



**FY09-FY12 Strategic Plan
Department of Speech and Hearing Science**

1. OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT

In the last ranking done by *US News and World Report* (2004, another new ranking will published later in 2008), the graduate program in audiology was ranked 13 and the graduate program in speech-language pathology was ranked 17 (both are the top-ranked professional programs in these areas in the state of Ohio). In each case, we are ranked below some of our peer programs (University of Iowa, University of Wisconsin, University of Washington, Indiana University) and above others (University of Maryland, University of Illinois, University of Texas at Austin). There is no separate ranking for undergraduate or PhD programs, nor is our discipline included in the NRC rankings.

A. Program Assessment

The assessment of the Department of Speech and Hearing Science (SHS) will be organized in terms of the four basic programs of the unit: the Undergraduate Program, the AuD program, the MA-SLP program, and the PhD program. SHS is also well recognized for its Speech-Language-Hearing Clinic which is recognized not only locally (by speech-language pathologists and audiologists working in hospitals, public education, nursing homes, clinics, etc.) but state-wide and nationally. The Director (G. Whitelaw) is often asked to talk about our clinic and its success (e.g., at the annual meeting of the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Science and Disorders, CAPCSD). This is clearly a strength of our professional programs. At the present time, SHS is perhaps most distinctive (in terms of publications, grant support and national reputation) in the academic areas of audiology, hearing science/psychoacoustics and speech perception/speech acoustics research (especially in the area of dialectology and second language acquisition).

1. Undergraduate Program

Over the past 3-5 years the number of undergraduate majors in speech and hearing science has significantly increased. We had approximately 130 majors in AY 2003-04; at the end of Autumn 2007 we had 295 majors. Obviously, this has been important to maintaining the department's budget under the current budget model. The Department and its faculty have been very active in recent years in the development of new disciplinary and interdisciplinary undergraduate. The Department has also been developing courses that can be taken as GEC and the American Sign Language program (which will grow in 2008-2009). In addition and we have created the Summer Undergraduate Distance-Learning Program that allows undergraduate students from other disciplines to enroll in a set of core undergraduate prerequisite classes taught on a distance-learning basis.

Strengths. The strengths of the Undergraduate Program include the relatively high number of honors theses completed by our majors and we place students in the top graduate programs (e.g., University of Iowa, Vanderbilt, Indiana University). In addition, undergraduates in our program have one of the best four-year graduation rates in the College.

Weaknesses. Given the relative small number of faculty in our Department (especially as we are now searching to fill 3 positions), we are unable to staff a large number of our undergraduate courses with instructors who are regular faculty members. Rather, we have had to rely on GTAs and lecturers to teach these courses. Given the College's budgetary model we need to continue to increase our undergraduate enrollments in terms of majors as well as non-majors but we currently have no "capstone" (597) course for our undergraduate majors and we have only a single honors course. Given the relatively small size of our faculty and current course demands on, it is difficult for faculty to find the time to create and teach new courses.

2. *Graduate Programs*

SHS has three graduate programs: a PhD program and two graduate professional programs (an MA in speech-language pathology and a professional doctorate, AuD, in audiology). As noted above, the quality of these graduate programs—as indicated by national ranking—is good. The graduate of our professional programs also enjoy a 100% employment rate after graduation. Students in our professional program also have a pass rate on the national Praxis Examination (need for certification and licensure) at neat 100%. Given the very different nature of each of these graduate programs, they will be evaluated separately.

a. *Professional Doctoral Program in Audiology (AuD)*

Strengths. A strength of the AuD program lies in the quality of the faculty and staff. Four faculty members (three tenured and one untenured) have their major area of expertise in the area of audiology/hearing science. These faculty members have active research programs and provide the majority of the academic instruction in the AuD program. Several other faculty members in speech-language pathology/speech-language science area also contribute significantly to the AuD program. Two clinical educators (G. Whitelaw who holds a PhD degree and C. Goodman who holds an AuD degree) have a wealth of experience, and both have been with the Department for more than 12 years. Faculty and staff members in this area also have recently held important positions in our primary national organizations. One (S. Davidson) was Vice President for Academic Affairs for ASHA and another (G. Whitelaw) was President-elect of the American Academy of Audiology (AAA). One faculty member (L. Feth) is a fellow of both the Acoustical Society of America and ASHA and was recently given the Honors of the Association by ASHA (their highest honor). Another strength of the AuD programs lies in the opportunities available for specialization and research, including an AuD/PhD option. Students can choose from existing prescribed sequences for Graduate Specializations and Minors (e.g., Gerontology, Cognitive Science, Neuroscience, Early Intervention) or, in consultation with an advisor, can develop an individualized grouping of courses based on professional goals.

