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A. Department Overall Mission and Goals

The psychology department’s broadest overall goal is defined within University President Gee’s stated intention of “moving Ohio State from excellence to eminence.” The department’s more specific mission statement (contained in our Pattern of Administration document and prior strategic plans) is to be distinguished in all that we do -- research, teaching, and service -- and be at the forefront of creating new psychological knowledge. Our graduate and undergraduate programs are focused around research experiences covering the full range of basic knowledge in psychology. The department aims to enhance its already strong reputation nationally and internationally as one of the premiere departments of psychology.

Psychology, a vital and growing discipline, employs rigorous, often laboratory-based, scientific methods to understand and predict people’s perceptions, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, especially as they are influenced by biological, developmental, cognitive, and social factors. From analyzing the functions of single nerve cells, to understanding the decisions and actions of individuals and social groups, to investigating how children perceive objects or learn language, to understanding how we come to know other people and hold positive or negative attitudes toward them, perhaps no other field of inquiry has such enormous breadth and complexity. Moreover, few disciplines play as central a role in developing the knowledge base necessary for understanding and solving so many of the most pressing health, educational, economic and social problems currently confronting the State of Ohio, the country, and the world.

By nearly every measure, the Department of Psychology is an excellent one and positioned to be a leader in OSU’s efforts to solidify its status as a world-class university. First, as a core unit in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division of the College of Arts and Sciences, psychology has one of the strongest faculties at Ohio State. Second, it also has one of the best graduate training programs and one of the most popular undergraduate majors. Third, psychology has been noted as one of the hub disciplines in science (along with math, physics, chemistry, earth sciences, and medicine). Therefore, strength in psychology is essential to the development and enhancement of inter and multi-disciplinary work across campus. The department is fortunate in having leaders at the university who appreciate the role that the psychology department can play in moving OSU forward.

This report is organized into several major sections covering (1) the faculty, (2) departmental governance, infrastructure, and the staff, (3) the undergraduate program, (4) the graduate program, and (5) the specific graduate training areas. The report concludes with an overall assessment of the department’s strengths, challenges, and priorities for the future.

B. The Faculty

Organization, Size and Demographics. The psychology faculty consists of regular faculty (where psychology is the tenure initiating unit or TIU), joint faculty (who have their TIU in another unit on campus), and adjunct faculty (courtesy appointments for psychologists whose primary appointments are not with the University). Among the TIU faculty, there are two broad categories, Columbus (main campus) faculty and regional faculty. The regional faculty have their TIU in psychology, but their salaries and support are separately funded by one of the four regional campuses. Regional campus faculty members

---

1 This report is based on the department’s prior planning documents and especially the most recent 2009-2012 strategic plan included in the review booklet. The document is based on input from the graduate program coordinators (the Department’s Executive Committee) as well as the Associate Chairs, Director of Graduate Studies, and Director of Undergraduate Programs.

have an exclusive undergraduate teaching role on their own campus. Although typically active in research activities, they are not expected to participate in graduate education. This document and the external review are concerned solely with an assessment of the Columbus campus program. Therefore, all data and plans contained herein focus only on it. However, the specific graduate program area reports presented in Appendix C make mention of other faculty (e.g., joints, regional) when relevant to their graduate programs.

For graduate training purposes, the faculty members are organized into seven topical areas. Each faculty member is assigned to a primary area, though several participate in more than one area. The primary faculty members in each area are listed in Table 1 in Appendix A. The smallest program in terms of faculty size and graduate students is IDD (Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities). The faculty members in this program, though tenured in psychology, are funded by the Nisonger Center, a unit of the OSU Medical School. The faculty affiliated with the other six training areas (behavioral neuroscience, cognitive, clinical, developmental, quantitative, and social) are funded by the College of Arts and Sciences and are part of the regular psychology budget. Salaries and raises for IDD faculty are determined by the Director of the Nisonger Center whereas those for all other faculty are determined by the Psychology Chair.

The six core areas of psychology in our department are part of a deliberate effort to represent the contemporary foundational areas of the discipline of psychology. These six core areas are present in some form in virtually all of the top psychology departments nationally. Of course, much cutting edge work in the field is at the intersection of these core areas (e.g., cognitive neuroscience) and in collaboration with other disciplines (e.g., behavioral medicine). As noted later in this report, the department also fosters this inter and multi-disciplinary work.

Figure 1 graphs the overall size of the faculty over the past 15 years. In 1999, the department was riding high. It had just won an internal “selective investment” competition that was to award $1 million to the department for new faculty hires -- $500,000 in new money and $500,000 in reallocated psychology positions. The internal reallocation came primarily from a phase out of the industrial-organizational psychology program and a reduction in size in the counseling psychology program. These funds were to be used to enhance more basic areas of the department. In 1999, a half page ad was run in the APS Observer noting that “the department has 54 faculty members, 1200 under-graduate majors, and about 150 graduate students.” The ad announced that “up to 8 additional faculty” would be hired over the next three years. Indeed, the goal of the department at the time was to achieve a faculty size of 62 based on an analysis of the size of peer institutions at the time. In addition, the ad announced that the university was committed to building an addition to Lazenby Hall for departmental expansion.

The building addition was completed in 2006 and has provided a superb work environment and serves as a stellar recruiting tool. The increased size of the department never occurred, however. In fact, as shown in Figure 1, over the past decade, the size of the faculty has generally decreased until the two most recent years when it was back on the upswing. There are two primary reasons for the decline. First, the department was retrenched about $1 million due to state wide budget cuts beginning in FY2002. Second, a

![Figure 1: Faculty Size (1995-2010)](image-url)
temporary decline in our course enrollments and grant indirects from the all-time high that was used as our base. To put these cuts into perspective, they amounted to more than the entire selective investment funds provided to the department (i.e., $500K in new funds coupled with a $1.3 million decline). To adjust to the net $800,000 budget loss and still be able to follow through on the selective investment commitments, the department strategically decided to phase out the counseling psychology program. Counseling faculty who retired and other retirements or resignations during that period were not replaced. Over the past several years, as psychology grant indirects began to recover and the department was awarded new funds to compensate for increasing enrollments, the faculty size has returned to 48 for AY 10-11, and will be at 51 in AY 11-12 if all current searches are successful this year (and assuming two planned retirements). Thus, the department will come close to the size it was over a decade ago. Notably, over the same period of time undergraduate enrollments and majors have increased considerably from what they were then. Undergraduate enrollments are up over 30% from the beginning of the decade and majors are up over 40% in that same period (see undergraduate program section and Tables 1 and 3 in Appendix B). The department has been able to meet the increased demand for courses with a reduced faculty size by hiring temporary lecturers. As the faculty returns to its former size, the number of lecturers can be reduced from current levels. However, as noted later in this report, semester conversion will pose some new teaching challenges.

What is the right size for the faculty? In a recent survey for their own external review, the chair at Virginia Tech surveyed “large university psychology departments” and collected data on current faculty size and majors. These data are presented in Table 2 in Appendix A. For Ohio State to move to the average majors per faculty member in the sample (i.e., 31.86 majors/faculty member), we would need to increase the current faculty size from 48 to 55. To move to the average of the 7 Big 10 universities included in the sample (i.e., 30.29), we would need to increase the faculty size to 58. The department will be at 51 next year if current searches are successful, and moving to 55 over the next few years is a goal to which we strive. This would place psychology at OSU closer to our peers and would position us to be the right size to better meet our increasing enrollments as well as semester conversion.

The department is committed to having a diverse faculty. As documented in Table 1 below, among the current faculty for the 2010-2011 AY (excluding IDD), approximately 30% are women and 8% are minorities (2% African-American; 6% other). According to the 2009-2010 APA Workforce Survey, approximately 45% of faculty in doctoral programs of psychology are women and 14% have minority status. Thus, the OSU department under-represents women and minorities compared to other doctoral programs. This is a source of concern and a priority in every search conducted by the department. Later in this document, statistics on recent searches are presented and indicate that the department is making some progress in diversifying the faculty. One other striking demographic factor of note is that by the end of the current academic year, nearly one third of the faculty (N=15) will be 60 years old or older. This means that over the course of the next 5 years, a large percentage of the faculty will reach traditional retirement age. Because some of these faculty are among the most productive and visible in the department, replacement of these faculty in a timely manner is of the utmost importance to the long term strength and reputation of the department.

Table 1. Proportion of Current Male, Female and Minority Psychology Faculty at Each Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>18 (75%)</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>24 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34 (71%)</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>48 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Quality. For several decades, OSU’s Department of Psychology has ranked among the top programs in the country. Although it remains to be seen how the 2010 National Research Council data will depict the department, the 1995 National Research Council rankings placed OSU Psychology at 21st in the
nation. Because raw scores contain some bias attributable to differences in ratings across disciplines, standard scores also were provided in the NRC report. These data showed that the quality of the faculty in the Department of Psychology ranked at the 11th percentile nationally, which also was the highest percentile ranking of any OSU department at the time.

The NRC assessment of the department is generally in accord with other reputational surveys, though more recent indicators show that psychology has improved since the 1995 assessment. Perhaps the most widely known and available metric is the survey of psychology department chairs conducted periodically by US News and World Report. The most recent ranking of psychology departments rated OSU as tied for 17th place overall (out of 150 Ph.D. programs rated), and within the Top 10 public university departments nationally. The social psychology program was rated as tied for second (with Stanford) in this survey. Reaching Top 10 status among public university departments has been a longstanding goal of the department. Although the department has routinely placed within the top 15-20 public university departments in the US News and other surveys over the years, the 2009 ranking is the first time the department cracked the Top 10. This improvement is mirrored by the department’s own internal assessment of progress.

Specifically, the department uses data on citations, publications, and grants to track our development along with external benchmark data. Consistent with an increasing national reputation, the department faculty have shown considerable growth in these areas over the past decade. Figure 2 shows how the citation impact of the faculty’s work has increased markedly moving from about 40 citations per faculty member per year about 15 years ago to over 100 today. Two faculty members are among the Institute for Scientific Information’s (ISI) 200 Most Highly Cited Researchers in Psychology/Psychiatry. To track journal productivity, the department uses an “internal points” index where papers earn from 1 (e.g., specialty journal) to 3 (e.g., Science, Psychological Review) points depending on their prestige and citation impact ratings. As Figure 3 demonstrates, department faculty members are becoming more productive going from an average points index of 2.4 points per faculty member per year 15 years ago to 5.9 most recently. This improvement in citations and publications was evident in the most recent ISI analysis of citations to work published by psychology faculty at all public and private institutions between 1995 and 2005. In that report, OSU Psychology ranked 12th in citations, and 15th in terms of the total number of papers produced during that time period (see Table 3 in Appendix A). Third, Figure 4 provides data on extramural funding in millions of dollars and shows that grant activity increased over 300% from 1995 ($1.7 million) to 2009 ($5.5 million). Notably, this increase in total dollars was obtained despite a generally decreasing faculty size over most of the period (see Figure 1). New faculty hires are already preparing and submitting proposals and as they become successful, grant dollars surely will increase in the years ahead. It is also
worth mentioning that over the past 5 years, approximately 60% of psychology faculty members were awarded an external grant ranging from a low of 43% in the developmental area to 100% in the behavioral neuroscience area. Given the profile of the most recent faculty hires, the overall departmental percentage of faculty having grants over the next five years is likely to increase. It is also notable that three faculty are NIH or NIMH K02 (New Scientist) or K05 (Senior Scientist) award winners. Area summary data on citations, publications and grants are contained in Table 4 in Appendix A.

The overall reputation and visibility of the faculty also can be measured by a variety of other metrics. Table 5 in Appendix A lists faculty appointments as journal Editors or service on Editorial Boards. At the present time, department faculty serve as editors of 2 journals, Associate Editor for 10 journals, and on the editorial boards of over 60 others. Over their careers, individuals currently on the faculty have served as editor of 6 different journals, associate editor for 28, and on the editorial boards of over 100. These are all listed in Table 5 in Appendix A. Over 95% of the tenured faculty members have held editorial positions. Faculty have also been honored as fellows of major Societies such as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association and the Association for Psychological Science as well as more specialized societies. They have also served as elected officials of various professional groups and have been presented with major awards. Table 6 in Appendix A lists many of these.

At the local level, the department has 3 current faculty who have won the OSU Alumni Distinguished Teaching Award (the top university-wide teaching honor) and 5 who have won the OSU Distinguished Scholar Award (the top university-wide research honor). The department also has two recipients of the University’s prestigious Distinguished Lecturer Award, three SBS distinguished professors and one Distinguished University Professor (the highest title conferred on a current OSU faculty member). Finally, when the University sponsors competitions for resources at a departmental level, psychology is almost always a winner. Noted earlier was the department’s Selective Investment Award, but the department has also been the recipient of two Ohio Eminent Scholar endowments (supporting faculty in social and health psychology), and most recently, two “Targeted Investment in Excellence” Awards (in health and decision making). During lean budget times, these awards have provided essential funding to help stave off the dire consequences that would have befallen the department when hit with the net $800,000 budget cut mentioned earlier.

**Faculty Workload and Assessment.** All faculty members in the department are expected to engage in research, teaching, and service. In terms of time spent, the expectation is the familiar 40-40-20 split common across research universities. On the current academic quarter system, untenured faculty and research active senior faculty (nearly all of the faculty) teach four courses over three quarters. Everyone is expected to participate in both graduate and undergraduate instruction over a three year period. Faculty who are not active in research can be assigned to a five or six course load. On occasion, faculty can obtain a course reduction for extraordinary local or national service. After semester conversion, the department will adopt a 3 course normal load for research active faculty and a higher load for inactive faculty. A three course load is the norm for psychology departments at all but one of the Big 10 schools on semesters.

Faculty are assessed annually by the chair and an elected “peer review committee” that evaluates faculty in teaching, research, and service. The evaluation period used is the prior three years and the ratings of the committee are used as input by the chair for annual merit raises. In addition to the merit raises determined by the department (in consultation with the SBS Dean), the SBS Dean often holds back a certain percentage of the raise pool for special merit raises that are determined by the Dean with input from the Chair. Regarding the evaluation of junior faculty, each untenured faculty member has a more senior mentor who advises on departmental matters and preparing for the fourth year and tenure reviews. In addition to the annual performance review by the peer review committee, each junior faculty member is evaluated each year by all tenured faculty and receives a letter from the department chair providing feedback on progress toward tenure. At the fourth year review and sixth year (tenure) review, a formal written document is
prepared by the department’s Promotion and Tenure Reading Committee. This committee represents the department in reading all of the candidate’s work and attaining expert feedback (including external letters at tenure time) on the candidate’s research program. An assessment of teaching and service is also made. The Committee’s report is presented to the full tenured faculty for discussion, comment, and revision. Following a discussion of this report, a vote is taken and majority support is needed to have a positive departmental recommendation for passing the fourth year or tenure review. The procedure is similar for promotion to Professor with an initial assessment being made by the P&T Reading Committee followed by a discussion and vote by the full faculty. The P&T Reading Committee is appointed by the chair. It deals with all cases up for review that year and is typically constituted to ensure representation from the review candidates’ substantive areas. In all fourth year review, tenure, and promotion cases, the chair makes a recommendation independent of that of the faculty, and both recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of SBS for further consideration.

Facility Retention and Compensation. The department aims to offer excellent compensation as a means of attracting and retaining top faculty. Although for many years, compensation at Ohio State was about average compared to its benchmark institutions (i.e., Big 10 Universities), a university-wide plan to improve its status combined with the ability of OSU to offer raises over the past several years while many of our peer institutions have remained stagnant has led to an overall improvement in salaries compared to our benchmarks. Of course, OSU does not only compete with Big 10 universities for top talent but also private universities such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia which typically offer greater compensation. The psychology department with the support of SBS has been aggressive over the past 15 years in making competitive retention packages for key faculty who have had external offers from public and private universities alike including Chicago, Stanford, Illinois, and Wisconsin. It is relatively rare to lose faculty to external institutions based on salary or scholarship issues alone. Rather, departures from the department (other than retirements) have generally involved idiosyncratic personal matters. Specifically, in the past ten years (2001-2010) there were 37 faculty who left the department. Of these, just over half were retirements (N = 19). Of the others, 3 individuals left psychology to join another department (neuroscience) or unit (i.e., Academic Affairs) on the OSU campus and still retain an affiliation with the department, 3 left due to the elimination of the counseling program, 2 were early departures of junior faculty due to tenure concerns or visa problems, and 4 left because of spousal issues (i.e., lack of a spousal job at OSU). This leaves 6 (16%) who left to take a position that they perceived to be more attractive elsewhere. In four of these cases OSU made no counteroffer, and in two we did, but still lost the faculty (to Michigan and Berkeley). Thus, the retention of faculty overall is good. Furthermore, competitive salary packages, an intellectually stimulating workplace, a vibrant city in which to live with a good cost of living, has helped the department recruit senior faculty away from other places such as UCLA, USC, Brandeis, Indiana, Purdue, Northwestern, Arizona, and Michigan. Over the past decade, the department easily has gained more faculty from other institutions than it has lost to them. The addition of these faculty has helped the department considerably in improving its national reputation over what it would have been if recruitment had focused exclusively at the junior level.

At present, and as documented in Table 7 in Appendix A, in comparison to other Big 10 universities, OSU is currently close to the top in median salaries for full professors where much effort has been made in recruitment and retention. We are close to the top third in salaries for Assistant Professors, but below the middle in salaries for Associate Professors. Although the salary picture is generally good, there are a few issues that could be addressed. First, as is likely the case in many departments, there is a tendency for senior faculty who have been recruited from the outside or been the recipient of an external offer and counteroffer to make more than senior faculty who have been in the department a long time and have not received a counteroffer. Receipt of external offers likely reflects merit and market forces but also individual personalities and personal circumstances. Fortunately, when salary discrepancies have become unfairly large (e.g., two individuals with similar scholarly profiles but very different salaries), the college has supported off cycle merit adjustments in select cases. We hope that this policy will continue under the new Arts and Sciences leadership. Second, starting salaries seem very much on the upswing for the top
junior faculty on the market recently leading some new assistant professors to be paid more than assistants who have been here longer and are equally or more productive (given their longer time in the field). The department needs to pay market salaries to attract and compete for the top new faculty (which we have done successfully), but it can create a salary inversion issue that should be addressed.

**Interdisciplinary Connections.** The faculty are involved in many cross area research activities as well as collaborations across campus and around the world. For example, the BN faculty are heavily involved in teaching and supervising graduate students in the interdisciplinary neurosciences Ph. D. program. They, along with neuroscience oriented faculty in other departmental program areas (e.g., cognitive), play an important role in the current undergraduate neuroscience minor. Furthermore, these same faculty are likely to play a critical role in the new undergraduate neuroscience major currently under discussion.

As testament to their interdisciplinary connections, faculty in the department have joint appointments in departments including: Statistics, Neuroscience, Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, Ecology Evolution and Organismal Biology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and in the School of Public Health. Faculty also participate in the activities of the Center for Cognitive Science, the Mershon Center for International Security Studies, the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, the Center for Law, Policy, and Social Science, the Institute for Energy and the Environment, the Center for Biomedical Engineering, the Center for Biotechnology, the Institute for Behavioral Medicine Research, the Medical Scientist Program, and the James Cancer Center. Faculty have engaged or currently engage in collaborative work with other faculty in the following departments: Linguistics, Spanish and Portuguese, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Neurology, Electrical Engineering, Computer and Information Science, Communication, Economics, Educational Policy and Leadership, Human Development and Family Science, Marketing, Internal Medicine, Allied Medicine, Psychiatry, Neuroscience, Surgery, Nursing, Public Health, Dentistry, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Medical Microbiology, Speech and Hearing, and Statistics. These and other collaborative links and outreach efforts are noted more fully in each of the graduate program self-studies presented in Appendix C.

### C. Departmental Governance, Infrastructure, and the Staff

**Departmental Governance.** According to the department’s formal Pattern of Administration document (POA), the leader of the department is the chair who makes final decisions on all important matters but is advised by the faculty on these matters. The POA specifies how the department is governed and is provided to all faculty members at the time of hire. According to the POA, faculty members formally vote on all matters regarding hiring of new faculty, promotion and tenure, and on other important issues as well (e.g., modifying the undergraduate major). Faculty meetings of the collective are held once each month, and meetings of specific program area faculty can take place more frequently depending on issues facing that area (e.g., hiring, graduate recruitment). Much of the day to day work of the department is conducted in various committees. Table 8 in Appendix A presents the departmental committee structure and membership for the previous academic year. The duties of the committees are generally self-explanatory with the possible exception of the “peer review” committee. This committee consists of four members of the faculty elected to evaluate their colleagues in teaching, research, and service each year. These ratings provide input to the chair who makes all salary recommendations to the Dean of SBS.

Although the Chair is ultimately responsible for all departmental decisions, decision making authority can be delegated by the chair to the Vice Chair(s), various standing or special committees of the Department, to faculty constituting the doctoral program areas, or to the faculty as a whole. For most non-trivial matters, the chair seeks the advice of at least one Vice Chair and one or more committees. However, it is a longstanding department tradition that the nature and importance of any individual matter determines how it is addressed. Department governance proceeds on the general principle that the more important the matter to be decided and the more faculty affected, the more widespread the consultation and agreement on a decision should be. Open discussions, both formal and informal in departmental committees, program area
meetings, and in general faculty meetings, constitute the primary means of reaching consensus on decisions of central importance. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a major (or minor) departmental initiative in the past 20 years that was not the result of a strong departmental consensus.

**Departmental Staff.** The psychology department is blessed with a talented and dedicated staff. In annual evaluations provided by the faculty there rarely is anything but praise for the vast majority of individuals providing support to our instructional and research mission. In brief, the staff are functioning well and smoothly to support the department, though a few challenges exist. First, a challenge for the Undergraduate Advising Staff is to keep up with the explosion of new majors over the last several years. The new technology fee (assessed on all undergraduate psychology majors) will help in this regard. A challenge for the technical staff is to keep up with the 10 new hires over the past two years. New faculty members invariably have greater technology needs than the faculty they replace and it has been extremely challenging for our tech staff to keep up. In addition, the tech staff have been charged with upgrading network connections in the older Lazenby Hall as new faculty arrive. In terms of organization, the chair is ultimately responsible for hiring the staff, although faculty and other staff who are impacted by or would provide immediate supervision of the new hire are routinely consulted prior to the hiring decision.

