.316	3.324		3.909	3.727		3.074	3.130
median		3.0	3.0		4.0	4.0		3.0	3.0
SD		.989	.806		.701	.647		.997	.815

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N</u> = 40	<u>N</u> = 38	<u>N</u> = 34	<u>N</u> = 12	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 11	<u>N</u> = 28	<u>N</u> = 27	<u>N</u> = 23
55. Advisory committee members should assist in obtaining resources from on-campus sources.									
mean		3.026	2.941		3.0	2.909		3.037	2.957
median		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
SD		1.000	.814		1.342	.944		.854	.767
56. Advisory committees should help raise unrestricted funds for hospitality programs.									
mean		3.737	3.647		4.455	4.091		3.444	3.435
median		4.0	4.0		5.0	4.0		3.0	3.0
SD		1.005	.884		.688	.539		.974	.945
57. Advisory committee members should be determined by the program CEO.									
mean		3.158	3.294		2.909	3.455		3.259	3.217
median		3.0	3.8		3.0	4.0		3.0	3.0
SD		1.151	.938		1.221	.934		1.130	.951
58. New advisory committee members should be selected by current committee members.									
mean		2.919	3.000		2.909	2.909		2.923	3.043
median		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
SD		1.164	.816		1.044	.701		1.230	.878
59. Advisory committee members should recommend colleagues for membership on the advisory committee.									
mean		3.921	4.059		3.818	3.909		3.963	4.130
median		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
SD		.784	.547		.603	.701		.854	.458

Table D-1. Continued

	Round			CEO's Round			Advisory Committee Round		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	<u>N = 40</u>	<u>N = 38</u>	<u>N = 34</u>	<u>N = 12</u>	<u>N = 11</u>	<u>N = 11</u>	<u>N = 28</u>	<u>N = 27</u>	<u>N = 23</u>
60. Students of various academic levels should be on the advisory committee.									
mean		3.526	3.559		3.273	3.455		3.630	3.609
median		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
SD		1.224	1.050		1.618	1.293		1.043	.941

APPENDIX E: DELPHI PANEL ROUND 3 STATEMENTS
CATEGORIED AND RANKED BY STANDARD DEVIATION
(Table E-1) AND MEAN (Table E-2)

	Page
Table E-1. Delphi panel round 3 statements categorized and ranked by standard deviation	167
Table E-2. Delphi panel round 3 statements ranked by mean rating	172

Table E-1. Delphi panel round 3 statements categorized and ranked by standard deviation

Number	Statement	SD
36.	Advisory committees should help identify research needed in hospitality education and the hospitality industry.	.388
38.	Advisory committees should promote cooperation among the industry, general public, and the hospitality programs.	.448
17.	Advisory committees should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program.	.452
50.	Advisory committee chair and program director should establish the agenda for meetings.	.459
53.	Advisory committees should help to improve the department visibility within the college or university.	.460
49.	CEOs should speak with all members between formal meetings.	.475
3.	Advisory committee members should have experience in some aspect of the program they will advise.	.535
8.	There should be program improvements attributable to advisory committee efforts.	.535
23.	Advisory committees should advise the school of employment opportunities in the hospitality industry.	.537
59.	Advisory committee members should recommend colleagues for membership on the advisory committee.	.547
34.	Advisory committees should help locate industry resource people to occasionally guest-lecture.	.557
40.	Advisory committees should help influence local, state, and federal legislation in ways favorable to hospitality education.	.561

Table E-1. Continued

Number	Statement	SD
37.	Advisory committees should help evaluate the overall hospitality education program.	.600
10.	Advisory committee suggestions should be implemented.	.613
13.	Advisory committees should be consulted for curriculum advice.	.618
4.	Advisory committee members should represent a wide variety of the hospitality industry segments.	.626
21.	Advisory committees should provide criteria for selection of the administrative head.	.627
26.	Advisory committees should meet face-to-face more often than once a year.	.652
11.	Implementing and working with an advisory committee should be a part of hospitality program directors educational preparation.	.654
47.	Advisory committee members should participate in special hospitality career opportunity programs.	.666
6.	Members should have a sense of responsibility , civic mindedness, and cooperative nature to be effective.	.691
14.	Advisory committees should make recommendations regarding the subject matter content of the courses.	.694
15.	Advisory committees should advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupations.	.710
24.	Advisory committees should help determine the education and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry.	.719

