



Interdepartmental Correspondence

TO: Marsha Landolt, Dean and Vice Provost
The Graduate School

FROM: Carol Stoel-Gammon, Chair *CSG*
Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences

RE: Departmental response to the review of the 10-Year Self Study

DATE: February 12, 2002.

Attached please find our response to the review of the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences undergraduate and graduate degree programs. If you need more information regarding this document please let me know.

Departmental Response to 10-Year Self-Study Review Committee Report

We wish to thank the Speech and Hearing Sciences Review Committee for their careful assessment of the Departmental degree programs. We are pleased that the Committee Report is "overwhelmingly positive in nature" and have carefully reviewed the suggestions for "fine-tuning." We feel the next 10 years will be a critical time in the field of speech and hearing sciences and wish to maintain and strengthen our role as a highly respected and one of the top-rated research and clinical programs.

In this response, we comment on and clarify various statements in the Review Committee report.

A. THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM: Comments and clarifications to the text

Page 3, Section A, Paragraph 1

... "the two tracks (a general academic track and a speech and hearing disorders track) differ by only two courses, which raises a question about the justification for offering two different curricula"

In reality, the requirements for the two options are different. Option 1 (General Academic) requires 22 credits from a list of approved classes. Option 2 (Speech and Hearing Sciences and Disorders) requires all 31 credits from the list. Option 1 includes two "classes" that aren't Option 2 eligible (462 and 499). Option 2 has two classes that aren't Option 1 eligible (471 and 481). We feel the two-track system is useful because it allows the Department to maintain a broader range and larger number of majors with different objectives. For example, Option 1 is popular among premed, pre-dental, occupational therapy, physical therapy, pre-law, nursing, and education students because it gives them a solid Arts and Sciences major with the flexibility to complete the large number of prerequisites necessary to pursue their non-graduate/professional school plans.

Option 1 is also ideal for the student who is interested in speech and hearing sciences but does not want to pursue advanced studies in any field. If we eliminate Option 1 and require Option 2 classes for all students, it would mean reassessing the teaching needs for 471/481, both with very small lab sections (6 students) or re-evaluating the way the class is taught.

2. page 3, Section A, Paragraph 2

"The department is working to provide more access for nonmajors, an effort applauded by our Committee. Currently, the main (if not only) course available to nonmajors is 'Communication and Its Disorders'."

In fact, SPHSC 100, 111, 250, 261, 303, 304, 308, 320, 371, 425, 445 are all free from prerequisites and currently serve as attractive courses for students across campus. The table below provides a summary of nonmajor enrollments in undergraduate SPHSC classes (open to non-majors) for 1998-2001. It can be seen that, across these offerings, over half the students enrolled were nonmajors.

Non-Majors in SPHSC Undergraduate Classes 1998-2001

School Year	Non-Majors	Total Enrollment	Percentage
1998-1999	801	1300	62%
1999-2000	769	1541	50%
2000-2001	787	1252	63%
Total	2357	4093	58%

3. Page 3, Section A, Paragraph 3

We question the statement that our undergraduate curriculum is “*so tightly scripted*” that it limits opportunities for participation in research. First, we don't get these students, for the most part, until they are in their third year of study so participation earlier would involve the general advising community recommending research opportunities in conjunction with our dept. Second, in every advising appointment, we discuss research in the Department. There are also printed resources that are available to students at all times describing the research opportunities and process to get involved. At our fall orientation, which includes undergraduates, we describe on-going research opportunities and invite student participation. Actually a respectable percentage of our undergraduates are participating in research projects as paid laboratory assistants, work study students, volunteers, or honors students.

The faculty are pleased about the number of undergraduate students who have participated in our Departmental Honors Program. This program engages seniors in a year-long research project with a faculty member, culminating in a presentation at the Department Spring Student Research Forum. We encourage as many students to participate as we can, given limitations on faculty time and resources. In addition, the student research lab and our newly developed “fireside chats” may help address some of these issues.

B. THE SPEECH PATHOLOGY PROGRAM: Comments and clarifications to the text

Several comments were made regarding our clinical program and the emphasis on clinical education within our own clinic (vis-à-vis placement of students at external sites). We would like to respond, as we consider our clinical laboratory crucial to our master's program and we take seriously our decisions regarding the timing of students' experiences.

1. Page 10, first full paragraph:

“External placement only occurs in the last quarter of the students' graduate program.”

