

AASIG Business Meeting
Saturday October 6, 2007

- I. Mary Rodgers called the meeting to order at 8:00am
- II. Minutes of the February 15, 2007 meeting were approved
- III. Announcements:
 - a. Judy White reported on the Foreign Credentialing Commission on Physical Therapy – Her PowerPoint is attached. Educational programs interested in developing programs to assist foreign educated PTs should contact Judy White.
 - b. Betty Protas and Stuart Bender- McCloud reported on their funded K-12 grants called Building Capacity in Rehabilitation Research. These are grant opportunities for PT and OT to develop research skills. Betty presented information on how programs can get involved and reported on her grant which is collaboration between UTMB and University of Florida. K awards offer a range of career development and training awards. They are awarded to institutions. Each grant will be for 5 years. Candidates must be US residents or citizens and be not more than 3 years past their post-doc training. Mentors must be tenured faculty, with established records of research with grant support in area of basic, applied or translational research relevant to rehabilitation medicine.
Both partnerships funded by K12 involve partnerships involve institutions with established research infrastructure & successful graduate training programs. The goal of these awards is to increase the number of rigorously trained extramurally competitive and competent researchers.

Stuart reported on his grant which is collaboration with University of Delaware, University of Pittsburg, & Washington University. They collaborate with 4 other universities to offer training sites. The goal is to develop rehabilitations scholars who have the potential to excel. This requires a 4-5 year commitment with $\geq 75\%$ of time for years 1&2 and more than 50% in years 3-5. Candidates who are supported by these training grants will maintain ties with their home institution. The grant pays 75% of salary for years 1&2; in years 3-5 candidates are expected to have their own funding to support salaries. The plan is the scholar will return to the home institution with skills to be successful in obtaining grant funding.
 - c. Mary Rodgers announced there is a need to get more involvement and participation in Education Section Awards. Diane Jette stated that there are several different awards offered by the section and there are few nominations. She asked all to go to education section website and pull down awards. Paperwork is minimal and nominations are due on December 1st.
 - d. Mark Weigand and Tom Mahew presented nominations for the following AASIG positions
Chair
Sandy Quillen
Leslie Portney
Secretary
Bob Sandstrom
Lisa Riolo

Nomination Committee
Barbara Sanders
Russell Carter

IV. Follow-up discussion from Friday Reports

a. US News and World Report (USN&WR) rankings

Lisa Riolo thanked those who met with URN&WR representatives. She presented 2 additional ideas provided by her faculty. Her faculty suggested that additional data provided to USNWR include faculty preparation and quality (# with PhD, grant dollars awarded, location of program such as medical center and environment).

Diane responded there is not good data on the grant funding and publications to put forward. Diane also stated the committee had considered offering information about location and research category of institution in a separate table.

Scott Haddon suggested including data on average NPTE score achieved by program in addition to % who pass overall. He also recommended including % of graduates who are APTA members.

Scott Minor asked to what degree is it valid for CAPTE to provide information. He is concerned about ethics of mixing CAPTE with rankings. Diane reported the consensus is that data provided are public data. Costs, pass rates, #faculty, # applicants are data that is traditionally publicly available. It was clarified that these data were not included as part of accreditation – they were collected separately and to make it easier for programs, CAPTE agreed to collect it for us. Scott stated that he feels uncomfortable having CAPTE involved and feels programs should provide the data directly. Scott stated USW&NR is a “for-profit” agency and expressed concern in assisting them.

Diane Jette reported that the group discussed putting together our own data and publishing it separately in a summarized form on the APTA website. This would facilitate review of programs for all applicants. Diane reported that USNWR will continue to do rankings unless NONE of us respond and this is not likely to happen. Scott added that it may take more time to develop our own grid, but encouraged the group to do this as it’s the right thing to do.

Don Kawalski expressed concern about reporting first time pass rate, especially due to the problems that occurred in 2005 and feels these data should not be used.

