

## **LARGE AND SMALL PROGRAM COLLABORATION**

### **OR IS IT ONLY DIFFERENT PROGRAMS?**

Nancy Creaghead, Ph.D.

University of Cincinnati

#### **Examples and Ideas**

##### **Encouraging Ph.D. Access:**

Collaboration between MA and PhD programs

- Partner with an MA only program in an area where PhD access is limited.
- Identify potential PhD candidates in that area.
- Combine efforts to support students
  - through the MA locally,
  - to continue into the partner PhD, program
  - and then return to their home area,
- Students may return to faculty positions in their home area.

##### **Possible Models for the above?**

- Identify students as seniors or as they begin the MA program.
- Begin research during MA program with connection to potential PhD program advisor.
- Travel to PhD program during MA program (or earlier).
- Enter PhD program directly from MA program – or complete CF first.
- Return to home university/co-advisor for dissertation research?
- Identify strong experienced Ph.D. candidates (clinical faculty? supervisors?) who desire PhD but cannot leave the area.
- Design a program that allows students to complete part of program at the PhD institution and part at the program which offers the master's or undergraduate degree in SLP and the PhD in other disciplines. The PhD in other disciplines is necessary so that students can take

those portions of their program (research tools, minors, cognates, etc.) that are not under the control of the CSD program to offer at a distance.

### **Encouraging Ph.D. Access:**

Collaboration between UG and PhD programs

- Partner with an UG-only program.
- Identify strong PhD candidates as seniors in the UG only program.
- Combine efforts to support students
  - through the senior year locally,
  - to continue into the MA/PhD partner program,
  - Students may return to faculty positions in their home area.

### **Possible Models for the above?**

- Identify students as juniors or seniors.
- Begin research project during senior year with connection to potential PhD program advisor.
- Travel to PhD program during senior year.
- Enter MS/PhD program directly from UG program.

### **Statewide Collaboration Among Programs**

There are ten graduate programs in Ohio:

- 5 PhD programs
- 4 MA or AuD only

We have developed collaborative efforts to address personnel shortages in Ohio, which has resulted in coursework sharing. The courses were originally developed to provide a distance learning master's degree to remote areas of Ohio where there were severe shortages in the schools. The Ohio Department of Education helped fund the master's degree program, which was a collaborative effort among the state funded universities. This project resulted in the

development of a collaborative relationship and distance learning courses that can be used for the following:

■ Distance learning UG prerequisite courses available to potential graduate students across the state

- Each program offers only one or a few of the courses
- Only one instance of each required course is offered through distance learning statewide so that each university can accept students with all of the prerequisites, but does not have to offer all of them through distance learning.

■ The distance learning graduate courses can also be used for:

- Permanent arrangements for distance courses delivered to another program in content areas where faculty are limited,
- Short term arrangements when faculty positions are vacant.

**Challenges to implementing these ideas:**

- Tuition – who gets the tuition?
- Figuring out a new way to operate
  - Transfer of credits among programs
  - Paying faculty for teaching students in another program
- Sufficient time to nurture new distance relationships
- Potential students with no flexibility to leave their geographical location to participate in these programs.
- Student staying power for the length of the journey from UG to PhD

## **BUILDING THE Ph.D. PIPELINE**

Sandra Laing Gillam

\*The University of Alabama

A PhD collaborative committee was formed within the Council of Academic Programs for Communication Sciences and Disorders (CAPCSD) to begin to address issues related to the doctoral shortage in speech language pathology. Committee members included Sandi Laing Gillam, Chair, at the University of Alabama, Julie J. Masterson at SW Missouri State University, Robert Allen Fox at Ohio State University, Richard Hurtig, at the University of Iowa, Linda Jarmulowicz from the University of Memphis, Melanie Schuele at Vanderbilt University, Celia R. Hooper, at UNC Greensboro, John A. Ferraro from the University of Kansas Medical Center, Joe Melcher at Xavier University of Louisiana, and Iris Johnson at Tennessee State University. The information presented in this paper was derived from surveys and discussions among PhD Collaboration Committee members.

