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PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP

Legal Issues For Academic Programs In CSD: Tools For Understanding And Proactive Positioning

Gary J. Rentschler, Ph.D.; Duquesne University
Jennifer Horner, Ph.D., JD; Medical University of South Carolina
John F. Burns, JD, The Ohio University.

The 2003 Annual Conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico, included a Pre-Conference Workshop for Program Directors, Clinic Directors, Clinical Supervisors, and Faculty on Wednesday April 9, 2003. The Workshop moderator was Gary J. Rentschler, Ph.D., Clinic Director and Coordinator of Clinical Education at Duquesne University, Jennifer Horner, Ph.D., JD, Associate Professor and Director of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Health Professions at the Medical University of South Carolina, and John F. Burns, JD, Director of Legal Affairs and Professor of Law at The Ohio University.

Dr. Rentschler, Dr. Horner, and Mr. Burns prepared the materials included as part of the proceedings of the Annual Conference, which primarily included Teaching Points (Appendix A) prepared by the moderator, Dr. Rentschler; the Select Cases in Academic Law (Appendix B) dealing with program and clinical operations prepared by Dr. Horner, and three (3) hypothetical cases (Appendix C) and their questions and answers prepared by Dr. Horner and Mr. Burns.

Dr. Rentschler’s fifteen (15) Teaching Points are designed to show the many types of legal/practical issues that arise in an academic program and clinical practice setting, and are also designed to initiate discussions on the legal issues facing faculty and academic administrators today. The Teaching Points raise a series of questions,
which are dependent in the facts and circumstance for each particular college/university program; but which are generally common to all academic and clinical programs.

Dr. Horner’s thirty nine (39) Select Cases on nine (9) general topics in the area of Academic Law focus on both the historical and contemporary landmark and unique cases that guide universities and academic administrators in trying to apply legal principles and precedents to very unique and specific factual settings and problems, with the understanding that there will always be new issues and case decisions that will apply to future issues and problems in academic programs and clinical operations.

The three (3) hypothetical cases prepared by Dr. Horner and Mr. Burns are designed to provide an opportunity for critical thinking, discussion, and debate over the proper legal, as well as practical approaches and alternatives, to dealing with the issues and questions raised in the hypotheticals. The basic point the panel is seeking to make in this portion of the program is that faculty members and academic administrators have to be sure they understand the facts and issues to the greatest extent possible before making decisions and that in the majority of circumstances where legal and practical issues have to be considered in decision making, it is very important to making a thoughtful decision to proceed, rather than wait for another party to make a decision, such as a grievance or lawsuit being filed.

With respect to the questions posed in the three (3) hypothetical cases the basic “answers” as suggested by the presenters are as follows:

A. Clinical Program At State University

(1) It is generally wise decision making at a college or university, specifically at a public university, whose records are often open to the public, to be open, honest, and specific in responses to the public, media, internal constituencies, legislators, and so forth and to keep the institution’s basic core values and goals as a clear part of the communication message, fully
understanding that problematic issues and events may cloud the message. However, an institution should always keep its message on point so it will ultimately be recognized as much as possible to assure public support for the institution.

(2) In a contemporary college or university clinical programs, the related courses, internships, affiliation agreements, and do forth are all subject to federal and state law and university rules and regulations to a great degree. A faculty member or academic administrator should be familiar with changing or developing legal issues in the discipline, and he or she should seek the most thoughtful and helpful advice from attorneys when appropriate.

B. Aphasia Grant At A Private University

(1) Development of a copyright policy in an academic setting is an important step because an institution needs to balance precisely its interests in financial gain and public relations, with a faculty member’s (author’s/creator’s) interests in the creative and economic value of owning his or her work and the monetary value to be personally received. These issues can and are usually resolved through specific policies and procedures involving ownership and assignment of copyrights.

(2) Faculty members should always be cognizant of balancing their caring/concern for a student or a faculty colleague with the ethical and moral responsibility of providing fair and accurate information in a recommendation. It is generally better to error on the side of no response to a recommendation request, if a response would be less than positive. Also, it is very important for faculty members and staff to avoid putting themselves into a position where they may create a perceived, as well as an actual, ethical conflict of interest of giving an inaccurate or an
enhanced recommendation.

C. More Problems At Public (State) University

(1) As noted in Hypothetical #1, a President or his/her spokespersons have to first deal with accurate and updated facts when dealing with the media or interest groups. The president of the institution should be advised to find/appoint someone who can investigate/administer any conflict of interest issues and report whether any action needs to be taken.

(2) Although the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution says no law should be passed restricting freedom of association; there are many federal and state laws and regulations that limit and restrict the above principle. Both faculty and academic administrators need to be aware of First Amendment issues; however, faculty members and their students do not have constitutional right to fraternize; and universities, both public and private, can adopt reasonable policies restricting certain types of relationships.

(3) The scope of the concept of academic freedom has been the issue of political debates and legal decisions for over one-half of the past century. Although academic freedom today still retains the principle of allowing wide latitude in the teaching of controversial academic subjects and issues; it does not include the freedom to engage in criminal activities, be it felonies or misdemeanors, or violate reasonable university policies dealing with harassment and fraternization issues.

(4) Under the Health Insurance Portability Access and Accountability Act, generally known as HIPAA, individual employees of so called "Covered Entities" are not going to be held personally responsible for violations of HIPAA or the HIPAA regulations, which are initially in place
as of April 14, 2003. However, a “Covered Entity” like a public or private university, can be found “liable” and fined $25,000/ occurrence for HIPAA violations. To avoid this somewhat remote possibility the faculty and staff of each public or private university or college should and must plan for their staff to undergo proper training programs regarding HIPAA.

This information and attached documents are designed to provide the Council of Academic Programs Communication Sciences and Disorders Conference attendees a basic outline of the workshop on the legal issues affecting the operations of academic programs and clinical operations of their institutions. The presenters’ advice is intended to make the attendees aware of the pertinent federal and state laws and regulations, cases and changes in the implementation and administration of these laws and regulations; and this can continue to be accomplished through the Council’s future programs and with the assistance of their individual institutional legal counsel.
# APPENDIX A

## LEGAL ISSUES PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP

### Teaching Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Responsibility to the Patient:</strong> Nonmaleficence and holding the patient’s welfare in highest regard are fundamental principles of ethics. Some states hold the licensee (not the student) responsible for a patient’s treatment. ASHA requires 25% supervision of students doing therapy; which can leave 75% of treatment unattended. Should a patient be harmed, who is responsible for what happens to the patient – the student, faculty, off-site supervisor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* How and where are the lines of responsibility drawn in situations of malpractice or incompetence involving student clinicians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Student/Faculty Relationships:</strong> Students and faculty have sort of a “yin-yang” relationship in the academic environment. Over the years, it seems the “yin” has become a much bigger force, with more and more rights. What is the current legal perspective on the rights of students and of faculty in terms of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sexual/racial discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Probation policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Course descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Faculty are spending more time “documenting” marginal student performances, leaving less time to work with good students. Course syllabi read more like sections of the penal code than statements to inspire students. How did these changes come about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Requirements of Off-Campus Placements:</strong> Some practicum sites impose requirements which exceed those of the university. For example, some sites require students to undergo a criminal background check or pass a drug test as a prerequisite for the placement. At what point do we consider these an invasion of our privacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* What do we do if a student refuses to submit to a background check, drug test, or other requirement in order to qualify for a placement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Educating Students Off-Campus**: When a student receives part of their university education at an off campus site, how is responsibility determined for a student when he or she:

- Fails to meet academic standards (off-site instructors do not always have the same standards as on-site instructors)
- Does not receive adequate instruction
- Misbehaves
- Causes or suffers an accident
- Is involved in malpractice?

* How much responsibility does an academic program assume sending a student to an off-campus site for part of his/her education? How much authority does the program yield to the site?

5. **Human Subjects in Research**: How do I insure that I am following the law when obtaining *informed consent* when using research subjects who are communicatively-impaired?

* When a potential subject has a cognitive or communicative impairment, what precautions should I take to assure that they understand the parameters and implications of the research project in which I would like them to participate?

6. **Intellectual Property**: Who owns the work when an employee invents something on work time or the data when a faculty member does research? What about joint research projects, with another faculty member or a student?

* Do similar rules apply when an employee creates something on his/her own time, even though it directly relates to a specific project they are working on at their place of employment?

Joint authorship; "Work for Hire"

7. **Copyright**: How have the standards of the laws governing copyright changed to meet the digital age?

* What governs how I can use copyrighted material in my academic and clinical teaching? How should students use copyrighted materials in their assignments?
(Teach Act; distance learning, concept of Fair Use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. <strong>Academic Dishonesty:</strong></th>
<th>If a student violates a copyright or plagiarizes material on his/her thesis or dissertation, is the faculty advisor equally liable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Do students need to be forewarned that their papers will be screened by software programs designed to detect plagiarism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. <strong>Specialty Recognition/Credentialing:</strong></th>
<th>As a practitioner having been awarded specialty recognition, should your work be held to a higher standard than other practitioners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* As a member of a specialty recognition credentialing board (or other not-for-profit organization), what additional risk or liability to you expose yourself to?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. <strong>HIPAA:</strong></th>
<th>Some of the situations in university clinics covered under HIPAA seem to contradict the intent of greater privacy and security. Were legislators only thinking of the large medical and health care conglomerates when HIPAA was created, or did they envision the impact on educational facilities as well?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* HIPAA does not supercede other ethical responsibilities and client protections. How do we decide what is required to best safeguard a client's interests?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. <strong>Letters of Recommendations and Phone References:</strong></th>
<th>Under FERPA (the Buckley Amendment) faculty cannot disclose information about a student's educational experience and performance without their written permission. When a prospective employer calls a faculty member for an employment reference, what should (and shouldn't) we do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* What are you obligated to disclose in a letter of recommendation? For example, if you have knowledge that an action was taken against a student or co-worker because of a drug problem, yet you were personally never directly informed of the problem, what are your ethical and legal obligations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. <strong>Conflicts of Interest:</strong></th>
<th>Through restructuring, consolidation, reassignment of responsibilities, a push toward entrepreneurialship in the academic setting, and other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
factors in today’s workplace, many faculty members are called upon to do many things. How do program managers steer clear of conflicts of interest?

* There are many potential sources of conflicting interests in today’s workplace. Can you give us some guiding principles that will enable us to objectively assess situations in which there is risk?

| 13. | **Faculty Practice Plans:** Many programs have a faculty practice plan in which faculty generate personal income or provide services (without students) outside the educational mission of the university. This often stirs the ire of practitioners in private practice or other agencies, who see this as unfair competition. Is this a “risky” venture given that most universities are state supported and/or have been granted tax exempt status?

* What are the legal boundaries of faculty practice plans and how can they be kept from being viewed as unfair competition by other service providers in the community who we rely upon to accept our students for externship placements?

| 14. | **Academic Freedom:** A faculty member’s right to do or say what they wish is one of the landmark privileges which separate academia from other forms of work life. Certainly there must be limitations. What happens when the freedoms of two faculty member clash?

* There are situations where academic freedoms could impinge on public safety or governmental policies. What do you see as the boundaries of academic freedom? |
APPENDIX B

Academic Law: *Select Cases*

Jennifer Horner

Medical University of South Carolina; Charleston, SC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1— Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (1961). “[T]he right to attend a public college or university is not in and of itself a constitutional right.” Nevertheless, students who are dismissed for misconduct (as distinct from failing to meet academic standards) deserve notice, an opportunity to be heard by an impartial panel, and a right to inspect pertinent reports by university officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2— Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, 435 U.S. 78 (1978). The U.S. Supreme Court reviewed a case involving dismissal of a student from medical school due to her failure to perform academically and clinically. Where a student violates rules of conduct, and is dismissed for disciplinary reasons, a hearing is required. In contrast, when a student is dismissed for academic reasons, “far less stringent procedural requirements” are necessary. “Courts are particularly ill-equipped to evaluate academic performance,” and academic dismissals rest on “the academic judgment of school officials.” Therefore, assuming the university’s decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious, the court will not second guess a university’s decision to dismiss a student for academic reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3— Abalkhail v. Claremont University Center, No. B014012 (Cal. Ct. App. Feb. 27, 1986), <em>cert denied</em>, 107 S. Ct. 186 (1986). Students have a significant legal interest in obtaining a degree and are entitled to procedural fairness. “At a minimum, a fair hearing requires adequate notice of the charges, a reasonable opportunity to respond, and an impartial hearing panel.” In this case, a student was accused of plagiarizing a major portion of his dissertation. His Ph.D. was revoked. After carefully reviewing the facts and the procedures, the court upheld the university’s decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4— Crook v. Baker, 813 F.2d 88 (6th Cir. 1987). Crook received a Master of Science in Geology and Mineralogy, but it was later discovered that he had fabricated data, and his degree was rescinded. The student was afforded procedural process. Furthermore, because the university’s decision was “not arbitrary or capricious, or lacking in a rational basis,” he was afforded substantive due process. The court upheld the university’s decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5— Fussell v. Louisiana Business College of Monroe, 519 So. 2d 384 (La. App. 2 Cir. 1988). Student was dismissed for allegedly engaging in behavior that “disrupted the scholastic program of the college.” The circumstances involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dissatisfaction by students in a legal secretary program regarding the qualifications of the instructors, the poor job placement record, and the admission of unqualified students. Neither the documentation nor the testimony by students, teachers or administrators could support the decision to dismiss plaintiff. The court held that plaintiff’s behavior did not justify her suspension.

6— **Ku v. State of Tennessee, 322 F.3d 431 (6th Cir. 2003).** Student alleged he was not given procedural due process when he was placed on a leave of absence from medical school. First, the court recognized that Ku had a “constitutionally protectable property interest in continuing his medical studies.” Second, the court found that the probation involved an academic (not a disciplinary) decision in light of the student handbook, which stated: “[e]valuation of academic performance may include (but is not necessarily limited to) measuring the student's knowledge, testing how the student applies such knowledge to specific problems, evaluation of the judgement a student employs in solving problems and assessing the quality of the student's psychomotor skills, ethical behavior and interpersonal relationships with medical colleagues, patients and patient's families.” The court held that the university followed procedures that were careful, reasonable, and deliberate and that the procedural due process requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment were satisfied. In response to the substantive due process complaint, the court cited a U.S. Supreme Court precedent: “University faculties must have the widest range of discretion in making judgments as to the academic performance of students and their entitlement to promotion or graduation” (Regents of Univ. of Mich. v. Ewing, 474 U.S. 214, 225 (1985). (Powell, J., concurring)).

---

**Academic Freedom and The First Amendment**

1— **Dong v. Board of Trustees of Stanford University, 236 Cal. Rptr. 912 (Cal. App. 6 Dist. 1987).** Dong accused Lucas of research fraud; Dong, in turn, accused Lucas of research fraud. Dong insisted that he had a right to access the university’s investigative (disciplinary) report regarding Lucas, in order to expose “the existence of fraud in publicly–funded research.” When the university denied him access to the report, he sued the university for infringement of his freedom of speech. In a U.S. Supreme Court case—*Sweezy v. New Hampshire*—Justice Frankfurter defined academic freedom as entailing “‘four essential freedoms’ of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.” Academic freedom is grounded in the First Amendment. However, the freedom of speech does not give a professor the “license” to disrupt or interfere with the operations of the university. Furthermore, according to the court, Dong’s right to speak does not impose on the university the obligation to listen. Dong’s lawsuit failed.

2— **Board of Regents of University of Wisconsin System v. Southworth, 529 U.S. 217, 237 (2000).** Brown, a master’s degree candidate challenged his thesis committee’s decision to disapprove his thesis because he had written a
scathing and profane “Disacknowledgments” section. The committee said it did not conform to the university’s standards, and the court agreed. Brown alleged a violation of his First Amendment rights. “[E]ducators can, consistent with the First Amendment, restrict student speech provided that the limitation is reasonably related to a legitimate pedagogical purpose.”

3— Salehpour v. University of Tennessee, 159 F.3d 199 (6th Cir. 1998). Student’s freedom of speech not violated when he was disciplined because his speech disrupted the educational environment.

4— Urofsky v. Gilmore, 216 F.3d 401 (4th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 121 S. Ct. 759 (2001). First Amendment not offended by a regulation that restricts faculty from accessing sexually explicit material on computers owned by the state.

5— Hoover v. Morales, 164 F.3d 221 (5th Cir. 1998). Professors who work as paid consultants or expert witnesses for parties opposing the state in litigation are protected by their right under the First Amendment to speak on matters of public concern.

6— Vanderhurst v. Colorado Mountain College District, 208 F.3d 908 (10th Cir. 2000). University did not violate a junior college professor’s free speech under the First Amendment when he was disciplined for using inappropriate (vulgar) language in the classroom.

### Academic Malpractice

**Miller v. Loyola University of New Orleans, 829 So.2d 1057 (La. App. 4 Cir. 2002)** (rejecting a student’s complaint regarding the quality of a course). Most states do not recognize “educational malpractice” claims. Montana is an exception. B.M. v. State, 649 P.2d 425, 427-28 (Mont. 1982) (placing a duty of care on educators). Eleven other states have considered, and rejected such claims under either tort or contract principles: Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Wisconsin. In *Miller*, the Louisiana Appellate Court rejected an educational malpractice claim under tort principles because there is not a uniform “standard of care” by which to judge teaching methods, because there is “inherent uncertainty” regarding cause and damages, and the court recognized the importance of academic freedom. Unless there is a breach of a specific contractual promise, there is no claim. Other theories considered and rejected by this court were: unjust enrichment, and detrimental reliance. The dissenting opinion lamented the lack of accountability in higher education, and opined that universities should be held, at least, to principles of “good faith and fair dealing” under contract law. See also Alligood v. County of Erie, 749 N.Y.S.2d 349 (N.Y. App. Div. 4, 2002) (no cause of action for educational malpractice in the State of New York.).

### Conflict of Interest

1— *Moore v. Regents, 793 P.2d 479 (Cal. 1990).* When Moore underwent blood tests and a splenectomy for hairy-cell leukemia, his physicians
harvested unique blood cells from Moore without telling him. The clinical researchers patented the cell-line, which was highly profitable. Moore sued them and lost on his property claim. However, the court held that the physicians breached their fiduciary duty to Moore by “fail[ing] to disclose the extent of their research and economic interests in Moore’s cells before obtaining consent to the medical procedures.”

2— **Gross v. University of Tennessee, 448 F. supp. 245 (W.D. Tenn. 1978).** When two professors at the Center for the Health Sciences refused to sign a Medical Practice Income Agreement, their positions were terminated. The court rejected their due process and equal protection claims, holding that plaintiffs had “no constitutional right to engage in the unlimited private practice of medicine while holding a public position of employment.”

3— **Odrich v. Trustees of Columbia University in City of New York, 747 N.Y.S.2d 342 (N.Y. Sup. 2002).** Fee-splitting of professional services is permitted in New York if those persons are “partners, employees, associate in a profession firm or corporation, professional subcontractor or consultant…” (Education Law s 6530(19)). Thus, fee-splitting between two ophthalmologists and Columbia Ophthalmology Consultants [COC], the duly incorporated faculty practice corporation, was legal. (“[T]he entities which are permitted to share fees...are those who in return share a correlative responsibility to the patients.”) However, after the doctors had severed ties with COC, they were told they could engage in practice at the medical school on condition that they paid “a 10% share of ‘all practice income,’ wherever generated.” The court held that this demand was illegal. “The ban on fee-splitting was...created to protect patients from inflated billings and clandestine partnerships which have the potential to compromise health care decisions.”

4— **Truong v. Regents of University of California, (Cal. App. 4 Dist. 2002).** Truong alleged that the university’s failure to reappointment him was due to discrimination based on his race and national origin, whereas the university said the dismissal was for financial reasons. In turn, Truong claimed that they were forcing him to participate in an illegal compensation plan. Throughout the State of California, faculty are required to share a portion of their clinical fees with the university. The court held that such contractual arrangements within a “faculty medical practice plan” did not violate the statute against referral fees or inducements, or fee-splitting.

5—**Institutional Conflicts of Interest**

- Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). *Protecting Subjects, Preserving Trust, Promoting Progress II: Principles and Recommendations for Oversight of an Institution’s Financial Interests in Human Subjects Research* (October 2002) (acknowledging that public trust and accountability are at stake in situations where an institution has ownership or investment interests in a research sponsor; emphasizing that patient safety and welfare could be compromised; recommending that administrative oversight for finances and for human research should be “full and reliably” separate).
Association of American Universities (AAU) Task Force on Research Accountability. Report on Individual and Institutional Conflict of Interest (October 2001) (defining individual financial conflict of interest as “situations in which financial considerations may compromise, or have the appearance of compromising, an investigator’s professional judgement in conduct or reporting research”; and an institutional financial conflict of interest as when the institution or its agents “has an external relationship or financial interest in a company that itself has a financial interest in a faculty research project”).


Faculty Affairs; Employment Disputes

1— Maron v. United States, No. 96-1492 (4th Cir. 1997). Maron, a renowned cardiologist at N.I.H. sued his former colleagues for intentional infliction of emotional distress, civil conspiracy, and invasion of privacy. The court held that the colleagues had acted within the scope of their federal employment at the time of the alleged acts. As such their employer, the United States, was substituted as the defendant and was immune from liability under the Federal Tort Claims Act 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), 2679(b)(1) (Feres v. U.S., 340 U.S. 135 (1950)).

2— University of Baltimore v. Iz, 716 A.2d 1107 (Md. App. 1998). A university enjoys wide discretion in the tenure review process. Collegiality may be considered in tenure and promotion decisions, as long as it is not used as a pretext for discrimination. Held, for the university.

3— Katzberg v. Regents of University of California, 29 Cal.4th 300 (Cal. 2002). The position of chair is an “at-will” position (terminable without cause). A United States Supreme Court case has found that “an at-will [public] employee’s liberty interests are deprived when his discharge is accompanied by charges ‘that might serious damage his standing and associations in his community’ or ‘impose on him a stigma or other disability that foreclose[s] his freedom to take advantage of other employment opportunities’; as such, the injured party has a right to a “name-clearing hearing.” Board of Regents v. Roth, 408 U.S. 564 (1972). When Katzberg was removed as chair during an investigation about misallocation of funds, he rejected an opportunity for a name-clearing hearing; instead, he sued for money damages for the violation of his liberty interest. The court held that a “constitutional tort” for damages is not available when meaningful alternative remedies are available.

4— Flaskamp v. Dearborn Public Schools (E.D. Mich. 2002). Where a teacher engaged in a sexual relationship with a student, he defended his right to do so under the constitutional right to “freedom of association.” The
court rejected his defense, because nonfamilial associations are not protected by the First Amendment.

5— **Karle v. Board of Trustees/ Marshall University, 575 S.E.2d 267 (W.Va. 2002).** Karle appealed the denial of her tenure, alleging that the process was unfair and the result was wrong. The court reviewed the findings of an administrative law judge and found: “The record demonstrates that the decision to deny appellant tenure was based upon the exercise of professional judgment and on the basis of factors bearing upon the appropriateness of conferring academic tenure.” The court will not overturn a tenure committee’s decision to deny tenure “unless shown to be arbitrary and capricious or clearly wrong.”

6— **Peterson v. State of North Dakota ex rel. North Dakota University System, 240 F.Supp.2d 1055 (D.N.D. 2003).** Faculty member’s dismissal followed two events. First, she shared confidential information about a student to a classroom of students. Second, she criticized administration policy. Following her dismissal, she sued on the grounds of violation of substantive due process (under the Fourteenth Amendment), which the court rejected, because a contractual employment contract with the state does not trigger substantive due process protection. On the other hand, she does have a protected property interest that triggers procedural due process protection—namely “notice and an opportunity to be heard”—which she was given. She also argued that her dismissal was in retaliation for the exercise of her First Amendment rights. The court disagreed, because the speech at issue, while job-related, was not of “public concern”—that is, was not about matters “of political, social, or other concern to the community,” as “determined by the content, form, and context” of the speech. Peterson’s dismissal was upheld.

---

**Intellectual Property**

1— **Speck v. North Carolina Dairy Foundation, 319 S.E.2d 139 (N.C. 1984).** Speck, a professor of food science and microbiology discovered a secret process that led to the production of “Sweet Acidophilus” while working at NC State University. The Dairy Foundation arranged for the licensing and marketing of the milk using the trademark “Sweet Acidophilus.” NCSU received royalties from these licensing agreements but Dr. Speck received none. He sued, alleging the NCSU had “breached their fiduciary duties by using the secret process to their own advantage.” The court rejected this claim, because the “rights of employer and employee in an invention or discovery by the latter arise from the contract of employment. The fruit of the labor of one who is hired to invent, accomplish a prescribed result, or aid in the development of products belongs to the employer absent a written
contract to assign [the rights in the product to the employer].” Therefore, Dr. Speck never possessed any legal interest in the process that he discovered.

2— **Salinger v. Random House, 811 F.2d 90 (2d Cir. 1987).** J.D. Salinger challenged the publisher’s intent to publish a biography that included portions of letters he had written and had no intention of publishing. The letters were in the libraries of Harvard, Princeton, and the University of Texas. The biographer had both paraphrased and quoted from Salinger’s letters under the “fair use” provisions of the Copyright Act. First, the court noted that “unpublished [literary works] normally enjoy insulation from fair use copying”; in other words, the author has, under the Copyright Act, “the right of first publication.” Second, the court found that the biographer had both directly quoted or closely paraphrased from Salinger’s letters. Third, the court emphasized that it was permissible for the biographer to cite facts from the letters, but not Salinger’s creative expression. In summary, the court found in Salinger’s favor, because the biographer appropriated Salinger’s creative expression and because Salinger, as the author and holder of copyright in these original works, had the right to control first publication (including the right not to publish). The biographer’s use was not “fair use” under the Copyright Act.

3— **Chavez v. Arte Publico Press, 204 F.3d 601 (5th Cir. 2000).** Chavez asserted that the University of Houston breached a contract when it continued to publish her book after she left the university, and misappropriated her name without compensation. There were several strikes against her: first, contract law is governed by state, not federal law; second, the fact that statutorily created rights in property [Trademark Remedy Clarification Act, Copyright Remedy Clarification Act] do not trigger Fourteenth Amendment due process rights; and, third, a statute written by Congress cannot abrogate a state’s Eleventh Amendment immunity from lawsuits by private citizens (in other words, “states are subject to federal law when they undertake activities regulated by it…the Eleventh Amendment only shields them from being sued in federal court” by private citizens). (The U.S. Supreme Court has addressed the validity of 15 U.S.C. § 1122; 17 U.S.C. §§ 501, 511.) For all of these reasons, Chavez cannot sue the state university.