Table E-1. Continued

Number	Statement	SD
29.	Advisory committees should interact with faculty.	.729
5.	Advisory committee members who are busy with their profession/business will be effective committee members.	.729
7.	Advisory committee members should be asked to evaluate the committee's productivity.	.740
9.	New advisory committee members should be oriented and trained regarding expectations of them.	.749
41.	Advisory committees should suggest news and feature stories to local newspapers and help in their publication.	.768
27.	Advisory committee members should educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with allied professionals, such as sales and equipment company representatives.	.774
30.	Advisory committees should initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by the faculty.	.784
19.	Advisory committees should recommend the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.	.788
48.	Advisory committee members should help determine how students could transfer from the hospitality program of other schools, colleges, and universities.	.788
54.	Advisory committee members should help generate funds to facilitate the development of student exchange programs.	.806
55.	Advisory committee members should assist in obtaining resources from on-campus sources.	.814

Table E-1. Continued

Number	Statement	SD
58.	New advisory committee members should be selected by current committee members.	.816
32.	Advisory committees members should present panel discussions to students and civic groups.	.821
44.	Advisory committees should assist in the placement of graduates.	.845
35.	Advisory committees should be asked to conduct parts of in-service programs for the faculty members.	.855
22.	Advisory committees should advise the school of trends in educational requirements.	.857
25.	Advisory committee members need to be given recognition in their community.	.864
39.	Advisory committees should assist in the development of informational programs.	.866
16.	Advisory committees should help develop educational objectives for the program.	.870
51.	Higher administrators should present facts to the committee but not participate in decision making.	.880
56.	Advisory committees should help raise unrestricted funds for hospitality programs.	.884
2.	The number of terms an advisory committee member can serve should be limited.	.884
18.	Advisory committees should assist with determination of budget expenditures.	.890
43.	Advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans.	.904
45.	Advisory committee members should help find jobs for "interns."	.914

Table E-1. Continued

Number	Statement	SD
12.	Advisory committees should make decisions on curriculum.	.925
33.	Advisory committees should help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.	.927
57.	Advisory committee members should be determined by the program CEO.	.938
28.	Advisory committees should assist the school to obtain instructors.	.946
42.	Advisory committees should arrange to publicize the hospitality program through exhibits, bulletins and meetings of civic groups, Chambers of Commerce, and other groups.	.952
46.	Advisory committee members should visit the campus early in the academic year to welcome and encourage hospitality students.	.954
1.	Educational degrees should be a consideration in selecting advisory committee members.	.957
31.	Advisory committees should facilitate the arrangements for appropriate field trips.	.977
52.	The Dean/Provost/Academic head of the institution should sit on the advisory committee.	.989
60.	Students of various academic levels should be on the advisory committee.	1.050
20.	Advisory committees should arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials.	1.149

Table E-2. Delphi panel round 3 statements ranked by mean rating

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
STRONG AGREEMENT <u>M</u> 5.0 TO 4.5			
23.	Advisory committees should advise the school of employment opportunities in the hospitality industry.	4.882	.537
4.	Advisory committee members should represent a wide variety of the hospitality industry segments.	4.824	.626
38.	Advisory committees should promote cooperation among the industry, general public, and the hospitality programs.	4.735	.448
3.	Advisory committee members should have experience in some aspect of the program they will advise.	4.673	.535
40.	Advisory committees should help influence local, state, and federal legislation in ways favorable to hospitality education.	4.559	.561
9.	New advisory committee members should be oriented and trained regarding expectations of them.	4.50	.749
AGREEMENT <u>M</u> 4.499 TO 3.5			
34.	Advisory committees should help locate industry resource people to occasionally guest-lecture.	4.412	.552
26.	Advisory committees should meet face-to-face more often than once a year.	4.382	.652
6.	Members should have a sense of responsibility, civic mindedness, and cooperative nature to be effective.	4.353	.691

