ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION OF UNDERGRADUATE ATHLETIC TRAINING PROGRAM DIRECTORS

by

Bridgett Mary Passauer

B.S. in Physical Education and Athletic Training, Canisius College, 1986

M.S.Ed in Athletic Training, Old Dominion University, 1987

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2004

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Bridgett Mary Passauer

It was defended on

October 28, 2004

and approved by

Maria Piantanida, Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

John Weidman, Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

Thomas Zullo, Professor, Dentistry and Administrative and Policy Studies

Dissertation Director: Glenn M. Nelson, Associate Professor, Administrative and Policy Studies

ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION OF UNDERGRADUATE ATHLETIC TRAINING
PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Bridgett Mary Passauer, EdD

University of Pittsburgh, 2004

Throughout higher education, faculty members have assumed the roles and responsibilities of
academic administrators. The field of athletic training is no different. Certified athletic trainers
assume the roles and responsibilities of academic administrators when they are named program
directors. The purpose of this study was to determine if undergraduate athletic training program
directors perceived themselves as prepared for the roles and responsibilities of academic
administration. The undergraduate athletic training program directors were also asked for
suggestions on how best to prepare future athletic training program directors. Eighty-nine
undergraduate athletic training program directors responded to an electronically distributed
survey which revealed that, overall, undergraduate athletic training program directors do not feel
prepared for the roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration. One of the
interesting results was found when analyzing the difference between types of candidates selected
for the position of undergraduate athletic training program director. Internal candidates had
higher mean scores for all roles and responsibilities however; only one of the mean scores was
above a 3.00. The overall population of respondents rated the role of leader and mentor as the
role they felt most prepared for with the role of faculty developer being the role they felt least
prepared for. When asked to recommend the level of education that a program specifically

geared toward educating future athletic training program directors, a minimum of a Master's degree was recommended by all respondents. This research further supports previous research, which sites the need for more comprehensive preparation of academic administrators, ideally prior to, but minimally, once appointed to the position of academic administrator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

PREFACE

A dissertation can be likened to a journey, a journey in which one individual is striving for a goal but along the way is assisted by many. My dissertation journey was no different and leaves me with many people to thank.

I was fortunate to have many wonderful instructors throughout my doctoral work. I was especially fortunate to have Dr. Glenn Nelson, Dr. Maria Piantanida, Dr. John Weidman, and Dr. Thomas Zullo as instructors and as members of my dissertation committee. Each of you challenged me, showed me new ways of approaching material, and, most importantly, made me a better educator, administrator, and individual. I am indebted to each of you.

To my Pitt-Bradford friends, family, and students, your support throughout this journey made it possible. Special thanks to my friend and role model Dr. Jody Burgert. I am getting closer to being just like you. To Drs. Fass and Page, you are the SPSSest. Heidi Mackowski, Pam Morton and Anne Malyuk, the Grammar Queens, thanks for proof reading when you really didn't have time to. Finally, Jeremy Callinan for assisting in the development of my electronic survey, I couldn't have done it without you.

To my family, thank you for understanding the time and dedication it took to achieve this goal. For the love you showed and the support you gave me, I will never be able to repay you. You always have my love. To my Corry family for putting up with my lack of contribution and my, at times, not so easy to live with attitude, you are forever in my heart.

A final observation as the journey ends and a new one begins. The dreaded doctoral hoops are a myth created to scare doctoral students. The process, if viewed as a journey, can be

one of the most enlightening, thought provoking, and life changing processes you will ever have. It's all up to you.

The last thank you, and most important, must be given to God for giving me the ability to finish this journey successfully. All things are possible through Him.

I. INTRODUCTION

The position of academic department chair and/or program director in higher education has a variety of roles and responsibilities (Roach, 1976; Jennerich, 1981; Singleton, 1987; Green, Murata, Lynn and Puffer, 1991; Williams, 1991; Carroll and Gmelch, 1992; Tucker, 1993; and Pettit, 1999). Chairs and/or program directors within the allied heath care professions also have the additional responsibilities of achieving or maintaining accreditation and overseeing the clinical aspects of their educational program. With the demands being placed on academic administrators, one would think there would be a clearer educational path to assist those interested in these positions.

As the literature points out, the majority of academic administrators start their careers as faculty members. These individuals are usually well-versed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. When appointed, asked, or elected to an academic administrative position, a faculty member is normally left to speculate about the qualities and competencies needed for the position. The roles and responsibilities of academic administration are often poorly defined and are rarely presented in any formalized manner (Tucker, 1993). It seems logical that the field of higher education would be in the forefront of providing these administrators with the best possible preparation for their positions; however, except in rare cases, this is not yet the norm. Many of those in positions of higher education administration came to their positions as chairs and/or program directors based on their reputations as exemplary teachers and/or scholars, with

little thought given to their ability to handle the administrative tasks of running an academic department (Roach,   1976).

The field of athletic training appears to be taking the same path as the majority of other higher education disciplines. Program directors are expected to be recognized as faculty, with all that entails and oversee the day to day needs of the administration of an athletic training program (*Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs: Standards and Guidelines for the Athletic Trainer*, 2001). Yet there is little evidence of any formal training to assist athletic training program directors in preparing for their roles and responsibilities.

This study explores the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors based on their educational preparation and trying to identify ways to enhance this preparation. The assumption was that athletic training program directors would not perceive their educational preparation as sufficient to prepare them for the responsibilities of their positions. The basis for this assumption is found in the literature related to the perceptions of academic department chairs and their level of preparation for their roles as academic administrators. Further attempts to support this assumption were made by exploring studies done by other allied health care field professionals on a similar topic.

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

This study explored the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors for the administrative roles and responsibilities associated with the position. As individuals educated from a clinical perspective, the roles and responsibilities associated with being an academic administrator might have been unfamiliar to them. This study investigated whether undergraduate athletic training program directors experienced adjustments similar to other academic chairs/program directors when they first became program directors. It also explored the extent to which undergraduate athletic training program directors felt their formal education had prepared them for the various roles and responsibilities associated with their positions. This research investigated the need for additional educational preparation for those athletic trainers interested in becoming program directors, in light of the requirement that all athletic trainers must graduate from a Commission of Accredited Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) accredited academic program to be eligible to take the National Athletic Training Association Board of Certification Examination (NATABOC), and these programs must have certified athletic trainers serving as program directors. A listing of abbreviations can be found in Appendix A.

Research Questions

1.   How do undergraduate athletic training program directors perceive their formal education in preparing them for their roles and responsibilities as academic administrators?

2. Do undergraduate athletic training program directors seek alternative methods (i.e. workshops, seminars, degrees other than in the field of athletic training) to assist them in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities?

3. Are there relationships between athletic training program directors that were educated via the internship route versus the approved curriculum route, based on the current level of education obtained (bachelors, masters, or doctorate), the number of years as a certified athletic trainer, the number of years as a program director, their academic status and rank, and the type of institution they are currently employed at in their perception of level of preparedness for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration?

4. What recommendations for components for inclusion in athletic training education programs would current undergraduate athletic training program directors make to prepare future athletic training program directors for their roles and responsibilities?

5. Do athletic training program directors perceive their role similarly to other academic administrators?

6. Do athletic training program directors use their time in a way that is similar to other academic administrators?

III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

"The chairperson, then, is a manager and a faculty colleague, an advisor and an advisee, a soldier and a captain, a drudge and a boss" (Tucker, 1993, p. 33).

As the field of athletic training continues to move forward as both a profession and in its educational preparation, many certified athletic trainers are becoming academic administrators. At the end of the 2003-2004 academic year there were 198 undergraduate, Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) for athletic training. According to the *CAAHEP Standards and Guidelines for the Athletic Trainer* (2001), each program must have a program director, who has a "recognizable department responsibility for the accountability of the day-to-day operation, coordination, supervision and evaluation of all aspects of the athletic training educational program" (p. 2). Along with the administration of the educational program, an athletic training program director must be recognized as a member of the teaching faculty, must have experience in supervising athletic training students, and a minimum of three years of experience as a certified athletic trainer. In addition, the *CAAHEP Standards and Guidelines for the Athletic Trainer* (2001) also state that,

> The Program Director should have a strong academic orientation and should have demonstrated a sincere interest in the professional preparation of athletic training students. Demonstrated involvement in athletic training and sports medicine through publication, public speaking, research, and membership in related professional organizations is highly desired (p. 3).

These stated requirements make the position of athletic training program director quite demanding. If the preparation for these demands is not sufficient, athletic training program

directors may have a difficult time balancing all of the requirements included in being a program administrator, a faculty member, and an athletic trainer.

This study explored the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors for the administrative roles and responsibilities associated with the position. The assumption was that athletic training program directors would not perceive their educational preparation as sufficient to prepare them for the responsibilities of their positions. The basis for this assumption was found in the literature related to the perceptions of academic department chairs and their level of preparation for their roles as academic administrators. Further attempts to support this assumption were made by exploring studies done by other allied health care field professionals on a similar topic.

THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Throughout the literature pertaining to the roles and responsibilities of academic chairpersons, there is little to no evidence supporting the claim that academic chairs are prepared to make the move from faculty member to administrator (Roach, 1976; Singleton, 1987 and Tucker, 1993). This section outlines the roles and responsibilities of a department chair followed by a discussion of the chair's preparation to meet those roles and responsibilities.

Many different authors and researchers such as Roach (1976), Singleton (1987), and Tucker (1993) have listed the roles and responsibilities of a department chair. After reviewing several authors, four common categories emerged: teaching, scholarship, service, and administration. To more clearly present all the authors cited, a figure was constructed listing the roles and responsibilities. Where the roles and responsibilities listed were too numerous, a sample of the terms used was given.

Author	Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Administrative
Roach (1976)	♦ Instruction ♦ Leadership ♦ Coordination ♦ Etc	♦ Professional development	♦ Problem solving	♦ Administration ♦ Personnel management ♦ Negotiation ♦ Etc
Jennerich (1981)	♦ Evaluation ♦ Program/course innovation and development ♦ Communication			♦ Recruit faculty ♦ Budget ♦ Evaluation ♦ Funding raising ♦ Program decision making ♦ Etc
Singleton (1987)	♦ Instruction	♦ Professional development ♦ Coordination		♦ Departmental governance ♦ External communication ♦ Etc
Green, Murata, Lynn and Puffer (1991)	♦ Teaching ♦ Program planning	♦ Research	♦ Committee work	♦ Program planning ♦ Personnel and budget decisions ♦ Supervision ♦ Providing clinical care ♦ Fundraising ♦ Practice management
Williams (1991)	♦ Faculty member	♦ Faculty member	♦ Faculty member	♦ Mentor ♦ Unit and university administrator
Carroll and Gmelch (1992)	♦ Leader ♦ Manager	♦ Scholar	♦ Leader	♦ Leader ♦ Scholar ♦ Faculty developer ♦ Manager
Tucker (1993)	♦ Teacher ♦ Mentor ♦ Leader ♦ Planner ♦ Supervisor ♦ Motivator	♦ Researcher ♦ Representer ♦ Entrepreneur ♦ Etc	♦ Representer ♦ Problem solver ♦ Peer-colleague ♦ Etc	♦ Leader ♦ Advocator ♦ Motivator ♦ Supervisor ♦ Facilitator ♦ Recruiter ♦ Mediator

Figure 1. Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs

Pettit (1999)	♦ Curriculum and instruction Student relations	♦ Professional development	♦ Internal/ external administration	♦ Curriculum and instruction ♦ Internal/external administration ♦ Professional development ♦ Human relations and personnel administration ♦ Budget and planning etc

Figure 1(continued)

A department chair has numerous roles and responsibilities, but depending on one's use of the term, many of the roles and responsibilities listed could be placed under more than one of these four categories. With the focus of this study on academic administration, it is important to further delineate the administrative roles listed in Figure 1. Analyzing the Administrative column in Figure 1, Figure 2 was constructed in order to categorize the items listed in terms of qualities academic administrators need and areas of competency. No effort was made to correlate the qualities and competencies listed.

Qualities	Competencies
♦ Mentor ♦ Leader ♦ Faculty Developer ♦ Advocator ♦ Facilitator ♦ Mediator	♦ Personnel Management ♦ Administration (Unit/University) ♦ Budget ♦ Faculty Recruitment ♦ Departmental Governance ♦ Evaluation ♦ Program Planning ♦ Internal/External Communication ♦ Legal Issues

Figure 2. Qualities and Competencies of Academic Administrators

By further delineating the qualities and competencies, academic administrators may have a clearer picture of the expectations of the position. Figure 2 also allows for a point of reference when studying the level of perceived preparation of academic administrators. Diverse roles and responsibilities can frustrate the department chair (Tucker, 1993). Although many studies allude to this, Tucker, 1993; Singleton, 1987; Roach, 1976 and Gmelch and Gates, 1995 make direct reference to the stresses of being a department chair. For example, Tucker (1993) states "This stress [that of being a department chair] is actually caused by excessive concern that one of the chair's tasks is not being done as well as it should be –or that the chair hasn't sufficient resources or control to see the task done well" (p. 550). In a study by Meredith and Wunsch (1991), it was found that department chairs were frustrated by lack of necessary funding for the current and/or future curriculum, difficulty in hiring quality faculty/staff, and lack of recognition for the chairperson. The roles and responsibilities of the department chair are not always stressful; however, the department chair is viewed as "…one of the most important yet most overlooked individuals in the governance of American colleges and universities" (Jennerich, 1981, p. 47). With this in mind, it important to understand how one becomes and prepares to become a department chair.

<div align="center">BECOMING A DEPARTMENT CHAIR</div>

When new faculty members enter academia, they understand that they will be required to excel in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Because of this, most faculty prepare themselves to do just that, but when it comes to becoming a department chair with administrative responsibilities, many faculty are left wondering what to do. "They often begin their administrative position lacking some of the skills and background knowledge needed for effective performance" (Townsend and Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996, p. 3). Twenty years earlier,

Roach (1976) supported this belief as well when he stated, "the chairperson is usually, if not always, trained to teach and to research. Much of his working day will be devoted to things he has not been trained for or aspired to" (p. 14).

So, how does one enter a role that he/she is not trained for and often has not aspired to? For the most part, a chair is selected in one of three ways: election by the faculty within the department, election by the faculty within the department and approved by the Academic Dean, or appointed by the Academic Dean with no input from faculty (Tucker, 1993). As a result of these various selection processes, the perspective the chairperson has on his/her position may vary. For example, if a chairperson is selected by the faculty, he/she may feel a strong loyalty to those individuals and may not be effective in carrying out requests from upper administration. The reverse may be true if the chair is appointed by the Academic Dean. In a study by Jennerich (1981), a survey of 3% of randomly selected department chairs in the United States found that 66% of those surveyed were appointed, thus reinforcing the belief that department chairs are in fact administrators, not faculty members with administrative duties. If this statement is true, that chairs are indeed administrators, an increased level of confusion could occur as to whom they are really serving. Are they serving the faculty they oversee every day or the administrators that appointed them? It seems logical that a faculty member with administrative duties would have a closer allegiance to the faculty; however, if the chair is an administrator, their loyalty may be with the administrators that appointed them. If the latter is true, it would not be too difficult to understand the potential for a difficult transition.

A study by Seedorf and Gmelch (1989) compared time spent on similar tasks by department chairs in comparison to managers from business, hospital administration, and a superintendent who were studied by Mintzberg ( ). When comparing time spent on scheduled

meetings, phone calls, unscheduled meetings, tours [leaving the office to make yourself available for conversation], and desk work, Seedorf and Gmelch discovered that department chairs spend, during an average day, 47% of their time in scheduled meetings, 22% in unscheduled meetings, 15% doing desk work and 9%, and 6% doing tours and handling phone calls, respectively (1989). These five tasks accounted for 99% of the department chair's day, but as Figure 1 indicated, there are many more responsibilities that a department chair must attend to. A statement from one of the department chairs studied was "I would be content being a full time department chair if there was not the pressure to teach and publish, but then I wouldn't be a professor which is why I'm in higher education" (Seedorf and Gmelch, 1989, p. 16). In another study, Carroll (1991) found that this reflects the challenging role of being both an academician and an administrator and the personal and professional conflict that may be encountered.

Faculty Member or Administrator?

"The importance of department or division leaders rests on the fact that they are situated precisely where the academic mission of the institution is implemented; the success of the college or university is very much a function of their success" (Bennett, 1990, p. 24).

As the literature continues to point out, being a department chair is not an easy task. A department chair is often caught in the middle between being a faculty member and being an administrator. With little training in administration, the department chair that was once a leader in his/her discipline, a successful scholar, and/or a fine teacher, may now spend most of his/her time on administrative tasks such as budgets, faculty evaluations, and faculty development. These tasks leave little time for the other three areas deemed important to higher education faculty teaching, scholarship, and service.

As faculty move from the position of faculty member into the administrative position of department chair, how do they see themselves, and how are they perceived by others? As Tucker

(1993) points out, the department chair is in a paradoxical position. The department chair can be supported by the faculty or taken down by them. He/she must answer directly to administration, but is the only person on campus that must make and implement tough decisions while still interacting on a daily basis with the faculty affected by those decisions. Unlike administrators above them, department chairs must also interact with students, staff, and alumni. The interactions have more perceived than actual authority. James O. Williams, Chancellor of Auburn University, commenting on the role of the department chair said:

> While representing the departmental faculty, the department chair must also serve as an extension of upper levels of administration in the tasks of planning, directing, designing curriculum and allocating resources with the academic department. It is this dual role that makes the position perhaps the most difficult in the university or college (1995, p. 164).

Thus, on one hand, the department chair is representing the faculty member to upper administration, while simultaneously being the voice of the administration to the faculty. Learning how to balance between these two worlds could be most helpful to a department chair.

In a paper presented by Gmelch and Gates (April 1995) entitled The stressful journey of the department chair: An academic in need of a compass and clock, there are several factors discussed that contribute to the stress of being a department chair. Their results indicate that a department chair's stress is multidimensional, with several things contributing to this. The main areas that cause a department chair stress are: administrative relational stress, role ambiguity stress, administrative task stress, and faculty role and perceived expectations stress. The results of their study show that more needs to be done to prepare department chairs for the roles and responsibilities of the position (Gmelch and Gates, 1995).

This finding is supported by an earlier study done by Gmelch and Burns (1991), in which a survey of 564 department chairs across the United States showed a perceived increase in stress

levels as a result of becoming a department chair. The stressors identified were: dealing with conflict, lack of time, changes in professional identity, and changes in professional roles and responsibilities. According to Gmelch and Burns (1991), the reason for this stress may be because "the primary qualification most chairs bring to the position is that they gained a measure of personal and professional respect from their faculty peers. An individual's training, experience or competency as an administrator may not be the primary criteria for selection as chair" (p. 3).

Further evidence of the stress associated with being a department chair was found in a study looking at job dissatisfaction and turnover in community college department chairs. Murray and Murray (1996) found that community college department chairs are the most important administrators within community colleges and outnumber other administrators within community colleges five to one. However, because of the increased responsibility of being a department chair and the lack of preparation for this position, there was a tremendous turnover rate among community college department chairs. This high turnover leads to lack of continuity and, in the end, costs the college because it limits the college's ability to move forward.

Tucker (1993) supports the opinion that stress increases when one becomes a department chair and states that many chairs are faced with figuring out how to balance their time between being a full-time chairperson and also fulfilling the demands of teaching and scholarly work. Tucker goes on to say that this dilemma is even more complicated for those chairs that are not yet tenured (1993). O'Neill, Simplicio, and Martin (1996), all with experience as non-tenured chairpersons, state, "thus, non-tenured chairs are in purgatory awaiting the time when, they hope, their deans will expunge from their records any sins--real or imagined--they have perpetrated

against senior colleagues by adhering to school standards" (p. 207). In another study, conducted by Singleton (1987) entitled "Sources and consequences of role conflict and role ambiguity among department chairs," department chairs were found to have both role conflict and role ambiguity, which was directly related to "decreased job satisfaction and increased anxiety on the job" (p. 48). Singleton went on to say that chairs would benefit from clarification of the responsibilities associated with the position.

A final point for discussion is a chair's potential loss of income as a result of becoming a department chair. In a 1996 study by Ragan and Reham, it was found that the longer an individual serves as department chair, the greater the decrease in potential earnings from research grants, books, and consulting becomes. This is because of the lack of time available to maintain or build new research interests.

If we accept what the literature says about a department chair's need for clarification of the roles and responsibilities associated with the position, what type of information and training would a faculty member need prior to, or soon after, being placed in the position of department chair?

Type of "Training" Needed

"Perhaps the least attention is given in the literature to the position of academic department head in the institution. Yet department heads are first line leaders who directly affect the quality of their departments" (Williams, 1995, p. 164).

The literature presented thus far indicates that department chairs are not as comfortable with their roles and responsibilities as they could be. With this in mind, some authors have suggested that providing training for future and/or current department chairs may be the key to minimizing the anxiety associated with the position. When designing any form of training or development for new and/or current department chairs, the first question that needs to be answered is "What do

they need to know?" The literature states that department chairs need knowledge in several areas. These include, but are not limited to: evaluation, budget and finance, legal matters, communication, time management, implementation of technology, problem solving, and organization (Roach, 1976; Jennerich, 1981; Singleton, 1987; Meredith and Wunsch, 1991; Gmelch and Gates, 1995; Townsend and Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996 and Pettit, 1999). The reason for this need for training/development stems from the fact that there is little department chair training/development being done on the campuses of today's institutions of higher education (Franke, 2001).

Some institutions have, however, recognized the need for such training/development and have implemented programs designed to enhance a chair's awareness of his/her responsibilities. In a study conducted by Berger and Passauer (2003), it was discovered that several institutions did, in fact, have established development programs. These institutions include: Harvard University, the University of North Carolina, The Pennsylvania State University, and The Ohio State University. From the results of this study, Berger and Passauer developed a Best Practice scenario for an institution interested in implementing this type of program. Some key elements for implementing a successful program include: using surveys, focus groups, and workshop evaluations to know what is needed and from the results obtained, develop a program specifically geared to the institution; having the program housed in Human Resources and/or Organizational Development with the academic provost being directly responsible for it, and making the program available to current chairs as well as those interested in becoming chairs in the future (Berger and Passauer, 2003). By approaching the development of a training/development program in a comprehensive way, an institution can meet its specific needs.

Another potential avenue for improving a department chair's ability to successfully manage his/her roles and responsibilities would be a mentoring program. In April 1995, Hopson presented a paper in which she advocated using mentors to help prepare current and future department chairs for their roles and responsibilities. Hopson also developed a course entitled Community College Leadership to assist in this process. In this course, she teaches others about all aspects of a community college, as well as the various roles and responsibilities associated with the chair position. Although a course like this may not be feasible for all institutions, the development of seminars and/or workshops could prove beneficial.

OTHER ALLIED HEALTH CARE DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

As the literature has shown thus far, many department chairs accept the position of department chair without really knowing exactly what their roles and responsibilities will be. In the allied health care profession, which is any health related profession recognized by the American Medical Association and which requires special training, these administrators are also faced with similar transitions, but have the added responsibility of maintaining or achieving accreditation of an allied health care program. Although limited, there has been some specific research done on allied health care department chairs and their perceptions of their roles and responsibilities, including one recent study of athletic training administrators. Because the field of athletic training is patterning itself after physical therapy and occupational therapy, studies from these two fields are presented.

Allied Health and Public Health Department Chairs

Rohrer (1990) examined the leadership and managerial roles of the academic department chairperson (or equivalent) in schools of health professions within higher education. Rohrer

points out that orientation programs are uncommon and that most of the knowledge gained is acquired through discussions with one's dean or the former chair. Using a descriptive survey, Rohrer found that, of the chairs surveyed, more than 50% learned about the roles and responsibilities of the chair's position from the previous chair, 33% had discussions with the department faculty, and 20% mentioned mentoring relationships outside of the field, while only 9.8% mentioned any formal orientation to the position. Rohrer states, "it cannot be concluded from the survey data whether such career preparation is perceived as, or in fact is, adequate in providing the chair with useful managerial tools, competencies and strategies for effective performance and leadership in this role" (1990, p. 153-154). It should be noted that more than 50% of the allied health care department chairs indicated using continuing education as a Means of educating themselves to their roles and responsibilities as department chair.