4— **Madey v. Duke University, 307 F.3d 1351 (C.A. Fed. 2002).** Madey sued Duke for infringement of his patents. In its defense, Duke used the “experimental use” doctrine to defend its position, saying it had a right to use the equipment “solely for experimental or other non-profit purposes.” The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit rejected this assertion because “experimental use” is limited to actions performed “for amusement, to satisfy idle curiosity, or for strictly philosophical inquiry.” Therefore, if the use has the “slightest commercial implication”—whether or not the user has a non-profit status—there is infringement. Furthermore, just because a federal grant was involved (thereby giving the government a license to use the patented equipment), the government’s right did not encompass Duke’s use.
5— Regents Of University Of New Mexico v. Knight, 321 F.3d 1111 (Ct. App. Fed. 2003). Knight alleged that the university did not own his inventions (and patents) because he had not assigned them to the university. Under the UMN Patent Policy, the university claimed that Knight had a contractual obligation to assign the patents. Even though 35 U.S.C. § 261 stipulates that the inventor is the owner, when Knight signed the Co-Inventor Agreement, he effectively assigned (transferred) ownership rights to the university.

**Specialty Recognition/Credentialing**

Parrish D. The Scientific Misconduct Definition and Falsification of Credentials. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS REPORT (AAAS) 1996; 9(4). Both the Office of Research Integrity and the National Science Foundation consider falsification of one’s credentials to be “scientific misconduct.” According to Parrish, the ramifications are very serious:

“Federal funds have been recovered from the institution that employed the researcher who presented false credentials and a researcher falsifying his credentials may be prosecuted under other federal and state laws. The researcher can be sued for fraud and misrepresentation and may be prosecuted criminally for embezzlement, theft by deception, false pretenses or impersonation. Some states have statutes making it a misdemeanor to claim to have a degree that one does not possess. Further, if the falsified credentials resulted in the funding of a grant application that would not otherwise have been funded, the researcher may be prosecuted under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 or the False Claims Act, 18 U.S.C. § 287, which prohibit falsification in documents or claims submitted to the United States government. Companies and institutions who discover an employee has falsified a credential have taken a variety of actions against the individual, from issuing a reprimand to terminating the employee.”

**Student Affairs; Discrimination and Breach of Contract**

1— Litman v. George Mason University, No. 98-1742 (4th Cir. 1999). Litman reported sexual harassment by a former professor, which ultimately led to her expulsion from the university. She then alleged sexual discrimination in violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. s. 1681 et seq.), and the university countered that it was immune for liability under the Eleventh Amendment (42 USC s 2000d-7(a)(1)). The court held that when the University accepted federal education funding, it waived immunity voluntarily and the lawsuit could go forward. Cf. Gupta v. Florida Board of Regents, 212 F.3d 571 (11th Cir. 2000).

3— Grutter v. Bollinger, 282 F.3d 732 (4th Cir. 2002). Students challenged the University of Michigan’s policy of using race as a factor in law school admissions decisions, asserting it violated the Equal Protection Clause of the
U.S. Constitution. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held that it is permissible as long as the public university’s interest is “compelling” and the procedure is “narrowly tailored” to serve that interest. (This is the “strict scrutiny” analysis used in constitutional equal protection cases.) (The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments for this and a companion case, Gratz v. Bollinger, on April 1, 2003. Cf. Regents of University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978) (holding that race could be one of a number of factors).)

4— Bender v. Alderson Broaddus College, 575 S.E.2d 112 (W.Va. 2002). When Bender started nursing school, a grade of 70% was required to earn a “C.” While still enrolled, the grading scale was changed, such that at 75% was required to earn a “C” and applied retroactively. Bender was unable to meet these standards and was expelled, because she was unable to complete the program within the requisite five years. Bender sued under breach of contract principles. The court acknowledged that the student-college relationship was “clearly contractual in nature,” but, “implicit in that contract is a right to change the college’s academic degree requirements if such changes are not arbitrary and capricious.” The court will consider the decisions of the educational institutional to be “valid as long as the decision is supported by substantial evidence or by a rational basis.” In short, Bender lost.

5— Bird v. Lewis & Clark College, 303 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2002). A paraplegic student alleged discrimination under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act because, she alleged, the university did not accommodate her disabilities during an overseas program. The court found in favor of the university and the appellate court affirmed. The student was disabled and the university was required to make reasonable accommodations; that is, provide “meaningful access,” and “when viewed in its entirety, is readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.” However, the ADA does not require the public entity to make “fundamental or substantial[,] modifications to its programs.”

### Research Misconduct

1— Berge v. Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama No. 95-2811 (4th Cir. 1997). Berge, a doctoral student at Cornell University, visited UAB to access a large database on cytomegalovirus (CMV) at UAB, funded in part by an NIH grant. She received her Ph.D., but had difficulty publishing her dissertation. Berge later accused a subsequent UAB doctoral student of plagiarizing her work, and accused UAB of making false statements in its annual report to NIH/NICHD. She brought suit under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 3729-3733) and a state law claim of conversion of intellectual property. The federal district court found in favor of Berge, but the federal court of appeals found in favor of UAB on all counts. First, the False Claims Act requires that false statements must be “material;” that is, “has a natural tendency to influence agency action or is capable of influencing agency action.” So, even if Berge’s allegations regarding UAB’s false statements
were true (which they were not), they were not material to NICHD's funding decision. Second, Berge's charge that the grant application plagiarized her work does not stand because UAB's professor was co-author and therefore co-owner of the copyright in the work. (The court noted that the Office of Research Integrity, ORI, does not consider credit disputes to be instances of plagiarism.) Third, Berge's charge that another doctoral student plagiarized her work was belied by the fact that the latter work had different hypotheses and conclusions. Finally, Berge's state law conversion claim was preempted by the Copyright Act (17 USC 102, 103, 301(a)).

2— Phinney v. Alderman & Verbrugge & Perlmuter, 564 N.W.2d 532 (Mich. Ct. App. 1997). In return for using Phinney's work in a grant application, Perlmutter promised her first authorship and a job in the Institute of Gerontology. Phinney relied on these promises. Later, Perlmutter used Phinney's creative work without acknowledgment, stole data and a test instrument library, and failed to hire her. When Phinney complained to the Institute's director Alderman, she was suspended, denied housing, and later fired. Phinney sued Perlmutter for fraud and misrepresentation, and Alderman, for retaliatory discharge under the state's Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA). She won on all counts. Among other important legal analyses, the court of appeals held that Phinney was allowed to sue under the WPA, because her report of suspected violations of law by "an agency receiving public money is in the public interest," and she had made her report to a "public body" (here, the University of Michigan) as required by the law.

3— Angelides v. Baylor, Fed. Reg. 64 (48): 12341 (March 12, 1999). Former professor, Department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics at Baylor College of Medicine was found by the HHS Office of Research Integrity (ORI) to have intentionally falsified data and misrepresented research results in five grant applications and in five publications. Dr. Angelides was barred from receiving federal grants for 5 years, barred from serving in any advisory capacity to PHS, and required to retract falsified figures and text. Later, Dr. Angelides sued Baylor for defamation and wrongful termination.

4— Berman v. Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, No. C01-0727L (BJR) (W.D. Wash.). A chemotherapy protocol involving two drugs, pentoxifylline (PTX) and ciprofloxacin. The patient was not informed, among other things, that seven prior protocol participants had died and that there were less risky and more effective treatments available. Furthermore PTX was referred to in the informed consent document as an agent that would inhibit tumor necrosis (Anti-TNF) resulting from the toxic effects of chemotherapy, when there were no medical data to support that assertion. The plaintiff was unable to tolerate the oral form of PTX and the intravenous form was not available, because, as the researchers knew, the manufacturer was no longer supplying it. The patient died as a result of her participation in the protocol. The court held that the defendant violated Washington's informed consent statute on the PTX claim. However, whether a similarly situated reasonable and prudent patient would have consented if she had had accurate information was a question left for a jury to decide.
5—Stewart v. Cleveland Clinic Foundation, 736 N.E.2d 491 (Ohio App. Dist. 8, 1999). Klais was diagnosed with Stage IV squamous cell carcinoma of the tongue. Dr. Adelstein, an oncology researcher, advised Klais of an experimental preoperative chemotherapy trial involving random assignment to chemotherapy + radiation therapy + surgery, or radiation therapy + surgery. He was assigned to the latter condition. No one told him that past studies had shown that the combination of chemotherapy and radiation would improve his chances of survival. Several years later, the cancer metastasized and Klais died. The tort of informed consent requires: "(a) The physician fails to disclose to the patient and discuss the material risks and dangers inherently and potentially involved with respect to the proposed therapy, if any; (b) the unrevealed risks and dangers which should have been disclosed by the physician actually materialize and are the proximate cause of the injury to the patient; and c) a reasonable person in the position of the patient would have decided against the therapy had the material risks and dangers inherent and incidental to treatment been disclosed to him or her prior to the therapy." The appellate court reversed the trial court’s ruling and remanded it for trial. The teaching point of this case is that researchers must tell a potential research participant what treatment is available outside the clinical trial.
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APPENDIX C
CASE STUDIES

# 1—Aphasia Grant at Private University

Private University is in a large city and has a medical school with a large teaching hospital which carries out $$$ Research for NIH, Big Pharma, and other sponsored research. Both undergraduate and graduate programs in the School of Speech and Hearing have cooperative relations with the medical school for faculty and students to participate in clinical research projects. Although the medical school administration and medical school physician faculty sometimes take themselves much more SERIOUSly than the academic faculty, they do cooperate on research projects.

Dr. MICHAEL MAKEMONEY, a Professor of Neurology at the medical school, has received a Big Pharma sponsored research grant to investigate aphasia and he asked NELLIE NERVOUS, Ph.D. to help with the design, application and assist in the research project. Dr. NERVOUS is a tenure-track faculty member whose penultimate year tenure decision is next year. NERVOUS has an excellent undergraduate student, SAM SERIOUS, who she thinks would be a good “worker bee” to interview, analyze and collect data on MAKEMONEY’s project. MAKEMONEY and NERVOUS hire SERIOUS at $7.50/hr. to help with the project. In addition to being very responsible on the job and an excellent student, SERIOUS is also “smart” as he keeps copy of the data he has collected and writes a paper about the project using the data he has seen and collected for another class and received an "A" for his effort.

MAKEMONEY and NERVOUS decide to prepare an article for publication in the Journal of Speech and Hearing Research about their research findings, assigning a copyrighted co-authorship submission to the publisher; and the journal starts the peer review process before publication.

In the meantime, SERIOUS decides he wants to go to graduate school in speech pathology; and finds out about MAKEMONEY’S and NERVOUS’ planned article. SERIOUS tells NERVOUS he really did much of the work and should be named as a co-author, or at least be given significant credit; and be a part of any press release about the article and future presentation at conferences and meetings. MAKEMONEY and NERVOUS consider this and tell SERIOUS "no."

SERIOUS brings the matter to the attention of the new School director WILLIAM WAFFLE, and the Dean, ROGER REPHRASE. REPHRASE appoints a committee to investigate SERIOUS' complaint. The investigation of SERIOUS' complaint leads to the finding SERIOUS was an actual co-worker on MONEY’S and NERVOUS’ project and should be given appropriate credit. Also, during the review of SERIOUS’ complaint, NERVOUS reviews SERIOUS’ paper he submitted in the other class, and finds many errors and plagiarism from NERVOUS’ other work. She makes a complaint to Private U’s student disciplinary office. Further, SERIOUS has contacted NERVOUS before NERVOUS contacted the disciplinary office, and asks NERVOUS to write a letter of recommendation for his admission to graduate school based on their academic and working relationship; SERIOUS uses Private U’s recommendation form from its Placement Office; in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the form has the option of the recommendation being “open” so SERIOUS can read the recommendation.

Questions and Discussion:

(1) What advice and counsel would you provide to NERVOUS about what she should do to avoid issues of who is an author in a program and who owns the copyright to an academic work product?

(2) What should NERVOUS do about SERIOUS’ request to provide the recommendation for admission to graduate school?

(3) What would you advise school Director WAFFLE and Dean REPHRASE to do to inform their
faculty of rules of copyright ownership and academic publications?
State University is a large public university with a college of Allied Health Programs and a School of Speech and Hearing. The School requires its majors to have clinical internship experiences and they have contacted the local community hospital, ALL-IS-WELL MEMORIAL, about placing the students in clinical internships in the hospital’s speech pathology program. ALL-IS-WELL sends the Dean of the College, DANIEL DETAIL, a five-page Affiliation Agreement with provisions requiring State U to be responsible for all the actions of its student, provide the student with a series of immunizations including Hepatitis B and Meningitis Virus, provide $1,000,000.00 of insurance coverage naming the hospital, holding harmless the hospital for the actions of the students, and provide proof of insurance for both State U and the student interns. They have also sent a Business Associate Agreement to comply with HIPAA.

The Affiliation Agreement arrives at DEAN DETAIL's office a couple of days before the student is to start the internship. The student begins the placement after Dean DETAIL has the School's clinical program director request ALL-IS-WELL to let the student start the internship, as this is a very busy time in the Dean’s office and he will review and take care of the matter soon.

ALL-IS-WELL indicates that is okay and will wait for the DEAN DETAIL to sign the Affiliation Agreement.

After about a week, a student, BOBBY BONG, starts not showing up for his scheduled work times. BONG’s SLP supervisor at ALL-IS-WELL, KATHY KIND, asks BONG why he has not been to work. BONG tells her he has not been feeling well but will be on-time for now on. BONG says he appreciates her concern and, as a “thank you,” BONG gives KIND some of his favorite marijuana joints for her and her friend. KIND does not know what to do and goes to see CARL CAREFUL, the administrator of ALL-IS-WELL Memorial Hospital.

CAREFUL tells KIND that the best thing to do is to call State U and the DEAN DETAIL’S office. He also indicates that BONG should leave the internship, as ALL-IS-WELL does not need any bad publicity about having BONG being assigned there; and administrator CARL CAREFUL says he will call the local police later to tell them what happened.

SLP supervisor KIND calls DEAN DETAIL at State U to tell him what happened. Dean DETAIL calls BONG in to tell him he is being removed from his academic program and that BONG will get an “F” in the internship course; as a result of KIND’s report, and he is going to send the information to State U student disciplinary office for their action.

Hospital administrator CAREFUL calls the local D.A., PAUL PICKY, and tells PICKY what happened. PICKY tells CAREFUL that this is a clear case of obstruction of justice in not calling the local police earlier, and CAREFUL and KIND will be called before the grand jury for not reporting the drug use to the police before they reported it to State U and DEAN DETAIL.

**Questions for discussion:**

1. What advice would you give the President of State U, SAM SMOOTH, about how to handle the incident involving BONG and ALL-IS-WELL Hospital?

2. What advice and counsel would you provide to the Provost of State U CHARLIE CLUELESS about how to structure and operate courses involving clinical internships, review of Affiliation Agreements, and administration and monitoring off-campus academic programs?
# 3—More Problems at Public University

**GERRY GIRAFFE** is the new HIPAA Privacy Director at State U. Despite the fact that he is the least favorite person on campus right now, he is getting more phone calls and emails than anyone else (go figure?)! **WILLIE WATCHDOG** calls with a concern about a fellow practicum student. According to him, **SALLIE SNOOPIE** finds medical records so fascinating, that she is reading as many as she can between her regular patients. **LAURA LAZY**, her clinical education coordinator for speech-language pathology, is usually having coffee, so she isn’t supervising **SALLIE SNOOPIE** most of the time. **WILLIE WATCHDOG**, on the other hand, has his “nose” to the ground.

Much to his surprise (and delight), **WILLIE WATCHDOG** learns that **SALLIE SNOOPIE** is actually screening medical records for a neurologist, **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES** (who thinks the rules are not for her), and is recruiting patients faster than anyone on record. After **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES** got a waiver of informed consent from the IRB, she recruited **SALLIE SNOOPIE**, promising 50$ for each successful recruitment; and as usual, money talks! Besides the publications and reputational interests at stake, **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES** and **RANDY RISKY**, the head of the IRB, already have one patent—and, if their latest research project proves their “hypothesis,” they can retire early (together, if you get our drift).

So, back at the HIPAA ranch, **GERRY GIRAFFE** is up to his neck in patient privacy notices, business associate agreements, and phone/email queries. (Rules, rules, and more rules!) A big-time researcher at the university, **FRANKIE FRANTIC** calls and asserts that this new HIPPA rule about Protected Patient Information (PHI) is infringing his freedom of speech / academic freedom. **FRANKIE FRANTIC** has just learned from his girlfriend **SALLIE SNOOPIE** that **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES** (in collusion with **RANDY RISKY** has by-passed both IRB and HIPAA rules, and is racing ahead of him in patient recruitment that he desperately needs for in order to compete for the next really-big Big Pharma contract.

When **GERRY GIRAFFE** advises **FRANKIE FRANTIC** that he shouldn’t be having a relationship with a student, and he has no inherent right to “do research,” **FRANKIE FRANTIC** asserts: under the First Amendment, I have not only a right to speak about my personal concerns, and a right to associate with whomever I want, but also a right to do my research without the government’s—or your—interference….and furthermore, I demand that you listen to my complaints! After 30 minutes of insults, **GERRY GIRAFFE** tells **FRANKIE FRANTIC** he is “stupid,” and hangs up on him. The very next day, **FRANKIE FRANTIC** files a lawsuit against State U, alleging infringement of his constitutional right to academic freedom, as well as defamation.

**Questions for Discussion:**

1. What advice would you give the President of State U, **SAM SMOOTH**, if he asked you to enforce the policy on individual and institutional conflicts of interest?

2. What advice would you offer the **RANDY RISKY** and **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES**, and, **FRANKIE FRANTIC** and **SALLIE SNOOPIE** about their respective right to freedom of association in the university context?

3. What advice would you offer **FRANKIE FRANTIC** about the scope of academic freedom?

4. If HIPAA privacy violations were to be investigated by the authorities, who would be held responsible? President **SAM SMOOTH**? Privacy Director **GERRY GIRAFFE**? IRB head **RANDY RISKY**? researcher **ALICE ANYTHING-GOES**? practicum supervisor **LAURA LAZY**? Or, SLP student (unofficial research assistant) **SALLIE SNOOPIE**?
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS:
VISIONS AND STRATEGIES BEYOND STANDARDS

Richard E. Talbott, Ph.D.
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

Good morning and welcome to the 24th Annual Meeting of the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders. I am privileged and honored to have served as President of your Association this year and to have the opportunity to work with so many bright and dedicated academic leaders, and leaders of academics, on your behalf. It would be inappropriate, I think, in this time of great international strife to not pause to thank and pray for the safe return from combat of those who are this day in harms way on our behalf.

I have had the pleasure to work with one of the most energetic and dedicated group of individuals one could imagine. The real secret to successful leadership is to surround oneself with the best and the brightest, then get out of the way and let them make you look visionary and productive. That has certainly been the case this year with the members of the Executive Board. I would like to report that you got your monies worth out of each of them for rather than simply executing the specific duties of the office to which they were elected or appointed, they all considered and contributed to the several accomplishments of the Board this year. Each of these individuals is known to you for their work on your behalf but I would ask that you join me in acknowledging their efforts on our behalf this year and ask that each stand and be recognized. First, congratulations on a very challenging job well done to Brooke Hallowell, your Vice President for Development and her committee Bob Novak, Assistant Chair, and Ellen Reuler and, of course, the work of our national office under the leadership of Frances Laven. We have once again set a record for attendance which is always a challenge to
meeting planning and is testimony to the quality of programming and collegiality that we all appreciate defines the Council. This year’s program offers a variety of topics that are critical to the future viability of our discipline—the first topic on the doctoral shortage is the result of over a year’s work by the joint ad Hoc ASHA and CAPCSD committee and obviously addresses a topic that is the lifeblood of our enterprise. The integration of Academic and Clinical learning environments and the critical “bottom line” funding issues are equally important Issues II and III respectively.

The other members of the Executive Board who will be giving individual reports on their activities at the business meeting:Past President-Mick Hanley; President Elect- John Saxman; Secretary- Harriette Gregg; Treasurer- Mick McNeil; Vice President for Communications- Trish Hargrove who could not be here today due to her Presidential duties to Minnesota; Vice President for Standards and Credentials- John Ferraro (and I might add Co-Director of the AGA—Audiology Golfers Association); Vice President for Research and Academic Development- Jan Ingham. They all deserve your appreciation and to each, a personal note of appreciation for their unselfish dedication to the Council.

In addition, a special thanks to our WEB Master (and unofficial photographer), Maurice Mendel who has done an outstanding job of making the Council’s portal to the world attractive and utilitarian. One of our most dedicated Past President’s, Elaine McNeice, is well known for her hard work and service to the organization but this year she went overboard in her efforts to “clean up” the archives of the Council and has done an outstanding job in sifting through and making current our ever expanding archive of Council activities. Elaine thanks for your continued dedication and not to mention your work in leading the Honors and Awards committee activities. I would like to acknowledge the presence of several distinguished guests including past presidents of our association, representatives from ASHA, NSSLHA, and AAA and, in particular, Council members who have given time to implement the several initiatives of the Council through their chairing standing and ad hoc committees. The names of these
individuals are on the following slides and please join me in acknowledging their professional contributions.

The State Of The Council

I am happy to report that the State of the Council is very sound and we are well positioned to assume a more proactive role in the affairs of higher education as it affects communications sciences and disorders than perhaps any time in our history. I will end this segment with a few comments pertaining to the necessity for, and our resolve, to assume this role. As you will hear in more detail throughout this meeting from those that provided the direct leadership, we have been busy with several new and continuing initiatives.

COMMUNICATION: Our close and continued excellent communication with the American Speech and Hearing Association has been facilitated for several years by a joint mini Executive Board to Executive Board meeting each year. This meeting typically occurs in January and serves as a mechanism by which we can discuss major initiatives of both organizations and, in particular, those initiatives that affect higher education in general and communication sciences and disorders in particular. These meetings are very beneficial in terms of facilitating open dialogue on matters of import to each organization and are often the springboard for joint efforts of mutual benefit. In view of the positive outcomes of these meetings the Council has also in the past few years established a similar meeting with the American Academy of Audiology and just in the past few weeks held our first joint meeting with the Council of State Association Presidents. As a part of this information exchange and with the goal of joint efforts on behalf of our respective constituents, we have added the AAA and CSAP along with ASHA to present updates at this meeting. In the future, as in the past, I am sure that we may not always agree on all policies and directions of our respective organizations but to the extent that we can find common ground the better the prognosis for success. The CSAP presentation will be included in this opening session and the ASHA and AAA updates will be at the business meeting on Saturday.
CONTINUING INITIATIVES: There are many ongoing activities that will be reported throughout this meeting but I will mention a few that have been a major focus of this year's board activities:

(1) Doctoral Shortage: I have already made reference to perhaps one of the most critical issues that continues to be a major concern of the Council and that is the issue of the lack of replenishment of our vital doctoral resources. Our future depends on success in this arena and you will hear a great deal about this issue later this morning. The collaborative work on this issue has been exemplary and the committee has done an outstanding job in developing guidelines and recommendations for addressing the problems. Special thanks to the Kim's squared- Wilcox and Oller, and Jan Ingham for their leadership in this endeavor. Stay tuned for more as the morning progresses.

(2) Political Action Network: Another continuing initiative is the establishment of a national political action network for the Council. Again, with the goal of establishing a more effective communication network from the State level to the Council and visa versa, we have identified State Council liaisons. The State liaison will serve as a major communication link between the council and the State and will work with the Council to develop a political action database of political, academic, and professional leaders. This continues to be a work in progress and we will keep you posted in future reports.

ACCREDITATION/CERTIFICATION: Accreditation and certification issues are always major areas of concern. We have enjoyed a very favorable relationship with the various Councils and Boards of ASHA charges with responsibility in these areas over the years (beyond the major challenge of keeping up with the acronyms changes from ESB to CAA, Standards Council to CFCC, and so forth). We have been invited to participate in
most of the deliberations concerning standards changes. We continue to be invited as not only an observer but as a participant in discussions by both CAA and CFCC and we appreciate this opportunity. The coordination of these activities falls to the Vice President for Credentials and Standards. John Ferraro and John Saxman before him have done an outstanding job keeping us in these very important loops. Occasionally, however, though well intentioned, one or more of these groups implements regulations that may cause some concern to the Council and it becomes necessary in the spirit of collegial guidance for us to express an amicus—a friendly, but unambiguous opinion for the good of the order. We are pleased that often these words are heeded and a certain calm is renewed throughout the land. John will have more comments in his report on Saturday in this regard. In summary, we take very seriously our duty to be advocates for maintaining the public trust through rigorous and appropriate accreditation and certification standards. We equally seek to effect a balance between the need for same and the need to protect ourselves from unwarranted and unnecessary intrusion into the academic environment absent compelling evidence of the benefit on student education and patient care.

New Initiatives

Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Data Management: During the course of the activities of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the Doctoral Shortage it became apparent that even with the excellent work that our survey folks and those at ASHA and other professional organization do, there were gaps in the information that would have been helpful. This triggered some discussions on the Executive Board with regard to the observation made by many of us in the Department Chair business, that we were so busy filling out surveys that we did not have time to generate any data upon which to report. In any case, these and other observations led to the proposal for joining forces with ASHA, SID 10, and other interested groups to consider better coordination and possible consolidation of our overall data acquisition and dissemination activities. An Ad Hoc working group was established and has met to discuss these issues. This falls under the responsibility of the Vice President for Research and Development and Jan Ingham
will report on the progress in more detail at the business meeting on Saturday. Can you
tell I am giving some promos for that meeting least you be tempted by the lure of the
surrounding mountains away from this important event. In any case, I did want to
emphasize that in all our discussions so far we have been clear that an important goal
will be to develop a plan whereby efficiency of acquisition, a comprehensiveness, and
validity of information are paramount; however, due recognition of and accommodation
for proprietary interests and association identification will be maintained.

As I hope you can see from the foregoing and will further appreciate as the
meeting progresses, the Council is concerned not only with reacting to issues as they
may arise but in being proactive in providing the kind of infrastructure that can respond
effectively to challenges as they may occur and in establishing sound principles upon
which decisions can be made in the future.

