

REPORT

**Department of Psychology
Review Committee**

February 14, 2014

Richard Folsom, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences
(Committee Chair)

Toby Bradshaw, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Biology

James McGaugh, Research Professor, Neurobiology and Behavior, U. California, Irvine

Stephen Hinshaw, Professor of Psychology, U. California, Berkeley; Vice Chair for Psychology,
Department of Psychiatry, U. California, San Francisco

February 14, 2014

TO: Dave Eaton, Vice Provost and Dean

Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs and Planning

FROM: Department of Psychology Review Committee:

Richard Folsom (Speech and Hearing Sciences, UW), Chair

Toby Bradshaw (Biology, UW)

James McGaugh (Neurobiology and Behavior, U. California, Irvine)

Stephen Hinshaw (Psychology, U. California, Berkeley)

Attached is the final report of the Department of Psychology Review Committee. All members of the committee have endorsed this report. If you have any questions, please call the Committee Chair at 685-7482 or email him at rfolsom@uw.edu.

CC: Werner Stuetzle, Divisional Dean, Natural Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences

James Clauss, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs

Sheri Mizumori, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology

Patricia Moy, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs

Joe Cook, Assistant Professor, Evans School of Public Affairs, Graduate School
Council Representative

Christine Harold, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, Graduate
School Council Representative

Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist, The Graduate School

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Strengths:

- Sheri Mizumori is a thoughtful and effective leader for the department.
- The department's faculty are strong and of the highest quality.
- The department's staff, led by Michelle Jacobs, is effective and motivated.
- The organization of the department's undergraduate programs is excellent.
- The undergraduate students interviewed by the committee held the Psychology Advising Office staff in very high regard.

Challenges:

- The department's organizational structure creates challenges that ripple through the department at numerous levels. These areas, termed "silos" by departmental faculty, work counter to the growth of collaborative intellectual communities between areas within the department and constrain the planning and recruitment of new and bridging areas of psychology. Additionally, graduate students are too often caught between non-permeable area boundaries; the rigid area structure is not in keeping with the explosive and unpredictable growth of the entire field.
- The department's dispersal of faculty and research labs across eight buildings across campus severely limits its ability to grow or maintain cutting edge research. This circumstance exacerbates the lack of community across the department.
- Interviews with faculty at all levels revealed a lack of unified vision for the department's future.
- The department is severely hampered by limited discretionary funds.
- Faculty interviews revealed dissatisfaction with the current departmental merit review process. Faculty did not perceive transparency in the process and some wondered how decisions regarding merit and how merit judgments translated into salary increase. Faculty focus on obtaining outside offers to justify salary increases and promotions constrains their commitment to department functions.
- Lecturers, most of them with temporary part-time titles, carry a large fraction of the undergraduate teaching load, but assignments are often made on short notice.

Recommendations:

- All degree programs should be continued with a subsequent review in three years.
- The committee recommends that the department take steps toward cross-area collaboration and resource sharing by discontinuing the practice of allocating resources directly to each area, and by encouraging existing faculty and graduate students to work across traditional area boundaries.
- A new building, or a substantial addition to Guthrie Hall, is essential to address the ills of the current fragmented space and the dispersal of faculty throughout multiple campus locations.
- Consideration should be given to accreditation of the clinical area via the Psychological Clinical Science Accreditation System (PCSAS), as a supplement, or even alternative, to accreditation via the American Psychological Association (APA).
- The appointment of an Advisory Board with members selected from the department, the UW, and the community, is a priority.
- The development of department-wide activities to foster departmental community appears essential.
- The department should strongly consider longer-term permanent appointments for instructional faculty (part-time lecturers) who are effectively but non-systematically fulfilling that job description now.

PROGRAM REVIEW: DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
University of Washington
January 2014

Committee Charge

The review committee's charge was to assess the quality of the Department of Psychology, provide the faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening the Department, and address these questions:

Is the Department doing what it should be doing?
 Is it doing it well?
 How can they do things better?
 How should the University assist them?