**Departmental Buildings, Equipment and Infrastructure.** The psychology department is housed in two connected buildings (Lazenby Hall and the Psychology Building). Together, these buildings comprise about 96,000 square feet of non-mechanical, non-classroom space providing high quality office and research environments for approximately 48 faculty, 148 graduate students, and all staff (both departmental staff and grant supported research staff). Graduate students are housed either within faculty labs or shared offices, and separate flexible space is available for those who are teaching to meet with undergraduate students. Undergraduate students commonly work in faculty labs. Lecturers, postdoctoral fellows, and some short term visiting faculty are also housed in the buildings. Lazenby Hall underwent a major renovation over 20 years ago and then a cosmetic renovation shortly after the new psychology building opened in 2006. Each of the buildings also has a computer lab for instructional purposes and use by undergraduate students in the off hours. These labs house a total of 52 computers. A recently enacted Undergraduate Technology fee for psychology majors allows these labs to be kept up to date and has also allowed the department to open two undergraduate research labs (each with four work stations where majors can collect data for projects, honors theses, etc.) and a Psychology Majors lab where computers can be accessed for homework and a plotter can be used for poster printing. In addition to offices and labs, the department has allocated space for the large Introductory Psychology operation, an Advising Office where students can meet with an academic advisor, and a Tech lab where the department’s technical staff can build, repair and/or upgrade department equipment. The two buildings contain seven larger (ranging from 40 to 160 seats) classrooms operated by the OSU Classroom pool and a few smaller seminar rooms (< 20 seats) controlled by the psychology department. All classrooms in the building are equipped with the latest technology for instruction.

Currently under construction in the basement of the Psychology Building is an fMRI facility that is being funded by the College of Arts and Sciences in collaboration with psychology. This facility will also be available for instructional use. Although this facility is not yet opened and the newly hired director is yet to arrive, there is much excitement about the potential this lab has for interdisciplinary work in the department and beyond. Indeed, various faculty are already planning studies and writing grant proposals to use it. In addition to the fMRI lab, an EEG lab is in the planning stages and will contain two shielded testing rooms. The EEG lab will be located in the basement of Lazenby Hall and will be shared by a number of faculty in the cognitive, social, and developmental areas. Together, these facilities and the faculty using them will move our department a giant step forward to include contemporary research on brain and behavior.
D. The Undergraduate Program (Alisa Paulsen, Director of Undergraduate Programs)

Currently at approximately 1800 declared majors, the psychology department has had over the past 35 years more students who have graduated with honors and with distinction, and have been awarded research scholarships than any other department at OSU. On average, about a third of our majors graduated in the top 10% of their high school class, and nearly a fifth are honors students. The Department also typically ranks first in the university in terms of the number of baccalaureate degrees conferred with an average of almost 500 (B.A. & B.S.) awarded each year during the past 5 years. Key features of our undergraduate program are described next beginning with the major program.

The Undergraduate Major. The psychology major offers both a BA and a BS degree option for students. Requirements for both options are 58 (quarter) credit hours beyond the introductory psychology course, including a research methods course, a data analysis course, one course from each of six core areas (Perception and Action; Memory, Decision-Making, and Language; Clinical/Counseling Psychology; Developmental Psychology; Behavioral Neuroscience; and Social Psychology), and one course from each of three advanced interdisciplinary areas (Behavioral Neuroscience and Cognitive Processes; Clinical and Developmental Psychological Science; and Social Behavior and Personality). In addition to these course requirements, BS students take a second data analysis course and an advanced research course. The faculty believes that the structure of this major reflects the current character of the discipline of psychology in terms of scope and interdisciplinary connections. It also ensures that students will achieve breadth as well as depth in the exposure to advanced coursework in psychology.

From academic year 2001-2002 through academic year 2009-2010, the psychology department experienced a tremendous growth in undergraduate credit hours from 61,087 to 80,539, representing a 31.8% increase. The majority of this increase has come from upper level coursework (300 and 400-level) with a surge of 103.9% over the same time period (see Table 1, Appendix B). In addition, psychology has led the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences in undergraduate credit hours since 2003 (see Table 2, Appendix B). This increase results from a growth in number of majors and minors as well as the development of new courses that appeal to students outside the major. The number of psychology majors has increased by 540 students from a total of 1253 in Autumn, 2001 to 1793 in Spring, 2010, representing a growth of 43.1% and mirroring the growth trend in number of credit hours over that same time period (see Table 3, Appendix B).

As is the trend across the country, the psych major is comprised of a majority of females (68% in Spring, 2010). It is interesting to note however, that we are now experiencing a higher growth rate among males than among females (see Table 3, Appendix B).

Since Autumn, 2001, we have experienced significant growth in each ethnic minority category (see Table 3, Appendix B). We exceed the overall university percentage of undergraduate ethnic minority students (18.9%) with 23% of our 1793 majors being minority students. Specific ethnic/racial categories where we surpass the university composition are African-Americans (10.3% versus 6.6%), American Indians or Alaskan Natives (.7% versus .3%) and Hispanic (3.0% versus 2.6%). Both in our department and within the entire university, 4% of the students are Foreign Nationals. Our department is involved in numerous recruiting efforts to continue to increase the diversity among our majors at various points along the recruiting spectrum. Examples include presenting a sample lecture during the Office of Minority Affairs recruiting visits, contacting admitted minority students by phone and email, and talking with admitted students when they attend summer programming aimed to smooth their transition to college.

The Undergraduate Minor. The department offers seven specialized psychology minor programs from which students can choose. In addition to a general psychology minor, students can select from six focused minor tracks that each emphasizes a subfield within psychology (Clinical and Individual Differences; Developmental Psychology; Organization and Performance; Social Psychology and Personality; Biological Bases of Behavior; and Psychological Research). These minor tracks are relatively new in our department.
Through student surveys, we found that students in other departments tended to have focused areas of interest within our department that were clustered within subfields according to their career goals. We believe the addition of these tracks allows us to better serve the educational and career goals of Ohio State’s diverse student population. An additional track under consideration includes one that takes advantage of the new Arts and Sciences imaging facility in the psychology building.

Each minor program is comprised of six courses. All require introductory psychology, a research methods course, and a data analysis course. In addition, students take three courses specific to the area of focus. Or, in the case of the general psychology minor, students must take a course from three of the six core areas from the major.

We have experienced significant growth in our minors, growing from 64 in Autumn, 2001 to 193 in Spring, 2010, representing an increase of 201.6% (see Table 3, Appendix B). While recent growth is likely due to the addition of our new minor tracks, we have also actively recruited new minors over this time period in a variety of ways, including promoting our minors to advisors in other departments, developing brochures for each minor, and sending emails to students to inform them of our minors. In addition to the increasing popularity of targeted minors in our department as a complement for other majors, our courses are also represented more than those of any other department within the interdisciplinary minors on campus. Forty-eight of our courses have been selected for inclusion within 16 of the 22 interdisciplinary minors.

**The Honors Program.** The Honors Program in Arts and Sciences provides high-ability students with opportunities to pursue challenging academic programs and encourages significant research involvement, culminating for some students in an Honors Thesis. Incoming freshmen with a minimum ACT composite score of 30 or a minimum SAT combined score of 1340 and a class rank in the top ten percent of their high school class are admitted directly into the Arts and Sciences Honors Program. Other students can apply for membership in the Arts and Sciences Honors Program on the basis of their Ohio State GPA and rigorous course selection. Additionally, junior and senior rank students can apply to the Honors Program for the purpose of completing an Honors Thesis.

Honors students fulfill their commitment to the Honors Program in one of two ways: 1) completing an Honors Contract which is an approved, individualized curriculum that includes honors courses, upper-division courses to meet general requirements, and a strong major program; and/or 2) writing and defending an Honors Thesis, an independent research project supervised by a psychology faculty member, including completion of a year-long course sequence that supports the Thesis process. For students pursuing the Honors Contract option, they select one of three options for their major curriculum in the Psychology Department: 1) complete at least three upper-level psychology honors courses; 2) complete two upper-level psychology honors courses and at least two 600-level courses; or 3) complete two upper-level psychology honors courses and at least two quarters and six credit hours of research experience (Psychology 699). The majority of honors student select this curricular option. Approximately 10% of psychology honors students pursue the Honors Thesis option. Our department ranks first at Ohio State in the number of Honors Theses completed (21 in 2009-10).

Since Autumn, 2001, the number of honors students majoring in psychology has fluctuated (in part due to changes in university admission requirements for honors students in Autumn, 2006). However, we have experienced a significant increase in the past couple of years, providing for a net increase of 28% in honors students since 2001 (see Table 3, Appendix B). Psychology has been a leader among the departments in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) in honors course offerings. In 2009-2010, we offered 41 sections of 12 different honors courses. Our annual honors course enrollment has grown from 552 students in 2002-2003 to 1038 students in 2009-2010, representing a growth rate of 88.0%. In fact, we enroll the most honors students of any department in SBS (see Table 4, Appendix B).
Although our department has long been strong in curricular offerings for honors students, more recently we have focused our attention on developing extra-curricular opportunities for honors students. A recent example is the Psychology Honors Research Mentorship Program, beginning its fourth year, which provides a three-year, intensive research experience opportunity beyond the Honors Thesis experience in which select honors students work closely with a faculty member to develop and hone their research skills. Although a majority of our honors students become involved in research with faculty, this program is geared for those honors students seeking a significant research experience beyond the Honors Thesis. Any psychology honors student can apply to this program during Spring quarter of the freshman year. Each year, no more than five students are invited to participate. During the sophomore year, students select a research lab and mentor, attend the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, and begin work on their Honors Thesis. Students in this program complete their Honors Thesis during their junior year and work with their research mentor to extend their research experience during the senior year. Examples from our first graduating class have included submitting research for publication, and/or presenting at conferences.

**Recent Curricular Changes.** In Summer, 2012, Ohio State University will convert from a quarter to a semester calendar system. Presented with this opportunity to reevaluate our curriculum, during the past year the Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC) explored semester psychology programs at benchmark institutions, and then relayed the findings to the faculty as a starting point for re-envisioning our curriculum. Based on faculty input, the USC proposed revised BA and BS versions of the major. These proposals were approved in modified form by the faculty as a whole in Spring of 2010. Subsequently, the USC reviewed all undergraduate courses, evaluating everything from our course numbering system, to prerequisite structure, sequencing, course content, and learning goals for our students.

We used the university recommended 3 to 2 conversion ratio that resulted in a reduction from 58 quarter to 36 semester credit hours for the major. Based on our investigation of psychology major programs at peer institutions, it became apparent that an adjustment to some requirements within the major would be beneficial for students. These revisions will more closely align our major with those at most other major research universities on semesters. The most important changes involved reducing the number of required core areas from six to four and restructuring our advanced course requirements. These changes reaffirm the faculty’s strong commitment to a major that promotes both breadth and depth, while maintaining some flexibility for students to explore individual interests and opportunities within the major.

Our proposed major includes introductory psychology plus 12 courses, arranged into four sections: (1) Data Analysis and Research Requirements; (2) Core Area Requirements; (3) Advanced Requirements; and (4) Elective Courses. Our Data Analysis and Research requirements remain the same, with two courses required for BA students and four for BS students. Our Core Area Requirements have moved from six topical areas of psychology to four, with students required to take one course from each area: (1) Brain and Behavior; (2) Cognitive Psychology; (3) Clinical and Developmental Psychology; and (4) Social Psychology. The semester major further integrates our Core Area Requirements with our Advanced Requirements in that students must complete at least two advanced courses, one of which must be sequenced with a core area course.

These revisions allow students either three (for BS) or four (for BA) elective courses. This provides students with the flexibility to focus more in depth in a specific area of psychology, partake in an internship experience, or develop a research relationship with a faculty member.

**Psychology 100.** Our Psychology 100 Program typically offers 81 regular and 3 online sections each academic year. We use advanced psychology graduate students to teach these sections of approximately 60 students each. Although our Psychology 100 Program is still the largest in the country, we have experienced a decline in enrollment since 2001 (see Table 1, Appendix B). This is most likely due to the increasing number of high school students who earn credit for introductory psychology through post-
secondary options or through the Advanced Placement (AP) Exam. Prior to 2008, students had to earn a 4 or 5 on the AP exam to receive credit for introductory psychology at Ohio State. Since 2008, the Board of Regents for all Ohio universities has mandated all state institutions in Ohio to accept AP scores of 3 and higher. It is notable that despite the decline in Psychology 100 enrollments, overall enrollments in our courses are increasing.

We have experienced a slightly increasing trend in average earned grade over the past four academic years, from a low of approximately a B- (2.75) in Winter, 2007, to a high of slightly over a B (3.25) in Autumn, 2009. This trend is consistent with other introductory General Education Curriculum (GEC) courses within Arts and Sciences (see Table 5, Appendix B) and is likely due to the increasing quality of entering freshmen at the university. Over the past four academic years, the mean earned grade in Psychology 100 is 3.10 which places psychology closer to the highest mean grade of 3.17 (English 201) than the lowest mean grade of 2.78 (Communications 200) in the courses listed in Table 5, Appendix B. For the past five years, the Psychology 100 Program has used a criterion-based grade scheme using grade cut-offs that were derived from several years' worth of norm-referenced data. However, it is felt that the previously established norms are no longer appropriate for our current student population and beginning in Summer, 2010, the grade assignment scheme was revised to reflect the standard OSU scale. Also, the Psych 100 Coordinator has been working with the graduate student instructors to refine the exam process which should result in better instruments to assess student learning.

Any student taking Psychology 100 may participate in the Psychology 100 Success Program, now beginning its sixth year. The program offers workshops and advising on building effective study skills and developing test-taking strategies, which are open to all students, but specifically, target students who have performed poorly on the first exam in the course. The data collected from this program demonstrates an improvement in performance for those who avail themselves of this opportunity. Although self-selection could account for these results, they suggest that the program could be useful. In academic year 2009-10, eight workshops were offered which 188 students attended while 165 students attended individual appointments.

Advanced undergraduate students with an interest in teaching can apply for the Psychology 100 Course Assistant (CA) Program. Undergraduate CAs work directly with an experienced instructor and can participate in all aspects of the course—proctoring exams, conducting classroom demonstrations, and even preparing and delivering a portion of a lecture. Since its inception in Spring, 2007, 12-15 students per year have participated in this program and the number of applicants has grown quickly. Students earn course credit for participating in this experience.

One challenge for the Psychology 100 course as currently offered at Ohio State is semester conversion. This is because a GTA typically teaches three sections of the course—one in each of three 10-week quarters. As the university moves to semesters, TAs are likely to teach one course each semester (as at peer universities) leading to an overall reduction in the number of sections available. This means that either additional GTAs and/or lecturers need to be involved in teaching this course or class sizes will need to be increased to meet the demand.

Role of Technology and the Major Fee. With the completion of the new Psychology Building in 2006, one of the department’s goals was to enhance the use of technology in the classroom. All central pool classrooms in the new building are video data equipped and our instructors use this available technology to enhance their teaching. In addition, Smartboards have been installed in 7 smaller department managed lab and conference rooms for faculty, staff, and student use. A second computer lab facility for enhanced teaching and research with 30 seats and interactive data capabilities was added to the department. In addition to providing more computer lab space for students, we have found that instructors who make use of this room are incorporating more interactive web-based activities in class to enhance student learning. We
intend in the near future to install site-licensed software for conducting online questionnaire research in this and many other faculty labs across both buildings.

For the past three academic years we have experimented with offering one online course, Psychology 100D. The student and instructor reactions to this course have been positive and we are considering development of additional online courses. As more faculty use the university-supported web-based course management system (Carmen) for posting course material and web links, chat rooms, class discussion, student feedback, and online quizzes, we expect that interest in participation in the development of other online courses will increase.

During the 2009-10 academic year, a quarterly Psychology Learning Technology Fee was approved and assessed on students declaring psychology as their major. As a result of the funds generated by this fee ($50 per student major per quarter), the Psychology Department initiated three broad categories of technology-based measures to enhance undergraduate classroom and research experiences. First, significant classroom and equipment enhancements were made and included the purchase of 150 student responders (“clickers”) for use in classes, and new laptop computers for faculty and GTA instructional use in any assigned campus classroom, and for undergraduate use for presentations and honors thesis defenses. Other enhancements purchased or developed for undergraduate student research use included an Undergraduate Computer Lab with eight dedicated computers (and subsidized printing costs) open daily only to psychology majors, the purchase of a high resolution HP color plotter for printing student posters (again with subsidized plotter costs for all psychology majors), and two independent four-station data collection laboratories. The second category, personnel enhancements, included the addition of a third full-time adviser with complementary technology skills to meet growing enrollment demands, a part-time honors adviser to help with the expansion of our internship program, and additional half-time graduate student support for the Advising Office during the academic year and Summer term. The third category of expenditures provided by the fee is being used to significantly enhance and expand our active undergraduate research program. Funds were established to bring in speakers whose current work is specifically and directly of interest to undergraduate researchers, up to fifty $300 conference travel scholarships to encourage undergraduate participation at national and regional conferences, three psychology student organization awards, honors students’ trips to the Midwestern Psychological Association conference each year, up to fifteen $1000 study abroad scholarships, up to five $3500 Summer Research scholarships to work with faculty, and a $5000 subsidy for our undergraduate Psychology London Experience Program.

**Faculty, Lecturer, and Graduate Student Teaching Mix.** Each year the Psychology Department must rely on a combination of full-time faculty, lecturers, and advanced graduate students (i.e., post-M.A.) to deliver our undergraduate courses. The increasing popularity of our courses and our minor programs places such persistent and extensive demands on our teaching that these needs could not be met by faculty course load alone, even if the number of new faculty hires were to continue to grow. For example, in 2009-10 alone, 4969 students took Introductory Psychology, equal to more than 75% of the entire OSU incoming freshman class. However, it is important to note that psychology faculty are heavily involved in classroom instruction. A 2010 survey by SBS revealed that psychology was second in the division in terms of the number of undergraduate credit hours taught by the regular faculty. A similar recent College of Arts and Sciences assessment showed that we were in the Top 5 among the 36 departments in the College.

For the past five academic years (including our current 2010-11 projections) the total number of psychology course sections open to undergraduates has remained quite stable (310-315 per year, not including independent or thesis research) despite significant variability in the number of faculty and full-time graduate students. Advanced graduate students currently teach most sections of our introductory course (Psychology 100), a mix of faculty, graduate students and lecturers teach sections of our lower level gateway courses (e.g., Introduction to Abnormal, Developmental, Social). Regular faculty members are, by and large, responsible for teaching our advanced courses in the major as well as all of the courses in their respective graduate programs. Hence, there is a consistent need to hire temporary non-tenure track lecturers to help meet the fluid undergraduate course offering shortfall due to retirement, professional leave and off-
duty quarters, faculty service, and popular specialty, interdisciplinary, and honors gateway courses. In most cases our temporary lecturers are recent PhD’s from our own department and they primarily offer introductory or specialty courses in their area of expertise. Other lecturers include emeritus professors, faculty in other departments at OSU or other universities, or professionals within the Columbus community. Quality of instruction for faculty, lecturers, and graduate students is monitored yearly by the department via the university’s Student Evaluation of Instruction format (SEI) and by grade distribution data. All lecturers who teach our honors courses must first be evaluated and approved by the University Honors and Scholars Center. The addition of a total of 10 new faculty over the past two academic years 2009-11 and a recent upturn in graduate enrollment during that same period will lead to a reduction in the reliance on lecturers.

**Unique Undergraduate Programs.** The Department strives to provide a variety of unique programs and opportunities for students that enrich both their academic and out-of-classroom experience and help them prepare for their future.

*Support/Adjustment Programs.* We are in our eighth year of offering the *Psychology Peer Mentoring Program.* All incoming first-year psychology students are invited to participate in the Program that pairs students with a junior or senior psychology major. Historically, about one third of our incoming freshmen have registered for this Program, approximately 50-65 students per year.

All incoming students are also invited and encouraged to attend our *New Student Welcome*, held the day before classes begin. Students meet their psychology advisor, learn about the major requirements and departmental programming, and hear from psychology student organization officers. We usually have over 100 students who attend the New Student Welcome. Each fall, the department holds the *Psychology Honors Reception* to provide all honors students with an opportunity to interact with each other and mingle with faculty.

*Career Exploration/ Career Development Programs.* The *Psychology Enrichment Program* provides an opportunity for students to meet psychology faculty and staff outside of the classroom while exploring various topics in psychology. Seven speaker events are scheduled throughout the year as part of this program. During this past year, 301 students attended these programs.

Twice each quarter, the Psychology Advising Office offers graduate school orientations, providing fundamentals of the graduate school process including fields of graduate study, degree options, the GRE, and a proposed timeline. During this past year, approximately 114 students attended these workshops. Annually, we hold the *Applying to Graduate School Workshop*, a half-day workshop that focuses on doctoral programs in psychology, including a faculty panel, a student panel, and a GRE information session. Over 70 students attended at least one of the seminars during the workshop this year.

Over the past eight years, the annual *Psychology Career, Internship, and Graduate School Fair* has grown to over 50 tables of representatives, including graduate programs outside the state of Ohio, and over 300 student attendees. The *Ask-an-Alum Program* recruits psychology alumni to be career contacts for current students. Currently, 130 alumni participate in this program. Students can search the department’s website for alumni listings by career area and request contact information for those alumni with whom they wish to connect.

*Research Opportunities.* The department long has provided unique research opportunities for undergraduate students. Our department ranks first at Ohio State in the number of students enrolled in Undergraduate Research (542 students in 2009-10). The majority of our faculty members are involved in supervising undergraduate students in research. In 2009-2010, students worked with 34 different faculty members in our department.
The annual Psychology Research Colloquium provides a forum for any student involved in research in the department to present a poster of his or her work. Now in its 13th year, psychology continues to be the only department on campus to provide this experience for our students. Additionally, the number of our undergraduates accepted for presentation at the university-wide Denman Undergraduate Research Forum has risen to such high numbers that since 2004, Psychology has had its own category (ranging from 15 student participants in 2005 to a high of 33 participants in 2010), the only department to have a division dedicated solely to its discipline.