Maintaining The Trust—Food For Thought

In considering my comments for today, myriad approaches come to mind.
Should I try to entertain?—Not possible. Should I try to create an inspiring and uplifting
message to carry us into our deliberations? The academic community is facing some of
the toughest times nationwide that it has ever experienced. In almost every state in the
country higher education is facing budget cuts, the likes of which have not been seen in
my twenty plus years of higher education administrative involvement. I say twenty plus
to maintain some ambiguity with regard to my age; however, the amount of gray is
making it more and more difficult to obfuscate. In any case, these are indeed serious
times. One of the amazing attributes of the human enterprise is that often, when things
look the worst, individuals come forth with ideas that sometimes transform our whole
way of thinking and new and creative ways of dealing with our challenges emerge.
Thus far, I am afraid that we have not heard that voice and the other side of that coin is
that times of conflict and challenge provides the opportunity for expedient, often self
serving approaches to emerge. In many ways the evolution of the academic programs
in Communication Sciences and Disorders has been a microcosmism of the overall evolution of graduate education in the country.

The graduate education system in the United States has long been recognized as second to none. It is no surprise that throughout history even our foes, including those with whom we are currently in conflict, have sent their sons and daughters to be educated in the United States. Many who are much more erudite on this topic than I have written about the underlying strengths of graduate education in the U.S. but the distinguishing characteristics that are highlighted by almost all is the quality of the faculty, the academic rigor of the academic programs, and the academic integrity. Indeed as indicated by most studies on the topic the top five to ten universities in the world are in the US. However, Martin Anderson in his book *Imposters In the Temple*, points to an erosion in our cherished system and, in particular, an erosion in integrity and academic rigor. Samuel Johnson’s comment over 240 year ago that “Integrity without knowledge is weak and useless, and knowledge without integrity is dangerous …” should be foremost on our minds today. Above all, our graduate institutions and programs should be temples of integrity and should hold to those principles that engender and maintain the highest level of public trust. I am disheartened that there is evidence of a deterioration in that sacred trust in the Academy at large and that we (communication sciences and disorders) may be part and parcel of that process. How so?

While the proliferation of institutions of higher education at the undergraduate level may be understood on a pragmatic basis of the need for a better educated populous to meet the technical demands of today’s workplace and on an more epistemological basis for the need in a democratic society of an enlightened electorate, the political decision to have a university in every state senators’, if not every state legislators’ backyard might be defended on the basis of the foregoing but not so for graduate education. Graduate education should not be driven by the same demands. Graduate education, whether in professional or research degrees, should reflect the highest level of academic integrity and rigor. It is as close to a statistical certainty that
statistics can get, that a proliferation of graduate programs will per force lead to a regression to the mean with regard to the quality of education. I am afraid that we have over the past several years missed a wonderful opportunity for at least one of our professions, that being of course my own—audiology, to stem this tide and to come together to insure that rather than being one more degree in the ever inflating number of degrees in the Academy, a truly exemplary professional degree would be emerge. There are many excellent AuD programs both extant and emerging; however, as long as we continue to define minimal standards based on the lowest common denominator, we will not gain the appropriate public trust that was enjoyed by our predecessors—several of whom we are fortunate enough to have here with us today.

For those of you, in fact the majority of you in the audience today, who are sitting complacently in your comfortable speech-language pathology position wondering if this is going to be yet another instance of the audiology tail wagging the speech-language pathology dog, it is not so. For while that faint beating you hear may be a distant drum, it will be booming ever louder in the not so distant future. The professional doctoral in speech-language pathology is not only coming, it is here. This could be a very good thing but this is more like a full course meal than a hors d’oeuvre in our food for thought exercise. Those that would seek the path of least resistance, that feels that academic degrees are something to be marketed like produce, or who would abrogate the primary stewardship role of faculty in the development of programs of study must not prevail.

So we have seen some existing and potential lemons. How to get to the lemonade is the challenge. Primary in this effort will be your resolve as the intellectual leaders of the discipline. The Council must assume the leadership and assert its rightful advocacy role in all matters affecting the teaching and learning of speech-language pathology and audiology students. We cannot posture above the fray expecting to be untainted by the forces that would sully our temple. We must return to the basic principles that have well served graduate education, in general, and communication sciences and disorders, in particular, over the years. It is interesting that the word elitist is often used as a pejorative by those outside the academy. Webster’s
characterizations of groups of persons who by virtue of education exercise influence—the intellectuals of society are not characterizations that should be rejected but embraced and that challenge us to use our intellect and influence to insure our continued high place in the academy and to not, by benign neglect, succumb to those who would embrace a “technical school” approach to graduate education. While there are several important initiatives we need to pursue the following are a few suggestions that are tops on my list.

1. We must continue to replenish the fountain from which all else springs—the research base of our discipline.

2. The Council should provide leadership in developing educational models to accommodate career ladders for clinical faculty.

3. The Council should articulate quality indicators of Ph.D. programs.

4. The Council should articulate quality indicators of professional doctoral programs and minimal academic and clinical resources.

5. The Council should articulate minimal undergraduate academic science background knowledge for entry into graduate study in both speech-language pathology and audiology.

6. The Council should reassert both the epistemological and pragmatic rationale for embracing the essential relationship between speech-language pathology and audiology under the umbrella of communication sciences and disorders. Communication is the common element that distinguishes and solidifies this relationship above all others.
I realize that these are not easy tasks and that there would be considerable debate and differences of opinion with regard to the outcomes. I also know that there are many other equally important initiatives that could be addressed but what in my opinion is most important is that we do not abrogate our responsibility for academic leadership and that we indeed exercise our role as leaders of academics.

As Martin Anderson points out in his *Impostors in the Temple*, education is often considered to be a process. It is not a process but rather the result of the process—the process is teaching and learning and an education is what comes of it.
ISSUE I: NOTES FROM SMALL DISCUSSION GROUPS
Shortening the Shortage of Ph.D. Students and Faculty
Barbara B. Shadden, Ph.D.
University of Arkansas

The following summary represents the topics and views that were addressed by participants in 14 discussion groups. Common issues, concerns and queries that emerged in group discussions are summarized first, followed by recommended ACTIONS for addressing Ph.D. shortages. The primary issues discussed in virtually all groups included mentoring, flexibility in programming, funding, collaboration, recruitment, and interdisciplinary involvement. Many comments also related to the concept of a continuum of studies beginning in the undergraduate program and continuing through doctoral work. In this context, many discussion themes from the past re-emerged. For example, questions were raised about whether or not we should consider restoring more clinical training in the undergraduate programs. The philosophical issue of whether or not we should be preparing “generalists” also surfaced in discussions.

Common Issues and Concerns

Mentoring
- Mentoring needs to occur at all levels, from undergraduate students through doctoral and post-doctoral studies and including faculty.
- Mentoring has many components, not just research. Mentoring efforts must be recognized and rewarded.
- Mentoring is time consuming, thus it creates challenges for the more productive faculty member who is already fully engaged in all aspects of the academy.
- Funds are available to support creative mentoring activities, but many faculty are not aware of the existence of the funds or the nature of activities supported.
- There is a need to consider whether or not we are mentoring and/or promoting the “discipline” or the “professions.”
Flexibility

- We must explore alternatives to traditional full-time on-campus programs of Ph.D. studies (distance learning, consortia, part-time studies, summer intensive programs, etc.)
- Obtaining clinical certification can be very challenging for Ph.D. students if students are encouraged to move seamlessly from bachelor's through doctoral studies. We must explore ways to become more flexible in providing that clinical training, if so desired. We must also consider ways to allow a speech-language or hearing scientist to pursue their research interests without imposing the CCCs as a requirement along the way.
- Definitions of research must be broad-based, to ensure maximum flexibility.
- Interdisciplinary doctoral programs are a potentially strong model for recruiting individuals into doctoral studies and into research/academic careers.
- As one participant noted, we need to “get real,” particularly when considering the doctoral shortage. Is adding to the number of graduating Ph.D.s the solution to other problems (such as the erosion of the scientific base)?

Funding

- Funding for Ph.D. students and/or for mentoring students into research careers must be expanded.
- Salaries at entry-level into university settings do not encourage pursuit of academic careers.
- In these times of fiscal constraint, we must be prepared to justify every component of our academic programs. In part, this requires demonstrating both the clinical and the scientific demands of the discipline and its professions. We must speak up on our own campuses.
- We need to explore more creative funding opportunities.
Collaboration

- Virtually every discussion group addressed the need for collaboration in some manner.

- Collaboration is needed:
  - Between undergraduate and graduate programs
  - Between master's and doctoral level programs
  - Between doctoral level programs
  - Between academic units on any given campus
  - Between universities and community partners (industry, schools, health care facilities, etc.)

- The need for clearly articulated agreements among undergraduate, master's, and doctoral level programs is particularly evident when attempting to recruit a student into an academic and/or research career.

- Articulated agreements between doctoral programs and other academic programs are critical as we attempt to recruit and retain diverse individuals.

Recruitment

- Discussion groups consistently grappled with the issue of recruiting students and/or practitioners into doctoral programs. Many recruitment challenges were identified, including:
  - Our emphasis on the need to acquire the CCC’s along the way to a doctoral degree
  - Our lack of a clear vision for when to begin grooming students for advanced graduate work, and who should be targeted.
  - Our own limited perspective on the theoretically seamless transitions that can occur between bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral level studies
  - The lengthy time currently required to complete a Ph.D., in a world where students see themselves saddled with extensive debt even at the end of a master’s degree program.
  - The allure of high-paying jobs as master's level practitioners.
Geographical constraints and time demands of work and family, particularly if it has been some years since the individual was enrolled in an academic program.

- A number of groups raised the question of whether or not we are actually providing strong role models for our students. In particular, it was noted that many of our better students simply see their faculty as overworked and underpaid. We often fail to communicate some of the joy in what we do, particularly research.
- Career tracking needs to be exploited as a strong recruitment tool.
- If we wish to attract researchers, we need to explore ways of ensuring that doctoral research faculty do not have to commit significant chunks of their work time to clinical supervision.
- We need to model the connection between the laboratory and the world.

**Interdisciplinary Involvement**

- There was a fair level of consensus that academic programs need to embrace interdisciplinary initiatives if we are to survive.
- Interdisciplinary involvement can occur at all levels, including:
  - Undergraduate coursework, and the importance placed on non-major courses by faculty
  - Graduate level collaboration between academic programs in coursework, clinical activities, and research
  - Recruitment of faculty in related degree areas, and recruitment of potential doctoral candidates from disciplines outside of speech-language pathology and audiology

**Recommended Action Steps**

For CAPCSD

- Use CAPCSD web site to
  - Promote research opportunities
provide biographical sketches on researchers and academicians in order to illustrate diverse career tracks and promote consideration of doctoral studies

- Advertise opportunities for research collaboration
- Support the Clearinghouse
- Convene a group of members that will assume responsibility and accountability for:
  - Developing an action plan to address doctoral shortages
  - Executing an action plan
  - Evaluating outcomes

For CAPCSD and ASHA

- Staff an information booth at professional organization conferences (such as the Modern Language Association, Linguistics Association, American Psychological Association) in order to market faculty opportunities in CSD (with appropriate additional coursework).
- Provide information to the American Association for Advancement of Science to encourage their promotion of speech/hearing science research careers in high schools.
- Identify two or three major collaborative priorities related to doctoral shortages; place resources behind addressing these priorities as a joint effort of ASHA and CAPCSD.
- Explore funding support for mentoring activities, such as research institutes, faculty shadowing, and so forth.
- Lobby change agents within ASHA regarding concerns about doctoral shortages.

For ASHA

- For CFCC -- increase flexibility in CFY timeframes.
- For CAA -- develop alternative models for CSD Ph.D. programs (e.g., consortia, distance learning)
- Make the issue of doctoral shortages a focused, high priority initiative.
• Create additional financial resources for prospective Ph.D. students.
• Waive NSSLHA dues if student reviews information/completes inquiry of Ph.D. program.
• Design more flexibility for the Clinical Fellowship experience for students in Ph.D. programs.
• Promote round table discussions of research at ASHA Conventions.
• Provide additional opportunities for students to talk with academicians and researchers (through ASHA’s Ad Hoc Committee on Mentoring).
• Provide scholarship or travel funds to specialty research meetings (e.g., APA, voice, motor speech).
• Collect salary data and disseminate to all programs to increase parity in salaries across institutions.
• Investigate using ASHA website as clearinghouse to facilitate spread of ideas to engage student interest in research.
• Re-examine KASA (in context of challenges of doctoral shortages).
• Attract other disciplines to the association (membership, presentation).

For Doctoral Programs
• Develop or expand joint/cooperative efforts
  o between Ph.D. programs
    ▪ Pursue sharing of coursework, lab experiences, collaborative research, and so forth,
    ▪ Consider cooperative ventures between institutions –could be a recruitment tool.
  o with B.A. and M.S. programs, medical centers, school districts, and so forth to bring research to smaller programs and to identify and recruit students.
• Recruit for doctoral studies more widely and more flexibly
  o From pool of graduates of our master’s programs who are now working professionally (keep lines of communication open)
  o from master’s only programs
o from pool of non-traditional, older students
o at high school level, by developing a speakers bureau to go into these settings and instill excitement about the discipline and about research within the discipline
o at college level, perhaps through funding Summer Research programs for students who are not necessarily in CSD, or Summer Research Exchange

- Recruit heavily from other graduate disciplines, such as psychology, linguistics, basic sciences, biology, engineering, and math and then…
  o Support post-doctoral work in CSD
  o Establish a certificate of advanced training in CSD for those outside of the discipline
  o Obtain NIH funding for post-doctoral fellows
  o Mentor these Ph.D.s into interdisciplinary scholarly activities with other faculty

- Promote continuous enrollment from master’s through doctoral, and provide mechanisms for students to complete their CF experience while being paid in doctoral program
  o Recognize that students typically have progressively less flexibility as they move into the workforce after completing the master’s degree
  o Map out the B.A. to Ph.D. coursework sequence carefully (including consideration of delaying the clinical requirements and CFY to some later point in professional involvement)

- Identify students with potential for doctoral studies early:
  o Identify three students yearly that profess interest in pursuing Ph.D., and mentor them through master’s program
  o Develop articulated agreements for B.A.or M.S. students who wish to continue on into the doctoral program

- Develop greater flexibility with respect to research agendas and clinical training
  o Consider data collection in clinical research towards hours for CCCs
o Modify dissertation, so that doctoral candidate will end up with a product that could be five to six articles, rather than one (might help break the cycle of doctoral students not publishing their work)

o Encourage programs to emphasize evidence-based research (e.g., promote applied research or scientist clinician)

o Develop varied models for doctoral studies
  ▪ B. A. through Ph.D
  ▪ Collaborative programs
  ▪ Consortia
  ▪ Part-time versus. full-time

• Recruit faculty who
  o have CCCs along with a Ph.D. in another discipline
  o have primary research interests with demonstrable funding sources

For all Universities

• Explore funding opportunities for both students and faculty researchers, as well as other strategies to promote research activity for faculty.
  o Support basic scientist training and positions, including hiring of speech-language and hearing scientists without CCC.
  o Make a case to administration for hiring scientists who may be able to bring in research dollars; facilitate university support for scientific base of discipline
  o Support supervision in ways that relieve Ph.D. faculty workloads
  o Develop imaginative strategies for funding students – going beyond status quo
  o Explore industry partnering in order to gain support for research via contracts, etc.

• Increase collaborative Ph.D. opportunities within different disciplines

• Evaluate structures and requirements in existing CSD Ph.D. (and M.S.) programs;
  o consider streamlining procedures and reducing program duration
o explore greater flexibility in program offerings
o draw students from other disciplines
o Allow for the new paradigm of students who “work hard-play hard” and be aware of today’s sociology of young people wanting immediate gratification
o Consider creating an option for a non-clinical master’s track which would include greater research focus

- Consider development of combined M.S./Ph.D. programs and establish funding for interested students at the outset
  o encourages intermingling of academic and research activities
  o could be designed to provide clinical and research experiences in the first two years, then allow students to declare a desire to complete AUD or Ph.D.

- Begin recruitment early
  o Recruit from pool of middle school/high school students who are scientist “wannabes” versus from students with an education /"health care-helper” mind sets
  o Start a culture of research at the high school level, and provide financial rewards for projects related to communication and its disorders, not just symbolic recognition (like a plaque)
  o Utilize NSSLHA groups for recruitment

- Begin mentoring of students early and have undergraduate and master’s level speech, language, and hearing students
  o participate actively in faculty research
  o develop and pursue their own research initiatives
  o follow an honors track in order to identify students early on who may wish to do an undergraduate honors thesis; place students in cohort groups, break research projects into smaller, “doable” units, support students throughout program
  o Put our best teachers in undergraduate classes
• Increase the background/teaching of reading and understanding research
• Encourage retired professors to come back on part-time basis to mentor junior faculty as well as students

• Create stronger support for early research knowledge and activities
  • Put together collection of activities for undergrads that are doable research-like projects
  • Increase undergraduate exposure to courses in sciences (including scientific bases outside of our discipline)
  • Use clinical work as a basis for experiencing research protocols, through single subject designs
  • Revise UG research coursework (thesis?) with careful attention to curricula which suitably allow for research training and preparation
  • Include a variety of design approaches in research courses (with particular emphasis upon clinical research)
  • Promote student research being presented at state speech-language-hearing conferences (award monetary prizes for UG and Graduate research excellence)
  • Increase the visibility/promote the value and importance of clinical research

• Develop internet seminars that would serve as recruitment tools (this could be recommendation for ASHA as well)

• Explore industry partnering to gain support for research via contracts and so forth

• Develop stronger procedures for mentoring students and faculty
  • Reduce stress of junior faculty regarding tenure and promotion by reducing their teaching loads
  • Support career transitions
  • Encourage practitioners to return for doctoral studies
  • Foster collegial mentoring for new faculty
- Team Ph.D. and master's level instructors in collaborations that may foster research ideas
- Form affiliations between M.S. and Ph.D. institutions to promote doctoral program enrollment (particularly important in encouraging diversity

- Plan ways to integrate clinic and research experiences
  - Increase multidisciplinary collaboration on campus with the notion of increasing the pool of potential Ph.D.s in CSD
  - Hire faculty members from related disciplines
- Make use of the Ronald McNair scholarship program (provides funding for first generation college students to be mentored by faculty scientist) and ASHA’s mentoring programs.

**For all entities**
- Talk to students about our enthusiasm for the professions and about our individual career paths
- Increase public awareness – who we are, what we do
- Identify funding sources for students at all levels, and particularly for student researchers and doctoral students
- Plan recruiting strategies at all levels of the educational continuum
A structural flaw in American higher education is that the same person who serves as a course instructor assesses the effectiveness of that course, creating opportunities for conflict of interest (Holyer, 1998). Davis (1995) and Rassi (1998) have reminded us that as demands for greater accountability for degree programs grows; this becomes an increasing liability, absent a meaningful program of assessment.

Formative assessment offers the opportunity for instructors in the classroom, clinic, and/or laboratory, at any level in the educational continuum, to obtain valuable feedback about student learning. When conducted throughout the term, rather than just at the end of the term, adjustments can be made that can improve teaching effectiveness, and thus student outcomes, for current and future learners. Nevertheless, there are a number of reasons why Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) faculty may be inclined to resist adopting assessment into their daily activities, not the least of which may be that they do not understand the why behind it. It is, therefore, critical that the departmental leadership provide helpful information, examples, and guidance to assist them in independently discovering the benefits of assessment so that they can routinely incorporate it into their work.

The discipline of CSD provides education at three fundamental levels: undergraduate, graduate clinical, and doctoral research. Approximately 85% of students enrolled in graduate clinical programs are graduates of undergraduate CSD programs (CAPCSD, 2000) and 66% of research doctoral students are graduates of graduate clinical CSD programs (Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Doctoral Shortage, 2002). In addition, it is likely that a very large percentage of faculty teaching and conducting
research in all three levels of CSD education, earned degrees in CSD. This scenario presents some built-in incentives. That is, if we can identify measurable core objectives and benchmarks for graduates at each level of CSD education, we can

(a) enhance our perspective of what students are expected to do nationally (for example, 71% of Harvard undergraduate students write 10 or more papers each year with 83% totaling over 60 final draft pages);

b) monitor and adjust those objectives as they evolve over time; and

c) make better use of the limited time we have to educate students by removing the need for remedial education, or at the very least, know precisely what remedial education is necessary at the beginning of a degree program.

Regular and multilateral feedback between the levels of CSD education is likely to benefit the entire discipline.

The NCAA classifies each college/university’s athletic programs based on variables such as strength of schedule and level of financial support for athletics. As a result, it is expected that the performance levels for programs in the three different classifications will differ and should not be compared against one another. Conversely, the Carnegie Foundation (2000) classifies each college/university academically based on variables such as the number of baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral degrees awarded. Different expected performance levels are not assumed between institutions of different Carnegie classifications offering the same degree. CSD academic programs are housed in institutions of various Carnegie classifications, providing additional incentive to identify core benchmarks for our graduates. The lack of common measures of academic outcomes across institutions, combined with the public's apparent thirst for information about quality indicators when searching for a college/university, led to the annually published college/university rankings initiated by U.S. News and World Report in 1983. Today they are read by millions of people world wide. Rankings have expanded into a variety of specific degree programs, including Audiology and Speech-
Language Pathology (A/SLP). Since the mid-1990s, their methodology has increased the use and weighting of other outcome measures and reduced the weighting of reputational surveys to 25-40%; however, the rankings in A/SLP (limited to graduate clinical programs) remain exclusively reputational surveys.

Bloom (1956) classified cognitive abilities along a hierarchy of six levels ranging from simple to complex: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. When describing course, clinic, or lab objectives, certain verbs match up best with each of these categories (see Appendix A). Light (2001) asked college seniors to identify a single change that would most improve teaching and learning and two responses predominated:

1. enhance awareness of “the big picture”; and
2. elicit helpful and regular feedback from students so that the instructor can make corrections along the way.

Cross recommends the one-minute paper, a popular classroom assessment technique requiring 1-2 minutes at the end of class and approximately five minutes of office time for analysis. It asks students two questions:

1. What was the main point that you learned today? and
2. What is your primary unanswered question?

Responses should be anonymous for the best results. Angelo and Cross (1993) identified nearly fifty different classroom (formative) assessment techniques in ten different categories, including knowledge, critical thinking, application, and self-awareness (see Appendix B). As programs begin to assess the knowledge and skills of students within a program, it is important that they remember there are many methods that can be used for this purpose. Programs will need to have a system developed that will assess knowledge throughout the program. What one program will use may be different from what another program uses. An effective formative assessment will assist in identifying areas of limitations for a student and should guide a program in determining leveling classes which would help the student achieve the competencies identified by the program.
In summary, there is an urgent need for CSD faculty to learn more about the benefits of, and methods for, incorporating assessment into their courses and the academic programs in which they play a role. Department leaders who are familiar with meaningful assessment are needed to facilitate this acquisition. The Joint Committee on Academic Assessment will launch a web page in summer of 2003 devoted entirely to assessment in CSD. It will include a large number and variety of links that should assist with the adoption of assessment.
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# Appendix A

## Suggested Verbs for Course Objectives for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Categorize</td>
<td>Appraise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define</td>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>Arrange</td>
<td>Combine</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Convert</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Break down</td>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Combine</td>
<td>Compose</td>
<td>Conclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
<td>Classify</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Create</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Distinguish</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Detect</td>
<td>Derive</td>
<td>Criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Demonstrate</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>Devise</td>
<td>Determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Extend</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td>Differentiate</td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>Extrapolate</td>
<td>Divide</td>
<td>Discriminate</td>
<td>Generate</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Generalize</td>
<td>Examine</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Give examples</td>
<td>Graph</td>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>Justify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Interpolate</td>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>Point out</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recite</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td>Manipulate</td>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>Rewrite</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td>Operate</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>Prescribe</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>Subdivide</td>
<td>Propose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>Utilize</td>
<td>Rearrange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtract</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reorganize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rewrite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ASHA Continuing Education Board
# Appendix B

## Classroom (Formative) Assessment Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing prior knowledge, recall, and understanding</th>
<th>Assessing students’ awareness of their attitudes and values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>background knowledge probe</td>
<td>classroom opinion polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focused listening</td>
<td>double-entry journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconception/preconception check</td>
<td>profiles of admirable individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empty outlines</td>
<td>everyday ethical dilemmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minute paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muddiest point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing skill in analysis and critical thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>categorized grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defining features matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro and con grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content, form, and function outlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytic memos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing skill in synthesis and creative thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one-sentence summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximate analogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invented dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotated portfolios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing skill in problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>problem recognition tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what's the principle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documented problem solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio- and videotaped protocols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing skill in application and performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>directed paraphrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-generated test questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human tableau or class modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper or project prospectus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing learner reactions to teachers and teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chain notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher-designed feedback forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group instructional feedback techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom assessment quality circles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing learner reactions to class activities, assignments, and materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSQC2 (recall, summarize, question, comment, and connect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group work evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading rating sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignment assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exam evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Angelo & Cross (1993)
The following summary represents some of the topics and views that were addressed by participants in discussing “Academic and Clinical Integration: The New Standards and Beyond.” These sessions are the most difficult to summarize because (a) there was considerable frustration with the new standards and the KASA form that has been developed to capture standards; (b) most participants were eager to raise questions and to hear what other programs are doing (so discussion was not focused); and (c) there were few points of consensus. Notes from each session describe a series of specific approaches being implemented by programs across the country. Common issues, concerns, and queries that emerged in group discussions are summarized first, followed by recommended ACTIONS for addressing the new standards.

**Common Issues and Concerns**

- In general, there were many more questions than answers. Many participants expressed frustration that they had attended a number of sessions on the new standards and forms, and still did not have a concrete understanding of what was desired.
- There was considerable debate regarding how flexible the new standards are, particularly in the context of the original and revised KASA forms. Program representatives expressed confusion about the type of documentation required. Some participants noted that the KASA was required to be maintained in the student’s file, while others noted that programs were free to develop their own documentation. There was also confusion about what the program director’s “signing off” would mean with new forms.
- There was a fair level of consensus that the new standards and requirements will result in much more documentation and too much additional paperwork. One
concern was that the process of documentation seems to undermine the original concepts behind changing standards.