For detailed committee charge, see Appendix 1. The last review of the Department of Psychology was completed in April 2004.

Review Committee Members:

Richard Folsom, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences
 (Committee Chair)

Toby Bradshaw, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Biology

James McGaugh, Research Professor, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior,
 University of California, Irvine

Stephen Hinshaw, Professor of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley; Vice
 Chair for Psychology, Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San
 Francisco

Process:

The review committee met in the Department of Psychology (and by telephone conference call*) on October 14, 2013. Present were Natural Sciences Divisional Dean Werner Stuetzle, committee members Richard Folsom, Toby Bradshaw, James McGaugh* and Stephen Hinshaw*, Psychology Chair Sheri Mizumori, and Graduate School Academic Specialist Augustine McCaffery. At the meeting the procedures for the upcoming review and site visit were discussed and we received our charge. In addition, Department Chair Mizumori reviewed and clarified the department's unit-defined questions (Appendix 2) and the committee had the opportunity to ask questions. The department's self-study was available to the committee on November 8, 2013 via a UW Catalyst site. A site visit agenda was provided on December 18, 2013. Prior to the site visit, the committee reviewed the department's self-study documents and requested additional budget information including faculty salaries and recapture budget data.

The site visit took place January 13-14, 2014. The site visit roughly followed the schedule put forward on the agenda (Appendix 3), with some minor modifications (e.g., some meetings lasted longer than foreseen). The review committee met with professorial, research, and lecturer faculty, Post-Docs, undergraduate and graduate students, key staff, and other constituents. In various ways, the Committee asked the faculty for their vision regarding the future of the department and their views on whether the Department is on the right track and positioned to move toward that vision. In addition, junior faculty were asked about mentoring support and ideas for improvement. Students were asked about financial support and perceptions of the program (graduate students) as well as the structure of the major and the quality of advising (undergraduate students). Staff members were asked about their roles and adequacy of support within the department.

The site visit culminated with an exit discussion including departmental faculty Sheri Mizumori (Chair), plus Associate Chairs Laura Little, and Jane Simoni; Dean of Arts and Sciences Robert Stacey; Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences Werner Stuetzle; Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs Jim Clauss; Associate Dean of the Graduate School Rebecca Aanerud; Graduate School Council Representative Jim Cook; Graduate School Council Representative Christine Harold; and Graduate School Senior Academic Program Specialist Augustine McCaffery.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The process described above resulted in the following findings, grouped under the headings of Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations:

Strengths

The Department of Psychology at the University of Washington is a highly respected department nationally with excellent national rankings based on a number of measures including Graduate Programs, Clinical Graduate Training Program, and grant and contract expenditures. They have a strong faculty with a history of impactful research, exemplary teaching, and purposeful service. Particular strengths noted by the review committee include the following:

1. **Leadership.** Sheri Mizumori has been a thoughtful and effective leader for the Department. As Chair since 2008, she has led under trying conditions of diminished state and, thus, diminished UW resources. The Department has maintained its excellence in spite of the imbalance between reduced state resources and the magnitude of its academic responsibilities, particularly in undergraduate education. It is coping well overall. The Department has three very capable Associate Chairs.
2. **Faculty:** The Department's faculty are strong and of the highest quality. Many are national and international leaders in their specialty areas and have received to numerous honors and awards. These include distinguished teaching awards, Research Scientist and CAREER awards, and APA Fellowships. Three members have been elected Fellows to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and five members are currently Directors of centers or institutes at the University of Washington. Further, the Department has made outstanding choices in its recent hires at the Assistant Professor level, and is clearly able to attract top talent. As a group, the Assistant Professors are eager and motivated to work toward innovative and interdisciplinary collaborations both within Psychology and across other units outside Psychology.
3. **Staff:** While the Department's fiscal staff has been stretched to meet the needs of the growing fiscal needs of the Department, on balance, the Department's staff, led by Michelle Jacobs, is effective, dedicated and motivated.
4. **Undergraduate Education and Research:** The organization of the Department's undergraduate programs is excellent. The Department's Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degree programs comprise one of the largest majors at the University of Washington with nearly 1,000 undergraduates registered as Psychology majors and 453 Bachelor degrees awarded annually. The Department has done a good job of managing its resources to meet the capacity challenges of the undergraduate demand for Psychology at the UW and to ensure adequate access to courses and timely completion of degree requirements. This feat has been accomplished in the face of diminishing state resources and unpredictability of