The committee conducted a survey to gather current information on factors that play a role in why our students do or do not choose to enter a doctoral program in CSD. We developed a web-based questionnaire and sent it to CAPCSD program and clinic directors. Program and clinic directors completed one survey and forwarded the student survey to Master's and AuD students. This session addressed some of the answers to those student survey questions in terms of how future PhD programs might be structured to recruit more students into the field.

More than 1300 students responded to the survey. The first question asked "Are you currently enrolled in a PhD program or are you going to enroll in the near future?" A total of 101 or 7.7% of respondents said they were enrolled or were planning on enrolling in a doctoral program in the near future. This is shockingly low. We asked students when they first considered pursuing a PhD. A total of 46% of students indicated that they first considered pursuing a PhD as an undergraduate student. Another 44% reported that they considered the PhD at the beginning of their graduate program. A small proportion of students (4%) considered

the PhD after receiving their Master's and completing their clinical training or after they had spent time working as a clinician (6%). When students were asked, "What was your primary reason for continuing on for a PhD?" 46% said they wanted to pursue a career in teaching and research. Students indicated that they wanted to teach (15%) or to pursue a career in administration (12%) although some indicated that they had a desire to do research (11%). Many students (11%) were pursuing a PhD because of their own personal drive to "pursue excellence", "teach in a clinical setting" and "pursue teaching, research or administrative careers." When asked "when" students actually began to pursue a PhD a total of 82.7% of respondents reported that they entered the PhD following completion of their BS, 69.9% after completion of their Masters, and 94.4 after completing an AuD.

When asked why they did not or would not pursue a PhD the majority of respondents (50.8%) reported financial constraints (n = 666). However, a large proportion of students (42.8%) reported their major reason for not pursuing a PhD as a lack of interest in teaching or research (561). An additional proportion of students (37.8%; 496) reported that they were only interested in pursuing a clinical degree. A somewhat smaller portion of the students (308; 23.5%) reported other reasons for not pursuing the PhD including "burn out", they were "tired of school" or "wanted to take a break", they "didn't feel it was beneficial", while others said that they needed to pay off their loans. The reason that was most often cited in the "other" category was that it took so long to complete a PhD that students felt it was not worth the financial, time and effort costs. Many students reported that they had already been in school for 5 or 6 years and that they could not financially or emotionally withstand any more schooling for the seemingly small benefits of obtaining a PhD. For example, 21.6% of respondents said they did not pursue a PhD because there was not enough salary incentive to justify the time and financial commitment necessary. Twenty percent cited family issues (262 respondents) as the primary reason they did not consider a PhD. When asked, "What would it take for you to consider a PhD?" a majority of respondents (67%) reported that a flexible program of study that

included part-time or distance education would be necessary in order for them to consider a PhD. A total of 66% of respondents reported that a financial package would also need to be available. Interestingly, only 27% of students reported that geographical proximity was a major consideration. Some students entered their own comments the majority of which stating that they simply had no interest in research or in pursuing further education and that no incentive package would impact on their decision not to pursue a PhD. In terms of choosing a program to attend, geographical proximity/location was not the most important factor (2.6%). Specialization interests (3%) and choice of a mentor (2.8%) were the top two reasons cited by students as to how they chose the program that they did.

In summary, students are reporting that they considered the PhD as undergraduate students, and that they require a flexible plan of study and financial support in order to consider the PhD in CSD. An undercurrent in all of the correspondence was the length of time that the PhD takes and the level of “burn out” that students experience. These considerations appear to be mitigating factors in whether or not a student eventually goes on to pursue their PhD. In addition, there are those students who have no interest in teaching or research in which case no amount of mentoring or financial/program assistance will influence their decision. Alternatively, there were also those students who indicated that nothing could dissuade them from their educational and career goals.