• The process of addressing standards and assessment was described as positive, in the sense of making faculty think about process and outcome issues. Another positive consequence of these changes will be better documentation of student progress (or lack thereof) in the event of any legal action.

• However, the actual documentation – the “external legislation” of forms and items – is viewed by some as excessive micromanagement. Further, for some participants, the KASA forms appear to imply a lack of trust in program faculty and an assumption that programs and faculty have not analyzed critically their academic and clinical training prior to the new standards.

• Some participants indicated concern that research involvement receives limited focus in the new standards, despite the discipline’s concern with the scientific base of our professions and with preparing academicians for the future.

• A number of program representatives expressed interest in addressing some of the following issues:
  - Making undergraduate knowledge stick, and verifying knowledge and skills acquired at the undergraduate level
  - Developing mechanisms for measuring stages in growth of academic knowledge and clinical skills
  - Enlisting participation of all faculty in using more formative assessment procedures in class (or in clinic)
  - Making program decisions in view of the lack of uniformity in approach to the revised standards, along with a fear that site visitors may be biased toward a particular approach when reviewing programs
  - Translating the KASA form into a true measure of competency in clinical practice
  - Expending considerable effort to recruit high quality students into our master’s and doctoral programs, only to expend even more effort documenting their lack of progress and possibly eliminating them from our programs
• Losing sight of the scope of practice across age and pathology by phrasing everything in terms of specific pathologies.

• In several discussion groups, it was emphasized that curriculum considerations should come first, followed by assessment approaches.

• There was also some consensus that you cannot have an assessment for every knowledge and skill resulting in successful completion of a single clinical task. Thus, it was recommended that programs fully develop a set number of knowledge and skill indicators (5 to 10) as an example.

•

Recommended Action Steps

All Major Players

• Develop a clearinghouse of how programs are dealing with integration of academic and clinical “sides of the house” and with formative assessment approaches. Options for disseminating this information could include
  o CAPCSD web site
  o Special Interest Divisions 10 and 11 (web, e-mail, other communication)
  o Hard copy
  o Regular feature in the AJSLP/AJA

For CAPCSD

• Serve as an advocate for university programs to make the transition to new standards as efficient and painless as possible

• Offer panel discussion at next convention on broader issues of enhancing integration of clinical and academic activities (the type of Bridging the Gap between Clinic and Classroom presentation done at ASHA several years ago). Do not focus solely on assessment.

• Create central repository for maintaining assessment tools and strategies so that programs can review and share ideas.

•

For CAPCSD and ASHA
• Endorse the concept that every program is free to develop their own assessment models, but make available examples of models
• Clarify what is needed to define/describe “formative assessment”
• Provide opportunity for public discussion and a vote by CAPCSD members regarding KASA draft documentation
• Put together an orientation packet that can be used to train off-campus supervisors regarding the new standards. This would assist programs in standardizing protocols used by these supervisors who are not directly in the academic arena.

For ASHA
• Provide a set of working models for managing the KASA form and designing and implementing formative assessment (CFCC/CAA). Information needs to be specific, not general. Functional models are needed. Models need to address approaches to formative assessment, examples of behavioral indicators of an outcome, and so forth.
• Initiate workshops, dialogues, and resource material development related to how to apply the KASA in an academic setting to ensure seamless development of student learning. Questions that should be addressed include:
  o How will the outcome of the completing the KASA forms validate the preparation of better SLPs?
  o How will we know that the new standards and the resulting tools for documentation will lead to better SLPs?
  o What are the mechanisms that will be used to define “better?”
  o How will a program’s compliance with new standards be evaluated?
  o How are the evaluators (site visitors) being trained to judge compliance and are there any data that support the reliability of interpretation among site visitors?
• Continue the 20 hour clinical requirement for each disorder or develop some other mechanisms for ensuring that students get close to 20 hours of experience in each area.
• Clarify who needs to use the KASA form and how much discretion will be allowed for program directors when they sign off on the form.
• Provide timely feedback/assistance from the accreditation site visit.
• Provide feedback on the perception that assessment has become the primary focus of what programs are doing. Clarify how the Knowledge and Skills components represented on the KASA form address larger issues of problem solving and program development.

For Academic Programs: The following points illustrate some of the ideas shared about addressing the new standards and integrating academic and clinical work.
• Keep in mind that assessment must relate to how people learn and particularly how adults learn. Formative assessment allows adjustment of the learning process to individual student’s learning style or time requirements.
• Determine/prescribe competencies across the academic standards to be included in the course syllabi.
• Review course syllabi to make sure standards are being addressed and create course syllabi that address Knowledge and Skills objectives in measurable terms. Identify components of standards, skills and knowledge that meet competencies, then ask a faculty member to include components in specific coursework (if not already included). Course assignments should be adjusted to match objectives and standards.
  o Connect the dots: identify existing mechanisms embedded in academic coursework, syllabi objectives, and clinical practica to meet standards. Map these academic and clinical opportunities to ASHA standards and scope of practice elements.
  o Operationally define skill “mastery.”
  o Develop portfolios to collect and track outcomes that map onto the standards.
  o Orient students to their opportunities and obligation to demonstrate competencies.
  o Encourage self-evaluation during coursework.
o Include students in dialogue about what graduate studies are about (expectations, responsibilities, etc.)

o Ask for secretarial support to manage data.

- Summative and Formative Assessment Options and Learning Experiences
  
o Should be ongoing as part of class assignments.
  
o Use role play.
  
o Present cases—for individual assignments or for semester long projects evolving out of student learning
  
o Use a Grand Rounds format in class to encourage higher order cognitive applications.
  
o Have students read journals, write paragraph summaries, and outline clinical implications (which can bring in multicultural issues and other disciplines.)
  
o List assignments in a course that meet outcome measures of standards and have students place those materials in a portfolio.
  
o Portfolios can be used in a variety of other ways (for example, when faculty provide written feedback on assignments or oral presentations.)
  
o Use reflective journal writing to show pre- and post-learning, and embed journaling in courses.
  
o Develop a Capstone Project as a summative assessment measure.
  
o Plan clinical experiences/applied activities (lab, case studies, etc.) to address the nine major areas in speech-language pathology.
  
o Use mock “orals” to demonstrate academic competency.
  
o Establish a periodic review mechanism with each student.

- With respect to the actual documentation:
  
o Identify who completes KASA form (student or program).
  
o Identify at what level of detail tracking of mastery of required competencies will occur.
  
o Put knowledge and skills into a grid to be used by clinical supervisors and academic faculty each semester to track student development.
- Develop a matrix that maps knowledge and skills acquisition across academic courses and clinical activities and links these to standards.

- Address different stages and levels of learning (clinical and academic). For example:
  - Assess students on first day of graduate studies as a kind of diagnostic tool to determine background knowledge and needs. This should be presented as a way to help students be successful in graduate studies.
  - Use comprehensive examinations for seniors (undergraduates) and analyze performance by course and content to guide faculty in future. There was considerable discussion about whether or not a recency learning effect existed, particularly for undergraduate classes. Assessment of undergraduate knowledge is particularly important since much of the scientific base of the discipline is acquired in undergraduate studies.

- Consider different models for comprehensive examinations as part of the graduate program of studies. For example:
  - A three-stage comprehensive examination (which resolves many legal challenges if a student is dismissed from graduate studies):
    - First stage is 200 multiple choice questions, with individual test scores and item analysis provided to the faculty advisor as a diagnostic of what the student knows and still needs to learn. This examination covers all aspects of normal behavior and development; it must be passed before the student graduates with a master's degree.
    - Second stage is a full day writing, with the morning oriented to comprehensive questions in adult neurogenics and children's disorders, and the afternoon providing a choice of two out of five questions related to specific pathologies. This stage is completed on computer and graded by the faculty. If two questions are failed, the student moves to...
    - Stage three – in which the student must complete orals and also rewrite examination.

- With respect to summative and formative assessment of clinical skills:
Consider use of a *grand rounds* approach across the graduate program to apply increasingly higher levels of knowledge and cognitive skills to the clinical decision-making process.

- Decide what first semester clinicians should be able to do and at what level of independence or mastery.
- Look at clinical behaviors in terms of frameworks such as Absent, Emerging, Present, Consistent.
- Look at evolving clinical behaviors in terms of the degree of assistance required (dependence/independence).
- Grade interpersonal behavioral skills on a pass/fail basis.
- Establish graduated levels of mastery (beginning, intermediate, mastery).
- Use pass/fail for all clinical practicum, with a failing grade meaning no academic or clock hour credit.
- Do formative mid-term evaluations that emphasize feedback on progress appropriate to the individual student.
- With time and experience, set a percent score for number of skills student should be able to demonstrate during a given clinical experience.
- “Practical Exam” at the end of the practicum experience.

- What are the challenges of new standards and assessments at the entry-level in doctoral work? In one institution, the doctoral program has been totally revamped, with extensive assessment in the first year and a first year project with clearly defined research milestones.

- Recognize the role of outside supervisors and identify mechanisms for keeping them informed and engaged.
  - Provide complimentary continuing education (CEUs) regarding supervision issues and new standards.
  - Share what programs are currently doing with summative and formative assessment and ask for input.
  - Train off campus supervisors to ensure calibration with new measures and approaches.
  - Provide free email accounts.
Invite supervisors to orientation breakfasts, dinners.
Recognize supervisors by certain types of rewards and/or gifts (e.g., gift certificates, therapy materials.)
Provide complimentary courses at the university.
Provide direct payment.

• Determination of outcomes at and after graduation can be accomplished a variety of ways.
  First, examine the measures the program is already using.
  Use exit interviews and consider both oral and written information (in order to ensure some level of confidentiality)
  Survey program graduates immediately post graduation.
  Obtain feedback from advisory boards/councils.
  Implement a consistent system of employee/employer evaluations one, three, and five years post graduation.
  Convene alumni roundtable discussion groups locally or at conferences.
  For undergraduate-only programs, follow-up with graduate programs and students with respect to preparation and skills.

• How do academic and clinical program components coordinate in the support of “at risk” students?
  Establish clear and consistent expectations for minimum grade levels in both academic courses and clinical activities.
  Develop support mechanisms for at risk-students based on both an academic and clinical review.
  Use formative assessment mechanisms to help students set their own self-improvement goals and plans of action.
  Frame information shared with supervisors and course instructors about a student’s performance in terms of identified learning needs rather than as deficits.

Work with appropriate university resources to identify what are reasonable accommodations for students with identified disabilities both within the university setting
and in externship sites. Realize that what is reasonable is context bound and make that clear to student and all supporting players before the start of a clinical experience.
ISSUE III: RAISING THE BOTTOM LINE

How To Encourage And Improve Extramural Funding In A Communicative Sciences And Disorders Department

Anne Smith, Ph.D.
Purdue University

Introduction

This talk is based on my experience. I am not an expert on extramural funding and have not done broader research on this topic. My experience includes six years as head of Department of Audiology and Speech Sciences at Purdue and 23 years of applying for grant funding and doing the funded work. I have also mentored a number of Ph.D. students and served as a grant reviewer for many types of NIH grants.

I. The first question I would like to consider is this: Is it realistic to expect researchers in our discipline to be funded? I would say the answer is definitely yes. The funding is there from NIH and NSF and from many other sources with which I am less familiar. Compared with other departments, especially if your school is in Liberal Arts as ours is, we have a real advantage. We do not have to spend a lot of time looking for likely funding sources.

II. The next question one might ask is this: What can we do to cultivate and inspire a culture of grant getting, from graduate students all the way up to full professors? I will consider this question from a “career span” perspective.
Graduate Students

I believe you must start with graduate students while they are in your program. They must start growing up in a “culture” of grant activities. Their mentors should involve them in grant preparation. They can help collect pilot data, analyze results, and they can read drafts of the grant as it is prepared. This helps them to understand the model of grant oriented research. In the grant model, there is a team of people working on the project. It is not just one person sitting in front of a computer analyzing data. This is a very positive aspect of research to share with students, who often worry that doing research is a lonely activity. As a course assignment, doctoral students should write short grant proposals. If there are not a lot of funded advisers in your program, you may want to arrange for your students to spend some time in laboratories in other programs where they can see such a model at work.

Development Of Faculty

Assistant Professors

One should start encouraging faculty toward the goal of obtaining extramural funding in the hiring process. The interview should include assessment of the candidate’s ability to write a research plan. When we interview candidates, we ask them to provide a short (2-3 pages) five-year plan. You need to make it clear in the interview that obtaining grants is expected. I think it is critical to provide a good startup package, so that the person is ready to be productive right away. In recent years, we have found that $50-100k is approximately what is needed. That is right; $100k startup packages are not unusual these days. If you want to be competitive for the best candidates, you must convince your upper administration to support these levels of startup packages. As part of the startup offer, I think it is a good idea to find a mechanism to provide summer salary for the first year that the faculty member is in your program and clearly indicate to the candidate that he or she will be expected to write a
grant. Another issue that has come up recently is that we have a new, more extensive concept of startup funds. These are not just funds for equipment. I encourage applicants to think of startup funds as everything he or she will need for their research program for the first two years (including human subjects payments, programming support, research assistants, outside facility fees, for example, for neuroimaging). We assume that it will be two years before candidates have their own funding, so they must have everything they need to get a good, fast start.

Another extremely important factor is giving the assistant professor time to be productive. I find that this is the most frequent roadblock for junior people. They should have no or minimal committee work. They should have reduced teaching loads; researchers running labs should not be expected to teach four courses per year. We give starting assistant professors one course the semester they start. Then typically they are released a full semester during their probationary period for tenure.

In our experience, the most frequent type of funding obtained by assistant professors is the RO3 from NIH. These are small, 3-year grants. These do not provide enough funding for the investigators to buy out of teaching. Chairs must consider other means of obtaining releases for the junior people funded on the RO3s. This is necessary because if you want the junior people to move from the smaller RO3 awards to the larger RO1 grants (typically around $200,000 a year for three to five years), they will need the time to make enough progress and to write the larger proposal. Another point I would make is that there seems to be a misperception that new grant writers must start with the R03. This is not true. If they are scientifically ready to write the larger scale plan, they may submit an RO1, without ever having done the smaller grant.

I would encourage you to mentor the assistant professors in terms of extramural funding. Have meetings of the faculty to talk about grants. Let senior faculty share their secrets for success. Encourage senior faculty to read and give feedback on grants and publications. Strongly encourage assistant professors to attend grant writing
workshops, both locally and nationally, and provide travel support travel support if they need it.

**Senior Faculty**

Many of the same strategies outlined above for assistant professors are relevant for people who are more senior. In fact, in our department, the full professors are the most productive in terms of obtaining extramural funds. A key focus should be on the associate professors and getting them to obtain the larger individual investigator grants. I think it is important to support changes in direction, if faculty indicate they want to work in a new area or with a new method. I have seen full professors make radical changes in their research programs and become much more successful in obtaining funding, because the old paradigms they were using simply had been exhausted.

Another thing that chairs can do is to help faculty when they have interim periods without funding. Our department does not get much of our fiscal and administrative fees and salary savings from grants back, but I know many of you do get large amounts returned to you. Use these funds to help senior faculty in those “in between” periods or to help them go in a new direction.

**Departmental Infrastructure**

Something you might not think about, but which is very important to the grant getting process, is the departmental infrastructure. It is essential to have excellent clerical and business support. Faculty write the proposals and will do the science; they should not have to do the budget or the clerical aspects. The chair must send a very strong message to all faculty, clerical staff, and business staff of the high priority of grants. The idea of the “grant culture” should be pervasive at every level in the department. Clinical supervisors in your departments may feel that the extramural funding process for research is not relevant to them. You need to help them understand
that all requests to the Dean, whether for a new clinical supervisor or a new piece of
equipment for the clinic, are looked upon in certain light, based on the general success
of the overall unit. Whether or not the Dean approves your $20,000 request for clinical
teaching equipment is directly related to the success of the unit in obtaining extramural
funds. By helping everyone to understand this, you can help to diminish the
research/clinical divide that often develops in our departments. Make clear how
resources flow from both sides to each other, how extramural funding can greatly
enhance clinical activities, and how clinical activities can enhance extramural funding.

**Strategic Planning**

Anyone who has been in administration over the past several years has probably
been doing strategic planning. Deans (and everyone above) love strategic plans. I
would recommend that you write a five-year plan that sets clear goals for increasing
extramural funding (e.g., the total dollar amount you expect to have, the number of
funded investigators in the department, etc.). In your strategic plan, envision the future
of your department in relation to the directions of future research in the field. How can
you position yourself to best take advantage of your strengths? How should your unit
expand to link with other areas? Include increasing extramural funding as part of your
justification in your plan for adding additional faculty to your program. Ask this question:
how does your department funding portfolio match that of NIH?

**Conclusion**

I feel that we are very lucky to be in communicative sciences and disorders
programs. Not only are there truly compelling scientific and clinical questions to ask, we
are able to ask for and often obtain the resources to explore these questions in the
optimal ways available to us.
The following summary represents the topics and views that were addressed by participants in breakout discussion groups addressing the topic “Raising the Bottom Line.” The primary focus of the keynote speakers was the need to recognize that CSD programs are being asked to be more accountable and self-sufficient financially. The demand for self-sufficiency will only increase in the future.

Common issues, concerns, and queries that emerged in group discussions are summarized first, followed by recommended ACTIONS for addressing funding challenges confronting programs in communication sciences and disorders. Most discussion involved sharing of strategies related to (a) private/corporate fund raising; (b) external grant funding; and (c) clinic revenues. There were fewer action steps than in other discussion sessions, since there was consensus that the topic(s) are important and need to be addressed in greater detail in the future.

**Common Issues and Concerns**

- The types of development activities described in the conference presentations are very time consuming. Not all program directors have the time (or training and knowledge) to be effective in these roles. Development is an ongoing activity
that requires a significant investment of time in maintaining communication with funding sources.

- There can be numerous institutional barriers, particularly the institutional development officers and offices.
  - We need to be visible to development.
  - We need to push our initiatives and our needs constantly.
  - We should work closely with the development office to learn about strategies for visits to donors.
  - We should take advantage of development office knowledge about how to develop a package of requests.
  - We should recognize that the development office can be helpful in identifying sources and using knowledge of the community to identify sources for particular projects.
  - We should build relationships with potential donors.
  - We should make sure that descriptive summaries of our activities are available on line or in newsletters and other communication media.

- Times are tight financially for all universities.
  - More clients/families are requesting scholarships.
  - Endowments are down.
  - Development offices may be somewhat protective of sources.
  - Clinic operations in summer, in particular, are undergoing change due to budgetary constraints.
Specific “money-making” activities, like hearing aid dispensing, have become particularly important in generating a revenue stream.

- The “culture” of university clinic operation needs to change to develop a business and professional image.

- There are tremendous research demands being placed on today’s new faculty. Because of the difficulties of offering new faculty reduced teaching or clinical loads, we may hire individuals with less interest in research development. Grants are the key for buying out faculty and producing research product, yet finding time for grant writing can be difficult.

- It is important to distinguish revenue generation from clinical education; these create constant friction. Supervision time should be planned to maximize revenue generation. Equipment and materials needed for educational training should be reviewed carefully and, when possible, maintained through money generated by clinical operations.

- University administration must understand that CSD programs are expensive. We must be prepared to attach appropriate fees to the activities of the clinic (e.g., fees for screening students in other programs, charges to campus-wide faculty and students). However, we must also help administrators understand that the clinic is a lab comparable to a chemistry or physics lab and should be considered that way in allocating budgetary resources.
Recommended Action Steps

For CAPCSD

• Offer session/discussionswap shop at next year’s conference which focuses on clinic operations (e.g., specific information regarding business plans, details necessary to operate a university clinic as a business.)

• Provide additional informationconference sessions on the situation of clinical instructors (M.S. level) rank, promotion, tenure, responsibilities, development activities.

• Use listserve to have on-line chats about funding.

• Encourage members to post successful development/funding ideas to CAPCSD web site.

• Repeat this presentation at the 2004 conference with a panel of various models
  o include development/foundation/administrators on panel
  o provide representation for rural, urban, and suburban settings
  o address “how to…” strategies for
    ▪ approaching foundations and/or development offices
    ▪ managing the politics of achieving collaboration
  o possibly bring in business consultants for pre-conference next year
  o identify ways in which master’s level or undergraduate-only programs can access some of the resources discussed by this year’s panel
For CAPCSD and ASHA

- As most programs are new to the idea of self-promotion in the funding arena, information should be gathered and distributed that assists programs to start being more entrepreneurial. Programs need information about how to develop contracts, such as:
  - How do you identify possible contracting opportunities?
  - How do you approach these agencies/persons?
  - Are there sample contracts available for programs to review?

For ASHA

- Continue to work with policy-makers regarding third party reimbursement.
- Gather and distribute “models” regarding the development and implementation of funding activities (both for on-campus and off-campus).
- Distribute training grant information, along with other sources of funding that could be used to recruit and train students.
- At the level of accreditation, CAA site visitors could do more to
  - Emphasize clinic and lab space, highlighting the quality of that space (or lack thereof.)
  - Provide information comparing the institution being reviewed with national averages with respect to funding.
  - Recommend currently accepted practices (e.g., using insurance companies as a standard for charging fees.)
For all Universities: The following is just a sampling of questions and ideas from various participants:

*Development Activities*

- How independently can fundraising be managed at a department level?
  - Each university has a protocol for fundraising/program development.
  - Most universities discourage or prohibit fundraising outside of the Development Office to manage competition over resources.
  - CSD programs can cultivate funding contacts and work with Development Office, and should cultivate cooperative relationships with such offices.

- Look to your existing contacts for possible sources of donations and connections to possible donors (clients, advisory boards, alumni).

- Contacts with alumni are important resources in any fund raising initiatives.

  Possible ways to work more closely with alumni (and clients and their families) include
  - Distribute newsletters on a regular basis to friends of the program
    - Get College to match newsletter funds.
    - Consider posting newsletters on the web and notifying interested parties with a postcard (but realize that not everyone has access.)
  - Build e-mail base for alumni, distribute information and appeal to them regularly (information typically can be obtained from alumni office.)
o Survey current students, alumna (and their families) regarding potential
  contacts and relationships for grant/funding connections.

o Develop focus for funding request to groups such as alumni scholarships
  are typically appropriate for this group.

o Develop target requests for alumni (e.g., ten dollars plus one dollar for
  each year alumnus has been out of program.)

o Develop a “friends of the program” initiative, which starts with small gifts
  and hopefully grows to larger donations.

o Create alumni events that can create donor connections.

- Develop a class coordinator, someone who will maintain contacts within a
  specific cohort group.

  o Initially, this will require staff time to set up program and faculty input to
    identify appropriate individuals.

  o The perk for the class coordinator is the opportunity to connect with
    classmates.

  o Each cohort group should be encouraged to develop a funding target
    (e.g., a specific aspect of program they wish to support.)

  o Try to get students to make a commitment before graduating.

  o Develop mechanisms for recognizing “class” efforts:
    - Take advantage of web site and newsletters,
    - Use success of one class as challenge to next one,
• Develop a kind of “thermometer” marking stages in reaching some designated funding target (like United Way,)

• Use the idea of giving back in appreciation for education and funding the program graduate may have received,

• Tie student/graduate financial contributions with some kind of award (tangible item, plaque or name space) at master's and doctoral level.

• Develop and use Advisory Boards
  
  o Board of Overseers Concept – small group of alumni who pay to be selected and who then give general operational input to the program and assist with fundraising

  o Clinic Advisory Board

  o Board members can be national as well as local representatives of constituents. Suggestions for use of Advisory Boards include

    ▪ Involve members in development.

    ▪ Meet once year for a full day. Pay for the night before, including a reception. Use the morning for updates and reports, then subcommittees in afternoon. Consider asking the Board members to assume some of the costs of meeting.

    ▪ Use conference calls to address issues during year.

    ▪ Look at student issues as well as other funding priorities.

    ▪ Create focused subcommittees for specific needs.
• Have clear goals!

- Develop relationships with the Development Office
  
  o Use faculty who have areas of special expertise or research interest to assist development office. These are the people who can present with passion and commitment.
  
  o Find out what development staff need to place your program on the university giving agenda.
  
  o Become the poster child for your college or university.
  
  o Volunteer to speak wherever you can, showing good faith participation in making donors aware of the university.

- Use the Foundation Center in New York City to select and match foundations to projects.

- Think big, consider directing your efforts towards high dollar initiatives.

- Develop your strategic plan, including specifics about development and funding needs, and link this plan to the University mission.
  
  o Use a link on your clinic website to your institution’s giving program, which highlights gift options.
  
  o Publicize development plans and fundraising requests in as many places as possible (website, newsletters, within university administration, advisory councils, etc.).
• Develop mechanisms for charitable giving (even modest giving) that programs can control and exercise discretionary access over (scholarship endowments, department foundations).

• When you get a donor, try to get that person to also help you get other donors.

• Develop a staff line for public relations and development. Ideally, this would be someone with development expertise within the discipline who could
  o work with alumni.
  o maintain contacts with all interested parties.
  o prepare newsletter.
  o develop other recruitment/development materials like videos.

Research Funding: How can universities more effectively pursue research and training grants?

• Seek D.O.E. personnel prep training grants, but be aware that these are not renewable and must be repackaged/reformatted for future submission.

• Explore State Department of Education grants in addition to federal government agencies as a potential source of training grants.

• Develop university-level financial incentives for research (e.g., “start-up” faculty grants) that allow faculty to initiate pilot research to support subsequent funding proposals.
• Work with administration to provide initiatives for those who are successful in grant writing (e.g., one institution gives the grant recipient a 10% increase in salary.)

• For new faculty, target the R03 Federal initiatives, which provide $50,000 and can fund a Research Assistant, equipment, and summer salary.

• Encourage applications for NSF grants that are explicitly designed for institutions and/or faculty without a strong external funding track record.

• Target grant writing for training of students in a specific area (e.g., preparing students to work with hearing impaired children.)

• Work closely with your state senators and representatives. There are funds available through Congress for “bricks and mortar” types of initiatives (look at Ombudsman legislation.)

• Be able to define your program’s unique capabilities and be aware of how these hold up when compared with the track records of other institutions.

• Consider partnering between smaller and larger institutions with different resources. Partnering is well received in most federal funding programs.

• Consider collaboration between different departments, providing stronger support for interdisciplinary initiatives.