Physical Therapy Department Chairs

As an allied health care profession, physical therapy has made great strides in the academic preparation of its students. This has increased the need for physical therapy department chairs to reach beyond their traditional clinical backgrounds into the realm of administration. Perry (2000) investigated the role of physical therapy department chairs as perceived by the chairs themselves as well as the faculty within the department. Perry found that the faculty and the department chairs agreed on the roles the chair should have, with faculty and department responsibilities viewed as most important and student interaction as least important. The characteristics viewed as most important included listening carefully, communicating effectively, being honest and trustworthy, and being helpful and supportive. The least important characteristics were following the advice of others, becoming angry, being friendly and agreeable, and having a good sense of humor. Perry states, "Little formal training has been

offered specifically to chairs in physical therapy departments" (2000, p. 8). Perry, citing a study by Thompson, said that chairs should have a job description and a mentor, as well as an in house training session (2000). Perry's study agrees with the information previously presented concerning the need for all department chairs to have some form of training directly related to their roles and responsibilities.

Occupational Therapy Department Chairs

In a qualitative study of four newly [less than four years of experience as a department chair] appointed occupational therapy department chairs conducted by Coppard (2000), she established a theory of transition that occupational therapy faculty go through when they become occupational therapy department chairs. Through her interviews of four department chairs, Coppard discovered that when asked how they each prepared for the position, one responded that she did nothing but worry and what remained was left to trial and error, while one chair monitored the listserv and talked with other chairs. One chair did attend a program director's meeting and also sought continuing education units in the administrative field. All four said they had no formal training directly related to academic administration (2000). Through her research, Coppard (2000) was able to make the following recommendations for occupational therapy to assist current and/or future department chairs: establish a mentoring/networking system, develop strategies to recruit chairs and develop educational material about the transition from faculty to chair.

The leadership qualities of occupational therapy department chairs were also explored by Dudek-Shriber (1997). In her study, she describes the top five qualities of leadership identified by both occupational therapy program directors and their faculty concern: i.e., for others [respectful leadership]; ability to help the organization adapt, attain goals, and maintain values

[organizational leadership]; ability to develop or inculcate organizational values [cultural leadership]; ability to affect outcomes [bottom-line leadership]; and the ability to manage and direct attention [focused leadership] (1997). Dudek-Shriber (1997) also stated,

> The discovery that the directors were perceived by their faculty as being 'average' leaders in most areas is important. In that the directors of occupational therapy programs receive little, if any, specific training for their positions, being rated as average in most areas of visionary leadership should not be considered a major detriment to them or to their department
> (p. 374).

She concluded that although program directors only had average perceived leadership skills, they could positively influence organizational goals. Responsibilities usually discussed when researching department chairs, such as budgeting and evaluation of faculty, were not addressed in her study.

Athletic Training Department Chairs

In a study conducted by Freesemann (2000) concerning the relationship of athletic training administration and educational structure to the success of students on the National Athletic Board of Certification [NATABOC] examination, he was able to identify some key issues faced by athletic training program directors. Through the use of a descriptive survey and two case studies, Freeseman discovered that 63.5% of the 52 respondents were assigned the titles of program director and coordinator of academic and clinical education. This increases considerably the traditional roles and responsibilities associated with being a department chair. Freeseman also found the average number of faculty in an athletic training program to be 2.1 full-time faculty, with only .9 having tenure and .8 being in the tenure stream. The majority (1.6) of faculty in athletic training programs were at the rank of lecturer. Freeseman accounts for this trend by identifying that most athletic training programs have faculty with dual appointments.

One related conclusion made by Freeseman was that CAAHEP recognizes the program director as the primary administrator and "the work expectations of the program director may exceed physical and productivity capacity, resulting in a detrimental effect on faculty, students, program, department and university" (p. 89). Because of the minimal number of tenured or tenure stream faculty and the small number of full-time faculty, Freeseman recommended that a minimum of two full time tenured/tenure track faculty be in the athletic training program. This could allow for a wider distribution of responsibilities and allow the program director to focus on his/her administrative, faculty, and clinical responsibilities.

ATHLETIC TRAINING EDUCATION

The following is an historical account of the development of athletic training education. Some background on the development of the field of athletic training as a profession is also necessary to support the need for standardized educational programs in the field of athletic training. This overview is presented to provide the reader with background on the professional education of those individuals who are serving as athletic training program directors in today's colleges and universities.

"The National Athletic Trainers' Association (NATA) has historically offered two routes to certification one requiring education in the context of a formal educational program and the other a more 'hands-on' experiential route supplemented by a minimal amount of course work" (NATA Education Task Force, 1997, pg. 16). The existence of two methods of certification has created a great deal of confusion over the years. In an article from the February 1996, *NATA News*, it states, "Image is certainly one of the issues. Having two routes to certification doesn't sit well with lawmakers and other health-care professions" (Ray & Schrader, pg. 17). It was for this and other reasons that NATA mandated

> …all candidates [students seeking certification by the National Athletic Trainers' Association Board of Certification] must possess a baccalaureate degree and have successfully completed a CAAHEP (Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs) accredited athletic training education program (NATA Education Task Force, 1997, pg. 16).

Beginning in January 2004, all those interested in becoming a certified athletic trainer must graduate from an accredited athletic training program and must graduate with a degree in athletic training.

The Growth of the Profession of Athletic Training and Athletic Training Education

In tracing the development of athletic training as a profession, O'Shea (1980) suggests, if you searched back far enough, you could find evidence of "athletic trainers "with the earliest existence of man through the first Olympic games in 776 B.C. and onto 160 A.D. when Galen was practicing medicine. The development of the profession of athletic training as we know it today can be traced back to the early 1900s. Real strides were made in 1950, when the National Athletic Trainers' Association (NATA) was founded. This marked the beginning of tremendous growth and educational development in the field.

Through the 1950s, the NATA worked to build the organization and laid the groundwork for the future. Two of the most significant occurrences during this decade were the initial publication of *The Journal of Athletic Training* in 1956 and approval of the first program of education by the NATA in 1959 (See Appendix B) (O'Shea, 1980).

Although the components of an athletic training education program were in place, little progress was made until 1969 (Kauth, 1984). Kauth points out that this was due to a lack of communication between those designing the curriculum and those responsible for overseeing it (i.e. the college health and physical education departments). As a result of this lack of growth, in 1968 the NATA surveyed department heads in institutions employing NATA athletic trainers.

The survey resulted in the NATA developing the content for a curriculum that was required to be approved by the NATA, the development of a certification examination designed to ensure that athletic trainers were meeting the minimal competencies necessary, and a strong push for athletic trainers who could also teach at the secondary level (Schwank & Miller, 1971). By 1969, two schools had met the requirements of a NATA approved curriculum in athletic training and by 1970, the first certification examination was given (Foster, 1995).

The early 1970s saw the evidence of much effort and hard work paying off. The membership of the NATA during this time period successfully guided the profession and its educational preparation to new levels. According to O'Shea (1980), the athletic trainer was no longer viewed as the jack-of-all-trades in the locker room, but as a highly trained professional with rigorous formal training. The field of athletic training was coming into its own and requiring less and less reliance on physical therapy and physical education curriculums (Delforge & Behnke, 1999). The advent of a required number of clinical hours under the direct supervision of a certified athletic trainer and the development of behavioral and learning objectives revealed that the field of athletic training had developed a significant body of knowledge (Delforge & Behnke, 1999). As with most professions, the profession of athletic training could not rest on its laurels; the next decade brought with it more changes.

Credibility Increased by Becoming an Academic Major

Throughout the 1970s, the education of athletic trainers was accomplished through the curriculum outlined in Appendix C. Although the curriculum was sound, individuals were not earning degrees in the field of athletic training. As the curriculum states, those students seeking to become certified athletic trainers majored in physical education and then supplemented their coursework with the necessary requirements (Schwank & Miller, 1971). The 1970s saw four

routes to certification for athletic trainers: the approved curriculum routes both on the undergraduate and graduate level, completion of a physical therapy degree, the internship route, and a route known as special consideration for those individuals actively engaged in the field of athletic training (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

Delforge (1982), cited in Scheiderer, presented the NATA's mandate as follows: Up to this point, NATA-approved undergraduate programs were not considered majors. They were delivered under the titles of concentration, minor, or specialization. The NATA did not feel this limited educational scope offered enough educational preparation for a student entering the field of athletic training. The result was a mandate that an athletic training major or its equivalent be offered by June 1, 1986, by all NATA-approved undergraduate athletic training programs or the program could risk losing NATA approval (Scheiderer, 1986). This date was later changed to July 1, 1986, and programs were only required to be in the process of seeking NATA-approval for their athletic training major or its equivalent (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

Delforge and Behnke (1999) outlined the requirements necessary for becoming an approved program, as originally stated by Delforge (1982). They stated that:

> To be considered in the process of developing an athletic training major, an institution sponsoring a NATA-approved undergraduate program was required to submit a letter from the administration of the sponsoring department attesting to initiation of program planning and the intent to meet the implementation deadline. Additional required documents included a list of program goals and objectives, strategies for meeting the stated goals and objectives, and implementation progress reports (pg. 57).

The NATA Board of Directors extended the implementation deadline again. Programs now had until July 1, 1990, to meet the necessary requirements (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

With this in place, the Professional Education Committee of the NATA concentrated on outlining the requirements for developing a major. In June 1983, the *Guidelines for*

Development and Implementation of NATA Approved Undergraduate Athletic Training Education Programs (1988) was published. A NATA-approved athletic training curriculum was required to be a major in athletic training, or its equivalent, as defined by the sponsoring institution (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

These changes were accompanied by changes in the subject matter required in a NATA-approved major, or its equivalent (See Appendix D). This change reflected the addition of *Competencies in Athletic Training* developed in 1983 (*Competencies in Athletic Training*, 1983). By the June 1, 1990 deadline, over two-thirds of the 73 NATA-approved programs were granting bachelor's degrees in athletic training. The remaining one-third were major equivalents, with many petitioning their institutions for approval to be degree-granting programs (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

The 1980s brought the education of athletic trainers to a higher standard. With NATA approved undergraduate athletic training majors coming into existence,and guidelines and competencies being implemented, the field of athletic training was ready to stand alone as an allied health care profession. All that was needed was some recognition and the decade of the 90s would see to that.

American Medical Association Recognition Effect on Athletic Training Education

The 1990s proved to be a pivotal decade in the recognition of athletic training as an allied health care profession. "In June 1990, the American Medical Association (AMA) formally recognized athletic training as an allied health profession" (*AMA endorses athletic training as allied health profession*, 1990, p. 14). This recognition set the stage for changes that are still taking place in 2004. The AMA's recognition was preceded by the NATA Board of Directors' desire to have the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) approval of entry-level

education programs.   The AMA recognition was the necessary first step to gaining CAHEA approval (Delforge & Behnke, 1999). The rationale behind this decision was the apparent benefit of a standardized education system for entry-level athletic trainers (Behnke, 1991).   This new effort precipitated the development of the Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training (JRC-AT). "Once organized, the first task of this committee was to develop standards and guidelines to govern JRC-AT and the Commission on Allied Health and Education Accreditation (CAHEA) accreditation of entry-level programs" (Delforge & Behnke, 1999). This effort resulted in the *Essentials and Guidelines for an Accredited Educational Program for an Athletic Trainer* (1991), which was approved by the AMA Council of Medical Education (CME) on December 6, 1991 (*Athletic Training Education Newsletter*, 1991).

With everything in place, February 1994, saw Barry University and High Point University granted accreditation by CAHEA, but CAHEA's role in this process was short-lived. In July 1994, CAHEA was replaced by CAAHEP, and the cycle of change continued (National Athletic Trainers' Association, 1994).   The actual differences in the accreditation process of CAHEA and CAAHEP were minimal, resulting in little interruption in the approval of entry-level undergraduate athletic training curricula (Delforge & Behnke, 1999). As of June 1998, 82 entry-level programs had been accredited by CAAHEP, including 68 previously NATA-approved undergraduate programs (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).   The transition was going well, but adjustments were still needed.

Responsibilities Change for Athletic Training Program Directors

With CAAHEP accrediting athletic training education programs, a previously acceptable route to certification needed to be eliminated.   Those institutions that had internship programs needed to make some decisions. By January 1, 2004, all applicants for National Athletic

Trainers' Association Board of Certification (NATABOC) were required to have completed a CAAHEP approved entry-level program (NATA Education Council Implementation Timeline, 2001).

In an article published in the February 1996 issue of the *NATA News*, the rationale for these changes were listed. Several statements related directly to the reasons that eliminating the internship route was necessary. They included:

> 1. Curriculum students outscore internship students in all areas of the certification exam.
>
> 3. Curriculum students pass all three sections of the certification exam on the first attempt at higher rates than internship students.
>
> 10. Lack of adequate oversight of internship candidates results in over half being denied permission to sit for the certification examination by the NATABOC.
>
> 11. For the years 1993 and 1994 there were 573 institutions utilizing the internship route to certification and 84 accredited/approved undergraduate institutions. Although most of the universities sponsoring students via internship routes produced small numbers of certification candidates, 81 institutions produced an average of 8.8 candidates per year. The 84 accredited/approved athletic training programs produced an average of 9.3 candidates per year.
>
> 12. For years 1993 and 1994, a total of 3,014 (66% of all certifies) were certified by the NATABOC through the internship route, and 1561 (34% of all certifies) through the curriculum programs.
>
> 14. The distinction between accredited and unaccredited athletic training education programs is unclear to the general public. For the year 1995, according to *Peterson's College Guide*, 133 institutions advertised majors in athletic training. Only 52 of these programs were approved by the NATA or accredited by the CAAHEP. Similarly, 130 universities advertised majors in sports medicine. Only 43 of these programs were approved or accredited. The actual number of approved/accredited programs is 84. (pg. 20).

John Schrader, HSD, ATC stated, "No other allied health profession has on-the-job- training as a basic route to entry. This is critical to our [athletic trainers'] credibility" (Ray & Schrader, 1996,

pg. 17).   In this same article, Karen Toburen, EdD, ATC, who has experienced both the internship and the NATA-approved routes to certification, said,

> A problem with the internship route is the disparity among courses
> students take from one university to another. In an approved
> curriculum program, classes must address the specific content
> areas covering the 191 competencies. In an internship offering
> classes must have a specific name- leaving a wide door of
> interpretation of what that class should entail (pg. 18).

With this in mind, the NATA Board of Directors adopted the 18 recommendations of its Educational Task Force at its December 1996, meeting (NATA Board of Directors Adopts Recommendations for Educational Reform, 1997).   The recommendation most affecting the premise of this study was under Provision 3 and stated, "the NATA should recommend to the JRC-AT that the CAHEEP Essentials & Guidelines be amended to include recommending that program directors possess a Program Directors' CAQ [certificate of advanced qualifications] or its equivalent by the year 2001" (NATA Educational Task Force, 1997, pg. 18). In the rationale it states, "Educational program design, management, and evaluation are not entry-level skills. Yet any certified athletic trainer with a minimum of three years post-baccalaureate experience is presumed to be qualified in these areas" (NATA Educational Task Force, 1997, pg. 18). The NATA recognized this fact and had planned for a method to assist current and future program directors by providing a certificate of advanced qualifications [CAQ], but as Chad Starkey points out, this type of educational qualification will not become a requirement.

> Although we are still in the process of developing CE [continuing education]
> to assist program directors, this certificate of advanced qualifications [CAQ] will not
> become a requirement. This decision was based on two factors: (a) CAHEEP (via JRC-
> AT) cannot enforce this requirement and (b) colleges and universities are the final
> authority in determining the credentials of their employees (Starkey, 2001, p. 1).

Although the NATA recognizes the need for additional education and training of educational program directors, it does not have the authority to make it a requirement. This places athletic

training program directors in the same position as other allied health care program directors and academic department chairs. Athletic training program directors are being asked to make the transition from a clinically based profession as faculty members to academic administrators with little to no apparent knowledge of the roles and responsibilities required for the positions.

SUMMARY

Academic department chairs, whether in athletic training or other disciplines, face many challenges. Department chairs in the allied health care fields may face additional challenges when the need for maintaining an accredited program is added to the list of roles and responsibilities. This review of related literature clearly shows that department chairs often accept the position of department chair with little or no prior experience or training. With specific attention to the educational preparation in the allied health care professions of public health, physical therapy, and occupational therapy, the field of athletic training can look to them as models. As the field of athletic training matures, it is appropriate that the preparation of the athletic training program director be studied. Therefore, the intent of this study was to ascertain the nature of educational preparation of athletic training program directors and make recommendations that might enhance that preparation.

As the literature states and Figure 1 outlines, the roles and responsibilities of academic administrators fall into four main categories: teaching, scholarship, service, and administration. Figure 2 more clearly identifies the specific qualities and competencies an academic administrator must possess. While individual competence cannot be assumed when one takes on the role of department chair and/or program director, the focus of this research is on the athletic training program director's administrative competency. This research sought to answer the

question of whether undergraduate athletic training program directors perceived their educational experience as sufficient in helping them to develop the qualities and competencies identified as necessary, or were undergraduate athletic training program directors falling into the same pattern as many other academic administrators? Are undergraduate athletic training program directors being placed in the role of academic administrators with little to no training/knowledge of the expectations of the position? These were questions worth exploring and, if the profession of athletic training was like other academic disciplines in that they provide little to no preparation for academic program administration, there will be an opportunity to restructure athletic training education to meet the needs of those individuals with aspirations for academic program administration and possibly set a standard for other academic disciplines to follow.

This study focused on trying to identify the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors for their role as an academic administrator based on their own educational experience. By identifying their perceived preparedness in areas such as, but not limited to, budgeting, faculty recruitment, evaluation, and departmental governance, this study identified whether or not undergraduate athletic training program directors perceive themselves as prepared for academic administration or if the educational preparation was falling short in this area. Attempts were made to find correlations between the type of educational preparation athletic training program directors may have had (e.g. accredited versus internship, undergraduate versus graduate education, etc.] to try to identify if there was an educational avenue in place that currently prepares undergraduate program directors for their roles and responsibilities as academic administrators.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The perceived level of administrative preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors based on their athletic training education and their recommendations for enhancing the preparation were assessed by Means of a descriptive survey. This chapter reports on the samples, instruments and procedures to be used for the descriptive survey.

SURVEY

A survey instrument (see Appendix E) was developed to obtain the necessary information about the perceptions of undergraduate, athletic training program directors concerning their perceived level of preparedness for the roles and responsibilities and any recommendations they might have about how to improve this preparation. Based on the review of the literature in the area of higher education administration and, more specifically, other studies related to administration of other allied health education programs, a survey was developed that addressed the six research questions presented. The research questions centered on how athletic training program directors perceived their level of preparedness for academic administration based on their own educational experience, alternative methods used to gain knowledge about the qualities and competencies needed for the position, how factors such as type of education, highest degree earned, and number of years in the position might effect their perceptions, and finally, are the perceptions of athletic training program directors similar to the academic administrators discussed in the literature.

Through a series of closed ended Likert scale, ranking, and single response questions, the investigator presents the findings as they relate to each of the six research questions.

SURVEY SAMPLE

The survey was sent to all 198 undergraduate athletic training program directors in the United States in March of 2004. Participants were identified using the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs [CAAHEP] listing of accredited athletic training programs (see Appendix F for a list of the institutions).

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES

The survey was originally planned to be administered in two ways. Because all program directors had email addresses, the need for a standard mailing was eliminated. For all participants with email addresses, the survey was sent electronically. A pre-notification email was sent indicating that the survey was coming and what its purpose was. After four days a second mailing went out which included a cover letter and a copy of the survey for the participant to complete. The investigator developed an email distribution list based on the email addresses documented in Appendix F. The pre-notification letter and cover letter was on the investigator's institutional letterhead stationary.

The survey did not contain any institutional identifying information and guaranteed confidentiality. Those participating electronically received a second mailing two weeks after the initial distribution. If a participant did not respond after the second mailing, he/she was considered a non-respondent for the purpose of sample size.

ANALYSIS

The data obtained from the survey were analyzed using Means, standard deviations and percentages to gather information about the whole population. Analysis of variance was also used to compare the various independent variables. Responses to specific survey questions were also related back to the review of related literature to determine if athletic training program directors perceive themselves similarly to other academic administrators.

For the series of Likert scale questions in Section I of the survey, Mean values were calculated for each of the responses. The Mean value was used to identify which response, (i.e. strongly agree, agree, etc.), was most important for that question. These data were used to gain information from the entire population and answer Research Questions 1 and 2. These responses were also used to determine if various subgroups of the population responded differently from other subgroups. The subgroups used were from responses to questions in Sections II and IV. Using One-way ANOVA, subgroup perceptions were compared to the population and to other subgroups. For example, responses of those athletic training program directors who perceived themselves primarily as administrators were compared to the entire population, as well as, to those who primarily saw themselves as faculty members. MANOVA analysis was also used to compare the highest degree earned by the respondents (bachelor's, masters, or doctorate), to compare differences in responses to the entire population, as well as, between the three degrees. If the distribution of the demographic information allowed, an ANOVA analysis was done. These data were then used to answer Research Question 3.

Research Question 4 used data from survey question 7 in Section I and all of Section III. These data allowed the researcher to determine if a curriculum which addressed the specific roles and responsibilities of athletic trainer program directors was needed; if so, what the content areas

and at what degree level such a program should be implemented. Again, Mean values were determined to calculate the most important responses.

In answering Research Questions 5 and 6, responses to Likert scale questions 8 and 9 in Section I were used, along with question 4 in Section II. Similar to Research Questions 1 and 2, the Mean value was used to determine the most important response. These responses were related back to the literature commensurate on how academic administrators perceive how their time is divided amongst their various roles and responsibilities to see if there were any similarities or differences.

V. RESULTS

This study sampled undergraduate athletic training program directors identified by the CAAHEP web site in order to assess their perception of how their athletic training education prepared them for the roles and responsibilities of being an academic administrator. Quantitative data were used, which included questions related to the roles and responsibilities of academic administrators as indicated in the literature, questions related to the respondent's self-perception of his/her role, the perceived need for an educational program for individuals interested in becoming athletic training program directors, and demographic questions were also used to determine the relationship to specific variables such as: type of undergraduate education, number of years certified as an athletic trainer, and tenure status.

This chapter is divided into three sections: (a) a description of the survey response rates; (b) presentation of the demographic characteristics of the respondents; and (c) the responses to the research questions from Chapter II.

SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

An electronic surveying technique was used to obtain the responses of undergraduate athletic training program directors identified by the CAAHEP web site (Appendix F). This list was of colleges and universities in the United States with undergraduate program athletic training programs. It is a CAAHEP policy that all athletic training programs have a program director. The web site identified the program directors for each of these institutions. The necessary email addresses were obtained in two ways. The first was directly from the CAAHEP web site. The second was from the institutional web sites of the individuals identified by the CAAHEP web

site as the program director, but with no email address given. A pre-notification letter was emailed to 198 individuals identified by CAAHEP as undergraduate athletic training program directors (Appendix G). The pre-notification letter gave a brief explanation of the purpose of the survey and let the potential respondents know that the cover letter and survey would be emailed in a few days. This also served as a way to identify and correct those email addresses that were incorrectly entered by either CAAHEP or the researcher. All email addresses that produced a System Administrator Error were corrected. After the pre-notification letter was mailed and all possible email address corrections were made, a total population of 168 possible undergraduate athletic training program directors existed. The initial cover letter (Appendix H) and survey (Appendix E) were emailed to all 168 potential respondents three days following the pre-notification being sent. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and a request to participate, along with some demographic information about the researcher. The cover letter also provided the link to the survey. A second request to participate was sent to all potential respondents two weeks after the first request was sent. The data gathering process ended two weeks after the second request to participate was sent. In order to maintain the anonymity of the respondents, no coding system was used to identify those who did or did not respond.

In sum, 90 (54%) of the 168 total possible respondents surveyed submitted a survey. One respondent's results were eliminated due to the fact that he/she did not complete Sections I and II of the survey. The remaining non-respondents were due to the elimination of the athletic training program, the CAAHEP identified program director was no longer in the position, failure to find an accurate email address, improper listing of the program as an undergraduate athletic training program or self-selected non-participation as determined through email correspondence to the survey request and viewing institutional web sites. This left the total number of respondents at

89 (53%). This response rate may speak to the perceived lack of time for additional activities by undergraduate athletic training program directors.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Section IV of the survey asked the respondents for demographic information to identify selected characteristics of undergraduate athletic training program directors. Degrees earned, number of years certified, number of years as an athletic training program director, number of years as a faculty member, current academic rank, current tenure status, and type of institution currently employed at were among the questions asked.