Sue Maginty asked re: grid that includes data related to diversity. Sue stated that if we have a commitment to this, then this is information that should be not be a separate table, but included in the weighting of the rankings.

Jim Gordon supported Scott Minors’ concerns about involving CAPTE. Jim expressed concerned that while data are public, it has always been presented in the aggregate. It has never been published identifying separate institutions. He also supported the idea that we should do this ourselves. He feels providing data to USWNR is “partnering” with them and the rankings would appear to be endorsed by APTA. He stated we should publish the data ourselves and make it available to the public. USWNR would then have the option to use the data or not.

Reed Humphrey is concerned about name recognition and its impact on the rankings. USN&WR is essentially a name recognition ranking which is biased. He expressed support for efforts that have been made to make rankings more objectives and to let USWNR know that we don’t endorse the process currently used in the rankings.

Bob Sandstrom commented on the use of licensing exam scores and disagreed with use of average scores for program graduates.

Mike Emery pleaded with group to move process forward on our own. He stated we can do a better job of presenting the data in more accurate and reliable fashion for use by potential applicants. He stated that people need to be able to take the data and weight it for themselves based on their own priorities. Mike suggested we take next four years and come up with a better way to provide these data.

David Lake stated discussion may be moot if applicants don't really use the rankings in their decision-making. David expressed concern about use of peer-assessment and would like to see validity of USWNR rankings as most of it is only opinion based.

Dave Arnall hopes the ranking will not be part of information put out by this group as it is divisive. He pleaded with group NOT to rank ourselves because it will outrage the bottom 3rd and suggests that the top two-thirds are worthier than others, even though all programs are accredited. Dave favors Mike Emery's recommendation of providing data so students can rank programs themselves.

Russell Carr stated that his immediate reaction to USWNR stating they will go ahead with the rankings regardless of what we do is similar to his reaction to the school yard bully. He hopes APTA will publish something that states we disagree with the rankings because of the lack of validity of them.

Mike Pagliarulo stated that when rankings came out he was called into his Dean's office and asked what should be done about the rankings. He agreed with others who feel we should provide data ourselves and let the consumer choose. His faculty was in favor of using outcomes and the only one on the list was pass rate. They were not supportive of including other data. Mike felt grant funding should be tied to the institution's Carnegie category because of the differing expectations.

Donna Frye suggested that something be put on the APTA website that talks about the validity of report coming out of USWNR. She feels it would be more appropriate to put it up proactively than retroactively.

Janet Bezner states calls come in daily to APTA asking which is the best PT school. APTA answers that programs are listed on website and recommend the applicant select the program that is best for them. Janet believes the public is unwilling to do the work of ranking themselves and feels some external ranking would be valued by the public. While it is possible APTA could create a searchable spread sheet, Janet doesn't believe they have the ability to do this right now. Janet asked "How does this fit in with priorities?" and do we have the resources to do this? Janet asked for input from the group regarding the importance of this project.

A motion was made by Scott Minor in which he "recommended that the Section for Education take the lead in developing a common set of data to be used by individual applicants as consumers in considering school choices. These data shall be collected independently of CAPTE. These data shall not be used for ranking of schools. There will be a draft report by AASIG in 2008 and a final grid for approval at the 2009 AASIG meeting." Motion was seconded.

DISCUSSION: Scott stated this activity should not be related to current ranking due to time constraints, but wanted to have a draft within one year. He feels this is a priority of this group and that we do have the resources within the section to do this.

Sherry Hayes stated there was a taskforce on benchmarking in 1999. It was not approved or funded by APTA, so the Section funded all meetings of task force. The Report identified benchmarks that provided a means of measurement against other like institutions. The issue became instead of identifying 10-15 quality indicators, there were 110 identified. Sherry stated the report went to APTA BOD and disappeared. She raised caution that this has been done and paid for by the Education Section 7 years ago. Sherry stated that like it or not the rankings are there and people will use them.