• Create/develop ways to decrease or eliminate the administrative oversight and micromanagement of departmental attempts to generate funding streams.

• Have available (and visible) case statement (vision/mission statements) for academic and clinic programs.
• Approach smaller agencies (and foundations supporting research) first.
• Use the Internet and development personnel for help with searches for funding sources.
• Contact service groups/agencies with a priority funding on speech-language-hearing issues (e.g., Sertoma, Lions, Quota Clubs).
• Use contacts (especially with board members) to approach corporations, foundations, service clubs, individual prospective donors.
• Work to establish endowed chairs, since such positions can bring together new partnerships, publications, and so forth.

Clinic Operations

• Begin to function more as a business and less as an (undervalued) service
  o Hire the right people to manage budgets, bill in a timely manner, and seek new revenue resources.
    ▪ Use university resources (training) to increase skills of staff.
    ▪ Hire person to do billing because persistence does matter.
    ▪ Outsource billing, and shop around for good deals.
    ▪ Share billing person with other university clinic.
    ▪ Streamline billing.
    ▪ Move toward electronic billing.
    ▪ Consider purchase of a medical billing software program.
- Evaluate clinic expenses, efficiency, and schedules from the perspective of a true business (e.g., some clinics are eliminating breaks because the community does not operate on a university calendar.)

- Encourage faculty to look at revenue potential when they develop project ideas.

- Be sensitive to local practitioners and local clients (e.g., the issue of competition.)

- Develop a business plan. Consider getting help in this process from your university’s business/economics department, possibly in the form of a graduate business student’s project.

- Explore the possibility of clinical contracts and specialty programs (e.g., prison facilities, nursing homes, memory programs, literacy programs, hearing aids, assistive listening, summer language programs.) Defining special programs may also enhance the possibilities of obtaining funding from organizations such as Scottish Rite.

- Affiliate with one or more physicians or medical clinics if needed for reimbursement/

- Become a participating member with respect to various third party funding groups.
  - Get insurance carriers to want to accept you/
  - Link up with general counsel to work through the associated red tape.
  - “Sell” the importance of and need for your services.
o Use someone in private practice to serve as a consultant for developing your Medicare/Medicaid/private insurance reimbursement programs.

o If available, try to use the Medical School for help with establishing billing procedures and possibly using their billing system.

o Make a decision whether or not insurance billing is worth it.

o Involve one or more faculty as members of insurance panels to enhance understanding of the procedures and guidelines used.

- How much of a part should clinical revenue play in the funding of CSD programs?

  o Most programs rely on a combination of funding sources.

  o Clinics that sustain themselves solely from their own revenue face pressures to treat patients in a manner that may not always allow for extended clinical mentoring.

  o Not following a true business model in clinical operations changes how programs can teach students to manage such aspects of professional practice.

The Clinic is a laboratory facility, and programs can make the case to university administrators that labs in chemistry and other areas are not expected to pay for themselves. It may be helpful to develop a proposal (based on other campus units) for the percentage of clinic operations that should be self-supporting. This would provide a basis for setting and/or raising clinic fees. Some strategies discussed by participants included sliding fee scales, moving clinic personnel to 12 months with understanding that they will actually provide services during university breaks, and charging lab fees for clinic.
New ASHA Standards for the Certificate of Clinical Competence (SCCC) will go into effect in 2005 for speech-language pathology (ASHA, 2002a) and 2007 for audiology (ASHA, 2002b). Besides being characterized by several new concepts (Lubinsky, 2001), the new standards form bases for assessment of students and programs. That is, programs and students can use the standards as targets to achieve through their assessment processes.

**The SCCC As A Context For Assessment**

To understand how the standards form bases for assessment, it will be helpful to clarify the philosophical and practical changes taking place. First, both sets of standards are largely predicated on outcomes, rather than processes, or inputs. According to the SCCC-SLP, “process standards specify the experiences, such as course work or practicum hours; outcome standards require demonstration of specific knowledge and skills.” Each set of standards presents a list of knowledge and skills required for entry into the respective profession. Thus, program faculties can develop
student learning goals based on the knowledge and skill statements. Once accomplished, program faculties can fashion assessments to measure students’ achievement of those knowledge and skills.

Having sets of knowledge and skills implies that programs may choose to have students develop those knowledge and skills in a wide variety of curricula (Lubinsky, 2001). Thus, although students must demonstrate mastery of information about basic processes and areas of disability, there are no longer any requirements for courses in particular basic processes or particular disorder areas.

New to the standards is the requirement for formative assessment. Formative assessment is, “the use of systematic evaluation in the process of curriculum construction, teaching, and learning for the purpose of improving any of these three processes” (Bloom, Madaus, & Hasting, 1981, p. 155). The emphasis in the SCCC is on student learning. To achieve that emphasis, students must undergo periodic evaluation of their knowledge and skill development, with appropriate feedback incorporating strategies to develop areas of weakness and strengthen areas of ability. As both SCCC indicate, “applicants and programs should use the ongoing assessment to help the applicant achieve requisite knowledge and skills.” As bases for assessment, the SCCC thus imply that academic programs need to develop mechanisms of formative assessment and processes to document their application and results.

Scopes of practice (SOP) continue to grow in both audiology and speech-language pathology. A comparison of the current SOPs with their predecessors will easily confirm the expansion. The SCCC recognize that development of clinical skills across the entire SOPs solely by means of patient contact is probably no longer possible. Thus, for example, the SCCC-SLP indicate (implementation for Standard IV-G), “In instances where applicants have not had direct patient contact with disorder and difference categories, appropriate alternative methods of skills development must be demonstrated.” In the absence of direct patient contact, academic program faculties
must be creative in devising assessments to verify students’ development and
achievement of clinical skills. Programs may wish to use emerging technologies to
assist them. For example, at least one study has shown excellent improvement in
(medical) clinical skill using virtual patients (Virtual Patients: Teachers of Tomorrow,
2003)

Both sets of standards require development of knowledge and skills in writing,
mathematics, and natural and behavioral/social sciences. The SCCC-A speak of these
as “prerequisite,” which can have two connotations. The more common one, of course,
is the requirement that something happen before something else. In this case, the
standards communicate the expectation that, ordinarily, students will enter audiology
programs with transcript credit in mathematics and sciences, and at least reasonable
writing skills.

However, “prerequisite” also has the connotation of being “foundational” or
prerequisite intellectually, rather than temporally. Thus, during the academic program,
the standards imply that students will use knowledge of science and mathematics to
help them learn, integrate, and apply clinical knowledge. The foundational aspect of
“prerequisite” is also evident in writing requirements. Thus, students will use their
essential writing skills as a foundation for learning to write “technical reports, diagnostic
and treatment reports, treatment plans, and professional correspondence” (ASHA
2002a, 2002b).

The requirements for knowledge and skills in mathematics, science, and writing
form a further basis for assessment. Both sets of standards speak to transcript credit
for mathematics and social and behavioral sciences. Academic programs may simply
accept transcript credit in those areas as meeting their (and the SCCC) requirements.
On the other hand, programs have some freedom and responsibility about the types of
courses, and the grades on the transcript they will accept. For example, one audiology
program may specify that the physical science be acoustics while another, looking at
physical science more generally, may accept a course in geology as meeting the requirement. All programs will need to assess their students’ writing ability.

**Audiology Standards**

The SCCC for Audiology (SCCC-A) have some unique aspects. For one, the SCCC-A do not retain the current requirement for a Clinical Fellowship. In a rather radical departure from the current standards, the SCCC-A require that students develop all entry-level knowledge and skills as part of their academic program. This becomes possible largely because of the requirement for 75 post-baccalaureate credit hours in 2007, adding the necessity of an entry-level doctoral degree in 2012.

Standard IV-B requires that students “have knowledge of” 21 different “foundations of practice,” for example normal development of speech and language or principles of psychoacoustics. However, “knowledge” may be at a very rudimentary level, or may require rather sophisticated and complex thinking (“Bloom’s Taxonomy,” Bloom et al., 1981). The standards are silent on the level of cognitive processing. Programs must, therefore, define what they mean by “knowledge” and assess their students accordingly.

Standards IV-C, IV-D, and IV-E are statements of skills for entry-level practice. As in the knowledge standards, programs must define the level of skill to be attained and assess students accordingly. Programs may wish to consider using ASHA’s “Clinical Skills Fellowship Inventory” to assist them (ASHA 2002c).

**Speech-Language Pathology Standards**

The CCC standards for speech-language pathology (CCC-SLP) are different from the audiology standards in a few ways. For one, because the SCCC-SLP require only 36 graduate credit hours and 400 hours of practicum, there is a recognition that a
clinical fellowship is still necessary to foster “the continued growth and integration of the knowledge, skills and tasks of clinical practice” before complete independence.

For the knowledge requirements, the CCC-SLP do define the levels of cognitive processing expected upon exit from the academic program. For example, a student should be able to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information about various speech-language disorders. Those descriptors are the highest three levels in Bloom’s Taxonomy. Conversely, the standards require only “knowledge” of contemporary professional issues. “Knowledge” embodies the simplest cognitive requirements in the taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1981). Academic programs, then, will need to tailor the ways they assess students to be consistent with the specified taxonomic stage. To assist in that process, ASHA’s Office of Continuing Education has developed a list of “action verbs” for each stage.

To ensure that applicants for certification have developed knowledge and skill across the breadth of the speech-language pathology scope of practice, the standards delineate a list of disorders, which have come to be popularly known as the “Big Nine.” They are (1) articulation, (2) fluency, (3) voice and resonance, (4) language, (5) hearing, (6) swallowing, (7) cognition, (8) social aspects, and (9) alternative modalities. The last is not actually a disorder area, but an application of alternative therapy strategies, such as augmentative technology or sign language.

The “Big Nine” form a critical set for evaluation, across which programs need to develop outcome statements of knowledge and skills. Programs need to then develop assessments for in a three-way matrix of (1) knowledge or skill, (2) at the requisite cognitive level, (3) across the Big Nine. Programs should remember, as noted above, that students may develop skills in ways alternative to direct patient contact.

The Knowledge And Skills Acquisition (KASA) Form
Programs will need to track progress toward, and final achievement of, knowledge and skills. To summarize the latter, The Council for Clinical Certification (CFCC) developed the Knowledge and Skills Acquisition (KASA) form. Academic programs may use this summary form or develop a form with equivalent information. The entries on the KASA indicate that (1) a knowledge or skill has been attained, and (2) the experience(s) such as class, practicum, and so forth in which the student finally attained the knowledge or skill.

Students and academic faculty should realize that the KASA is not an evaluation instrument. Rather, evaluation of knowledge and skill needs to be completed before an entry is made in the KASA. For the convenience of students and faculty, the KASA will be electronic, so programs can expand cells or modify them in suitable ways. If programs wish to use the KASA, faculties and students will need to develop cooperative methods of input and maintenance.

The KASA will become a critical part of the application process under the new standards. Consistent with current practice, however, pass through students, those who complete their education in programs accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA), will not need to submit an entire completed KASA or other program summary document. All that will be required is the one page of the KASA on which the program director verifies that the applicant has acquired all the knowledge and skills of the standards. Students who are not “pass through,” however, will need to submit an entirely completed KASA. The latter includes students who (1) did not initiate and complete their study in a CAA-accredited program and (2) apply after passthrough timeline dates.

**Application Timelines**

The new SCCC-SLP go into effect in 2005 and the SCCC-A in 2007. To ease the transition to the new standards, CFCC has developed a set of application timelines
to show applicants under which set of standards, current or new, they may or must apply (ASHA 2002a, 2002b)

Council On Academic Accreditation (CAA)

The changes in certification standards mean that programs and the CAA will both be required to re-think how we do what we do. In order to help the programs make adjustments to the new standards, CAA is providing assistance and opportunities for exchange of information in several formats including (1) CAPCSD meetings, (2) CAA Assessment Workshops (April 26, 2003 in Scottsdale, AZ and June 7, 2003 in Washington, DC), (3) ASHA Convention sessions, (4) targeted training for site visitors Summer 2003, (5) program preparation sessions for those anticipating a site visit 2003-04, (6) updated CAA Manuals, and (7) Web resources.

The primary change in the way in which accreditation standards are affected by the new certification standards is that there is a shift from identifying the process of acquiring academic and clinical knowledge and skills to combining process and outcome measures. The process specifies the experiences, such as course work or practicum hours. Outcomes require demonstration of specific knowledge and skills. Outcome measures combine formative and summative assessments for the purpose of improving and measuring student learning.

What Is An Outcome?

Ewell (2001) described an outcome as, “Something that happens to an individual student (hopefully for the better) as a result of his or her participation in a particular course of study.” It is visible only by looking at what happens to the student. Learning outcomes require programs to ask the following questions:
• What do you want students to look like at the end of the program?

• What knowledge should they have (i.e., areas of content students can recall, relate, and use; Ewell, 2001)?

• What abilities (or skills) do they have (i.e., “the learned capacity to do something” such as think critically, communicate effectively, collaborate effectively or perform tasks; Ewell, 2001)?

**What Does It Mean For Programs?**

Ewell (2001) indicates that an outcomes-based approach means that programs must define learning goals at the outset. It also implies that learning goals will serve as guides for instruction and as guides for judging student attainment. One of CAA’s responsibilities is monitoring programs’ success related to student achievement. CAA would look at their program-defined knowledge and skills. CAA will also examine indicators of success and their thresholds. These include such measures as Praxis results, program completion rates, and employment of graduates in the first year after graduation.

**Accreditation Standards**

Only five of the 31 accreditation standards are affected by the new certification standards. These accreditation standards are

1.2 consistency of missions and goals

1.6 assessment

1.7 documentation

3.1 curriculum

5.5 large and diverse client base
A more detailed description of these standards is provided in Appendix A.

What Will The CAA Look For?

With regard to the five accreditation standards affected by the new certification standards, many programs want to know specifically what the CAA will look for in the process of program review. What the CAA will look for through review of applications and via site visits will be

- Connections among goals, student learning outcomes, curriculum, and assessments.

- Breadth of knowledge and skills covered in the curriculum and the depth of content consistent with student learning outcomes.

- Good planning. Programs should incorporate the six components of formative and summative assessments the CAA first provided to programs in documents beginning April of 2002.

Regarding good planning, CAA will specifically ask the following six questions:

1. **Where are the K/S addressed in the academic or clinical curriculum? (Std. 3.1)**

   - Are the breadth of knowledge and skill covered?
   - Are all aspects of the K/S covered?
     - (e.g., anatomical/physiological, acoustic, psychological, developmental, linguistic and cultural)
   - Are student learning outcomes listed on a course syllabus sufficient by themselves or should they lead to larger more overarching student learning outcomes?

2. **What are the Behaviorally Defined Indicators of achievement/learning goals for each K/S? (Stds. 1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 3.1, 5.5)**
Variability between programs on goal depth
Documentation that student learning outcomes (or BDIs) identified for each K/S
Are student learning outcomes appropriate to the goals and mission of the program?
Do you have the resources for students to meet the goals?

EXAMPLE

• A program establishes as one of its goals that it will prepare students for employment in a hospital setting.
• Would you then expect to have an outcome that students can demonstrate skill in working with clients with
  o Aphasia?
  o Motor speech disorders?
  o Balance problems?

3. What mechanism or instruments are used to assess student achievement for each K/S? (Std. 1.6)

• How are the student learning outcomes assessed?
• By whom?
• How often?
• Mechanism and instruments needed to assess students’ progress in reaching the indicators of achievement for each learning goal

Assessment Mechanisms

• Effective Assessments much include
  o Triangulation of data (multiple sources)
  o Good evidence
• Principles of Evidence (Ewell, 2001)
  o Be comprehensive
  o Include multiple judgments
  o Include multiple dimensions
  o Be a direct measure of student performance

Characteristics of Good Evidence

• Valid - evidence is capable of representing the underlying concept with a clear rationale for why it is related to the intent of the standard
• Reliable - produce the same result consistently over time.
• Verifiable - evidence that is documentable and replicable; sufficient to enable reviewer to corroborate what was found.
• **Representative** - evidence truly represents the performance of wider populations
• **Cumulative** - use of multiple sources, methods, and approaches providing independent corroboration; triangulation from several data points.
• **Actionable** - focusing on evidence that is analyzed and interpreted so that it will reveal specific implications for the program and provide guidance for action and improvement.

**EXAMPLE**

- **Outcome statement**: Students will be able to describe the etiologies of localized tumors and lesions of the larynx.
- **Assessment method**: Multiple choice test in a voice course.
- **Issue**: Student misses all the test questions on etiologies of localized lesions.
- **Question #1**: Could the student still pass the test although questions about etiology were missed?
- **Question #2**: Was the stated learning outcome adequately assessed?

4. **How will records be kept and feedback provides to students, faculty and supervisors and what type of remediation plans are in place?** *(Stds. 1.6, 1.7)*

- ALL PROGRAMS MUST KEEP A KASA FOR EACH STUDENT.
- KASA is only a summary record of student.
- What tracking mechanisms are used regarding student progress?
- How is that information provided to students and faculty?
- How are opportunities provided for remediation?
- Keep records of the results of their formative assessments

5. **How did you validate the indicators of student learning goals and student achievement for each K/S?** *(Stds. 1.2, 1.6)*

- “How do you know that the learning outcomes you have selected are appropriate for entry level practitioners?”
  - What data have you collected?
  - How are the indicators related to goal setting?
  - How have you determined these outcomes?
  - How you know when to add or alter them?

6. **How are the data used to evaluate and improve the program’s effectiveness?** *(Stds. 1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 3.1, 5.5)*

- Evaluations are ongoing and systematic
• Multiple evaluators – students, alumni, employers, consumers, and so forth
• Program awareness of assessment results
• Evidence of plans for change or improvements

Reporting During 2003 – 2004

Beginning July 1, 2003, CAA will assess all programs’ compliance via the Annual Report, the Candidacy Progress Report, the (Re)Accreditation Application, and the site visit. Programs will be required to demonstrate that students are eligible to meet new certification standards. Site visitors will verify that program has, in place, mechanisms to demonstrate compliance with the standards.

The Site Visit – Fall 2003 And Beyond

As always, CAA will seek verification of compliance with standards. The structure of the Curriculum Offerings table will show how the breadth of the standards is covered. Further verification takes place via discussions with the chair, faculty, students, staff, and external sources. Reviewers and site visitors judge compliance by triangulating data among the application, program goals, curriculum, formative assessment plans, documentation, and representative KASAs.

Until 2005/2007, site visits will be conducted with the understanding that student cohort differences exist. Thus, site visits will involve verifying compliance with CAA Standards related to certification for both cohorts of students (pre- and post new SCCC).

Highlights Of Changes – Reporting

New reporting procedures will involve new questions and requirements. The highlights of these will be
• Examples and description of student learning outcomes
• Description of assessment procedures
• Tracking mechanisms and responsibility
• Program’s student completion rate
• Graduate employment rate
• Validation process for outcomes
• Two sample KASAs
• Praxis results for the ETS testing year instead of the program reporting year, so that programs can “compare apples with apples”
• Identification of sources of performance on the Praxis
• CAA will assess success based on 3-year average pass rate.

Questions And Answers

Many questions typically arise concerning CAA’s expectations. Some of the common ones are

• Where/how do the behaviorally defined indicators (BDIs) fit into the KASA? Programs should have a BDI for each area of the SCCC; however, these BDIs (or student learning outcomes) will not be reflected on the KASA summary form that is submitted to CFCC by the applicant. Outcomes should be included in the tracking mechanisms, advising sheets, course syllabi, and so forth.

• How do we integrate work already done by students, such as undergraduate work? Once a program sets markers for achievement of each K/S, the program should assess an incoming student’s knowledge and/or skill and make appropriate entries. Programs should apprise their students of the achievement markers.
Will the program’s responsibility toward a student’s clinical fellowship change?

For SLP – NO. A 36-week (FTE) clinical fellowship is still required under the auspices of a mentor who holds CCC-SLP. Typically, the SLP-CF is done post-degree, so the program has little or no responsibility.

For Audiology – yes. The SCCC-A require applicants to complete the equivalent of 12 months of full-time clinical practice (i.e., 35 hours/week x 52 weeks = 1820 hours). This approximates the same as required under the 1993 SCCC-A (350 hours + 36-week FTE CF). Now, the difference is that it is intended to be distributed throughout the program of study and that it is done as part of the program of study.
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Appendix A
Accreditation Standards Affected By
Changes in Certification Standards

Std. 1.2: Consistency of program’s mission, goals, and objectives with entry-level standards & institutional mission
Common Programmatic Goals

- Students will be able to complete graduate degree program
- Students will be eligible to meet other appropriate professional credentialing requirements (e.g., licensure, teacher certification)
- Students will be eligible for ASHA certification

Std. 1.6: Assessment

- Ongoing and systematic
- Includes academic and clinical education
- Performance of students
- Performance of graduates
- Students have input to assessment
- Results used to plan and implement improvements
- Reflects relationship between program’s mission, goals and student learning outcomes

Std. 1.7: Documentation of student progress

- Completion of the graduate degree
- Completion of state credentialing requirements
- Completion of ASHA certification requirements
- Information available to students

Std. 3.1: Curriculum (academic and clinical education)

- Consistent with the mission and goals of the program
- Sufficient to permit students to meet credentialing requirements

Std. 5.5: Large and diverse client base

- To achieve the program’s mission, goals, and objectives
• To prepare students to meet credentialing requirements
• Variability between programs on goal depth
• Documentation that student learning outcomes (or BDIs) identified for each K/S
• Are student learning outcomes appropriate to the goals and mission of the program?
• Do you have the resources for students to meet the goals?
One thing that struck me as I attended my first University President’s Council retreat after becoming Dean was that, aside from the Dean of Nursing, I was the only woman at the table. In contrast to ASHA conventions, the line at the ladies room at our breaks was very short. There have been numerous studies of women in corporate and academic leadership. Interestingly, law and academics lag behind the business world in advancing women in administrative roles. It may be that business rewards performance more directly or it may be that the women who choose business for a career are more directed toward administrative goals. Certainly, you have a better chance of reaching goals if you set them.

Leadership styles between men and women differ and our ideal of a good leader appears to have shifted over the past decade. A study of middle managers in the early 1990s listed important descriptors of leaders to be authoritative, decisive, and take charge. A follow up to that study recently showed the most used descriptors to include effective, consensus builder, and good communicator. The change seems to be in direction of attributes that are more gender specific to females than males. Perhaps more importantly for our field, they are qualities that are widespread in our CSD chairs. This may be one reason our disciplines appear in disproportionate numbers in academic administration.

I think there are some strategies that can help us, male or female, move into academic leadership. First, take a research approach to leadership. Do some self
analysis to understand your own strengths and weaknesses. Understand and test out hypotheses about how you impact situations and those around you. The Harvard Summer Programs in Higher Education Administration and the Bryn Mawr Program in Leadership are good places to do some self assessment. Look for mentors both outside and inside the university. Read and gather data that are qualitative and quantitative so that you understand as much as possible about academic leadership.

Having done the leadership “literature review,” it is necessary to determine your specific aims. Identify clearly what your goals are and begin to decide what steps you need to take to develop the skills and experience needed to accomplish these. Early in my career Julia Davis advised me that, while men can jump over steps in a career ladder, women generally need to fill in all the spaces. This may mean being an Associate Dean for three to five years to show that you understand how a Dean’s Office operates, if a Deanship is your goal. Being in a support role for too long, however, can be a career ender, so you need to set some limits on these sorts of experiences.

I believe that our training as clinicians, learning how to move clients from A to B, is the best sort of approach to academic leadership. Administration requires that we take the role of the other person, that we have realistic expectations, that we reward performance and effort, and that we always reach for the best possible outcome. With this approach I have a distinct impression that the lines at the ladies room will be getting longer.
The Best Way To Earn An Administrative Appointment
Robert Ringel, Ph.D.
Purdue University

The best way to earn an administrative appointment is to

1. Establish yourself as an exemplary scholar/teacher. Universities of high standards want their administrators to have earned the stamp of approval from their disciplinary peers. Academic administrators are expected to be role models and mentors for those whom they will lead.

2. Become visible and eligible for a senior administrative position by performing with excellence in your current administrative appointment.

3. Let the administrative position find you. Campus-based search committees, executive-search firms, informal networks of colleagues, and sitting senior administrative friends are continually looking for people who are making an impact in their current performance. Believe that strong people are sought out and found! The nomination and recruitment system usually works quite well.

4. While you are waiting to be discovered, continue to prepare yourself for the position to which you aspire. Take on additional responsibilities in your present appointment, attend seminars and short courses in higher education administration (the Harvard, Bryn Mawr and American Council of Education are good programs with national visibility), publish in journals which focus on issues of higher education, and read the literature in this area of interest. Reach out beyond your own department, school, and even your employer university. Remember, all that you need to know in terms of content and people is not likely to be found in Communication Science and Disorders journals, nor are they likely to be at the ASHA Convention.

5. Even as a senior administrator, try hard to remain active in your academic area of specialty. You must retain the option of returning to your field if the senior level administrative position ceases to remain your "pleasure."
6. Be thoughtful and considerate of the people you meet on the way up the administrative ladder. You will certainly have to work with them when you reach the top rung and you will surely meet them again if you descend the ladder.

7. Administrative stars are seldom born overnight. It is perhaps a cliché, but true nonetheless, that success in finding the job of your life occurs when preparation meets opportunity. Your job is to be deep into preparation.
Department Chair To President To Dean: Why That Pathway And How?

Kim Wilcox, Ph.D.
The University of Kansas

My career track was somewhat atypical, moving from department chair, to head of a state higher education system, to college dean. This progression was not entirely by design, but it has provided me with an exciting and rewarding career. My experience offers two primary lessons. The first is to prepare yourself. I was fortunate to have two formal administrative training experiences, one on-campus and one off-campus, and both for an entire academic year. In addition, I sought out other administrative opportunities wherever I could, with two goals in mind: broaden my experiences and be as helpful as I could. These two goals were not always compatible, in that sometimes I could be most helpful doing things that did not expand my knowledge or skills. But, overall the two goals served me well and provided me with a wide-range of experiences.

The second lesson that my career offers is to take advantage of whatever opportunities come your way. I was never much of a “planner,” but over two years time, I found myself assisting in and then directing strategic planning at two universities. Similarly, I never aspired to the position of state system head, in fact for most of my career would probably not have taken the job, if offered. But I did take the job and benefited enormously from the experience; and I believe accomplished a great deal for the state.