This is not true. Consistent with ASHA requirements, speech-language pathology students have placements in three different sites, and audiology students have two or three such placements. In addition to internships, all speech-language students complete a practicum at the Center for Human Development and Disability (CHDD), and many also work in the Experimental Education Unit (EEU). Further, many students have experiences early in their program where they visit other sites to observe speech-language pathologists or audiologists. Finally, students

complete a preinternship in the quarter before their internship (the final external placement); thus the culminating external placement has elements over two quarters, or half of their second year.

2. Page 10, first full paragraph:

The decision to provide most clinical training within the Department “...is admirable; however, it comes at a substantial cost to the Department.”

While it is true that clinical teaching and supervision are expensive, there is no viable economic solution in the community as the reviewers suggest. Professionals in the community are, for the most part, paid at a higher salary than University of Washington lecturer faculty. We would hardly suggest to these professionals that they work for free for the University of Washington. If they were to receive compensation for their time, the costs would be greater than those at the University. Moreover, current pressures in healthcare mandate that professionals accrue high numbers of billable hours, which would leave little time to give the necessary attention to inexperienced students. In addition, recent regulations require that certified professionals be present when students provide services billed to Medicare, further limiting professionals’ flexibility when taking on students.

We do agree that experiences in community settings are important for our graduate students. We continue to seek opportunities that are appropriate to all involved parties--students in training, professionals who have legal and ethical responsibilities, and clients who have sought healthcare in professional settings. Possibilities for increasing students’ external experiences include service-learning courses, volunteer positions, “shadowing” opportunities, and selected practica (already implemented when there is a good match between site and students). We consider such experiences valuable and necessary, but they are *adjuncts* to the core training provided in our Speech and Hearing Clinic. We believe neophyte graduate students need systematic assistance not available in outside settings, and that clinical learning is a process requiring a unique pace, intensity, and “room for error.” We trust our lecturer faculty to provide the kind of the clinical training that is an essential part of our graduate education. We would hope the University would more adequately fund this aspect of the program, recognizing that it is an integral part of our master’s program much like the laboratories in chemistry and physics are integral to those graduate programs.

It should be noted that the speech-language pathology group has made or intends to make some changes to the curriculum in near future, some of which are based on suggestions from the Review Committee report. These include:

- Timing of SLP students’ decision to select the “school: or “hospital track.” Although we encourage students to think about their options early in their program we don't require them to select a track.
- We are considering some changes in the master's curriculum, to offer the Counseling during the year, rather than summer only. Further we hope to offer a course in augmentative and alternative communication more often, and plan to teach it next autumn.

- Finally, we are planning to expand our clinical experiences in the area of Voice. While we have developed a specialty area in Voice, we realize that students need exposure to a variety of clients.

C. THE AUDIOLOGY PROGRAM: Comments and clarifications to the text:

1. page 8, line 7-9.

"The faculty of the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences plan to offer the AuD (or whatever it ends up being called) to meet new Audiology standards. ... the three Audiology faculty described the preliminary outline of the degree as requiring 9 quarter. However, on page 28 of the Self-Study document, the program is described as potentially having four years."

The proposed AuD program will be completed in twelve quarters; making it possible to finish in three academic years plus three summers.

2. page 8, lines 17-20. Regarding additional faculty for the Au D:

We wish to reinforce this statement of need regarding an additional faculty position in Audiology to support the AuD program. In fact, this program will ultimately require an additional professorial line and an additional lecturer line to cover the increased loads in both curricular coverage and clinical education. The pressure for these additional lines will not be immediate. For example, it is possible that the new professorial line could be delayed until the third year of the new program, although the need for the lecturer would be immediate. It is the Department's desire that these positions would be incremental rather than a shifting of current Departmental FTEs resulting from future retirements.

3. page 10, first full paragraph:

"The faculty have chosen to do most of the clinical teaching provided to the graduate students here rather than placing students out in community service settings for more of their clinical education. External placement only occurs in the last quarter of the students' graduate program."

This description is inaccurate for Audiology graduate students. For example, seven of the current nine second-year master's students have had at least one and usually two external placements well before their final quarter. They also are rotated through the Center for Human Development and Disability early and repeatedly throughout their program in addition to their assignments in the Speech and Hearing Clinic.

4. page 10, first full paragraph:

"...the students expressed a desire for a more diverse clinical experience in such areas as voice and cochlear implants and these could be provided by external placements"

Students with expressed interest are given external placements to work within cochlear implant programs. It is not clear that external cochlear implant programs could or would be equipped to train all or even most of the Audiology students in their facilities.

5. page 10, first full paragraph:

“Thus, the department needs to carefully weigh the costs and benefits of their policy to use this Clinic as the principal clinical teaching environment.”