teaching assignments due to nearly universal faculty buyouts. In spite of a reduction in undergraduate research credits in recent years, the Department remains a campus leader in the range and number of undergraduate research opportunities. This is testament to the outstanding faculty and its willingness to include undergraduates on their research laboratory teams.

5. **Undergraduate Advising:** The undergraduate students interviewed by the Committee held the Psychology Advising Office staff in very high regard. The support provided by this office works to recruit prospective students and provides guidance to current majors. The payoff has been maintenance of the large numbers of undergraduate majors, increased enrollment of under-represented minorities, and an increase in the Department's undergraduate graduation rate.

Challenges

1. **Department Organization:** The department's organizational structure creates challenges that ripple through the department at numerous levels. The department is organized into eight distinct, seemingly autonomous, areas. (cf. Self Study Report, appendix 2-1). These areas, termed "silos" by departmental faculty, work counter to the growth of collaborative intellectual communities between areas within the department. Interviews led the committee to believe that faculty are far more likely to collaborate outside of the department than within the department if collaborations cross silo boundaries. This concern was highlighted in the most recent (2004) department review, which also noted the department's fragmented nature and the "siloed" nature of the area organization. Little appears to have changed since that review. Assistant professors coming to the UW from elite Psychology programs around the country pointed to this as a serious barrier to the growth of their research aspirations and career development. Associate professors are all too familiar with the problems arising from the "silo" structure, but after failed attempts to alter the structure in any meaningful way, are very frustrated and now seem to lack the vigor to make changes. As one said, "We cannot survive with strong areas – we need a strong department." Comments from faculty regarding the negative impact of "silos" ranged across:
 - a. Hiring decisions
 - b. Assistant professor mentoring
 - c. TA allocations
 - d. Resource allocation
 - e. Graduate recruitment
 - f. Graduate requirements/curriculum
 - g. Departmental planning
2. **Inadequate space / Department fragmented physically:** The department's own Unit-Defined Questions report that the physical constraints of Guthrie Hall and the dispersal of faculty and research labs spread throughout eight buildings severely limits its ability to grow or maintain cutting edge research. This circumstance further limits the appeal of the department in attracting new hires and limits the professional

and research careers of existing professorial faculty. There is a clear lack of community across the department. This circumstance is likely exacerbated by the physically fragmentation of departmental space.