**Student Outcomes Assessment.** For several years, the Department has used a multi-method strategy to assess student outcomes and guide program changes. Mastery of the subject matter is routinely assessed through instructors’ grading of exams and written assignments. Three surveys indirectly assess students’ learning experience: the Social and Behavioral Sciences Graduating Senior Exit Survey which measures student perceptions of gains in knowledge and skills, as well as satisfaction with coursework and other experiences; a quarterly survey of students who participate in guided research experiences (Psychology 699) which measures student perceptions of their knowledge of research methods and ethics; and our Alumni Survey which indicates further educational opportunities and careers that our alumni are pursuing.

**Student Satisfaction and Alumni Experiences.** Monitoring student satisfaction is an important and continuing commitment within the department. In general, we are on target with our goals of successfully preparing students. The most recent data available from the Graduating Senior Exit Survey (2008-2009) shows that the overwhelming majority of students agree that to a great or moderate extent they have acquired a comprehensive knowledge of psychology (83%) and that their coursework has enhanced their skills in communication (74%), critical thinking (84%), analytical reasoning (82%), and ethical and moral reasoning (81%). Eighty three per cent of students report a high degree of satisfaction with their experience in the psychology major.

**Research Skills.** A primary goal of our Psychology 699: Undergraduate Research in Psychology course is not only for students to gain practical research skills, but also to improve problem-solving, oral and written communication skills, and to encourage a stronger appreciation for research. Our students overwhelmingly report that they have improved their research skills (awareness of ethical issues, ability to communicate purpose of the study, research design, and findings, understanding of data analysis, and a stronger appreciation of research) after working alongside faculty and graduate students in their research labs. A breakdown of questions and percentages is available in Table 6, Appendix B.

Every three years, we send an electronic survey to alumni who have graduated between one and six years previously. Three hundred and seventy two alumni completed our most recent Alumni Survey from December, 2007 (response rate = 21%). Seventy-one percent of our alumni reported securing a job within 3 months of graduation. Forty-five percent reported that they have received or are currently pursuing a graduate or professional degree (e.g., law school, medical school, physical therapy, nursing, etc.).

**Directions for the Future.** Our department is continuously looking for ways to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. During this past year, we have been experimenting with a more personalized style of academic advising. Specifically, declaring a psychology major is now a two-step process. First, students attend a major declaration session in which they learn about the requirements of the major, as well as opportunities and programs available within the department. The second part of the declaration process is an individual meeting with the student’s assigned academic advisor to discuss the student’s academic and career goals. The aim is to encourage students to begin planning early, as well as make students aware of experiences and resources that may assist them in reaching their academic and career goals. In addition, it is hoped that if students meet with their academic advisor early in their career, this relationship will be utilized to a greater extent, to the student’s benefit. Student feedback on advising satisfaction surveys indicates a high degree of satisfaction with the level of rapport, helpfulness, information, and support that students perceive from their academic advisor.
A population that we feel has historically been underserved in our department is transfer students. In the past couple of years, we have proactively contacted these students and encouraged them to meet with their psychology advisor, as well as invited them to the New Student Welcome. Beginning in Autumn, 2010, we are planning programming specifically targeting this audience.

Internships are becoming an increasingly important part of the undergraduate experience for students. In 2004, our department developed an internship course (Psychology 489: Internship in Psychology). This is a graded course that counts on the major program. Student feedback suggests that there is a desire for other internship credit opportunities. A part time staff member has recently been assigned the job of expanding our internship program. In Autumn, 2010, she will propose a more flexible, online internship course that we expect will facilitate more students earning credit for their internship experiences.

We are pleased with the large number of students who become involved in research in the department; however, we are now focusing our attention to increasing students’ exposure to research outside of Ohio State and looking at ways to encourage attendance and presentation at conferences. We have been encouraged by the recent increase in the number of students from our department who attended the Midwestern Psychological Association conference. In 2008, one student presented and five attended while in 2010, 13 presented and 17 others attended. We attribute this increase to not only adding a course assignment of writing a conference abstract in the Honors Thesis course, but also to the funds available since Winter, 2010, for conference travel, as a result of the Psychology Major Technology Fee. We continue to look for ways to encourage further engagement with research.

E. The Graduate Program (Michael Vasey, Graduate Studies Director)

Overview. The Ph.D. program in psychology, a highly ranked program nationally, is part of a long and distinguished tradition at Ohio State University (OSU). The first masters degree in Psychology was awarded in 1915; the first Ph.D. in 1917. Since that time, more than 2,800 master's degrees and 2,000 doctorates have been conferred. For many years the Psychology Department’s graduate program has been among the very strongest at the university. In 2007-08, the OSU Graduate School conducted a comprehensive review of all 98 doctoral programs at the university and our department was among only 12 designated as being in the top category of “high quality” programs. Department graduates hold respected teaching, research and professional positions across the United States and other countries. In fact, there is at least one OSU graduate on the psychology faculty of almost every major university in America.

The Ph.D. program in Psychology is designed to prepare research-oriented scholars to be tomorrow's leaders in all major areas of the discipline. Although there is formally only one psychology Ph.D. program recognized by the Graduate School, for purposes of graduate training and supervision, the department operates specialized training programs in seven areas of psychology: behavioral neuroscience, clinical, cognitive, developmental, intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD), quantitative, and social psychology. The common doctoral curriculum consists of a small core of required courses for all Ph.D. students coupled with additional requirements and options associated with a major concentration in at least one of the seven specialized areas. In each area, students are provided with extensive and diverse opportunities to develop the research and professional skills needed to become leaders in their fields. Some cross area program specialties have also been established (e.g., cognitive development). This section of the departmental report focuses on the graduate program overall. Individual self-study reports on the department’s seven core program areas of concentration can be found in Appendix C.

Curriculum. Psychology is an exceptionally broad discipline that encompasses topics ranging from the molecular-level (e.g., the operation of single nerve cells) to the macro-level (e.g., the interaction of social groups). The seven areas of concentration in our doctoral program reflect this breadth. Because these seven areas differ widely in content and methods, the department’s philosophy is to allow considerable autonomy and flexibility for each of these areas to design their own curricula and requirements so as to best meet the
needs of their students. In 2007, our Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) undertook a thorough review of our departmental doctoral program, during which the common core of the psychology Ph.D. and the requirements for each area of concentration were clarified and reaffirmed.

Students are admitted directly into the psychology doctoral program but are required to earn a thesis-based MA (or equivalent) on the way to completing the Ph.D. Students are advanced to candidacy after satisfactory completion of written and oral candidacy examinations. The specific format of the written candidacy exam is determined by a student’s area of concentration. The core requirements of the doctoral program in psychology regardless of area of specialization are as follows: 1) Statistics Requirement; 2) Area of Concentration Requirement; 3) Breadth Requirement; 4) Flexibility Requirement, and 5) Research Ethics Requirement. To satisfy the Statistics Requirement students complete a minimum of two courses in our first-year statistics sequence. The Area Concentration Requirement is met by a set of three or more courses specified by an area as sufficient for a doctoral concentration in that area. Students meet the Breadth Requirement by taking at least two courses outside their area of concentration. The Flexibility Requirement stipulates that the curriculum requirements specified by each area should be sufficiently flexible to allow the possibility for students to pursue a subspecialty that crosses areas (e.g., social-neuroscience, cognitive-neuroscience, health psychology, or judgment and decision making). Finally, the Research Ethics Requirement is met by area-specific experiences designed to ensure adequate exposure to ethical principles and practices.

Program Size. From 2000-2009, the average entering class size was 29.3 (median = 28.5). However, as shown in Figure 5, class size declined substantially over this period ($M_{2000-2004} = 34.0$; $M_{2005-2009} = 24.6$). This decline reflects at least two related factors that operated during this period 1) a decline in the overall number of faculty in the department (see Figure 1); and 2) elimination of two graduate training specialties. Due to a confluence of fiscal challenges beginning in the late 1990s as well as a strategic plan to focus on more basic research areas of psychology, the department decided to phase out our Industrial-Organizational and Counseling Psychology training programs. This decision also helped to maintain the strength of our more foundational areas. Although we had more than 50 faculty lines in the late 1990s, our faculty numbers declined to below 40 by 2006. Not surprisingly, the department’s fiscal situation had a serious impact on our graduate training program. As we had to downsize the faculty, so too did we downsize our graduate admission numbers in order to meet our obligations with respect to the provision of quality training and in light of increases in graduate student stipends, tuition, and benefit costs. As a consequence of all of these factors, our graduate student enrollments declined from a total of 174 students in the program in 2001-2002 to 130 in 2007-2008. Fortunately, despite the recent economic turmoil, we have been able to generate and attract increased resources that have permitted us to recoup some of our faculty losses. This has increased

![Figure 5. Entering Graduate Student Class Size (2000-2009)](image-url)
the number of research active faculty with concomitant increases in the size of our incoming classes of graduate students in the past several years. As of 2008-2009, we had a total of 140 students in the program.

**Student Quality.** The quality of students entering our program is very high, with relatively little variation across our seven areas of concentration. As shown in Figure 6, over the past ten years, the average GPA for our entering students was 3.72 (median = 3.71), with little variability ($SD = .03$). This compares favorably with a median of 3.55 for admitted students in psychology doctoral programs nationally in 2006-2007 (APA, *Graduate Studies in Psychology, 2009*). The average Verbal and Quantitative GRE scores for our admitted students were 618 and 710 respectively over that same 10-year period. In comparison, median scores for admitted psychology graduate students nationally were 575 (GRE-V) and 640 (GRE-Q; APA, *Graduate Studies in Psychology, 2009*). As shown in Figure 7, the average GRE scores of our admitted students have increased substantially from the first five years to the second five years during this period, with GRE-V scores rising from 611 to 626 and GRE-Q scores rising from 696 to 724. Percentiles show a similar increase (GRE-V from 85.9 to 89.2; GRE-Q from 68.1 to 76.1).

**Figure 6: Average GPAs of Enrolled Graduate Students (2000-2009)**
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**Figure 7: Average GREs of Enrolled Graduate Students (2000-2009)**
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The OSU graduate school runs an annual competition to award fellowships on a competitive basis. Psychology is consistently among the top OSU Departments in graduate fellowships won. For example,
from 2000-2005, we had more winners than any other department at OSU. From 2000-2009, we have averaged 43.2 awards and 19.1 acceptances per year. However, as shown in Figure 8, we experienced a reduction in total awards and, to a lesser extent, total accepted awards, from 2004-2006. This temporary reduction reflects several factors including the previously noted reduction in the size of our faculty and the elimination of one of our largest areas of concentration as well as changes in the fellowship program itself. However, in the past three rounds, the numbers of awards received and accepted have returned to historical levels, reflecting increased fellowship submissions due largely to increased faculty size.

The excellence of our graduate students is illustrated by their level of research activity. In 2009 alone, they made at least 136 presentations to regional and national professional conferences, and they had at least 102 peer-reviewed articles and 21 chapters in print or in press. It is also notable that the department also regularly has students win the Edward F. Hayes Graduate Research Forum (10 award winners since 2002) as well as the prestigious OSU Graduate Alumni Teaching Award (9 since 2000).

Figure 8: Graduate School Fellowships Awarded and Accepted (2000-2009)

Graduate Recruitment. We are committed to recruiting students of the highest quality. In doing so, we face the challenge of competing with other top psychology graduate programs. The students to whom we extend offers of admission typically receive offers from several other programs. In 2006-2007 we surveyed students offered admission to our program to gain insight into the reasons some students elected to attend another program. The elite nature of the students for whom we compete is shown by the fact that they received an average of 2.9 other offers, with those declining OSU receiving the most offers ($M = 4.5$). However, because of the strength of our program we are successful in attracting these elite students nearly half of the time. On average 45% of those offered admission enrolled during the period of 2000-2009. When we lose students, it is typically to other very strong programs (e.g., in the last several years we have lost students to Harvard, Carnegie Mellon, University of Chicago, Cornell, Illinois, Michigan, NYU, UCLA, and Stanford).

For the most recent 5 year period (from 2005-2009), the department’s number of graduate applications has averaged 454, a figure that is >150% of the median number of applications received by programs nationally (APA Graduate Studies in Psychology, 2009). Of those applications, on average only 12% were offered admission. The national median rate of admissions is >20% for U.S. doctoral programs (APA, Graduate Studies in Psychology, 2009).

Figure 9 shows the percentage of applicants offered admission, the percentage of offers with guaranteed funding packages, and rates of acceptance from 2000-2009. Three aspects of this graph are noteworthy.
First, during this period we reduced the percentage of applicants offered admission from nearly 21% in 2000 to 14% in 2009. Second, we increased the percentage of applicants to whom we made offers that include funding, from 75% in 2000 to 94% in 2009. Third, the percentage of offers being accepted has held steady across this period, with an average rate of 46%.

Figure 9: Rates of Offers Made to Prospective Graduate Students and Accepted (2000-2009)

![Graph showing rates of offers made and accepted from 2000 to 2009.]

Although we did not see declines in the percentage of offers accepted during this period, we were concerned that students declining offers cited higher graduate stipends at their chosen university in explaining their decision. A survey of students offered admission in 2006-2007 revealed that, on average, students who declined our offer had received better offers in terms of dollars per month ($M = $1899/month), months of funding per year ($M = 10.5$ months), and number of years of funding guaranteed ($M = 4.5$ years). Until recently our typical funding package involved 4-years of guaranteed funding, with 12-months of funding in Year 1 and 9-months of funding in years 2-4. Additionally, our 9-month stipends were somewhat below the national average and considerably below the amounts offered by our peer competitors. Although we had not yet seen a reduction in the percentage of offers accepted, we were concerned that such declines were inevitable if we did not enhance our funding packages. This concern led to several recent changes described below.

First, we lengthened our guaranteed funding packages from four to five years beginning with the recruitment of the 2008-2009 class. These funding packages comprise our Department Fellows Plan, which was originally developed in the 1990s and revised in 2007. The purpose of this plan is to maximize the quality of our graduate students across the department by attracting our best applicants with guaranteed packages of support, assuming reasonable academic progress and job performance. There are two ways that students can qualify for department fellow status and therefore be guaranteed 5 years of support. First, students who are awarded University Fellowships for one or more years (an average of 62% of those offered admission from 2005-2009) automatically qualify. Second, students not receiving University fellowships also can be named Department Fellows if they meet certain quality indicators and a principal investigator guarantees two of the years on an external grant. Second, with the help of a recently added SBS fellowship program, we were able to add additional summer support to our funding packages.

Specifically, for the past several years we have been able to offer support during the summer following a student’s second year in the program. This means that typical students have 12-months of funding during at least their first two years in the program. Many students are funded during additional summers if their advisor has research funding available although such support is not guaranteed. Third, we raised our stipend levels to partially close the gap with our competitors. Fourth, being designated as a “high quality program” by the Graduate School has allowed us to add an additional $3000 per year to our fellowship offers. When
the new base department and divisional support are added to the extra stipend from the graduate school, our offers are now in range of the amounts offered by most of our peer competitors.

Taking all of these changes into account, a typical student making expected progress through the program would currently receive a guaranteed package paying an average of $1816/month, for 10.2 months per year, for a total of five years. Although these values are not among the highest in the discipline, they are comparable to those at most of our competing peer institutions.

**Attrition and Time to Degree.** Our emphasis on admitting high quality students and our efforts to ensure they make timely progress through the program have led to strong and improving rates of successful and timely degree completion. The median time to degree for Ph.D. graduates from Spring 2002 – Spring 2010 was 5.75 years. That compares very favorably with a median of 8.7 years in Psychology for research-extensive U.S. universities (NSF report, *Time to Degree of U.S. Research Doctorate Recipients*, March 2006) and a median of 7 years in all psychology doctoral programs (APA, *Graduate Studies in Psychology*, 2009). During this same period, the median time to complete the MA was 2.0 years and the median time to be advanced to candidacy was 2.7 years.

Overall attrition was 27.4% for the 1992-2008 cohorts. Attrition rates are shown separately during this period by race/ethnicity in Figure 10. Importantly, attrition rates did not vary by race/ethnicity. A Chi-square test comparing these groups (not including Native Americans due to low numbers) was not significant (Chi-square (4) = 5.94, p = .20. Attrition rates have declined across this period, from 30.1% in 1992-1996, to 26.1% in 1997-2001, to 19.4% in 2002-2005.

**Figure 10: Graduate Student Attrition Rates by Race/Ethnicity (1992-2008)**

As shown in Figure 11, finer grained analyses of the 1996 – 2006 cohorts reveal that the percentage of students successfully completing the master’s degree from the 1996 – 2006 cohorts has averaged 84.9%. However, across this period, completion rates have increased from 79.9% for the 1996 – 2000 cohorts to 89% for the 2001-06 cohorts. Rates at which students are advanced to candidacy following the MA have averaged 88.6% for the 1996-2005 cohorts. Finally, the percentage of doctoral candidates who successfully completed the Ph.D. averaged 91.4% for the 1996-2002 cohorts. Increases in the rates of completion of all three milestones are apparent during this period.

**Academic Life of the Department.** In Psychology, we have a strong commitment to creating an environment in which all members of the Department will be able to achieve their optimal performance. Students are trained under a mentorship model in which they work closely with at least one faculty member. In such relationships they are provided the guidance and support necessary for them to develop into effective, independent investigators in the field. To that end, faculty members are closely involved in graduate training, both in the classroom an in the research laboratory. Faculty members interact closely with
students and through such interactions seek to provide models of excellence in research, teaching, and service for students to emulate. Following such models, our students are successful in their research and in their teaching. As noted earlier, most of our graduate students present their research at regional or national conferences and publish in peer-reviewed journals, an activity for which the department provides financial support.

Figure 11: MA and Candidacy Completion Rate (1996-2006)

All of our program areas hold regular workshops, colloquium series, or brown bag seminar series in which students have opportunities to see others present their research as well as to present their own research. These provide valuable opportunities for students to hone their presentation skills (e.g., practice job talks) in a supportive and constructive environment. Because the Department and its specialty areas regularly present colloquia by nationally prominent scholars, students have many opportunities to see effective models and to make contacts with leading scholars in their fields.

To improve the training and supervision of graduate student instructors, we have a graduate course, PSYCH 852 (combined lecture and lab) devoted to psychology teacher training. Students complete this course during the summer prior to their first quarter of teaching. For most students, this is prior to either their second or third year in the program. Although it is not required that our students teach during their time in the program, the vast majority do so.

One important aspect of the optimal performance we seek to foster is timely progress through the program. To monitor students’ progress, graduate students are asked each year to complete an electronic annual Student Activity Report (SAR). This report is cumulative and contains a listing of students’ courses completed and grades obtained, scholarly presentations and publications, awards and honors received, degree completions, and sources of support for each year in the program. Importantly, the SAR also permits students to provide self-evaluations that then are used by program faculty to set annual, individualized goals. It also allows students to provide anonymous program evaluations that are used as input to our ongoing efforts to offer the very best in graduate training in Psychology. All students receive an annual evaluation letter from their faculty mentor with input from their relevant specialty program faculty. Students are typically provided with office space within their advisor’s research laboratory. However, students with teaching assignments are provided with additional office space in which to meet with undergraduate students. In either case, students are provided with access to computers and facilities for copying and printing. Those students teaching Introductory Psychology have resources and support staff available to them in an office dedicated to that large course.
**Placements.** The overarching goal of our graduate training mission is to position our students, through coursework and laboratory-based apprenticeship-style training, to assume leadership roles in those efforts. Success is measured by the placements of our students in prominent academic, research, and industry (including mental health services) positions. In keeping with these goals, our students have considerable success in gaining tenure track academic positions and other positions of leadership in the field. From 2000 – 2009, initial placements for our students have averaged approximately 37% in postdoctoral fellowships, 33% in academic positions, and 24% in industry and other applied settings (e.g., clinical practice). National averages in 2005 were 42% postdoctoral, 27% academic, and 27% industry/applied (NSF, *Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering: Fall 2005*). Table 2 shows a comparison of our program to top ranked programs (according to the 2009 *U.S. News and World Report* rankings) based on placement rates in 2006-2007 reported in the APA *Graduate Studies in Psychology Guide, 2009*). A more extensive set of data on OSU graduate placement by program area can be found in Table 5 in the next section.

### Table 2. Comparison of Initial Placements of Ph.D. Graduates – 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department*</th>
<th>Postdoctoral</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA (3)</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan (3)</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University (3)</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University (3)</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois (7)**</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of Above</td>
<td>48.19%</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU (17)</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>46.50%</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2009 *U.S. News and World Report* rankings in parentheses; Stanford University (1) and University of California–Berkeley (1) failed to provide data to the APA.** Illinois did not report data for 2006-07; most recent available data were from 2004-05.*

**Student Diversity.** In our graduate program we are strongly committed to the training of students from under-represented groups, and we have a long history of success in doing so. For example, the Fall 2005 NSF *Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering* showed that the OSU Psychology program produced more African American Ph.D.s than any other department at OSU and, in fact, accounted for half of OSU’s total production. A recently restructured committee with expanded responsibilities oversees the department’s efforts to maintain and enhance the recruitment and retention of minority graduate students in Psychology. This committee is active in hosting students during recruitment visits and helps to coordinate opportunities for students in various programs, including the American Psychological Association’s (APA’s) Summer Scholars Program (40% of the enrollees are by design undergraduate minority students), the APA’s Minority Undergraduate Student Excellence program, and the Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP). Committee members and other faculty routinely host students in these programs.

An examination of the demographics of our doctoral students from 2000-2009 shows that OSU Psychology compares favorably to national and university figures for the percentages of under-represented groups. During this period, an average of 15.3% of our applicants were members of racial or ethnic minority groups. As shown in Figure 12, this percentage has held fairly steady during the past ten years. Figure 12 also shows that, on average during this period, 16.1% of our offers of admission have been to minority students. This percentage fluctuates from year to year depending on the applicant pool. However, as shown in the figure, it is apparent that this percentage declined (to an average of 9.6%) during the period of 2003 – 2005. This decline reflects the fact that our counseling psychology area was phased out in 2003. Historically, students from under-represented groups applied to this program in relatively high numbers and
thus were particularly well represented in the counseling program. However, as Figure 8 shows, this decline was temporary and from 2006 – 2009, offers to minority students have averaged 19.4%.

Table 3 shows the percentage of students enrolled from 2002-2009 by race/ethnicity compared to average values for doctorates in Psychology drawn from the NSF Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering. As is readily apparent, the percentage of students in each minority group is comparable to the national average.

