

April 19, 2004

TO: Elizabeth Feetham  
Acting Dean, The Graduate School  
  
Gail L. Dubrow  
Associate Dean, Academic Programs, The Graduate School

FROM: Department of Psychology Review Committee:

Judith A. Howard (Committee Chair)  
Professor and Chair, Department of Women Studies

Mark Appelbaum  
Associate Vice Chancellor, Undergraduate  
Education  
Professor, Department of Psychology,  
University of California at San Diego

Thomas Carew  
Professor, Department of Neurobiology and  
Behavior  
Chair, Center for Neurobiology  
University of California at Irvine

Lewayne Gilchrist  
Professor, School of Social Work

Michael Posner  
Professor, Department of Psychology and Institute  
of Cognitive  
and Decision Sciences, University of Oregon

Peter Salovey  
Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences  
Professor of Psychology, Yale University

John Wingfield  
Professor, Department of Biology

RE: Report of Psychology Review Committee

**The Review Process:**

This report addresses our assessment of the Department of Psychology, as requested in your memo of January 12, 2004, in which we were asked to assess the quality of the degree programs and provide the faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening the programs. Our observations are based on the extensive self-study document and supporting materials prepared by the Department of Psychology as well as our two day site visit with departmental faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, staff and administrators. During the site visit we held meetings with the following constituencies: the Department Chair, the former Chair, the Associate and Assistant Chairs, the Associate Professors, the Assistant Professors, a selection of the lecturers, graduate students, undergraduate students, the Planning Committee, the Undergraduate Faculty/Advising staff, the Administrative staff, a group representing diversity concerns in the department, the eight area heads, and investigators using animals in their research. In addition, we toured the department facilities as well as the facilities of the Center for Autism and the Institute for Brain and Learning. We also invited written input from all members of the Department and received several such commentaries. The report that follows is endorsed by all seven members of the review committee.

We want to acknowledge at the outset the exceptional self-study report; this report is a model of thoroughness and candor and has been extremely helpful. We would like also to acknowledge Augustine McCaffery of The Graduate School and Beth Rutherford of the Department of Psychology for their helpfulness with all the details of scheduling and many other support services for this review.

We begin with summary observations of key themes and then turn to specific strengths and limitations and identify some key issues we think merit attention.

**Overall Evaluation:**

We are deeply impressed with many aspects of the department's functioning. As literally all indicators attest, the department supports a remarkable amount of teaching, offering a markedly disproportionate (per number of faculty) amount of the student credit hours within the College of Arts and Sciences. The department also generates an extraordinary amount of grant support. The Department of Psychology is unusual in its capacity to excel in both teaching and research productivity. This accomplishment is all the more laudable given the limited resources available to the department to support its work.

These accomplishments come with some costs and limitations, which we address in detail below. Although some of these seem inevitable, some do not, and we will note some concerns the department may want to consider. One key concern is the unevenness in the distribution of precisely who makes these contributions. In the teaching programs, half of the student credit hours are generated by lecturers and graduate students, rather than by ladder faculty. In the research programs, the major proportions of grant dollars and academic publications are produced by a smaller subset of the tenured and tenure-track faculty than might be desirable. Although some degree of disproportionality is typical of all departments, this variation may be more extreme in Psychology than is desirable. At the same time, we stress that the overall departmental profile is one of excellence.

The review committee was provided a copy of the report from the previous ten-year review, which generated a certain sense of *déjà vu*. Many of the observations we make now about the department were also made ten years ago. At that time the department was advised to continue to develop its graduate program. It has indeed moved in this direction, although primarily in the past two years. The recent changes have been to good effect, and we strongly recommend continuing these new directions. That report also stressed how much the department generates with how few resources, a theme that is echoed in our own report. We agree that the department has received remarkably few resources given its contributions and we endorse the department's request for increased support. At the same time, we also make suggestions about potential economies of scale that may be possible within the department. We recognize the budgetary constraints in the College of Arts and Sciences and acknowledge that addressing the resource limitations will require considerable creativity on the parts of the department, the College, and the Provost's Office.

We also want to highlight our judgment that the department is headed in the right direction. There have been major changes in the leadership of the department, with a new chair, new associate chair who is also directing the graduate program, and a number of new administrative procedures. The sense of renewed optimism expressed by the great majority of the department, faculty and students alike, is palpable. We commend the Dean's office in its selection of Professor Ana Mari Cauce as Chair and urge the provision of support that will allow her to effect the changes she seeks to bring about in the department. We do note also that many sectors of the department have experienced a good deal of pessimism and discouragement over the past decade. The introduction of a new chair and what some label "regime change" can reverse this pessimism, but there are other challenges in the culture of the department that may prove difficult to dislodge.

In the sections that follow we address several distinct aspects of the department: overall research activities and scholarship; the undergraduate program; the graduate program; the status of the resources with which the department operates, including its overall budgets, staffing, and, especially, space; department climate, including the diversity of the department's profile and programs, and the overall culture and morale of the department. We turn then to discussion of the directions in which the department seems to be headed. We approach these tasks by speculating about who and what the department will be some years from now, if current directions and circumstances continue. We make some suggestions about what steps might intensify the departmental strengths and turn some limitations into additional strengths. (Because the clinical psychology programs went through an intensive accreditation review - and received a glowing evaluation - just this past November, we paid somewhat less attention to these programs in our review.)