3. **Lack of unified, departmental vision:** Interviews with faculty at all levels revealed a lack of unified vision for the department's future. Individual areas seemed more likely to have a vision for an area future, but there was little vision for the department as a whole—the Chair's department-wide vision set forth in the Self Study Document notwithstanding.
4. **Lack of discretionary funds:** The department is hampered by limited discretionary funds. The department is heavily reliant on their release/recapture budget, garnered primarily through teaching buyout of professorial faculty. This limited budget leaves the department without meaningful discretionary funds and limits its ability to respond with any agility to new opportunities.
5. **Lack of systematic merit review process:** Faculty interviews revealed dissatisfaction with the current departmental merit review process. Faculty did not perceive transparency in the process, and some wondered how decisions regarding merit are made, and how merit judgments translated into salary increase. This dissatisfaction may well be linked to the general sense of malaise at the University of Washington resulting from the statewide salary freeze from 2009 to 2013. Still, faculty desire a transparent, systematic (possibly point-driven) process for conducting merit reviews and assigning salary increases. Merits and promotions should not be linked to obtaining of outside offers.
6. **Impact of buyout on undergraduate teaching:** Nearly all of the instructional faculty are hired on a temporary part-time basis, paid with salary recapture funds from tenure-track faculty buyouts. Lecturers carry a large fraction of the undergraduate teaching load but have a difficult time planning their teaching because their assignments are often made on short notice, though sometimes this is unavoidable. Lecturers would appreciate greater recognition for the important role that they play in the department's teaching mission. The buyout policy does free tenure-track faculty to carry out their research, and the salary recapture funds are used in part for departmental operations in lieu of GOF. However, the review team believes that all tenure-track faculty should participate in undergraduate classroom teaching, to ensure students a quality experience and access to Psychology's world-class faculty.
7. **APA/PCASA Accreditation**
The review committee was surprised that the clinical area in the department had not been proactive in accreditation via the Psychological Clinical Science Accreditation System (PCSAS), a relatively new, alternative accreditation system to that of the American Psychological Association (APA). Given the perennially high national rankings of this department and its explicit scientific training models for clinical

psychologists, the PCSAS would seem to be a logical fit and could provide substantial benefit to the department.

Recommendations

The committee identified three high priority recommendations listed below (1-3) and several additional ones (4-7) for consideration. All are considered important, particularly given the unit's self-professed goal of becoming a top-10-ranked Department of Psychology. Only a more nimble and forward-looking structure will be able to help the faculty attain this objective.

1. All degree programs should be continued with a subsequent review in three years
2. The high quality of the Department's faculty and national respect notwithstanding, the Department's organization into areas ("silos") creates barriers to the growth of collaborative intellectual communities and fragments the Department. The committee strongly recommends that the department move toward cross-area collaboration and resource sharing, with explicit incentives for collaborative multidisciplinary research and teaching. The committee does not recommend the elimination of area structure per se; the department is sufficiently large that it will, of necessity, mold itself into natural groupings, each with broader interests and aims than those of the current groups. The committee recommends a re-examination of department procedures that would move the department away from an area-specific model and toward a department-wide model of decision-making and resource allocation. Moreover, appointment of a 'blue ribbon panel' (including consultants from other departments around the country) would help the department plan strategically to redefine its current structure, with an eye toward future trends in the field and key areas for greater collaboration and multi-disciplinarity. A broader process for decisions such as faculty hiring, graduate student recruitment and requirements/curriculum, TA allocation, space allocation, etc., would be a significant step toward the development of the department's stated desire for a unified sense of department goals and increased collaborative research across areas. Additional possibilities could include, but are not limited to:
 - a. As a community of scholars, identify the most interesting open questions in the field, and target faculty hiring to address those questions
 - b. Incentivize collaborative research that spans the traditional area boundaries
 - c. Expect faculty to self identify in both a primary and secondary area(s)
 - d. Encourage graduate student rotations across multiple areas and faculty co-mentoring
3. The College of Arts & Sciences has committed to further renovation of Guthrie Hall, including additional improvement of vertebrate animal care facilities <http://www.cpo.washington.edu/ProjectFinder/Project/Details/201563>. Although this renovation will dramatically improve the animal care facilities, a new building, or a substantial addition to Guthrie Hall, is necessary to address the ills of the current

fragmented space and the dispersal of faculty throughout multiple buildings. A first step in addressing the department's desire for community and collaboration across faculty is to bring that faculty under one roof. A \$78M addition to Guthrie is in the UW Capital Projects plan for future biennia. The College could be of great assistance to the department by advocating for a shorter, more aggressive timeline for this project. Fundraising efforts, perhaps involving an Advisory Board (see below), could also enhance prospects for initiating the design process. Design elements of the Guthrie addition, such as open office and lab spaces, could be employed to encourage collaborative multidisciplinary research.