The Speech and Hearing Clinic is the principal clinical teaching environment. Currently, we are taxing our external placements with the numbers of internship and other placements. The Speech and Hearing Clinic also serves as an important community resource with requirements for consistent patient flow and service provision in areas not covered by external settings.

D. FUNDING AND GRANT ACTIVITY

The Committee’s comments on Departmental funding (pp. 12-13) are well taken and we are in full agreement that a top priority for the Department is to increase our level of external grant funding. However, the current funding levels are not quite as grim as described in the paragraph on page 13 wherein it is stated that “... *only Professors Kuhl, Moore and Werner are P.I. ’s on major ongoing (R01-type) funding from federal agencies that are administered through the UW. ... The two Assistant professors have been active in obtaining small grants ... RRF Awards and other foundations grants.*”

In addition to the faculty mentioned above, it should be noted that, within the last three years, other Departmental faculty have obtained external funding:

- Rich Folsom was a P.I. on two grants from NIDCD from 1993-1999; in addition, Professor Folsom was funded through three small grant programs from 1999-2001/2002.
- Lesley Olswang was P.I. on two small grants in addition to being funded on a subcontract from the University of Kansas, and is a co-investigator on a large grant from the CDC.
- Carol Stoel-Gammon P.I. on an R01 from NIDCD from 1996-2000.
- Ed Burns is P.I. on a small grant from Deafness Research Foundation.

E. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

The Review Committee’s states that “The technical equipment in use in the clinical and research facilities and programs is good”; however, Departmental faculty remain concerned about the maintaining state-of-the-art equipment for classroom teaching, clinical instruction, and research endeavors. Our release-recapture budget provides some funds for new equipment, but the first priority for use of this budget is for clinical instruction. In many cases, new equipment is purchased only when a piece of older equipment is broken beyond repair. While the Tools for Transformation Award has provided us with extraordinary equipment for upgrading technology in teaching, we are concerned about ways to maintain this initial investment, including service and replacements.

We also feel that the Clinic is desperately in need of new carpeting and that public spaces should have scheduled routine painting and repairs. Finally, as noted in the report, concerns about the infrastructure in Eagleson Hall remain high.

F. SALARIES

The Review Committee's comments on salaries for faculty in Speech and Hearing Sciences state that Departmental faculty lag behind their peers at UW (compared with other faculty in the Natural Sciences division) as well as peer faculty at other institutions. As stated in our Self Study, our faculty are particularly vulnerable to competitive offers and thus we must seek every means for raising salaries to the level of their peers.

In addition to the need for salary increases for our Assistant Professors, our faculty also lag behind others at UW (Natural Sciences) at both the Associate and Full Professor Ranks. Figure 1 shows the relative salary positioning of faculty in Speech and Hearing Sciences. This figure was derived from Autumn, 2001 salary data available through the online UW Factbook.

Departmental means, weighted for FTEs, were used to generate cumulative distributions for each professorial rank, so that the vertical axis of each point yields the percentage of Natural Sciences faculty below corresponding salary on the abscissa. Individual SpHSc faculty members are plotted as filled circles on each division-wide distribution at their corresponding rank. What is immediately clear from this figure is that some of the Faculty in Speech and Hearing Sciences are well below the expected salary levels associated with their respective ranks. Three Full Professors and two Associate Professors fall below the distribution altogether. It should not be assumed that these salaries reflect performance. The department has been consistently ranked among the top three programs nationally, and some of the faculty members at the bottom of their respective distributions generate up to 50% of their salaries through external research funding.

A primary concern arising from this analysis is the evident exposure of the faculty to competitive recruitment by other universities. Speech and Hearing Sciences is laboring under a severe shortage in new faculty; most estimates put the shortfall at approximately 110 positions annually and project further increases. Undercompensated faculty among the leading programs are obvious targets of opportunity for universities seeking to fill their ranks.

G. ADVISING

The committee praised our advising practices, but wondered if they "*command more effort than is necessary to meet Department goals.*" Undergraduate and Graduate advising practices have been modified over the years to create a system that works well for students as well as faculty. We are pleased with the structure and responsibilities that the staff and faculty bring to advising. Students have provided us feedback concerning the clarity of advising and their feeling of commitment to making their programs go smoothly. We have had very few complaints over the last several years in this area. We think that we have a good system in place, and would not wish to alter it.

**Cumulative Salary Distributions in A & S by Rank
for 277 tenure stream faculty in the Division of Natural Sciences
(Individual points indicate Speech and Hearing Sciences faculty)**