As we move into these specifics, we want to make one additional point. There are keen constraints on both space and operations budgets. Although there are few departments at the University of Washington that could not say the same thing, we do feel that the Department of Psychology has experienced more intense constraints than many units. Because space and budgets are so fundamental to the successful operation of any academic unit, they have quite reasonably been the focus of the department's self-study and the focus of the Chair's and Planning Committee's efforts. Some of the other issues we raise here are matters we fully anticipate the Chair and her associates and Planning Committee are committed to and will address, even if they have not been the primary focus to date.

### **Research Activity:**

The big picture of scholarship and research in the Department of Psychology is truly excellent. The department ranks second in the country in the receipt of federal grants, a ranking they have sustained for the past ten years. Almost all of the senior faculty are fellows in their respective professional organizations, many do now or have edited key scholarly journals, and virtually all sit on major editorial boards.

Strengths: Overall the faculty has a highly commendable research record. This is reflected both in their ability to obtain extramural research support and in their publication record. The department is among the top 10 psychology grant recipients in the country (in 2001 it was #2 after Wisconsin). In 2001-2002, 89% of the Full Professors held grants (53% held more than one); and 69% of the Associate and Assistant Professors held grants. Moreover, the Department has consistently been one of the top grant recipients in the Natural Sciences at UW. The funding profile

for the department has been quite stable over the last decade. Turning to the department's publication record, overall the faculty has been very productive. Using 2001-02 as an example, the Full Professors averaged 5-6 publications per year, while the Associate and Assistant Professors averaged a bit more than 2 papers per year. For the most part these publications were in high impact journals.

Limitations: Many of the challenges to sustenance and further development of the research profile of the department are institution-wide issues. Perhaps most critical are the constraints on research space. Although this problem is intense throughout the university and especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, the lack of space in Psychology is particularly acute compared to both Psychology Departments nation wide and other science departments in the College. What space the department does have is spread around campus and some sites are well off campus. Current space in Guthrie Hall is very overcrowded and needs extensive renovation. Annexes are scattered and often substandard. When internal funds for renovation are available, often the construction timeline has been so slow that the faculty is delayed in initiating research projects. This situation seems unacceptable for a major research university, particularly given the critical importance of operational research facilities for junior faculty, who have a limited timeframe in which to develop a tenurable record.

In the recent past there have been plans for new "Life Sciences" buildings that would benefit Psychology. Now, the possibility of a new building is essentially non-existent unless donors are found. Nonetheless, space in buildings close by is possible (e.g. the old Architecture building next door, or the recently vacated Law School in Condon Hall). Some faculty members seem to feel, however, that there is a lack of support from the UW Administration and thus that Psychology is a low priority for any new or renovated space. The consequences of both the lack of space and the poor quality of those facilities that are available are all too predictable. The department is losing faculty, both senior and junior, to other institutions.

Core facilities (e.g. imaging, computing, animal quarters, molecular genetics facility) need serious attention and funding to be operational. Faculty members from different disciplines are beginning to come together to write multiple user equipment grants, (e.g., for the animal facility) and they should explore possible matching funds from the College and/or Provost especially for renovation of space. The matching funds for the animal facility (\$3,000,000) made available from the Provost's Office and the College indicate substantial support and interest from the central administration, and more collaborative efforts from the faculty will likely attract even greater interest. Another case in point is the initiative to develop a brain

imaging center for the Department of Psychology. Department members do have access to a brain imaging center in the Medical School that is the only core facility that is state of the art, but such access has to be shared with many others in the Medical School. Greater faculty cooperation in relation to this core facility may go a long way to convince the central administration that investment in the department will pay off.

Other issues related to research are specific to the department. While the overall record of research activity is very strong, there is considerable variance in productivity. The impressive record described above appears to be carried by a subset of the senior faculty who has achieved preeminent status in their fields. There do not appear to be processes in place that could address this issue. We are concerned, for example, that a clear mechanism through which all faculty (including senior faculty) receive feedback regarding their research activities seems not to be operative. Related to this point, no clear mechanism for the junior faculty to receive consistent mentoring concerning grant writing, funding opportunities and programmatic research strategies appears to exist either. Although there are several instances where such mentoring has been provided, this appears to be area-specific and informal rather than systematic.

Research projects appear to be structured almost entirely by perceived area boundaries. The Department might wish to consider identifying effective strategies to encourage seeking funding for projects that explicitly span area boundaries. One such mechanism would be to pursue training grants that both span and coordinate research activities across areas. This would have the added benefit of encouraging more effective interactions among faculty and students in different areas. Similarly, it might be productive to pursue funding opportunities for projects/programs that span departmental boundaries (e.g., Program Projects, Center grants, Foundation grants), especially to introduce young faculty into additional research revenue streams.