Of the 89 respondents, 35 (39.3%) had bachelor's degrees from an approved athletic training curriculum, 28 (31.5%) from an athletic training internship program, and 27 (30.3%) had bachelor's degrees in areas other then athletic training. Those that responded "Other" were grouped into five categories: biology, education, physical education, fine arts and physical therapy. Of those respondents earning bachelor's degrees in areas other than athletic training the majority 10 (11.2%) were in physical education; three (3%) were in biology and education respectfully, two (2%) were in physical therapy; and one (1%) was in fine arts.

All 89 respondents had earned a Master's degree, with 43 (48.3%) having a Master's in athletic training and 48 (53.9%) having Master's in other areas. The reason for the sum of these two categories being greater than 89 was that some respondents had earned two Master's degrees. Of those earning their Master's degrees in areas other than athletic training, there were seven primary categories: administration, biology, curriculum/education, physical education exercise science/physiology, health, and fitness management. The majority nine (10%) had earned their degrees in physical education, followed by seven (8%) in exercise

science/physiology, and six (7%) in curriculum/education. The remaining categories were four (4%) in administration, two (2%) in health and fitness management, and one (1%) in biology.

Of the 89 respondents, 49 (55%) had earned doctorates. Of that 49, only two (2.2%) were in athletic training, with the other 47 (53%) being in areas other than athletic training. The limited number of respondents with doctorates in athletic training may be due to the fact that there are only three universities currently offering this degree. The doctorates in areas other than athletic training included: 15 (17%) in curriculum/education, eight (9%) in administration and five (6%) in physical education. The remaining eight (9%) degrees were distributed between health, human performance, Kinesiology, and sports medicine. For the purpose of analysis, all 49 respondents, which held doctorates, were grouped together.

Of the 88 (99%) responding to the question related to the number of years as a certified athletic trainer, only one respondent had been certified for 3-5 years with all other respondents being certified for at least three or more years. For the purpose of analysis, the 3-5, and 6-10 years certified categories were combined. With the largest number of respondents being certified 21+ years, this increased the likelihood of more respondents having gone through the internship route toward certification.

Eighty-six (97%) of the total respondents responded to the question related to the number of years as an undergraduate athletic training program director. The majority of respondents had been program directors for 3-10 years, with the fewest being program directors for 11-15 and 21+ years. When compared to number of years as a certified athletic trainer, the number of years as a program director is almost opposite.

The same 86 (97%) of the total respondents completed the question pertaining to the number of years as a faculty member. There are fewer numbers of respondents that had been

faculty members for 16 or more years then had been certified as athletic trainers. This may be indicative of the changes in athletic training education or the movement of clinical athletic trainers to faculty after serving as a clinical athletic trainer for several years.

Ninety-nine percent (88) of the total respondents indicated their current academic rank, with 10 (11.4%) being instructors, 41 (46.6%) being assistant professors, 27 (30.7%) being associate professors, and 10 (11.4%) being full professors.

All 89 respondents completed the questions related to tenure status. The fact that 40.4% of the respondents were tenured already and 25.8% were in the tenure track was an optimistic result because academic administrators that are in the non-tenure stream often have increased difficulty with those they supervise that are tenured or in the tenure track (O'Neill, Simplicio, and Martin, 1996).

For the final demographic question, respondents were asked to indicate the type of institution where they were currently employed. Of the 168 possible respondents, 34% were employed at public research universities, 32% were from private, four year colleges, 23% were employed at public, four year colleges and 11% were from private, research universities. Of those responding to the survey, the majority were employed at four year private (41%) and public (33%) colleges, with 20% being from public, research universities and 8% were from private, research universities. The respondents tended to be over represented in private, four year colleges (41% versus 32%) and under represented in research universities (20% versus 34% and 8% versus 11%) when compared to the 168 potential respondents. Based on the demographic results, Table 1 illustrates a typical athletic training program director.

Table 1

Characteristics of Typical Athletic Training Program Director

Characteristic	Typical Athletic Training Program Director
Degree Held	Master's (54% with Doctorates)
Number of Years as a Certified Athletic Trainer	21+ years
Number of Years as a Program Director	3-5 years
Number of Years as a Faculty Member	6-10 years
Current Academic Rank	Assistant Professor
Current Tenure Status	Tenured
Type of Institution Currently Employed At	Private, Four Year College
Route for Athletic Training Education*	Accredited/Approved

EXAMINATION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question One

In response to research question one, "How do undergraduate athletic training program directors perceive their formal education in preparing them for their roles and responsibilities as academic administrators?" Question 4 in Section I of the survey specifically asked respondents to indicate how they perceived their formal education had prepared them for academic administration. The response rate was as follows: 48 (56.5%) responded strongly disagree and disagree that their athletic training education prepared them for academic administration, while 37 (43.6%) responded a combined strongly agree and agree that they were prepared. See Table 2. Please note that all N/A (Not Applicable) have been eliminated from all data analysis.

Table 2

Athletic Training Education Prepared Program Directors for Their Roles and Responsibilities N=85

Mean	Standard Deviation	Rating	N	Percentage
2.45	.838	Strongly Disagree	9	10.6
		Disagree	39	45.9
		Agree	27	31.8
		Strongly Agree	10	11.8

When asked if they would have benefited from a formal athletic training education that specifically addressed the roles and responsibilities of being an athletic training program director, over 46.1% strongly agreed and 31.6% agreed, while only a combined 22.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Refer to Table 3.

Table 3

Would Have Benefited from a Formal Education for Program Directors N=76

Mean	Standard Deviation	Rating	N	Percentage
3.16	.953	Strongly Disagree	6	7.9
		Disagree	11	14.5
		Agree	24	31.6
		Strongly Agree	35	46.1

With program accreditation being a major responsibility of athletic training program directors, the response to them being only adequately prepared to handle these responsibilities based on their athletic training education could lend support for the need for a more formalized educational program. Table 4 displays complete results.

Table 4

Adequately Prepared for Achieving/Maintaining Program Accreditation N=88

Mean	Standard Deviation	Rating	N	Percentage
2.44	1.004	Strongly Disagree	18	20.5
		Disagree	28	31.8
		Agree	27	30.7
		Strongly Agree	15	17.0

The literature identified various roles and responsibilities of academic administrators. The respondents were asked to rate their athletic training education in preparing them for a select list of roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration. Table 5 exhibits the respondents' perceptions to their preparedness for the responsibilities of academic administration and are presented in descending order based on Mean response.

Table 5

The Perception of Preparedness for the Responsibilities of Academic Administration

Responsibility	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Budget Management	2.95	.844	87	4.7	23.5	43.5	28.3
Legal Issues	2.86	.880	84	6.0	28.6	39.3	26.2
Communication with Faculty	2.75	.955	84	10.7	28.6	35.7	25.0
Program Planning	2.66	.962	87	13.8	27.6	37.9	20.7
Personnel Management	2.50	.808	86	10.5	38.4	41.9	9.3
Faculty Liaison to Administration	2.46	.993	87	17.2	39.1	29.9	13.8
Department Management	2.45	.906	85	14.1	41.2	30.6	14.1
Communication with Upper Administration	2.42	1.023	86	22.1	31.4	29.1	17.4
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	2.34	.989	86	22.1	37.2	25.6	15.1
Accreditation Preparation	2.30	1.030	86	14.4	38.4	19.8	17.4
Faculty Evaluation	2.26	.953	85	25.9	31.8	32.9	9.4

 Budget management and legal issues were the areas that the majority of respondents felt most prepared for based on their athletic training education, yet still did not achieve a mean average above 3.00 for any of the responsibilities listed. Aside from accreditation preparation, those

areas that the respondents felt least prepared for all related to faculty relations. Athletic training education does discuss how to evaluate injured athletes but rarely, if ever, are issues related to academic administration ever discussed.

As academic administrators, undergraduate athletic training program directors take on several roles. These include: mentor, leader, faculty developer, facilitator, and mediator. When asked how the respondents felt their athletic training education prepared them for each of these roles, there was a mixed response. For the roles of leader and mentor, means above 3.00 were achieved, while the other roles were not rated above a mean of 2.85. See Table 6 for complete results. With faculty developer having the lowest mean (2.42), this further supports the responses related to academic administrators responsibilities that athletic training program directors are not well prepared.

Table 6

The Perception of Preparedness for the Roles of Academic Administration

Role	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Leader	3.32	.922	80	6.2	14.8	29.6	49.4
Mentor	3.13	.905	80	6.3	16.3	36.3	41.3
Mediator	2.85	.927	86	9.3	23.3	40.7	26.7
Facilitator	2.71	.936	82	11.0	29.3	37.8	22.0
Faculty Developer	2.42	.943	85	14.1	47.1	21.2	17.6

Research question one revealed that the responsibility respondents felt most prepared for was budget management and they felt least prepared for the responsibility of faculty evaluation. The role most respondents felt prepared for was that of leader, while they felt least prepared for the role of faculty developer. Over 57% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that their athletic training education prepared them for their administrative roles and responsibilities. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents felt that they would have benefited from a formalized educational program that addressed the roles and responsibilities of academic administrators.

Research Question Two

Research question two asked the undergraduate athletic program directors, "Do athletic training program directors seek alternative methods (i.e. workshops, seminars, degrees other than in the field of athletic training) to assist them in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities?" The respondents used the Likert scale rating to indicate if and how they obtained further knowledge about their roles and responsibilities as academic administrators. Acknowledging that the mean for the response "other" was the highest at 4.17, it should be noted that 62.9% of the respondents indicated that this response was not applicable and the N/A response was eliminated from data analysis. Many athletic training program directors sought advice and mentoring from other administrators outside the field of athletic training. Many athletic training program directors may have sought the guidance and advice from other academic administrators due to the fact that they have little to no background in academic administration. This may also have been true due to the fact that athletic training program directors do not have easy access to other athletic training program directors. Another interesting result was that "trial and error" was rated third,

implying little to no guidance is thought available when it comes to academic administration.

Table 7 contains complete results.

Table 7

Alternative Methods Used to Gain Knowledge about Academic Administration

Method	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Other	4.17	1.361	35	11.4	2.9	5.7	17.1
Other Administrators Outside of Athletic Training	3.43	.692	79	1.3	7.6	38.0	53.2
Trial and Error	3.35	.807	77	2.6	13.0	31.2	53.2
Mentor	3.25	.845	77	3.9	14.3	35.1	46.8
Workshops Offered by Athletic Training Professionals	3.04	.999	76	11.8	11.8	36.8	36.5
Academic Coursework Outside of Athletic Training	2.95	1.044	76	10.5	25.0	23.7	40.8
Higher Education Workshop Outside of Own Institution	2.85	.974	72	12.5	18.1	41.7	27.8
Workshops Offered by Own Institution	2.47	.963	78	17.9	32.1	34.6	15.4

Another means of gaining knowledge about their roles and responsibilities was indicated by the demographic information related to degrees earned. Of those respondents with earned doctorates, only two doctorates were in athletic training, while 23 (49.0%) of the doctorates earned were in curriculum education (15) or administration (8).

The results of research question two reveal that most athletic training program directors learn about the roles and responsibilities by reading books, journals, and magazine articles. Some seek the advice of other academic administrators, while trial and error remained high on the list of methods used to gain knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of academic administration.

Research Question Three

Research question three asked respondents if there were differences between undergraduate athletic training program directors perceptions of level of preparedness for their roles and responsibilities based on the following variables: method of undergraduate education (internship versus accredited program); current level of education (bachelor's, master's or doctorate; type of candidate (internal versus external); perception of their position (administrator, faculty member or clinical); number of years certified as an athletic trainer; number of years as a faculty member; number of years as a program director; current academic rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or full professor); current academic status (tenured, tenure stream but not yet tenured or non-tenure stream) and type of institution where employed. Because of the nature of the question, each variable is presented separately with variations in method of analysis also being presented. In presenting all the results, the responsibilities are

presented first followed by the roles. All tables contain both the responsibilities and the roles for each analysis and all N/A responses were eliminated from the data analysis.

When analyzing the differences between those program directors educated through the accredited route versus those educated through the internship route, the four responsibilities that showed significance using a multivariate analysis were perceived preparedness for department management (F=4.662 and p=.013), communication with faculty (F=5.199 and p=.008), legal issues (F=6.368 and p=.003), and budget management (F=3.186 and p=.048). In response to this question, there were 21 respondents that were educated through an internship curriculum and 29 educated through an accredited curriculum. There was also no significant difference for perception of preparedness for the roles of academic administration. Complete results can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

MANOVA for Accredited (N=29) versus Internship Routes (N=21) of Education

Responsibilities	**Type of Program**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**
Personnel Management	Accredited	2.45	.827	.250	.779
	Internship	2.60	.821		
Department Management	Accredited	2.10	.860	4.662	**.013**
	Internship	2.85	.875		
Accreditation Preparation	Accredited	2.41	1.053	1.690	.192
	Internship	2.45	1.099		
Communication with Faculty	Accredited	2.59	.867	5.199	**.008**
	Internship	3.15	.875		
Legal Issues	Accredited	3.07	.753	6.368	**.003**
	Internship	3.00	.725		

Table 8 (continued)

Responsibilities	Type of Program	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	Accredited	2.41	1.053	2.013	.141
	Internship	2.65	.988		
Program Planning	Accredited	2.52	1.056		
	Internship	2.90	.912	1.298	
Budget Management	Accredited	2.50	.778	3.186	**.048**
	Internship	3.05	.759		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Accredited	2.17	.928	1.270	.287
	Internship	2.60	.995		
Faculty Evaluation	Accredited	2.24	.988	.075	.928
	Internship	2.35	1.040		
Communication with Upper Administration	Accredited	2.38	1.178	.276	.760
	Internship	2.55	.99		

Role	Type of Program	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Accredited	3.07	.961	.299	.743
	Internship	3.25	.786		
Leader	Accredited	3.28	.922	.417	.661
	Internship	3.25	.716		
Faculty Developer	Accredited	2.48	1.056	.967	.385
	Internship	2.55	.826		
Facilitator	Accredited	2.66	.974	1.022	.365
	Internship	2.95	.887		
Mediator	Accredited	2.83	.889	.911	.407
	Internship	2.90	.968		

When current level of education was analyzed, it was determined that all respondents had a master's degree. Because of the small (N=2) number of respondents with doctorates in athletic training, all respondents with doctorates were combined for an N=49. In order to eliminate analyzing those with a master's degree and doctorate twice, all respondents holding a terminal degree were analyzed against those only holding a master's degree. A MANOVA was used to accomplish this analysis. Results are found in Table 9. There was no significance found in perceived level of preparedness for the responsibilities or roles. Those with masters' degrees had only one mean score (1.96) that was lower than the mean scores of those with doctorates. This was for their perceived level of preparedness for the responsibility of accreditation preparation. Both those with doctorates and those with masters' degrees had their lowest means for the role of faculty developer.

Table 9

MANOVA for Doctorate (N=30) versus Master's (N=23) Degrees

Responsibilities	**Degree Held**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**
Personnel Management	Doctorate	2.53	.730	.023	.880
	Master's	2.57	.788		
Department Management	Doctorate	2.37	.890	.203	.654
	Master's	2.48	.898		
Accreditation Preparation	Doctorate	2.40	1.037	2.604	.113
	Master's	1.96	.928		
Communication with Faculty	Doctorate	2.67	1.061	.003	.956
	Master's	2.65	.775		
Legal Issues	Doctorate	2.77	.898	.429	.516
	Master's	2.91	.668		

Table 9 (continued)

Responsibilities	Degree Held	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	Doctorate	2.53	1.137	.403	.528
	Master's	2.35	.935		
Program Planning	Doctorate	2.70	.988	.252	.618
	Master's	2.57	.945		
Budget Management	Doctorate	2.73	.868	.601	.442
	Master's	2.91	.793		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Doctorate	2.53	1.042	.720	.400
	Master's	2.30	.876		
Faculty Evaluation	Doctorate	2.40	1.102	.417	.521
	Master's	2.22	.902		
Communication with Upper Administration	Doctorate	2.50	1.196	.005	.944
	Master's	2.52	.994		

Role	Degree Held	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Doctorate	3.10	.845	.016	.901
	Master's	3.13	.920		
Leader	Doctorate	3.27	.868	.118	.733
	Master's	3.35	.832		
Faculty Developer	Doctorate	2.57	1.040	.988	.325
	Master's	2.30	.822		
Facilitator	Doctorate	2.80	.961	.549	.462
	Master's	2.61	.891		
Mediator	Doctorate	2.77	1.006	.004	.949
	Master's	2.78	.736		

Another area analyzed was the perception of respondents to their positions. Respondents

were asked to rank (1 primary role, 2 secondary role, and 3 tertiary role), whether they viewed

themselves primarily as an administrator, a faculty member or a clinician. Both descriptive statistics and an ANOVA were used for each category, with post-hoc analysis being done, if significance was found, using both the Tukey and Scheffe. Overall, 52 of the respondents viewed themselves primarily as administrators, with 40 viewing themselves primarily as faculty members and only six viewing themselves primarily as clinicians. It should be noted that some respondents viewed themselves equally as administrators and faculty members. This response may be indicative of the struggle academic administrators have differentiating themselves as being an administrator or a faculty member. Of those who ranked themselves primarily as administrators and those who ranked themselves primarily as faculty members, there were no significant differences found when compared to the entire population. Through descriptive statistics, it was found that there was only one responsibility that those perceiving themselves primarily as administrators felt they were prepared for budget management (mean=3.00). See Tables 10 and 11 for complete results of those who perceived themselves primarily as administrators and primarily as faculty members. Those who perceive themselves primarily as clinicians, did show significance for the responsibility of faculty recruitment/retention (p=.036). See Table 12.

The perceived level of preparedness for their roles as academic administrators showed no significant difference based on the ANOVA analysis, but it should be noted that the mean for the perceived level of preparedness was higher overall in comparison to the Mean for the responsibilities. The role of leader had the highest mean score at 3.27 for those perceived primarily as administrators and 3.14 for those perceived primarily as faculty, while clinicians rated the role of mediator highest with a mean of 3.50.

Table 10

ANOVA for Primarily Perceived as an Administrator N=52

Responsibilities	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Budget Management	3.00	.775	.222	.801
Legal Issues	2.84	.889	.320	.727
Communication with Faculty	2.73	.961	.042	.959
Program Planning	2.72	1.026	.682	.508
Department Management	2.57	1.021	.517	.599
Personnel Management	2.54	.803	.404	.669
Department Management	2.48	.918	.018	.982
Communication with Upper Administration	2.44	1.056	.165	.848
Faculty Liaison to Administration	2.40	1.007	.120	.887
Accreditation Preparation	2.29	1.054	2.450	.093
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	2.25	.988	1.179	.313
Faculty Evaluation	2.18	.974	.577	.564

Role	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Leader	3.27	.917	.168	.845
Mentor	3.09	.974	.109	.897
Mediator	2.85	.894	.010	.990
Facilitator	2.71	.957	.441	.645
Faculty Developer	2.44	.978	.682	.508

Table 11

ANOVA for Primarily Perceived as a Faculty Member N=40

Responsibilities	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Legal Issues	2.82	.885	.094	.911
Budget Management	2.75	.899	2.264	.110
Communication with Faculty	2.68	.989	.169	.845
Program Planning	2.55	.932	.505	.606
Personnel Management	2.45	.783	.160	.853
Department Management	2.40	.900	.600	.551
Accreditation Preparation	2.33	1.047	.264	.769
Faculty Liaison to Administration	2.33	.859	.416	.661
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	2.30	.911	.781	.461
Faculty Evaluation	2.23	.931	.740	.480
Communication with Upper Administration	2.21	.894	1.616	.205
Role	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**
Leader	3.14	.887	.705	.497
Mentor	3.11	.875	.403	.958
Mediator	2.73	.960	.677	.511
Facilitator	2.66	.909	.375	.689
Faculty Developer	2.36	.932	.350	.706

Table 12

ANOVA for Primarily Perceived as Clinician N=6

Responsibilities	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance	Tukey	Scheffe
Budget Management	3.67	.516	2.900	.061		
Communication with Upper Administration	3.40	.894	2.619	.079		
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	3.33	1.033	3.467	**.036**	**.030**	**.039**
Faculty Liaison to Administration	3.00	.632	1.431	.245		
Department Management	2.83	.983	.719	.490		
Program Planning	2.83	.753	.196	.822		
Legal Issues	2.80	.447	1.056	.353		
Personnel Management	2.67	.816	.630	.535		
Accreditation Preparation	2.67	1.033	.686	.507		
Communication with Faculty	2.60	.548	.065	.937		
Faculty Evaluation	2.60	5.48	.819	.445		

Role	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance		
Mediator	3.50	.837	1.725	.184		
Leader	3.40	.894	.126	.882		
Facilitator	3.40	8.94	1.275	.285		
Faculty Developer	3.20	1.095	1.652	.198		
Mentor	3.00	.000	1.334	.269		

The difference in method of appointment (internal versus external) did not reveal an area of significant difference in the responsibilities or the roles. One interesting point was that the mean scores for internal candidates were all higher in comparison to the external candidates for both responsibilities and roles. This may be a reflection of the internal candidates' prior familiarity with the administrative system at their particular institution. See Table 13.

Table 13

ANOVA for Internal N=38 versus External Candidate N=47

Responsibilities	**Type of Candidate**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**
Personnel Management	Internal	2.58	.858	.750	.389
	External	2.43	.773		
Department Management	Internal	2.55	.950	1.055	.307
	External	2.35	.875		
Accreditation Preparation	Internal	2.32	.989	.006	.937
	External	2.30	1.082		
Communication with Faculty	Internal	2.82	.982	.244	.623
	External	2.71	.944		
Legal Issues	Internal	2.89	.875	.051	.822
	External	2.85	.894		
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	Internal	2.39	1.054	.197	.658
	External	2.30	.954		
Program Planning	Internal	2.69	.977	.128	.722
	External	2.62	.968		
Budget Management	Internal	3.16	.855	3.789	.055
	External	2.80	.806		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Internal	2.49	.970	.684	.411
	External	2.32	.911		
	External	2.11	.971		

Table 13 (continued)

Responsibilities	Type of Candidate	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Evaluation	Internal	2.42	.919	2.258	.137
	External	2.11	.971		
Communication with Upper Administration	Internal	2.56	1.071	1.597	.210
	External	2.28	.981		

Role	Type of Candidate	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Internal	3.44	1.095	.676	.413
	External	3.28	.949		
Leader	Internal	3.56	1.021	.074	.787
	External	3.28	.971		
Faculty Developer	Internal	2.67	1.132	.276	.601
	Internal	2.49	1.019		
Facilitator	External	2.84	.928	1.390	.242
	Internal	2.59	.948		
Mediator	External	3.05	.928	3.073	.083
	Internal	2.70	.907		

Experience in a particular field often influences perceptions. This study looked at the number of years respondents had been certified as athletic trainers, the number of years they had been faculty members, and the number of years they had been program directors. ANOVAs were done for each of these conditions and their effect on the respondents' perceptions of preparedness for academic administration. The ANOVA analysis revealed no significant difference between years certified and the preparedness for the various roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration. Table 14 shows the complete analysis.