Weaknesses. Although the faculty and staff available to the AuD program are first-rate, there are simply too few of them to be maximally effective in the undergraduate, AuD and PhD programs—this is especially the case given that we run a 12-month program (we offer undergraduate and required graduate courses every summer quarter). This problem was exacerbated with the resignation of S. Davidson. One professor (J. Weisenberger) who is in this area, only teaches a single course for use as she is full-time in the Office of Research. Although we can cover the curriculum with current faculty, adjunct faculty and part-time lecturers, the sheer number of the AuD courses to be covered means that faculty are not

available to teach regularly in the undergraduate program nor to teach the optimal number of seminars for PhD students. Reliance on adjunct faculty can also be problematic—quality control can be an issue as can the administrative burden of integrating adjuncts into the teaching process. Another weakness of the program is the variation in student quality and number of applicants. Because we cannot fund the majority of applicants to our program, we tend to find wide variability in those students who matriculate into the program. We have some exceptional “first tier” students (e.g., those we’ve recruited using graduate fellowship and graduate associate funding mechanisms) but we lose a large number of students in the “first tier” to other universities who can provide funding options for these students. Consequently, we also admit some students who meet entrance standards, but are not our best applicants to fill the class. A final weakness of the program relates to the lack of an active, positive working relationship with at least one of the major medical centers in Columbus (Riverside Hospital).

b. MA Program in Speech-Language Pathology

The 8-quarter MA program in speech-language pathology (which includes 2 summer quarters) represents our largest graduate program. This is an important professional program and, we believe, well-respected nationally.

Strengths. The MA-SLP program is well-recognized in the state (as well as across the country) in terms of producing extremely well-qualified professionals and our graduates are extremely competitive when applying for positions within the schools, hospitals, clinics, rehabilitation service providers, or nursing homes. Like the AuD program, a distinct strength of the MA-SLP program is the quality of the on-campus clinical experience. Students see a wide-range of clients (in terms of disorder, age, and ethnicity) and are guided by three extremely strong clinical supervisors, each of which have been with the Department for more than 10 years (one has been with the University for 30 years). We also have several strong speech-language scholars who are active in research (publications, pursuing grants): R. Fox (a co-investigator on 3 NIH grants), E. Jacewicz (a research scientist who is a PI or co-investigator on 3 NIH grants), M. Trudeau is well know state-wide in the area of voice disorders and W. Secord (a senior research scientist who has a national reputation in the area of language and literacy—a PI on a Leadership Grant in this area—and assessment test development). Our newest faculty member, L. Milman although in her second year, has demonstrated herself to be research productive in the area of neurogenics.

The students admitted to the MA-level graduate program in speech-language pathology include outstanding students (especially those recruited through Fellowships) and reasonably strong students. As in the AuD program, we do admit some students into the MA-SLP program who meet our entrance requirements but whom are not among the strongest applicants. Again, the lack of funding for graduate students has a negative effect on recruitment of the very best students. Not only do some excellent students choose to go to other programs (who can offer them financial support), but they are replaced by less qualified applicants.

Weaknesses. As in the AuD program, a significant weakness is the relatively small number of faculty members in this area given the relatively large number of MA-SLP graduate students and graduate courses. As we do in the audiology program, we depend on adjunct faculty and lecturers to teach many of our courses—especially those in the summer. The small size of the speech-language faculty together with the demands of the MA-SLP program also challenges us in terms of being able to offer doctoral-level seminars. If the Department is to ever attain a top-ten ranking in this area, we will need to grow the size of the speech-language faculty (all of the Departments currently ranked above us in the *US News and World Report* Rankings have more faculty members than does ours). We currently have two active faculty searches in this area and we hope to hire senior faculty members who have well documented research experience and publications. Another weakness related to the speech-language faculty (who contribute to

either the MA-SLP program and/or the PhD program), is the lack of significant research productivity (in terms of published research papers or funded grants) from several of the tenured faculty.

c. PhD Program in Speech and Hearing Science

The PhD program in Speech and Hearing Science has a long tradition and history at the Ohio State University, preceding the formation of the Department. The PhD program is very flexible with students normally taking courses in our Department as well as related departments (depending on the student's areas of concentration).