### **Undergraduate Programs:**

The undergraduate program in Psychology offers both the B.S. and the B.A. degrees. Psychology is an extremely popular field at the national level and the UW is no exception; the Introduction to Psychology course is the single most popular course on campus, with over 3500 undergraduate students enrolled in this course in a recent year. More than 7,000 undergraduates are enrolled in the Psychology general education courses, and the department serves about 4,000 students in their upper level courses. The number of students majoring in Psychology has been increasing steadily in recent years, averaging about 800 majors in 2003. The department graduated more students in 2003 (about 500) than any other department in A&S. In short, the Psychology undergraduate program is extremely productive.

The quality of undergraduate education in psychology also seems strong. A national ranking group listed the UW Psychology Department's undergraduate programs as 19<sup>th</sup> in the country five years ago, and we anticipate that ranking would continue now. Students seem to agree. Exit interviews with former majors over the past five years give the department high rankings for knowledge of human and animal behavior, and for quantitative skills (both 4 or higher on a 5 point scale). Somewhat lower ratings are given to oral skills and overall intellectual challenge. The trend for these ratings over the five years is upward. In terms of the acquisition of career skills, exit questionnaires also show steady improvement in ratings of readiness for a career and for advanced study, as well as instructional quality in the major (for the latter, Psychology receives the highest ratings among the natural sciences and the two largest comparable social science departments). Psychology also receives the highest average student course evaluations for lower division courses among these comparison departments. The quality of these ratings is all the more impressive given that the average size of their lower division and upper division classes are the largest of any of their comparison departments. As we noted above, a full half of the SCHs in the department are generated by lecturers and (a few) graduate student instructors; the bulk of these courses are at the lower level, suggesting that the highest student evaluations are being earned, as a group, by non-ladder faculty. Psychology also receives the highest ratings for faculty interaction with students outside the classroom, but we note that this item generates lower ratings than any other except faculty assistance in career planning. (Although Psychology is clearly stronger than other departments in this arena, none of these departments are outstanding in this regard.) The undergraduate students with whom we met during our site visit also seemed to be quite satisfied with the instruction they

receive; we note they were an extremely impressive and articulate group. One of the distinctive strengths of the program is the opportunities many majors have to work on research in faculty laboratories, and the honors students also have the opportunity to do an independent senior thesis research project. The non-tenure track (part time and full time) instructors are particularly enthusiastic about undergraduate education and appear deeply dedicated to the quality of the instruction they offer and the overall shape of the major.

Strengths: The department provides instruction to an extremely large number of undergraduate students, both majors and non-majors. Overall, the quality of this instruction is very high. As a group, the lecturers are especially strong instructors, and several members of the faculty have been acknowledged for their excellent teaching in the form of UW Distinguished Teaching Awards and other forms of recognition.

The department is concerned about the quality of writing in the curriculum and directs non-trivial amounts of their resources to advanced training in writing for the undergraduate students. One caveat is that there has been discussion about discontinuing the Psychology Writing Center, due to lack of funds. Given the new College-wide emphasis on writing, we urge the department to participate in these initiatives as a way to continue this skills-based training and support.

Many students, particularly in the B.S. program, have extensive hands-on research experience in faculty laboratories.

The department provides substantial advising resources for undergraduate students. Students are extremely positive about the quality of the advising; our committee was also impressed with the high quality and dedication of the advising staff.

The faculty and department administration have been proactive and creative in recognizing and responding to problems in the provision of undergraduate education, within the constraints imposed by very limited resources. Among the most effective of the ways in which they are revising the curriculum and the overall undergraduate program are:

The redesign of curricular sequences to assure less overlap in course content.

The reduction of course sizes in a number of the upper division courses for psychology majors.

A greater emphasis on courses for majors at the expense of some ease of access to psychology courses, especially general education courses, for non-majors.



A plan for the reduction in the number of psychology majors while, at the same time, an improvement of the quality of the major for those who remain as majors.

The department has reduced the total numbers of PTLs and full time lecturers, retaining the best of these instructors.

Limitations: There is great demand for seats in undergraduate courses in psychology as well as an extremely large number of students wishing to major in psychology, with rather meager resources provided to meet these needs. These resources do not seem to be directly proportional to the number of student credit hours generated by the department.

Historically, course buyouts have been used as a simultaneous solution to a number of resource and workload problems and have been consistent with a view of the department as largely a research-oriented unit. It is true that due to salary differentials, buyouts of faculty courses and assignment of these courses to lecturers expand the number of seats available and support additional courses. This creates a potentially more satisfied faculty but with substantial risks of having some of the most distinguished and well known members of the faculty doing little or no undergraduate instruction. The way in which course buy-outs are utilized and the consequences of the buyout policy would benefit from some reexamination. Should large undergraduate lecture courses be among the first to be bought out, for example? Care must be taken in this inquiry, however. Significant reduction of course buyouts should only be considered if other sources of instructional funding can be found. It is also worth noting that the average teaching loads are somewhat higher in Psychology than in other natural science departments or in other psychology departments at state universities (although they are not higher than teaching loads in the social science departments).

Part time and full time non tenure-line instructors are a vital part of the instructional resources of the department; evaluations and other indicators suggest these are among the strongest instructors in the department. Although these instructors seem to be appreciated by the department, and strongly so by the students, there is little opportunity for their professional development and little thought or support seems to be given to allowing them to develop new courses or to significantly modify their courses they already teach. Given that the department has also streamlined the number of lecturers, retaining the very best, we recommend better support for those who remain. For example, the department might encourage them to participate in the Institute for Teaching Excellence or provide funding for course development efforts.

