



UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Graduate School

G-1 Communications

Box 353770

Seattle, Washington 98195-3770

Telephone: (206)543-5900

Fax: (206)685-3234

July 2, 2004

To: David B. Thorud
Acting Provost
Office of the Provost
Box 351237

From: Gail L. Dubrow
Associate Dean for Academic Programs

Subject: Department of Psychology 10-Year Review

Summary and Recommended Action

At its meeting of June 3, 2004, the Graduate School Council met with members of the team that reviewed the Department of Psychology's BA, BS, MS, and PhD degree programs, the Chair and faculty of the Department, and the Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Council unanimously recommended that the undergraduate and graduate degree programs be continued, with the next review scheduled for the 2013-2014 academic year.

I concur with the Council's recommendations and comments.

Background

The Department of Psychology offers the BA, BS, MS and PhD degrees. It also has an established relationship with the BS degree program in Neurobiology. The Department of Psychology was established in 1917 upon its separation from the Department of Philosophy. The department has a total state-funded faculty of 46.92 (49 faculty) and 7 research faculty. The distribution across rank includes 19 full professors, with 1 research professor, 15 associate professors and 5 research associate professors, 9 assistant professors, plus 1 research assistant professor and 6 senior lecturers. The department also has a large number of post-doctoral fellows and approximately 150 affiliate or clinical faculty members. In the 2003-2004 academic year the department had 800 undergraduate majors and 133 graduate students. Beyond the education of those

specializing in psychology, the department plays a critical role in the general education of undergraduates.

The Department's academic record reflects a strong commitment to excellence in both undergraduate and graduate education, as well as in research and community service. Unlike psychology departments in other universities that have focused and built strength in particular program areas, the Department of Psychology offers extensive breadth and diversity in both the basic and applied fields. Faculty view this approach to be a strength, though it also accounts for some continuing difficulties in connecting across areas of specialization.

The previous ten-year review noted that while the department operated with limited resources to support its overall educational and research mission, faculty were highly productive and nationally the department was considered to be top rated. According to the National Research Council 1993 ranking of research doctorates, the department ranked 12th among the 190 psychology programs. This ranking situated the department in the 94th percentile among all departments in the country, with a quality ranking of 4.24 out of a possible high of 5. Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the department is one of the strongest units. The 2004 review again found the department to be highly competitive nationally, with the added strength of outstanding leadership from the Chair, Ana Mari Cauce. Professor Cauce has built on the efforts of previous department administrations and planning committees that instituted changes in various program areas. The strategic plan developed five years prior to her appointment played a key role in the improvements of the undergraduate program.

The department's capacity to sustain high quality programs and its national research rankings will be jeopardized if University investments remain at the current level. When compared with similar academic research units within the College of Arts and Sciences on key factors of staff, operations budget and research, Psychology appears to lack comparable resources, particularly considering the high level of faculty productivity in teaching and research. Resource constraints threaten to weaken the department's foundation. The Chair's efforts to effect needed changes are hampered not only by limited resources, but also by a \$400,000 debt inherited from the department's previous administration. The chair has initiated discussion with the Dean's office to seek debt relief. A second conversation, focused on the appropriate level of support for the department's operating budget, also is warranted in light of the combination of high performance, service to the College, and disparities among units identified in the review process.

Though the review identified significant resource issues that merit new investments, the solution to some concerns rests directly in the hands of faculty itself. The previous ten-year review raised serious issues about departmental culture, the lack of an overall sense of community, the structure of the graduate program curriculum, and undergraduate teaching and research. Subsequent to the review, the department has instituted changes in all areas, some with significant success and others that require continuing attention.

The relationship with the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's office — which suffered in the past — has improved due to the department Chair's efforts. The department's commitment to launching a strategic planning initiative is essential to develop a clearer vision for the future, to formulate concrete steps toward achieving greater integration across departmental areas, and to foster a culture that supports the professional development of faculty and students, both in the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Program Review Process

The review committee was comprised of seven faculty – three internal and four from peer institutions. Judith Howard, Professor in the Department of Women Studies, was the committee chair. Other internal members included Lewayne Gilchrist, Professor in the School of Social Work, and John Wingfield, Professor in the Department of Biology. The external committee members were Mark Appelbaum, Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education and Professor of Psychology at the University of California at San Diego, Thomas Carew, Professor of Neurobiology and Behavior and Chair of the Center for Neurobiology of Learning and Memory, University of California at Irvine, Michael Posner, Professor of Psychology at the University of Oregon, and Peter Salovey, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Yale University. The review committee conducted a two-day site visit on March 8 and 9, 2004, when they met with faculty, students, staff, and key administrative faculty.