Figure 12: Percentage of Minority Applicants, Offers, and Acceptances (2000-2009)

Table 3. Distribution of OSU Psychology Students by Race and Ethnicity Compared to National Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages of U.S. citizens only to be comparable to the NSF data.

As is typical among psychology programs, the majority of applicants to our graduate program are women. On average, from 2000-2009, 71.4% of applicants were women, with little variation from year to year ($SD = 2.3\%$). Similarly, during this period an average of 67.9% of offers of admission were made to women and 69.7% of admitted students were women. Among the cohorts admitted from 2000-2005, 111 students have earned Ph.D.s of which 72.1% are women. These figures are comparable to national averages. For example,
according to the NSF *Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering*, from 1998-2007, 69.8% of doctoral degrees in psychology were awarded to women.

**Student Support.** The vast majority of our graduate students are on fellowship during their first year and thus have no work responsibility to the Department. A small number of first year students serve as Teaching Assistants. Specifically, they serve as Course Assistants who assist faculty members in their courses but do not have responsibility for teaching courses themselves. Another small group of first year students are supported as Research Assistants on funded research projects. All students with at least one year of fellowship funding have guaranteed funding for an additional 3-4 years (4 years beginning with the 2008-2009 cohort). Most other students also have guaranteed funding for a total of 4-5 years. As previously described, these guaranteed packages include funding for students’ second summer.

The nine-month stipends for Graduate Associates in academic year 2009-2010 ranged from $14,400 to $18,000. The twelve-month stipends for Fellowship students ranged from $20,148 to $24,600. These fellowship stipends reflect a $3000 supplement stemming from the department being designated as a “high quality” graduate program by the Graduate School. Students who receive this extra stipend in their first year also receive it to top off their departmental stipends in subsequent years making the GA appointment worth $17,400 to $21,000.

The department has recently increased funding for graduate students to attend professional conferences. Previously, students could receive up to a total of $300 to attend one or more conferences at which they are presenting a poster or a paper. Beginning in 2010, students are eligible to receive up to $600. Students also commonly receive travel support from the Council of Graduate Students Ray Travel Award for Scholarship and Service. Student can also receive financial support from other sources on campus, such as the Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship program.

**Summary.** The psychology department at OSU offers one of the strongest Ph.D. programs at the University. Seven specialty areas are offered to a talented group of incoming students. The department has an excellent pool of applicants from which to choose (about 450 overall applicants each year) from which about 12% are offered admission. About half of those offered admission accept and receive a competitive offer of financial support. Students graduate in a timely manner and move on largely to postdoctoral or faculty positions. However, to maintain the high quality of our program and enhance it further, several challenges should be addressed. First, as noted earlier in this report, one challenge will be to provide sufficient support for an increasing number of graduate students. Second, whereas we have made great strides in enhancing cross-area interactions and collaborations among faculty, our graduate programs remain largely insular in their formal structure. Recent appointments of faculty who have interests across areas are helping to break down these barriers allowing synergies between program areas to begin to blossom. Third, although we are at the national average with respect to graduate student diversity, we aspire to do better.

**F. Graduate Program Areas**

As noted earlier, the department offers 7 graduate specialties: behavioral neuroscience, clinical, cognitive, developmental, intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD), quantitative, and social. In a department as large as Ohio State’s, as in most of our Big 10 peer institutions, an area structure is necessary to organize and focus the appropriate expertise to admit, train, and supervise the many graduate students in the department. Although under the general governance and rules of the OSU Graduate School and the Department’s Graduate Studies and Stipends Committee (GSSC), the areas generally determine their own specific graduate course and candidacy exam requirements. Students who do not meet the department’s overall admission requirements can receive an exemption if approved by the GSSC. Table 4 presents information about each of the graduate program’s graduate student applicants and those who enrolled over the last 5 years. As shown in Table 4, the number of applicants to each program varies widely with clinical
and social receiving the most. However, and perhaps most importantly, the quality of students admitted to each program as judged by GPA and GRE scores are roughly comparable.

Table 5 presents the placement statistics in general categories for graduates of each program specialty. Over the past 10 years, 73% of graduates overall took an academic job (e.g., tenure track, postdoc) immediately following graduation with 22% going to clinical practice or industry. The remaining 5% were either not in psychology or unknown.

Table 4: Most Recent 5 Year Admission Data for All Graduate Program Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Mean Number Applied Each Year</th>
<th>Mean Number Accepted Each Year</th>
<th>Mean Percent of Applicants Accepted Each Year</th>
<th>Mean Number Enrolled Each Year</th>
<th>Mean Percent of Admitted who Enroll</th>
<th>Mean GPA of those enrolled</th>
<th>Mean Verbal + Quant GRE of those enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Ten Year First Job Placement Data for Graduate Program Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS (First job placement data)</th>
<th>10 YR # Grads (1999-2009)</th>
<th>% in Tenure Track job</th>
<th>% in Other Academic job (postdoc, lecturer)</th>
<th>% in clinical or private practice</th>
<th>% in industry or govt.</th>
<th>% not in Psychology</th>
<th>% unknown</th>
<th>5 YEAR # Grads (2005-2009)</th>
<th>Area Faculty N</th>
<th>5 Yr. PHD Production (Students/Faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL AREAS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of our graduate programs has their own traditions, but students and faculty from each of the programs are increasingly working together. In preparation for the overall departmental self-study, each of the areas of specialization completed a self study in which the area’s overall program goals, program quality,
contribution to undergraduate and graduate instruction, strengths and weaknesses, and priorities for the future were considered. These area self studies, contained in full in Appendix C along with brief biographies of the primary regular faculty affiliated with those programs, provided important input to the overall department assessment and plans for the future which are presented in the next section of this report.

G. Overall Departmental Strengths, Challenges, and Priorities

As should be evident from the sections above, psychology at Ohio State is a relatively large and diverse department with significant strengths in its faculty, staff, facilities and graduate and undergraduate programs. We are home to two Top 5 area programs (social and quantitative) and several others that are moving into the top echelons as well. Being located in a large and multi-faceted university is also a big plus in that it provides for numerous possibilities for inter- and multi-disciplinary collaborations on a virtually endless list of topics. The presence of a large research-oriented Medical School, University Hospital, and School of Public Health steps away from the department is also useful in fostering the department’s movement into integrative neuroscience and topics such as behavioral genetics and health psychology. It is often said that whatever you want to know or study, there is an expert at OSU who can help. A number of our recent hires were attracted to OSU for exactly this reason. The comprehensiveness of OSU provides a competitive edge over many other places. Furthermore, psychology has been fortunate to have earned the respect of the higher level College and University administrators who have rewarded the department for its strategic planning and success in improving itself over the years into the highly ranked department it is today. The support of SBS and A&S of the new Human Brain Imaging Lab is but the most recent example of this, and the opening of the new psychology building in 2006 is easily the most dramatic. The new building has made it much easier to attract top faculty and graduate students. Furthermore, by providing one (connected) home to all areas of the department, it has ensured that faculty see each other more often leading to tangible results such as an increase in multi-faculty (collaborative) research projects and grant proposals.

One relatively untapped strength of the department is our very large alumni base. It is only in the last 5-10 years that this base has been pursued in any systematic way. For the last five years or so, the department has sent an annual newsletter to many of our more senior alumni (see recent examples included) and has maintained an alumni section on our web pages. These help us to stay in contact with our vast alumni, but the mere size of the alumni population makes it a challenge to keep up with who might be in the best position to contribute to the department. Nevertheless, the department has received several sizeable donations or pledges from alumni in the past 15 years including an endowed chair in applied psychology and an endowed professorship in social psychology. Furthermore, there are two announced bequests that will pay off at some point in the future. Each bequest is in the millions of dollars with one targeted to support the quantitative psychology program in particular and the other to support the department more generally. Other existing endowments support student scholarships, travel, various colloquia series, and so forth. Next, some of the most immediate challenges and priorities for the future are noted.

Undergraduate Program. Our undergraduate program and the psychology major in particular has recently undergone an extensive analysis in preparation for the university conversion to semesters. If enrollments and majors continue on their upward trajectory, it will be difficult to accommodate the growth without increases in faculty and graduate students. As noted earlier in this document, our department is undersized compared to other major research universities given the number of majors that we have (see Table 2, Appendix A).

One potentially exciting development for the future is the introduction of an undergraduate Neuroscience major on campus. Because the Department of Neuroscience is located in the OSU medical school and its faculty do little if any teaching of undergraduates, the day to day administration of the major is likely to be the Department of Psychology, though the program director would likely report to the Dean of SBS. In fact, a similar arrangement with Psychology administering the neuroscience major appears to work well at
other Big 10 universities such as Indiana and Michigan. Indeed, there is great potential for psychology to capitalize on the investment in the new Imaging Facility by offering a more biologically oriented psychology major. At the University of Michigan, for example, in addition to offering a traditional psychology major and a neuroscience major, the department offers a biologically focused psychology concentration referred to as a “Brain, Behavior, and Cognitive Science” major. If Michigan provides a relevant comparison, such specialized majors are likely to prove very attractive to undergraduates. Although some current psychology majors might be attracted to these new majors instead of psychology, a significant increase in overall majors is expected (e.g., from current biology majors or students interested in medical school but majoring in something else). The goal, of course, is not to increase the number of majors the department serves. There are already plenty of those. Rather, the goal is to take advantage of new faculty expertise, and provide cutting edge training for undergraduates in areas that are of greatest interest and potential benefit to them. If psychology were to add further to its majors, of course, additional funds would be necessary to hire additional advising staff. However, if the psychology major fee applied to these new majors, the costs would be partially offset.

**Graduate Program.** The graduate program has a cadre of high quality students who go on to successful careers. Over the past several years the department has made great strides in moving graduate stipends to competitive levels so that we can continue to attract the best students. The size of the graduate program has decreased over the past several years with the closing of the counseling program and the reduction of the number of faculty due to state budget cuts (see Figure 5). However, with the recent additions to the faculty, the graduate program is beginning to grow once again.

As the faculty returns to a size it was a decade ago, we will need to have funds to support a corresponding increase in the number of graduate students. Similar to other major research universities, faculty on average supervise three graduate students at any one time, though this varies across area. Using this ratio as a base, an increase in the size of the faculty from 41 in 2009 to 48 this year to 51 next year will mean a desired net increase of 30 graduate students. Our department budget model assumes that it provides about 3 years of support (GTA) for a typical student and 2 years are provided externally (e.g., graduate fellowship, grant RA, national fellowship). Stated differently, on average, the department funds 1.8 students per faculty member and the faculty member funds 1.2. Thus, an increase of 10 faculty means an overall increase of 18 graduate student lines funded by the department and 12 on grants or fellowships. We anticipate that the new faculty hires will bring in additional grant funds to keep this model going, but to meet our goals will require the college to do its part.

A second reason additional GTA lines will be needed going forward involves the university conversion to semesters. Just as faculty course loads will drop from 4 quarter courses to 3 semester courses, graduate teaching responsibilities are likely to drop from 3 courses (one each quarter) to 2 (one each semester). This drop in the number of sections taught by each GTA can be made up either by increasing class size (difficult given the university classroom pool and our desire to enhance the undergraduate experience) or increasing the number of GTAs. Nicely, the increased number of faculty supports an increased number of GTAs that is similar to what is needed due to semester conversion.

**Departmental Faculty Hiring Plans.** As is made clear in the area self-study reports in Appendix C, the department has had “top 5” social and quantitative psychology programs for two decades. Maintaining the high status of these programs is a very important departmental priority and will be considered when faculty from these areas leave or retire over the next five years. In addition, the programs in behavioral neuroscience, clinical, and cognitive psychology have emerged as leading national contenders. The department aims to move these programs to Top 10 status as well. Doing this will likely require additional faculty especially in the clinical and behavioral neuroscience programs. These programs are currently well below their peers in number of faculty. Furthermore, given the size and quality of the clinical graduate program in particular, it could use additional faculty to better serve its graduate students. Although the clinical area has a healthy number of joint faculty who help in supervising students, these cannot replace the
on site mentorship and expertise that is provided by regular faculty. Additional faculty and the hiring of a staff psychologist to assist with clinical practicum supervision in the Department’s Psychological Services Center would also place more clinical faculty in front of undergraduate students. A search for a clinic supervisor is currently in progress.

In addition to a clinical faculty hire or two, adding 1-2 additional faculty within the BN program is also highly recommended. Ideally, faculty who study the cellular and molecular mechanisms underlying learning and memory (linking to the cognitive area) and the epigenetics of psychiatric illness (linking to the clinical area) would be found. The BN faculty are likely to be very involved in any new neuroscience or brain and behavior major administered by psychology. Importantly, there is room in the psychology building basement for 1-2 additional BN faculty who conduct research with animals and this customized animal space should be used fully for this purpose (i.e., it is connected to the ULAR facility). Currently, the department is searching for a faculty member with expertise in psychopathology. This individual is likely to affiliate with either the clinical or BN programs.

The cognitive program has been infused recently with three new hires who engage in brain and behavior studies and there is the potential for another hire to join them this year. This foray into cognitive neuroscience is timely and will help to improve the stature of this program, graduate recruitment efforts, and better link the area to others in the department. One missing type of expertise in the area is in the domain of human attention. A hire in this area would connect to the existing strengths within the area in cognitive neuroscience and computational modeling, and it would also have great promise of bridging to the work of current faculty in the behavioral neuroscience, clinical, and social programs. One challenge for the cognitive program in adding new faculty is the relatively small number of graduate students. As the cognitive area plan to increase the number of students becomes reality (see the cognitive area plan in Appendix C), an increase in faculty size becomes more feasible.

With respect to the remaining two areas, the developmental psychology program, with a few key hires, can also become a leading program nationally. It is anticipated that 1-2 hires would be requested in this area over the next few years as retirements in the area occur or new positions become available. Ideally, such hires would broaden the research expertise of the Developmental area, build on emerging strengths in the existing program, and link the developmental area further to others in the department (e.g., a hire in developmental neuroscience; infant perception/attention; biological foundations of development). There are already strong ties between the developmental and cognitive programs and further links to this and other areas are encouraged. Finally, we note that although programs in IDD are not common at peer institutions, our program is a nationally visible one. This area has a desire to expand somewhat, though positions would be funded by the Nisonger Center. The area strategic plans presented in Appendix C describe the specific rationales for these desired new faculty hires in greater detail.

The department will likely stand at 51 faculty by the end of this academic year if all current searches are successful. Based on a comparison with peer institutions (see Table 2 in Appendix A and earlier discussion), our goal is to grow to a size of 55 over the next 3-4 years. As explained above, the added faculty would likely specialize in aspects of behavioral neuroscience, clinical, and developmental psychological science with connections to one or more other programs in the department. Further enhancement of the cognitive program is also warranted, especially when the hire can contribute to a broader department, college, or university initiative (e.g., theoretical systems neuroscience). Relevant requests for a subset of these faculty hires will be made to the Arts and Sciences Executive Dean each year at the annual call for proposals.

**Cross Area and Interdisciplinary Connections.** Although the department has significant strengths in the core areas of psychology and aims to become even stronger, it is not possible to achieve the highest level of distinction in the field without consideration of interconnections among the areas and new fields of study. That is, we cannot rest on our laurels and traditions alone. Psychology is a dynamic field that is ever
Importantly, the department will not move forward simply by focusing on the specific core graduate training areas that exist currently. Research in psychology is increasingly interdisciplinary both within areas of psychology and across levels of analysis and departments on campus. Although for many years the program areas at Ohio State were somewhat insular with faculty being more likely to work with colleagues in other departments or colleges (e.g., medicine, engineering, political science) than colleagues in psychology, this is changing rapidly. In particular, although interdisciplinary work with faculty in other departments is still on the upswing, a major new development is the increasing number of faculty in the department who are working with fellow faculty in the department across area boundaries. The area reports outlined many of these connections. And, a subset of the proposed new faculty hires, though appointed in areas, are expected to work at the intersection of one or more areas.

Although the area reports in Appendix C mention specific and numerous examples of cross area and cross department collaboration, there are three cross cutting themes that the department and college as a whole have recognized as important to pursue and that have been pursued over the past several years: Integrative Neuroscience, Health, and Decision-making. Current faculty work in these three broad areas proceeds at various levels of analysis, from a focus on genetics and individual differences, to basic cognitive mechanisms, to life span issues, to social and cultural processes. This work also relies on various methodologies (e.g., involving both psychophysiological measurement and neuroimaging techniques) and an array of approaches (e.g., experimental, animal and computational models of human behaviors).

Progress in each of these cross areas is described next.

**Integrative Neuroscience.** Over the past 5-10 years, there has been a virtual explosion of interest in the neurosciences, the study of the functional organization of the brain. Psychologists have been key players in this emerging multidisciplinary field. Indeed, as a result of their research, we have begun to understand more and more about the neural underpinnings of cognitive, affective, motivational, and social behaviors. Many of the top psychology departments (e.g., Princeton, NYU) have developed strong brain and behavior programs and several also have their own imaging facilities. Although there are still many exciting developments in traditional areas of psychology, it is clear that a neuroscience perspective will figure prominently in major advances in many areas of psychological research in the future. At the time of our last strategic plan, there was consensus in the department that to continue our ascendance into the top ranks of departments of psychology, we needed to develop a greater presence in this area than we currently had.

For most of its history, a neuroscience perspective was represented almost exclusively in the department’s behavioral neuroscience (BN) program. A notable exception was the development of social neuroscience at Ohio State over a decade ago with former Professors Cacioppo (in social) and Berntson (in BN). More recently, however, the department has undertaken an “integrative neuroscience” initiative with the explicit goal of hiring faculty who bridge across the specific graduate program areas of the department and bring a biological (brain and genetics) perspective to the numerous topics studied by psychologists. Doing this has been a departmental goal for a long time but it was not until the approval and support of the new Arts and Sciences Human Brain Imaging facility that it could become a reality. Although other imaging facilities are available on campus and have been used by faculty on occasion, these facilities were not designed for research purposes and their use proved unsatisfactory. Fortunately, a research oriented imaging facility is currently under construction in the basement of the psychology building and is set to open in January, 2011. The opening of this facility will allow the department to realize its ambitions.

Building on a core small group of existing faculty who had conducted imaging studies in collaboration with colleagues elsewhere, over the past two years the department has hired four new faculty with imaging expertise (2 in cognitive, 1 in clinical, 1 in social). A fifth hire, Zhong-Lin Lu, will become the inaugural director of the imaging facility and arrive in Summer of 2011. Professor Lu is currently a Professor of psychology and co-Director of the Dornsife Cognitive Neuroscience Imaging Center at the University of Southern California. Dr. Lu is working with the department in a consulting capacity now and is already at work advising us on hiring personnel for the facility (e.g., physicist, lab tech) and preparing the IRB
documentation. Although our integrative neurosciences initiative will have an immediate impact on faculty collaboration and grant submissions, there are also preliminary discussions about creating a formal minor on this topic that would be open to graduate students in all program areas. The facility will also be available to faculty in other departments in Arts and Sciences and the university more generally. Bringing these faculty together will foster interdisciplinary work, and some psychology faculty are already organizing a monthly meeting of faculty across campus interested in imaging. The opening of the new imaging center and the new faculty it brings to the department will be transformative for the department, college, and university.

**Other Interdisciplinary Initiatives.** In addition to a strong emphasis on a neuroscience perspective that cuts across our traditional area boundaries, there are two other interdisciplinary initiatives that are part of the department’s strategic plan. These emerged from a prior planning effort in the department and an analysis at the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences regarding topics that are so fundamental and broad that they can contribute to multiple departments in the SBS college. These are health and decision making. A health psychology emphasis has long been a strong suit of the psychology department – especially within the clinical and BN areas. With the recent addition of two more faculty and an Ohio Eminent Scholar in this area, the department will have significant resources to compete with the best health psychology programs nationally. A challenge will be to link the individual faculty working in health into a more integrated collective that could eventually lead to a graduate training specialty in this area, large grant projects, etc. However, health interests now not only include clinical and BN faculty but also faculty in quantitative and social.

A similar case is true with respect to decision making. Although the department has a long tradition of having individual faculty who are well known for their research in this area, and the quantitative program has a JDM specialization offered to graduate students, the field of decision making crosses area boundaries. In addition to faculty in quantitative, faculty in the cognitive and social areas also make important contributions to this field and the time is ripe to consider a cross cutting graduate minor in this area as well.

The three cross cutting areas all have the potential to (1) capitalize on existing or emerging departmental synergies, (2) place the Department at the forefront of future developments in the field nationally, (3) break down traditional area boundaries leading to more collaboration, (4) increase training and research funding, and (5) provide dividends in recruitment of the very best undergraduate and graduate students into our programs. Finally, all three of these domains seem to represent areas that could attract private donations. That is, brain-behavior relationships, health and quality of life issues, and decision-making in applied contexts would seem particularly likely to capture the imagination and interest of the public. In sum, Departmental hiring priorities for the next five years will focus on maintaining, enhancing and extending our 6 core graduate programs as well as building significant expertise in the 3 cross cutting areas.

**Diversity.** As noted earlier in this report, although the department’s percentages of minority faculty and graduate students is comparable with national, disciplinary figures, the same is not true for gender – at least when it comes to the faculty. Stated simply, we are below the national averages and where we should be for the number of women on our faculty. Addressing the issue of gender representation as well as keeping our focus on minority hires is of paramount importance in all faculty searches. To ensure full consideration of woman and minority hires, all recent searches have included wide advertising, personal contacts when available, appointing a faculty member on each search committee specifically charged to examine this issue, and tracking of women and minorities (when possible) in the applicant pools.

These efforts are beginning to pay off. Over the last two years the department has conducted 10 different faculty searches and the data suggest the following. First, across all searches we received 455 applicants of which 47% were women, although this varied dramatically by search. For example, the developmental search in 08-09 had 73% women applicants and our two integrative neuroscience searches netted just 34% female applicants.
Table 6 presents the data by search regarding the percentage of the total number of interviewees who were woman and the percentage of the total hired who were women. Across the two years, 55% of the candidates interviewed were women and 50% of those hired were women. In addition, 11% of candidates interviewed had minority status, and 20% of those hired were minority individuals. To the extent that this rate can be continued or enhanced in future searches, much progress will be made in improving the faculty in terms of diversity.