Taken together, these limitations suggest a broad concern. These practices send a signal about teaching. The existence of widespread course buyouts by tenure-line faculty, especially among senior core faculty, conveys a message that the educational mission of the department is secondary to the research mission.

### **Graduate Programs:**

The graduate program, like the undergraduate program, is highly ranked. Various reputational surveys place the graduate program in the top 20 nationally, and the clinical psychology area was recently rated second in the U.S. The graduate program awards an "on route" M.S. degree and the Ph.D. to about 20 to 25 students each year, with an average of about 120 total enrolled graduate students. About 400 students apply to the program annually, with the majority of the applications going to the clinical (adult and child) area. About 20% of the graduate students are from ethnic minority groups ( we discuss departmental diversity in greater depth below).

Graduate students are generally promised full funding for four years of study. About half the students are funded from teaching assistantships and about half from research assistants. There are a very few fellowships and traineeships available. The admissions and training model is very much in the "mentor" tradition: Applicants are selected to work with a specific faculty member, who, if grant-supported, will likely fund them with a research assistantship. For the most part, graduate students work with the faculty member who admitted them for their entire time in the program, although switching to another advisor is possible (but few switch).

The program is fairly structured, especially for clinical students, with a series of statistics courses, within-area courses, and outside-of-area courses. Students complete a first-year project, general examination, dissertation, and final examination. Although the full average time to degree is upwards of 7 years, the registered time to degree averages closer to 5.5 years. (Because the clinical students must do a year-long internship, the latter indicator is a more accurate indication of time to degree.) In terms of attrition, approximately 20% of admitted students do not complete the Ph.D. for various reasons. Exit surveys suggest that the graduate students are generally well-satisfied with the graduate program, with the exception of the space, facilities, and equipment; we agree they should not be satisfied with these. The majority of new Ph.D.s continues to work in research settings after completing their degrees, most frequently as post-doctoral scholars.

Strengths: The review committee met with a fairly large group of graduate students for a lively exchange and reviewed the findings

from an (excellent) recent survey of graduate student perceptions about the program conducted by the students themselves. We were impressed by the generally positive attitudes of the students toward their program and advisors, the high level of morale among the group, and the seriousness with which the students approach their graduate educations. The students also expressed great appreciation for the new Graduate Program Coordinator, Nancy Kenney.

The program enjoys a strong national reputation with the clinical program viewed as the strongest of the areas. The students themselves appear to be of high quality; the program is able to attract students with strong academic backgrounds and admirable motivation for graduate study.

Generally, students felt the requirements of the program are rational and appropriate. Students are encouraged to move into research early in their graduate careers and, in general, they receive strong research mentoring. Both of these attributes, however, present some limitations, discussed below.

Professional preparation was praised by the graduate students. They expressed particular appreciation for the new seminar on writing and the workshops offered both inside and outside the Department for teaching assistants. (It is noteworthy, however, that some undergraduates complained about the lack of quality of some of their teaching assistants.) Graduate students also felt supported as they entered the job market and were generally optimistic about their prospects for finding appropriate employment.

The inclusion of graduate students in the governance and decision-making of the Department is also noteworthy, and recent improvements in this regard were praised. Graduate students serve on search committees and are invited to some faculty meetings. For example, they presented their survey at a recent meeting to great interest by the faculty.

Limitations: The most frequently cited weakness in the graduate program is the model used to support graduate students financially. Nearly all stipends are paid for through teaching or research assistantships. The lack of fellowship support creates challenges in competing with many top programs for the very best students, and especially for minority students. Support is guaranteed for only four years and only during the three quarters of the academic year (not the summer quarter). Although the monthly stipend is comparable to that at many programs (not overly generous), students with well-funded advisors may feel that it is too risky to switch mentors due to their reliance on them for an RA, and students with younger or otherwise not well-funded advisors may serve as a TA during most quarters. This is substantially more teaching than can be

justified on educational grounds. Students also expressed concern about the predictability of funding; those in their first through fourth years complained that often they did not know from one quarter to the next what course they would be assigned to, and those beyond the fourth year of study did not know from quarter to quarter whether they would have an appointment.

Although the students did not register many complaints about the training model, the review committee was concerned about some of the educational constraints inherent in the strong mentorship tradition. Most students reported that they conducted research with one and only one member of the faculty, that they rarely attended the laboratory meetings of other faculty members, that switching advisors was frowned upon, and that they knew few faculty members (or even their classmates) outside their areas of study. Moreover, because assignment to mentors is done at the time of admissions, applicants are assumed to know at a young age and with only an undergraduate background in psychology not just the subfield of psychology to which they want to commit their careers but also the specific area of research. The committee felt that it would be in the educational interests of graduate students to encourage more exploration and free choice in the selection of mentors and programs of research such as by rotating through laboratories in the first year and/or not having to select a research advisor until some time after the start of the program. Students who switched advisors in the current system reported feeling somewhat isolated and stigmatized.