Findings and Recommendations

The review team commended the College of Arts and Sciences on the appointment of the current Chair, Ana Mari Cauce, and acknowledged that her superb leadership appears to be guiding the department in the right direction. The leadership change has also infused a needed sense of optimism among faculty, students and staff. The Dean's office support of the department chair is critical for effective change to occur and will assist the department in meeting the continuing challenges that it faces. The review committee found a healthy department overall, which possesses strengths in key areas of the discipline. These strengths have enabled the department to make significant contributions to the College of Arts and Sciences and the University as a whole.

The review team found excellence in the department's record of research and scholarship. It is reflected in the faculty's productive publication record, with a significant number of faculty having published in top peer reviewed journals. The committee noted that research activity is strong overall, however there is considerable variability in faculty productivity, with a core of senior faculty among the most prolific. The committee urged the department to institute mechanisms for continual interaction among faculty on the subject of their research activity. An additional concern is the need for developing a systematic mentoring process, for junior faculty in particular, to ensure they reach their full potential as teachers and scholars.

The review committee noted the faculty's extraordinary record of funded research and commended them for maintaining second place national ranking for federal grant awards over a 10-year period. In the 2001-2002 academic year, recipients of federal grants included 89% of the Full Professors, with 53% having more than one award, and 69% of

the Associate and Assistant Professors. Since faculty research projects are predominantly structured around small interest groups, the committee encouraged the department to seek other types of funding, such as training grants, that would facilitate collaboration across research areas, both within the department and with other related units.

The undergraduate program ranks as one of the best nationally. The department is productive, serving a large constituency of undergraduate majors and non-majors, with continued increase in majors. In 2003, there were approximately 800 majors and 500 graduates. This was the largest number of graduates of all the College of Arts and Sciences academic units for that year. A major challenge for the department is to achieve a balance between providing general education for non-majors and addressing the needs of psychology majors. The committee noted that the research opportunity offered to majors is a distinctive strength of the program. The quality of the undergraduate curriculum is reflected in student course evaluations; ratings have increased over the past 5 years. The department's undergraduate curriculum serves a significant number of students in the College of Arts and Sciences. The review team recommended that the department continue its efforts to reduce the numbers of majors as well as to reduce non-major enrollments, with the objective of strengthening the quality of the major. How adequately the department's teaching agenda is funded, and by what means, are subjects that merit continuing discussion within the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as with the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education.

The committee urged the department to reexamine its policy on course buyouts in relation to the undergraduate program. Although current practices provide faculty with opportunities to focus on their research, and subsidize an increased number of course offerings, some concerns remain about the engagement of senior faculty in undergraduate teaching. While recognizing that there are many venues for teaching, including through service as undergraduate research mentors, the committee nevertheless expressed discomfort with the extent of course buyouts utilized by faculty holding research grants.

The doctoral program is rated in the top 20 nationally, with the clinical psychology program rated second in the country. The committee found overall high student satisfaction with the graduate program, particularly with writing and teaching assistantship training. One clearly identified weakness is the existing model for graduate student financial support, which is provided primarily through teaching and research assistantships. The lack of fellowships puts the department at a competitive disadvantage.

Additionally, the committee raised concerns about the timing and process of the graduate program's approach to selecting mentors. This process may hinder student exploration of alternative research areas. Greater participation of students in selecting mentors, and more frequent opportunities for interaction with faculty and students in other sub-areas, might be desirable improvements in the graduate program. The committee encouraged the department to consider developing opportunities for forging connections across research areas and for implementing a broader model of graduate student training.