Jan Richardson heard Scott say to collect data that consumer could use and Janet Bezner say that consumers not interested in doing that. If that is the case the effort required to provide data may not be worth the time and effort required. Jan supported the notion of working with USWNR to provide objective data. She doesn't think it would be in our best interest NOT to be listed in their publication. Mike suggested that for this year we have a list of schools which did NOT participate in rankings for USWNR. He recommended that APTA or the Section put the list of schools who would NOT participate in rankings on the website.

Mike Pagliarulo spoke in favor of Scott's motion that the Section provide the data and allow students to make comparisons on their own. He also stated that even if we don't participate in rankings, it will occur. Mike recommended that APTA respond to calls re: best program by stating "we don't rank".

Jody Gandy stated that the task force on benchmarking was a shared cost effort with two outcomes: a set of potential benchmarks but there was no evidence that these were the best benchmarks. The second part was delayed until profession could develop a consistent outcomes tool so data collected was consistent across programs and these were the elements that needed to be collected. There is a group being overseen by Janet Bezner to develop a set of tools for schools to use to benchmark. Denise Wise stated she is ambivalent about the motion and rankings. She feels the motion makes a lot of sense because she doesn't have knowledge of all programs being ranked. She rose in support of motion.

Jane from University of Florida appreciates work of committee. She continues to provide input to USNWR and says her Dean would not allow her to state she won't contribute to it. Her faculty wondered if they would consider ranking programs on levels of Carnegie categories. Janet Bezner said USNWR said they would be open to that.

Stuart Blatt expressed concern about the enormity of the charge that Scott put forward in his motion. He expressed concern about the cost and is not sure Section has the resources.

Becky Craig wondered if people would be compliant and timely in sending in information and asked group to be realistic about the cost and effort related to this motion. She also stated APTA should be involved.

Barbara Tschoepe, a member of the Ad Hoc Group, felt we are getting off track with discussion. Three questions: Are we going to collaborate with USWNR? If we want to play do we leave it the way it is or not? Do we want to benchmark or not?

Member stated students would want to know how many courses taught by core faculty.

Penny stated she liked idea of giving students the information, but stated doesn't believe all students are using the rankings as primary source of information and is concerned that this effort may not be worth effort.

Member from Missouri State University stated he did use USWNR when looking for college for children. Looked at where graduates from programs had gone and asked if we would include where the alumni are for the top level schools.

Mike Pagliarulo stated he didn't think it will cost lots of money. Mary Rodgers indicated this is only a recommendation to the Education section and the Section will determine if we have resources. Mary Rodgers called for a vote.

Motion was approved.

A member stated a compromise might be for the Section to continue to implore USNWR to include objective data and schools could provide the data to ease the pressure on schools who are required to work with USNWR.

Barbara Tschoepe moved that for the upcoming USNWR process (2007-2008) that AASIG work with USNWR & keep with the understanding that we provide data to include: 3 year average for overall pass rate, ratio of # applicants to member offered position; overall enrolled GPA, ratio of # of FTE core faculty to total # of students. This information will be pulled from AAR 2007 report. There will be an opportunity to opt out for those who do not wish to participate. Motion was seconded.

DISCUSSION

Marion Minor asked what our intention is in contributing to the ranking. Thinks there is a down side to contributing – that is that we lose moral high ground of being able to say this is a popularity contest and we haven't contributed.

Other members also expressed concern that providing information was not in the best interests of the programs because it would appear we are in partnership with them.

A member expressed concern about including pre-admission GPA as it may not reflect the true quality of the program if data are not presented in context of program.

Susan Campbell supports motion. She reported having had a positive experience from being included in rankings. The result was an increase in applications and diversity of where people came from. Susan feels inclusion in rankings increased the quality of applicants, even though they weren't in the top ten.

Larry Chernak rose in opposition to participation in providing data for USWNR.

Reed Humphrey wonders why we can't say we are working with USNWR to improve the ranking process but couldn't do that for the current ranking.