Strengths. The senior faculty is very much a strength in the PhD program. In addition, several of the junior faculty members are providing considerable support to the PhD program. Another strength is the availability of colleagues—many of whom are adjunct faculty members in SHS—in related departments including Psychology, Linguistics, and Electrical Engineering, among others. We have a research scientist (E. Jacewicz) along with several PhD level adjuncts (including K. Barin, J. Gokcen, and P. Rabidoux) who make significant contributions to student mentoring.

Weaknesses. One of the greatest challenges to our PhD program—a challenge faced by the majority of doctoral programs in our discipline across the country—is the national shortage of individuals enrolling in and applying to PhD programs across the country. This has long been recognized and discussed by scholars in our field, and there have been ongoing initiatives supported by ASHA and CAPCSD. Currently, the number of PhD students in the Department is stable at around 16. Among the Big Ten programs, our numbers place us in the middle of the group with programs such as Northwestern and Wisconsin having much larger numbers (of course these also have many more regular faculty members than do we). Another challenge is the increase in the proportion of part-time students rather than full-time students. The increase in the number of part-time PhD students is another national trend as many PhD students are already clinically certified in either audiology or speech-language pathology, have worked in professional positions at least a year, and are loath to give up the income to accept GA stipends for several years). Obviously, PhD students need to be provided with appropriate funding (a Fellowship or 50% GA position) and securing this funding is a continuing challenge for any PhD program.

C. Faculty and Student diversity

The faculty maintains a balance between male and female faculty members. However, although one of our PhD lecturers is African-American (A. Manley), we have relatively limited ethnic diversity among the faculty and staff. Traditionally, the graduate students have been much more diverse (e.g., >15% minority).

D. The Current Budgetary Model and Student Enrollment

The Department has currently reasonable cash reserves. This cash comes primarily from the summer program teaching undergraduate courses through Continuing Education, the graduate courses taught for the Ohio Consortium through Continuing Education, release time expenditures from grants and marginal increases in our research indirects. However, although the Department has been able to maintain the level of its PBA over the past few years through increases in undergraduate enrollment we have not lost any faculty lines over the same period of time (we are now conducting 3 faculty searches), one can argue that SHS is not faring as well as it could under the current budgetary model. SHS has the largest ratio of graduate students to undergraduate majors in the College (38%). Given the two professional graduate programs and the PhD program described above, we have a relatively large number of graduate courses that must be taught by either faculty members or senior lecturers. These graduate courses are simply more

expensive to offer than are undergraduate courses. The number of students in the classes is small and our most senior (and expensive) faculty must teach them. The current budget model does not address or adjust for this fact. It is true that we have differential tuition that can be assessed for graduate students in both our AuD and MA-SLP programs, but this differential fee cannot be raised high enough to meet the needs of the Department (we have to keep our tuition at the same basic level as our peer schools in order to be competitive). For SHS to prosper, it needs to grow in terms of faculty members (and, probably, clinical supervisors). It is impossible to see how the current budgetary model will facilitate that growth.

We have met the increased enrollment demands of the undergraduate program by allowing our courses to be larger and/or increase the number of sections. Our greatest challenge in meeting undergraduate student demands has been the significant difficulty in finding appropriate classroom space (we are often faced with the problem of having greater demand for a course than a classroom will hold, but being unable to secure a larger classroom).

In terms of graduate enrollment, we do not want to grow the MA-SLP program (our largest graduate program). We are near or at the limit of the number of SLP students that our clinical education program (staffed by clinical supervisors) can handle. We would like to improve the retention of students in both our AuD and MA-SLP programs (through increase student quality) and increase the number of students in our PhD program. Improving the quality of the students in our professional program will likely take increased student financial support. We are addressing this issue by submission of training grants, but we need to do more to support incoming students.

The most recent trends in grant income and indirect cost recoveries have been positive. However, one of the faculty members responsible to generating grant funds (Susan Nittrouer) has moved her TIU to Otolaryngology. While she is physically in our building (her lab has not as yet moved), we will continue to receive her marginal indirects. However, we expect to lose those in SU 2008. We will be trying to hire senior faculty (one of whom will replace Nittrouer) who have a good history of grants.