Related to the approach to mentoring, students also reported feeling somewhat isolated due to the strong area structure of the department. The attempt by the social-personality and developmental areas to offer a joint brown-bag program was praised as a positive step to address this sort of problem, but clearly more needs to be done. Students conducting research with animals and those conducting research with humans, for instance, seemed not to know each other at all; the students in animal behavior seemed particularly isolated from the others (perhaps less so from graduate students in biology), and it was noteworthy that no graduate students from the behavioral neuroscience area even showed up to meet with the review committee.

The general space problem in the department also has negative effects on graduate education. Graduate student offices are only barely adequate (although improved since the days of "The Pit"). Graduate students may have offices in any of ten different buildings and not necessarily near any students or faculty members other than their advisors. This restricts the opportunities to learn from one's peers and for the kinds of informal morale-building sessions that are so critical to a successful graduate experience. The students should be congratulated for attempting to address these limitations with their own initiatives such as, for example, setting up a graduate

student presentation series at which they can practice giving talks and learn about what each other is doing.

The committee was concerned, as well, about the overly individualistic nature of program requirements. Many of the formal aspects of the program are negotiated at the area level or even at the level of the faculty mentor. The general examination seems to come at different times and in different forms for every student, some of these more congruent with career goals than others. The departmental proseminar is attended by some students but skipped by others. Moreover, it was not entirely clear to us whether the dissertation itself facilitated the publication of student work; we had the impression that a non-negligible proportion of the graduate students are encouraged to produce "old-fashioned," narrative style dissertations rather than a sequence of empirical papers or a report of the kind that could easily become one or more journal articles.

Other issues that should be addressed include: (a) the need for more regularized instruction in issues concerning ethnicity and culture as well as support for students who want to conduct research on special populations; (b) the lack of career advice for students seeking employment in liberal arts colleges or in non-academic settings; (c) the relevance of the departmental statistics sequence for students in some areas of study (the biostatistics sequence was preferred by animal behavior students, for example); and (d) the fact that the first-year project, by design and name, is conducted so early in the graduate career that often it represents little original work by the student.

### **Overview of Resources:**

Despite many resource constraints, there are broad areas of strength. The faculty has many stars; overall, this is one of the strongest psychology faculties in the U.S. Recruiting the best young faculty and retaining the strong senior faculty are significant concerns that ultimately depend upon space and funds for set-up packages. In general the natural sciences departments are expected to provide one third of the resources needed to recruit, and the College and Provost match with a third each. Psychology will need considerable help and influx of resources to be able to make such contributions.

Budget: State budgets have been declining for the University as a whole. Psychology has suffered too, and there is a general perception that they have lost more than other departments. Whether or not this is true, there are several areas of concern that need attention within the department. There have been only minimal efforts to raise development funds from outside the University and thus discretionary funds are very scarce to non-

existent. There is one endowment for a seminar series that is a focus for departmental culture that could be developed more. There is a great need to raise external funds as a long-term strategy to build discretionary budgets. The department has an extensive alumni group that could be exploited much more aggressively. In addition to department newsletters and donation requests, they could develop a "donate key" on their websites - i.e. give people the opportunity to donate while reading about the department on the website. The department has no shortage of material for such a site. Indeed, the College is actively encouraging departments to have a direct link for giving, and most departments have already done so.

Indirect cost recovery is an important source of funds due to the number of large grants obtained by faculty. This could be an even greater source of discretionary funds were it not that several of the largest grants are housed off campus and thus subject to a lower indirect cost rate. The budget generated by indirect cost recovery provides the only true source of support for infrastructure, set-up funds for new faculty, and so forth. However, this fund is already over \$400,000 in debt. This severely limits use of these funds for start-up packages for new faculty, facility maintenance, etc.

Space: We have already addressed the extreme space constraints in earlier sections of the report. Suffice it here to underscore that the space constraints experienced by Psychology have serious negative effects on all constituencies. We are most concerned about the problems these pose for new junior faculty who need to get their research programs underway quickly, and who also need to have regular interaction with other faculty in the department; for senior faculty who need extensive laboratory space to support their ongoing research - these faculty are highly vulnerable to external offers; for graduate students who also need to have available space for their research and interactional access to the full array of faculty and students in the department. Quantity concerns extend also to the quality of the space the department does have available; it is with some irony that we note that the conditions some of the humans in the department have to work in would not be tolerated for the animal facilities.

Staff: Departmental staff provides essential departmental support by maintaining records, administering all departmental functions, assisting faculty (including secretarial help), providing grant writing support, teaching support, computing and technological support, advising students, and maintaining the building, including efficient running of core facilities. The great majority of the current staff members do a superb job under trying circumstances of space and funds. They often are as over-worked as the faculty, but the likelihood of new staff positions is very low given declining state budgets.

Past budget cuts have eroded the numbers of staff to a point that the department is severely understaffed. Although other science departments have also suffered heavy staff losses in the College of Arts and Sciences, data are presented in the self study showing that this department has fewer staff than others. Some faculty complained that a few of the current staff apparently are not too cooperative - especially in the area of computing support. This may be due to over-work given the large size of the department, but other problems may be responsible as well. Junior faculty apparently receives little response from some staff thus resulting in frustration and delays in obtaining operational offices and laboratories. But we want to acknowledge especially the main office staff and the advising office staff as being exceptionally capable and deeply appreciated by the faculty and students.