Vote was taken and motion failed. This means no data will be sent to USNWR and system will remain as it has been.

Cathy from University of Puget Sound made a motion that the Section post a statement on the Section website stating the USNWR rankings are not endorsed due to methodology used. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

Ken Harwood, Director of Practice and Education

Introduced himself to the group and provided a brief autobiography.

Jim Gordon rose and asked that Janet Bezner be recognized for her efforts as head of the Division of Education and the advances made in the past. He wanted to hear how education's agenda would be prioritized in this re-organization. Ken responded they are looking for practical ways increase communication between units and feels the re-

organization will achieve this. He stated the strategic plan for education will continue to be moved forward. Ken stated there will be unit reviews to eliminate redundancies.

Stuart Blatt asked why the division that was created was not “Practice, Education and Research”? John Barnes responded that they wanted to more closely connect Research with the Foundation. He further stated that the research function is a connection to government affairs, reimbursement, and all aspects of APTA.

Mike Sheldon asked group if one of the things we want looked at is the vision statement “vision 20/20”. He is coming from a University that is trying to operationalize “interdisciplinary” education. He wonders if the use of “autonomous” has alternative interpretations that don’t support interdisciplinary education. Janet Bezner responded the Task Force on Strategic Plan for Vision 2020 has same concerns. Task force has revised definitions of each of the elements of the vision 20/20 and they are on the APTA website under “About APTA”. What you will see re: autonomous practice includes collaboration with others. Janet agreed we can do a better job of helping ourselves and others to understand what that means. Janet asked all who have difficulty operationalizing the vision to please contact her.

Mary Sinnot shares concern re: use of term autonomous practice and recommended use of term “autonomy”. She stated she would like to see verbiage about interdependence included.

Jim Gordon returned to topic of re-organization. He stated this morning is a good example of the problem this group has --- we have no decision making capability. We are taking votes on things and don’t even know who is in this room. He expressed concern there is no system of governance for PT education. Most other professions have a separate organization of schools. He feels we need a similar organization to work collaboratively with the APTA but allows for governance of the programs. He feels Education Section is not the place to be doing these things.

He feels it is time for PT Education develop its own organization.

Scott Ward rose in support of a separate organization for PT Education. Scott stated that APTA has no issue with this suggestion. Scott stated that beyond re-organization, the units will be reviewed department by department and will look at overarching strategic planning process and potentially uncover things APTA shouldn’t spend time on. Scott stated there will also be a comprehensive governance review to include more than HOD operations. In light of this, he feels this is a great time for the discussion of a separate organization for PT Education programs.

Becky Knight wanted to be certain that the PTA was taken into account in all the changes and re-structuring. Ken responded that PTA is being considered in strategic plan.

Mary Rodgers asked for additional items of discussion

Mike Sheldon asked about the Centralized Application Process. He asked about GPA calculations and the pre-requisites, given the variability of pre-requisites across programs.

Libby Ross stated the CAS program will not calculate GPAs for each program’s pre-requisites. This will have to be done by individualized programs. CAS will create a program page for each program and include a table of the pre-reqs required by each program. This has the potential to identify trends and the potential to identify which courses predict success in the program.

Janet Bezner stated that APTA was charged to bring back the pre-requisite table. Mary Jane Harris has created the table and found that about 75% of pre-requisites are common across

programs. This table has been posted on the directory page. Please review pre-reqs for your program and let them know if it is correct.

Annette Iglarsh asked about issuance of original transcripts. Libby indicated that the service will collect official transcripts, but it doesn't have the capability of sharing transcripts with the programs. In other professions, programs ask applicants who enroll to send official transcripts.

Peggy Trublood asked if there is anyway that CAS could provide the grid we have been discussing. Response was that it is possible to do this.