Table 6: Interviewees in Psychology Searches (2008-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY 2008-2009 Search Title</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Number Hired</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Neuroscience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE - Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE - JDM Quantitative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE - JDM Social</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminent Scholar in Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY 2009-2010 Search Title</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Number Hired</th>
<th>Percent Women</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Neuroscience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fMRI Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Neuroscience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminent Scholar in Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE - Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 YEAR TOTALS** | **45** | **55.6%** | **11.1%** | **10** | **50%** | **20%** |

**Summary of Priorities.** In its most recent 5 year strategic plan prepared in 2008, the Department adopted 6 key goals. This self-study concludes with a brief review of and summary statement regarding the status of each of these stated goals.

- Make a significant improvement in the Department’s NRC rankings (move to Top 10 among public university departments by 2012). According to the latest US News and World Report survey, the department has met this goal for the first time by being ranked number 10 among public universities. Maintaining this position will require constant vigilance especially over the next 5 years as the department faces the prospect of retirements among some of its most visible and productive faculty. In some instances, it would be wise to make pre-emptory hires – replacing soon-to-retire faculty before they retire as these distinguished faculty can be used to recruit new eminent faculty to the department.

- Attract the top students nationally to our graduate programs. As documented in the section on our graduate program, the department has been very successful in attracting top students to its programs. The clinical and social programs attract the most applicants, but students admitted to all programs are well above national averages and comparable to those found at the very best institutions. The applicant numbers to the cognitive and BN programs are relatively low and can be improved. This will likely happen in cognitive with the new cognitive neuroscience emphasis and
the soon to open Brain Imaging facility. BN numbers are also likely to improve with the addition of more faculty. However, it should be noted that the BN faculty not only supervise psychology Ph.D. students but also graduate students in the University’s interdisciplinary neurosciences program.

✓ *Increase efforts to secure external funding.* Despite a shrinking faculty size, the department has shown a small increase in total dollars awarded during the last few years. As new faculty become successful, these dollars are likely to increase. Further, new faculty collaborations focused on imaging research are also likely to spur new grant dollars. Enhanced efforts have been made in private fund raising, and hopefully these activities will pay dividends in the future.

✓ *Enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience for psychology majors.* As documented in the undergraduate self-study, enrollments and majors are increasing at a rapid rate. This is due largely to the strong efforts on the part of the Associate Chair for Instruction to arrange for popular courses, the undergraduate advising office to provide outstanding service and programs, and the faculty and graduate students who show dedication in the classroom. The undergraduate major has been completely revamped for semester conversion and the new major technology fee has led to a significant enhancement in facilities and services for undergraduate majors in the department. The next important challenge and opportunity will likely be psychology’s development of a more biologically oriented major.

✓ *Enhance the quality of the graduate experience.* As explained in the graduate program report, the quality of graduate students and their placement is a source of department pride. Some areas are admitting and attracting the very best available students nationally and some areas have room for improvement. As the programs themselves enhance their stature, the pool of graduate student applicants is likely to increase in these programs, but the graduate program is currently in very good shape. The major challenge for the future will be to increase the graduate program size to fit the increasing size of the faculty.

✓ *Enhance the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students.* Progress in this area is not as rapid as desired, at least with respect to the faculty, but in the two years since the strategic plan was written, the department has hired 5 more women (50% of all hires) and 2 minority faculty (20% of all faculty). These percentages are higher than the current base representation in the department and are even higher than the national averages presented in the 2009-2010 APA Workforce Survey. If the department can keep to this pace going forward, or even exceed it somewhat, much progress will be made toward our goal of enhancing diversity.
APPENDIX A:

(FACULTY DATA)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Neuroscience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet Givens</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derick Lindquist</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Steinmetz <strong>(Executive Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences)</strong></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedetta Leuner <strong>(starts 1/2011)</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Wenk</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bruno</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Andersen</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Emery</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Strunk</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Cheavens</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Thayer</td>
<td>Professor <strong>(Ohio Eminent Scholar in Health Psychology)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vasey</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruchika Prakash</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Beck</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Petrov</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Bernhardt-Walther</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail McKoon</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Todd</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pitt <strong>(Associate Chair of Psychology)</strong></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Sederberg</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhong-Lin Lu <strong>(starts 6/2011)</strong></td>
<td>Professor <strong>(Director of Human Brain Imaging Lab)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jagacinski</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ratcliff</td>
<td>Professor <strong>(Distinguished Professor of SBS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Dennis</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gibbs</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Opfer</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Wagner</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Montemayor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Boysen</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Johnson</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Sloutsky</td>
<td>Professor <strong>(Director of Center for Cognitive Science)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDD (Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Lecavalier</td>
<td>Associate Professor <strong>(and Nisonger Center)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Tasse <strong>(Director of Nisonger Center)</strong></td>
<td>Professor <strong>(and Nisonger Center)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Aman</td>
<td>Professor <strong>(and Nisonger Center)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Peters</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Myung</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Browne</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Edwards</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike DeKay</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Betz</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cudeck</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Nygren (Associate Chair of Psychology)</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Van Zandt</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duane Wegener</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Weary (Divisional Dean of SBS)</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Crocker</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentaro Fujita</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Libby</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Petty (Psychology Department Chair)</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Way (starts 1/2011)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Arkin</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Fazio</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cunningham</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Faculty Size, Majors, and Majors per Faculty Member in the Virginia Tech Survey Ranked by Majors per Faculty Member (April, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>FTE faculty (tenure-line)</th>
<th># of undergrad majors</th>
<th>Majors per Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington- Seattle</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC -Berkeley</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Alabama</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>28.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia U</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Maryland-College Park</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>1755</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>41.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC - Davis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University, Tempe</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>53.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

1995 - 2005 ISI Citations and Productivity Rankings of Universities
(Institutions Ranked by Total Citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HARVARD UNIV</td>
<td>26544</td>
<td>2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNIV MICHIGAN</td>
<td>25069</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNIV CALIF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>22950</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STANFORD UNIV</td>
<td>21670</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNIV ILLINOIS URBANA</td>
<td>20793</td>
<td>1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNIV MINNESOTA</td>
<td>19969</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>YALE UNIV</td>
<td>19277</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UNIV PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>18990</td>
<td>1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UNIV WISCONSIN MADISON</td>
<td>17367</td>
<td>1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNIV WASHINGTON</td>
<td>17154</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UNIV PENN</td>
<td>15713</td>
<td>1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OHIO STATE UNIV</td>
<td>15362</td>
<td>1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>COLUMBIA UNIV</td>
<td>15092</td>
<td>1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>INDIANA UNIV</td>
<td>14962</td>
<td>1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UNIV CALIF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>14797</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4  Faculty Research Statistics by Program Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Number of Faculty (2009)</th>
<th>Number of Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Percent of Faculty with Tenure</th>
<th>Avg. No. of Journal Publications Per Faculty Member per Year (2007-2009)</th>
<th>Avg. No. of Internal Points per Faculty Member per Year (2007-2009)</th>
<th>Avg. No. of Citations per Faculty Member per Year (2007-2009)</th>
<th>Avg. No. of Citations per Tenured faculty member per Year (2007-2009)</th>
<th>Percent of Faculty with External Funding in Last 5 years</th>
<th>Average Grant $ generated per faculty in last 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Neuroscience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,557,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$923,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$830,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$499,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$389,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$211,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$423,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$623,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Faculty Editorial Positions (Current Faculty Only)

**Journal Editorships**

**Basic and Applied Social Psychology**
Robert Arkin (2002-2009)

**Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**

**Journal of Mathematical Psychology**
Jay Myung (2010-present)

**Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin**

**Physiological Psychology**
Gary Berntson (1983-1985)

**Social & Personality Psychology Compass: (Social Cognition Section Editor)**
Duane Wegener (2007-present)

**Journal Associate Editorships**

**American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities**
Marc Tassé (2009-present)

**American Journal on Mental Retardation**

**Annals of Behavioral Medicine**
Barbara Andersen (1990-1993)

**Applied Psychological Measurement**
Robert Cudeck (1995-present)

**Basic and Applied Social Psychology**
Duane Wegener (2005-2007)

**Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers**
Trisha Van Zandt (1994-1997)

**BioPsychoSocial Medicine**
Julian Thayer (2006-present)

**Cognitive Science**
Mark Pitt (2008-present)

**Comparative Education Review**
Vladimir Sloutsky (1994-1999)

**Emotion**

**Emotion Review**
Gary Berntson (2007-2009)
William Cunningham (2010-present)

**Human Factors**

**Journal of Adolescent Research**
Raymond Montemayor (1986-1988)

**Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology**

**Journal of Early Adolescence**
Raymond Montemayor (1983-1993)

**Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**
Russell H. Fazio (1998)

**Journal of Mathematical Psychology**
Trisha Van Zandt (2004-present)

**Journal of Mental Health in Intellectual Disabilities**
Michael Aman (2007-present)

**Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**

**Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology**
Gifford Weary (1982-1987)

**Music and Medicine**
Julian Thayer (present)

**Perception and Psychophysics**
Mark Pitt (2003-2006)

**Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin**
Robert Arkin (1985-1988)
Gifford Weary (1981-1984)
Duane Wegener (2000-2001)

**Physiological Psychology**
Gary Berntson (1978-1985)

**Psychological Science**

**Psychometrika**
Robert Cudeck (2005-present)

**Psychophysiology**

**Topics in Cognitive Science**
Vladimir Sloutsky (2007-present)
Journal Editorial Boards

**American Journal on Intellectual Disabilities**
Michael Aman (1998-present)

**Animal Learning and Behavior**
Sarah (Sally) Boysen (2001-2005)

**Annals of Behavioral Medicine**
Charles Emery (1991-1993; 2010-present)

**Applied Research in Mental Retardation**
Steven Beck (1984-1988)

**Archives of Sexual Behavior**
Barbara Andersen (2005-present)

**Assessment in Rehabilitation and Exceptionality**

**Autism Research and Treatment**
Michael Aman (2009-present)

**Basic and Applied Social Psychology**
Russell Fazio (1994-present)

**Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews**
John Bruno (2001-2005)

**Behavioral Medicine Abstracts**
Steven Beck (1984-1988)

**Behavioral Modifications**
Steven Beck (1984-present)

**Behavioral Neuroscience**
Bennet Givens (1999-2001)

**Behaviormetrika**
Michael Browne (2001-present)

**Behavior Research Methods, Instrumentation, and Computers**

**British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology**
Michael Browne (1981-1990)

**British Journal of Social Psychology**
Robert Arkin (1984-1987)

**Child Development**

**Clinical Medicine Insights: Pediatrics**
Michael Aman (2007-present)

**Clinical Medicine Insights: Psychiatry**
Michael Aman (2007-present)

**Contemporary Psychology**

**Developmental Neuroscience**
John Bruno (2006-2009)

**Developmental Psychobiology**

**Emotion**
William Cunningham (present)

**Encyclopedia of Career Development**
Nancy Betz (2004-2006)

**European Journal of Neuroscience**
John Bruno (2001-2007)

**Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience**
Gary Wenk (2009-present)

**Health Psychology**
Steven Beck (1989-1992)

**Human Factors**
Richard Jagacinski (1978-1979)

**Human Movement Science**
James Todd 1988-1999

**International Journal for Behavioral Development**

**International Journal of Psychophysiology**
Gary Berntson (2007-present)

**Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology**
Michael Vasey (2002-present)

**Journal of Adolescence**
Raymond Montemayor (1985-1997)

**Journal of Adolescent Research**
Raymond Montemayor (1993-2005)

**Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders**
Luc Lecavalier (2007-present)

**Journal of Behavioral Decision Making**
Hal Arkes (1988-present)
Ellen Peters (2010-present)

**Journal of Behavioral Education**

**Journal of Behavioral Medicine**
Charles Emery (2009-present)

**Journal of Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation**

**Journal of Career Assessment**
Nancy Betz (1991-present)
Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychopharmacology
Michael Aman (1990-present)

Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology
Michael Vasey (1999-present)

Journal of Comparative Psychology
Sarah (Sally) Boysen (1987-2002)

Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology
Barbara Andersen (1986-1989)

Journal of Consumer Psychology
Russell Fazio (1991-present)

Journal of Consumer Research

Journal of Counseling Psychology
Nancy Betz (1990-1992; 2001-present)
Tracy Tylka (2006-present)

Journal of Early Adolescence
Raymond Montemayor (1995-present)

Journal of Experimental Pharmacology
Michael Aman (2009-present)

Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance
James Todd (1983-present)

Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition
Trisha Van Zandt (2001-2004)

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
Russ Fazio (1980-97, 2003-present)
Richard Petty (1990-present)
Duane Wegener (2003-present)

Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences
Jennifer Cheavens (2010-present)

Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability
Michael Aman (1987-present)

Journal of Intelligent Systems
James Todd (1987-present)

Journal of Mathematical Psychology
Jay Myung (2001-2009)
Mark Pitt (2010-present)
Roger Ratcliff (1985-present)
Trisha Van Zandt (2004-present)

Journal of Mental Health Research in Intellectual Disability
Luc Lecavalier (2007-present)

Journal of Motor Behavior
Richard Jagacinski (1990-2004)

Journal of Near-Death Studies
John Gibbs (2001-present)

Journal of Neuroinflammation
Gary Wenk (2003-present)

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
Richard Petty (1979; 1983-present)
Duane Wegener (2002-present)

Journal of Psychosomatic Obstetrics and Gynecology
Barbara Andersen (1987-1995)

Journal of Sex Research
Barbara Andersen (1989-1992)

Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology
Barbara Andersen (1986-2002)
Gifford Weary (2002-present)

Journal of the Optical Society of America A, Topical Editor for Color
Delwin Lindsey (2009-present)

Journal of Vocational Behavior
Nancy Betz (1980-1983; 1990-present)

Judgment and Decision Making
Ellen Peters (2008-present)

Linguistics and Philosophy
Laura Wagner (2007-present)

Media Psychology
Richard Petty (1998-present)

Medical Decision Making
Ellen Peters (2007-present)

Memory and Cognition
Simon Dennis (2005-2006)

Multivariate Behavioral Research
Michael Browne (2007-present)
Neural Networks
James Todd (1988-present)

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
Hal Arkes (1989-present)

Perception & Psychophysics

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
Robert Arkin (1982-1984)
William Cunningham (2010-present)
Richard Petty (2009-present)
Gifford Weary (2005-2009)

Personality and Social Psychology Review
Richard Petty (1995-present)
Russ Fazio (2009-present)

Psychological Bulletin

Psychological Methods
Michael Browne (2005-present)
Michael Edwards (2009-present)

Psychological Review
Jennifer Crocker (2010-present)
Gifford Weary (1994-1997)

Psychological Science
Richard Petty (2006-2008)

Psychology and Marketing
Robert Arkin (2002-present)

Psychology of Women Quarterly

Psychometrika

Psychonomic Bulletin & Review
Mark Pitt (2006-present)
Trisha Van Zandt (2006-present)

Psychosomatic Medicine
Barbara Andersen (2004-2010)
Julian Thayer (2002-present)

Replications in Social Psychology
Robert Arkin (1974-1977)

Research in Developmental Disabilities
Michael Aman (1980-present)

Review of Social and Personality Psychology
Gifford Weary (1985-1989)

Social and Personality Psychology Compass
Russ Fazio (2007-present)

Social Cognition
William Cunningham (present)
Russ Fazio (1992-2000)

Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience
William Cunningham (present)

Social Neuroscience
William Cunningham (present)

Social Psychological and Personality Science
Jennifer Crocker (2009-present)
Kentaro Fujita (2009-present)
Russ Fazio (2009-present)
Duane Wegener (2009-present)

Social Psychology
Robert Arkin (1981-1984)

Social Psychology Quarterly
Russ Fazio (1979-1983)
Gifford Weary (1980-1984)

Structural Equation Modeling
Robert Cudeck (1992-present)

The Behavior Therapist
Daniel Strunk (2010-present)

The Journal of Sex Research
Terri Fisher (1994-present)

The Open Clinical Cancer Journal
Barbara Andersen (2007-present)
### Table 6: Faculty Awards, Presidencies, and Fellow Status (Current Faculty Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Awards</strong></th>
<th><strong>National Institute of Mental Health / NIH</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Academy on Mental Retardation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Independent Scientist / Development Award</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Scientist Award</td>
<td>Jennifer Crocker, 2000-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Association of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>MERIT Award</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Lecavalier, 2008</td>
<td>Roger Ratcliff, 1999-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Psychological Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior Scientist Award</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Scientific Award for an Early Career Contribution</td>
<td>Barbara Andersen, 2004-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Wegener, 2001</td>
<td>Roger Ratcliff, 1990-95; 2000-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguished Scientist Lecturer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Person Memory Interest Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Petty, 1999</td>
<td>Thomas M. Ostrom Award for Outstanding Lifetime Contributions to Social Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Boysen, 2000</td>
<td>Russell Fazio, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Career Award from Division 33</strong></td>
<td><strong>Society for Consumer Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Lecavalier, 2008</td>
<td>Distinguished Career Contribution in Consumer Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Holland Award for Research Integrating Career and Personality Psychology from Division 17</strong></td>
<td>Richard Petty, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Betz, 1993</td>
<td><strong>Society for Mathematical Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leona Tyler Award for Distinguished Lifetime Contribution to Counseling Psychology from Division 17</strong></td>
<td>New Investigator Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Betz, 2000</td>
<td>Jay Myung, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding Contributions to Health Psychology Award from Division 38</strong></td>
<td><strong>Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Andersen, 2003</td>
<td>Cattell Early Career Research Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Psychosomatic Society</strong></td>
<td>Robert Cudeck, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Award for Contributions to Psychosomatic Medicine</td>
<td><strong>Sells Lifetime Career Award for Distinguished Multivariate Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Thayer, 1996</td>
<td>Michael Browne, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Association for Decision Making</strong></td>
<td><strong>Society for Personality and Social Psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Beattie Scientific Recognition Award for Innovative Contributions to Decision Research</td>
<td>Donald T. Campbell Award for Distinguished Career Contribution to Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation for Social and Personality Psychology</strong></td>
<td>Russell Fazio, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Early Career Award</td>
<td><strong>Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cunningham, 2009</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Society for Self and Identity</strong></td>
<td>Jennifer Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Career Award</td>
<td><strong>Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Crocker</td>
<td>Jennifer Crocker, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISI Highly Cited Researcher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Society of Behavioral Medicine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Petty, 2003</td>
<td>Distinguished Mentor Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ratcliff, 2003</td>
<td>Charles Emery, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Academy of Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Society of Experimental Psychologists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troland Research Award</td>
<td>Warren Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ratcliff, 1986</td>
<td>Roger Ratcliff, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Society of Experimental Social Psychology
Scientific Impact Award
Richard Petty, 2009

Society of Vocational Psychology
Lifetime Achievement Award
Nancy Betz, 2009

The Ohio State University
Distinguished Lecturer Award
Gifford Weary, 1999
Barbara Andersen, 2003

Distinguished Scholar Award
Gifford Weary, 1984
Richard Petty, 1995
Barbara Andersen, 2000
Russell Fazio, 2008
Roger Ratcliff, 2010

Distinguished Teaching Award
Nancy Betz
Sarah Boysen, 1996
John Bruno, 1994

Honors Faculty Service Award
Richard Jagacinski, 2009

Joan N. Huber Faculty Fellow
Nancy Betz, 2001
James Todd, 2004
John Bruno, 2005
Mark Pitt, 2007
Gary Wenk, 2009
Vladimir Sloutsky, 2010

Presidencies:
Academy of Behavioral Medicine Research
Julian Thayer, 2010

American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities
Marc Tassé, 2004-2008; 2011

International Behavioral Neuroscience Society
John Bruno, 2001-2002

International Society for Self and Identity
Jennifer Crocker, 2006-2009

Midwestern Psychological Association
Richard Petty, 2007

Psychometric Society
Michael Browne, 1992
Robert Cudeck, 2004

Rocky Mountain Bioengineering Symposium
Julian Thayer, 2008

Society for Mathematical Psychology
Jay Myung, 2001-2002
Trish Van Zandt, 2006-2007

Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology
Michael Browne, 1998
Robert Cudeck, 1995

Society for Personality and Social Psychology
Gifford Weary, 1998
Richard Petty, 2009
Jennifer Crocker, 2010

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Jennifer Crocker 2000-2001

South African Statistical Association
Michael Browne, 1978

Fellowship Honors:
Academy of Behavioral Medicine Research
Barbara Andersen
Charles Emery
Julian Thayer

American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Richard Petty

American Association for Applied Psychology
Richard Petty
Gifford Weary

American Association for the Advancement of Science
Barbara Andersen
Sarah Boysen
Richard Petty
Gary Wenk

American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation
Charles Emery

American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities
Marc Tassé

American Psychological Association
Barbara Andersen
Robert Arkin
Nancy Betz
Jennifer Crocker
Robert Cudeck
Charles Emery
Russell Fazio
Richard Jagacinski
Raymond Montemayor
Richard Petty
Gifford Weary
Duane Wegener
**Association for Psychological Science**
Robert Arkin
Nancy Betz
Jennifer Crocker
Russell Fazio
Richard Jagacinski
Susan Johnson
Richard Petty
Roger Ratcliff
Vladimir Sloutsky
Michael Vasey
Gifford Weary
Duane Wegener
**International Behavioral Neuroscience Society**
John Bruno
**International Society for Self and Identity**
Robert Arkin
**Midwestern Psychological Association**
Robert Arkin
Russell Fazio
Richard Petty
Gifford Weary
Duane Wegener
**Pavlovian Society**
Derick Lindquist
**Society of Behavioral Medicine**
Charles Emery
Julian Thayer
**Society of Experimental Psychologists**
Roger Ratcliff
**Society of Experimental Social Psychology**
Robert Arkin
Jennifer Crocker
William Cunningham
Lisa Libby
Russell Fazio
Richard Petty
Gifford Weary
Duane Wegener
**Society for Consumer Psychology**
Richard Petty
**Society for General Psychology**
Russell Fazio
**Society for Neuroscience**
Derick Lindquist
**Society for Personality and Social Psychology**
Jennifer Crocker
Russell Fazio
Richard Petty
Duane Wegener
**Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues**
Jennifer Crocker
**South African Statistical Association**
Michael Browne
Table 7: Big 10 Median Salary Survey and Faculty Size (2009-2010)

**Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Median $</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minnesota</td>
<td>152,292</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan</td>
<td>145,305</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Northwestern</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan St.</td>
<td>134,060</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Iowa</td>
<td>128,480</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Penn State</td>
<td>127,028</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indiana</td>
<td>126,193</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wisconsin</td>
<td>119,370</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Illinois</td>
<td>107,684</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Purdue</td>
<td>101,036</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Associate Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Median $</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan St.</td>
<td>102,900</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minnesota</td>
<td>89,826</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northwestern</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan</td>
<td>87,005</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Penn State</td>
<td>81,936</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Iowa</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,708</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Illinois</td>
<td>77,321</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wisconsin</td>
<td>77,122</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indiana</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Purdue</td>
<td>69,407</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assistant Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Median $</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan St.</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Penn State</td>
<td>74,628</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minnesota</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iowa</td>
<td>72,800</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Northwestern</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wisconsin</td>
<td>69,394</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Michigan</td>
<td>69,229</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Illinois</td>
<td>68,665</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purdue</td>
<td>68,388</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Indiana</td>
<td>67,327</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 8: Faculty Committee Structure and Membership (2009-2010)**

(* = committee chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDING COMMITTEES</th>
<th>GRADUATE STUDIES &amp; STIPENDS:</th>
<th>LIAISON POSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMISSIONS:</td>
<td>*Vasey (Grad Studies Chair)</td>
<td>A&amp;S Senate = Pitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ratcliff (Cog)</td>
<td>*Givens (BN) (Stipends Chair)</td>
<td>(Alt., Todd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaevens (Clin)</td>
<td>Aman (IDD)</td>
<td>Computer Lab = Pitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekay (Qnt)</td>
<td>Andersen (Clin)</td>
<td>Honors = Bruno/Paulsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens (BN)</td>
<td>Myung (Qnt)</td>
<td>ILACUC = Berntson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecavalier (IDD)</td>
<td>Opfer (Dev)</td>
<td>(Alt., Givens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby (Soc)</td>
<td>Petty (Soc)</td>
<td>Library = Cudek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opfer (Dev)</td>
<td>Ratcliff (Cog)</td>
<td>SBS Curriculum = Opfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Architect = Nygren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVERSITY, RECRUITMENT, &amp; RETENTION:</th>
<th>PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (Elected):</th>
<th>FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Betz (Qnt)</td>
<td>*Petty (Admin)</td>
<td>Behavioral Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boysen</td>
<td>Arkes (Grp 2; 09-11)</td>
<td>*Gary Wenk (Chair, BN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheavens (Clin)</td>
<td>Bruno (Grp 2; 08-10)</td>
<td>Ben Givens (BN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis (Cog)</td>
<td>Fazio (Grp 1; 08-10)</td>
<td>Barb Andersen (Clin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujita (Soc)</td>
<td>Lindsey (Reg; 08-10)</td>
<td>Gail McKoon (Cog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montemayor (Dev)</td>
<td>Vasey (Grp 1; 09-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT &amp; TECH SERVICES:</th>
<th>PSYCH. SERVICES:</th>
<th>Eminent Scholar in Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Berntson (BN) (Equipment Chair)</td>
<td>*Beck (Clin)</td>
<td>*Rich Petty (Chair, Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Todd (Cog) (Tech Services Chair)</td>
<td>Cheavens (Clin)</td>
<td>Russ Fazio (Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudek (Qnt)</td>
<td>Strunk (Clin)</td>
<td>Mike Vasey (Clin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham (Soc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Browne (Qnt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (Dev)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHICS:</th>
<th>RESEARCH EXP. (REP):</th>
<th>Health Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Arkes (Qnt)</td>
<td>*Nygren (Qnt)</td>
<td>*Charles Emery (Chair, Clin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boysen</td>
<td>Cunningham (Soc)</td>
<td>Mike DeKay (Qnt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs (Dev)</td>
<td>Fujita (Soc)</td>
<td>Julian Thayer (Clin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer (Clin)</td>
<td>Wagner (Dev)</td>
<td>Lisa Libby (Soc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Area Coordinators):</th>
<th>SPEAKERS:</th>
<th>Integrative Neuroscience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN - Wenk</td>
<td>*Gibbs (Dev)</td>
<td>*Rich Petty (Admin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical - Emery</td>
<td>Edwards (Qnt)</td>
<td>Gary Berntson (BN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive - McKoon</td>
<td>Fujita (Soc)</td>
<td>John Bruno (BN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental - Opfer</td>
<td>Petrov (Cog)</td>
<td>Wil Cunningham (Soc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD - LeCavalier</td>
<td>Strunk (Clin)</td>
<td>Simon Dennis (Cog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative - Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Opfer (Dev)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social - Fazio</td>
<td>*Paulsen (Advising)</td>
<td>Ruchika Prakash (Clin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Paulsen (Advising)</td>
<td>Arkin (Soc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruno (BN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carroll (Reg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

(UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM DATA)
### Table 1. Undergraduate Enrollment Trends by Credit Hours: 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Tier</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>Change 01-10</th>
<th>% Change 01-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 &amp; 200 level</td>
<td>28615</td>
<td>26680</td>
<td>26380</td>
<td>24705</td>
<td>23460</td>
<td>24230</td>
<td>25315</td>
<td>27085</td>
<td>26399</td>
<td>-2216</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 &amp; 400 level</td>
<td>17461</td>
<td>20241</td>
<td>22587</td>
<td>23935</td>
<td>27109</td>
<td>28540</td>
<td>30461</td>
<td>33275</td>
<td>35595</td>
<td>18134</td>
<td>103.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 &amp; 600 level</td>
<td>15011</td>
<td>16988</td>
<td>16720</td>
<td>16249</td>
<td>16241</td>
<td>15839</td>
<td>17740</td>
<td>18984</td>
<td>18545</td>
<td>3534</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61087</td>
<td>63909</td>
<td>65687</td>
<td>64889</td>
<td>66810</td>
<td>68609</td>
<td>73516</td>
<td>79344</td>
<td>80539</td>
<td>19452</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate Psychology Enrollment: 2001-2010

- 100 & 200 level
- 300 & 400 level
- 500 & 600 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>22,642</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>26,484</td>
<td>28,559</td>
<td>29,902</td>
<td>28,428</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>46,630</td>
<td>49,358</td>
<td>52,964</td>
<td>56,340</td>
<td>58,925</td>
<td>57,720</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>64,905</td>
<td>64,230</td>
<td>62,842</td>
<td>64,092</td>
<td>65,527</td>
<td>67,166</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>26,109</td>
<td>26,104</td>
<td>26,453</td>
<td>26,429</td>
<td>24,385</td>
<td>22,796</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>46,684</td>
<td>51,689</td>
<td>48,473</td>
<td>46,528</td>
<td>43,769</td>
<td>40,890</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>65,657</td>
<td>64,889</td>
<td>66,280</td>
<td>68,370</td>
<td>72,695</td>
<td>78,474</td>
<td>80,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>62,353</td>
<td>60,797</td>
<td>56,771</td>
<td>56,797</td>
<td>55,960</td>
<td>52,160</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEECH AND HEARING SCIENCE</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>5,813</td>
<td>6,819</td>
<td>7,979</td>
<td>9,278</td>
<td>11,830</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data unavailable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych Majors</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Students</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>116.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National/Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Minors</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>201.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Hearing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5: Grade Distribution for Selected Introductory GEC Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Au06</th>
<th>Wi07</th>
<th>Sp07</th>
<th>Au07</th>
<th>Wi08</th>
<th>Sp08</th>
<th>Au08</th>
<th>Wi09</th>
<th>Sp09</th>
<th>Au09</th>
<th>Wi10</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Undergraduate Research in Psychology Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Skill Achieved</th>
<th>% Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% Range from 2006-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More aware of ethical issues</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83 - 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to communicate purpose of study</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87 - 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to describe research design</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85 - 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased understanding of data analysis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75 - 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to communicate findings</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 - 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger appreciation of research</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87 - 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:

(Program Area Self Study Reports and Brief Faculty Biographies)
(1) BEHAVORIAL NEUROSCIENCE AREA SELF-STUDY  
(Gary Wenk, Area Coordinator)

BN Mission and Goals. The mission of the Behavioral Neuroscience (BN) Area is consistent with the mission of the Department of Psychology as a whole. A core element of that mission is building a world-class faculty and with that, achieving recognition that the department is a top 10 department nationally. Essentially, that means improving our research visibility and profile, maintaining and improving our graduate program, and continuing to enhance our undergraduate program. In terms of our priorities, high quality is our primary consideration.

Our major goal is to bring the BN Area, the Department of Psychology, and the University further into national prominence, by enhancing the focus on the biological determinants of behavior. Important in this development will be expansion of the core faculty and resources in the field of behavioral neuroscience. Although there is existing strength in the BN area, it has the smallest number of faculty in a core area within the Department of Psychology. Training and research in BN is central to the Psychology Department as the biological determinants of behavior represent a common thread running through each of the subareas of psychology. Consequently, a strong BN program is a key to reaching departmental eminence. In order to further enhance the eminence of the department, additional faculty and resources are necessary to maintain and strengthen BN and to continue to promote integration of this central focus with other areas of the department.

BN Area Focus and Quality. The levels of analyses in BN range from molecular to social neuroscience. Significant advances in the major branches of neuroscience research, including molecular and cellular and behavioral genetics, increasingly demand multi-disciplinary approaches. In line with these developments there is increasing recognition of the importance of integrating the behavioral neuroscience perspective into psychology and in establishing interdisciplinary links both inside and outside the department.

Each faculty member’s research has high translational value, as indicated by the consistently high levels of federal funding over the past decade despite the precipitous drop in federal funding to approximately 8% of submitted grants.

As of October 1, 2010, the core faculty in BN is John Bruno, Bennet Givens, Derick Lindquist and Gary Wenk. Gary Berntson became emeritus faculty in 2010 and will continue to participate in area teaching for the next three years. Benedetta Leuner recently accepted an offer from the department and will join the faculty in January, 2011. She will contribute to the BN mission by bringing expertise in the area of endocrine and experiential regulation of structural plasticity in the adult brain with a view toward uncovering the functional consequences of structural plasticity. The BN Professors are highly distinguished and widely recognized. The productivity of the BN Area full professors is documented by the impressive publication record of its faculty. Since 2007, the BN faculty has had an average annual publication rate of 3 peer-reviewed papers per faculty member. These publications were cited an average of 255 times per year; the highest citation rate of any area in the department.

The BN faculty publishes in a wide range of refereed, high impact journals, aimed at both general and specialty audiences. Among these are highly prestigious journals, including the American Psychologist, Biological Psychiatry, Experimental Neurology, Journal of Neuroscience, Molecular Psychiatry, Nature Reviews Neuroscience, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Psychological Review, Synapse, Journal of Neuroscience and Trends in Neuroscience. The mean
impact rating was 3.1 for the journals in which BN faculty published. This average impact score is placed within the top 10% of journals in the general psychology category, as well as every specialized subcategory.

The BN faculty has also been very active in procuring external funding. In a climate of increasing competition and funding difficulties, the BN faculty members have exhibited a steady increase in grant dollars. All of the tenured faculty in the BN area currently has external funding.

**BN Area Undergraduate Teaching.** Even though the area is small, BN faculty are active in pursuing excellence in instruction, and are superior teachers as a whole. The BN area faculty offer the following courses to undergraduate students: Psych 305 (Drugs and Behavior; 4 cr), Psych 313 (Behavioral Neuroscience; 5 cr), Psych 501 (Advanced Behavioral Neuroscience; 4 cr), Psych 513 (Introduction to Cognitive Neuroscience; 4 cr), Psychology 600 (Psychobiology of Learning and Memory; 4 cr); Psychology 601 (Comparative Psychology; 4 cr), Psychology H613 (Biological Psychiatry; 4 cr), Psychology 623 (Biological Clocks and Behavior; 3 cr), Psychology 644 (Hormones and Behavior; 3 cr), Psychology 650 (Psychobiology of Stress; 3 cr), Psych H783.01 (Honors Research; 3 cr), Psychology 726 (Seminar in Behavioral Neuroscience; 4 cr). These courses are quite popular with the undergraduates and have consistently high enrollments each quarter.

**BN Graduate Training.** The strength of graduate applicants and of those admitted to the BN Program is highly competitive. The program typically competes for students with the leading neuroscience programs in the country. Our competitiveness is challenged by the small size of our program which is dictated by the small number of faculty in BN. Our students’ success in obtaining prestigious post-doctoral and faculty positions positions attests to the high quality of the students BN trains.

Our faculty has trained an average of 10 graduate students per year over the last seven years. The graduate training program consists of a series of "Core Courses" that all BN students are required to take, regardless of specific area of interest. In addition, the students are required to take a minimum of three courses or seminars that cover a wide range of areas of research in BN as they are represented by the faculty members of the program. Additional coursework will be tailored to the individual student in consultation with the advisor. The core courses include: Survey of Behavioral Neuroscience (Psych 806, 807, 808); Seminar in Experimental Psychology: Research in Behavioral Neuroscience (Psych 811); Statistics (Psych 826, 827); Neuroanatomy (Neuroscience 725); Neuropharmacology (Pharm 824) and Introduction to Behavioral Neuroscience (Psych 726); The Seminar in Experimental Psychology: Research in Behavioral Neuroscience course serves as BN’s program course and includes: student presentations; courses on ethics and scientific conduct, grant writing and professional survival skills; electronic instrumentation course; presentations by invited speakers; and an annual poster session. The course is offered three times a year and BN students are expected to participate continually. An important measure of the effectiveness of our training program is the ability to place recent graduates into the job market or high quality post-doctoral experiences.

We have a good track record in placing our PhD recipients and post-doctoral trainees. The multi-disciplinary nature of our field dictates that recent graduates obtain post-doctoral training (typically 3-6 years) if they desire a faculty position at a major research university, and we have done well in securing such training opportunities. We have had twelve students receive their Ph.D. over the last seven years. All took initial post-doctoral positions. These included postdoctoral positions at: University of Chicago, University of Michigan, University of Colorado,
Emory University, Princeton University, and Columbia University, Illinois Wesleyan University, SUNY Albany, and Virginia Commonwealth University.

It is important to note that BN faculty contributes in a major way to teaching courses in the interdisciplinary Neuroscience graduate program. For example, BN faculty have primary responsibility for organizing and extending the Behavioral Neuroscience course (Psychology 726) to new BN graduate students, as well as to students from the clinical and cognitive areas, nursing, engineering and computational science programs. This course is taught each spring quarter. Two newly designed courses are being offered during the next year. Psychology H613 offers a biological perspective to the graduate students from the clinical program in the department; this course satisfies a component of their licensure. Psychology 806 – Survey of Behavioral Neuroscience I, is the first in a three quarter sequence surveying behavioral neuroscience with an emphasis on neurophysiology, the integration of neuronal signaling, and the emergence of higher functions. Psychology 807 - Survey of Behavioral Neuroscience II, is the second of the two quarter sequence surveying behavioral neuroscience with an emphasis on the age-related changes in the brain, consequences of brain damage and the dementias.

The courses that are open to graduate students include Psychology 600 (Psychobiology of Learning and Memory; 4 cr); Psychology 601 (Comparative Psychology; 4 cr), Psychology H613 (Biological Psychiatry; 4 cr), Psychology 623 (Biological Clocks and Behavior; 3 cr), Psychology 644 (Hormones and Behavior; 3 cr), Psychology 650 (Psychobiology of Stress; 3 cr) and Psych H783.01 (Honors Research; 3cr); Psychology 726 (Seminar in Behavioral Neuroscience; 4 cr), Psychology 806 (Survey of Behavioral Neuroscience I; 3 cr), Psychology 807 (Survey of Behavioral Neuroscience II; 3 cr) and Psych 811 (Advanced Seminar in Behavioral Neuroscience; 2 cr).

**BN Interdisciplinary Connections and Outreach.** The BN Area, with its expertise in behavioral neuroscience, represents the central hub of the interdisciplinary focus on brain-behavior research at OSU and provides the critical integrative perspective that can serve to link faculty within the Department with the broader interdisciplinary programs on campus. For example, Drs. Bruno and Wenk collaborate on a project to study the role of brain inflammation upon glutamate dysfunction and Drs. Sloutsky and Berntson share a grant to study developmental psychology. Due to the limiting factor of the need for highly specialized laboratory space, BN strives for excellence in a few research areas that can share resources efficiently, rather than comprehensive coverage of the vast field of behavioral neuroscience. These areas of specialization include psychopharmacology, psychophysiology and psychoneuroimmunology.

The core areas of behavioral neuroscience in which we are in the greatest need of building is the cellular and molecular mechanisms underlying learning and memory and the epigenetics of psychiatric illness. By developing these key areas, new avenues will open for collaborative research and training among the Cognitive Science Center, the Institute for Behavioral Medicine Research, the Neuroscience Graduate Studies Program, and the Center for Molecular Neurobiology.

The BN faculty has a particularly strong history of interdisciplinary involvement in research and training programs extending across departments. This is indicated by joint appointments of BN Faculty in the Departments of Neuroscience, Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, Ecology Evolution and Organismal Biology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and in the School of Public Health. In addition, the majority of the current BN faculty are members of interdisciplinary programs, including the Center for Biomedical Engineering, Center for Biotechnology, Center for Cognitive Science, Medical Scientist Program, Institute for Behavioral
Medicine Research, and the Neuroscience Graduate Studies Program. These and other collaborative ties have resulted in extramural funds supporting research and student training in areas as diverse as pediatric endocrinology, neuropharmacology, and psychoneuroimmunology.

Our Community Outreach Programs include a yearly demonstration (8 hrs per day for 5 days) at the Center Of Science and Industry (COSI) during Brain Awareness Week by grad students and faculty. The goal is to expose school age children to the wonder and excitement of the brain through books, puzzles and games.

**BN Strengths and Weaknesses.** The Behavioral Neuroscience faculty as a whole excels in research productivity and grant support particularly given the small number of faculty. Importantly, such activity is not at the expense of teaching and service. Our faculty routinely receives excellent teaching evaluations and continues to be successful in training students at all levels. Our faculty also make numerous and important professional/service contributions both within and outside the University, and are the frequent recipients of awards and recognitions as highlighted in Table 6, Appendix A.

For the future, the BN area is poised to move from an exceptionally strong program to one of national prominence. In order to remain competitive and achieve such prominence, however, we need at least two additional core BN faculty.

**BN Area Strategic Plan.** At present, BN has insufficient faculty size to competitively pursue multi-PI program grants or to maintain quality undergraduate and graduate training programs. The department must hire additional core BN faculty. Without new hires, the post-doctoral and graduate student quality in Psychology and enrollment would likely drop; this would ultimately jeopardize productivity and chances of both non-competitive and competitive grant renewals. Furthermore, a decline in the quality of the program would make it difficult to retain highly productive faculty in the future. First, the faculty of the BN area has determined that we need to hire someone who does high quality behavioral genetics, such as epigenetic models of psychiatric disorders. Second, we need to hire someone who has expertise in molecular psychopharmacology as it relates to learning and memory issues. These are two critical areas that are lacking in coverage and also areas that would readily synergize with several of our current area research programs as well as with others both inside and outside of our department. These are also areas that are cornerstones of contemporary BN and represented within the best of BN programs nationally. Finally, these hires would lead to additional collaborations with other integrative neuroscientists within the department who use the neuroimaging center.

**BRIEF BN AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES**

1. **John P. Bruno** (Professor, Ph.D., 1980, The Johns Hopkins University, Behavioral Neuroscience). Professor Bruno studies the neurobiology of cognitive deficits seen in schizophrenia with a goal of developing cognition enhancing medications. Using validated animal models, we identify the developing neural systems, and associated neurotransmitter systems, that become dysregulated in the disease. We characterize the neurochemical interactions that are disrupted during this abnormal development and the ensuing deficits in cognitive behavior. We then determine the effects of novel therapeutics for promoting cognition in these animal models and in patients. Dr. Bruno has served as President of the International Behavioral Neuroscience Society and is author of over 200 publications. He currently is PI on 2 NIH grants.

2. **Benedetta Leuner** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2005, Rutgers University, Biopsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience). Dr. Leuner joined the department after receiving an individual
National Research Service Award for postdoctoral studies at Princeton University. Her research examines the endocrine and experiential regulation of structural plasticity in the adult brain with a view toward uncovering the functional consequences of structural plasticity. She has received the Society for Behavioral Neuroendocrinology Young Investigator Award and is author of over 15 publications. She currently is PI on a K99 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.

3. Bennet Givens (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1989, University of North Carolina, Neurobiology). Dr. Givens investigates the neural basis of cognitive processes by combining neurophysiological recording techniques and pharmacological manipulations with an analysis of operant behavior in rats. A major focus has been on the role of brain oscillations, especially at the theta frequency, on mechanism of memory as well as the effects of alcohol on these memory processes. He is author of over 44 publications and currently is PI on an NIH grant to investigate the effect of alcohol on the mechanisms of memory encoding and retrieval.

4. Derick H. Lindquist: (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2004, Yale University). Dr. Lindquist joined the department after postdoctoral fellowships at the University of Kansas and Indiana University, where he received a National Research Service Award for postdoctoral studies. He utilizes emotional and motor classical conditioning in rats to examine the neurodevelopmental consequences of early ethanol exposure (modeling fetal alcohol syndrome) and to characterize conditioning deficits in the temporal dimension, similar to those seen in schizophrenic patients. He is the author of 14 papers, including 9 peer-reviewed articles, and is a fellow of the Society of Neuroscience and the Pavlovian Society.

5. Gary L. Wenk (Professor, Ph.D., 1980, University of Cincinnati, Neurotoxicology). Dr. Wenk studies the consequences of chronic brain inflammation and animal models of Alzheimer's disease. He is author of about 200 publications and is currently the PI on an NIH grant. Dr. Wenk has been member of several federal grant panels and is a fellow in the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He has been interviewed about his work by many magazines and radio stations, including National Public Radio, CBS News, & CNN. He was interviewed recently by Lucasfilm, Ltd. and Amanada Productions for a 2-hr TV documentary on the topic of cognitive enhancers.

(2) CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY AREA SELF-STUDY
(Charles Emery, Area Coordinator)

Clinical Area Mission and Goals. The mission of the clinical program is to advance clinical psychological science for understanding and treating problems of human behavior, affect, cognition, and psychological or psychophysiological aspects of physical health problems. Our mission includes: 1) advancing empirical research and theory in clinical science, as well as developing and evaluating psychological therapies; 2) mentoring pre-doctoral and post-doctoral trainees in conducting research in clinical science and clinical health psychology; 3) educating undergraduate students in the historical and contemporary contributions of clinical science to understanding and addressing problems of human behavior, and the interaction of psychological processes in health conditions/illnesses; 4) fostering the application of advances in clinical science; and 5) disseminating knowledge in clinical science to practitioners, scientists, policy-makers, and consumers.