Constraints on space present major challenges for the department. The department's home in Guthrie Hall is at capacity and requires remodeling to increase its utility for faculty research. Faculty offices and research facilities are scattered in various

locations across campus. The space situation has required some faculty to move to rented facilities off campus. The physical fragmentation is one — though not the only — factor hindering collaboration and the creation of a stronger collegial academic community for faculty, students and staff. Though a consolidation of Psychology faculty into a shared facility is an unlikely prospect, the development of higher quality research facilities is a clear and pressing priority.

On the issue of budgetary resources, the committee urged the department to develop a long-term strategy to generate external funding from alumni and other donor potential sources. This strategy would enable the department to begin to develop a discretionary budget. The committee noted with concern the department's staggering indirect research cost recovery debt, which negatively impacts the funding of start-up packages for new faculty, facility maintenance and other activities ordinarily funded from indirect cost recovery. They encouraged the College administration to assist the department with reduction of this debt, while simultaneously addressing the need for an increased operating budget.

The department also contributes to the diversity of the institution, with 30% of its ladder faculty being female (43% of total faculty, including lecturers, are female). While this is high compared to both other science and social science departments in Arts and Sciences, the department is 3 female faculty members short of availability in the field (44%). The committee recommended that the department continue its efforts to recruit additional faculty of color. While 20% of ladder faculty are faculty of color, which is well above availability in the field (8%), they are short 1 African American faculty member compared to availability in the field (2.3% vs. 3.7%). Continuing efforts to recruit and retain students of color were also identified as a priority, both for the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Early findings from the campus-wide diversity study also suggest that new initiatives are needed to enhance the integration of diversity issues into the curriculum throughout the University of Washington's three campuses. In the case of the Department of Psychology, numerous opportunities exist to address the role of culture and race on individual and group psychology and behavior within the curriculum, in speakers' series, and in research and training programs. A closer relationship with the Graduate School's Graduate Opportunities and Minority Achievement Program (GOMAP) might suggest strategies for developing fellowship funds for students of color and for supporting faculty who play key roles in mentoring these students.

Graduate Council Recommendations

The Graduate School Council concurred with the review committee's findings, commending the team for the thoroughness and quality of the review it produced. The committee was comprised of distinguished faculty both internally and externally. The Council commended the department for its excellent leadership, the national stature of its undergraduate and graduate programs, its distinguished faculty in areas of research and scholarship, the quality of the undergraduate and graduate students, and the faculty's continuing record of outstanding achievement in securing federal funding.

The Council recognizes that a major priority of the department is to reduce its indirect cost recovery debt. The College Dean's office has expressed a commitment to work with the Provost and the department to address these and other concerns. The College has also expressed, in principle, support of the department's renewed efforts to pursue faculty hires. A common theme, expressed at all levels of the review, was the hope that future hires would represent strategic choices about areas of inquiry that build bridges among subfields and across disciplines, harnessing the potential for intellectual innovation. Both the College and the Office of the Provost recognize the need for remodeling of facilities to reduce constraints on space. The Council applauds the College's support of the department in seeking to address long-standing resource and space issues.

Looking to the future, the Council recommended that in addition to the department forging stronger connections internally, that it explore potential areas in the health sciences that could support growth in the biological sciences component and open new opportunities to secure other sources of funding. Specifically, joint training grants might provide new resources.

In light of these findings, the Graduate School Council enthusiastically recommended continuation of the Department of Psychology's degree programs, and recommended that the next review take place in ten years.

- c: Mark A. Emmert, President, Office of the President
Elizabeth L. Feetham, Acting Dean, The Graduate School
Susan E. Jeffords, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Office of the Provost
David C. Hodge, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
George S. Bridges, Dean and Vice Provost, Office of Undergraduate Education
Ronald S. Irving, Divisional Dean, Natural Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences
Christine Ingebritsen, Acting Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Education
Ana Mari Cauce, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology
Nancy J. Kenney, Associate Professor and Associate Chair,
Department of Psychology
Beth Kerr, Associate Professor and Associate Chair, Department of Psychology
Laura Little, Senior Lecturer and Assistant Chair, Department of Psychology
Members of the Psychology Review Committee
Graduate School Council
Augustine McCaffery, Assistant to the Dean/Manager, The Graduate School