Table 14

ANOVA for Number of Years Certified as an Athletic Trainer

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Personnel Management	15	3-10	2.53	.640	.088	.967
	23	11-15	2.52	.846		
	19	16-20	2.42	.902		
	28	21+	2.54	.838		
Department Management	16	3-10	2.13	.719	1.563	.205
	22	11-15	2.36	1.002		
	19	16-20	2.44	.984		
	28	21+	2.71	.854		
Accreditation Preparation	16	3-10	2.25	1.000	.599	.617
	23	11-15	2.39	1.076		
	19	16-20	2.05	1.079		
	27	21+	2.44	1.013		
Communication with Faculty	16	3-10	2.88	.885	.307	.820
	21	11-15	2.86	1.014		
	18	16-20	2.61	1.037		
	28	21+	2.71	.937		
Legal Issues	16	3-10	2.81	.981	.042	.988
	22	11-15	2.91	.750		
	18	16-20	2.89	.900		
	27	21+	2.85	.949		
Faculty Recruitment/Retention	16	3-10	2.13	.885	1.246	.299
	22	11-15	2.14	.889		
	19	16-20	2.37	1.257		
	28	21+	2.61	.916		
Program Planning	16	3-10	2.69	.793	1.397	.249
	23	11-15	2.57	.945		
	19	16-20	2.37	1.116		
	28	21+	2.93	.940		
Budget Management	16	3-10	3.00	.730	.064	.979
	22	11-15	3.00	.690		
	19	16-20	2.89	.994		
	27	21+	2.96	.940		

Table 14 (continued)

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Liaison to Administration	16	3-10	2.06	.772	1.042	.378
	23	11-15	2.39	.988		
	19	16-20	2.47	.964		
	28	21+	2.57	.959		
Faculty Evaluation	16	3-10	2.25	.854	1.299	.281
	22	11-15	2.05	.950		
	18	16-20	2.11	.963		
	28	21+	2.54	.999		
Communication with Upper Administration	16	3-10	2.19	.750	1.237	.302
	23	11-15	2.26	1.010		
	18	16-20	2.39	1.290		
	28	21+	2.71	.976		

Role	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	13	3-10	3.15	.801	.222	.881
	21	11-15	3.24	.831		
	18	16-20	3.00	1.138		
	27	21+	3.15	.864		
Leader	13	3-10	3.23	.832	.050	.985
	22	11-15	3.27	.883		
	18	16-20	3.28	1.074		
	27	21+	3.19	.921		
Faculty Developer	16	3-10	2.50	.894	.188	.905
	22	11-15	2.32	.945		
	18	16-20	2.39	1.092		
	28	21+	2.50	.923		
Facilitator	14	3-10	2.64	.745	.861	.465
	21	11-15	2.09	.768		
	18	16-20	2.44	1.199		
	28	21+	2.79	.957		

Table 14 (continued)

Mediator	16	3-10	2.94	.772		.169	.917
	23	11-15	2.91	.900			
	19	16-20	2.74	1.098			
	27	21+	2.85	.949			

Another area where the number of years of experience may have impacted the respondents was the number of years as a faculty member. The results of the ANOVA revealed significance for: department management (p=.022) and faculty evaluation (p=.028). The Tukey revealed significance between those respondents with 6-10 years of experience and those with 21+ years of experience for department management. Faculty evaluation showed significance at 6-10 years and 21+ years and 16-20 and 21+ years. The Scheffe did not reveal significance for the responsibility of faculty evaluation but did for department management at 6-10 years and 21+ years. The complete analysis is found in Table 15. There was no significance found for the roles of academic administrators.

Table 15

ANOVA for Number of Years as a Faculty Member

Responsibilities	**N**	**Number of Years**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**	**Tukey**	**Scheffe**
Personnel	8	1-2	2.25	.463	1.594	.172		
Management	16	3-5	2.81	.750				
	27	6-10	2.26	.813				
	5	11-15	2.40	.548				
	15	16-20	2.40	.986				
	12	21+	2.83	.835				

Table 15 (continued)

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance	Tukey	Scheffe
Department Management	8	1-2	2.13	.641	2.812	**.022**		
	16	3-5	2.63	1.025				
	26	6-10	2.04	.744			**.012`**	**.047**
	5	11-15	2.40	.548				
	15	16-20	2.53	.990				
	12	21+	3.08	.900			**.012**	**.047**
Accreditation Preparation	8	1-2	2.75	1.048	1.660	.154		
	17	3-5	2.47	1.007				
	27	6-10	1.85	.907				
	5	11-15	2.60	.894				
	15	16-20	2.27	1.033				
	11	21+	2.55	1.214				
Communication with Faculty	8	1-2	2.88	.835	.906	.482		
	16	3-5	3.06	.929				
	26	6-10	2.58	1.027				
	5	11-15	3.00	1.000				
	14	16-20	2.43	.938				
	12	21+	2.83	1.030				
Legal Issues	8	1-2	3.00	.756	.287	.919		
	16	3-5	2.94	1.029				
	27	6-10	2.78	.892				
	5	11-15	2.80	.837				
	14	16-20	3.07	.997				
	11	21+	2.73	1.009				
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	8	1-2	2.13	.641	1.495	.201		
	16	3-5	2.25	.931				
	27	6-10	1.96	.940				
	5	11-15	2.60	.894				
	15	16-20	2.47	1.060				
	12	21+	2.75	.965				
Program Planning	8	1-2	2.50	.756	1.360	.249		
	17	3-5	2.71	1.047				
	27	6-10	2.33	.920				
	5	11-15	2.80	.837				
	15	16-20	2.73	1.100				
	12	21+	3.17	.937				

Table 15 (continued)

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance	Tukey	Scheffe
Budget Management	7	1-2	3.14	.690	.321	.899		
	17	3-5	3.06	.748				
	26	6-10	2.81	.801				
	5	11-15	3.00	1.000				
	15	16-20	2.87	.834				
	12	21+	2.83	1.115				
Faculty Liaison to Administration	8	1-2	2.13	.641	1.534	.189		
	17	3-5	2.41	.870				
	27	6-10	2.19	.962				
	5	11-15	2.60	.894				
	15	16-20	2.27	1.033				
	12	21+	3.00	.953				
Faculty Evaluation	8	1-2	2.00	.535	2.680	**.028**		
	16	3-5	2.44	.983				
	27	6-10	2.04	1.055				**.037**
	5	11-15	2.20	.447				
	14	16-20	1.86	.864				**.025**
	12	21+	3.00	.953				**.037/ .025**
Communication with Upper Administration	8	1-2	2.25	.707	1.862	.111		
	17	3-5	2.41	.939				
	27	6-10	2.07	.997				**.041**
	5	11-15	2.20	.837				
	14	16-20	2.36	1.515				
	12	21+	3.08	.900				**.041**

Role	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance	Tukey	Scheffe
Mentor	7	1-2	2.57	1.134	.922	.472		
	14	3-5	3.59	.825				
	26	6-10	3.23	.908				
	5	11-15	2.80	.837				
	13	16-20	3.31	.947				
	12	21+	3.00	.953				

Table 15 (continued)

Role	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance	Tukey	Scheffe
Leader	7	1-2	2.57	1.356	.967	.444		
	16	3-5	3.20	.862				
	26	6-10	3.44	.804				
	5	11-15	3.00	1.000				
	13	16-20	3.31	.947				
	12	21+	3.08	1.084				
Faculty Developer	8	1-2	2.25	.886	.581	.714		
	17	3-5	2.65	.931				
	26	6-10	2.23	.992				
	5	11-15	2.40	.548				
	14	16-20	2.21	.8002				
	12	21+	2.50	1.000				
Facilitator	7	1-2	2.71	1.113	.595	.704		
	16	3-5	2.81	.834				
	25	6-10	2.60	.957				
	5	11-15	2.60	.894				
	14	16-20	2.36	.929				
	12	21+	2.92	.900				
Mediator	7	1-2	3.00	.8.16	.350	.881		
	17	3-5	3.00	.866				
	27	6-10	2.74	.944				
	5	11-15	2.60	.894				
	15	16-20	2.67	1.047				
	12	21+	2.83	.937				

The final area investigated based on years of experience was that of years as an undergraduate athletic training program director. There were a total of 85 respondents for this question. The ANOVA revealed one significant difference for the responsibility of department management, but the Tukey and Scheffe post-hoc analysis did not support this. The ANOVA revealed no significant difference for either the responsibilities or the roles associated with

academic administration as it related to the number of years as an athletic training program

director. See Table 16 for complete response.

Table 16

ANOVA for Number of Years as a Program Director

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Personnel Management	7	< 1	2.57	.787	.536	.779
	11	1-2	2.45	.688		
	23	3-5	2.61	.783		
	20	6-10	2.35	8.75		
	4	11-15	2.00	.816		
	13	16-20	2.46	.877		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		
Department Management	7	< 1	2.29	.756	1.493	.192
	11	1-2	2.18	.982		
	22	3-5	2.73	.883		
	20	6-10	2.10	.852		
	4	11-15	2.00	.816		
	13	16-20	2.69	.947		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		
Accreditation Preparation	7	< 1	2.43	1.134	.504	.804
	11	1-2	2.09	1.136		
	24	3-5	2.42	.929		
	20	6-10	2.10	1.165		
	4	11-15	1.75	.957		
	13	16-20	2.46	.947		
	4	21+	2.50	1.291		
Communication with Faculty	7	< 1	3.29	.756	1.796	.111
	11	1-2	2.18	.751		
	23	3-5	3.09	.733		
	18	6-10	2.61	1.195		
	4	11-15	2.75	1.500		
	13	16-20	2.46	.776		
	5	21+	2.80	1.304		

Table 16 (continued)

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Legal Issues	7	< 1	3.29	.756	.930	.479
	11	1-2	2.82	.603		
	23	3-5	2.63	1.012		
	19	6-10	3.50	1.000		
	4	11-15	3.50	1.000		
	12	16-20	3.00	1.044		
	5	21+	2.80	1.304		
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	7	< 1	2.00	.816	.521	.791
	11	1-2	2.18	.874		
	23	3-5	2.35	.982		
	20	6-10	2.15	1.040		
	4	11-15	2.00	.816		
	13	16-20	2.62	1.044		
	5	21+	2.40	.894		
Program Planning	7	< 1	2.57	.535	.800	.573
	11	1-2	2.36	1.027		
	24	3-5	2.75	.944		
	20	6-10	2.55	1.050		
	4	11-15	2.00	.816		
	13	16-20	2.92	1.038		
	5	21+	3.00	1.225		
Budget Management	7	< 1	3.26	.756	.570	.753
	11	1-2	2.73	.786		
	24	3-5	2.96	.751		
	18	6-10	2.83	.924		
	4	11-15	2.75	.957		
	13	16.20	3.08	.862		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	7	< 1	2.00	.577	1.054	.397
	11	1-2	2.00	.632		
	24	3-5	2.63	.824		
	20	6-10	2.35	1.137		
	4	11-15	2.00	.816		
	13	16-20	2.46	1.127		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		

Table (16 continued)

Responsibilities	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Evaluation	7	< 1	2.14	.690	1.150	.342
	11	1-2	2.09	.944		
	23	3-5	2.52	.846		
	19	6-10	1.95	1.026		
	4	11-15	1.75	.957		
	13	16-20	2.23	1.092		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		
Communication with Upper Administration	7	< 1	2.43	.535	1.759	.119
	11	1-2	1.91	.701		
	24	3-5	2.58	.929		
	19	6-10	2.05	1.079		
	4	11-15	1.75	.957		
	13	16-20	2.77	1.166		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		

Role	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	5	< 1	2.75	.957	1.437	.213
	11	1-2	2.64	.924		
	22	3-5	3.41	.734		
	19	6-10	3.16	1.015		
	4	11-15	2.75	1.500		
	12	16-20	3.42	.669		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		
Leader	7	< 1	3.71	1.380	1.490	.194
	11	1-2	2.64	1.027		
	25	3-5	3.56	.821		
	4	11-15	2.75	1.500		
	14	16-20	3.64	.842		
	5	21+	3.00	1.225		
Faculty Developer	7	< 1	2.86	.900	1.280	.277
	11	1-2	1.91	.539		
	23	3-5	2.61	.839		
	19	6-10	2.16	1.068		
	4	11-15	2.25	1.258		
	13	16-20	2.38	.768		
	5	21+	2.40	1.140		

Table 16 (continued)

Role	N	Number of Years	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Facilitator	5	< 1	3.20	.837	.837	.545
	11	1-2	2.45	.820		
	22	3-5	2.86	.839		
	19	6-10	2.47	1.020		
	4	11-15	2.25	1.258		
	13	16-20	2.62	.961		
	5	21+	2.80	1.095		
Mediator	7	< 1	3.29	.756	.991	.438
	11	1-2	2.64	.924		
	24	3-5	3.00	.659		
	19	6-10	2.74	1.098		
	4	11-15	2.25	1.258		
	13	16-20	2.77	.927		
	5	21+	2.40	1.140		

As the review of related literature revealed, method of appointment influenced how other academic administrators felt about their preparedness for their roles and responsibilities. With undergraduate athletic training program directors, the ANOVA analysis showed significance when comparing faculty recruitment/retention for those appointed by the dean with no faculty input and those selected by the faculty with input from the dean. Twenty-four respondents indicated other methods of appointment. The large number of respondents indicating selection by another method other than those available for selection may be due to a misunderstanding of the question or a lack of knowledge about how they were appointed to the position of program director. The ANOVA analysis of the roles also revealed no significant difference between the various methods of appointment. Please see Table 17 for complete analysis.

Table 17

ANOVA for How Appointed to Position

Responsibilities	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Personnel Management	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.27	.905	.605	.615
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.83	.983		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.54	.778		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.60	1.140		
Department Management	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	10	2.30	.823	.668	.575
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.83	.983		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.34	.855		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.60	1.140		
Accreditation Preparation	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.36	1.120	.654	.584
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.83	.983		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.22	1.037		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.40	.548		
Communication with Faculty	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	10	2.60	.699	1.385	.257
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.33	1.033		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.68	.960		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	4	3.50	.577		
Legal Issues	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	9	2.89	.782	.202	.895
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.00	.632		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.83	.946		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.60	.548		

Table 17 (continued)

Responsibilities	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty*	10	2.00	.943	3.531	**.020***
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean*	6	3.33	1.211		***Tukey significant at .035**
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.29	.873		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.00	1.000		
Program Planning	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.73	1.009	.146	.932
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.83	.983		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.61	.945		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.80	1.304		
Budget Management	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	3.27	.647	1.387	.256
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.33	1.211		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	39	2.82	.790		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.20	1.095		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.27	1.104	.637	.594
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.50	.837		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.44	.923		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.00	1.414		
Faculty Evaluation	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	10	2.30	.949	.519	.671
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.83	.983		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.29	1.006		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.40	1.140		

Table 17 (continued)

Responsibilities	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Communication with Upper Administration	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.36	1.120	1.022	.390
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.00	1.265		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.39	.997		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.00	1.225		

Role	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	9	3.22	.972	1.153	.336
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	2.67	1.033		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	39	3.26	.850		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.60	.548		
Leader	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	10	3.50	.527	.593	.622
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.00	1.549		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	39	3.28	.826		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.60	.894		
Faculty Developer	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.18	.874	1.130	.344
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.17	1.329		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	41	2.54	1.051		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.60	1.140		
Facilitator	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	10	2.70	.823	.684	.566
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.17	1.329		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	40	2.63	.979		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	3.00	.707		

Table 17 (continued)

Roles	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mediator	Appt. by Dean, No Faculty	11	2.91	.539	1.458	.235
	Selected by Faculty, Input from Dean	6	3.50	1.225		
	Selected by Faculty w/ Approval from Dean	40	2.70	.883		
	Selected by Dean, Agreed Upon by Faculty	5	2.80	1.095		

Academic rank can often change the expectations placed on a faculty member. The ANOVA analysis of responsibilities revealed no significant difference between the four academic ranks. The means from the descriptive statistics did reveal that associate professors felt the least prepared for the responsibilities associated with academic administration (mean=2.46), followed closely by assistant professors (mean=2.47), instructors (mean=2.72), and full professors (mean=2.82). These means may be a result of the N's for both instructors and full professors being low, while the N for assistant and associate professors averaged 40 and 25 respectfully. The ANOVA analysis of roles also showed no significant difference, but the overall Means were higher in comparison to the overall means for responsibilities. See Table 18.

Table 18

ANOVA for Academic Rank N=88

Responsibilities	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Personnel Management	Instructor	10	2.80	.422	1.567	.203
	Assistant Professor	40	2.53	.816		
	Associate Professor	26	2.23	.765		
	Full Professor	9	2.78	1.093		

Table 18 (continued)

Responsibilities	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Department Management	Instructor	10	2.60	.516	1.439	.237
	Assistant Professor	40	2.30	.883		
	Associate Professor	25	2.40	.913		
	Full Professor	9	2.89	1.167		
Accreditation Preparation	Instructor	10	2.20	.632	1.117	.347
	Assistant Professor	41	2.34	1.087		
	Associate Professor	26	2.23	1.107		
	Full Professor	8	2.50	1.069		
Communication with Faculty	Instructor	10	3.00	.471	.978	.850
	Assistant Professor	40	2.80	.966		
	Associate Professor	24	2.50	.978		
	Full Professor	9	2.89	1.269		
Legal Issues	Instructor	10	3.10	.568	.545	.653
	Assistant Professor	40	2.85	.864		
	Associate Professor	24	2.63	.924		
	Full Professor	9	3.11	1.054		
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	Instructor	10	2.50	.850	.709	.549
	Assistant Professor	40	2.20	1.018		
	Associate Professor	26	2.38	1.023		
	Full Professor	9	2.56	1.014		
Program Planning	Instructor	10	2.70	.483	.815	.489
	Assistant Professor	41	2.56	1.050		
	Associate Professor	26	2.69	.928		
	Full Professor	6	2.89	1.167		

Table 18 (continued)

Responsibilities	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Budget Management	Instructor	10	3.10	.738	.132	.941
	Assistant Professor	39	3.00	.858		
	Associate Professor	26	2.85	.834		
	Full Professor	9	2.78	.972		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Instructor	10	2.60	.516	1.981	.123
	Assistant Professor	41	2.27	.923		
	Associate Professor	27	2.44	1.086		
	Full Professor	10	3.10	1.287		
Faculty Evaluation	Instructor	10	2.60	.516	1.762	.161
	Assistant Professor	40	2.05	1.011		
	Associate Professor	25	2.28	.936		
	Full Professor	9	2.67	1.000		
Communication with Upper Administration	Instructor	10	2.70	.675	1.917	.133
	Assistant Professor	41	2.24	1.044		
	Associate Professor	25	2.40	1.041		
	Full Professor	9	2.89	1.167		

Role	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Instructor	10	3.50	.527	.854	.469
	Assistant Professor	36	3.06	.924		
	Associate Professor	25	3.16	.898		
	Full Professor	9	2.89	1.167		

Table 18 (continued)

Role	Academic Rank	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Leader	Instructor	10	3.70	.483	1.180	.323
	Assistant Professor	37	3.22	.947		
	Associate Professor	25	3.12	.881		
	Full Professor	9	3.00	1.225		
Faculty Developer	Instructor	10	2.70	.823	.782	.508
	Assistant Professor	40	2.48	.960		
	Associate Professor	25	2.20	.957		
	Full Professor	9	2.44	1.014		
Facilitator	Instructor	10	3.30	.949	.762	.519
	Assistant Professor	38	2.63	.970		
	Associate Professor	25	2.60	.866		
	Full Professor	9	2.78	1.093		
Mediator	Instructor	10	3.00	.667	2.072	.110
	Assistant Professor	40	3.05	.876		
	Associate Professor	26	2.54	.948		
	Full Professor	9	2.56	1.130		

The tenure status of respondents was also used to determine the perceived level of preparedness for academic administrative responsibilities and roles. The ANOVA of responsibilities revealed no significant difference between the three tenure statuses (tenured, tenure stream but not tenured and non-tenure track). The overall mean for each group as it related to responsibilities was: tenured (mean=2.39), tenure-track, but not yet tenured (mean=2.41), and non-tenure track (mean=2.57). Budget management received the only mean

scores at 3.00 or above with tenured at 3.00 and non-tenured at 3.07. The ANOVA analysis of administrative roles revealed no significant differences between the three tenure statuses (Table 19).

Table 19

ANOVA for Current Academic Status

Responsibilities	**Academic Status**	**N**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Significance**
Personnel Management	Tenured	34	2.44	.927	1.588	.211
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.32	.716		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.70	.702		
Department Management	Tenured	33	2.48	1.034	2.97	.744
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.32	.995		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.50	.682		
Accreditation Preparation	Tenured	33	2.48	1.093	1.100	.338
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.30	1.185		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.10	.803		
Communication with Faculty	Tenured	32	2.69	1.030	.113	.893
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.77	1.066		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.80	.805		
Legal Issues	Tenured	32	2.91	.955	.320	.727
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.73	.883		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.90	.759		
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	Tenured	34	2.47	1.107	.758	.472
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.14	.941		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.33	.884		

Table 19 (continued)

Responsibilities	Academic Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Program Planning	Tenured	34	2.88	1.008	1.579	.212
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.52	1.082		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.50	.777		
Budget Management	Tenured	34	3.00	.816	1.069	.348
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.74	.864		
	Non-Tenure	28	3.07	.858		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Tenured	34	2.47	1.134	.943	.394
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.17	.887		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.50	.682		
Faculty Evaluation	Tenured	36	2.56	1.252	.180	.836
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.30	1.185		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.23	.774		
Communication with Upper Administration	Tenured	33	2.33	1.051	1.782	.175
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.18	1.053		
	Non-Tenure	30	2.60	.814		

Role	Academic Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Tenured	32	3.25	.842	.679	.510
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	20	2.95	.887		
	Non-Tenure	28	3.11	.994		
Leader	Tenured	32	3.28	.88	1.827	.168
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	21	2.90	.944		
	Non- Tenure	28	3.39	.916		

Table 19 (continued)

Roles	Academic Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Developer	Tenured	33	2.36	1.025	.219	.804
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.39	.941		
	Non-Tenure	29	2.52	.871		
Facilitator	Tenured	33	2.76	.969	.761	.417
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	22	2.50	.964		
	Non-Tenure	27	2.81	.879		
Mediator	Tenured	34	2.74	.994	.893	.413
	Tenure Track, but not Tenured	23	2.78	.998		
	Non-Tenure	29	3.03	.778		

The final analysis in response to research question three used the type of institutions where the respondents were employed. With an N=89, an average of 35.5 were from private, four year colleges; 27.5 were from public, four year colleges; six were from private, research universities; 16 from public, research universities and the one response for "Other" was omitted. The ANOVA analysis of the responsibilities showed only one response of significance, budget management. The difference was between those employed at public, four year colleges and those employed at private, research universities. It should be noted that the N for public, four year colleges was 28, while the N for private, research universities was only six. The overall means for each were: private, four year college (mean=2.53); public, four year college (mean=2.39); private, research university (mean=2.96) and public, research university (mean=2.59). There was also no significant difference between the roles of academic administrators and the type of institution employed at. Results are found in Table 20.

Table 20

ANOVA for Type of Institution Employed at Currently N=89

Responsibilities	Type of Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Personnel Management	Private, Four Year College	35	2.63	.808	.954	.419
	Public, Four Year College	28	2.43	.836		
	Private, Research University	6	2.67	.516		
	Public, Research University	16	2.25	.856		
Department Management	Private, Four Year College	35	2.60	.775	1.389	.252
	Public, Four Year College	27	2.30	1.031		
	Private, Research University	6	2.83	.408		
	Public, Research University	16	2.19	1.047		
Accreditation Preparation	Private, Four Year College	36	2.19	.889	.293	.830
	Public, Four Year College	28	2.32	1.219		
	Private, Research University	6	2.50	.548		
	Public, Research University	16	2.44	1.153		
Communication with Faculty	Private, Four Year College	36	2.81	.856	1.305	.279
	Public, Four Year College	26	2.46	1.067		
	Private, Research University	6	3.17	.408		
	Public, Research University	15	2.87	1.060		

Table 20 (continued)

Responsibilities	Type of Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Legal Issues	Private, Four Year College	36	2.83	.845	1.004	.396
	Public, Four Year College	26	2.65	.936		
	Private, Research University	6	3.17	.753		
	Public, Research University	15	3.07	.884		
Faculty Recruitment/ Retention	Private, Four Year College	36	2.28	.882	1.424	.242
	Public, Four Year College	27	2.15	1.134		
	Private, Research University	6	3.00	.894		
	Public, Research University	16	2.50	.966		
Program Planning	Private, Four Year College	36	2.56	.843	.261	.853
	Public, Four Year College	28	2.64	1.129		
	Private, Research University	6	2.67	.816		
	Public, Research University	16	2.81	.981		
Budget Management	Private, Four Year College	35	2.91	.818	2.711	**.050***
	Public, Four Year College*	28	2.79	.957		***Tukey is significant at .030**
	Private, Research University*	6	3.83	.408		
	Public, Research University	15	3.00	.655		
Faculty Liaison to Administration	Private, Four Year College	36	2.42	.770	.457	.713
	Public, Four Year College	28	2.25	1.076		
	Private, Research University	6	2.67	.516		
	Public, Research University	16	2.50	1.155		

Table 20 (continued)

Responsibilities	Type of Institution	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Faculty Evaluation	Private, Four Year College	36	2.17	.811	1.017	.390
	Public, Four Year College	26	2.15	1.047		
	Private, Research University	6	2.83	.408		
	Public, Research University	16	2.38	1.204		
Communication with Upper Administration	Private, Four Year College	36	2.44	.877	1.773	.159
	Public, Four Year College	27	2.15	1.064		
	Private, Research University	6	3.17	.753		
	Public, Research University	16	2.50	1.265		

Role	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Mentor	Private, Four Year College	33	3.21	.893	1.289	.284
	Public, Four Year College	25	3.20	1.000		
	Private, Research University	6	3.50	.548		
	Public, Research University	15	3.33	.724		
Leader	Private, Four Year College	33	3.21	.893	1.095	.356
	Public, Four Year College	26	3.08	1.055		
	Private, Research University	6	3.83	.408		
	Public, Research University	15	3.20	.862		
Faculty Developer	Private, Four Year College	36	2.36	.762	1.664	.181
	Public, Four Year College	26	2.27	1.002		
	Private, Research University	6	3.17	.983		
	Public, Research University	16	2.56	1.153		

Table 20 (continued)

Role	Method of Appointment	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
Facilitator	Private, Four Year College	35	2.57	.884	1.983	.124
	Public, Four Year College	25	2.60	1.080		
	Private, Research University	6	3.50	.548		
	Public, Research University	15	2.87	.834		
Mediator	Private, Four Year College	36	2.83	.878	1.044	.378
	Public, Four Year College	28	2.79	.995		
	Private, Research University	6	3.50	.548		
	Public, Research University	15	2.80	1.014		

Research question four exhibited several interesting results. When comparing those who graduated from an accredited athletic training program to those who graduated from an internship route program, those coming from an internship route program felt more prepared for three of the four areas that demonstrated significance. The majority of the respondents viewed themselves primarily as administrators (52), while only six viewed themselves primarily as clinicians. This may be a direct result of the respondents becoming an academic administrator because the field of athletic training is very clinically based. Another interesting result was that internal candidates had higher Mean scores for perceived level of preparedness for all roles and responsibilities. As Table 15 revealed, perceived level of preparation for the various roles and responsibilities of academic administration varied based on the number of years of experience as faculty member. The selection committee may want to pre-determine the roles and responsibilities their particular institution may need to emphasis and select candidates based on their perceived level of prepared as it related to number of years as a faculty member.