The Clinical Psychology program at OSU is grounded in a clinical scientist framework with a primary focus on conceptualizing and treating psychopathology. Doctoral students focus their work on either adults or children, emphasizing either traditional clinical issues (e.g., anxiety disorders) or issues in health psychology (e.g., psychosocial aspects of cancer). For all clinical
students, training emphasizes: 1) contributions to empirical knowledge and theoretical understanding of factors in the etiology and clinical course of human problems of behavior, affect, and cognition, and 2) development, validation, and use of techniques for the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of such problems and for promoting adaptive functioning. Students focusing on psychopathology develop specializations in one or more aspects of such disorders. For students with a health psychology focus, emphases include: 1) contributions to understanding the etiology, prevention and treatment of and recovery from medical illness; 2) determining factors contributing to positive health behaviors and lifestyles; and 3) developing and validating behavioral approaches to maintaining and promoting good health, assisting those with medical illnesses, and contributing to reductions in morbidity and mortality.

**Clinical Area Focus and Quality.** Current faculty research interests include psychopathology (anxiety, mood, and personality disorders), other adjustment problems (e.g., sexual dysfunction), the role of cognitive factors in emotion regulation and dysregulation across the lifespan, and clinical trials of empirically based therapies (e.g., cognitive-behavioral, biobehavioral, mindfulness). Health psychology emphases include cancer, cardiovascular and pulmonary disorders, stress and coping, psychoneuroimmunology, cardiovascular psychophysiology, neuropsychology, affective neuroscience, and the influence of health behaviors (e.g., exercise).

According to the 2008 *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, the clinical program at OSU is in the top 25% of programs nationwide (ranked 33 out of 135 Clinical Psychology Ph.D. programs). Importantly, the program is included in the Academy of Psychological Clinical Science, a select alliance of training programs that are committed to, and have an established record of, the training of clinical scientists. Consistent with this, faculty are highly productive investigators with an excellent track record of external grant funding. Current data show the publication rate per year/person to be 6.16 (the national average for clinical Ph.D. programs is 2 per year/person). In addition, the clinical area faculty were awarded more than $7 million in external grant funds during the past 5 years, a testament to the long-term research strength of our clinical science program.

Further visibility and national reputation of the clinical faculty is evident in appointments to journal editorial boards and grant panels, and election to society leadership. The majority (88%) of the clinical faculty currently serve on one or more editorial boards of prominent journals in the field (e.g., *Psychosomatic Medicine, Journal of Gerontology, Annals of Behavioral Medicine, Behavior Therapist*, see Table 5, Appendix A). One faculty member is a current recipient of an NIH K05 career award and four of the faculty members (50%) currently serve on NIH grant review panels. One faculty member was recently elected President of the Academy of Behavioral Medicine Research and two other faculty members have previously been elected officers in national organizations in psychology. The full professors in the area are Fellows of one or more national organizations (e.g., American Psychological Association, Association for Psychological Science; see Table 6, Appendix A).

The clinical area faculty represents diverse cultural backgrounds. Among the 8 faculty are one Asian woman and one African-American man. Overall, 3 of the 8 faculty (38%) are female with the remaining 4 (50%) Caucasian males.

**Clinical Area Involvement in Undergraduate Education.** The clinical area faculty is fully engaged in undergraduate teaching. Faculty teach a large number of popular, high-enrollment undergraduate courses including Positive Psychology, Abnormal Psychology, Psychology of Adjustment, Personality, Health Psychology, Clinical Psychological Science, Human Sexuality, and Psychology of Aging and Health. Due to the high demand for courses such as Abnormal
Psychology, clinical faculty also provide supervision of advanced doctoral students assigned by
the department to teach additional sections of such courses. Quality of undergraduate teaching is
excellent as reflected by overall average SEIs of 4.44 (on our 5-point scale). Consistent with
those ratings, in recent years two clinical faculty members have received the annual department
award for exceptional teaching. In addition to classroom teaching, all clinical faculty members
routinely supervise undergraduate students participating in research activities in faculty
laboratories, and all clinical faculty have supervised undergraduate honors theses. During the past
five years, clinical faculty members have served as advisors for 24 undergraduate theses, and
have served as committee members for another 14 theses. These are impressive numbers in that
the clinical area only recently increased from 5 to 8 within the past 3 years.

Clinical Area Graduate Program. The clinical program has consistently accounted for
approximately 50% of the Department’s applicant pool (N/year is 400 to 500 applicants). Of the
200-250 applicants, admission is extremely competitive, a 5-10% rate, with a range of 5-12 new
students per year. Admitted students have demonstrated excellent undergraduate performance,
with an average GPA of 3.71 among students admitted during the past 5 years.

Since its inception, the clinical training program has been APA accredited. There is a rigorous
core curriculum (lasting 1.5 years). It consists of the core of clinical psychology (e.g.,
psychopathology, cognitive behavior therapy, personality) with an equally substantive element of
research design and methodology (i.e., research design, psychometrics, 4 course requirement in
statistics). Students must also complete coursework required for APA accreditation, involving
courses in domains of psychology (developmental, and psychobiology, cognitive, and social).
Students begin required clinical practica in the second year and continue in clinical externships
during their 3rd and 4th years. Students are required to complete a one-year, full-time internship in
clinical psychology. Students are successful in both securing internships at the top training sites
(e.g., Duke, Brown, UCLA), with the majority then going on to competitive postdocs at research
universities or large medical centers (e.g., GIVE a prominent child placement).

It should be noted that faculty advisors in our doctoral program include not only the core faculty
(i.e., those with primary appointments in Psychology) but also clinical psychologists with joint
appointments in Psychology. These faculty members contribute to the mission of the doctoral
program in various ways (e.g., teaching graduate seminars or providing clinical supervision) and
allow us to compensate in some ways for the fact that our core faculty is smaller than is typical
for clinical doctoral programs. These joint faculty advisors are also relevant to interpreting the
number of PhDs graduated per faculty member, which Table 5 in the departmental self-study
document shows was 3.7 from 2000-2009. However, this number can be misinterpreted because
the numerator reflects the total number of PhDs produced but the divisor includes only faculty
with primary appointments in Psychology. When the five faculty advisors with joint
appointments are considered who also routinely supervise students, our program actually
produced 2.2 PhDs per faculty advisor during this period.

During their subsequent training in our program, graduate students become fully immersed in the
research enterprise and are actively engaged in presentation and publication of research data.
Students in our program have multiple opportunities to present their work at scientific meetings
and to publish. The average number of publications among students currently enrolled in our
doctoral program (n=43) is 1.8. It is worth noting that these data reflect publications among
students at all stages of training, including the 12 students who have recently completed the first
year of doctoral study. As students progress in the program, individual numbers of publications
increase substantially. Mean number of presentations at national conferences for all students in
the program is 4.1. Professional presentations represent a wide range of studies, most of which will lead to subsequent publications co-authored by students.

Following graduation, in the past five years, most graduates of our program (58%) are employed in academic positions. Approximately 20% of recent graduates hold tenure-track faculty positions, and 38% hold non-tenure track faculty positions (mainly in academic medical centers). Among recent graduates, 35% are in private practice (but many of those individuals hold adjunct faculty appointments reflecting ongoing teaching and research activities), and the remaining 8% have taken consulting jobs in business or industry. Thus, the graduate program is very successful in recruiting talented students and producing clinical scientists who contribute to the knowledge base and dissemination of knowledge in our field.

The clinical psychology training program has been exceptionally successful in recruiting and graduating doctoral students from racial/ethnic minority groups. Since 2000, 14 minority students have completed our doctoral training program (averaging more than 1 per year). Currently, we have 13 minority students enrolled in the program. We plan to continue utilizing the recruitment strategies that have been successful in recent years (e.g., making early contact with minority applicants to the program, asking current minority students to communicate with minority applicants). In addition, we have maintained communications with recent minority graduates as a source of future referrals of minority students to the training program.

Clinical Area Interdisciplinary Connections and Outreach. The clinical faculty maintains an unusually broad range of research collaborations. Every faculty member in the clinical area is involved in collaborative research and training. These collaborations occur both within the department (across areas) and across departments in the university. Within the department, clinical faculty members regularly collaborate with faculty in several areas including social, behavioral neuroscience, developmental, cognitive, and quantitative. Outside of the department, collaborations are numerous, including the Departments of Internal Medicine, Surgery, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Psychiatry, and Medical Microbiology; as well as with the Colleges of Nursing, Social Work, Public Health, Education, and Dentistry. Two clinical faculty members hold joint appointments in departments in the College of Medicine and/or School of Public Health.

The Psychological Services Center (PSC) is a primary community outreach resource for the department. Clinical area faculty members supervise all clinical services conducted in the PSC by clinical doctoral students. The PSC provides outpatient behavioral/psychological assessment and intervention to children and adults in the Columbus metropolitan area. Referrals come from the university community (undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, staff) as well as from community agencies. The PSC is an important mental health resource for lower-income families in the Columbus area because it serves patients on a sliding fee schedule. Within the PSC are four specialty clinics: the Anxiety and Stress Disorders Clinic (ASDC), the Depression Treatment and Research Clinic (DTRC), the Dialectical Behavior Therapy Clinic, and the Cardiopulmonary Behavioral Medicine Clinic. In the past year, more than 400 patients have been treated through these clinics by clinical graduate students.

Clinical Area Strengths and Weaknesses. Strengths of the clinical area include: (a) the visibility of our program afforded by regular publications by faculty in top-tier journals, national service on grant panels, appointment to journal editorial boards, and election to offices in national professional organizations; (b) continuing success in securing external grant support; (c) the highly interdisciplinary nature of the research conducted by the faculty, with close links to other departments, including the medical center; (d) the high quality graduate students recruited from a large pool of very competitive applicants every year; (e) an impressive building and layout of
offices and labs facilitating interdisciplinary clinical science research; (f) accessibility of a state-of-the-art clinic for treatment of clinical populations in research and training; (g) engaging large numbers of undergraduate students in our laboratory work; (h) maintaining popular undergraduate courses with high enrollments; and (i) continuing success in recruiting and graduating students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups.

Weaknesses of the clinical area include: (a) a relatively small number of faculty in relation to other comparable doctoral programs (data from peer institutions indicates that clinical faculty sizes of 10-11 are typical); (b) the absence of a senior investigator in adult psychopathology (it should be noted that a search for a senior psychopathology researcher is currently underway); (c) the lack of staff resources in support of the clinic (i.e., clinic director, full-time receptionist, intake coordinator) to facilitate clinical research of faculty and doctoral students training. In this regard it should be noted that a search for a full time clinic director is currently underway.

**Clinical Area Strategic Plan.** Although our inclusion of faculty with joint appointments in our program compensates in part for our smaller size relative to peer programs, it also poses difficulties that additional core faculty members would alleviate. Most notably, core faculty members carry the responsibility for providing most of the clinical practicum and externship training for the students of our joint faculty members. Consequently, our 5-year plan includes hiring two additional faculty members. For these positions, we seek to hire researchers who are best able to bridge across disciplines, and would specifically recruit one senior investigator in adult psychopathology (search underway) and one faculty member in an area of research that is not central to adult psychopathology or health psychology but would relate to ongoing research in the department (e.g., research in marital relations, or research in race and ethnicity). The latter hire would broaden the scope of the training program without detracting from the current program foci. These hires would enable us to enhance our national reputation in adult clinical psychology while further strengthening the prominence of the department. In addition, we would hire a Ph.D.-level Clinic Director (with Ph.D. from an APA-accredited clinical psychology program) for the Psychological Services Center to facilitate ongoing clinical research conducted by current and future clinical faculty as well as assist in clinical supervision of graduate students (search underway).

Nationally, there is increased emphasis on research and training in empirically-supported treatments (ESTs), and on translational research (i.e., bridging basic science and clinical application). Our 5-year plan embraces those areas of focus. Hiring additional faculty and staff would facilitate conducting clinical trials research that would further enhance the visibility of our doctoral program. In addition, our plan will focus on studies addressing the relationship of basic science and clinical outcomes, enhanced by the availability of fMRI technology in the department.

**BRIEF CLINICAL AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES**

1. **Barbara L. Andersen** (Professor, Ph.D., 1980, University of Illinois, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Andersen conducts research on the psychological, behavioral, immune, and endocrine aspects of cancer. Her Biobehavioral Model of Cancer Stress and Disease Course has provided the conceptual basis for randomized clinical trials of psychological interventions for cancer patients at highest risk for distress and premature mortality, including those with comorbid major depressive disorder and progressive disease. Her research has been continuously externally funded since 1983. She is the author of 3 edited volumes, and over 150 articles on behavioral medicine topics. She currently holds a senior scientist award (K05; 2004-2015) from the NIH/National Cancer Institute and is Director of the Livestrong Survivorship Center of
Excellence for the OSU Comprehensive Cancer Center and Solove Research Institute. She is past recipient of the APA Division 38 Outstanding Contributions to Health Psychology Award.

2. Steven J. Beck, ABPP (Associate Professor, Ph. D., 1981, University of Georgia, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Beck is currently assessing the feasibility of software that is associated with improvements in working memory for children and adolescents diagnosed with ADHD. He is also investigating if certain working memory programs are more effective for certain subtypes of children and adolescents diagnosed with ADHD.

3. Jennifer S. Cheavens (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2002, University of Kansas, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Cheavens studies mood and personality disorders, particularly ways to improve treatments of these disorders. Her work focuses on understanding traits and processes that facilitate (e.g., hope) and complicate (e.g., difficulties in emotion regulation) and adapting treatments to target these constructs and processes. She is author of 30 peer-reviewed papers, 17 book chapters, and 48 professional presentations.

4. Charles F. Emery (Professor, Ph.D., 1985, University of Southern California, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Emery studies psychological adaptation to chronic illness, specifically chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and cardiac disease; behavioral interventions (e.g., physical exercise, relaxation) to enhance physiological and psychological functioning among middle aged and older adults. He is author of over 75 publications and is currently PI on two NIH grants, as well as co-investigator on two additional NIH grants. He is a former Fulbright fellow and recipient of the Distinguished Mentor Award from the Society of Behavioral Medicine.

5. Ruchika Shaurya Prakash (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2009, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Prakash’s research interests broadly focus on understanding neuroplasticity in the context of healthy aging and neurological disorders, specifically multiple sclerosis, and applying the knowledge gained through research in basic sciences to design interventions that tap into such neuroplasticity. She is author of over 25 publications and currently PI on 1 NIH grant, Co-PI on 2 NIH grants, and 1 industry-sponsored grant.

6. Daniel R. Strunk (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2004, University of Pennsylvania, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Strunk studies the role of cognition in abnormal emotional states—particularly the role of cognition in the etiology and treatment of depression. With regard to treatment, his work has addressed how treatments (such as cognitive therapy) achieve their effects. He has authored 18 publications. His work has been published in journals such as the Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology and Behaviour Research and Therapy.

7. Julian F. Thayer (Ohio Eminent Scholar in Health Psychology and Professor, Department of Psychology; PhD New York University, 1986). Dr. Thayer has published over 195 research papers and book chapters covering a wide range of topics including behavioral medicine, cardiology, emotion, psychopathology, bioengineering, research design and multivariate statistical techniques. He is President-elect of the Academy of Behavioral Medicine Research and Past President of the Rocky Mountain Bioengineering Symposium. He is also past recipient of the Early Career Award for Contributions to Psychosomatic Medicine, a recipient of a Fulbright fellowship and an Alexander von Humboldt Research Award to study in Germany.

8. Michael W. Vasey (Professor, Ph.D., 1990, The Pennsylvania State University, Clinical Psychology). Dr. Vasey studies the cognition-emotion interface in relation to risk for,
protection against, and treatment of emotional disorders across the lifespan. Topics include: 1) The role of cognitive biases in the development, maintenance, and treatment of emotional disorders as well as in the prediction of relapse following successful treatment; and 2) Temperamental/personality factors that predispose to or protect against symptoms of emotional disorders, with particular emphasis on interactions between such factors. He is author of over 60 publications and currently Co-PI on 1 NIH grant.

(3) COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY AREA SELF-STUDY
(Gail McKoon, Area Coordinator)

Cognitive Mission and Goals. The signature of research in the Cognitive area is the effort to better understand human cognition through the development of rigorously tested theories. We believe that it is impossible to understand a system as complex as the human mind/brain with only a purely experimental approach. What is critical is the interaction between theory and data to advance both. All of our faculty are strongly committed to a research methodology that emphasizes explaining empirical data with explicit models of cognitive processes. Most recently, we have expanded our areas of expertise to cognitive neuroscience.

Cognitive Area Focus and Quality. Over the past few years, beginning with the arrival of McKoon and Ratcliff, our visibility has been and will be dramatically increased with the addition of several junior faculty (Bernhart-Walther, Dennis, Petrov, and Sederberg). They have great promise, are becoming well-known nationally, and have articles in top journals. They are and will be galvanizing the area, joining in multiple collaborations. As a result of these new people, cognitive psychologists at other universities now see us as a major player in cognitive modeling. Along with Van Zandt and Myung in the Quantitative area, our prominence in cognitive modeling has risen to the point that we rank in the top five in the country. Current leading-edge approaches to cognitive modeling are represented in our program: neural modeling, computer simulations, quantitative theories, and Bayesian modeling.

There are four, typically overlapping, core areas of research represented in our group-- memory, language, perception/action, and cognitive neuroscience. The first three have been strengths for some time now. Dennis, McKoon, Pitt, Ratcliff, and Sederberg engage in memory research; Dennis, McKoon, and Pitt engage in language research, and Bernhart-Walther, Jagacinski, Petrov, and Todd engage in perception/action research. Our newest strength is cognitive neuroscience which includes Sederberg, Bernhardt-Walther, Ratcliff, Todd, Petrov, and Dennis. Joining the faculty in 2011 is Zhong-Lin Lu who will add to our expertise in perception and cognitive neuroscience. Here we briefly list the research interests of the current faculty.

Bernhart-Walther: Empirical investigations and models for how people perceive complex visual scenes, drawing on methods from perceptual psychology and cognitive neuroscience using techniques ranging from behavioral testing to neuroimaging (fMRI), computational modeling, and computer vision.

Dennis: Models of memory that capture the distinctions between frontal and parietal event-related potential signals and provide explanations of fMRI data from memory tasks.

Jagacinski: Quantitative modeling of perceptual-motor and multi-limb coupling in complex skilled movement tasks, identifying sources of information flow that can inform neuroscience models.
McKoon: Empirical and theoretical investigations of text comprehension and memory; applications of theoretical work to decision-making, memory, and text processing in patients with memory disorders and patients undergoing chemotherapy.

Petrov: Neurologically grounded models of perceptual learning, object recognition, scene perception, and analogy-making; experimental testing and validation of these models; neural network models of high-level cognition; Cognitive architectures.

Pitt: Experimental work in psycholinguistics, studying the problem of perceptual constancy in spoken word recognition; modeling work is methodologically oriented, developing quantitative tools with which to evaluate computational models.

Ratcliff: Models of decision making that are applied to the neurobiology of decision making, single-cell recordings, ERP, fMRI, deficits from memory disorders, and the effects of chemotherapy.

Sederberg: Studies of human memory informed by neuroimaging (fMRI, EEG), designed to develop models of memory encoding and retrieval and their associated neural activity.

Todd: Empirical investigations and models of how 3D layouts of a person’s environment can be computed from 2D visual patterns and how they are tied to neural mechanisms (e.g., parietal cortex), as measured by fMRI, electrophysiology, and patient studies, for both humans and monkeys.

The cognitive faculty have published extensively in the past few years including many high impact publications (see faculty CVs). Also, we note that since 1999, faculty currently in our area have produced 15 Psychological Review papers, which is 2 or 3 more than the cognitive faculty at Indiana, Irvine, and Carnegie Mellon.

Diversity. With respect to diversity, the cognitive faculty has one woman Professor. We will continue to search for diversity in future hiring, seeking out women and minorities.

Cognitive Undergraduate Involvement. Every one of our faculty teaches at least two service and/or large undergraduate classes (with the exception of Ratcliff for whom one of his two-course teaching load is a large undergraduate statistics course). We offer several sections each year for three gateway courses at the 300 level (Memory and Cognition, 312; Sensation and Perception, 310; Listening and Reading, 302) enrolling about 600 students per year. We also have about 18 undergraduates enrolled in independent study courses per year.

Cognitive Graduate Program. Recently, we have had two students, Thaler and White, move into post-docs at major research universities. The incoming students over the past 2-3 years have been excellent, and we hope to continue that trend. We are attempting to raise the quality of our graduate students. In the past (e.g., over 5 years ago), most of the students were placed in small teaching colleges or industry. Along with our new faculty have come more research-oriented students. We hope that the majority of them will finish in 5-6 years and find post-docs and eventually positions in research-oriented universities. However, currently our graduate program is small, and we have too few high-quality applicants. Advertising our program both nationally and internationally is one of our highest priorities. Eventually, we aim for 2.5 graduate students per faculty member adding six new graduate students each year.

Our curriculum emphasizes the development of an individual plan of study for each student, in consultation with his/her adviser, including both depth of study and breadth. Students are required
to take six courses in the Cognitive area, at least one course in each of three areas: Language, Memory, and Attention/Performance. As our new faculty become integrated with our program, there will be cognitive neuroscience courses in each of the three areas. The development of our curriculum is under progress and will not near completion until we have worked out courses to be taught by our new faculty. In developing a curriculum, we will have to keep in mind the dean's requirement that there be at least eight graduate students in every class. When relevant to their plan of study, they are strongly encouraged to take courses in other areas of the department and in other departments. A minimum of three such courses is required.

Each student must complete a first year research project by the end of the summer of his/her first year. This requirement is designed to give students a strong beginning step on the way to involving themselves in several research projects, with the aim of producing a significant number of publications by the time they have their PhD.