Dave Miller states they are a freshman entry program primarily and asked the impact on them. Libby responded there will be pathways for those applying from high school and those with bachelor's degree. Applicants will have to identify where they are in their education and options available to them will pop up. There is no cost to the program. Revenue is generated by applicant fees. There will be a base fee and incremental fee for each additional program applied to. Admit software that you have option of using that works with CAS. There is a yearly license fee of \$5,000. Don't have to use this system.

Debbie Heiss from Ohio State asked about the impact of CAS on applicant fees required by rigid institutions. Libby stated that programs can still collect a supplemental fee if that is an issue. Programs will receive all data collected. Janet Bezner stated that Libby has a generous budget for travel and will be visiting many campuses. Janet asked programs to notify her if we are willing to host this group. There will also be webinars to clarify what CAS will provide and how it will work.

Russell Carter asked if they have considered the severely financially disadvantaged student in this system. He feels that disadvantaged students shouldn't be denied access to all programs. Libby stated there will be a fee waiver process for disadvantaged applicants based on US poverty rate (200% of US poverty rate based on size of household).

Sandy Quillan asked about background checks. He wondered if this is on the radar screen for this group. Libby replied that they are looking at the national criminal background check system that AAMC is currently pilot testing. Through the CAS system applicants who are accepted could potentially be re-directed to a third party for criminal background check that may be required by a PT program. No decision has been made about this issue, as we are waiting to learn about the experience at AAMC.

Mary Rodgers asked if there were other items for discussion.

Mike Pagliarulo asked that the deadline for student early registration for student conclave be pushed back. He also stated that the AAR fall deadline is problematic because of all other responsibilities related to the start of the school year. Mike wondered if there is a different cycle for this. Related to this, he stated there was a significant difference between the electronic and paper forms of the AAR and thanked CAPTE for the extension. As a final thought, he recommended that there be programming for new program directors for PT and PTA programs. Mary Jane Harris responded to these comments by stating that the timeline for AAR is related to timing for this meeting. Mary Jane Harris presents admission data at this meeting and that's why the deadline is set. She indicated this could easily be changed to another time if admissions data are not vital to this meeting.

Jim Gordon rose in support of moving the deadline back. The issue of having admissions data arose in late 90's when there was a sinking applicant pool. He doesn't feel the data are critical to this meeting. He also suggested CAPTE delay sending the annual accreditation

bill until after reports are due. Mary Jane referred that comment to Chuck Martin. Libby indicated there will be applicant/admission data available through CAS.

David Miller rose asking for a straw poll asking that Nov.1 be the deadline for AAR. Mary Jane took responsibility for difference between written and electronic copies. CAPTE has been trying to make the information the same across AAR, Self-study report and Progress reports. A benefit of the AAR is that the data will only need to be edited in the future.

When it comes to a self-study all you will need to do is upload documents that already exist electronically and write a narrative.

Jim Ferris was a beta tester for the electronic AAR. He felt all worked exceptionally hard on getting the bugs out of the electronic system and thanked them for their efforts.

Mike Sheldon asked if deadline was pushed back how it would impact posting of fact sheet. Mary Jane responded fact sheet will be created from AAR and it will be published more quickly. If a deadline of Nov. 1 is set, we could have the fact sheet by end of Nov.

Mark Reinking asked if there would be a chance to edit the drop down choices. Mary Jane stated there are options to change all of that and would be happy to address concerns and suggestions.

Sharon Dunn congratulated Mary Jane and her team on the hours of efforts put into the electronic version of the AAR. Sharon asked for an update for PTPAC. Nancy stated the AASIG is still behind student assembly donations. She indicated 60% of student assembly has donated while only 50% of AASIG has. We need 45 people to contribute to meet the 60% mark set by students.

Mike Pagliarulo rose to commend Mary Jane Harris for her work on AAR. He also asked about the requirement for signature page to be submitted after the electronic file has already been submitted. Mike wanted to know if deadline for report and signature page could be the same. Mary Jane stated that it was intended for you to print and take the preview page to the deans and others for signature before submitting your report.