The latter lesson, take advantage of opportunities, however, must be tempered by good judgment and research. Most administrative positions naturally lead in some directions and not in others. For me, I realized that my system position would not facilitate moving to most major on-campus administrative positions. But I knew that going in, and planned accordingly. Others faced with unexpected opportunities would be well-advised to do their homework about the implications that any decision has for their career-track before saying “yes.”
Look Before You Leap
Ro Scudder, Ph.D.
Wichita State University

I chose the title of my talk to represent the three years I spent as Director of the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence at Wichita State University (WSU). I am fairly certain I would do it again, and I certainly do not regret those three years, but there are certain aspects of the position that I did not thoroughly consider before I took the job.

Some background information is necessary first. I had been on the faculty at WSU for almost 30 years and had served as Clinic Director and Department Chair. I had also been on Faculty Senate and many department, college, and university committees. During the time prior to the establishment of the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE), I had served as the writer for the university’s North Central Accreditation application. I worked closely with an Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and spent some time in those offices. I began to consider a “next step” in my academic life and thought I would like to pursue some type of administration beyond the department level. The Vice President was considering starting a center for teaching and I had the opportunity to serve on and then chair a task force to study the feasibility for a center, and then, when it was developed, I applied for and was selected as the Director for a three-year term.

The terms of my contract included a pay raise, a new office in a wonderful suite on the fourth floor of an older building in the center of campus (this alone was an enticement to a “basement-dweller” for 20-some years!), and excellent support staff in a full time administrative assistant and part time student assistant. This position was .5 EFT so I knew that I would have some difficulty going back and forth between the CTRE and the Communicative Disorders and Sciences (CDS) department, but anticipated that
I could organize the division of days satisfactorily. Plus, I was excited to further teaching excellence and develop the Center and its many outreach activities.

Now to the reality of those three years and the things I did not consider or could not predict. The office, while large in size and perfectly decorated and furnished, was on a floor where the other offices housed the foreign languages department. The only “walk-by” traffic consisted of those faculty and students, and the Center was not in a convenient enough location so that faculty from across the campus could use the resources easily. Also, as many could have predicted, two half-time jobs do not equal one! I had difficulty sticking to a schedule because of conflicting meetings, demands, and so forth. The biggest surprise for me, however, was that I missed the comings and goings of fellow faculty members and students. I now had a large, quiet office with no interruptions and I found I missed those interruptions!

Now that I have returned full time to the CDS department and academe, I realize that the intangible benefits of one’s job are often not recognized or given enough credit. The daily interactions and familiarity of place, job expectations, and knowledge of colleagues are often not factored into what makes our work rewarding. I have had the opportunity to move into administration and I am pleased I did, but I am also even more pleased that I could return “home!”
I have been at the University of Central Arkansas (UCA) for 28 years. My family obligations and choices defined the geographic boundaries of my career path but I honestly do not feel this has been a barrier to my growth and development in academic administration. In the past 15 years, I have had opportunities to serve as clinic director, Assistant Dean of the College of Education, Chair of the Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Graduate Dean, and now Associate Provost. Each position has provided a chance to broaden my perspective and understanding of the university and determine how I might contribute.

Moving up the career ladder at the same institution carries risks. Some are similar to the risks of those who move up in multiple institutions, while others are unique to being place-bound. In both cases you carefully weigh the risks against the potential benefits. Obviously there are no hard and fast rules as you approach the risky business of putting yourself forward as a leader and higher level administrator at your current institution.

My mother described some of the early opportunities in my career as “being in the right place at the right time.” I did not recognize until about 15 years after I started at UCA, that her perception simply was not true. I was and would always be “in the same place, all the time,” meaning the remainder of my career. Success was not so much about being lucky but usually came from taking opportunities when they were presented and then working very hard. I was choosing to make it “the right place at the right time.”
Here are some of my own suggestions to make the same place be the right place, whenever you determine it is the right time.

1. Define your own beliefs and values. Be aware of your personal strengths and then look for opportunities to match strengths with institutional needs. To do that you must also develop an in-depth understanding of the needs of your institution.

2. You can attain an immediate advantage by volunteering for activities that provide an opportunity to broaden your experiences, develop new skills, get to know the institution, and become known to faculty and upper administrators. Do something that helps someone else or advances the goals of the institution or unit rather than your personal goals. This may include such things as faculty governance positions, accreditation steering committees, and strategic planning initiatives.

3. Do not take short cuts. You must go through the appropriate ranks and experiences to establish credibility as a dean or vice-president. Do not move into administration too quickly. First develop competence and recognition as a teacher and scholar.

4. Find a role model. Not everyone is fortunate enough to have a real and helpful mentor, but you can observe administrators you respect and analyze carefully the traits you admire in their leadership style.

5. Take advantage of professional development activities for HIED administrators such as the Bryn Mawr Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration, Harvard Leadership Series, and New Dean’s Institutes of various professional organizations.

6. Do not hesitate to make known to others that you are interested in moving up. If offered a position as interim, consider taking it if you would be allowed to apply for the position. That gives you the opportunity to see if there is a “fit” while also demonstrating your competence in the position.

7. Be a dynamic subordinate and make your immediate superior “look good.” However, be careful that you do not attach your own career to one individual. He
or she may not be place-bound. If you plan to remain at your current institution, you do not want to be viewed as being loyal only to the previous administration. Make your loyalties to the institution.

8. If you do apply for a position internally address directly the fact that you are a “home-grown.” It is tempting for search committees and other decision makers to give stronger consideration to applicants from outside the institution to bring in fresh ideas. Do not assume because you have been at your institution for so long that everyone knows or remembers what you have accomplished. Share your experiences, personal philosophy, resultant leadership style, and vision for the institution or the unit in which you are seeking a position. Give specific examples that confirm you have the experience and knowledge to provide comprehensive and quality leadership in the position you want.
Handheld technology, especially pocket-sized, first took off with the engineers or computer-types. Pocket-sized technology seems to be taking off in more and more directions and for those who watch the market, models seem to be changing everyday. Palm and other manufacturers are following the model Apple used to sell their computers-getting them into the hands of teachers and kids to discover new uses. Soon, more and more students entering college will have had experiences with pocket-sized personal data assistants (PDAs). Medicine, pharmacy, nursing and other fields are expanding their uses as well.

Experimental and in some cases, typical uses by K-12 as well as higher education administrative can include online resources; anytime, anywhere access to email; online resources and references; student data access; calendar and scheduling access; word processors; organizers; contact information; and online collaboration. Medicine, nursing, and pharmacy have used the technology to have quicker access to reference material, track patient care, document visits, and transfer information. Obviously, these same functions can be completed through a computer. However, when mobility is the challenge, pocket technology may be hard to beat - with a possible stumbling block being the cost of wireless access. Currently, wireless networks in universities and hospital vary in their availability.
A Sample Of Student Use

Student use of pocket technology may be in its infancy in speech-language pathology. In a sample of 25 students at the University of Akron, only two students used PDAs, while all 25 had a computer, access to the internet, and used email and all but two had a cell phone. Four had tried the technology, but only two pursued it and they primarily used the technology for calendar and address functions. The majority continued to use paper-based organizers, calendars, to do lists, and contact information lists. All but two students felt potential uses of pocket technology included client contact logs, scheduling clients, and keeping references handy, such as lists of ICD-9 codes. More than half agreed that PDAs would be a good resource for keeping track of professional expenses such as mileage, contact information for vendors or referrals, client information, clinical data collection, and billing information. Most students agreed that low cost, long battery life, portability, ease of learning, rechargeable batteries, expandable features, and capacity to store lots of information were essential features. Colorful screens, alarms, built-in telephones, wearability, or the capacity to perform text to speech or speak to you were not seen as essential.

In a trial use by three research assistants for three months, none of the three adopted the technology for themselves after the trial. The blocks to use included the time it took to enter data on the spot, worries about losing data, and worries about theft or loss. Two of three had models with attachable keyboards. They found the keyboards difficult to attach and when encased with the PDA, the keyboard made the package bulky for their briefcases or backpacks and added to the weight.
Experimental Use With Clients

Clinical uses are also a possibility for PDA use. Currently, the Assistive Technology Research and Development Collaborative on Cognitive Disabilities began to explore the use of pocket technology with youth and adults who have cognitive disabilities, both developmental and acquired. The National Institute on Disabilities and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) sponsors the project (#H133A0101607A) administered by the Brain Injury Association of America. Each research partner conducts research on various segments of the total population. Partners and their populations include: The University of Akron, School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology (children and adolescents with traumatic brain injury or mental retardation), Moss Rehabilitation (adults with traumatic brain injury), Temple University (adults with mental retardation) and technology consultant, Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital.

This collaborative partnership will investigate the use of the PDA as a cognitive prosthesis for memory and organization difficulties common to these populations. Data collection currently under analysis includes surveys of trends and perspectives in pocket technology use in the cognitive-communicative disability community and trials of pocket-technology use. The project intends to provide an interactive forum to share information that will be of growing use to families and individuals with disabilities as the technology becomes more and more prevalent. Currently, a catalog of pocket technology suitable for those with disabilities can be found at www.biausa.org. The Website will also provide information on the project’s progress as it grows. A virtual town hall meeting on pocket technology will be presented by project partners on March 26, 2004.
Uses And Potential Uses In Communication Sciences And Disorders

As the technology grows in availability and acceptance, applications in communicative sciences and disorders will likely include clinical treatment, administrative functions and teaching. In clinical treatment, pocket technology may assist in documenting client information, tracking and charting behaviors, and documenting observations. Administrative uses can include documenting treatment hours, providing billing information, and scheduling. In clinical supervision, uses may be to track student performance, keep track of directions to off-campus sites, document impressions and observations, track hours and experiences, and review client data. Client data uses will need to be compliant with Health Information Portability and Accountability ACT (HIPAA). Special care needs to be taken due to the fact that information can be easily "beamed" from one PDA to the next. For example, instant access can occur when the student clinician and supervisor beam each other information or when wireless access to the Internet is possible.

Again, early adopters are likely to be those working in highly mobile situations who are willing to trade paper for pocket-sized technology. Since students are frequently highly mobile and without permanent workstations, they are the most likely to adopt pocket-sized technology. Student use may pave the way for more widespread use in the profession.
The purpose of this presentation is to discuss the process of mentoring new members of the professoriate and the interpersonal and technical skills this requires on the part of the mentor as well as on the part of the new faculty member. Much of this discussion will relate to Goleman’s and colleagues’ (Goleman 1995, 1998; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002) study of emotional intelligence and its impact on leadership. The central thesis will be that the mentor has to have strong self-management as well as management of relationships skills to be an effective mentor. Simply put, new faculty will find it hard to listen to, follow, and place trust in a guide who too is lost!

We will begin our discussion by examining the essential components of emotional intelligence and how such qualities may influence leadership and the mentoring process. Second, we will discuss how such qualities may influence the person being mentored. Third, and finally, we will discuss the bi-directional nature of the interaction between mentor and person being mentored, and ways to increase the chances that the mentor-mentee relationship is a win-win situation.

The Mentor

Leadership And Emotional Intelligence

The cornerstone of leadership, according to Goleman and colleagues, is emotional intelligence (EI). Adapting Goleman’s (1998) descriptors of the five interrelated components of emotional intelligence, the present author would describe these components as follows

- Know thyself (self-awareness)
- Control thyself (self-regulation)
- Stretch thyself (motivation)
- While knowing others (empathy)
- And realizing that nothing important gets done alone (social skill)

Self-Management Before Management Of Others

For the purposes of the present discussion, the first three (know, control, and stretch thyself) self-management skills are crucial for the mentor. Again, it is difficult for the beginning teacher-scholar to put faith and trust in the advice/words of his or her academic guide, when that guide is obviously lost. The mentor him or herself must have established the kinds of skills that he or she is trying to impart to the new faculty member. Most importantly, as we will discuss subsequently, the mentor needs to be clear regarding how those skills were acquired and be able to explicate the process of skills acquisition to the beginning teacher-scholar. So rule number one for the mentor: Know, control and stretch thyself, if you expect your new faculty member to do the same. Let the new faculty member see the continuing challenges of leading the life of the mind, hear about the mentor’s difficult decisions, both personal as well as professional. Above all, the mentor should describe his/her failures, not only the successes.

One common mistake that mentors make is to assume that merely presenting a role model of excellence as a teacher-scholar will be sufficient. Some mentors appear to make the assumption that mere exposure to the role model alone permits the new faculty member to copy, emulate, and develop as well as build the long-term capabilities of a teacher-scholar. Certainly, the mentor's having previously walked the walk of the new faculty member provides the mentor with tremendous ethos, believability, and face validity. Clearly, role models are important. However, simply having done what the mentor is asking the new professor to do is necessary but it is not sufficient for the purposes of effective mentoring.
Talk The Talk, Not Merely Walk The Walk

What rounds the picture out, for the mentor, is not only to be able to show, but to tell. And the mentor can not tell if he or she does not clearly understand the process by which he or she accomplished his or her achievements. The person being mentored must not only see the end-product of a life of accomplishment, but he or she must be told about it, given some clues regarding the blueprints or map to the highway of accomplishments. In other words, it is all about the journey for the new faculty member. Thus, reaching the goal is much more apt to occur if the journey is well delineated by the mentor's explication of the nature of that journey. So the second rule for the mentor: The mentor must not only walk the walk, but talk the talk as well. The mentor needs to talk about his or her own journey. The mentor needs to demonstrate that he or she is still on this journey, that growth, learning, and development continue throughout the life of the teacher-scholar. The answers to questions lead to more questions, as one's scholarly careers evolve.

I Have A Dream

If we assume, for the moment, that the mentor is striving towards meeting rules 1 and 2 above, then we can discuss the style or nature of the mentor's leadership. As we will discuss in more detail later in this paper, the coaching style (Goleman et al., 2002) would appear to be most appropriate for the academic mentor. With the coaching style, according to Goleman, the mentor attempts to connect what a person wants with the goals of the department and University. The coach attempts, through a variety of inter-related means, to assist the mentee develop long-term capabilities. No small trick, that. Typically, the coaching mentor is positive in approach. This approach is much more likely to employ the carrot than the stick. Unfortunately, too many mentors find the stick, and installation of fear of non-promotion to be more to their liking.

One way to begin minimizing this tendency is to, starting with the interview process, find out if the new faculty members have a dream. Why did they get a Ph.D.?
What did they want to do with it? What are their aspirations, hopes, dreams? What do they want to accomplish? Sounds all very spiritual and the like, but that neither means it is wrong nor inappropriate. Talk about the new faculty members’ dreams with the new faculty members, help them better understand what they want to do, dream about doing. Let the faculty members know that science advances through accretion. Certainly, quantum leaps in knowledge represent an ideal to strive towards but experience indicates that this ideal is far less than likely. Yes, the dreams of our career nights are often dashed on the shores of our workaday realities, but thus is life. That is part of the fun, figuring how to make the dream a reality. No one ever said any of this was going to be easy. So rule three for the mentor: find out what the new faculty members’ dreams are and do everything you can to help them realize that. The mentor, however, should understand and explain to the mentee that the journey towards the dream will be incremental, but nonetheless sweet when achieved.

Investment In Human Capital

While literature coming from the field of business, like that of Goleman’s, is quite informative, it is not always applicable to academe. First, there is a basic difference in the purpose of the University versus business. The main purpose of the University is knowledge production and dissemination. Business is all about production of profit. Second, the University deals in human capital, predominantly, while business deals in monetary capital. Not that the former eschews the latter, far from it, but ideally the University is not run to earn money. Rather, the University earns money to run, to accomplish its goals of knowledge dissemination and production. These important distinctions oftentimes get lost by both the mentor and the person being mentored. So, rule four for the mentor: understand that when mentoring a new faculty member, the mentor, the department, and University are investing in human capital. This investment pays off in the form of knowledge production and dissemination and the growth of future human capital, that is, students who join the work force, the academy, and so forth.
**One Size Does Not Fit All**

Finally, mentors may think that because the end goal – promotion and tenure – is the same for each new faculty member that the journey each mentee takes is also similar. **Wrong. One size journey does not fit all.** For some mentees, the journey will involve a series of studies on different but related aspects of one larger topic. For others, it will be a more restricted number of carefully crafted studies within a larger programmatic investigation. For still others, a lot of “on the road” presentations will be helpful, but others will barely do more than present yearly at the annual national conference. A team, and that is what a University department is, needs players possessing various skills. Granted, all team members need to be committed to leading the life of the mind and to relish informational and theoretical achievements. They must also understand that the life of the mind is about being consequential not famous. However, that said, the way each member realizes these lofty aspirations can and must vary. Otherwise, neither students nor fellow faculty members will benefit from the diverse panoply of intellectual endeavors that is one of the hallmarks a vibrant and active department.

**The Person Being Mentored**

It is fair to say that emotional intelligence is no less important for the person being mentored than the mentor. So, the new faculty member will also need self-management skills as well as management of relationships, particularly the former. For if new faculty members have an unclear idea of who they are (their relative strengths and weaknesses), they will find it difficult to benefit from the mentoring process, let alone advance their careers.
One Gets Promoted Because They Publish; They Do Not Publish To Get Promoted

Perhaps one of the biggest determents to successful mentoring is fear. Fear on the part of the new faculty member in terms of not getting promoted and tenured. Quantity, not quality, of scholarly contributions are often held up as the benchmark. This is wrong both for the new faculty member, the mentor, the department, the University, and society at large. Obviously, a reasonable degree of productivity is salient; however, when only number rather than nature of accomplishments are stressed, the new faculty member gets the wrong message: Crank out any and everything you can, forget content or the message, merely clog up the medium with “stuff.” So, rule one for the new faculty member: understand that one gets promoted because he or she publishes, one does not publish to get promoted. More on this below, when we discuss the mentee’s motivation.

Do Not Confuse Being Consequential With Being Famous

The new faculty member should be encouraged to express, explore, and develop his/her ideas. These are ideas that his/her curiosity encourages him/her to explore. Following the idea, the curiosity to explore same, the mentee should be encouraged to develop the ingenuity to find methods and procedures that allow him/her to explore empirically those ideas he/she is curious about. While some descriptive work will naturally be a part of any teacher-scholar’s agenda, ideas should, ideally, lead to non-trivial testing of salient concepts, ideas, and theory. Again, to live the life of the mind, the new faculty member is being encouraged to use his or hers to its fullest extent. And difficulty of the journey is no excuse for not embarking on the trip. Indeed, the more difficult the journey, oftentimes the more consequential the rewards for taking it. The new faculty member must be encouraged to keep his or her eye on the prize: being an individual whose professional accomplishments are consequential. Surely, fame can follow consequence, but fame without consequence is less than desirable for an academic. Indeed, a University’s long-range goal is not well served if the fame of many
of its faculty members exceeds their consequence. The second rule for new faculty members: understand the difference between being consequential and being famous, and do everything possible to engage in the former and disengage in pursuing the latter. The consequential professional strives, for the most part, to generate non-trivial ideas and develop non-trivial tests of the ideas which result in answers that push back the frontiers of knowledge. If fame and fortune follow that, great, but consequence, not fame is the driving wheel.

**Stretch Yourself**

In the 1990s, the term *the stretch objective* was introduced into the field of business. Variously defined, the stretch objective essentially means striving for accomplishments slightly beyond one’s grasp. The concept is not new, of course. For example, a long time ago, a poet opined that, “a man’s reach must exceed his grasp or what’s a heaven for.” Of course, one can always inappropriately over-reach and we have all been there. However, motivation to achieve, to accomplish, not merely for money, prestige or fame, but for the sheer love of accomplishment, should be included in any new faculty member’s scholarly quiver. Certainly, the mentor will want to protect the mentee from needlessly entering areas of investigation that are either unrealistic to study in terms of time and effort and/or unlikely to bear fruit. The mentor must, however, balance these realities with the mentee’s need to grow, develop, and stretch. Such stretching typically involves the mentee to enter, at least for him or her, uncharted waters. Stretching beyond the known, the safe, the new faculty member should be encouraged to study, no matter how tentative, areas of relative darkness in terms of knowledge. Based on his own personal and professional experience, the present writer can not help but agree with Goleman et al. (2002) that “…there’s a special sweetness to success that pushes people beyond their abilities” (p. 61).
The Other Half Of Inspiration Is Perspiration

Finally, all the above rather lofty ideals are, of course, just that, an ideal, if the new faculty member is reluctant to work. Or, as we have all heard, “I’m an idea person.” Translated, “I’m uncomfortable with, uninterested in the grunt work involved with empirical science.” Often, after the good idea, and the good proposal, comes a good amount of work. Those who are reluctant to get their hands dirty in the ooze and the slime of messy methodology, running participants, and so forth really have no business, themselves, asking their own students to do the same. Again, if this were easy, it would have been done long before.

So, the final rule for the new faculty member, the crucible that forges together the ideas, the curiosity and the ingenuity, is this: the other half of inspiration is perspiration. A philosopher once noted that advances in his field were accomplished by those who went to work “everyday like a green grocer.” Translated, in the immortal words of Bullwinkle T. Moose, “it takes more than wishes to wash the dishes.” So, the fourth rule for new faculty members: the other half of inspiration is perspiration. The new faculty member must understand that anything worth having is worth working towards. Too often, however, one will hear new faculty members say, that or that is too hard, it will take too much time. Read rule three above, about “stretching” oneself. Or as an old professor of mine, Harold Westlake once told me when I opined that thus and so was “too hard,” “Ed, one has to do more than enough before one learns what enough is.” None of our abstract thoughts will ever bear concrete fruit if we fail to stay the course, fight the good fight, and persevere. None.
The Bi-directional Nature Of The Relationship Between Mentor And The Person Being Mentored

The Coach

As mentioned above, the present author believes that the coaching style (Goleman et al, 2002, pp. 59-63) of leadership is most suited to the mentoring of new faculty. To begin, coaches have frequent and non-trivial conversations with new faculty members about their life, their life goals, dreams, and hopes. Many of us present or potential mentors might say, “I don’t have time” for coaching. Or, “I can’t be their research coach.” Some might even say, “if the new faculty member doesn’t have it in them by now, they never will.”

Such fatalistic, and, in my opinion, short-sighted, opinions are non-productive. Both mentors and the people they mentor are made not born. Otherwise, what is the purpose of mentoring? Why bother mentoring if we believe that the new faculty, to be successful, are born that way, either they will or they will not be successful. Within this style, the coach focuses on personal development, rather than solely accomplishing tasks, making deadlines. The person who is mentored by such an individual feels that he or she matters to the mentor, to the department and is less apt to feel he or she is just a tool to get the job done. This style enables the new faculty member to better listen and respond to performance evaluations, understanding that such feedback will further his or her aspirations not merely the mentor’s or department’s interest.

The coaching style helps new faculty members identify their own strengths and weaknesses. The coaching mentor helps the faculty member establish long-term goals, conceptualize a plan to reach these goals, but all the while clearly distinguishing between the mentor’s responsibilities and those of the person being mentored. The coach helps the new faculty member tie their daily activities to their own and in the department’s long-term goals, something that can really help motivate the new faculty member. The coach also can effectively employ the stretch objective with new faculty
member, and rejoice in their successes along the way, but tolerate their failures as well, understanding that one may learn more, much more, from one failure than many successes.

Obviously, as Goleman et al. (2002) point out, coaching works best with those new faculty members who show initiative and desire professional growth, and is less successful with those faculty who lack motivation and require excessive personal direction and feedback. Further, as Goleman notes, when inappropriately applied, such a style can resemble micromanaging or excessive control of the person being mentored. This is particularly problematic during performance feedback that should be building motivation rather than fear or apathy within the new teacher-scholar.

Where this writer sees mentoring going frequently awry is concentrating on short-term goals, rather than long-term achievements, aspirations, and goals. Too much focus on the solution without any real understanding of the problem, from the new faculty member’s perspective, tends to make the new faculty feel less appreciated than more motivated. Rather than focus on what must be or what has not been accomplished, the good coach demonstrates a belief in a person’s potential and an expectation that he or she can and will do his or her best. Such demonstrations, according to Goleman, and this present writer’s experience, is most apt to lead to the new faculty member having positive, meaningful developmental experiences and lead to the creation of more loyal members of the departmental team.

Whatever the style, the mentor must strive to drive the new faculty member’s emotions positively (resonance) rather than negatively (dissonance.) The former leads to enthusiasm, to conditions under which people rise to the occasion, the latter leads to conditions under which anxiety, lack of productivity, and the like are more apt to occur. Being out of touch with the feelings of the new faculty member, in essence, may mean that the mentor is out of touch with the new faculty member and unable reach the new faculty member.
Certainly, other mentors can and will select other leadership styles than the coaching one described above. For example, the pace-setting style of mentoring/leadership is frequently seen in business and academic circles. In our opinion, at least in terms of mentoring new faculty members in higher education, solely relying on a pace-setting mentoring styles (e.g., holding him/herself and all fellow faculty members to high standards, an agenda marked by constantly doing things better and faster, quickly pinpointing poor performance, etc.) does not seem likely to get the job done with most new faculty members. Rather, the relentless, vague demands of the pace-setting mentor leaves the new faculty member feeling pushed too hard and having to guess what the mentor and/or system want. We agree with Goleman that such styles of leadership/mentoring are fairly dissonant, leading to emotions within the new faculty member that are seemingly contradictory to successful progress. Conversely, if the mentor wants the new faculty member to commit to the department, the University, and his/her profession, the mentor must attempt to maximize positive emotions felt by the new faculty member.

Conclusion

Thus, this brief paper has come full circle. If mentors want new faculty members to know themselves and control themselves, to stretch themselves towards desired personal, professional, departmental and University goals, mentors must first do the same. That is, knowledge of others is importantly related to knowledge of oneself. The latter, while not sufficient to fully understand the former, is clearly necessary.

We have tried to make the case that the more successful mentors will be individuals who

(1) know, control and stretches themselves,

(2) not only walk the walk of the life of the mind but also talk the talk about the process involved with their particularly scholarly journey,

(3) understand the new faculty member’s dream, aspirations, and goals,
(4) realize that the mentor’s job is an investment in human not monetary capital, and
5) know that one size does not fit all in terms of the nature of the journey each new faculty member will travel to reach their goals.