Recall that we learned that most of the students who responded to the survey decided to pursue a PhD in their BA programs. Further, after the master’s was completed, very few (<6%) reported that they did or would return for a PhD. This would suggest that we recruit students in their undergraduate years in order to begin to solve the problem of reduced PhD’s in the field. One suggested solution to this is to encourage more undergraduate CSD programs to explore developing joint majors or CSD tracks in other majors (Kansas model). Similarly, programs could bolster the BA degree to include more “science oriented courses” and courses to interest students in our field. These tactics would also be useful in recruiting students to obtain a minor

in CSD. The minor may be a very important way to recruit future PhD students. That is, on many campuses, students are introduced to speech and hearing (as well as linguistics) through undergraduate minors. For examples of minors see the following minors at Ohio State University (undergraduate minor). [http://sphs.osu.edu/SpHrng\\_UG\\_Minor.htm](http://sphs.osu.edu/SpHrng_UG_Minor.htm); linguistics minor [http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/handbook/minor/ling\\_minor.generic.htm](http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/handbook/minor/ling_minor.generic.htm)). The Acoustic minor at Ohio State is currently being developed.

Another suggestion geared toward recruiting quality BA level students is to develop summer research opportunities specifically in CSD that would attract high school students, undergraduates and master's students. Celia Hooper, Joe Melcher, and Robert Fox investigated a number of undergraduate research models that are currently available around the country. The first of these are on-campus summer undergraduate research programs. Some institutions offer an optional summer research experience between the junior and senior years that is designed to recruit interest in aspects of the CSD discipline. Summer research programs for undergraduate students are readily available, particularly in the biological and physical sciences but are not as prevalent in CSD. Summer programs that offer research opportunities include the following:

University of Maryland; <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/dean/summer.html> and

<http://www.nacs.umd.edu/program/summer.html> Louisiana State University, Department of Biological Sciences; [www.biology.lsu.edu/hhmiproq/undergrad/](http://www.biology.lsu.edu/hhmiproq/undergrad/)

University of Rochester Medical Center; [www.urmc.rochester.edu/GEBS/summer.htm](http://www.urmc.rochester.edu/GEBS/summer.htm)

University of Minnesota, Center for Cognitive Sciences, Research Experience for Undergraduates; [www.cogsci.umn.edu/REU/REU\\_descr.htm](http://www.cogsci.umn.edu/REU/REU_descr.htm)

San Diego State University; Minority Biomedical Research Support Program;

[www.sci.edsu.edu/MBRS/about.html](http://www.sci.edsu.edu/MBRS/about.html)

University of Missouri-Columbia, Undergraduate Research;

<http://undergradresearch.missouri.edu/opportunities/programs/for-all-students.php>

Northern Arizona University; Departments of Biological Sciences & Psychology; National Science Foundation Funded Research Experience for Undergraduates in Neural & Behavioral Science <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~shuster/>

Students indicated that they did not enjoy research. One reason for this may be that they have had very little experience with it. One successful approach to providing research experiences and recruiting quality undergraduates into CSD is to allow students to stay on one campus for the academic year and engage in interesting research activities throughout the year. For example, Ohio State provides students with research experiences through mentorships between faculty and honor's students. An interesting approach has been taken by the Department of Psychology who advertise faculty research projects on their websites in hopes of recruiting undergraduate students to participate (as participants and researchers). In addition, there are "Freshman seminars" that are designed around an interesting content in a disciplinary area. For example, Robert Fox taught/teaches Forensic Phonetics that is directed at freshman or sophomores to interest them in speech science topics. Examples of web sites for year round and summer models are as follows:

UNC Greensboro (University wide- each department conducts their program independently)

<http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/stuResearch.html> and go to <http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/undergrad.html>

UNC Chapel Hill (campus wide program) <http://www.unc.edu/depts/our/> For a department

example, <http://www.bio.unc.edu/undergraduate/research.htm> or

<http://www.chem.unc.edu/undergrads/research.html>

Summer <http://www.med.unc.edu/pmbb/sure/>

Wayne State University (connected to Honors program) <http://honors.wayne.edu/purpose.php>

Iowa (University wide) <http://www.uiowa.edu/~honors/research.html>

Flexible scheduling was a major consideration cited by students as to why they did not consider a PhD. One solution to this may be in the formation of regional or national consortia in CSD after the model of the CIC/Big-10. This would allow students to take courses via a course-

share agreement (distance) and to spend time visiting another campus as a “visiting scholar”.

The goal of the CIC Consortium is to extend learning opportunities by sharing courses, research facilities, and online course development and curriculum.