### **Department Governance, Organizational Culture, and Diversity:**

#### Governance:

Strengths: The formal governance structure within the department consists of the Chair, an Associate Chair who also functions as Director of Undergraduate Studies, an Associate Chair who also functions as Director of Graduate Studies, and an Assistant Chair whose role is to coordinate all course offerings and scheduling. The governance structure also includes an elected 6-member Planning Committee, a body that advises the Chair on issues of policy and personnel. No formal job descriptions were in evidence, but the roles and structures are similar to those in many departments of similar size. The role of Director of Graduate Studies (at least as embodied by Nancy Kenney) is relatively new and received a number of accolades from the graduate students. Appreciation was expressed during the site visit for the competence and dedication of the other Associate Chair and the Assistant Chair. Incumbents in these roles as well as in administrative staff roles all seem to be functioning well in spite of significant resource constraints.

Limitations: The Review Committee met with several constituencies who expressed some puzzlement about "how decisions get made around here." None of these expressions were strongly stated, but reviewers were left with the impression that governance is not as visible as it might be. No information was available on how long it has been since these roles were reviewed and revised, nor were the actual duties specified for the Associate Chairs. It isn't clear how much discretion they actually have within the department. Their roles as presented to us seemed more staff- than faculty-like. If this impression is accurate, could these roles be empowered to make more substantive decisions? Perhaps some economies of scale would emerge from a more coordinated effort linking undergraduate and graduate

studies chairs in coordinated planning (perhaps this already happens but if so we did not see evidence of it). Why the issue of course scheduling should be so last minute and absorb an Assistant Chair's time was not immediately evident. In other UW schools and departments scheduling is a staff function and assistant chairs are more occupied with a full range of student services. The related issues of scheduling of TA appointments is likewise last-minute and not transparent to graduate students. Perhaps in the absence of resources for professional staff these faculty-level positions are necessary to meet current organizational needs. This structural issue may be worth analysis and reconsideration but additional resources will be necessary to preserve current functions.

An elected Planning Committee is a useful organizational structure but as a whole the current one seems not to have grappled with many of the more contentious issues within the department. Policy governing the allocation of research space is one such issue. Policies regarding supports for associate professors is another. Might the Planning Committee eventually be empowered by the Chair to conduct feasibility studies and make recommendations preparatory to policy changes such as reorganizing the current area structure? The department as a whole for many years has been divided into six substantive areas, each with its own designated "head." How these area heads now interact with the Planning Committee--or with the Chair--and what decision-making authority they actually have was not clear in the review. For what are area heads held accountable? This lack of clarity in leadership roles and responsibilities within the faculty might be most fruitfully addressed after or in the context of careful revision of the area structure itself (see the next section).

#### Organizational culture:

In the review of the Psychology Department 10 years ago reviewers commented strongly on the fragmented nature of the department. Each specialty area appeared as a "silo" unconnected to any other. While some improvements in this silo structure are in evidence, the current review clearly reveals that the organizational culture of an area structure creates a number of undesirable barriers, such as the promotion of individual and substantive isolation. The department should give important attention to creating tasks, activities, policies, and plans that require and gradually institutionalize cross-area contact and collaboration. Building greater allegiance among faculty to the department as a whole can benefit both faculty morale and planning/productivity efforts by permitting more creative innovations in scholarship and teaching. Currently, department members tend to blame morale and collaboration problems on the absence of a common space for meetings and professional small talk as well as on the absence of resources for expensive



research equipment. Although both of these resource issues are accurate and valid, the will to do anything more than maintain current ways of working seems absent. More efforts could and should be made to open faculty members generally to generative trends elsewhere in the department, on campus, and in the field of psychology as a whole. Reviewers gained the impression that "the vision thing" with few exceptions was muted among current faculty members and limited to relatively small within-area concerns only. Remaining at the small-picture "within-area only" level of thinking appears to pit one area against another for scarce internal resources. A more inclusive and holistic organizational model would work toward a much more fluid organizational structure capable of encouraging creative collaborations to garner new resources not now available to a single area separately.

With regard to culture within academic ranks, the assistant professors appeared happy with the support they receive (except for office space problems and need for staff assistance in constructing and submitting grant applications) and as having sufficient motivation and guidance to gain promotion and tenure. The associate professor group, however, expressed greater morale and productivity problems. They were deeply concerned with salary compression issues. They also felt that while they "ran the department" in terms of filling many of the internal governance roles, they were not recognized for this internal service work. Some of the associate professors lamented not having any mentor or guidance. Effort should be spent in mentoring and career planning with current associate professors to maximize their future prospects. Finally, the full professors in the department were described as "absentees" as far as the daily life of the department; reviewers saw little to contradict this description. Effort could fruitfully be made in the future to pull the full professors more into teaching and departmental life.

