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**Goal:** To assess adequacy of Professional Issues training in the Ph.D. Program in Speech-Language-Hearing Science (SLHS).

**Professional Issues in SLH:**
Students of the SLHS Program receive Professional Issues training in several settings. Graduate students in SLHS are required to complete the same two-credit ethics course SPLHS 79500 “Professional Issues Seminar” currently taught by Dr. Richard G. Schwartz) for credit. Most students work in research labs; in this setting, they receive some training in professional issues. Many of our students go on to academic positions, and frequently undergo the application and interview process during the final year of work on the dissertation. Professional issues are often addressed in individual meetings between a faculty mentor and student in relation to this process.

**Assessment Method for This Report:**
The Acting Executive Officer (Valerie Shafer), Michelle MacRoy-Higgins (Hunter College) and Dr. Richard Schwartz (who teaches the Ethics and the Professional Issues Course), served as the ad-hoc assessment committee. In addition, the Curriculum and Exam’s (C & E) committee, which consists of four central faculty members, two faculty members from the campuses and two graduate students participated in generating assessment questions for a survey of faculty and students and reviewed and commented on this report at the C & E meeting on March, 18, 2016. The survey examined whether faculty and students were satisfied with training.

The C & E committee first generated a set of questions for the survey. Then, the smaller ad-hoc committee revised the survey questions to address the areas of SLH Professional Issues Training. In addition, the C & E committee reviewed the syllabus for Professional Issues in light of the results from the survey. Results of the survey have been provided to Dr. Schwartz to allow revision of the syllabus. The results of this assessment process are provided in Appendix A. In creating the survey, the required course “Professional Issues Seminar” (syllabus attached) was used as a guide. Five core areas of content were identified:

1. Mentor-Mentee Relationships
2. Writing for Publication
3. Journal Article Preparation and Reviewing
4. Grants
5. Job Hunting, Interviewing, and Career Development

**Assessment Results:**

**Examination of SLHS 79300 syllabus:** The Professional Issues course was designed to the five areas listed above. Dr. Richard Schwartz has been teaching this course since its inception. The C&E review of the course found it comprehensive and the survey by students (below) indicates satisfaction with the course. The syllabus is attached.

**Results of Student and Faculty Surveys**
Evaluation of Professional Issues Program in Speech

Fourteen students completed the surveys. The key topics (e.g., authorship, data ownership) were reported as being covered by over 70% of the students. Several topics were not satisfactorily covered for at least half of the students (interviewing and time management, see Table 1, Appendix B). All students reported that the professional issues topics that they had learned about were addressed in class. 62% of students also learned about some of these issues in lab meeting. Fewer reported learning about these issues in colloquia or other workshops. Students offered a number of suggestions for improving knowledge of professional issues, including a workshop on the job-application process, more discussion of time management and more sessions on grant writing. See Appendix B, Tables 1-4 for student responses.

Six faculty completed the survey (out of 6 central faculty). Faculty (5/6) covered most topics listed on the survey. Several members also reported covering topics that were not listed, including reviewing, racism and working outside of academia. Most members reported that the topics were often covered in lab meetings, and less frequently in the classroom (other than the Professional Issues course) or colloquia. One other setting not listed on the questionnaire was discussion of the topics in individual mentoring, and at least 50% of the faculty do this. Faculty reported receiving training on these issues at conferences, during CITI training, attending seminars on the topics, during grant review responsibilities (for example, NIH study section), talking to colleagues and media outlets (e.g., Chronicle of Higher Ed). Faculty were generally satisfied with how professional issues are being addressed in the program. See Appendix B, Tables 5-9 for faculty responses.

Recommendations:

1. The results of this assessment will be disseminated to faculty and students.

2. Dr. Schwartz, who currently teaches the RCR course, will be provided with the results to allow revisions as a result of this survey.

3. Students will be surveyed each year to ask which topics they would like more coverage of, through special workshops or colloquia. In addition, the requests on this survey will be used to plan workshops for Fall 2016.

4. In general, the Professional Issues course meets the needs of our students.
Professional Issues Seminar

**Required Books:**


**Some Recommended Readings**


Summary of Required Assignments and Grading: Bring a paper you’ve written; Edit/reviiew partner’s and rewrite yours (10); List of Journals (2.5); Instructions to Authors (2.5); Cover letter to journal editor (2.5); Review of Manuscript (10); Revision of Manuscript to respond to reviews; Funding Sources List (2.5); Predoctoral Proposal (F31/30/NSF); CV; Position Negotiation List; Application Letter (10). Details to be provided. 30% of the grade is class participation—participate frequently and meaningfully! Also there will be multiple in class and take home writing/editing assignments every week.