Research Question Four

Research question four asked, "What recommendations for components for inclusion in athletic training education programs would current undergraduate athletic training program directors make to prepare future athletic training program directors for their roles and responsibilities?"   Respondents were asked to rate, based on a Likert scale, roles and responsibilities they felt need to be included in a curriculum for future athletic training program directors. The overall results are presented in Table 21. Of the items presented, no item had less than 10 respondents who thought it should be included in a curriculum for future athletic training program directors. Of the items available for selection, teaching program accreditation received the largest number of "strongly agree" responses with 73.3%. Following was program planning with, 64.5% and faculty evaluation at 53.1%, although departmental management ranked third based on the ranking of mean scores.

Table 21

Athletic Training Program Director Curriculum Recommendations N=88

Curriculum Recommendations	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
Accreditation	3.63	.712	2.7	5.3	18.7	73.3
Program Planning	3.54	.720	2.6	5.3	27.6	64.5
Departmental Management	3.44	.633	1.3	3.8	45.0	50.0
Faculty Evaluation	3.42	.705	1.2	8.6	37.0	53.1

Table 21 (continued)

Curriculum Recommendations	Mean	Standard Deviation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Legal Issues in Higher Education	3.33	.729	2.5	7.6	44.3	45.6
Mentor Faculty	3.33	.717	1.2	10.7	41.7	46.4
Faculty Liaison to Administration	3.26	.644	1.2	7.3	56.1	35.4
Faculty Recruitment	3.24	.695	1.2	11.0	50.0	37.8
Budget/Finance	3.23	.678	1.3	10.1	53.2	35.4
Administrative Liaison	3.20	.637	1.2	8.5	59.8	30.5

When asked at what degree level such a program should be placed, the responses were mixed. The only real definitive answer was not to place an athletic training program director curriculum on the bachelor's level.

Table 22

Level Athletic Training Education Curriculum Should be Offered At N=84

Level of Degree	N	Percentage
Bachelor	1	1.2
Master's within Athletic Training	22	26.2
Master's with Higher Education Administration	21	25.0
Doctorate within Athletic Training	13	15.5

Table 22 (continued)

Level of Degree	N	Percentage
Doctorate within Higher Education Administration	21	25.0
Master's Non-Specific	2	2.4
Doctorate Non-Specific	4	4.8

Overall, research question four felt an educational program designed to prepared athletic training program directors should emphasize all the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. They felt accreditation, program planning and department management were the three most important areas to include. They also felt that this type of educational opportunity should minimally be placed on the Master's level.

Research Question Five

Research question number five asked, "Do athletic training program directors perceive their roles similarly to other academic administrators?" The specific areas addressed were the availability of time away from job related tasks since becoming an undergraduate athletic training program director and having enough time to meet the research expectations of their positions. In response to having time available for non-job related tasks, 11 (13.6%) strongly disagreed that their time away from job related tasks has decreased, 24 (29.6%) disagreed, 24 (29.6%) agreed that their time away from non-job related tasks had decreased, and 22 (27.2%) strongly agreed that their time away has decreased. Table 23 shows these results.

Table 23

Decreased Time Away from Non-Job Related Activities

Mean	Standard Deviation	Response	Frequency	Percentage
2.70	1.018	Strongly Disagree	11	13.6
		Disagree	24	29.6
		Agree	24	29.6
		Strongly Agree	22	27.2

In reference to sufficient time to complete research demands, 28.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 28.6% disagreed that they had sufficient time. Twenty (26.0%) agreed they had sufficient time while 13 (16.9%) strongly agreed that they had sufficient time. See Table 24 for results.

Table 24

Sufficient Time Available to Meet Institutional Research Needs

Mean	Standard Deviation	Response	Frequency	Percentage
2.31	1.067	Strongly Disagree	22	28.6
		Disagree	22	28.6
		Agree	20	26.0
		Strongly Agree	13	16.9

One of the areas pointed out in the literature is that academic administrators do not feel they have enough time to fulfill all the expectations their institutions have (Seedorf and Gmelch, 1989). This is also true for undergraduate athletic training program directors, 72% felt they did not have time to meet their institution's research demands. Undergraduate athletic training program directors were slightly different than other academic administrators in that only slightly more than half (56.8%) felt they had less time away from non-job related tasks. This may be due to the fact that the athletic training profession, traditionally, does not work a normal 40 hour work week. It is not uncommon for an athletic trainer to consistently work 50-60 hours per week. Thus the time demands of academic administration are not unfamiliar to an athletic training program director.

Research Question Six

The final research question asked, "Do athletic training program directors use their time in a way that is similar to other academic administrators?" Respondents were asked to rank from 1 to 5, with one being the most time spent on a task per week and five being the least amount of time spent on a task per week, on five tasks identified in the literature as academic administrator tasks. The tasks included: budget/financial; faculty development/evaluation; teaching; program accreditation issues and their own professional development. The responses can be found in Table 20. Teaching was ranked number one by 67 respondents, program accreditation was ranked number one by 23 respondents, with faculty development/evaluation being ranked number one by six respondents, and personal professional development was ranked number one by one respondent. Budget/financial issues did not receive any number one rankings. This may be a result of athletic training program directors feeling more comfortable with the responsibility

of budget/finance as it relates to other administrative responsibilities. (Refer to Tables 5,10,12,13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20)

Table 25

Time Spent on Administrative Tasks in an Average Week N=89

Task	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Budget/Financial	4.13	.919	2	4	4.5
			3	20	22.5
			4	25	28.1
			5	40	44.9
Personal Professional Development	3.93	1.064	1	1	1.1
			2	8	9.0
			3	23	25.8
			4	21	23.6
			5	36	40.4
Faculty Development	3.57	.782	2	6	6.7
			3	36	40.4
			4	37	41.6
			5	10	11.2
Program Accreditation	2.02	.929	1	23	25.8
			2	52	58.4
			3	6	6.7
			4	5	5.6
			5	3	3.4
Teaching	1.31	.632	1	67	75.3
			2	18	20.2
			3	2	2.2
			4	2	2.2

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the results of the study designed to determine the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors for the roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration. Six research questions were asked in an electronic survey that used quantitative data methodologies. Included in the results were: (1) the response rate to the survey, (2) the results of various questions related to the roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration and (3) demographic information of the respondents related to specific research questions.

The examination of the six research questions was then presented. For Research Questions 1 and 2, results of the Likert scale questions were presented. For Research Question 3, both MANOVA and ANOVA analysis was used to see how the several variables effected the perceived level of preparedness for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. The variables used for analysis included: internship route versus accredited route for undergraduate education, current level of education, primary perception of their position (administrator, faculty member or clinician), type of candidate (internal versus external), number of years as a certified athletic trainer, number of years as a program director, number of years as a faculty member, method of appointment, current academic rank, current academic status, and type of institution currently employed.

Research Question 4 used the results of a series of Likert scale items to determine what roles and responsibilities should be included in a curriculum for future athletic training program directors. Respondents were also asked at which academic level such a curriculum should be placed.

Research Questions 5 and 6 used the responses to Likert scale questions to help compare undergraduate athletic training program directors to other academic administrators as it relates to their roles and responsibilities, perceived time for institutional research demands, time available for non-job related tasks, and time spent on specific administrative tasks per week. The specific results are discussed and highlighted in Chapter 5.

VI. DISCUSSION

Academic administration has many roles and responsibilities associated with it. Many academic administrators arrive at their administrative positions with little knowledge of the roles and responsibilities associated with it (Tucker, 1993). Undergraduate athletic training program directors are faced with the same administrative roles and responsibilities as other academic administrators, with the addition of achieving and/or maintaining program accreditation. As most academic administrators, many undergraduate athletic training program directors are asked to manage an academic program with little or no prior knowledge or training in academic administration.

Because of the lack of research in the area of academic administration as it relates to the field of athletic training, it was necessary to design a study that would gather data from undergraduate athletic training program directors on their perceptions of academic administration and how well their athletic training education prepared them to handle the many roles and responsibilities associated with academic administration. With the use of an electronic survey, the necessary data were gathered and analyzed to answer the several questions of how undergraduate athletic training program directors perceived their level of preparedness for academic administration.

This chapter includes five sections: (a) a summary of the study findings, (b) interpretation of the findings, (c) limitations of the study, (d) implications for future research, (e) discussion and (f) conclusions.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Of the 168 surveys emailed to undergraduate athletic training program directors, 90 were returned for a 54% return rate. One survey was eliminated due to the respondent's failure to complete all of Section I and Section II leaving 89 usable surveys, a 53% response rate. The 53% response rate may have been caused by inaccurate information on the CAAHEP web site, researcher error in entering email addresses, the elimination of programs or it may be a reflection of the high demands on undergraduate athletic training program directors time leaving little to no time to complete an electronic survey. Forty-nine (55%) of the 89 respondents held doctoral degrees and all respondents held master's degrees. Over 99% of the respondents had six or more years of experience as certified athletic trainers, 79% had at least three years of experience as a program director, and 91% of the respondents had three or more years of experience as a faculty member. The respondents' academic rank was varied with instructors and full professors each making up 11.4% of the respondents, assistant professors accounted for 46.6%, and associate professor represented 30.7% of the population. The tenure status of the respondents had 40.4% with tenure, 28.8% in the tenure track, but not yet tenured and 33.7% were non-tenured. The majority (41.6%) of the respondents were employed at private, four year colleges, followed by 32.6% at public, four year colleges, 18.0% at public, four year universities, and 6.7% at private research universities.

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if undergraduate athletic training program directors perceived themselves as prepared to handle the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. The study also sought recommendations to enhance the preparation of future

90

undergraduate athletic training program directors. The data revealed that, overall; the undergraduate athletic training program directors did not feel prepared by their athletic training education for their administrative responsibilities. A total Mean of 2.54 for perception of preparedness for the responsibilities of academic administration supports this statement. With the Likert scale being: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree. With an overall mean of 2.54 and no individual Mean above 3.00, it demonstrated that more preparation is needed. This follows the literature on academic administrators needing more preparation for the various responsibilities associated with it (Singleton, 1987 and Tucker, 1993). The one area that differed for athletic training program directors versus other academic administrators was the responsibility of budget and finance. Although the mean score was only 2.95, it was the highest for all the responsibilities listed. This may be a result of the fact that undergraduate athletic training curriculums include at least one course where preparing a budget for an athletic training department is part of the curriculum. However, this budgeting exercise is not for an academic department, but for an athletic training department that is associated with athletics. This activity may have better prepared athletic training program directors to handle this responsibility. Budget and finance was also the area that respondents spent the least amount of time on during an average week.

When the roles of academic administration were examined, an overall mean of 2.87 was found for perceived level of preparedness. All respondents felt least prepared for the role of faculty developer (mean=2.42) and most prepared for the role of leader (mean=3.32). This may be due to the fact that there is no formal education within athletic training or many other academic fields which teaches faculty development (Delforge & Behnke, 1999).

The strongest argument for the need for better preparation of athletic training program directors was found in their response to Question 1 of Section III of the survey. This question asked, "Would you have taken academic courses related to the roles and responsibilities as an athletic training program director if such courses were available?" Ninety-two percent of the respondents indicated that they would have taken such courses. When asked to respond to a similar question in Section I, 78% agreed or strongly agreed that they would have benefited from formal educational preparation related to being an athletic training program director. Over half (56.5%) felt their athletic training education did not prepare them for their roles and responsibilities as program directors, while only 11.8% strongly agreed they were prepared.

When addressing the additional administrative responsibility of program accreditation, the respondents were closely divided between disagreeing (52.3%) that they were prepared and agreeing (47.7%) that they were prepared. No reference was found in the literature to support or refute this finding as it relates to other academic administrators.

When analyzing the data, there were some interesting findings that deserve further discussion. Although MANOVA and ANOVA analysis generally failed to find significant differences between the variables tested, the MANOVA for Accredited versus Internship Routes of Education (Table 8) had four responsibilities that showed significant differences. The surprising result of this was that three out of the four had higher means for the internship route respondents versus the accredited respondents. The one area where the accredited respondents had a higher mean was for legal issues. It could have been assumed that the accredited respondents, having a more structured education, would have felt more prepared, but this was not the case for the responsibilities of department management, communication with faculty, and budget management.

When comparing those respondents with doctorates to those with Master's degrees, there were some responsibilities and roles where those with Master's degrees felt more prepared. Those areas were: personnel management, department management, legal issues, mentor, leader, and mediator.

When the analysis of the perceived level of preparedness was done for those who rated themselves primarily as faculty members, there were two areas that had significant difference. In each of those cases, those with 21+ years as a faculty member felt more prepared for the responsibility of department management compared to those with only 6-10 years as experience. For the responsibility of faculty evaluation both those with 6-10 years of experience and 16-20 years of experience as a faculty member showed significant difference when compared to those with 21+ years of experience. Those respondents with 6-10 years and 21+ years of experience as faculty members showed significant difference in two areas department management and faculty evaluation. These findings may be due to a higher rate of burnout among faculty between their sixth and tenth years as faculty or the fact that the tenure stream but not yet tenured faculty fall into this category and may be concentrating more on gaining tenure than academic administration. For those respondents with 21+ years as a faculty member, there may be difficulty differentiating between what their athletic training education prepared them for versus the various other methods of preparation they may have used. Another interesting finding was related to those 49 respondents who held doctoral degrees. Of those only 2% earned their doctoral degrees in athletic training. Also, when asked on what level and in what area courses should be offered for future athletic training program directors, 55% felt courses should be offered within higher education administration, with only 45% stating that academic administration courses should be within an athletic training curriculum.

Further evidence that the respondents athletic training education did not prepare them for academic administration were the results of the question pertaining to methods used to gain further knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. The majority of respondents responded that they primarily sought advice from administrators outside the field of athletic training, with trial and error being the third highest method indicated for gaining knowledge about academic administration. Of the possible choices given, attending workshops at the respondents own institution was used the least to gain further knowledge. This supports previous literature on the training of department chairs and the need for more training specifically targeting academic administration (Franke, 2001).

When asked what components current athletic training program directors would recommend for inclusion in an academic program geared toward the preparation of athletic training program directors, all the roles and responsibilities listed were recommended for inclusion. Current undergraduate athletic training program directors recognize the roles and responsibilities listed as important components within academic administration. They also recommended that the following also be included: student recruitment, stress management, student counseling, research skills, and service to the university.

Similarities were also found between respondents and previous academic administration research related to the amount of time needed to meet research demands and the increase in time spent on job related tasks since becoming a program director. One of the respondents in the Seedorf and Gmelch (1989) study said it best, "I would be content being a full time department chair if there was not the pressure to teach and publish" (p. 16). Respondents in this study ranked teaching as the task they spend the most time on in an average week, followed by accreditation issues. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents felt they did not have enough time to

94

meet their institution's research demands, while 42.9% thought they had sufficient time. Fifty-three percent of respondents felt their time away from job related tasks had decreased since becoming a program director, while 43.2% disagreed. It should be noted that the profession of athletic training typically demands more than a forty hour work week, with weekend and holiday work being an expectation. This may have weighed into the survey results.

The perception of role, be it administrator, faculty member or clinician, showed 58% of the respondents viewed themselves primarily as administrators. This places the responding undergraduate athletic training program directors in the same paradoxical position pointed out by Tucker (1993) and may potentially add the stress that Gmelch and Gates (1995) discovered in other academic administrators. This also further supports the need for a more formalized process for athletic training program directors in order to better prepare them for the increased demands that academic administration places on them.

A final observation is that undergraduate athletic training program directors do not vary too much from other academic administrators. Undergraduate athletic training program directors perceive themselves better prepared for the roles of an academic administrator and less prepared for the responsibilities. They, like other academic administrators, support the need for more training and feel they would have benefited from a formalized educational process directly related to program administration.

LIMITATIONS

Data collection revealed the limitations of this study. The limitations to be discussed are: (1) instrumentation and methodology, (2) bias of the researcher, and (3) generalizability of the results. These limitations have a direct effect on the implications for future research.

Instrumentation and Methodology

Respondents were asked to indicate perceptions for several Likert scale questions, which allowed for a response of N/A (not applicable). According to Bolman and Deal (1992), "The forced choice measure produces sharper differentiation among frames because it does not permit rating oneself or someone else high on everything" (p. 320). The N/A responses ranged from a high of 17 to a low of 1. The elimination of the N/A response from the data analysis eliminated the potential for data inflation.

The overall use of an electronic method for survey distribution had both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages came in the ease of distribution and data collection. The survey was distributed twice, with pre-notification letters going out before the first distribution and cover letters going out with both distributions. The data were collected in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, which made transporting the data into SPSS very easy. The disadvantages of an electronic surveying method were the lack of knowledge about who responded. Because an email address can easily identify a respondent, and because the researcher was being assisted by another individual for data collection purposes, a coding system was not employed to identify those individuals who did not respond. Traditional mail survey techniques allow for a coding system to be employed, which allows for the identification of non-respondents. The lack of coding also forced the researcher to email the survey twice to all potential respondents.

The issue was raised about the 53% return rate being too low. This small N may have had an effect on the researcher's ability to find significant differences between the various groups surveyed. After two distributions of the survey and the inability to identify non-respondents, a third distribution became prohibitive due to the end of the academic year and many of the potential respondents not being available. If the study was replicated, a confidential

96

coding system would be devised to allow for re-distribution of the survey to only non-respondents.

Bias of the Researcher

As a former athletic training program director, the researcher had preconceived ideas about the results of this study. The ability to let this fact influence the results of this study were minimized by using quantitative data collection methods.

Generalizability

The 53% return rate eliminates the potential to generalize the results to all undergraduate athletic training program directors. Those respondents who chose to respond were a self-selected sample. The 79 non-respondents may not have similar characteristics as the 89 respondents used for this study. Some of the 79 non-respondents indicated that they were no longer the program director or that their program had been eliminated. In the case of individuals indicating that they were no longer the program director, the researcher went to the institution's web site and tried to identify the individual who was the athletic training program director and email him/her the survey.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research was to determine if undergraduate athletic training program directors perceive themselves as prepared for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. It was also to discover the recommendations that current athletic training program directors have for preparing future athletic training program directors.

Although the research was able to answer several questions, it raised many others. If research was conducted in the future, it would be important to increase the response rate to allow

for the generalizablity of the results to all undergraduate athletic training program directors. It would also be beneficial to compare graduate athletic training program directors to undergraduate athletic training program directors to discover preparation methods used by graduate athletic training program directors that may be beneficial to undergraduate program directors. With research in other allied health professions being available as it relates to academic administration, a cross sectional study of allied health care program directors may provide further knowledge on how to better prepare program directors for their administrative responsibilities. The most important research that could be conducted would be to actually design and implement a curriculum specifically geared toward educating individuals to be administrators within athletic training and possibly other disciplines. A longitudinal study of these individuals may demonstrate that a specific program design to prepare future athletic training program directors is beneficial and would further advance the field as a whole.

DISCUSSION

This study explored the perceived level of preparedness of undergraduate athletic training program directors for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. The review of related literature revealed that academic administrators did not feel prepared for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. As Jennerich (1981) stated many academic administrators are appointed to their positions because they are excellent researchers and/or teachers or simply by default. Athletic trainers normally begin their careers in a clinical setting, whether that is in an athletic training room at a high school or college, at a hospital or even in an industrial setting. The role of academic administrator may not be one the professions the field of

athletic training even considers when educating its future professionals. This was evident in the responses to research question one which revealed that 57% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that their athletic training education prepared them for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents felt they would have benefited from a formalized educational program geared toward the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. This is similar to the results of the research done by Rohrer, 1990; Coppard, 2000 and Perry, 2000 on the perceived level of preparation for academic administration for physical therapists, occupational therapists and public health professionals. Program directors in these fields did not feel their educational experience prepared them for their administrative roles and responsibilities.

As a former athletic training program director, I would agree with the results of this study. I can also say that many of my administrative colleagues had similar feelings of ill-preparedness. As program directors and department chairs, we were given little to no orientation to academic administration and often used one another as resources about how to approach various administrative activities. As revealed by the respondents' mean scores to the question about being an internal or external candidate for their positions, being familiar with how the institution functions made the internal candidates perceived level of preparedness higher than those that were external candidates. This was the case for many of my administrative colleagues as it was for me, but the transition to administration could have been much smoother if more information was given about the roles and responsibilities of academic administration.

Surprisingly, the majority of respondents in this study (47) were external candidates for the position of program director. This may account for the overall means for perceived level of preparedness for the responsibilities of academic administration never reaching a mean above

2.95. Many institutions may not have felt that the athletic trainers that were potential internal candidates were qualified to be academic administrators causing them to look externally for their program director. Selection/search committees may not have weighed the benefits of having someone that was familiar with the institution's policies and procedures in the position of program director. An internal candidate would at least have an increased familiarity with the potential resources available to assist him/her in the transition to academic administrator. If institutions took a pro-active approach and identified individuals interested in academic administration, they could provide the necessary development opportunities to them prior to obtaining an administrative role. This may decrease the transitional stress of moving into the role of academic administrator and allow for a more productive academic department (Singleton, 1987 and Tucker, 1993).

An interesting result of this research in comparison to previous research about academic administration was the consistently high means for perceived level of preparedness for the responsibility of budget/finance. The review of related literature revealed that many academic administrators felt this responsibility was very difficult (Roach, 1976; Jennerich, 1981; Gmelch and Gates, 1995 and Pettit, 1999). The reason for this difference may be the result of athletic trainers being taught how to design and manage a budget for an athletic training room. It may also be due to the fact that many of the respondents held advanced degrees, which may have had budget/finance as part of the curriculum.

An area that remained consistent with the previous literature and the results of this study was the methods used to gain further knowledge about academic administration. The respondents in this study read books, journals and magazines as their primary source of information about academic administration. They also sought advice from other academic

administrators and learned on the job through trial and error. As Franke (2001) pointed out training/development is needed because there is little being done on the campuses of today's institutions to prepare academic administrators. The results of this study further support Franke's recommendations.