The most successful new faculty member, will be, in our opinion, the individual who understands the difference between
(1) quality and quantity of scholarly work;
(2) consequence and fame;
(3) achievement for achievement sake rather than achievement for money, prestige, and fame; and
(4) perseverance, perspiration, and inspiration.
Also, he or she will actively engage in career planning and exhibit strong degrees of job involvement (Noe, 1988).

Bringing together the aforementioned attitudes, beliefs and skills, on both the part of the mentor and the person being mentored, along with the mentor’s coaching leadership style (i.e., one that focuses on development of long-term capabilities), should increase the chances that a resonance will to occur between the two parties. And once achieved, we would like to suggest, that this resonance, has the greatest potential for successfully driving a positive mentoring experience for both the mentor and the new faculty member.
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The mentor takes the protégé under his/her wing, invites the protégé into a new occupational world, shows the protégé around, imparts wisdom, cares, sponsors, criticizes, and bestows his/her blessing. The teaching and the sponsoring have their values, but the blessing is the crucial element. (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978)

The suggestion that academic programs in communication sciences and disorders institute mentoring programs is often heard. The idea that mentoring will help junior faculty members achieve success in meeting the demands of challenging academic environments certainly makes sense intuitively. What is not clear is what constitutes an effective mentoring program. Perspectives on mentorship can be found in literature produced by diverse disciplines, especially education, business, and nursing (Borman & Colson, 1984; Clawson, 1980; Fagan & Walter, 1982; Gray & Gray, 1986; May, Meleis, & Winstead-Fry, 1982; Rawlins & Rawlins, 1983; Swoboda & Millar, 1986; Wildman, Magliaro, Niles, & Niles, 1992; Woodlands Group, 1980). One will find diverse definitions of mentoring (cf. Phillips-Jones, 1982). For example, one of my favorite examples defines a mentor as one who provides “a brain to pick, a shoulder to cry on, and a kick in the pants” (Josefowitz, 1980). Although this definition has appeal, it does not provide much guidance on how to offer effective mentoring. This paper presents a model of mentorship and explores its application to academic settings. Then a developmental progression in mentoring relationships will be presented. Finally, the
potential for mentorship networks as a means of expanding beyond and overcoming the limitations of traditional dyadic mentoring relationships will be discussed.

The model that I would like to share has the advantage of encompassing many of the ideas found in the diverse literature one encounters on mentorship. Anderson and Shannon (1988) emphasize mentoring as a nurturing process:

in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter’s professional and/or personal development. Mentoring functions are carried out within the context of an ongoing, caring relationship between the mentor and protégé. (p. 40)

This model of mentoring is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1. A schematic model of mentorship adapted from Anderson & Shannon (1988).
Note that the perimeter of the model designates several predispositions that are essential for one to serve as a mentor. First, one must be willing to open oneself to protégés. This might entail a willingness to share reflections on one’s past successes and mistakes or to divulge thought processes that guide personal and professional decision making. Second, one must lead incrementally. Because preparation for academic challenges varies, mentors must individualize the mentoring process and maintain realistic expectations that progress in an incremental fashion. Protégés have different strengths and needs. This second predisposition acknowledges the need to individualize the mentoring process to lead in an incremental fashion. Third, mentors must express genuine care and concern. The mentoring process requires a personal connection that is at its heart supportive.

Fundamentally, mentoring implies a relationship between a mentor and a protégé. Anderson and Shannon’s (1988) model proposes three possible roles for the mentor: (1) serving as a role model for the protégé, (2) nurturing the protégé, and (3) caring for the protégé. These three roles set the context for the most informative part of this model, the identification of five mentoring functions: teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counseling, and befriending. Each of these functions could be operationalized via a variety of activities. A few examples are provided.

*Teaching* can be a rather direct form of mentoring. Examples abound: when a mentor might provide feedback on a manuscript that is being prepared for submission; when offering questions or suggestions about a proposed research study; when confirming that the protégé’s response to a manuscript or grant review is appropriate; when suggesting an alternative means of assessing student performance; when offering suggestions for how to provide feedback to students on their written assignments.
The mentor also can serve as a sponsor for the protégé. This may occur when the mentor suggests the protégé for a review panel or as a consultant. On the other hand, the mentor may protect the protégé from becoming overcommitted to a variety of activities that may detract from research and teaching efforts. In general, the mentor provides support in such a way to increase the local and especially the national visibility of the protégé while trying to maintain a balance that will not overwhelm the protégé.

The mentor offers encouragement. This may be a matter of affirming or praising the quality and quantity of the protégé’s work. It may be a matter of offering inspirational chats. For some protégés offering challenges may be most effective. Nicholas Hobbs taught me the benefit of challenges. He introduced me to the concept of JMDs or Just Manageable Difficulties. He taught that if individuals put themselves in situations that were difficult, but just manageable, it would promote personal growth and development.

Counseling is another function of a mentor. The mentor might need to be able to lend a sympathetic ear or ask probing questions that help the protégé understand motivations or values associated with actions. As problems arise, the counseling function might serve to bring greater clarity to personal and professional expectations, roles, and situations. Sometimes the mentor offers advice.

Finally, the mentor is expected to function as a friend. One is expected to relate to the protégé with positive interaction patterns leading to a friendly relationship. A sense of acceptance and an acknowledgement of the protégé’s individuality needs to be communicated. Successful mentorship is built upon a good interpersonal relationship and sufficient time for the mentor and protégé to relate.
By outlining these functions prospective mentors can evaluate whether they are able to serve all these functions. Similar to all kinds of relationships, a mentor may self-identify an unwillingness or lack of comfort with his/her ability to carry off some of these functions. That does not necessarily disqualify a person from being a good mentor. Nevertheless, this self-awareness could be communicated to help the protégé determine areas that might best be addressed by other colleagues, friends, or mentors.

To sustain mentoring there needs to be advantages to both the mentor and the protégé. The activities discussed above outline many advantages that protégés might realize from the mentoring relationship (Goldstein, 1993). Common advantages to the protégé include:

- Gaining advice on career goals
- Receiving encouragement; help instilling self-confidence
- Acquiring new or improved skills and knowledge
- Being offered models of how to handle difficult situations
- Being provided opportunities and resources
- Being provided increased exposure and visibility
- Being provided guidance and a model to help bridge difficult life transitions

Of course, the primary purpose of mentoring junior faculty is to ensure their success by promoting career development, thus bringing along a colleague (and “worthy successors”). Perhaps there are advantages that are not altogether altruistic. Some potential advantages thought to appeal to those considering serving as a mentor, include:

- Furthering one’s own development. One learns by teaching. Also, new faculty members are likely to bring new skills that might be of value to mentors.
• Alleviating feelings of alienation by forming relationships with others like us. Indeed, social psychologists observe that parents envision their children to be just like themselves but a little better. Don’t faculty members share a similar vision for their doctoral students? This is a common tendency that faculty members may need to overcome if they are willing to broaden their perspectives and consider unfamiliar strategies and activities that may improve their mentoring skills. At the very least, through mentoring relationships one learns to talk the same language.

• Being involved in close, caring, and productive relationships. The nurturing of interest and desire, and the development of skills can be accomplished in a reciprocal fashion if one believes that these accomplishments are best achieved through such relationships.

• The returned investment when protégés involve their mentors through their future contacts, advise, expertise, and so forth.

It may be useful to think about how the functions and activities involved in mentoring are implemented as the mentoring relationship develops. Haring (1993) makes this explicit in her discussion of a developmental model of mentorship. During the *Initiation* phase, the emphasis might be on activities associated with the teaching function (e.g., modeling, informing, consulting, and coaching). Subsequently, there may a long phase of *Cultivation*. During the Cultivation phase, a number of additional functions may be added, such as encouraging, sponsoring to provide exposure and visibility to other colleagues, protecting, and counseling. Over time, many of the functions that are outlined in Anderson and Shannon’s model would need to be faded. Eventually, one should expect a *Separation* phase. At this point, the protégé should be increasingly independent and have established an strong self-identity; the mentor no longer plays a pivotal role. Finally, a *Redefinition* phase may be discerned as the mentor moves from being a transitional figure to a friend, colleague, and co-equal.
Mentor-protégé interactions do not always flourish and develop into productive, mutually beneficial relationships. In the literature on mentorship, there are a number of potential problems that are discussed (Bolton, 1980; Brooks & Haring-Hidore, 1987; Goldstein, 1993; Kram, 1983; Philips-Jones, 1982 Rawlins & Rawlins, 1983; Rowe, 1981; Shapiro, Haseltine, & Rowe, 1978). Matching a mentor to a protégé is far from a science. Inappropriate choice of mentor or protégé could produce a number of unsatisfactory outcomes, such as:

• Excessive time and energy commitments experienced by either the mentor or the protégé.

• Unrealistic expectations imposed by the mentor upon the protégé or vice versa. Although such mismatches in expectations might be preventable through open and honest communication, candid discussions leading to shared expectations may be rare.

• Expectations of protégé failure. This is a serious problem and one that is likely to lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

• Protégé’s feelings of inferiority. This may be an issue when an inexperienced faculty member is intimidated by the reputation, skills, activities, or productivity of the more experienced mentor.

• Unfair manipulation by a mentor or a protégé. The mentor may view the protégé as an underling to do his or her bidding or cavalierly exploit the protégé’s ideas or skills. On the other hand, the protégé may take advantage of a situation and exploit the mentor.

• Overdependence. Not only might the protégé become overly dependent on the mentor and fail to develop independence, the mentor also may become overly dependent on the protégé as an assistant, coauthor, statistician, and so forth.
Even healthy and productive mentor-protégé relationships may not be free from problems. For example, such relationships could evoke excessive jealousy from others—other faculty members or family members might not appreciate the time or camaraderie they perceive.

Exploring Alternative Models of Mentorship

Many of the potential problems associated with dyadic mentor-protégé mentoring could be minimized with “networking mentoring” (Haring, 1993; Swoboda & Millar, 1986). Because mentors may be uncomfortable with all the mentoring functions outlined by Anderson and Shannon (1988), drawing on Haring’s (1993) concept of a network of mentors has distinct advantages. Different mentors might help meet diverse needs and even provide multiple perspectives when multiple mentors are addressing the same needs. Dyadic mentoring relationships have an explicit acknowledgment that the more experienced mentor is offering assistance to a less experienced protégé. In contrast, networking mentoring has the potential for reciprocal and non-hierarchical relationships. Perhaps the greatest advantage is the potential for gaining multiple perspectives. One could argue that combining new perspectives with the empowerment of networking is likely to yield more creative problem-solving and is more likely to yield departures from the status quo.

In most universities where mentorship programs exist, they typically promote a dyadic mentor-protégé model. Although they may be highly successful programs, a lot depends on a mentor’s ability to function effectively in that role. And success with one protégé does not guarantee that productive relationships will be repeated with other protégés. Training programs for mentors are scarce, to be sure. In the spirit of developing a network of mentors at FSU, I asked if junior faculty would be interested in participating in weekly morning meetings. Four assistant professors welcomed the opportunity. In fact, they gave the weekly meetings a name: The Meerkat Roundup. I have since learned a bit about Meerkats; they showed up in the novel, The Life of Pi
(Martel, 2001). The FSU Meerkats found a website with a motto they found apt
(http://www.meerkats.com/): “Respect the elders, teach the young, cooperate with the
family, play when you can, work when you should, rest in between. Share your
affection, voice your feelings, leave your mark.”

From the outset, I expressed my expectation that this weekly meeting should not
be considered a “tenure-prep course.” I saw it serving two basic functions. First, we
would focus on writing projects. My intention was that this would make all of us
accountable for planning writing projects and evaluating whether we were making
progress each week. I encouraged them to share parts of manuscripts, grant
proposals, and reviews. I did so as well. This allowed us to have mini-research
meetings in which we were able to get feedback on our writing projects. Second, we
would provide a forum for problem-solving. We shared ideas about the common
problem of how to distribute one’s efforts to maintain a satisfying and productive
balance in our lives. In many respects, we reflected on the Meerkat motto. As a
function of these meetings, it is my impression that these junior faculty members were
more willing to share thoughts, ideas, and concerns with one another as well as other
colleagues. I believe it had an effect on writing productivity and the development of
coping strategies. At the very least, the Meerkats knew that someone cared and was
willing to assist them. I am less confident that these meetings helped establish network
mentorship, but it has raised the consciousness of faculty members in the department
and perhaps many folks associated with the CAPCSD.
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WORKSHOP FOR CHAIRS: NEW AND USED
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The Workshop for New and Used Chairs was designed to provide program heads the opportunity to exchange ideas, concerns, and information related to administering and otherwise managing academic programs in audiology and/or speech-language pathology, across degree levels. As a springboard for this year’s session, the workshop leaders surveyed CAPCSD membership regarding topics they would like to see discussed at this session. In response, the following topic areas were selected for discussion at this workshop. The format for the session included comments from the workshop presenters on each topic, followed by group discussion. The outline below presents topic areas, including sub-topics, covered by the presenters.

Balancing Administration with Teaching, Research and Clinical Duties

• Can it be done?
• How do you set your priorities?
• Should you be a role model for the faculty?

Responsibility for Mentoring Junior Faculty

• Proper selection
• Advocacy
• Guidance (mentoring)
• Cut your losses
Faculty Workloads

- Pre-tenure versus post-tenure
- “Fair” service assignments in small departments
- Performance guidelines
- The policy monster

Advising Responsibilities of Research-Active Faculty

- Personpower needs
- Best use of talents
- Pros: learn the curriculum; get a broader picture of departmental operations; connect with students

The Chair’s Role in Fundraising

- Importance to the Department
- Importance to personal and professional growth
- Necessary skills:
  1. Learn how to schmooze.
  2. Remember for the sake of your Department, that you may never stand so tall as when you are bending over to kiss a donor’s behind.

Senior Faculty Who Are Not Effective Teachers (and maybe not effective at much else)

- Performance guidelines
- Post-tenure review
- Incentives, collaborations
Promotion, Tenure, and Faculty Status of Clinical Supervisors

- Is tenure a reasonable expectation?
- Clinical track versus tenure track and related ranks
- Multiple year contracts

How the Clinical Doctorate May Change Our Educational Models/Role and Promotion of Faculty Who Hold Clinical Doctorates

- Traditional versus non-traditional models of education
- Ph.D. shortage and implications re: program accreditation status
- Should holders of clinical doctoral degrees be placed in tenure-track positions?

Monitoring Effective Teaching

- Student evaluations do give some useful feedback
- Peer reviews – early, often and rigorous
- Culture of teaching
- Performance guidelines

AND THE THREE WORDS THAT CHAIRPERSONS HATE TO HEAR THE MOST:

“Got a minute?”
While it is somewhat trite sounding at this point, it is, nonetheless, appropriate to note that the web has revolutionized communication and information management across many aspects of our society. Certainly, professionals in the speech and hearing sciences have experienced this phenomenon along many dimensions. From a training perspective, the web has provided new or improved means of delivering education content and enabled innovative means of both pre- and in-service training. For a more administrative perspective, the web has facilitated nearly universal access to information and new organization schemes for information.

While there are any number of reasons to explain the communication revolution related to the web, two of the more important may relate to the issues of access to the web and ease of development of web pages. Of these two, the ease of development issue is most relevant to this presentation. The traditional means of presenting a web site involves developing a number of web pages and then storing them on a web server for individuals to access. Development of the web pages involves the use of a relatively simple programming language (i.e., HTML) to both present the content and format the output of the content. While the simplicity of developing web pages can be viewed as one of the more obvious advantages in enabling web presentation of information, it can also be viewed as one of the greatest limitations in realizing the full potential of web-based dissemination of information.

The project described in this presentation resulted from a convergence of the publishing and dissemination capabilities offered by the web and a number of motivating factors related to information organization and dissemination. This project was started while I was the director of the Speech and Hearing Sciences program at Portland State
University. During my tenure as director, the university had identified an organizational priority related to student advising and communication. We were also faced with the record keeping challenges built into the new certification standards. With these tasks added to the basic information broker function of higher education administration, a strategic decision was made to utilize more actively the web as a primary information storage and delivery mechanism for our program.

On first pass, the decision to utilize the web as a primary information management tool seemed obvious. However, it quickly became obvious that there were technical limitations with basic web protocols that would limit the effectiveness of this project. By its very nature, a web based on traditional HTML is a static presentation medium (see Figure 1 on the next page). When the information contained on a given page becomes outdated the author of the page must, at the very least, edit the given page (if not completely recreate it) and then re-upload it to the server. This may be little more than an annoyance for a small web site consisting of a small number of pages. However, as web sites grow larger and the information begins to cross-link over many pages, this updating process can become a major site maintenance nightmare.

Over the last few years, a number of technologies have evolved that have enabled the deployment of much more dynamic and interactive web pages in which information can be automatically updated and the user can more meaningfully manipulate components of the on-screen presentation. Some of the more widely used dynamic content technologies involve the use of a scripting language and a server-housed database system. Scripting languages can be either client-side (e.g., JavaScript, VBScript) or server-side (e.g., PHP, ASP, ColdFusion). While client-side scripting languages can introduce some degree of dynamic content to a web page, the server side languages, by design, allow the greatest degree of dynamic content control on a web page.
1. User’s browser sends a request for a file: (e.g., http://www.sphr.pdx.edu/faculty.html) to the server.

2. Server (i.e., www.sphr.pdx.edu) retrieves the file "faculty.html" from the disk storage system.

3. The server extracts the contents of the file (i.e., HTML code; "<HTML><head>...")) and sends it to the browser which formats and displays the content.

Figure 1. Traditional HTML presentation.
As shown in Figure 2 (on the next page), a server-side scripting language can dynamically create a complete web page without utilization of any statically-stored HTML code. If a web server is configured to support a given scripting language, then a small program called a scripting engine will be running on the server computer. When a web page is requested that includes scripts to be handled by the scripting engine, the server software will send the requested file to the scripting engine for processing. The scripting engine will execute any scripts embedded in the requested web page generating the new and dynamic content that is returned to the server software as a file written in HTML. The server then forwards the file to the user’s browser for display on the screen.

As with any typical database system, a server-housed database provides complex storage, manipulation, and retrieval of nearly any type and quantity of data. The web-server database system adds the advantage of nearly universal access to the data. The data available on the server are accessed via scripts written directly into the web page. Utilizing the mechanism described above, the scripting engine can request data from a database and incorporate the data directly into a web page. Thus, with a server-side scripting engine working in conjunction with a web-based database server, web pages can be created that deliver new and current content each time the page is requested. It is this dynamic technology that has enabled the web to become a mature and functional information management system.

For the initial phase of this project the PHP scripting language was utilized in conjunction with the mySQL database server to build a dynamic information management system for the Speech and Hearing Sciences program at Portland State University. The project is currently being converted for use at the University of Cincinnati. This conversion was necessitated as the University of Cincinnati does not support the PHP/mySQL development tools but instead has chosen to support ASP/MS SQL Server software form the Microsoft corporation. Although the scripts for
Figure 2. Delivery of web pages using a dynamic delivery scheme
the web pages have to be rewritten to accommodate the new scripting language and database server software, the basic operational and organizational concepts described herein still hold.

**Example 1: Program News And Calendar**

The home page for the program website displays news and calendar items that are in effect for the date of the user’s visit to the site. The database for the site contains a table that has entries for each news item event and calendar date. These entries each contain start and end dates that control when the items are displayed on the home page. When a user requests the program home page (e.g., enters http://www.uc.edu/csd into the address line of their browser), a script is executed that queries the database for news and calendar items that are scheduled to display on the given date. If any items are scheduled to be displayed, the script gathers the necessary information for displaying the news or calendar items and then automatically generates the necessary HTML code for display of the items in the user’s web browser.

Figure 3 (on the next page) displays the news item editor web page. Since the information regarding the news or calendar items is maintained in the database, there is no need for anyone to have to edit the actual web page to get the items to display. An editor web page is available (via a password authentication page) to the site administrator that allows him or her to add or edit news and calendar items to the database. The use of the web interface for adding information to the database simplifies the overall management of the site considerably.
1. The News editor allows for the entry of the specifics of the event including the beginning and ending date for displaying the item.

2. When the home page is opened, whatever news items that are scheduled to display are shown.

3. Clicking on the 'Details...' link opens a window displaying the specific details of the news or calendar event.

Figure 3. Example of function of the New Item editor and home page display.
Example 2: Online Formative Assessment Management Program

The formative assessment requirements written into the new certification standards certainly are presenting numerous challenges to all training programs. While not discounting the efforts that will be required to meet the actual assessment aspects of the program, the recordkeeping requirement may present more of a logistics nightmare to programs. On analyzing the recordkeeping needs for meeting these new standards, a web-base management system seemed to be a very reasonable and useful solution. Figures 4 - 7 (on the following pages) present an overview of a formative assessment management system that will be implemented at the University of Cincinnati.

This system revolves around a so-called learning marker entity. The learning marker is a conceptual entity that defines a measurable activity demonstrating a level of mastery for a given skill or knowledge area, a rubric for defining the students actual level of mastery for the given activity, the specific knowledge or skill area from the certification standard reflected in the defined activity, and the experience (e.g., specific class, practicum, comprehensive exams, case study presentations, etc.) in which the student will be expected to complete the defined activity. Learning marker definitions will be developed in a sufficient number to address all knowledge and skill areas defined in the standards. These definitions will be stored in a master learning marker database.

As a student moves through his/her graduate program he/she is evaluated against each of the learning marker definitions. These evaluations are completed by the faculty and instructors in the program and a web page interface is used for entering the evaluation information directly into the formative assessment database (see Figure 5). At any point in time, the individual student’s assessment results can be combined with the learning marker definition data to display a web page report of the student’s progress against the
knowledge and skills defined in the standards (see Figure 6). Figure 7 displays a web-based version of the KASA form that is generated dynamically at any time to serve this reporting purpose.

1. The formative Evaluation program is course based. We are developing sets of ‘learning markers’ for each class. Each learning marker will identify 1.) the knowledge or skill that the student will demonstrate, 2.) the standard item that the marker is tied to, 3.) the criteria for the various achievement levels, 4.) the target achievement level for the course, 5.) the evidence source for the marker (i.e., how will the student demonstrate their achievement level), 6.) the validator for the marker (i.e., why is this a valid marker), and 7.) an optional comment by the marker author. These marker definitions are stored in the database used in our formative assessment program.

![Learning Marker Review](image)

Figure 4. Learning Marker Definition entry page.
2. When a student is enrolled for a class, a set of markers for that class is created for the student and stored in the database. During the course of the term, the faculty member will evaluate each student against each learning marker for the class.

![Figure 5. Student Assessment entry page.](image-url)

Figure 5. Student Assessment entry page.
3. Student performance against the learning markers can be evaluated for each class. The scripts for this window will retrieve the individual student's markers from the database and the definition for each marker. Next, the student's performance will be compared against the target achievement for the class and the outcome will be reported using different type face colors.

![Figure 6. Student performance report for individual class.](image)
4. At the conclusion of the student's program, a script is available that can extract all of the student's learning markers from the database and generate the Knowledge and Skills Assessment (i.e., KASA) graph automatically.

![KASA Form Image]

Figure 7. KASA form generated automatically from stored assessment data.
Do any of these scenarios “ring a bell”? Your student papers and assignments do not include reasonable sources or all look strangely alike on some topics despite constant updates to academic search tools. Some cite non-scholarly sources or even projects students at other universities have posted on the Internet. Frankly, you suspect that some might be plagiarized. If these examples seem familiar, failures in information literacy may be a large part of the problem. The purpose of this paper is to define information literacy, to pinpoint problems that information illiteracy creates, and to suggest curricular and programmatic solutions to these problems.

Literacy Redefined

What is information literacy and what does it have to do with Standards for the CCCs?

“Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (American Library Association, 1989, p.1). For some of us who just reviewed the new revised standards for the Certificates of Clinical Competence in Speech-Language Pathology (CCC-SLP), this sounds a lot like Standard III-G!!! Standard III-G for the CCCs-SLP requires “evidence-based practice.” Evidence-based practice (EBP; Sackett, Rosenberg, Gray, & Richardson, 1996; Straus & Sackett, 1998) includes the following assumptions:

- That clinical skills grow with the application of cutting edge data, not just personal experience;
- That expert clinicians should seek new information to improve
their effectiveness; and

- That clinicians should be data seekers, data integrators, and application evaluators.

To achieve these goals, steps in implementing evidence-based practice might include the following for a given clinical problem:

First, pose a clear and concrete question. This in and of itself is not so easy. A question such as, “What is the best treatment for stuttering?” is not likely to yield informative results, while a question such as “What is the efficacy of operant treatment for stuttering in preschool children?” may provide data that are more readily interpreted.

Next, one should search the literature. It is this step that will be a large focus of our discussion, because it is a step fraught with complications when done incorrectly. How does one search for information appropriately and efficiently?

Following searches, students (or clinicians) should critically evaluate the information that was obtained. Is it reliable and valid? This important step presumes that students know how to evaluate published data and determine whether or not it is relevant to their specific question and case.

Next, EBP presumes that one will integrate the information into the specific case at hand, taking the client's specific concerns into account.

Finally, and very importantly, EBP is evaluated by examining the result you obtain from applying your findings.

As indicated above, we find direct parallels between EBP as endorsed by the CCCs and the information literacy competency standards. Importantly, it is
difficult to achieve the goals of EBP if one cannot obtain and interpret the evidence appropriately.

In setting the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, the Association of College and Research Libraries (2000) list the following five standards:

1. The student determines the nature and extent of information needed.
2. The student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
3. The student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his/her knowledge base and value system.
4. The student individually, or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
5. The student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Let’s go through each of these skills individually.

1. The student determines the nature and extent of information needed.

The student starts by defining and articulating the need for information. This involves doing some background reading or discussion with others to become more familiar with the topic, formulating a thesis statement and questions, and possibly revising or refining the questions based on initial exploratory research.

At this stage, the student also identifies the variety of types and formats of potential sources for information. There are a number of ways to contrast the options. One is by intended audience. (Is it meant for lay or popular reading or
for professional or scholarly readers? Is it meant to sell something? Is it commercial?) Students often cannot appreciate the level at which material is provided. For Web-based materials, we will provide you with a suggested evaluation tool later in this article.

Students also need to distinguish between primary and secondary sources. Often they cannot make this distinction and are as likely to summarize material from a text or a summary review as to retrieve original sources (or write “Smith (1980) as reported by Jones (1990).”). If you feel strongly about primary sources, define what you mean for the students.