I. Mentor-Mentee Relationships Week 1 2/1

Readings:

http://www.the-aps.org/careers/careers1/mentor/guide.htm


http://www.asha.org/students/academic/doctoral/mentorship.htm

Read all the required books

II. Writing for Publication Weeks 2-4 2/8, 2/22, 3/7
A. Editing and rewriting
B. Voice/Audience
C. Flexibility
D. Professional Writing
E. Taking Risks
F. The Literature
G. Completion

Reading: Becker; Strunk, White & Angell (Read these books by 3/19)
http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/

Assignments: Bring a paper, review a partner’s paper, revise your paper.

   A. Selecting a Journal
   B. The submission and review process
   C. The revision process

Reading: APA Manual; Instructions to Authors

Assignments: List of Journals; First submission of a paper to a journal from colleague or advisor, write a review, respond to reviews. Write a cover letter; write methods, write a discussion; presentation PowerPoints.

IV. Grants (NIH, NSF, Foundation) Weeks 8-9 4/4, 4/11
   A. Generating Ideas
   B. Identifying Funding Sources
   C. Writing a grant
   D. Review Process
   E. Revising
   F. Grant reviewing

Readings: TBA

Assignments: Funding Sources; prepare a proposal; review, revise

V. Job Hunting, Interviewing, and Career Development Weeks 10-11 5/2, 5/9
   A. Finding Jobs and Postdoctoral Positions
   B. Applying
   C. Interviewing
   D. Negotiating
   E. Planning Programmatic Research
   F. Time Management

Assignments: CV, Application Letter, and Negotiation List, Research Statements

Learning Goals

1. Students will understand the nature and development of mentor-mentee relationships.
2. Students will learn academic writing style, journal article preparation, the process of journal publication, responses to reviews and revision strategies, journal article reviewing grant preparation, and the federal grants process.
3. Students will learn the processes of job hunting, application, interviewing, and principles of career development (planning programmatic research, time management).

Students Responses

Table 1. Has the Program addressed the following Professional Issues (check all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th># responses</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>authorship</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data ownership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuscript prep</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work place ethics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviewing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant writing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other- Some of these will be addressed later in the semester. Some have been addressed last semester.

Table 2. Where have these topics in professional issues been addressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th># responses</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colloquium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. How satisfied are you with what is covered in the Program regarding Professional Issues?

I get more information about professional issues from lab meetings than anywhere else. I worry that people in other labs may not get the same amount of information and training. I'm not sure when an appropriate time would be to learn some of the topics covered in Professional Issues, but sometimes I feel that the topics covered are not relevant to me now.

Satisfied
Satisfied
Satisfied

Table 4. What suggestions for improvement or changes do you have for Professional Issues (e.g., cover some topics in greater or less depth, cover additional topics)?

n/a

I would like to see more support for the job application process. Maybe a workshop near the beginning of every fall that goes over tips on applications and another one at the beginning of the spring on interviews and campus visits.
I think writing an IRB from scratch would be helpful.
None at the moment
More about grant writing
Now that I think about it, it would be great to talk about more things, like time management and how to build a CV and how do students make connections to useful figures in our area of interest.

Faculty Responses
Table 5. Do you address the following Professional Issues (check all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th># responses</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>authorship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data ownership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuscript prep</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work place ethics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviewing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reviewing, Job hunting, Interview, Career Development, ethical issues that arise in academe, racism in academe Working outside academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Where do you address these professional issues topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th># responses</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colloquium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other- Individual meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Where do you (as a faculty member) receive continuing education on Professional Issues (i.e., How do you keep current)?

ASHA, reading OHR website, CITI training, etc.
attending seminars/talks on the topic(s)
talking with colleagues, reading the media training. literature. study section.
CITI course RCR from CUNY discussions with colleagues
Through my personal networks; through higher ed press (Chronicle, Inside Higher Ed); I follow some higher ed bloggers
Table 8. Are you satisfied with the way Professional Issues are addressed in the Program?

Yes
yes
In my lab, pretty much. I cannot say about others'!
yes
yes
yes

Table 9. What suggestions for improvement or changes do you have for Professional Issues (e.g., cover some topics in greater or less depth, cover additional topics)?
none
add issues of racism, trigger warnings
I don't know what % of our students land in non-academic positions, but I feel that in general we could be doing a better job of preparing PhDs for non-academic work.