When asked how the respondents saw themselves, as administrators, faculty members or clinicians, the majority (52) saw themselves as administrators. This is surprising in that fact that 41 responded that they were selected by the faculty with input from the dean. The next closest group was 11 that were appointed by the dean with input from the faculty. This contradicts the previous literature by Tucker (1993) and Jennerich (1981) that indicated how administrators were appointed determined their perception of their positions. If administrators were appointed by the dean, they saw themselves primarily as administrators. If they were appointed by the faculty, they saw themselves primarily as faculty. This difference is also made more unique by the fact that the respondents overwhelmingly ranked teaching as the task they spent the most time on per week. Teaching is primarily the role of faculty. The combination of these factors may account for the overall low means for perception of preparedness for the responsibilities of academic administration and further supports Singleton's (1987) research which indicated academic administrators experience role conflict and role ambiguity when moving from faculty to administration. This may also be the reason for the high number of N/A (Not Applicable) responses given throughout the survey. Many respondents may have been unclear about their roles and responsibilities and thus felt the items in question were not applicable to them. Due to the lack of training/development for academic administrators, many may not even be aware of the expectations of the position resulting in the feeling that certain roles and responsibilities

simply do not pertain to them. Further research on this specific area would be needed to determine if this assumption is actually true.

The final area of discussion is how to best select an undergraduate athletic training program director. If the current status of available preparation remains consistent, an institution selecting a new undergraduate athletic training program director would want to select someone with 21+ years of experience as a certified athletic trainer, faculty member and program director. When comparing the mean scores of the ANOVA analysis for each of these factors, those with 21+ years of experience had higher mean scores for perceived level of preparedness in seven of the 11 responsibilities. Personnel management, department management, program planning, faculty liaison to the administration, communication with upper administration, and faculty evaluation were the areas that those with 21+ years of experience as certified athletic trainers, faculty members and program directors ranked highest in.

Although the recommendation may be to hire someone with 21+ years of experience in all three areas, the reality is that this may not be practical or even possible. With the results of this study and the previous literature on the perceived preparation for academic administration by other academic administrators, the best recommendation would be to provide those individuals with aspirations and/or potential for academic administration the training/development they need to prepare them for the roles and responsibilities of the position. This training/development may be in the form of formalized education, discipline specific training/development, mentoring and/or other methods deemed appropriate by the institution and/or organization, such as in the case of the National Athletic Training Association. The literature consistently has supported the need for better preparation of academic administrators in all fields. The key is to stop saying it and start doing it. Failure to take action on this issue will cause higher education to continue to

place individuals in administrative positions that are ill-prepared for the roles and responsibilities they will be facing.

CONCLUSION

Undergraduate athletic training program directors are not unlike other academic administrators in the perception of preparedness for the academic roles and responsibilities they face. This study only reinforces the need for higher education to recognize that accomplished teachers and researchers may not be the best individuals to place in academic administrative positions.

Developing programs appears to be necessary and desired by those in administrative positions, whether it be formal degree awarding programs or comprehensive seminars and/or workshops on academic administration. It is the mission of higher education to provide the knowledge and skills necessary to those who seek out degrees; yet, we fall short when providing the knowledge and skills necessary for those we entrust to the administration of those very programs.

This study of administrative preparation, along with those that preceded it, again reinforces the need for higher education to take a proactive approach to preparing future academic administrators. It would be interesting to see how successful academic administrators could be, if only given the necessary knowledge and skills before taking on the position of administrator.

APPENDIX A

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

AMA: American Medical Association

CAHEA: Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation [a branch of the AMA, which was responsible for the accreditation of entry-level allied health programs]

CAAHEP: Commission of Accredited Allied Health Education Programs [replaced CAHEA]

CME: Council of Medical Education [oversees all medical education for the AMA]

JRC-AT: Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training [works with the NATA and CAAHEP in the accreditation process; responsible for training reviewers, updating program directors, etc.]

NATA: National Athletic Training Association [the governing body of athletic trainers]

NATABOC: National Athletic Training Association Board of Certification [responsible for designing, administrating, and evaluating the certification examination for those pursuing certification in athletic training; the NATABOC is also responsible for evaluating continuing education requirements of certified athletic trainers.]

APPENDIX B

FIRST NATA-APPROVED EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

I. A major study including teaching license in physical education and/or health variable, by states:

    A. Total of 24 semester hours in laboratory physical, biological, and social sciences
        1. Biology-zoology, (anatomy and physiology)-8 hours
        2. Physics and/or chemistry-6 hours
        3. Social sciences (at least 6 hours of psychology)-10 hours

    B. Electives strongly advised
        1. Additional biological and social sciences
        2. Physical education, such as group activities, dancing, etc.
        3. Hygiene
        4. Speech

II. Specific required courses (if not included in I, these must be added):

    A. Anatomy-one or more courses including human anatomy
    B. Physiology-circulation, respiration, digestion, excretion, nervous, brain, and sense organs
    C. Physiology of exercise
    D. Applied anatomy and kinesiology-the muscles: emphasis on their functions in and development for specific activities
    E. Laboratory physical science-six semester hours in physics and/or chemistry, including principles of chemistry
    F. Psychology-six semester hours including personality, intelligence, emotion, memory, thinking, attention, perception, learning
    G. Coaching Techniques-nine semester hours
        1. Include football, basketball, and track
        2. Recommended baseball, soccer, wrestling, plus preferred sports by geographical areas
    H. First aid and safety-minimum of Red Cross First Aid
    I. Nutrition and foods
        1. Basic principles of nutrition
        2. Basic diet and special diet
    J. Remedial exercise-exercise for typical and/or temporary and permanent handicaps
    K. Organization and administration of health and physical education programs
    L. Personal and community hygiene
    M. Techniques of athletic training-basic, general course (acceptable for coaches, also)
    N. Advanced techniques of athletic training-special course for athletic training candidates with full academic background
    O. Laboratory practices-six semester hours credit (equivalent work)

III.   Recommended courses

        A.   General physics
        B.   Pharmacology-specific side effects of drugs
        C.   Histology
        D.   Pathology-laboratory study of tissues in pathological condition

(Schwank & Miller, 1971, pg. 42)

APPENDIX C

MID 1970'S EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Mid 1970s Athletic Training Curriculum Course Requirements

Anatomy (1 course)
Physiology (1 course)
Physiology of exercise (1 course)
Applied anatomy and kinesiology (1 course)
Psychology (2 courses)
First aid and safety (1 course)
Nutrition (1 course)
Remedial exercise (1 course)
Personal, community, and school health (1 course)
Basic athletic training (1 course)
Advanced athletic training (1 course)
Laboratory or practical experience in athletic training to include a minimum of 600 total clock hours under the direct supervision of a NATA-certified athletic trainer

(Delforge & Behnke, 1999, pg. 56)

APPENDIX D

1983 ATHLETIC TRAINING SUBJECT MATTER

1983 Athletic Training Curriculum Subject Matter Requirements

        Prevention of athletic injuries/illnesses
        Evaluation of athletic injuries/illnesses
        First aid and emergency care
        Therapeutic modalities
        Therapeutic exercise
        Administration of athletic training programs
        Human anatomy
        Human physiology
        Exercise physiology
        Kinesiology/biomechanics
        Nutrition
        Psychology
        Personal/community health
        Instructional methods

APPENDIX E

SURVEY

UNDERGRADUATE ATHLETIC TRAINING PROGRAM DIRECTOR SURVEY

This survey has been designed to gather information from undergraduate athletic training program directors to determine their views on their roles and responsibilities as program directors. The survey is confidential and participation is voluntary. The survey has been pre-tested and the time needed to complete this survey is approximately 15 minutes.

SECTION I
This series of questions asks you to respond to your perceptions about specific items related to your position as an athletic training program director. For each item you are asked to mark only one response by placing an "X" in the box that most accurately describes your perception for that particular item. This series of questions has the following response options:

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree   Not Applicable [The NOT APPLICABLE response should only be used if the item listed is not part of your role or responsibility as an athletic training program director]

	SD	D	A	SA	NA
1. My athletic training education adequately prepared me for the following administrative competencies:					
a. Personnel Management					
b. Departmental Management					
c. Accreditation Preparation/Management					
d. Communication with Faculty					
e. Legal Issues					
f. Faculty Recruitment/Retention					
g. Program Planning					
h. Budget Management					
i. Faculty Liaison to the Administration					
j. Faculty Evaluation					
k. Communication with Upper Administration					
2. My athletic training education adequately prepared me to serve in the following capacities in my role as program director					
a. Mentor					
b. Leader					
c. Faculty Developer					
d. Facilitator					
e. Mediator					
3. I would have benefited from a formal athletic training education which specifically addressed the roles and responsibilities of being an athletic training program director.					
4. My athletic training education adequately prepared me for the roles and responsibilities of being an athletic training program director.					

	SD	D	A	SA	NA
5. To gain further knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of being an athletic training program director, I used:					
a. higher education workshop/seminar offered outside of my institution (e.g. Faculty evaluation)					
b. workshop/seminar offered by my institution (e.g. Personnel management)					
c. workshop/seminar offered by athletic training professionals					
d. a mentor					
e. academic course work in a discipline outside of athletic training					
f. trial and error					
g. other administrators outside of athletic training					
h. other, please list on lines below					
6. I feel I was adequately prepared to handle the expectations of achieving and/or maintaining CAAHEP accreditation prior to becoming a program director.					
7. If an athletic training program director curriculum were developed, it should include courses/topics related to:					
a. budget/finance					
b. mentoring of faculty					
c. program planning					
d. accreditation process and maintenance					
e. clinical athletic training site acquisition/maintenance					
f. legal issues in higher education					
g. faculty recruitment					
h. faculty evaluation					
i. administrative liaison to the faculty					
j. faculty liaison to the administration					
k. departmental management					
l. others, please list on line below					
8. I feel I have sufficient time to meet my institution's research expectations.					
9. Since becoming an athletic training program director, my time away from job related tasks has decreased.					

SECTION II
This section asks you to indicate your perceptions and the process/procedure used when you were selected as the athletic training program director.

1.   Please rank from 1 to 3 which most accurately describes your perception of your **PRIMARY** role as an athletic training program director [1= PRIMARY, 2=SECONDARY, 3=TERTIARY].

_____   Administrator

_____   Faculty Member

_____   Clinician

2.   Please select the **ONE** item which most accurately describes how you became an athletic training program director at your current institution.

_____   Appointed by the Dean, without input from faculty

_____   Selected by the faculty, without input from Dean

_____   Selected by the faculty, approved by the Dean

_____   Selected by the Dean, agreed upon by the faculty

_____   Other, please indicate

3.   I was [an] [select one]

_____   external candidate

_____   internal candidate

_____   other, please specify _____

4.   There are many tasks associated with academic administration. This question asks you to rank five tasks frequently identified in the literature. Please rank the following tasks from 1 to 5 according to the amount of time you spend on them in a typical week. Give the rank of 1 to the task you spend the **MOST** time on and the rank of 5 to the task you spend the **LEAST** time on.

_____   Budget/financial

_____   Faculty development/evaluation

_____   Teaching

_____   Program accreditation issues

_____   My own professional development and research

SECTION III
This section asks you to indicate your perceptions of issues directly related to athletic training education.

1.   Would you have taken academic courses specifically related to your roles and responsibilities as an athletic training program director if such courses were available?

     _____ Yes   _____ No

If you responded YES, at which level of education would your recommend the courses be offered. [Select only one]

     _____ Bachelor's level

     _____ Master's level, select one: _____ within Athletic Training

                                            _____ within Higher Education Administration

     _____ Doctoral level, select one: _____ within Athletic Training

                                            _____ within Higher Education Administration

SECTION IV
This section asks you to provide demographic information that will be used to assist in data analysis **NOT** participant identification

1.   Please check all the academic degrees you have earned

     _____ Bachelor's degree in an athletic training approved curriculum

     _____ Bachelor's degree in an athletic training internship curriculum

     _____ Bachelor's degree in another discipline, please indicate _____

     _____ Master's degree in athletic training

     _____ Master's degree in another discipline, please indicate _____

     _____ Doctorate in athletic training

     _____ Doctorate in another discipline, please indicate _____

     _____ Other degree(s), please indicate _____

2. How many years have you been certified as an athletic trainer? Place an "**X**" next to the appropriate category.

    _____ 3-5 _____ 6-10 _____ 11-15 _____ 16-20 _____ 21+

3. How many years have you been an athletic training program director? Place an "**X**" next to the most appropriate response.

    _____ less than one _____ 1-2 _____ 3-5 _____ 6-10 _____ 11-15

    _____ 16-20 _____ 21+

4. How many years have you been a faculty member? Place an "**X**" next to the most appropriate response.

    _____ less than one _____ 1-2 _____ 3-5 _____ 6-10 _____ 11-15

    _____ 16-20 _____ 21+

5. What is your current academic rank? [Check only one]

    _____ Instructor

    _____ Assistant Professor

    _____ Associate Professor

    _____ Full Professor

6. What is your current tenure status? [Check only one]

    _____ Tenured

    _____ Tenure track position, but not tenured

    _____ Non tenure track position

7. Please indicate the type of institution you are currently employed at [Check only one]

    _____ Private four year college

    _____ Public four year college

    _____ Private research university

    _____ Public research university

    _____ Other, please indicate _____

APPENDIX F

LIST OF ACCREDITED ATHLETIC TRAINING PROGRAMS

Commission on Accreditation
of Allied Health Education Programs

35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1970, Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 553-9355

| **Home** | **Programs & Careers** | **Obtain Accreditation** | **Publications** | **Contact Us** |

Frequently Asked Questions

Profession Description

Professional Associations and Certification

Newly Accredited Programs

Recently Withdrawn Programs

On-line/Distance Programs

Filing Complaints Against an Accredited Program

Program Status Definitions

Search Results listed by state for

Athletic Trainer

in **ALL**state(s) at **All Institutions**

Alabama

Samford   **University****Program** **Director:** Chris   A Gillespie
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:**   (205)   726-2379
PO   Box   292448**Email:** cagilles@samford.edu
800   Lakeshore   Drive
Birmingham, AL - 35229 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Troy   State   **University****Program**   **Director:** John Anderson
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:**   (334)   670-3722
27   Eldridge   Hall**Email:** athtrain@troyst.edu
Troy, AL - 36082 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University   of   **Alabama****Program**   **Director:** Deidre Leaver-Dunn
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:**   (205)   348-8683
P   O   Box   870311**Email:** dleaver@bama.ua.edu
Tuscaloosa, AL - 35489-0311 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University   of   West   **Alabama****Program**   **Director:** R   T Floyd

120

Athletic Training **Phone:** (205) 652-3714
UWA Station 14 **Email: rtf@uwa.edu**
Livingston, AL - 35470 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Arkansas

Arkansas State University **Program Director:** Matthew J. Comeau
PO Box 240 **Phone:** (870) 972-3066
State University, AR - 72467 US **Email: mcomeau@astate.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Arizona

Grand Canyon University **Program Director:** Cynthia Seminoff
3300 West Camelback Road **Phone:** (602) 589-2741
Phoenix, AZ - 85017 US **Email: cseminoff@grand-canyon.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

California

Azusa Pacific University **Program Director:** Cynthia M. McKnight
Department of Physical Education **Phone:** (626) 815-5086
701 E. Foothill Blvd **Email: cmcknight@apu.edu**
PO Box 7000
Azusa, CA - 91702 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

California State University - Fresno **Program Director:** Rebecca Cheema
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (559) 278-7094
5275 N Campus Dr **Email: rebeccac@csufresno.edu**
M/S 28
Fresno, CA - 93740-0028 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

California State University - Northridge **Program** **Director:** Shane Stecyk

18111 Nordhoff Street**Phone:** (818) 677-4738
Northridge, CA - 91330-8287 US **Email: shane.stecyk@csun.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

California State University - Sacramento**Program Director:** Doris E Fennessy
Athletic Trainer PrgmFlores
CSUS 6000 J St**Phone:** (916) 278-6401
Sacramento, CA - 95819 US **Email: floresde@csus.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

California State University, Fullerton**Program Director:** Robert Kersey
PO Box 6870**Phone:** (714) 278-2676
Fullerton, CA - 92834-6870 US **Email: rkersey@fullerton.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Point Loma Nazarene University**Program Director:** Leon Kugler
3900 Lomaland Drive**Phone:** (619) 849-2376
San Diego, CA - 92106-2899 US**Email: lkugler@ptloma.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

San Diego State University**Program Director:** Denise Wiksten
Department of Exercise and Nutritional Science**Phone:** (619) 594-6952
5500 Campanile Drive**Email: denise.wiksten@mail.sdsu.edu**
San Diego, CA - 92182 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

San Jose State University**Program Director:** Leamor Kahanov
One Washington Square**Phone:** (408) 924-3040
San Jose, CA - 95192-0054 US**Email: Leamor@hup.sjsu.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate

Status: Initial Accreditation

La Verne University **Program Director:** Marilyn Oliver
1950 Third Street **Phone:** (909) 593-3511 Ext: 4270
La Verne, CA - 91570 US **Email:** oliverm@ulv.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of the Pacific **Program Director:** Sharon West
Department of Sport Sciences **Phone:** (209) 946-3182
3601 Pacific Avenue **Email:** swest@uop.edu
Stockton, CA - 95211 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Vanguard University **Program Director:** Terry Zeigler
55 Fair Drive **Phone:** (714) 556-3610 Ext: 280
Costa Mesa, CA - 92626 US **Email:** Tzeigler@vanguard.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Colorado

Fort Lewis College **Program Director:** Mary Ann Erickson
1000 Rim Avenue **Phone:** (970) 247-7694
Durango, CO - 81301-3999 US **Email:** erickson_m@fortlewis.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Mesa State College **Program Director:** Helen Binkley
1100 North Avenue **Phone:** (970) 248-1985
Grand Junction, CO - 81501 US **Email:** hbinkley@mesastate.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Northern Colorado **Program Director:** Shannon Courtney
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (970) 351-2822
Sch of Kinesiology and Phys Ed **Email:** Shannon.courtney@unco.edu
Butler-Hancock 124
Greeley, CO - 80639 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Connecticut

Central Connecticut State University **Program Director:** Peter Morano
1615 Stanley Street **Phone:** (860) 832-2609
New Britain, CT - 06050-4010 US **Email:** moranop@ccsu.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Sacred Heart University **Program Director:** Gail Samdperil
5151 Park Avenue **Phone:** (203) 396-8033
Fairfield, CT - 06432 US **Email:** samdperilg@sacredheart.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Southern Connecticut State University **Program Director:** Charles F. Davis Jr.
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (203) 392-6090
501 Crescent St, Pelz Gymnasium **Email:** Davisc2southernet.edu
New Haven, CT - 06515 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Connecticut **Program Director:** Douglas Casa
2095 Hillside Road, U-1110 **Phone:** (860) 486-3624
Stors, CT - 06269-2064 US **Email:** douglas.casa@UConn.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

District of Columbia

George Washington University **Program Director:** Beverly J Westerman
Exercise Science Pgms/Athletic Training **Phone:** (202) 994-3862

817 23rd Street, NW**Email:** **bev@gwu.edu**
Washington, DC - 20052 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Delaware

University of Delaware**Program** **Director:** Thomas Kaminski
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (302) 831-6402
541 South College Avenue**Email:** **Kaminski@udel.edu**
Newark, DE - 19716 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Florida

Barry University**Program** **Director:** Carl R Cramer
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (305) 899-3497
11300 NE 2nd Ave**Email:** **ccramer@mail.barry.edu**
Miami Shores, FL - 33161-6695 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Florida Southern University**Program** **Director:** Sue Stanley-Green
111 Lake Hollingsworth Drive**Phone:** (863) 680-4262
Lakeland, FL - 33801-5698 US **Email:** **sstanleygreen@flsouthern.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Stetson University**Program** **Director:** Michele Skelton
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (904) 823-3463
421 N Woodland Blvd Unit 8317**Email:** **mskelton@stetson.edu**
Deland, FL - 32720-3770 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

The Florida State University**Program** **Director:** Angela Sehgal
436 Sandels Bldg**Phone:** (850) 644-1828
Nutrition Food and Exercise Sciences**Email:** **asehgal@mailer.fsu.edu**

Tallahassee, FL - 32306 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Central Florida **Program Director:** David Cassidy
4000 Central Florida Boulevard**Phone:** (407) 823-3463
HPA II, Room 121**Email:** dcassidy@mail.ucf.edu
Orlando, FL - 32816-2220 US

Degree: BHS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Florida **Program Director:** April Rasmussen
PO Box 118205**Phone:** (352) 392-0584 Ext: 1297
148 Florida Gymnasium**Email:** Aprilr@hhp.ufl.edu
Gainesville, FL - 32611-8205 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Miami University **Program Director:** Scott McGonagle
312 Merrick Building**Phone:** (305) 284-4528
Coral Gables, FL - 33124-2040 US**Email:** smcgonagle@miami.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of North Florida **Program Director:** Christopher Joyce
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (904) 620-2841
4567 St Johns Bluff Rd S**Email:** cjoyce@unf.edu
Jacksonville, FL - 32224-2645 US

Degree: BSH
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of South Florida **Program Director:** Marchell M Cuppett
School of Physical Education,Wellness & Sports**Phone:** (813) 974-3443
Studies **Email:**
4202 E. Fowler Avenue PED 214mcuppett@tempest.coedu.usf.edu
Tampa, FL - 33620-8600 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Georgia

Georgia College and State University **Program Director:** Earl R. Cooper Jr.
Campus Box 65 **Phone:** (478) 445-1786
Milledgeville, GA - 31061 US **Email:** bcooper@gcsu.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Georgia Southern University **Program Director:** Paul R. Geisler
Hollis Building **Phone:** (912) 681-5264
PO Box 8076 **Email:** pgeisler@gasou.edu
Statesboro, GA - 30460-8076 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

North Georgia College & State University **Program Director:** Mary Ann Westerfield
007 Memorial Hall **Phone:** (706) 864-1669
Dahlonega, GA - 30597 US **Email:** Makirby@ngcsu.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Georgia **Program Director:** Michael S. Ferrara
Athletic Training Program **Phone:** (706) 542-4801
300 River Road **Email:** mferrara@coe.uga.edu
Ramsey Center
Athens, GA - 30602 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Valdosta State University **Program Director:** Lori Howard
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (229) 245-4380
Dept KSPE **Email:** lchoward@valdosta.edu
Valdosta, GA - 31698 US

Degree: BS

Status: Continuing Accreditation

Iowa

Buena Vista University **Program Director:** Chris Todden
610 West Fourth Street**Phone:** (712) 749-2022
Storm Lake, IA - 50588 US**Email:** **toddden@bvu.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Clarke College **Program Director:** Melody Higgins
1550 Clarke Drive, MS# 1757**Phone:** (563) 588-6549
Dubuque, IA - 52001 US **Email:** **Dee.Higgins@clarke.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Coe College **Program Director:** Mitch Doyle
1220 First Avenue NE**Phone:** (319) 399-8653
Cedar Rapids, IA - 52402 US**Email:** **mdoyle@coe.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Iowa State University **Program Director:** Mary Meier
225 Forker Building**Phone:** (515) 294-3587
Ames, IA - 50011 US **Email:** **mkmeier@iastate.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Loras College **Program Director:** Susan P. Wehring
1450 Alta Vista**Phone:** (563) 588-7020
Dubuque, IA - 52004-0178 US **Email:** **swehring@loras.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Simpson College **Program Director:** Mike Hadden

701 North C. Street**Email: hadden@simpson.edu**
Indianola, IA - 50125 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

St Ambrose University**Program Director:** Douglas R. West
518 W. Locust Street**Phone:** (563) 333-6444
Davenport, IA - 52803 US **Email: WestDouglasR@ambrose.sau.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Iowa**Program Director:** Danny T Foster
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (319) 335-9393
414 FH**Email: danny-foster@uiowa.edu**
Iowa City, IA - 52242 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Northern Iowa**Program Director:** Richard Biff Williams
203 Wellness Recreation Center**Phone:** (319) 273-6824
Cedar Falls, IA - 50614-0241 US**Email: Biff.Williams@uni.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Upper Iowa University**Program Director:** Brooke Kerns
605 Washington Street**Phone:** (563) 425-5206
PO Box 1857**Email: kernsb@uiu.edu**
Fayette, IA - 52142 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Idaho

Boise State University**Program Director:** John W McChesney
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (208) 426-1481
Dept of Kinesiology/G-209**Email: jmcches@boisestate.edu**
1910 University Dr
Boise, ID - 83725 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Illinois