4. The department should explore the appointment of an Advisory Board to provide collegial advice and guidance on relevant, overarching issues facing the department including the advancement of external fund-raising activities. Members could include individuals from within the department, the UW at-large, and from among active alumni and community stakeholders. This committee would provide partners who would support the strategic objectives and goals of the department and provide the Chair with support and advice.
5. Consideration of accreditation via the Psychological Clinical Science Accreditation System (PCSAS), as a supplement, or even alternative, to accreditation via American Psychological Association (APA). PCSAS accreditation (a) spans 10 years; (b) signals to scientists and prospective students the science-based nature of accredited programs; (c) affords flexibility in curriculum planning, facilitating timely degree completion; and (d) allows for a strong collective voice of PCASA-accredited programs in the further shaping of the science of clinical psychology.
6. The department should be encouraged to develop department-wide wide activities, both social and academic, that would serve to bring the department together and reinforce a sense of community across the department as a whole.
7. The department should consider longer-term permanent appointments for instructional faculty who are effectively fulfilling that job description now. Mechanisms to recognize the dedicated efforts of lecturers should be developed.

Appendix 1

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Graduate School

October 17, 2013

Department of Psychology Review Committee

Richard Folsom, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences
(Committee Chair)

Toby Bradshaw, Professor and Chair, UW Department of Biology

Stephen Hinshaw, Professor, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley

James McGaugh, Professor, Department of Neurobiology and Behavior,
University of California, Irvine

RE: Charge to Committee for the Department of Psychology Review

Dear Review Committee:

Thank you once again for agreeing to serve on the committee to review the B.A., B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees offered by the Department of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Washington. The review is conducted in accordance with the state legislative mandate and under the auspices of the Graduate School, College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of the Provost. The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning in the Graduate School will coordinate the review.

Committee Charge

In general, the committee's charge in this review is to assess the quality of then undergraduate and graduate programs and provide the faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening the programs. These reviews provide the University with a clearer understanding of the program's quality, educational value, role within the University and community, role within the academic discipline, and resource requirements.

As background information, the last review of the Department's degree programs was completed in July 7, 2004. The Review Committee and the Graduate School Council both recommended continuation of the undergraduate and graduate programs with a review to occur in the 2013-2014 academic year. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs concurred with the recommendation.

For this review, the possible recommendations range from suspension of student entry into the degree programs to a recommendation for continuing status with a subsequent review in 10 years. A shorter term can be recommended if you deem it appropriate. Equally

important to this status recommendation, your review can offer the department and the administration an independent assessment of the “health” of the degree programs and advice on how they can be improved.

The Department self-study and draft of the site visit agenda are due **November 1, 2013** and will be made available shortly thereafter on the Catalyst site. After reviewing the self-study, you may wish to initiate your work before the site visit to ensure a thorough and rigorous review. Based on our experience, we suggest that the external reviewers be relied upon as content experts who can evaluate the quality of the undergraduate and graduate program from a national perspective. They are also likely to be able to comment on recent developments in the field and their incorporation into the programs. We encourage the committee to communicate with Sheri Mizumori, Professor and Department Chair, so that she knows your interests and expectations, particularly for the site visit, and to communicate with other key faculty, if time permits. UW committee members may conduct interviews prior to the site visit as they deem appropriate.

The two-day site visit on **January 13-14, 2014**, will culminate with an exit discussion, divided into two portions. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning of the Graduate School, the College of Arts and Sciences’ Divisional Dean of Natural Sciences, the Associate Dean in Undergraduate Academic Affairs, a representative of the Graduate School Council, and the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will participate in the exit discussion. The first portion of the discussion will include Professor Mizumori and other faculty members she may invite, while the second portion, the executive session, will include only the review committee and administrators. We will request the committee’s formal recommendation regarding the continuance of the degree programs early in the second portion of the exit discussion. We will also ask you to describe your plan for completing the written report in a timely manner.

The Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS) participates actively in the program review process. The GPSS will send a survey to current graduate students in the program, and a GPSS representative will join the graduate student meeting during the site visit. At the conclusion of the review the GPSS will submit an independent report to the Graduate School based on its findings, which will be included as part of the formal record of the review. The department is encouraged to convey to students the importance of their participation in the survey. The department is also asked to assure broad representation in the graduate student session with the committee during the site visit.

We request that the committee submit its written report within 4 weeks of the site visit. Specifically, the **written report is due February 14, 2014**. A written response to the report will then be provided by the unit and is due on **March 14, 2014**. When the response is available, the report and response will be considered by the Graduate School Council. The Graduate School Dean will then convey in a letter the final recommendations on the review to the Dean and the Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences for their consideration and action.

Please note that upon completion of program reviews, the primary review documents become public documents and are placed on the UW accreditation web site. The website and program review documentation are now password protected. These documents include the self-study, the review committee report, the unit's response to the report, and the Graduate School Dean's letter to the College of Arts and Sciences Dean and the Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences.

The most important objective of your review is an assessment of the academic and educational quality of the unit. Guiding questions for the review include:

- 1) Are they doing what they should be doing?
- 2) Are they doing it well?
- 3) How can they do things better?
- 4) How should the University assist them?

The Part B: Unit Defined Issues of the self-study discussed in the charge meeting is attached.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist, at amccaf@uw.edu with any questions you may have about the review.

Sincerely,



David L. Eaton
Vice Provost and Dean



Rebecca Aanerud
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning

- c: Sheri Mizumori, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology
 Patricia Moy, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs
 Robert Stacey, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
 Werner Stuetzle, Divisional Dean of Natural Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences
 James Clauss, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs
 Joe Cook, Assistant Professor, Evans School of Public Affairs, and Graduate School Council Representative
 Christine Harold, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, and Graduate School Council Representative
 Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist, The Graduate School

Appendix 2**Department of Psychology Program Review
Self-Study Part B: Unit Defined Issues**

1. How to resolve the physical constraints on our ability to achieve our research and instructional visions.
2. How to build an intellectual community that improves communication across areas.
3. How brand the Psychology Department in a way that creates new translational visions.
4. How to improve graduate student recruiting and competitiveness.
5. How to transform our undergraduate curriculum to better reflect the interdisciplinary nature of psychological research, including the development of a more flexible teaching load policy for faculty.
6. How to best to conduct merit evaluation of faculty.
7. How to create a fiscally sound and meaningful system that recognizes research, instructional, or service contributions that go well above and beyond the call of study.

Appendix 3

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School**

**Department of Psychology Program Review Site Visit
January 13 and 14, 2014**

Agenda

Sunday, January 12

6:00 p.m. Review Committee Working Dinner – **The District Lounge**
Hotel Deca, 4507 Brooklyn Avenue NE (634-2000)

Monday, January 13

8:30 – 9:10 a.m. **Location: Guthrie Annex 3, Room 120**

8:30 – 9:10 a.m. Sheri Mizumori, Professor and Chair

9:10 - 9:30 a.m. Sheri Mizumori, joined by Associate Chairs: Laura Little, Nancy Kenney, and Jane Simoni

9:30 – 10:20 a.m. Planning Committee and Area Coordinators
Geoff Boynton, Cheryl Kaiser, Jeansok Kim, Liliana Lengua, Betty Repacholi, Joe Sisneros, Wendy Stone, Lori Zoellner

10:30 – 11:15 a.m. Assistant Professors: Sapna Cheryan, Kate McLaughlin, Kristina Olson, Chantel Prat

11:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Associate Professors: Geoff Boynton, Ione Fine, Brian Flaherty, Cheryl Kaiser, Nancy Kenney, Kevin King, Jaime Olavarria, Joe Sisneros