#### Diversity Profile:

Background: In terms of gender balance the Psychology Department is 43% female among its ladder faculty. Nine of 42 ladder faculty are faculty of color. Review Committee members note that this distribution is better than many, if not most, psychology departments nationally. Psychology Department undergraduates are slightly more likely to be members of underrepresented minority groups compared with the student body as a whole (9% vs. 8.2%). The percentages would be greatly increased were Asian students included in these figures. Among Psychology graduate students the percentage of ethnic minority students has been between 7% and 15% in the last 6 years. While never high, a substantial drop in ethnic minority graduate admissions occurred for the 2002 entering cohort. Neither the self-study document nor the site visit turned up an explanation for this sudden change. Although

a slight increase in minority graduate admissions occurred in 2003 these admissions are still lower than at any time in the past 4 years. (The passage of I-200 could be related to these trends, but that has affected undergraduate much more than graduate admissions across the university.) The largest graduate program, clinical, is predominately female in both faculty and student membership; gender balances in the other substantive areas were not available.

Strengths: The department has a formal mechanism called MECA for bringing together students and faculty interested in race, ethnicity, and other minority statuses. The MECA group members who met with the review committee felt that although the department has a good representation of gender and ethnic groups for the natural sciences and biomedicine as a whole, it was also clear that diversity of department members needs more focus. It was our impression that a small number of dedicated faculty members, Professor Bill George in particular, are available to mentor minority students. The minority students in the undergraduate group warmly praised the mentoring/advising they received from faculty members interested in diversity, especially Professor George. But the Chair and senior faculty need to raise awareness of, and continue to promote diversity at faculty, student and staff levels.

Limitations: Although no serious morale problems emerged with regard to diversity, the self-study document was unusual in not containing any reference to recruitment and retention planning for minority students. The single exception is the expressed desire to have more fellowships available to attract minority graduate students. The MECA group has been fairly inactive recently. Group members lamented the loss of the Research Assistantship that was formerly assigned to the Diversity Group, a position that was seen as helping recruit minority students into the major and into graduate studies in psychology. One graduate student stated, "Culture as something that matters is not well attended to in this department," with some concurrence from other students.

A diversity-related issue emphasized by students during the review was the desire voiced by both undergraduate and graduate students for more multicultural content in formal coursework related to the role of culture and race in human identity, emotions, behavior, and functioning. The students did not name particular new courses that they'd like to see, but they did recommend that current course offerings be updated to contain this material. Outside of the faculty assigned to teach diversity-related courses it was hard to ascertain the awareness and commitment of the rest of the faculty to issues of cultural diversity. One faculty member stated that for graduate students there wasn't much of a market for doctorally-prepared psychologists in the area of culture and diversity and the

department didn't want to steer its doctoral students in unmarketable directions. This belief seems challengeable. In terms of NIH alone abundant funding opportunities exist for examining a host of issues related to cultural minority status and social, health, mental health, and developmental disparities.

Recommendations: At least some department members and students seem aware of cultural issues. At this time there wasn't evidence of poor morale or specific problems in this area. The MECA Group members who met with the reviewers identified seven priority issues for the department in the area of diversity. First, recruit additional faculty of color; second, increase mechanisms within the department for conversations on multi-culturalism on a continuing basis; third, talk about diversity at the yearly retreat; fourth, have outside speakers on diversity issues; fifth, refund the RAship formerly assigned to MECA; sixth, offer the courses on diversity that are already on the books on a more consistent and predictable basis; and seventh, identify funding opportunities for diversity and multi-cultural work. We would add to these excellent recommendations the suggestion that the department review their course offerings to identify opportunities to provide training related to the effects of cultural minority status on psychological and behavioral functioning; the department attempt to explain and address why ethnic diversity has dropped off recently in graduate admissions; and the department construct formal recruitment and retention plans for both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Because minority students frequently feel most comfortable being mentored by minority faculty, recruitment and retention planning should include methods for supporting minority faculty who work with minority students. In addition, the department should step up development activities to garner more fellowship funds for minority graduate students. Closer connection to the Graduate Opportunities and Minority Achievement Program (GO-MAP) of the UW Graduate School would be a useful first step in this direction.

### **Strategic Planning and Program Development:**

The department appears to have the structure in which to carry out strategic plans to advance its intellectual objectives. It has an elected Planning Committee which acts as an executive committee. This committee did prepare a brief strategic plan in 2000, but this did not deal with many of the department's most critical needs. It is important that the Chair and Planning Committee take seriously long term planning for the department. It would be important to have Assistant Professors (not represented on the present committee) fully involved in the planning. The Department Chair shared many exciting ideas for future developments with us at one of our meetings, but the Planning Committee needs to consider these and present them to the full department to provide a consensus. We outline here some

of the issues that seemed to us most critical in developing a concrete plan for and shared vision of the department.

First, during the last several years the department has lost a number of its best known leaders to resignation or retirement (including Hunt, B. Loftus, Sackett, Jacobsen, Gottman and Sarason); how can the department best compensate for these losses? The department has also lost several carefully recruited young faculty; what actions can it take to improve retention? The answers to these questions will be critical if the department is to maintain its high national ranking.

Second, how can small areas, probably below critical mass, be made more effective?

The faculty associated with the social-personality area, in particular, seem remarkably reduced in number from earlier days due to retirements and departures. At present, there is only one senior social psychologist (Greenwald), one mid-career social psychologist (Brown), one mid-career personality psychologist (Shoda), and one untenured social psychologist (Plaks). This is no longer a critical mass in either social or personality psychology (nor even in the combined program), and it is difficult to imagine how this program can compete for the best students against the many fine programs in social-personality psychology in North America and Europe. Rebuilding social-personality should be a priority.