E. Interdisciplinary Activity by Faculty and Students

Many faculty members and students are active in terms of interdisciplinary scholarship. This includes cross-unit participation in undergraduate honors research and graduate/faculty research and teaching. For example, L. Feth, M. Trudeau and R. Fox have all been active in development of interdisciplinary minors.

F. Outreach and Engagement

The primary Outreach and Engagement of the Department comes from its Speech-Language-Hearing Clinic which serves hundreds of clients each year. In calendar year 2007, the Clinic provided service to 1,349 clients for a total of 5,200 clinical sessions.

G. Donor Development and Alumni Communication Efforts

SHS is striving to increase its development activities. Most recently, a new donor provided \$18,000 which will be used to support 3 graduate scholarships. We have plans to identify donors who might be able to provide more substantial gifts (but realize this is a longer-term prospect). We also have plans to develop an on-line newsletter to be given to donors and alumni.

H. Current Space

Over the past few years, SHS has had a few significant problems with its space—especially the odor problem related to the presence of the animal lab (the Keck facility) in our basement. The interior of our space is also showing the effects of “aging” and is in need of new carpeting and an overall “facelift.” Portions of the basement also leak during rain and ice storms and there will be a major construction project (60 days) in SU 2008 to address the leakage problem.

2. DEPARTMENT GOALS FOR FY09-FY12

A. Realistic Goals for Quality

Given our ranking in the top 20 for both audiology and speech-language pathology, an obvious goal would be to become a top ten program. To do this we clearly need to increase the research productivity of the faculty and I think that we can make such an improvement in faculty scholarship if we make good hires (and we believe that we have several good senior candidates for each position). Faculty need to be more active in seeking research funding and we should consider changes that would be attractive to the faculty member (e.g., setting the amount of funds needed to release a course to 10% salary and benefits for one course rather than 20%). But, will this be enough to propel us into the top ten? The answer is, probably not. Each one of the programs in the top 12 in speech-language pathology (Iowa, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Purdue, Washington, Arizona, Vanderbilt, Kansas, Indiana, Pittsburgh and Texas) have more faculty than do we, some of them twice as many faculty (the difference is even greater if you include clinical faculty, see Appendix I). We can make steps for this goal, but it will only be accomplished if we have more than 11 regular faculty members.

B. Program Priorities

A top priority is the PhD program in terms of increasing the number of students and the number of course offerings. It would be very significant if we can develop consistent MA-PhD and Aud-PhD feeder programs (too often students interested in eventually earning a PhD complete the professional program and then take jobs – we have to get them more interested in research early in the graduate program). Another top priority (because of the needs and size of the MA-SLP program) is the MA speech-language pathology/speech-language science program. We need to make two good hires in this area (hiring research productive scholars whose area of expertise matches the needs of the Department). The speech-language faculty are committed to revising the curriculum in light of current needs of the students and changing emphases in the discipline. Another priority is the audiology/hearing science program. One of the most recent faculty members to resign (S. Davidson, who took a position with the Board of Regents) was an essential part of the AuD program and it is important to replace her with some who will make important contributions to audiology and who will be a research productive scholar. All three of these hires are essential to the PhD program.

In terms of national recognition (and disciplinary rankings) and program quality, the lowest priority program is the undergraduate program. Ironically, this is the program that we cannot neglect given the current budgetary model of the College.

In terms of relative emphases regarding students, from a programmatic viewpoint, the high priority would be PhD students, then students in our professional (AuD and MA-SLP) programs, honors students, majors and lastly non-majors. We currently struggle with meeting the needs of each of these constituencies given the relatively small number of faculty members in the department.

C. Optimal Numbers

Dean Beck's memo asked us to provide optimal numbers "given our budgeting system" for a number of constituencies. However we cannot meet these optimal numbers with the present budgeting system (as long as funding for graduate programs is stringently linked to enrollment numbers). So, we are providing what the optimal numbers needed to meet our goal of improving our ranking (see Appendix I which provides information about the number of regular and clinical faculty for eight state-supported programs, each of which is ranked in the top 12 (above us) in the area of speech-language pathology by *US News and World Report*. Most of these programs are also ranked in the top 12 in the area of audiology as well.