Aurora **University** **Program** **Director:** Oscar H. Krieger
347 South Gladstone**Phone:** (630) 844-4224
Aurora, IL - 60506 US **Email:** okrieger@aurora.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Eastern Illinois **University** **Program** **Director:** Lee Ann Price
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (217) 581-7615
600 Lincoln Avenue**Email:** cflp@eiu.edu
2220 Lantz
Charleston, IL - 61920 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Illinois State **University** **Program** **Director:** Todd McLoda
Box 5120**Phone:** (309) 438-2605
Normal, IL - 61790-5120 US **Email:** tamclod@ilstu.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Lewis **University** **Program** **Director:** Cathy Oczkowski
One University Parkway**Phone:** (815) 836-5921
Romeoville, IL - 60446 US **Email:** oczkowca@lewisu.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

McKendree **College** **Program** **Director:** Dawn M. Hankins
701 College Road**Phone:** (618) 537-6917
Lebanon, IL - 62254-1299 US **Email:** dhankins@mckendree.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Millikin University **Program Director:** Tisha Hess
1184 W. Main **Phone:** (217) 420-6624
Griswold Center **Email:** thess@mail.millikin.edu
Decatur, IL - 62522 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

North Central College **Program Director:** Heidi M. Matthews
30 North Brainard **Phone:** (630) 637-5511
Naperville, IL - 60540 US **Email:** kematthe@noctrl.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

North Park University **Program Director:** Andrew Lundgren
3225 West Foster Avenue **Phone:** (773) 244-6293
Chicago, IL - 60625 US **Email:** alundgren@northpark.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Northern Illinois University **Program Director:** Gretchen
Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education A Schlabach
Lowden Hall **Phone:** (815) 753-1424
DeKalb, IL - 60115 US **Email:** gas@niu.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Olivet Nazarene University **Program Director:** Chris T. Harman
One University Avenue **Phone:** (815) 928-5415
Bourbonnais, IL - 60914 US **Email:** charman@olivet.edu

Degree: BA BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Southern Illinois Univ at Carbondale **Program Director:** Ronald Wagner

Athletic Training Program**Phone:** (618) 453-3124
Mail Code 4310**Email:** rwagner@siu.edu
Carbondale, IL - 62901-4310 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Trinity International University**Program Director:** Karl J. Glass
2065 Half Day Road**Phone:** (847) 317-7066
Deerfield, IL - 60015 US **Email:** kglass@tiu.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Univ of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign**Program Director:** Gerald W Bell
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (217) 333-7699
Dept of Kinesiology/209 Freer Hall**Email:** gwbell@uiuc.edu
906 S Goodwin Ave
Urbana, IL - 61801 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Western Illinois University**Program Director:** Renee L. Polubinsky
Athletic Trainer**Phone:** (309) 298-2050
Brophy Hall 221 P**Email:** RL-Polubinsky@wiu.edu
1 University Circle
Macomb, IL - 61455 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Indiana

Anderson University**Program Director:** Steven D Risinger
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (765) 641-4491
1100 E 5th St**Email:** sdrisinger@anderson.edu
Anderson, IN - 46012-1362 US

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Ball State University**Program Director:** Thomas Weidner

Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (765) 285-5039
HP 209**Email:** tweidner@bsu.edu
Muncie, IN - 47306 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

DePauw **University** **Program** **Director:** John Locke
Athletic Trainer**Phone:** (765) 658-6689
313 S. Locust**Email:** jlocke@depauw.edu
HPP Department, Lilly Center
Greencastle, IN - 46135 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Franklin **College** **Program** **Director:** Katherine Taylor
501 E. Monroe Remsburg
Spurlock Center**Phone:** (317) 738-8135
Franklin, IN - 46130 US **Email:** kremsburg@franklincollege.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Indiana **State** **University** **Program** **Director:** Catherine Stemmans
Arena Room C-09**Phone:** (812) 237-8336
Athletic Training Dept**Email:** Cat@indstate.edu
Terre Haute, IN - 47809 US

Degree: BS MS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Indiana **University** **-** **Bloomington** **Program** **Director:** Katie Grove
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (812) 855-4509
Sportsmedicine Dept/Assembly Hall**Email:** kagrove@indiana.edu
1001 E 17th St
Bloomington, IN - 47408 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Indiana Wesleyan University**Program Director:** Linda Sommers
4201 South Washington Street**Phone:** (765) 677-2629
Marion, IN - 46953 US **Email: Linda.sommers@indwes.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Manchester College**Program Director:** Mark W. Huntington
Box PERC**Phone:** (260) 982-5033
North Manchester, IN - 46962 US**Email: mwhuntington@manchester.edu**

Degree: BS BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Purdue University**Program Director:** Larry   J Leverenz
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (765) 494-3167
800 Stadium**Email: llevere@purdue.edu**
West Lafayette, IN - 47907 US

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Evansville**Program Director:** Kyle Kiesel
1800 Lincoln Avenue**Phone:** (812) 488-2848
Evansville, IN - 47722 US **Email: kk70@evansville.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Indianapolis**Program Director:** Connie Pumpelly
1400 E. Hanna Avenue**Phone:** (317) 788-6143
Indianapolis, IN - 46227 US **Email: cpumpelly@uindy.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Kansas

Emporia State University**Program Director:** Robert Stow
Athletic Trainer Program**Phone:** (620) 341-5653
1200 Commercial, Campus Box 4013**Email: stowrobe@emporia.edu**
Emporia, KS - 66801 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Fort Hays State University Program **Director:** Mark Stutz
600 Park Street **Phone:** (785) 628-4354
Hays, KS - 67601 US **Email: mstutz@fhsu.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Kansas State University Program **Director:** Shawna Jordan
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (785) 532-6991
241 Justin Hall **Email: sjordan@ksu.edu**
Manhattan, KS - 66506-0302 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

MidAmerica Nazarene University Program **Director:** Eric Walser
2030 East College Way **Phone:** (913) 791-3388
Olathe, KS - 66062-1899 US **Email: ewalser@mnu.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Kansas Program **Director:** Aric J. Warren
Department of Health Sport and Exercise Sciences **Phone:** (785) 864-0799
1301 Sunnyside Avenue **Email: warren@ku.edu**
161 Robinson
Lawrence, KS - 66045 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Kentucky

Eastern Kentucky University Program **Director:** Alice Wilcoxson
Athletic Training Education Program **Phone:** (859) 622-8173
College of Health Sciences - Exercise & Sport Science **Email: alice.wilcoxson@eku.edu**
Dept
231 Moberly Building
Richmond, KY - 40475 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Louisiana

Louisiana **CollegeProgram** **Director:** Janet   L Passman
PO   Box   563**Phone:** (318)   487-7290
Pineville, LA - 71359 US   **Email: passman@lacollege.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Southern   Louisiana **UniversityProgram** **Director:** Ronnie Harper
SLU   10845**Phone:** (985)   549-3871
Hammond, LA - 70402 US   **Email: rharper@selu.org**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Massachusetts

Boston **UniversityProgram** **Director:** Sara   D Brown
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:** (617)   353-7507
635   Commonwealth   Ave**Email: sara@bu.edu**
Boston, MA - 02215 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Bridgewater   State **CollegeProgram** **Director:** Kathleen M Laquale
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:** (508)   531-1717
MAHPLS   **Email: mkanderson@bridgew.edu**
Kelly   Gym   Room   107
Bridgewater, MA - 02325 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Endicott **CollegeProgram** **Director:** Deborah Swanton
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:** (978)   232-2433
376   Hale   St**Email: dswanton@endicott.edu**
Beverly, MA - 01915 US

Degree: BS

Status: Continuing Accreditation

Lasell **College** **Program** **Director:** William P. Nowlan
1844 Commonweath Avenue **Phone:** (617) 243-2262
Newton, MA - 02466 US **Email: bnowlan@lasell.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Merrimack **College** **Program** **Director:** Birgid Hopkins
315 Turnpike Street **Phone:** (978) 937-5332
Andover, MA US **Email: birgid.Hopkins@merrimack.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Northeastern **University** **Program** **Director:** Jamie Musler
Athletic Training **Phone:** (617) 373-5355
304 Dockser Hall **Email: j.musler@neu.edu**
Boston, MA - 02115 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Salem State **College** **Program** **Director:** Amy Everitt
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (978) 542-6576
352 Lafayette St **Email: Amy.everitt@salemstate.edu**
Salem, MA - 01970-5353 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Springfield **College** **Program** **Director:** Charles J Redmond
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (413) 748-3231
Allied Health Science Center **Email: credmond@spfldcol.edu**
Springfield, MA - 01109 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Westfield State College **Program Director:** William N. Miller
Department of Movement Science **Phone:** (413) 572-5450
577 Western Avenue **Email:** <u>wmiller@wisdom.wsc.ma.edu</u>
Westfield, MA - 01086-1630 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Maryland

Salisbury University **Program Director:** Jill Manners
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (410) 543-6347
1101 Camden Ave **Email:** <u>jamanners@salisbury.edu</u>
Salisbury, MD - 21801 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Towson University **Program Director:** Matthew Rothbard
Athletic Trainer **Phone:** (410) 704-3166
8000 York Road **Email:** <u>mrothbard@towson.edu</u>
Towson, MD - 21252 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Maine

University of Maine at Presque Isle **Program Director:** Barbara
181 Main Street J. Blackstone
Presque Isle, ME - 04769 US **Phone:** (207) 768-9415
Email: <u>blackstb@umpi.maine.edu</u>
Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of New England **Program Director:** Brian Bachelder
Department of Exercise and Sport Performance **Phone:** (207) 283-0170 Ext: 2465
Biddeford, ME - 04005-9599 US **Email:** <u>bbachelder@une.edu</u>

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Southern Maine **Program Director:** Brian J. Toy
37 College Avenue **Phone:** (207) 780-4799
Gorham, ME - 04038 US **Email:** btoy@usm.maine.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Michigan

Central Michigan University **Program Director:** Denise Webster
Rose Center 117 **Phone:** (517) 774-1411
Mt Pleasant, MI - 48859 US **Email:** webst1dl@cmich.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Eastern Michigan University **Program Director:** Jodi Johnson
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (734) 487-7120 Ext: 2722
318P John W. Porter Bldg **Email:** jodi.johnson@emich.edu
Ypsilanti, MI - 48197 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Grand Valley State University **Program Director:** Shari Bartz
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (331) 895-3044
Movement Science Department **Email:** bartzs@gvsu.edu
192 Fieldhouse
Allendale, MI - 49401 US

Degree: BS
Status: Academic Probation

Hope College **Program Director:** Richard Ray
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (616) 395-7708
168 East 13th Street **Email:** ray@hope.edu
Holland, MI - 49422-9000 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

LSSU Athletic Training Education Program **Program Director:** Christopher Kirk
Lake Superior State University **Phone:** (906) 635-2604

650 West Easterday Avenue**Email: ckirk@lssu.edu**
Sault Ste. Marie, MI - 49783 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Northern Michigan UniversityProgram Director: Julie Rochester
Department of HPER**Phone:** (814) 865-8816
1401 Presque Isle Avenue**Email: jnh3@psu.edu**
Marquette, MI - 49855 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Saginaw Valley State UniversityProgram Director: Paul A, Ballard
7400 Bay Road**Phone:** (898) 964-7269
Univesity Center, MI - 48710 US**Email: pballard@svsu.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of MichiganProgram Director: Brian Czajka
401 Washtenaw Avenue**Phone:** (734) 647-2702
4745E Kinesiology Building**Email: baczajka@umich.edu**
Ann Arbor, MI - 48109-2214 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Minnesota

Bethel CollegeProgram Director: Neal S. Dutton
3900 Bethel Drive**Phone:** (651) 638-6255
St Paul, MN - 55112 US**Email: dutnea@bethel.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Gustavus Adolphus CollegeProgram Director: Gary D Reinholtz
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (507) 933-7674
800 W College Ave**Email: gdratcr@gac.edu**
St Peter, MN - 56082 US

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Minnesota State University - Mankato **Program Director:** Patrick Sexton
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (507) 389-2092
1400 Highland Center **Email:** Patrick.sexton@mnus.edu
Mankato, MN - 56002-8400 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Minnesota State University - Moorhead **Program**
106D Alex Nemzek Hall **Director:** Dawn Hammerschmidt
1104 Seventh Avenue South **Phone:** (218) 236-2318
Moorhead, VA - 56563 US **Email:** hammerda@mnstate.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Winona State University **Program Director:** Shellie F. Nelson
Department of Health and Human Performance **Phone:** (507) 457-5214
117 Memorial Hall **Email:** snelson@winona.edu
Winona, MN - 55987 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Initial Accreditation

Missouri

Central Methodist College **Program Director:** Wade Welton
411 CMC Square **Phone:** (660) 248-6217
Fayette, MO - 65248 US **Email:** wwelton@cmc.edu

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Initial Accreditation

Lindenwood University **Program Director:** Randy L. Biggerstaff
2096 South Kingshighway **Phone:** (636) 949-4683
St. Charles, MO - 63301 US **Email:** rbiggerstaff@lindenwood.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Park   **UniversityProgram**   **Director:** Thomas Bertoncino
8700   NW   Riverpark   Dr.**Phone:**   (816)   587-8001
Parkville, MO - 64152 US   **Email:** bertoncino@yahoo.com

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Southeast   Missouri   State   **UniversityProgram**   **Director:** Craig Elder
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:**   (573)   651-5193
One   University   Plaza-MS7650**Email:** celder@semo.edu
Cape   Girardeau, MO - 63701 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Southwest   Missouri   State   **UniversityProgram Director:** Thomas W. Kaminski
Professional   Building   160**Phone:**   (417)   836-8553
901   S.   National   Avenue**Email:** twk545f@smsu.edu
Springfield, MO - 65804 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Truman   State   **UniversityProgram**   **Director:** Michelle Boyd
125   Pershing   Bldg**Phone:**   (660)   785-7364
Kirksville, MO - 63501 US   **Email:** mboyd@truman.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Mississippi

The   University   of   Southern   Mississippi Program   **Director:** Trent Gould
PO   Box   5142**Phone:**   (601)   266-6339
Hattiesburg, MS - 39406-5001 US   **Email:** Trent.Gould@usm.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Montana

University of Montana - Missoula**Program Director:** Scott T Richter
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (406) 243-5246
Health & Human Performance Dept**Email:** Scott.richter@mso.umt.edu
McGill Hall 109
Missoula, MT - 59812-1055 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

North Carolina

Appalachian State University**Program Director:** Jamie Moul
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (828) 262-3138
Hlth Leisure and Exercise Science**Email:** moulij1@appstate.edu
Boone, NC - 28608 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Barton College**Program Director:** Carla Stoddard
Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies**Phone:** (252) 399-6377
PO Box 5000**Email:** cstoddard@barton edu
Wilson, NC - 27893 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Campbell University**Program Director:** Rick Baker
Athletic Training Education Program**Phone:** (910) 893-1563
PO Box 10**Email:** bakerr@mailcenter.campbell.edu
Buies Creek, NC - 27506 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Catawba College**Program Director:** Robert Dingle
Athletic Training**Phone:** (704) 637-4455
2300 West Innes Street**Email:** Rdingle@catawba.edu
Salisbury, nc - 28144 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

East Carolina University **Program Director:** Katie W Walsh
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (252) 328-4560
ECU-Sports Medicine Div**Email:** walshk@mail.ecu.edu
245 Ward Sports Medicine Bldg
Greenville, NC - 27858 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Elon University **Program Director:** Martin H Baker
100 Campus Drive**Phone:** (336) 278-6713
Campus Box 2500**Email:** bakerm@elon.edu
Elon, NC - 27244 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Gardner-Webb University **Program Director:** Ashley White
Department of Physical Education,Wellness & Sport**Phone:** (704) 406-3810
Studies **Email:** awhite@gardner-webb.edu
Campus 7257
Boiling Springs, NC - 28017 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Greensboro College **Program Director:** Michelle
815 W. Market StreetM. Lesperance
Greensboro, NC - 27401 US **Phone:** (336) 272-7102
Email: mlesperance@gborocollege.edu
Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

High Point University **Program Director:** Rick Proctor
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (910) 841-9267
833 Montlieu Avenue**Email:** rproctor@highpoint.edu
High Point, NC - 27262 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Lenoir-Rhyne College
Athletic Training
Dept of Healthful Living and Sports
PO Box 7356
Hickory, NC - 28603 US

Program Director: Michael R McGhee
Phone: (828) 328-7127
Email: mcgee@lrc.edu

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Mars Hill College
PO. Box 668
Mars Hill, NC - 28754 US

Program Director: Kimberly DeReamer
Phone: (828) 689-1217
Email: kdereamer@mhc.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Methodist College
5400 Ramsey Street
Fayetteville, NC - 28311 US

Program Director: Hugh W. Harling
Phone: (910) 630-7418
Email: hharling@methodist.edu

Degree: BA BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Univ of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Athletic Training Education Program
211 Fetzer CB 8700
UNC - Chapel Hall
Chapel Hill, NC - 27599-8700 US

Program Director: Darin Padua
Phone: (919) 843-5117
Email: dpadua@email.unc.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Department of Kinesiology
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC - 28223-0001 US

Program Director: Jolene M. Henning
Phone: (704) 687-6202
Email: jhenning@email.uncc.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Program Director: Sandy Shultz

250
Greensboro, NC - 97310 US

HHP**Phone:** (336) 334-3027
Email: sjshultz@uncg.edu

Degree: MS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of North Carolina at Wilmington Program **Director:** Kirk Brown
Department of HPER**Phone:** (910) 962-7184
601 South College Road**Email:** brownk@uncwil.edu
Wilmington, NC - 28403 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Wingate University**Program** **Director:** Traci N. Gearhart
Box 3079**Phone:** (704) 233-8179
Wingate, NC - 28174 US
Email: tgearhar@wingate.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

North Dakota

North Dakota State University**Program** **Director:** Pamela Hansen
Bentson Bunker Fieldhouse 1G**Phone:** (701) 231-8093
PO Box 5576**Email:** pam.Hansen@ndsu.edu
Fargo, ND - 58105-5600 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Mary Program **Director:** Blaine Steiner
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (701) 255-7500 Ext: 456
7500 University Dr**Email:** bsteiner@umary.edu
Bismarck, ND - 58504-9652 US

Degree: BA BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of North Dakota Program **Director:** James D Rudd
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (701) 777-3102
Div of Sports Medicine**Email:** jrudd@medicine.nodak.edu
Box 9013

Grand Forks, ND - 58202-9013 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Nebraska

Creighton UniversityProgram Director: P. Charles Pfeifer
2500 California Plaza**Phone:** (402) 280-2770
Omaha, NE - 68178 US **Email: pcp@creighton.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Nebraska Wesleyan UniversityProgram Director: Stacy L. Ocander
5000 Saint Paul Avenue**Phone:** (402) 465-2277
Lincoln, NE - 68504 US **Email: socander@hotmail.com**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Nebraska at KearneyProgram Director: Scott Unruh
905 W 25th Street**Phone:** (308) 865-8627
Cushing Building Room 158**Email: Unruhsa@unk.edu**
Kearney, NE - 68849 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Nebraska at OmahaProgram Director: Joshua Nichter
6001 Dodge Street**Phone:** (402) 554-3224
HPER 207R**Email: jnichter@mail.unomaha.edu**
Omaha, NE - 68182-0216 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

New Hampshire

Colby-Sawyer CollegeProgram Director: William G Ross
Athletic Trainer**Phone:** (603) 526-3618
100 Main Street**Email: willross@colby-sawyer.edu**
New London, NH - 03257 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Keene State College **Program Director:** Sherry I Bovinet
Athletic Training **Phone:** (603) 358-2301
229 Main Street **Email:** sbovinet@keene.edu
Keene, NH - 03435-2301 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Plymouth State College **Program Director:** Linda Levy
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (603) 535-2577
MSC 22 **Email:** levy@mail.plymouth.edu
Plymouth, NH - 03264 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of New Hampshire **Program Director:** Daniel R Sedory
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (603) 862-1831
Dept of Kinesiology **Email:** Dan.sedory@unh.edu
145 Main St/Field House
Durham, NH - 03824 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

New Jersey

Kean University **Program Director:** Gary Ball
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (908) 737-5437
D'Angola Gym **Email:** gball@cougar.kean.edu
1000 Morris Avenue
Union, NJ - 07083 US

Degree: BA
Status: Academic Probation

Montclair State University **Program Director:** David A. Middlemas
1 Normal Avenue **Phone:** (973) 665-7090
Montclair, NJ - 07043 US **Email:** middlemasd@mail.montclair.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Rowan **UniversityProgram** **Director:** Douglas Mann
201 Mullica Hill Road**Phone:** (856) 256-4500 Ext: 3706
Glassboro, NJ - 08028 US **Email: Mannd@rowan.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Seton **Hall** **UniversityProgram** **Director:** Carolyn Goeckel
400 South Orange Avenue**Phone:** (973) 275-2826
South Orange, NJ - 07079 US**Email: goeckeca@shu.edu**

Degree: MS
Status: Initial Accreditation

William **Paterson** **Univ** **of** **New** **JerseyProgram** **Director:** Linda Gazzillo Diaz
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (973) 720-2364
300 Pompton Rd**Email: GazzilloL@wpunj.edu**
Wayne, NJ - 07470 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

New Mexico

New **Mexico** **State** **UniversityProgram** **Director:** Leah Putman
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (505) 646-5038
Box 30001/Dept 3SMC**Email: lputman@nmsu.edu**
Las Cruces, NM - 88003-0001 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University **of** **New** **MexicoProgram** **Director:** Susan McGowen
#1 University of New Mexico**Phone:** (505) 277-5903
MSC 04 2610**Email: yorex@unm.edu**
Albuquerque, NM - 87131 US

Degree: BS
Status: Academic Probation

Nevada

University of Nevada - Las Vegas **Program Director:** Bill Holcomb
Athletic Trainer **Phone:** (702) 895-1015
4505 Maryland Parkway **Email: wholcomb@unlv.edu**
Box 453034
Las Vegas, NV - 89154-3019 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

New York

Canisius College **Program Director:** Peter Koehneke
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (716) 888-2954
2001 Main St **Email: koehneke@canisius.edu**
Buffalo, NY - 14208-1098 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Hofstra University **Program Director:** Suanne S Maurer
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (516) 463-6952
220 Hofstra University **Email: Hprssm@hofstra.edu**
The Dome, Room 112
Hempstead, NY - 11550 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Ithaca College **Program Director:** Kent Scriber
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (607) 274-3178
Department of Exercise and Sport Science **Email: Kscriber@Ithaca.edu**
10 Hill Center
Ithaca, NY - 14850 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

SUNY at Brockport **Program Director:** Timothy J Henry
Athletic Training **Phone:** (716) 395-5357
355 Tuttle North **Email: thenry@brockport.edu**
Brockport, NY - 14420 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

SUNY College at Cortland Program **Director:** John Cottone
Exercise Science and Sport Studies Department **Phone:** (607) 753-4962
PO Box 2000 **Email:** cottoneJ@cortland.edu
Cortland, NY - 13045 US

Degree: BA BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

The Sage Colleges Program **Director:** Karen Balter
45 Ferry Street **Phone:** (518) 244-2419
Troy, NY - 12180 US **Email:** baltek@sage.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Ohio

Baldwin-Wallace College Program **Director:** Garry Miller
275 Eastland Road **Phone:** (440) 826-2181
Berea, OH - 44017 US **Email:** gmiller@bw.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Capital University Program **Director:** Bonnie M Goodwin
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (614) 236-6667
Troutman Hall **Email:** bgoodwin@capital.edu
2199 E Main St
Columbus, OH - 43209 US

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Kent State University Program **Director:** Kimberly S. Peer
School of Exercise, Leisure and Sport **Phone:** (330) 672-0231
Room 263H Gym Annex **Email:** kpeer@kent.edu
Kent, OH - 44242 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Marietta
Athletic Trainer
215 Fifth
Marietta, OH - 45750-4031 US

CollegeProgram **Director:** Sam Crowthers
Prgm**Phone:** (740) 376-4774
St**Email:** crowthers@marietta.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Miami
Athletic Trainer
PHS
Oxford, OH - 45056 US

UniversityProgram **Director:** Patricia J Troesch
Prgm**Phone:** (513) 529-7526
Dept**Email:** troescpj@muohio.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Mt Union
Athletic Trainer
1972 Clark
Alliance, OH - 44601 US