The concept of peer-review is also very unclear to some students. Some databases include a limit option allowing students to retrieve only those materials that are from scholarly peer-reviewed journals. Critically, most of what is out there on the open Internet is NOT peer-reviewed. If your intent is for students to complete an assignment using peer-reviewed materials, you will need to explain what that means, why it is important, and how to search for them.

An important step in doing research is **in determining the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.** Virtually everything is obtainable these days, but at some cost of time or money. For instance, is the resource you want in the library? Can it be obtained through interlibrary loan? Can it be viewed or purchased from the Internet?

Students must also determine a realistic plan for acquiring the needed information and completing the project. Here is a tip for teachers and students to make sure that students allocate the appropriate time and resources to the assignment. Refer them to the Assignment Calculator from the University of Minnesota ([http://www.lib.umn.edu/help/calculator/](http://www.lib.umn.edu/help/calculator/)). As shown on the sample screen below, it allows students to choose a general topic area, enter the due
date, and receive step-by-step instructions on how to go about a scholarly search and the paper preparation process.

Once students have come up with a list of possible sources of information, they need to re-evaluate the nature and extent of information needed to complete the assignment. It is very tempting in today’s world when using university databases that provide some full-text of articles, to only read or reference those that could be obtained in full-text electronic format from the comfort of dorm or home, rather than those that require actually going to the library. More seriously, when university and other fee-based databases are not available, students may only rely on those sources of information available on the open Internet. In one of the following sections, we will show how student reliance on only full-text options can produce papers with a fairly “cloned” quality.

2. The student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
To access needed information effectively and efficiently, it is critical that the researcher select the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing information. For those of us in higher education, that really translates into knowing your search engine and interface (database screen), as we will detail.

Most of us are familiar with certain types of search engines such as Google, Yahoo, and Alta Vista. As we have noted, these search the open Internet and are less likely to access scholarly papers or materials protected by copyright. Many of us are also familiar with the PubMed version of MEDLINE, the free database from the National Library of Medicine, that searches millions of records of scholarly biomedical journals and produces citations and abstracts for those that are identified as relevant to your search. In recent years, most university libraries have invested in fee-based databases provided by vendors, such as EBSCOhost and Ovid, that essentially provide searching of databases, such as ERIC, CINAHL, Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition, LLBA, MEDLINE, and PsychInfo. Not only do these databases index scholarly journals (and in some cases, books and chapters), as well as a broad array of other materials, many now also provide full-text access to the article contents embedded within the database. [For those practicing clinicians who no longer have access to university resources, a good fee-for-service alternative is a new database for hearing and speech literature called The Dome (http://www.comdisdome.com)] These fee-based databases offer tremendous advantages, but also pose real challenges for appropriate student use. We will illustrate some considerations in using them in the next section.

Students need to appreciate what types of information are available through the database that they choose. Databases index a defined set of journals or other materials, span a specific range of years, and may include citations, abstracts, or full-text of articles. Some databases provide an option to
select more than one database to search simultaneously. Databases also provide options for setting limits on a search to refine the retrieval. If the student fails to use these options effectively, the default search will produce fewer relevant results.

Next, students need to appreciate **what search language or parameters will be required in the search command**. While it may seem simple to type in a term such as *dysphagia*, an undefined search in a multidisciplinary database, such as Academic Search Premier via EBSCOhost, produces nearly 1,000 hits and by adding the databases ERIC, MEDLINE, and PsychInfo to the search for better journal coverage, we yield an astounding 11,000 citations! Students should not have to weed through such a massive result and need to refine the search. One way of accomplishing this is by using the Boolean connectors AND, OR and NOT. For example, by adding another relevant search term with the Boolean connector, AND, the results will contain a much more defined set. To illustrate, searching *dysphagia AND children AND speech* will produce citations to all articles in the database containing all three words *dysphagia*, *children*, and *speech*. This will prove to be a much more defined set of articles than simply searching on the single term, *dysphagia*.

Along with the appropriate use of Boolean connectors, to implement and construct an efficient search strategy, students need to **identify keywords, synonyms, and related terms appropriate to the discipline and question**. Searches quickly go awry when students use ambiguous search terms, such as *SLI* (which is an abbreviation for many things besides Specific Language Impairment), or limiting search terms (such as *stuttering*) when a more complete search will result from using the root word, *stutter*, combined with the truncation character * (asterisk). Searching with *stutter* will retrieve variations on the word stutter, such as stutter, stutters, stuttering, and stuttered. Furthermore, it would be useful to search synonyms such as dysfluency, disfluency, (or *dysfluen* or *disfluen*). The search example here could be: *stutter* OR *disfluen*.
One strategy is to try alternate wording of the search terms until a more desirable outcome is achieved. When using a database that contains a thesaurus, such as ERIC and PsychInfo, for example, or MEDLINE’s MESH terms, you may more easily select appropriate keywords for a search in a particular database without having to make guesses and go through as much trial and error searching.

Once finding initial citations to articles in one or more databases that appear relevant to the research question, students need to evaluate the quantity, quality, relevance, and scope of the resources they identify, as well as gaps within obtained information, and revise the search as necessary. As they do this, they should be recording pertinent citation information for later use in establishing their references. This may be done with pencil and paper or through the use of an online clipboard or folder feature, if offered as a feature in the database.

3. The student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected info into his/her knowledge base and value system.

Most of us have expectations that go further than simply gathering together good resources. We want students to critically evaluate information and its sources and incorporate only selected information in their final product. We expect them to extract main ideas and restate them in their own words or quote appropriately. (More on academic dishonesty later!). We also expect them to examine information to evaluate validity, reliability, accuracy, and potential bias. These issues become critical when students use the open Internet for information. There is some great information out there, but students (and other consumers of the Web) need to be able to assess the value of Web site information. One good resource for Web site evaluation from the University of Maryland, College Park Libraries is “Evaluating Web Sites” (http://www.lib.umd.edu/UES/evaluate.html) which guides the user to asking
questions about the purpose for which the information is posted, the source of
information, its author, and how recently the information has been updated. A
checklist also is included.

4. The student individually, or as a member of a group, uses information
effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

During the next stage of a project, students would be expected to
synthesize information and compare it with prior knowledge about the topic
to determine the value added by the new information, or identify contradictions
and reconcile differences. One way of assuring that this step occurs is to remind
students to research the conclusion that they reach in the paper as well as the
original topic. In other words, if you review a broad literature and conclude that
auditory discrimination practice is a worthwhile component in articulation therapy,
re-run your search using the terms auditory discrimination AND articulation to
see if you missed anything.

5. The student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues
surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information
ethically and legally.

This final and non-trivial skill in information literacy requires understanding
privacy and security issues, free versus fee-based access, censorship and
freedom of speech, and ever more importantly, intellectual property and copyright
fair use concerns. (Napster and “cut and paste” papers anyone?)

Why Do We Feel That This Is An Important Issue For CAPCSD Members?

Some troubling trends are emerging. According to Philip Davis (2003),
between 1996-2000, student term paper bibliographies grew incrementally, but
contained progressively fewer scholarly resources. It is evident that students are
relying more and more on general search engines (e.g., Google), full-text articles in searchable databases, as well as non-peer reviewed Web sites for their academic assignments. It is clear they (and their professors) do not always know the difference between options such as the Internet search engine, Yahoo, and fee-based scholarly databases. Thus, professors who do not want unpleasant surprises need to let students explicitly know their expectations. Unfortunately, it is not just the students who are “Googling”…

“If ‘Google has won’…it deserves the victory. …I don’t know anyone who wouldn't prefer sorting through too much material to scouring library shelves or limited databases to find enough… If a Google search can accomplish that more effectively, I say hurray for Google… it eliminates the middleman between user and information – how wonderful! There are still many niches for librarians to fill…”


Instructors and students need to understand that Google and scholarly, academic databases access completely different types of information. As a field that relies on its research base and urges students to adopt evidence-based practice, we need to demonstrate that the scholarly literature is not well-represented on the open Internet.

In this section, we briefly illustrate how search engines like Google and fee-based databases produce different responses to identical queries. We will undertake two illustrative examples, one of a professor seeking to determine whether or not problem–based learning is an effective approach to teaching, and one which asks if auditory feedback alteration is an effective treatment for stuttering.
Let us start with the first example. A professor wishes to know whether or not to adopt problem-based learning because it has been touted in recent discussions of improved pedagogy. First, we go to Google, on the open Internet and type in "problem-based learning." Our results are interesting – over 16,000 hits. From an initial scanning of items on the first page, most of are relatively high quality, produced by educational institutions. However, the content is inappropriate for our question. The Web sites mainly endorse the approach and explain how to implement it. They do not offer information about whether or not it has been shown to be an effective alternative to current pedagogy.

In our next attempt, we go to MEDLINE (PubMed), the free database of scholarly articles indexed by the National Library of Medicine. We re-run the search on "problem based learning." The resulting search yields fewer than 2,000 citations. Many of these are in fact geared toward evaluation of the effectiveness
of the approach, but it becomes clear that most have studied the question in medical professions, such as nursing. Thus, to explore further, we specify our search as *problem based learning AND (audiology OR speech)*, using the search grammar suggested by the program. Perhaps to our surprise, we find only seven articles that address application to our discipline, none from the major American journals in speech and hearing. While it is reasonable to extract from other disciplines to our own, it becomes clear that documenting the appropriateness of this approach to our field is only in its infancy.

In our next search, we simulated the task of a student who wanted to know about treatment of stuttering using altered auditory feedback. Once again, we went first to Google. What we got here was a true mix, the kind that bedevils many professors attempting to mark papers. Of the 2,000 Web sites that were identified, a large proportion of the top listed sites on the first few pages were commercial ventures selling auditory aids for people who stutter. A few were
sites featuring recently publicized aids on shows such as Oprah and Today. A few were unpublished conference papers. A few were chat rooms discussing personal experiences with devices. Taken together, they provided a relatively poor mix of resources for a student to determine whether or not auditory aids were appropriate treatment options for people who stutter.

Next, we went to the database, Academic Search Premier, and include ERIC, MEDLINE, PsychInfo, and other major health-related databases in its search scope. We retrieved far fewer items, but the articles did tend to address whether or not auditory feedback affected stuttering frequency and severity. However, we note the consequences of working from home or other remote location from off campus, where we insist that ONLY those items with full-text be displayed: we got only 12 hits. For professors who wonder why some term
papers seem to be clones of one another, the answer may not be plagiarism, but simple dependence on the same small set of easily obtainable materials.

Somewhere between 2,000 and 12 sources, there is room for very good student research work. We suggest that instructors teach students to treat the open Internet with care and the full-text ease of university-supported databases with caution as well. The true answer to any question will come from judicious use of both sorts of information sources as appropriate to the research question.

Okay, Enough Preaching, What Do We Do Now?

In this section, we briefly address the very important question of how to integrate the information literacy competency standards into the curriculum. Among the options for building assignments into the curriculum are tasks that
require students to use library resources. (A first step might be asking if your students know where to find the library.)

Programs may wish to consider a formal information literacy course in their curriculum. This might be a stand-alone one-credit course, one credit attached to a 3-credit research course, required or an elective.

Another potential solution is an online tutorial with assessment. The development of such a resource is a monumental task. However, as an example, we refer you to Terrapin Information Literacy Tutorial (TILT), which was adapted by the University of Maryland from the original tutorial developed by the University of Texas (http://www.lib.umd.edu/UES/TILT/). If you visit this site, you will see an adoption for teaching and assessing students’ basic information literacy skills in some of the areas we have discussed in this article.

Although not a complete solution, a step towards information literacy is the use of course-related Web pages that contain print and electronic resources tailored to one or more research-related assignments for a particular course. These are meant to be a support when a librarian provides information literacy instruction to a class. However, they have been used as well to support an assignment when library instruction was not possible. For an example of a course-related Web page see: http://www.lib.umd.edu/MCK/hesp305.html.

A method of organizing electronic resources in a specific subject area to aid in the selection of appropriate resources is the Web Resources by Subject page. Following is an example of Web Resources in Hearing and Speech Sciences from the University of Maryland, College Park: http://www.lib.umd.edu/ETC/SUBR/resources.hearing_speech_sciences.html.

Minimally, we believe that professors and programs need to establish expectations for use of resources in class projects, such as requirements that
resources be scholarly and peer-reviewed. At the University of Maryland, College Park, User Education Services has produced a helpful brochure and Web site for instructors that detail how to create effective assignments: [http://www.lib.umd.edu/UES/assignment.html](http://www.lib.umd.edu/UES/assignment.html). This resource includes information on setting the purpose, preparing students, characteristics of effective assignments, pitfalls to avoid, the role of the librarian, as well as appropriate citing and plagiarism. In the Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences, searches may be assigned as a pre-assignment to class papers, take-home assignments, candidacy papers, and such.

How do we document competency? First, the faculty should be competent! If you have faculty who still think that Google and PubMed are the beginning and end of electronic resource “surfing,” have them talk to your university or college librarians. Next, for the students, if at all possible, information literacy instruction should not be a “one-shot” deal. A typical 50-minute library instruction session as part of a course is helpful in supporting a research assignment, but does not allow for the development and assessment of skills that make the students information literate. In contrast, the use of early and preliminary assignments or the use of a search journal attached to an assignment, for example, can aid in the evaluation and development of skills throughout a program, culminating in capstone assignments (e.g., theses, research papers/candidacy papers) for a full documentation of a student’s ability to pursue life-long learning through intelligent use of information resources.

For a great set of resources for faculty, including model programs in information literacy, we recommend *Information Literacy in a Nutshell* at [http://www.ala.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ACRL/Issues_and_Advocacy1/Information_Literacy1/Overview2/Info_Lit_for_Faculty/Info_Lit_for_Faculty.htm](http://www.ala.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ACRL/Issues_and_Advocacy1/Information_Literacy1/Overview2/Info_Lit_for_Faculty/Info_Lit_for_Faculty.htm)

**Academic Dishonesty**
No discussion of information literacy would be complete without a discussion of academic dishonesty. The growth of electronic resources, and the ease of “copy and paste,” has made plagiarism more attractive and effortless than ever before.

How does one prevent academic dishonesty? First, climate is important. Students need to be explicitly instructed about instructor and program expectations of them. Thus, we firmly believe that it is the responsibility of the instructor to educate students to prevent it or otherwise catch it. We take this position because it is not clear students are being taught how NOT to plagiarize before getting to college or graduate school. To avoid honest but painful mistakes, do not assume! Tell students what plagiarism is and then follow through with the consequences if they do not respect the rules.

There are a number of very good sources that discuss academic dishonesty and plagiarism and we list a few here. For students and faculty (mainly focusing on how to prevent it):
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_plagiar.html
http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/wts/plagiarism.html
http://www.georgetown.edu/honor/plagiarism.html

These sites provide excellent and easily understandable explanations of what plagiarism is and why it is considered dishonest. Some institutions, particularly Georgetown University, provide answers to plagiarism from the perspective of today’s students who have always been able to find the answers to homework on the Web. Do yourself and your students a favor – read them and recommend them.

Unfortunately, some students will willfully violate honor codes. So, for faculty, here are some sources on how to catch it. A major new site, www.turnitin.com, is a site that will allow professors to have students submit
papers for preview by the site for verification of authenticity. Other excellent sites that discuss the faculty role in plagiarism include

http://alexia.lis.uiuc.edu/~janicke/plagiary.htm
http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfbhl/wiu/plagiarism.htm
http://www.academicintegrity.org/
http://www.library.ualberta.ca/guides/plagiarism/

Some Sobering Closing Thoughts

We spent a large portion of this article explaining how to obtain quality resources for academic papers. However, according to www.plagiarism.org, between one-third and one-half of college students admit plagiarizing their assignments from the Internet. Other sources (e.g., Hinman, 2000) make it clear that some of this problem is preventable through better education – it is not entirely an ethical issue. Many students cross the line without meaning to. They simply have not been educated properly. How do we stop this and improve students’ information-finding abilities? Here are some final suggestions. (See more great teacher resources at www.turnitin.com):

- TEACH students the skills required of information literacy
- Particularly, how to SEARCH, how to CITE, how to EVALUATE
- PREVENT “mistakes”
  - Explain information literacy EXPECTATIONS, including ethics/quality of work
  - Make CONSEQUENCES clear
  - Check intermediate STAGES of work
- DON’T EXCUSE “mistakes”
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The Council’s Diversity Incentive Award is presented to the individual, individuals, or academic programs making significant contributions to achieving diversity in the field of Communication Sciences and Disorders. Recipients of this award are individuals or academic programs that have made a significant contribution to increasing the presence of under-represented populations in our field. Last year was the inaugural year for this award and it was presented to the graduate program at Long Island University’s Brooklyn Campus. This year’s recipient is an individual whose legacy of commitment to enhancing diversity in our field is unequaled.

Our honoree initiated her studies in speech-language pathology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and graduated with her bachelor’s degree from Hampton Institute. She proceeded to earn her master’s degree at Emerson College and embarked on her academic career at Hampton University. She returned to school to earn her doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh. In 1985 she left Hampton University to continue on her career path in academia at Howard University.

A review of this individual’s record of publications, grants, and professional presentations attests to her leadership in issues of cultural diversity including the development of cultural competence, the use of culturally valid assessment and intervention strategies, interaction with culturally diverse clients and families, and ways to achieve cultural diversity in university programs. Universities and agencies have sought her expertise and advice as noted by the number of
adjunct faculty positions and consultantships, including five years with the National Institutes of Health, our honoree has held during her career.

Her service has extended far beyond her academic role. She was Deputy Director of the National Black Association for Speech-Language and Hearing from 1982 to 1984. She has served as ASHA’s Vice President for Academic Affairs and has devoted many years of service to ASHA’s Council on Professional Standards, the ESB (now CAA), the Clinical Certification Board and the Council for Clinical Certification, and Special Interest Divisions 1 and 10. In 1992 our honoree became an ASHA Fellow and in 1999 she received the Honors of NSSLHA. For our own Council this individual was secretary and board member in 1991 to 1993 and we have seen her as a presenter at past Council conferences.

What is missing from this list of distinguished achievements and contributions, however, is the number of minority students that this individual has recruited and mentored through their academic programs and on into their professional careers. How many of us have seen this colleague at conferences and meetings where she is giving and receiving hugs from myriads of young professionals whose lives she has touched?

When we think of this individual many of us immediately think of her years of leadership as Chair of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders at Howard University. She has brought those leadership skills and talents to Florida International University in Miami where she now serves as Director of the School of Health.

For her dedication and outstanding contributions to achieving diversity in our field, it is my pleasure to present the Diversity Incentive Award of the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders to Dr. Noma Anderson.
HONORS AND AWARDS

Award Of Appreciation To Richard Talbott, Ph.D.

Presented by

Dianne H. Meyer, Honors and Awards Committee
Rush University

The Council’s Award of Appreciation is presented to individuals in recognition of significant contributions to the Council or to the discipline. This evening the Council is pleased to recognize a colleague who, for over 10 years, has benefited the Council with both his leadership abilities and his insightful presentations at Council meetings.

On a national level, this honoree helped guide the profession of audiology in its transition to an entry-level doctoral degree. With that experience and expertise, he gave a timely keynote address to the Council in 1992 on *The Emergence of Audiology and Speech Pathology as Separate Professions*. More recently, he has chaired the CAP/ASHA/AAA Joint Committee on Audiology Standards.

You might think that dealing with we audiologists would be more than enough for an award of appreciation, but this recipient has done much more! He has presented on additional topics at Council meetings, including *Chairing the Academic Department* and a special session on *Budgeting the Academic Department*. Over the past 4 years, our honoree has contributed his talents and time to the Council by serving on the Executive Board as Secretary from 1999-2001, Parliamentarian during 2000-2001, President Elect in 2002, and currently as President.

Of course, by this time, you know the identity of this honoree. But the introduction would not be complete without including these comments from his nominator, “Rick Talbott never approaches a task part-way. He becomes fully
committed to his role and responsibilities in any activity to which his attention is
directed, and the Council has been very fortunate to be the recipient of this
attention.” And the nominator continues, “There is another accomplishment that
is no doubt among the most important of his career and that is his role as one of
the Founding Fathers of the AGA or Audiology Golfer’s Association!”

On behalf of the Council of Academic Programs in Communication
Sciences and Disorders, I am privileged to present an Award of Appreciation to
Dr. Rick Talbott.
HONORS AND AWARDS

Award For Distinguished Contributions To Patrick J. Carney, Ph.D.

Presented by
Colleen M. O’Rourke, Honors and Awards Committee
Georgia State University

The Council’s Award for Distinguished Contributions is presented to individuals, agencies, businesses, or organizations in recognition of significant and sustained contributions that have enhanced the Council’s ability to serve its membership or which have effectively enriched education in communication sciences and disorders. Our honoree’s contributions have done both – enhanced the Council’s service to members and enriched education in our field.

Our recipient began his journey in speech-language pathology with an undergraduate degree from the University of Wichita. He then earned his master’s degree at Wichita State University and his doctorate at the University of Iowa. This individual has a long history of service to his state association, ASHA, and the Council as well as other professional organizations.

He was president of the Tennessee state association in 1977 and chaired seven different committees for that association over a number of years. He served as our Council’s President-Elect, President, and Past-President in addition to chairing the Working Group on Personnel Shortages, serving as a member of the Nominations Committee and the Conference Program Committee, and speaking at our conferences. In 1991 he received our Award of Appreciation for his service. That same year he served as president of ASHA after having been a Legislative Councilor and the Vice President for Standards and Ethics. During his time as Chair of what was then ASHA’s ESB, now the CAA, and as an
accreditation site visitor, this individual has made significant contributions related to accreditation standards and their implementation.

As a University teacher and mentor since 1969, our honoree has touched many professionals’ lives and he was given ASHA’s Golden Apple Award in 1993. In his role as department chair at the University of Tennessee from 1986 to 2000 this individual had a significant impact on the education of many speech-language pathologists and audiologists. For his outstanding and ongoing contributions to the Council, I am pleased to announce that Dr. Jerry Carney is the recipient of the Award for Distinguished Contributions. Unfortunately Dr. Carney is not able to be with us this evening. As you all know Jerry retired last year and as we speak he is traveling in Europe. Ilsa Schwarz will be accepting the award for Jerry.
HONORS AND AWARDS

Award For Distinguished Service To John M. Hanley, Ph.D.

Presented by
Dianne H. Meyer, Honors and Awards Committee
Rush University

The Council’s Award for Distinguished Service is presented to individuals in recognition of a distinguished record of service to the Council.

A review of the CV of this year’s recipient of the award reveals how generously he has served not only the Council but also his department, University, and community. He has served his current university for 23 years, including 13 years as Chair of the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology. This individual has a broad understanding of academic and faculty issues, which is evidenced by the fact that he has chaired or served on 35 college or university committees. The charges of these committees have varied from research and scholarship concerns to interdisciplinary curricular issues to financial and university planning matters. Clearly, he has devoted exceptional time and effort toward academic affairs. Recently, he received a Distinguished Service Award by his university, in recognition of his extraordinary service commitment.

Over the many years that our recipient has attended Council meetings, he has contributed valuable perspectives during discussions. In 1997 he challenged our thinking about curriculum with his presentation, Implementing a Broad Based Liberal Arts Curriculum. As his nominator explained, “His pragmatic approach to problem solving and commitment to excellence have served the Council well.” Recently, our recipient served in the Executive Board and in 2002 he served as Council President.
Before I actually name this recipient, I should add another comment provided by his nominator. “Among Mick’s most notable accomplishments is his election as an honorary member of the Audiology Golfer’s Association, since full membership is reserved only for audiologists.”

On behalf of the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, I am privileged to present an Award of Appreciation to Dr. Mick Hanley.
HONORS AND AWARDS

Honors Of The Council To Janis Costello Ingham, Ph.D.
Elaine M. McNiece, Chair Honors and Awards
University of Central Arkansas

The Honors of the Council is the highest award bestowed by the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders. It is presented to those individuals whose contributions to the Council and/or to education in communication sciences and disorders have been of such magnitude that their impact on the Council - or on the education of speech-language pathologists, audiologists, or speech and hearing scientists - is recognized throughout the professional community.

Our recipient is one of the elite few in the room tonight who appeared in the Archives photo of participants attending the first conference of this Council in 1980. If this were a reunion of her classmates from Northwestern where she received her bachelor’s degree or from University of Kansas Medical Center where she earned both MA and Ph.D. degrees, she would certainly win the award for the person who has changed the least. If you have examined the photo in the display, you would likely agree that the recipient looks essentially the same today as in that photo more than two decades ago.

Our honoree served the Council as a member of the Executive Board in 1981 and 1982 as Chair of the Professional Development Committee and received the Award for Distinguished Service in 1982. During the decade of the 80s she was a visible and active participant in conference programs serving as discussion leader and as a major presenter twice. If more had heeded the pleas and recommendations in her 1984 presentation, Master’s Degree Curricula – The Place of Research, perhaps we could have reduced today’s concerns regarding
an erosion of the scientific base of our discipline and the critical shortage of
doctoral faculty for our academic programs.

   This scholar’s advocacy and tireless efforts to maintain the highest
standards for doctoral education and the importance of research and research
training to the clinical process have continued to be her most notable
achievements. She has exemplified these standards throughout her own career
as a clinical scientist and on the national level. Her skills and energies have
been applied by serving as editor or editorial consultant to all our major journals.
As ASHA’s Vice President for Research and Technology in 1998-2000 she was
instrumental in the conduct of several initiatives aimed at improving the research
competence and opportunities for young scientists. To increase the visibility of
our discipline, she chaired and organized research updates for directors of all
NIH Institutes that fund research in communication sciences and disorders.

   She has been active as a planner and participant in several workshops on
grant writing, publications, and research ethics, including the upcoming
conference in Savannah sponsored by ASHA and the US Office of Research
Integrity. At the University of California – Santa Barbara, where she has been a
faculty member since 1969, she serves as Chair of the system-wide University of
California Committee on Research Policy.

   We are all pleased that she is again applying her considerable knowledge
and expertise in a leadership role for the Council as our current Vice President
for Research and Academic Development and you heard her perspectives
yesterday as our representative and Co-Chair of the CAPCSD/ASHA joint Ad-
Hoc Committee on the Shortage of Doctoral Students and Faculty in
Communication Sciences and Disorders. I am privileged to present on behalf of
the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders
the Honors of the Council to Dr. Janis Costello Ingham.
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