- 14 tenure track faculty, with more individuals at a senior (professor level) than at the other levels
- 2-3 research faculty (moving our research scientists into that position)
- 7 clinical supervisors. Note, we currently have 5 clinical supervisors, and would like the opportunity to convert those positions into clinical faculty positions. Although the recommended limit on clinical faculty positions is approximately 10% of regular faculty, that is simply not the commonly accepted rule in our discipline (see Appendix I).
- 6-7 administrative staff members (we currently have 5, including two staff members in the Clinic)
- 2 technicians (we currently have 1 whose work is supplemented by a part-time student).
- 12-14 GTAs
- 10 GRAs
- 5 GAAs
- 20 PhD students (all funded through Fellowships, GTAs or GRAs)

D. Student Research

We normally have 10-15 honors undergraduate majors completing honors theses. This is probably the correct number. We would like to increase the number of MA/PhD and AuD/PhD students who would need to complete research projects as well. We are also working on a proposal for dual enrollment in the AuD/PhD program.

E. New and/or Emerging Disciplinary Areas

Genetics and communication disorders; language and literacy in speech-language pathology.

F. Space, Technologies and Equipment Needs

If we increase the size of the faculty and the number of clinical supervisors, we will need additional space. If we stay in Pressey Hall, we would need to expand into other areas of the building (there is some empty spaces now although there are in dire need of renovation). We need better equipped teaching classrooms in Pressey Hall (which is where we teach all of our Graduate courses). The University currently does not (and will not) include our classrooms in the classroom pool, thus we cannot get them furnished nor equipped by Classroom Services.

G. Estimated cost in Additional Annual Rate and/or Cash for Realizing the Aforementioned Goals

- Increasing faculty size to 14: \$400,000 PBA
- Startup costs: \$150,000 cash
- Major equipment needs (new and replacement computers and peripherals): \$80,000 cash
- Facilities needs (renovation of current portions of Pressey, updating classrooms, finding new space): \$250,000 cash
- Funding increases in PhD Program (to support 4 Fellowships and/or GRA/GTA positions): \$120,000

- Increased support for students in AuD and/or SLP programs (which will improve overall quality of incoming classes, could be 25% GA positions or scholarships): \$60,000

3. MATCHING RESOURCES TO GOALS FOR FY09-FY12

A. What Resources Could Be Generated under Current Budget Model?

Some additional resources could be generated under the current budgetary model, but we doubt that increase in budget would match our ideal scenario (described above). Some possibilities are described below:

- We expect some increased resource generation when the Department increases the number of sections of American Sign Language (in FY 09). However, these increases will be relatively small since we will be paying for 33% of the salary of the new associate coordinator, we will be paying for the lecturer or GTA to teach the course, and the size of these courses is limited to 24 (by agreement with the other departments participating in the ASL program).
- We have done some advertising on campus buses for courses and/or recruiting research subjects. The department can increase its efforts in this direction, and can likely produce at least small increments in the enrollments in our undergraduate courses. Our courses enrollments have been increasing in the past 2 years, so such an approach may produce additional enrollments (speech-language pathology and audiology are recognized as outstanding job opportunities well into the future by various organizations and the media).
- We need to continue to increase the number of undergraduate majors. We have more than doubled over the past 4 years, and we may be able to continue this increase with improved instruction in our undergraduate courses.
- We have discussed the development of additional GEC courses, but this is limited by the availability of faculty to develop (and/or teach) these courses, and the changes to the GEC requirements themselves. The creation of a 597 would produce additional income, but the challenge is, again, in finding the appropriate faculty member to create and teach it.
- Faculty are encouraged to submit grants to extramural agencies, and we will be seeking to hire new faculty who have demonstrated success in obtaining such funding. This process should increase our resources. To do so, we need to provide more and better incentives for faculty members (e.g., reduction in the cost of releasing a course). However, this projected amount of the increase in resources from such grants by current and future hires has to be balanced against the loss of S. Nittrouer (and her significant extramural funding) to Otolaryngology.
- The department is active in the submission of training grants for both professional and PhD students (one training grant was awarded in the past 18 months, and a second was resubmitted in January, 2008). Through this mechanism we can increase the support for and, likely, the number and quality of graduate students in our programs.

B. Other Resources?

Below are outlined other resources that were suggested in Dean Beck's memo that might produce additional budget for the Department.