Third, what role does animal behavior and behavioral neuroscience separately or together play in the future of the department? We generally agree with the department's choice not to follow the clear recommendation of the last visiting committee to combine these areas with others in the University in a separate department. The Department Chair has spent much of her time and the department's resources trying to deal with the needs for animal care. Yet the department does not seem to have articulated a vision of how these areas can best be used to advance the department's overall mission.

Fourth, a molecular genetics program is one admirable strategic goal for which the department has submitted a grant request. However, it will take extensive planning to utilize such a facility in an optimal way. The department should consider the implications this will have for the direction of animal research, how this will articulate with other genetics research on campus and its likely impact on the study of individual and group differences within the various areas of the department.

Sixth, a major program undertaken by the University is the new Institute of Brain and Learning Sciences. Although this institute is co-led by one of the department's professors there appears to have been little discussion of the implications this is likely to have on teaching and research within the psychology

department. This example is generalizable; we have the sense that new centers and initiatives tend to be created in a rational individualized manner that does not articulate systematically with department programs.

### **Overall Recommendations:**

We have embedded a number of recommendations in the body of this report. Here we conclude by highlighting those we think most important for the department to address.

Budget: The department is currently operating with a \$400,000 deficit in its operating budget, giving it no flexibility whatever and no discretionary funds. We hope the College and Provost's Office will do all they can to help the department reduce this deficit.

Space: Here we have recommendations both for central administration and for the department. Clearly space is a major constraint, even to the point of students and possible hires not coming to the UW, or perhaps worse, leaving the UW; effects on junior faculty and graduate students are of special concern. If the administration could allocate space in nearby buildings such as Architecture or (former) Law Buildings, that would be a great help. Also, a grant is pending to remodel the animal laboratory facilities in Guthrie. If the grant is not obtained, we hope that central administration would seriously consider holding over the matching funds for another round of grant submission. Internally, though, some are convinced that there is unused lab space that could profitably be reassigned. We strongly recommend the establishment of a departmental Space Committee and development of space usage policies.

Planning: Long-term planning needs to be institutionalized in the department. Retreats are useful, but annual half day events are not sufficient. A long-term strategic planning process should be initiated and continued. This seems to us essential as one way to supercede the effects of area-specific planning, hiring, curriculum development, and mentoring.

Integration: The entire department is structured by areas, seemingly inflexibly. This has a number of negative consequences. Thus we recommend that the department develop a set of strategies designed to encourage cross-area connection, interaction, and collaboration.

Diversity: The department should intensify efforts to increase both the diversity of the faculty and graduate student body, as well as the degree to which the curriculum and research incorporate concerns with diversity. Concretely, the department should target cultural diversity as a top priority for hiring;

develop mechanisms through which this conversation can be conducted at a department-wide level; develop closer connections with the GO-MAP Program in the Graduate School to help with graduate student recruitment and retention program; refund a TA to coordinate the MECA group.

Teaching Commitments: The department should review the widespread use of course buy-outs, and consider limiting such buy-outs to increase the number of faculty teaching undergraduate courses. On the College's part, this might entail reducing the overall teaching load. If the current dependence on lecturers continues, more support for professional development of the long-term lecturers would be highly desirable.

Pressure on the Psychology Major: The department should continue its recent efforts to reduce the number of majors (assuming the current allocation of resources) and increase the quality of the major. The recent policy of reducing the number of non-major general education enrollments is a wise step, barring the infusion of new resources into the undergraduate education program.

Staff Support: The department should increase support for grant administration; this is critical for junior faculty especially. Other forms of staff support are needed as well, but we recognize that budgetary constraints may make this impossible without external support.

Graduate Program Issues: More cross-area connections and broader training should be encouraged for graduate students. This direction would be greatly facilitated by structural change at the department level. A shift away from the individual mentor model of training would also be wise; together with this effort, graduate students should be encouraged to pursue their own independent research priorities, rather than to necessarily model themselves after their advisors. It might be useful to convene department-wide discussion of expectations about dissertations, encouraging models that lead to academic publications. Graduate students also need more support for developing their teaching skills; they should be allowed/encouraged to teach their own classes, with the caveat that their own professional goals should be taken into account in all aspects of their training opportunities.

Development: Development efforts should be ramped up markedly, including the establishment of an internal Development Committee and an internal/external Visiting Committee. Ideally a staff person would be hired to assist with development efforts, but many UW departments do not have this important form of support.

**Conclusion:**

We have made a number of specific recommendations in this report, but we want to conclude our observations by repeating our overall assessment that the Department of Psychology is an exceedingly strong department with laudable strengths in many key arenas of academic life, and a department that makes critical contributions to the College of Arts and Sciences and the University more generally. The size of the department is such that it is like a small city rather than a department. Thus it is not a surprise that there would be a number of issues that could stand some attention. Given the current administration of the department and the renewed optimism that we refer to above, we are confident that the department will take up these challenges with good cheer and continue their positive upward trajectory toward even greater excellence.

CC: David C. Hodge  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

George S. Bridges  
Dean and Vice Provost, Office of Undergraduate  
Education