12:10 – 1:40 p.m. Lunch – meet with Mike Beecher and Eliot Brenowitz, Professors, Animal Behavior Area

12:40 – 1:20 p.m. Graduate Students & GPSS Representative: See attached list

1:30 – 2:15 p.m. Undergraduate Students: See attached list

2:30 – 3:20 p.m. Full Professors: Eliot Brenowitz, Ellen Covey, Peter Kahn, Jeansok Kim, Bob Kohlenberg, Liliana Lengua, Geoff Loftus, Lee Osterhout, Andy Meltzoff, Ronald Smith, Frank Smoll, Wendy Stone, Lori Zoellner

3:30 – 4:00 p.m. Postdoctoral Fellows: Phil Baker, Sara Cardoso, Anastasia Flevaris, Belinda Graham, Fang Jiang, Anna-Kaisa Newheiser, Maria Navarro Haro

4:00 – 4:45 p.m. Tour of facilities

4:45 – 5:30 p.m. Recent Ph.D.s: Joyce Bittinger, Emily Clark, Jeremy Clark, Lauren Graham, David Huh, Berit Olsen, Geoff Valentine, Serap Yigit-Elliott

6:00 p.m. Review Committee Dinner:
Nell's Restaurant - 6804 E. Green Lake Way North (524-4044)

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School
Department of Psychology Program Review Site Visit
January 13 and 14, 2014
Agenda

Tuesday, January 14	Location: Guthrie Annex 3, Room 120
8:30 – 9:00 a.m.	<u>Lecturers:</u> Deborah Chun, Dana Nelson, Jacquie Pickrell, Julie Quamma, Ann Voorhies
9:00 – 9:30 a.m.	<u>Administrative Staff:</u> Michele Jacobs, Administrator; Susan Carpenter-Brandt, Associate Administrator; Beth Rutherford, Assistant to the Chair
9:30 – 10:00 a.m.	<u>Research Faculty:</u> Jim Ha, Reneé Ha, Lynn Fainsilber Katz
10:00 – 10:30 a.m.	<u>Social-Personality Area Faculty:</u> Sapna Cheryan, Tony Greenwald, Cheryl Kaiser, Yuichi Shoda
10:30 – 11:00 a.m.	<u>Advising:</u> Nancy Kenney & Jeanny Mai (Graduate); Laura Little & Carrie Perrin (Undergraduate); Patti Loesche (Writing Center Director)
11:00 – 11:30 a.m.	<u>Diversity Group: Faculty:</u> Sapna Cheryan, Bill George, Cheryl Kaiser, Nancy Kenney, Jane Simoni <u>Students:</u> Laura Brady, Arianne Eason, Teri Kirby, Andy Paves, Joyce Yang
11:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	<u>Animal Researchers:</u> Sheri Mizumori, Jaime Olavarria, Joe Sisneros
12:15 – 1:00 p.m.	<u>Lunch</u> – Review Committee: UW Club, Colleen Rohrbaugh Room
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.	Review Committee Executive Session
2:30 – 3:30 p.m.	<u>Exit Discussion:</u> <u>Department:</u> Sheri Mizumori, Chair; Nancy Kenney, Laura Little, and Jane Simoni, Associate Chairs <u>Provost's Office:</u> Patricia Moy, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs <u>College of Arts and Sciences:</u> Werner Stuetzle, Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences <u>Undergraduate Academic Affairs:</u> James Clauss, Associate Dean <u>The Graduate School:</u> Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs & Planning Joe Cook, Assistant Professor, Evans School of Public Affairs and Graduate School Council Representative Christine Harold, Associate Professor, Department of Communication and Graduate School Council Representative Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist

3:30 – 4:30 p.m.	<u>Exit Discussion – (continued)</u> Administrators and Graduate School Council Representatives without Department representatives
4:30 – 5:00 p.m.	Review Committee Debriefing