- The Department's current reinvestment funds will be used to support the three replacement faculty members that we hope to hire this year. Cash will be used to help support start-up costs and GRA support.
- Expenditures from most of the development funds in the Department are already earmarked for specific uses (including the John Black Lecture Series, the Ruth Beckey Irwin Lecture and its support

of SLP students doing research, and the Goff-Graham fund in support of ESL students and multicultural instruction/research). Other cash will be used to help complete necessary renovations in Pressey Hall.

- We have had some increase in Development over the past several years, and can expect to expand efforts in this direction. However, at this point we have been unable to secure large donations (e.g., to support a faculty member or provide a large number of scholarships/fellowships) from several alumni who might be capable of such gifts.
- The Department does have a large earning unit, the Speech-Language-Hearing Clinic. However, this “earnings unit” is in reality an clinical educational unit. All of the earnings generated by the clinic are used to support the salaries and benefits of the clinical supervisors, other clinic staff (including GAAs), and space utilization “taxes.”

C. New Investments from the College or University?

In order to achieve the “optimal” scenario that was outlined above, we feel that a substantial portion would need to come from College reallocation of department “taxes” and/or some reallocation from the University. Clearly, one of the most important contribution that the University can make (from the Provost’s office) is to permanently reassign the funds currently used to support the salary and benefits of R. Koenigsknecht (past Dean of the Graduate School) to our PBA. Otherwise, when Koenigsknecht retires, we are in danger of losing a faculty line.

One of the possible new hires is actually a spousal hire and this would mean that 2/3 of her salary and benefits would be paid by another department and/or university unit for a period of three years. However, this will be cash and will not directly help our PBA.

Clearly we will be seeking to interview (and hire, when possible) diversity candidates and, if so, will try to secure FHAP funds. However, we have no firm commitments as yet.

It is the strong opinion of our faculty that the current budgetary model does not reflect a strong commitment to graduate education. In particular, the relatively formulaic approach to providing resources based primarily on enrollment is a disincentive to a program which has a large graduate program in comparison to its undergraduate enrollment.

D. Resources Generated Internally through Reduction of Costs and Reallocations

It is difficult to know what costs might be reduced. If we could have our classrooms supported and furnished by Classroom Services, that would reduce costs but we have not been successful in that endeavor. Similarly, the Speech-Language-Hearing, a clinical educational unit, currently pays more than \$84,000 in PPA (this is after a central credit of \$24,678) and overhead because it is an “earnings unit.” If these charges could be reduced, this would help our budget significantly.

E. Effect on Operations with 10% more PBA? with 10% less PBA?

An increase of 10% would allow us to hire at least one additional faculty member and perhaps provide additional support for graduate students. Although a 10% increase would not allow us to meet the optimal scenario, it would provide much needed support for our program.

A decrease of 10% in our PBA would have deleterious effect on the program. We are a small program with, at the point, basically “no fat.” We cannot afford to lose a faculty line, so any decrease in PBA would have to be compensated by cash (on a year-to-year basis) as much as possible. This would likely

lead to less support for graduate students (especially for AuD and MA-SLP students) and decreased student quality.

4. BENCHMARKS FOR ASSESSING ACHIEVEMENT OF GOALS?

Benchmark for achievement of various goals:

- Success in hiring senior faculty into three open positions
- Increase in number of faculty line beyond current faculty lines by at least 1
- 30% increase in number of peer-reviewed publications by faculty over next 2-3 years
- 20% increase in number of PhD students
- Improvement in mean GPAs and GRE scores of students admitted to MA-SLP and AuD programs as well as PhD program (i.e., improvement in quality of graduate students)
- 25% increase in number of undergraduate majors and/or in undergraduate credit hours generated
- 40% of faculty supported (as PI or co-investigator) on extramural grants
- Receipt of at least 1 more training grant in support of MA-SLP, AuD or PhD students
- Improvement in development efforts, in particular, documented increase in amount of significant donations to Department

Appendix I. Comparison of faculty/clinical professor sizes of 8 state-supported programs ranked ahead of Ohio State.

Programs	Number of Regular Faculty			Number of Clinical Faculty (all levels)
	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
<i>Iowa</i>	3	4	9	9
<i>Wisconsin</i>	4	3	6	12
<i>Purdue</i>	4	8	8	11
<i>Washington</i>	5	2	7	10
<i>Arizona</i>	5	4	5	10
<i>Illinois</i>	6	7	5	8
<i>Pittsburgh</i>	5	10	4	n/a
<i>North Carolina</i>	6	3	9	n/a