Table E-2. Continued

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
8.	There should be program improvements attributable to advisory committee efforts.	4.324	.535
24.	Advisory committees should help determine the education and experience applicants need for work in the hospitality industry.	4.294	.719
13.	Advisory committees should be consulted for curriculum advice.	4.265	.618
47.	Advisory committee members should participate in special hospitality career opportunity programs.	4.265	.666
15.	Advisory committees should advise on special training needs for specific hospitality occupations.	4.265	.710
11.	Implementing and working with an advisory committee should be a part of hospitality program directors educational preparation.	4.235	.654
44.	Advisory committees should assist in the placement of graduates.	4.206	.845
45.	Advisory committee members should help find jobs for "interns."	4.209	.914
50.	Advisory committee chair and program director should establish the agenda for meetings.	4.176	.459
30.	Advisory committees should initiate a speaker's bureau to provide experts on topics specified by the faculty.	4.147	.784
22.	Advisory committees should advise the school of trends in educational requirements.	4.147	.857

Table E-2. Continued

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
7.	Advisory committee members should be asked to evaluate the committee's productivity.	4.121	.740
29.	Advisory committees should interact with faculty.	4.118	.729
17.	Advisory committees should make recommendations for the physical facilities and equipment necessary for the program.	4.088	.452
59.	Advisory committee members should recommend colleagues for membership on the advisory committee.	4.059	.547
37.	Advisory committees should help evaluate the overall hospitality education program.	4.059	.600
14.	Advisory committees should make recommendations regarding the subject matter content of the courses.	4.059	.694
36.	Advisory committees should help identify research needed in hospitality education and the hospitality industry.	4.029	.388
53.	Advisory committees should help to improve the department visibility within the college or university.	4.029	.460
16.	Advisory committees should help develop educational objectives for the program.	3.971	.870
42.	Advisory committees should arrange to publicize the hospitality program through exhibits, bulletins and meetings of civic groups, Chambers of Commerce, and other groups.	3.941	.952

Table E-2. Continued

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
39.	Advisory committees should assist in the development of informational programs.	3.912	.866
5.	Advisory committee members who are busy with their profession/business will be effective committee members.	3.882	.729
31.	Advisory committees should facilitate the arrangements for appropriate field trips.	3.882	.977
32.	Advisory committees members should present panel discussions to students and civic groups.	3.853	.821
52.	The Dean/Provost/Academic head of the institution should sit on the advisory committee.	3.853	.989
35.	Advisory committees should be asked to conduct parts of in-service programs for the faculty members.	3.765	.855
41.	Advisory committees should suggest news and feature stories to local newspapers and help in their publication.	3.676	.768
27.	Advisory committee members should educate hospitality program faculty on procedures for working with allied professionals, such as sales and equipment company representatives.	3.647	.774
56.	Advisory committees should help raise unrestricted funds for hospitality programs.	3.647	.884
19.	Advisory committees should recommend the type and quality of facilities and equipment the hospitality program requires.	3.606	.788

Table E-2. Continued

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
60.	Students of various academic levels should be on the advisory committee.	3.559	1.050
10.	Advisory committee suggestions should be implemented.	3.441	.613
46.	Advisory committee members should visit the campus early in the academic year to welcome and encourage hospitality students.	3.382	.954
49.	CEOs should speak with all members between formal meetings.	3.324	.475
54.	Advisory committee members should help generate funds to facilitate the development of student exchange programs.	3.324	.806
57.	Advisory committee members should be determined by the program CEO.	3.294	.938
25.	Advisory committee members need to be given recognition in their community.	3.265	.864
28.	Advisory committees should assist the school to obtain instructors.	3.206	.946
58.	New advisory committee members should be selected by current committee members.	3.000	.816
21.	Advisory committees should provide criteria for selection of the administrative head.	2.971	.627
55.	Advisory committee members should assist in obtaining resources from on-campus sources.	2.941	.814

Table E-2. Continued

Number	Statement	Mean	SD
51.	Higher administrators should present facts to the committee but not participate in decision making.	2.882	.880
20.	Advisory committees should arrange for student loans or gifts of instructional equipment, books, and materials.	2.882	1.149
2.	The number of terms an advisory committee member can serve should be limited.	2.647	.884
1.	Educational degrees should be a consideration in selecting advisory committee members.	2.588	.957
48.	Advisory committee members should help determine how students could transfer from the hospitality program of other schools, colleges, and universities.	2.500	.788
DISAGREEMENT \bar{M} 2.499 - 1.5			
33.	Advisory committees should help select student recipients of awards and scholarships.	2.441	.927
18.	Advisory committees should assist with determination of budget expenditures.	2.235	.890
43.	Advisory committees should set standards for student scholarships and loans.	1.971	.904
12.	Advisory committees should make decisions on curriculum.	1.853	.925