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The Future of Undergraduate Education

About the Presenter
- Observations on our discipline and on undergraduate education.
- List of Suggested Actions

Was Kim correct when he said that “…we, in CSD, are not secure in our discipline…”?
Or that “…we too seldom think of ourselves as an academic discipline in the same way that others on campus do…:?”
Have we Focused Too Much on:

- Undergraduate programs as preparation for master’s/doctoral programs

- Clinician shortages and what to do about them?

- The perceived threat of PTs, OTs, and others?

- On short-term clinical opportunities for payment enhancement?
Kim’s Biases:

- Fewer curricular requirements are better than more.

- Higher expectations are better than lower ones.

- You can’t require too much math or science.
Suggestions Offered

- We should impose more rigor.
- We should move away from courses that are defined by a skill set.
- We should move toward real discovery-based instruction.
- We must become truly interdisciplinary.
- It is OK that undergraduates never “do any clinic”.
Actions for Council to Consider

- Leading a discussion on the future research questions facing society and the world and how the discipline should best prepare for them.
- Leading a discussion on the definition of the knowledge–based canon that sustains us – and to challenge that conversation (initially without reference to SLP or Audiology).
- Leading a discussion on curricular reform that is rooted in contemporary notions of student learning.
1996

Irving Hochberg, “Building a Strong Foundation in Communication Sciences and Disorders”.

Addressed the role of science and research in the discipline and the professions – stated that the role apparently needed periodic reaffirmation and resolve.

Reminded us of the 1963 and 1983 ASHA national conferences on undergraduate and/or graduate education.
Hochberg’s Assertions

- Undergraduate curricula in CSD should be deprofessionalized. Our ug students should feel that it is possible to major in the discipline without professional intentions.
- Require a course in the history of communication sciences and disorders.
- A laboratory–based undergraduate curriculum.
- “We must assert our resolve that nothing less than bold, courageous and imaginative action for substantive change will do.”
1997: Implementing a Broad Liberal Arts Curriculum

Presentations from Different Perspectives:

- Alfonzo, P. J., 1997. *Institutional Perspectives*

- Logemann, J. A., 1997, *Undergraduate Education in the Discipline and/or the Profession*


Hanley: “Students should enter their professional education at the graduate level with a basic appreciation of the discipline and its history as well as the ability to:

- Analyze issues and problems in a critical way
- Review processes and procedures in a critical way
- Apply problem solving logic to better understand scientific and professional issues
- Integrate information in a meaningful way
- Enjoy the process of learning.”
Alfonso: “My guess is that institutional classification does not affect in a significant way the degree to which CSD departments can support a liberal arts and sciences curriculum.”

“We need to remind ourselves periodically that it is us, as members of the academy, who are ultimately responsible – not the colleges in which our departments live nor the national association to which many of us belong, but rather you and me.”
Logemann: “The current undergraduate education committee for the Council of Graduate Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders has defined undergraduate education in the discipline as follows:

- An educational program designed to provide students with information on the discipline of human communication and an introduction to its disorders with minimal or no coursework included to obtain clinical certification, state licensure or licensure by a State Board of Education.”
Naas: Began by describing a plan written by Dorothy Moeller in *Speech Pathology and Audiology: Iowa Origins of a Profession* (1975).

- Early 1920s – …”championed education across the university curriculum. Esoteric departmental lines were blurred. There was a clear, present commitment to learning – not simply to the acquisition of what we euphemistically refer to as ‘knowledge and skills’”.
- “Tufts of grass” analogy.
Wilcox – talked about undergraduate curricular strategies as part of his “doctoral program” presentation:

1. Reduce the importance of “tools” in formulating courses/curricula.
2. **Assume** that we offer courses that are of value to others on campus and act accordingly.
3. Change the way that we characterize the discipline in class.
Examples from Kim’s own experiences at KU.

- “only limited progress on putting the B.A. goals into practice.
- Genetics of Communication Disorders course is a regular part of the Human Biology (pre-med) program.
- Phonetics curriculum is being redesigned in collaboration with the Linguistics department.

Why did they “continue to struggle”?

- Strong personal attachments to individual courses.
- Self–perceptions
WSU’s Provost Gary Miller
Group Discussion Questions
1. Do we need an undergraduate curriculum in CD? If so, what would be the curriculum?
2. Do we need a uniform curriculum? Or are we doing the “right” thing now?
3. If we need a uniform curriculum, what key courses should be offered? Does doing the same thing across programs make it a better experience for those entering graduate school?
4. When in the course of 4 years should courses be offered?
5. Given the conclusions of your group, what should be the next specific steps for the CAPCSD?
1. Should UG CSD curriculum be deprofessionalized? If so, what basic sciences and what liberal arts courses should be included?

2. What courses and/or experiences that address the evolving global and multicultural nature of our world should be included?

3. How should research be addressed at the UG level? Should UG curricula address reading and critiquing literature only?
4. Should research at the UG level include evidence-based evaluations of basic and clinical literature?

5. Should research requirements include participation in an existing research line? Require students to produce their own guided research projects and papers?

6. How can UG CSD programs make the best use of on-campus writing assistance before students take the majority of their CSD courses?
ARE THERE OTHER QUESTIONS?

- Please feel free during your discussion to generate questions/responses beyond those we have suggested!