CollegeProgram **Director:** Daniel M Gorman
Prgm**Phone:** (330) 823-4882
Ave**Email:** gormandm@muc.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Ohio Northern
Athletic Trainer
525 S Main
Dept. of HPESS/#243 Sports Center
Ada, OH - 45810 US

UniversityProgram **Director:** Michelle Glon
Prgm**Phone:** (419) 772-2443
St**Email:** m-glon@onu.edu

Degree: BA BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Ohio
Grover
Athens, OH - 45701 US

UniversityProgram **Director:** Kristi White
Building**Phone:** (740) 597-1876
Email: whitek2@ohio.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Otterbein
180 Center Street
Roush Hall,
Westerville, OH - 43081 US

CollegeProgram Director: Joan E. Rocks
Phone: (614) 823-3505
320**Email: jrocks@otterbein.edu**

Degree: BA BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Akron
Memorial Hall
Akron, OH - 44325 US

AkronProgram Director: Stacey Buser
60B**Phone:** (330) 972-7475
Email: buser@uakron.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Cincinnati
PO Box
526 Teacher's
Cincinnati, OH - 45221-0002 US

CincinnatiProgram Director: Pat Graman
210002**Phone:** (513) 556-0576
College**Email: Pat.graman@uc.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Toledo
College of Health and Human Services
Department of Kinesiology
2801W. Bancroft Street
Toledo, OH - 43606 US

ToledoProgram Director: James M Rankin
Phone: (419) 530-2752
Email: James.Rankin@utoledo.edu

Degree: BS BE
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Wilmington College
Athletic Training
251 Ludovic Street
Pyle Center Box 1327
Wilmington, OH - 45177 US

CollegeProgram Director: Kathy Springsteen
Phone: (937) 382-6661 Ext: 392

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Wright State University **Program** **Director:** L. Tony Ortiz
Health & Physical Education Dept**Phone:** (937) 775-3259
316 Nutter Center
Dayton, OH - 45435 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Xavier University **Program** **Director:** Brett Massie
Athletic Training**Phone:** (513) 745-3859
3800 Victory Parkway**Email:** massie@xu.edu
Cincinnati, OH - 45207-6312 US

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Oklahoma

East Central University **Program** **Director:** Jeff Williams
1100 E. 14th**Phone:** (580) 310-5357
Ada, OK - 74820 US **Email:** jwillims@mailclerk.ecok.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Oklahoma State University **Program** **Director:** Tona Palmer
427 Willard Hall**Phone:** (405) 744-9437
Stillwater, OK - 74078 US **Email:** ptona@okstate.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Southwestern Oklahoma State University **Program** **Director:** Ron H. Walker
100 Campus Drive**Phone:** (580) 774-3186
Weatherford, OK - 73096 US **Email:** walkerr@swosu.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Tulsa **Program** **Director:** Robin Ploeger

Athletic Training Program**Phone:** (918) 631-3170
600 S. College Avenue**Email: Robin-ploeger@utulsa.edu**
Chapman Hall 355
Tulsa, OK - 74104-3189 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Oregon

George Fox University Program **Director:** Dale Isaak
414 N. Meridian St. #6182**Phone:** (503) 554-2916
Newberg, OR - 97132 US **Email: disaak@georgefox.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Linfield College Program **Director:** Tara M. Lepp
900 SE. Baker Street**Phone:** (503) 883-2417
McMinnville, OR - 97128 US **Email: tlepp@linfield.edu**

Degree: BA BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Oregon State University Program **Director:** Mark Hoffman
Room 107B Women's Building**Phone:** (541) 737-6787
Corvallis, OR - 97331-3303 US **Email: Mark.hoffman@oregonstate.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Pennsylvania

Alvernia College Program **Director:** Kimberly Stoudt
400 Saint Bernadine Street**Phone:** (610) 796-8335
Reading, PA - 19607 US **Email: kim.stoudt@alvernia.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

California University of Pennsylvania Program **Director:** Bruce D Barnhart
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (724) 938-4562
250 University Ave**Email: barnhart@cup.edu**
California, PA - 15419 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Duquesne University **Program Director:** Paula S Turocy
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (412) 396-5695
122 Health Sciences Bldg**Email: turocyp@duq.edu**
Pittsburgh, PA - 15282 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

East Stroudsburg University **Program Director:** John R Thatcher
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (570) 422-3065
200 Prospect St**Email: jthatcher@po-box.edu**
East Stroudsburg, PA - 18301 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Indiana University of Pennsylvania **Program Director:** Jose' E. Rivera
228 Zink Hall**Phone:** (724) 357-5507
1190 Maple Street**Email: jrivera@rocketmail.com**
Indiana, PA - 15705 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

King's College **Program Director:** Jeremy Simington
133 North River Street**Phone:** (570) 208-5900 Ext: 5636
Wilkes-Barre, PA - 18711 US **Email: jpsiming@kings.edu**

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Lock Haven University **Program Director:** Thomas F. West
116 Himes Hall**Phone:** (570) 893-2383
Lock Haven, PA - 17745 US**Email: twest@lhup.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Marywood **University** **Program** **Director:** Christopher
2300 Adams Avenue W. O'Brien
Scranton, PA - 18509-1598 US **Phone:** (570) 348-6259
Email: cobrien@es.marywood.edu
Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Mercyhurst **College** **Program** **Director:** Suzanne Gushie
MAC Bldg/Sports Medicine Department **Phone:** (814) 824-7472
501 E. 38th Street **Email:** sgushie@mercyhurst.edu
Erie, PA - 16546 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Messiah **College** **Program** **Director:** Edwin A Bush
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (717) 691-2511 Ext: 6037
PO Box 4501 **Email:** sbush@messiah.edu
Grantham, PA - 17027 US

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Penn State University - Main Campus **Program** **Director:** Jay Hertel
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (814) 865-8868
Department of Kinesiology **Email:** jnh3@psu.edu
279 Recreation Building
University Park, PA - 16802 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Slippery Rock **University** **Program** **Director:** Bonnie Jo Siple
Athletic Trainer Prgm **Phone:** (724) 738-2930
212 BSB **Email:** bonnie.siple@sru.edu
Slippery Rock, PA - 16057 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Temple UniversityProgram Director: C Buz Swanik
Athletic Training**Phone:** (215) 204-9555
Department of Kinesiology
127 Pearson Hall
Philadelphia, PA - 19122 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of PittsburghProgram Director: Kevin Conley
School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences**Phone:** (412) 383-6737
4049 Forbes Tower**Email: kconley@pitt.edu**
Pittsburgh, PA - 15260 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Waynesburg CollegeProgram Director: Ken Alberta
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (724) 852-3295
51 W College St**Email: kalberta@waynesburg.edu**
Waynesburg, PA - 15370 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

West Chester UniversityProgram Director: Carol Jimenez
Department of Sports Medicine**Phone:** (610) 436-3293
Sturtzedecker Health Science Center/ Room 215**Email: cjimenez@wcupa.edu**
West Chester, PA - 19383 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

South Carolina

Charleston Southern UniversityProgram Director: Thomas G. Palmer
9200 University Street**Phone:** (843) 863-7399
South Carolina Sports Medicine and Orthopedic**Email: Tpalmer@csuniv.edu**
Center
North Charleston, SC - 29406-9167 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

College of Charleston **Program Director:** Susan L. Rozzi
66 George Street**Phone:** (843) 953-7163
Charleston, SC - 29424 US **Email: rozzis@cofc.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Erskine College **Program Director:** Kelly Ramsdell
Two Washington Street**Phone:** (864) 379-6614
Due West, SC - 29639 US**Email: ramsdell@erskine.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Lander University **Program Director:** Jerald D. Hawkins
CPO Box 6026**Phone:** (864) 388-8290
Greenwood, SC - 29649 US **Email: jhawkins@lander.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of South Carolina **Program Director:** James M. Mensch
218 Blatt Center**Phone:** (803) 777-3846
Columbia, SC - 29208 US **Email: Jmensch@gwm.sc.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

South Dakota

Augustana College **Program Director:** Brian T. Gerry
2001 S. Summit Avenue**Phone:** (605) 275-5534
Sioux Falls, SD - 57197 US**Email: brian_gerry@augie.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Dakota Wesleyan University **Program Director:** Dan Wagner
1200 West University**Phone:** (605) 995-2145

Box   912**Email:** dnwagner@dwue.edu
Mitchell, SD - 57301 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Si   Tanka   UniversityProgram   Director: Steve Fryberger
333   9th   Street   SW**Phone:**   (605)   353-2014
Huron, SD - 57350 US   **Email:** sfryberger@sitanka.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

South   Dakota   State   UniversityProgram   Director: Jim Booher
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:**   (605)   688-5824
Department   of   HPER   -   PEC   265**Email:** James_booher@sdstate.edu
Brookings, SD - 57007 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Tennessee

Lincoln   Memorial   UniversityProgram   Director: Amanda Smith
PO   Box   2028**Phone:**   (423)   869-6322
Harrogate, TN - 37752 US   **Email:** asmith@lmunet.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

David   Lipscomb   UniversityProgram   Director: David Adams
Athletic   Trainer   Prgm**Phone:** (615) 279-5700 Ext: 2705
3901   Granny   White   Pike**Email:** David.adams@lipscomb.edu
Nashville, TN - 37204-3951 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Middle   Tennessee   State   UniversityProgram   Director: William Whitehill
Department of Health, Physical Education,Recreation**Phone:**   (615)   904-8453
and   Safety**Email:** wwhitehi@mtsu.edu
PO   Box   96
Murfreesboro, TN - 37102 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Union **University** **Program** **Director:** Robert Steigmann
1050 Union University Drive**Phone:** (731) 661-5280
Jackson, TN - 38305 US **Email: rsteigm@uu.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga **Program** **Director:** Marisa Colston
615 McCallie Avenue**Phone:** (423) 425-4209
Dept 6606**Email: Marisa-Colston@utc.edu**
Chattanooga, TN - 37403 US

Degree: MS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Texas

Southwestern **University** **Program Director:** Miguel A. Benavides
1001 East University Avenue**Phone:** (512) 863-1385
Georgetown, TX - 78626 US **Email: benavidm@southwestern.edu**

Degree: BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Texas Christian **University** **Program** **Director:** Steve Snowden
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (817) 257-5359
PO Box 297730
Ft Worth, TX - 76129 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Texas State University at San Marcos **Program** **Director:** Bobby Patton
Athletic Trainer Prgm**Phone:** (512) 245-2938
601 University Dr**Email: bobbypatton@txstate.edu**
San Marcos, TX - 78666 US

Degree: BESS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

The University of Texas at Arlington **Program Director:** A. Louise Fincher
Department of Kinesiology**Phone:** (817) 272-3107
Box 19259**Email: lfincher@uta.edu**
Arlington, TX - 76019-9259 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Utah

Brigham Young University **Program Director:** David Kaiser
Athletic Training Programg**Phone:** (801) 422-1627
College of Health and Human Performance**Email: David_Kaiser@byu.edu**
120-F Richards Building
Provo, UT - 84602-2111 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Utah **Program Director:** John P. Mattson
250 S. 1850 S. Room 200**Phone:** (801) 581-7362
Salt Lake City, UT - 84112-0920 US**Email: jmattson@hsc.utah.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Weber State University **Program Director:** Roberto Herrera
2801 University Circle**Phone:** (801) 626-6742
Ogden, UT - 84408-2801 US **Email: rherrera@weber.edu**

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Virginia

Bridgewater College **Program Director:** Barbara H. Long
402 East College Street**Phone:** (540) 828-5771
Bridgewater, VA - 22812 US **Email: bhlong@bridgewater.edu**

Certificate/Diploma
Status: Initial Accreditation

Carilion Roanoke Memorial Hospital/Jefferson College of Health Sciences
920 South Jefferson Street
PO Box 13186
Roanoke, VA - 24031 US

Program Director: Michael S. Krackow
Phone: (888) 985-8483
Email: mkrackow@chs.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Emory & Henry College
P.O. Box123
Emory, VA - 24327-0947 US

Program Director: Margaret F. Hutson
Phone: (276) 944-6237
Email: mfhutson@ehc.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

James Madison University
Athletic Trainer Prgm
Department of Health Sciences
MSC 4301
Harrisonburg, VA - 22807 US

Program Director: Herbert K Amato
Phone: (540) 568-3576
Email: amatohk@jmu.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Longwood University
115 Lancer Hall
Farmville, VA - 23909 US

Program Director: Sharon M. Menegoni
Phone: (804) 395-3845
Email: smenegon@longwood.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Lynchburg College
1501 Lakeside Drive
Lynchburg, VA - 24501 US

Program Director: Tim Laurent
Phone: (434) 544-8726
Email: Laurent@lynchburg.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Roanoke CollegeProgram **Director:** James Buriak
221 College LanePhone: (540) 375-2343
Roanoke, VA - 24153 US **Email:** buriak@roanoke.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Vermont

Castleton State CollegeProgram **Director:** John J. Feenik
Glenbrook GymnasiumPhone: (802) 468-1370
Castleton, VT - 05735 US **Email:** John.Freenick@castleton.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of VermontProgram **Director:** Alan Maynard
Athletic Trainer PrgmPhone: (802) 656-7678
213 A Patrick Gymnasium
97 Spear ST
Burlington, VT - 05405 US

Degree: BS BA
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Washington

Eastern Washington UniversityProgram **Director:** Garth Babcock
200 PEBPhone: (509) 359-2427
PEHR Department**Email:**
526 5th Street**Garth.Babcock@mailserver.ewu.edu**
Cheney, WA - 99004-2476 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Initial Accreditation

Washington State UniversityProgram **Director:** Carol Zweifel
Athletic Trainer PrgmPhone: (509) 335-0307
Kinesiology & Leisure Studies**Email:** carolz@wsu.edu
PEB 104
Pullman, WA - 99164-1410 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Whitworth
Athletic
300 W. Hawthorne Rd.
Spokane, WA - 99251 US

CollegeProgram Director: Russell J Richardson
Trainer**Phone:** (509) 777-3244
Email: rrichardson@whitworth.edu

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

Wisconsin

Carroll
100 N. East Avenue
Waukesha, WI - 53186 US

CollegeProgram Director: Steven K. Reese
Phone: (262) 524-7665
Email: sreese@cc.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

Carthage
2001 Alford Park Drive
Kenosha, WI - 53140 US

CollegeProgram Director: Dan Ruffner
Phone: (262) 551-5741
Email: druffner@carthage.edu

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

University Wisconsin - La Crosse
Athletic Trainer
135 Mitchell Hall
LaCrosse, WI - 54601 US

Program Director: Mark H Gibson
Prgm**Phone:** (608) 785-8190
Email: Gibson.mark@uwlax.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

University of Wisconsin-Madison
2000 Observatory Drive
Room 1037
Madison, WI - 53706 US

Program Director: Andrew Winterstein
Phone: (608) 265-2503
Email: winterstein@education.wisc.edu

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Department of Human Movement Sciences

Program Director: Kyle T. Ebersole
Phone: (414) 229-5553

Enderis 413**Email: ebersole@uwm.edu**
Milwaukee, WI - 53201-0413 US

Degree: BS
Status: Initial Accreditation

University of Wisconsin OshkoshProgram Director: Hal Strough
112 Kolf CenterPhone: (920) 424-1298
Oshkosh, WI - 54901 US **Email: strough@uwosh.edu**

Degree: BS BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

West Virginia

Alderson-Broaddus CollegeProgram Director: Eric M. Shore
500 College Hill RoadPhone: (304) 457-6276
Box 2062**Email: shorem@mail.ab.edu**
Philippi, WV - 26416 US

Degree: BA
Status: Initial Accreditation

Marshall UniversityProgram Director: R Daniel Martin
Athletic Trainer PrgmPhone: (304) 696-2412
College of Education & Human ServicesEmail: martind@marshall.edu
400 Hal Greer Blvd
Huntington, WV - 25755 US

Degree: BA
Status: Academic Probation

University of CharlestonProgram Director: Joseph Beckett
Athletic Trainer PrgmPhone: (304) 357-4902
2300 MacCorkle Ave SE**Email: jbeckett@ucwv.edu**
Charleston, WV - 25304 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

West Virginia UniversityProgram Director: Vincent Stilger
Athletic Trainer PrgmPhone: (304) 293-3295 Ext: 5148
PO Box 6116 ColiseumEmail: vstilger@wvu.edu

166

Morgantown, WV - 26506 US

Degree: BS
Status: Continuing Accreditation

West   Virginia   Wesleyan   CollegeProgram   Director: Jean   M Fruh
Athletic   Training**Phone:**   (304)   473-8002
59   College   Avenue**Email: Fruh j@wvwc.edu**
Buckhannon, WV - 26201-2995 US

Degree: Baccalaureate
Status: Continuing Accreditation

APPENDIX G

PRE NOTIFICATION LETTER

University of Pittsburgh

April 19, 2004

Dear Program Director:

Within the next few days you will be receiving a request to complete a brief survey. As a former athletic training program director, I am interested in learning how athletic training program directors perceive their educational experience has prepared them for the roles and responsibilities of academic administration. I also wish to gather recommendations on how to enhance the preparation of athletic training program directors.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would take some time to complete the survey when it arrives. Your knowledge about this topic can prove very valuable to the present and future direction of the athletic training field.

Thank you,

Bridgett M. Passauer, M.S., Ed, ATC
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford

APPENDIX H

SURVEY COVER LETTER

University of Pittsburgh

April 22, 2004

Dear Program Director:

As an athletic training program director, you have additional roles and responsibilities assigned to you over and above other athletic trainers. As a former athletic training program director, I had many additional roles and responsibilities that were over and above those assigned to clinical and staff athletic trainers. Because of my experience, I became interested in discovering if my colleagues face similar challenges and adjustments. The focus of this research is the educational preparation of undergraduate athletic training program directors. Knowing if you perceive your educational experience as adequately preparing you to carry out those additional roles and responsibilities is an important aspect to the growth of our field.

This survey gives you the unique opportunity to express your opinions on several issues that relate to the roles and responsibilities of being an athletic training program director. You will also have the opportunity to indicate how the preparation experience may be enhanced.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The Institutional Review Board at the University of Pittsburgh has approved this survey for the purpose of my doctoral dissertation. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about this study. Please email me at passauer@exchange.upb.pitt.edu or call me at 814-362-5052.

Thank you for your participation. It is greatly appreciated.

To begin the survey, please click on the following: http://www.upb.pitt.edu/webapps/athletic_training_survey/index.asp

Sincerely,

Bridgett M. Passauer, M.S., Ed, ATC
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A report from the education task force" (1996). <u>NATA News,</u> February 19-27.

Accreditation, C. o. A. H. E. a. (1991). "Essentials and Guidelines for an Accredited Educational Program for the Athletic Trainer." (1991). Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation.

Behnke, R. (1991). "NATA "approved" to CAHEA "accredited: The transition." *NATA News*: April: 4-5.

Bennett, J. B. (1990). The dean and the department chair. *Educational Record, 71*(1), 24-26.

Berger, S. & Passauer, B. (2003). *Management training/development in higher education: A benchmark study*. Unpublished. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 28 (3), 314-329.

Carroll, J. B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education,* 32(6), 669-688.

Carroll, J. B. & Gmelch, W. H. (1992). *A factor-analytic investigation of role types and profiles of higher education department chairs.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

172

Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs: Standards and Guidelines for the Athletic Trainer. (2001).

"Competencies in athletic training." (1983) Greenville, North Carolina: National Athletic Trainers' Association.

Delforge, G. (1982). "The athletic training major: a report from the Professional Education Committee." *Athletic Training, JNATA* 17: 288-290.

Delforge, G. & Behnke, R. (1999). "The history and evolution of athletic training in the United States." *Journal of Athletic Training* 34(Number 1, January-March): 53-61.

Dudek-Shriber, L. (1997). "Leadership qualities of occupational therapy department program directors and the organizational health of their departments." *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 51, 369-377.

Freesemann, K.W. (2000). *An evaluation of select athletic training education programs administration and educational structure*. An unpublished dissertation. University of Southern California.

Foster, T. (1995). "The Father of Modern Athletic Training: William E. "Pinky" Newell." *NATA News* February: 4;6;8.

Franke, A. H. (2001). *The A B C's of training for department chairs and deans*. Paper presented at United Educators Insurance, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Gmelch W. H. & Burns, J. S. (1991). *Sources of stress for academic department chairs: A national study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Boston.

Gmelch, W. H. & Gates, G. S. (1995). *The stressful journey of the department chair: An academic in need of a compass and clock.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Green, L., Murata, P., Lynch, W. & Puffer, J. (1991). A characterization of the imminent leadership transition in academic Family Medicine. *Academic Medicine, 66*(3), 154-158.

Hopson, C. S. (1995). *Mentoring new administrators*. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Meeting of Southern States Communication Association, New Orleans.

Jennerich, E. J. (1981). Competencies of department chairpersons: Myths and realities. *Liberal Education, 67*, 46-70.

Kauth, B. (1984). "The Athletic Training Major." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* October: 11-15.

Meredith, G. & Wunsch, M. (1991). The leadership of department chairpersons: Time/resource management, rewards, frustrations, and role satisfaction. *Psychological Reports, 68*(2), 451-454.

Murray, J. & Murray J. (1996). *Job dissatisfaction and turnover among two year college department/division chairpersons.* Paper presented at the Fifth Annual International Conference for Community & Technical College Chairs, Deans, and Other Organizational Leaders, Phoenix/Mesa.

National Athletic Trainers' Association (1990). "AMA endorses athletic training as allied health profession." *NATA News*. September: 4.

National Athletic Trainers' Association. (1994). "JRC-AT update," *NATA News*. May, pg. 34.

National Athletic Trainers' Association (1997). "NATA Board of Directors adopts recommendations for education reform." *NATA News* January: 6, 17

National Athletic Trainers' Association Professional Education Committee. (1991). Athletic Training Education Newsletter, December.

NATA Education Task Force. (1997). "Recommendations to Reform Athletic Training Education." *NATA News* February: 16-24.

National Education Council (2001). NATA Education Council Implementation Timeline. Retrieved September 14, 2001 at http://www.cewl.com/ec/timeline_1.html

Newell, W. E. (1984). "Keynote Address: Reflections on Athletic Training." *Athletic Training* 19(Winter): 256-259; 311.

O'Neill, A., Simplicio, J. S. C., & Martin, G. (1996). *Survival skills for non-tenured department chairpersons.* Paper presented at the Thirteenth Annual Conference Academic Chairpersons: Approaches to Accountability, Orlando, Florida.

O'Shea, M. (1980). A History of the National Athletic Training Association, National Athletic Trainers' Association

Perry, W. L. (2000). *The role of the academic physical therapy department chair as perceived by physical therapy faculty and chairs*. An unpublished dissertation, Andrews University.

Pettit, J. M. (1999). Situating midlevel manager's training: Learning and doing in context. In A. M. a. B. Cohen, Florence B. (Ed.), *Preparing Department Chairs for Their Leadership Roles* (Vol. XXXVII, pp. 57-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ragan, J. G. & Reham, Q. N. (1996). "Earning profiles of department heads: Comparing cross-section and panel models." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 49 (2), 256-272.

Ray, R. & Schrader J. (1996). "Renewing athletic training education: A step into the future." <u>NATA News</u> February: 17-18.

Roach, J. H. L. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities. *Educational Record, 57*(Winter), 13-23.

Rohrer, W. M. (1990). *Leadership, performance, evaluation and development of the academic chairperson in health professions*. An unpublished dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Scheiderer, L. L. (1986). Program Director and Department Chairperson Preferences for Undergraduate Professional Preparation of Athletic Trainers. <u>College of Education</u>. Athens, Ohio University**:** 288.

Schwank, W. C. & Miller, S. J. (1971). "New dimensions for the athletic training profession: A curriculum for athletic trainers." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* September: 41-23.

Seedorf, R. G. & Gmelch, W. H. (1989). *The department hair: A descriptive study.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Convention, San Francisco.

Singleton, B. (1987). Sources and consequences of role conflict and role ambiguity. *Capstone Journal of Education, 7*, 39-50.

Starkey, C. (2001). Educational Task Force Recommendations. B. Passauer. Corry. (Email correspondence).

Townsend, B. K. & Bassoppo-Mayo, S. (1996). *If I'd only known: Administrative preparation that could have made a difference.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Tucker, A. (1993). *Chairing the Academic Department*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Williams, J. O. (1991). Academic department head as key university administrator. *Education, 112*(2), 164-167.