V. Other Business

a. Donation in honor of Kay Shepard

Kay was Mary McMillan lecturer this year. Kay didn't want a reception so what was decided was that a donation would be made to the Educational Research Endowment Fund. Kay donated her honorarium. PA, Education, and Research have all made donations. To date have collected \$12,000. Kristen stated Kay would like to get to \$15,000. Katie Harvey will be accepting donations. Incentive if we get to \$15,000. If we meet goal, Diane Jette will put on cheerleading outfit. Checks are made payable to Educational Research Foundation.

VI. Group topics for afternoon sessions (2:30 – 4:00pm)

- i. PT Education organization
- ii. Autonomy vs. Autonomous
- iii. Common data set for use by consumers in selecting schools
- iv. Faculty shortage
- v. New AA group
- vi. Challenges related to post-professional education

Work groups could recommend plans, programming etc. Workgroups will initially meet in this room with reports to larger group at 4pm.

VII. Upcoming AASIG Meetings

- vii. Oct. 3-5 2008 Phoenix, AZ

Annette Iglarsh wanted group to know that board of HPA has identified a committee to standardize curriculum so LAMP curricula will be standardized. There are also plans to work on developing a common leadership curriculum. Long range plan is to incorporate other disciplines we work with.

Jim Carey asked group to consider forming an assembly, separate from APTA to allow PT Education Programs to have own governance. Jim stated his concern about AAR lumping publications and published abstracts; concerned with ability to agree on any benchmarks. States we have not established a culture on what we should aspire to as academicians.

Diane Jette responded that there has been an ad hoc group that has been meeting and talking about the role and place of PT education in the academy. Diane reported the group has started talking about the need to address Jim's concerns. The group is looking to have a conference about these issues. Part of the issue will be funding. The group is thinking about a "Gordon-like" Conference to discuss this in bigger, broader terms. Dianne encouraged board to think about the imperative for funding.

Mike Sheldon is newly elected vice chair of AASIG. One role is developing programming for this meeting. He would like input re: time used at this meeting as well as getting input for programming for future meetings.

Members attending the meeting divided into 4 workgroups in the afternoon. These included:

1. Assembly of Physical Therapy Education Programs – this group discussed the pros and cons of developing an Association of PT Programs that would be a decision making body. The purpose would be to facilitate excellence in physical therapy education and research with the potential to influence practice. Some stated the need for this new organization arises because there is a difference in culture between the academy and profession. Questions raised were: Should the new organization be inside or outside APTA? Does the PT program belong to the Profession or the Academy? Mary Rodgers received names of those interested in continuing to investigate this and will appoint an 8-person task force. The task force will provide an interim report at CSM and a draft final report in Oct. 2008.
2. New Academic Administrators
3. Autonomy Vs. Autonomous
4. Comments from the fourth work group were as follows:
 - a. We need to include academic, research, and environmental (size, location) information.
 - b. We should include research ranking according to Carnegie listing to indicate the mission of the universities in which our programs exist. This would have to be explained to consumers as to why it makes a difference.
 - c. There is a need to list the items that will make up the data set, and to have this list discussed by all interested programs. There will be disagreements, and these will need to be discussed and adjudicated. The question of who will be the final arbiter was raised.
 - d. There is a need to have an introductory statement indicating that the consumer should be the person who ranks the programs for herself/himself. All programs that are accredited should be considered. Scott Minor stated he will draft a statement for comment. (Editorial comment after the fact - This statement would be different than the one

provided by the Section/SIG.) The Work Group suggestion for a statement was one that informs consumers that the rankings that count are the ones they create, and it is the institutions' responsibility to provide as much information as possible so the consumer can make informed choices.

e. A list of items to include in the data set was started, but must be expanded.

f. It was a group assumption (Editorial comment - with the exception of one person) that Scott Minor would lead this effort. A working group must be established to generate a proposal for this effort.

The meeting was officially adjourned at 4:45pm

Respectfully submitted,

Beth C. Marcoux, DPT, PhD

AASIG Secretary