One issue we face in graduate teaching with the move from quarters to semesters is providing in-depth skills to students. If a course goes into a topic in great depth, enrollment might be too low to allow the course to be taught. Our innovation for some of our courses is to teach the courses at a level appropriate to students from other areas of the department, but to add to the courses optional, specialized modules that teach in-depth skills. Such modules might include programming memory models, generating simulated response time data and fitting models to them, programming EEG analyses, and so on. These modules would be taken by students only after consultation with their adviser.

The topics on which we offer courses show the breadth of our area as well as possible specializations, in particular, quantitative modeling of cognitive processes and cognitive neuroscience: cognitive science, mathematical models of cognition, simulation modeling in R, models of language, models of memory, neuroscience methods (e.g., EEG, fMRI), neural networks, analogy and reasoning, vision, decision making, human performance theory, computational cognitive neuroscience, and psycholinguistics.

**Cognitive Interdisciplinary Connections.** The collaborations among our faculty and others are too many to list here but below we give a sample. The huge number of collaborations across the United States and around the world is a reflection of our strength in modeling. Collaborations across Psychology Department areas are: Pitt with Myung (quantitative); Dennis and Sederberg with Cunningham (social); Ratcliff and McKoon with Vasey (clinical); Ratcliff with Opfer (developmental); Ratcliff with Thayer (clinical); Petrov and Dennis with Sloutsky (developmental). Collaborations across OSU departments are: Dennis, Brew, and Kibler-Campbell (Linguistics); Dennis and Belkin (Computer Science); Dennis and Nehm (Human Ecology); Jagacinski and Lavender (Industrial and Systems Engineering); Ratcliff and Scharre (Neurology); Ratcliff, McKoon, and Porcu (James Cancer Center); Ratcliff and Moore (Epilepsy); Petrov and Martinez (Engineering); Pitt and Hume (Linguistics); Pitt and Shahin (Otolaryngology); Todd and Martinez (Electrical Engineering); Todd and Davis (Computer and Information Science); Todd and Woods (Industrial and Systems Engineering); Dennis and Lane (Allied Medicine). Collaborations outside of OSU include: Ratcliff has collaborated with over 30 other researchers in the past five years, and Dennis, Petrov, McKoon, Todd, and Pitt each collaborate with from about 5 to 15 other researchers. These include researchers in Canada, Great Britain, Holland, Germany, Spain, China, Taiwan, and Australia.

The area has also gained considerably in national visibility from three workshops Ratcliff organized or co-organized where researchers from other universities came together for interdisciplinary interaction. The topics of the workshops express our group’s focus on models of
cognition. The first was titled *Model Selection in the Real World*, funded by OSU (Ratcliff and McKoon). Talks and discussion centered on explanatory modeling-- what are the major competing models, what can they explain and not explain, how are they likely to develop in the future, and how can we select among them. The second was titled *Neural Mechanisms of Stochastic Decision Making*, funded by AFOSR. The issues included: neurophysiology of decision making, decision-making guiding action; formulating and testing stochastic models of decision making, formulating and testing biophysical neural circuit models of brain function, and probing brain function in humans, macaque monkeys and rats as they are tested in cognitively demanding tasks. Third, Ratcliff was a co-organizer of the Mathematical Biosciences Institute workshop, *Systems Biology of Decision Making*. This brought together psychologists, neuroscientists, and systems biologists (e.g., decision making in ant and bee colonies).

**Cognitive Strengths and Weaknesses.** Our overall strength is simple -- the quality of our faculty, the quality of their publications, and their broad participation in interdisciplinary research. Our major weakness is graduate recruitment.

**Cognitive Strategic Plan.** Our top priority is to build a Cognitive group that can raise the Psychology Department’s ranking into the top 10 in the country among all universities. Even considering our new hires, we are a small group and we need to be larger. Cognitive psychology is the dominant presence in psychology in the National Academy. By recent counts, 61% of the psychologists in the Academy are cognitive psychologists (the next nearest area is physiological/comparative with 22%). The majority of the cognitive members are leaders in mathematical psychology or computational modeling. Cognitive psychology is also a major factor in determining the national ranking of Psychology Departments. According to recent figures for the top 20 ranked departments, cognitive faculty make up at least 40% of the faculty (an average of 14 out of 35 average departmental size). Our faculty are particularly poised to move our area into the center of current research in cognitive psychology. Theories are being developed that simultaneously explain an organism’s behavior and its neural functioning as they unfold over time. fMRI, ERP, and other measures of brain activity (such as single-cell recordings and simultaneous multiple-cell recordings from rats and monkeys) are being used to inform models of cognition.

Our second priority is to improve our recruiting of graduate students. We need to redesign the web site for our area (with the help of the department’s technical staff). We also plan to send letters advertising our program to colleagues around the country and we need to make stronger contacts with prospective students from other countries. We are all committed to advertising our program to colleagues when we attend conferences and workshops.

Third, a pressing need of the cognitive area is to broaden our research and course offerings into the area of human attention. This is one of the oldest topics in cognitive psychology, and it is one in which Ohio State University was once quite active. However, the departures of Lester Krueger and Harvey Shulman have created a significant void in this aspect of our graduate training program. The importance of attention within the field of cognitive psychology is highlighted by the number of sessions that are typically devoted to this topic at the annual meetings of the Psychonomics Society, The Vision Sciences Society, and the Cognitive Neuroscience Society, and by the number of active researchers in this field at most top-rated psychology programs. This is a particularly promising area for growth at OSU because it can piggyback on our existing strengths in cognitive neuroscience and computational modeling, and it also has the potential to build bridges to other areas of the department such as clinical and psychobiological. We ideally would hire at least one person in this area in the next few years.
Fourth, at the level of the college and university, we would like there to be a new initiative toward theoretical systems neuroscience. We would like to play a central role in such an initiative. Currently, OSU has no presence in this domain of research. We believe this is needed in order for neuroscience at OSU to become nationally recognized. We emphasize theoretical research because the department currently lacks the lab space to hire new experimentalists. Such an initiative could capitalize on our strengths in theoretical modeling in cognitive and quantitative psychology. The aim would be to hire new faculty into the psychology department who are at the beginnings of their careers. This field is moving quickly and the best people will be young. This initiative would require strong support from the college. To make it work, the minimum number of hires would have to be three, probably new assistant professors.

We currently have a very strong group (with Zhong-Lin Lu arriving in 2011) in human theoretical neuroscience. However, this is a small part of systems neuroscience and we feel that this strength, along with our behavioral neuroscience group, will provide the bridges that are needed to add theoretical systems neuroscience to our department.

Theoretical systems neuroscience covers a number of domains for which the goal is to describe and explain how the various systems of the brain interact. Research enterprises range from models of lower level activities --single neurons, dendritic processes, subcellular signaling dynamics, short-term and long-term plasticity, neural population coding and variability-- up to higher levels such as feed-forward and recurrent networks, basal ganglia control, sensory processing and motor behavior, and higher cognitive functions such as working memory, selective attention, and decision making. All of these domains of study would link to people already in our department, though new hiring would be expected to be in the lower level domains. New faculty would also link to faculty in arts and sciences and the medical school, and more generally link our program to national and international research. Links both inside and outside the university would be necessary because the theoretical work should make contact with data produced by experimentalists, here at OSU and at other universities around the world.

BRIEF COGNITIVE AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES

1. **Dirk Bernhardt-Walther** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2006, California Institute of Technology, Computation and Neural Systems). Dr. Bernhardt-Walther studies how people perceive complex visual scenes. When people encounter a complex scene, such as a busy street, they almost immediately know it is a street scene. But recognizing the details, such as the cars, pedestrians, or trees, requires scrutinizing the scene area by area, object by object. Dr. Bernhardt-Walther’s research explores both aspects of scene perception. He comes to OSU after a postdoctoral fellowship at the Beckman Institute at the University of Illinois.

2. **Simon Dennis** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1993, University of Queensland, Computer Science). Dr. Dennis studies human memory and language processing. Using a combination of behavioral, event-related potential and computational modeling techniques, he is investigating the processes behind episodic memory and sentence processing. He is also involved in a number of applied projects in the areas of defense, education and information technology. Currently, he holds grants from Defense Research and Development Canada and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. He has published in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *Psychological Review* and the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

3. **Richard Jagacinski** (Professor; Ph.D., 1973, University of Michigan, Experimental Psychology). Dr. Jagacinski currently studies rhythmic models of upper body - lower body coordination in golf, the effects of aging on perceptual-motor skills, mathematical analysis
of musical performance, mathematical interpretations of religious symbols, and measures of creative design. He is author of 33 journal articles, 5 book chapters, and 1 book (*Control Theory for Humans* (2003)). His teaching covers the topics of perceptual-motor control and learning, human performance, decision making in dynamic contexts, the behavioral impact of technology on quality of life, and research methods.

4. **Gail McKoon** (Professor, PhD 1975, University of Colorado). Dr. McKoon studies the psychology of language, memory, and decision modeling. Much current research in the domain of text processing rests on her work, including two papers that are often called "classic." Currently, a focus of her work is the effects on cognitive abilities of aging, mild cognitive impairments, and chemotherapy. She is an author on over 90 publications, including 10 in *Psychological Review*. She is currently a PI on one grant and a Co-PI on another.

5. **Alexander A. Petrov** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 1998 New Bulgarian University, Cognitive Science). Dr. Petrov studies the mechanisms of learning-perceptual learning in particular - using a combination of behavioral experimentation and computational modeling. He has developed a neural-network model of perceptual learning that takes actual images as inputs; process them according to the known neurophysiology of the early visual areas, and accounts for a wide range of behavioral phenomena. Dr. Petrov also develops and tests models of visual object recognition, category rating, visual analogy making, and other high-level tasks. He is author of 18 peer-reviewed publications, including 2 in *Psychological Review*.

6. **Mark Pitt** (Professor, Ph.D., 1990, Yale University, Cognitive Psychology). Dr. Pitt has two research programs. One in the field of psycholinguistics in which he studies spoken word recognition. His research explores the classic problem of perceptual constancy, how listeners can recognize spoken words despite the enormous amount of variation found in their production. The other line of research is best described as a meta-modeling. Along with Jay Myung, he develops quantitative methods that are used in the evaluation and discrimination of computational models of cognition (memory, language, etc.). He is the author of over 60 publications, an online speech corpus, and currently co-PI on 2 grants (NIMH, AFOSR).

7. **Roger Ratcliff** (Distinguished Professor of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ph.D., 1974, University of Auckland, New Zealand, Psychology). Dr. Ratcliff's research interests include mathematical models of decision making, including memory, perception, and reaction time. In addition to his theoretical modeling work, Dr. Ratcliff is interested in practical applications of modeling, and has published work on aging, sleep deprivation, IQ, hypoglycemia, aphasia, mild depression and anxiety, and EEG measures and single-cell recording data in monkeys. He also studies priming phenomena, text processing, practical issues in analyzing RT data, and issues of mimicking between models. He is author of over 150 publications including numerous papers in *Psychological Review*. He is currently PI on 2 NIH grants and past recipient of the Troland Award from the National Academy of Sciences and the Warren Medal from the Society of Experimental Psychologists.

8. **Per B. Sederberg** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2006, University of Pennsylvania, Neuroscience). Dr. Sederberg studies human memory with studies of behavior, neuroimaging (including fMRI and EEG), and computational models. The overarching goal of his research is to develop a computational theory of memory that simultaneously predicts the success (and failure) of memory encoding and retrieval along with its associated neural activity. He is an
author of over 15 publications including first-author publications in Psychological Review, Journal of Neuroscience, Psychological Science, Cerebral Cortex, and Neuroimage.

9. James T. Todd (Professor, Ph.D., 1977, University of Connecticut, Experimental Psychology). Dr. Todd studies visual perception and the visual control of motor action. He is author of over 100 publications and he has been continuously funded over the past 25 years. He has served on the editorial boards of 5 journals in his field.

(4) DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AREA SELF-STUDY
(John Opfer, Area Coordinator)

Overview of Developmental Area. The principal goal of the graduate program in developmental psychology at The Ohio State University is to educate developmental scientists who will contribute to the advancement of the science of psychology. As part of their training, students participate in faculty research and conduct their own research. They also take general courses in developmental psychology, courses in theory and methodology, and specialty courses and seminars.

Current faculty (and their interests) include John Gibbs, Professor (delinquency and moral development); Susan Johnson, Associate Professor (social cognitive development and attachment); Raymond Montemayor, Associate Professor (adolescence and socialization); John Opfer, Associate Professor (cognitive development); Vladimir Sloutsky, Professor (cognitive development); and Laura Wagner, Assistant Professor (language development). Advising graduate students in the area is also Sally Boysen, Professor (comparative developmental psychology).

Of the 8 full-time graduate students currently enrolled in the Developmental graduate program (2009), four are pre-MA, four post-MA, and three post-Generals. In an average year (2003-2009), 23 students apply to the Developmental Program, 5 students are admitted, and 1 to 2 students enroll. The last 4 of the past 10 years have seen a large increase in the number and quality of applicants, as well as number of enrolled students.

Developmental Area Quality. To assess the quality of the doctoral program of the OSU Developmental Area, it is useful to compare it to doctoral programs at other universities. A review of 97 doctoral programs in the developmental sciences (Byrnes & McNamara, 2001) found that strong developmental programs are characterized by: (1) high faculty research productivity — among the 802 individuals evaluated for faculty research productivity, the average faculty member published 1.71 publications/year (1.25 journal articles/year), with the 90th percentile publishing 2.7 journal articles and the 95th percentile publishing 3.4 journal articles; (2) publishing high impact publications — among the top 33 developmental doctoral programs, faculty work accumulated an average of 38 citations per year (3) externally-funded research—in the top 33 departments for grant funding, the average department had 5.4 externally-funded grants, and 24% of faculty in developmental programs had external funding; (4) national level service, especially developmental faculty who serve on editorial boards (average of 0.66 boards/faculty member in the top 33 programs); and (5) successful placement of graduate students in top programs. As detailed below, the OSU Developmental Area compares favorably to very favorably to peer institutions along each of these qualities.

Rankings. At a national level, there are no recent external reports that rank the OSU Developmental program in terms of research productivity, impact, funding, editorships, or graduate placement. However, empirical reviews such as the Byrnes and McNamara (2001)
report provide a benchmark, and this benchmark implies a strong Developmental doctoral program that would be placed in the top 15% of the 97 programs reviewed. In terms of faculty research productivity (2007-2009), OSU developmental faculty members each published an average of 2.8 journal articles per year (above the 90th percentile). In terms of impact, faculty work accumulated an average of 33 citations per year (above the 85th percentile). In terms of funding, 43% of faculty members had external funding (above the 85th percentile), and in terms of national service, .86 editorial boards/faculty member (90th percentile). Although the OSU Developmental program ranks well in this national comparisons, it ranks less well within the very strong OSU Department of Psychology, ranking 5th (of 7) in journal publications, 7th in citations, and 4th in total grant dollars.

**Faculty Quality.** With a large number of retirements and hires in the Developmental Area between 2000 – 2009, the composition and emphasis of the Area has changed considerably. Of the six primary faculty members in Developmental today, four were hired in the last seven years: in 2003, John Opfer (Ph.D., 2000, University of Michigan) was hired as Assistant Professor; in 2005, Laura Wagner (Ph.D., 1998, University of Pennsylvania) as Assistant Professor; in 2007, Vladimir Sloutsky (Ph.D., 1986, University of Moscow) as Professor; in 2009, Susan Johnson (Ph.D., 1994, Massachusetts Institute of Technology) as Associate Professor. The research specialties of all four recent hires were in the areas of language, cognitive, and social cognitive development.

The quality of area faculty is attested by the number and prestige of the awards earned. One area member was recently awarded the 2010 Huber Award for Outstanding Research in Social and Behavioral Science from OSU. Nationally, Area faculty members hold prestigious fellowships in AAAS, APS, and APA. One was named the Distinguished Scientist Lecturer by APA and “One of the 50 Most Important Women Scientists in the U.S.” by Discover Magazine. In terms of local awards and honors, Developmental faculty consistently obtain high ratings in Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI), and several have received or have been nominated for department, college, and university teaching awards. In addition to high quality research and teaching, several faculty members are Associate Editors or on the Editorial Boards of psychology journals, including Frontiers in Developmental Psychology, Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, Journal of Adolescent Research, Journal of Early Adolescence, Linguistics and Philosophy, and Trends and Opinions in Cognitive Science (see Table 5, Appendix A).

**Developmental Area Involvement in Undergraduate Education.** Undergraduate courses taught by the Developmental Area faculty, which are shared equally among senior and junior faculty members, are consistently among the most popular courses in the psychology major, with high enrollments per course and per faculty member. Over the past five years, undergraduate enrollments have totaled 4,301 students for courses taught by faculty (Dept average = 2,809) and 7,612 students for courses taught by faculty and lecturers combined (Dept average = 5,662). Due to the high popularity of Area course offerings relative to the number of faculty teaching them, the average Developmental Area faculty member typically teaches 54% more undergraduates than the average Psychology Department faculty member (Area average, 144 undergraduates/year; Dept average, 93 undergraduates/year). Three undergraduate courses in the Department—Psych 340 (Lifespan Developmental Psychology), Psych 550 (Psychology of Childhood), and Psych 551 (Psychology of Adolescence)—consistently result in more than 500 credit hours per course. Though these courses are the most popular ones, the Area offers a much richer selection of courses than these, with the average Developmental faculty member teaching 31% more courses than the average Psychology Dept faculty member (Area average, 3.8 courses/year; Dept average, 2.9).
In addition to teaching popular courses, Developmental Area faculty members also supervise a large number of undergraduate research projects, honors theses, and independent study projects. Over the past five years, undergraduate enrollment in the courses offering credit for these activities (Psych 693 and 699) have totaled 430 undergraduates (Dept average, 320), with an average Area faculty member supervising the research activities of 14.3 undergraduates (Dept average, 10.4). Thus, the Area not only offers popular courses, but it also contributes greatly to the training of future scientists in Developmental Psychology.

**Developmental Area Graduate Training.** The primary emphasis of the doctoral training program in Developmental Psychology is cognitive development, including attention and memory, learning and conceptual development, language acquisition, and the interactions among these processes. Secondary areas of emphasis include social cognition, moral development, and parent-adolescent relationships. Students are trained in state-of-the-art experimental methods for studying cognition in infants and young children, including preferential looking, habituation, EEG, fMRI, microgenetic approaches, as well as traditional experimental techniques and physiological measures.

**Program Requirements.** During their first two years, students take a series of core courses that prepare them intellectually and methodologically for the program. The intellectual core consists of Cognitive Development (Psych 845), Child Development (Psych 835), and Language Development (Psych 847); the methods core consists of a multi-quarter statistics sequence and a specialized Developmental Methods course (Psych 849). Students are also expected to take more specialized courses that link to their research interests and inform the research for their master’s degree.

Students are expected to complete their master’s degree, including the master’s thesis, by the end of the first two years of study. At the end of the third year, students are admitted to Ph.D. candidacy after passing the Candidacy Examination. Questions for the Candidacy Examination are based on a reading list that is prepared with the help of the four faculty members who serve on an examination committee. An additional one to two years are typically spent completing the Ph.D. dissertation.

In addition to traditional training in Developmental Psychology, a major cross-area initiative has been the formation of a cognitive/developmental track between the Developmental and Cognitive areas. This track is meant for students who have been admitted into either the Developmental Area or Cognitive Area. Students enroll in the developmental or cognitive program and follow most of its requirements. Enrolling in the cognitive development concentration allows a student to engage in a program of courses that might deviate from the cognitive or developmental program slightly in order to be tailored to the skills, interests, and aims of the student. The cognitive/developmental track has four main components: (1) coursework from both the Cognitive and Developmental areas, including new courses on the development of cognition; (2) laboratory rotations in both cognitive and developmental labs, with faculty mentors in each area; (3) joint advising of students; and (4) participation of faculty from both areas in qualifying exams and dissertation committees. The track offers two benefits: first, it provides a grounding in cognitive and developmental processes and associated experimental methodology; and second it will allow students to compete for a wider selection of post-graduate positions than otherwise.

**Quality of Graduate Training Program.** With a change in the emphasis of the Developmental doctoral training to language and cognitive development, the program as a whole has benefited. During the previous five years (2005 - 2009), there has been a steady increase in the number and quality of applicants to the Developmental graduate program. During this time, an average of 23
students applied yearly to the doctoral program, with 39 students applying in the most recent year. Of the students admitted and enrolled during this period, the average applicant had a GPA = 3.75 (second in the department) and scored in the 78.7th percentile for their combined GRE scores (third in the department); in the most recent year, the average applicant had a GPA = 3.8 and scored in the 87th percentile for their combined GRE scores. From 2005 to 2010, 9 students received their Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology, 89% (8) of whom were women. In the year after completing their Ph.D., 3 graduates were hired as assistant professors at colleges and universities, 3 were hired as lecturers, 2 accepted post-doctoral positions, and 1 entered clinical practice.

Courses offered for the Developmental doctoral training program also serve the training mission of the department and university as a whole, with Developmental graduate courses being popular among students outside the Developmental Area and being rated highly by graduate students. One indicator of this popularity is the number of students enrolled in Area graduate courses relative to the number of students enrolled in the Developmental doctoral program itself (i.e., 11.5 students enrolled yearly in Developmental graduate courses for every Developmental student currently enrolled in the program; cf. Dept average of 5.9 students enrolled yearly per area student). Contributing to the popularity of Developmental graduate courses is the quality of the courses themselves. Graduate courses offered by Developmental Area faculty members elicit an average SEI rating of 4.37 (Dept average, 4.21).

**Developmental Area Interdisciplinary Connections and Outreach.** Faculty members of the Developmental Area collaborate broadly within the department. Opfer has co-authored a paper under review with a member of the cognitive area (Ratcliff) and another with a member of the social area (Cunningham), and co-authored a proceedings paper with members of the quantitative and cognitive areas (Myung & Pitt); he is also a co-PI on a federally-funded project with a member of the cognitive area (Dennis) and has submitted a grant proposal with members of the quantitative and cognitive areas (Myung & Pitt). With a member of the cognitive area (Dennis), Sloutsky has co-advised graduate students and co-authored a proceedings paper. Finally, the Developmental Area has a close collaboration with the Cognitive Area in graduate recruitment and training (see “Cognitive/Developmental Track” above).

Faculty members of the Developmental Area also have numerous collaborations across the university. Montemayor co-taught a course with a faculty member in the Department of Human Development and Family Science, published articles with another member of the HDFS Department, is a member of the OSU Adolescent Network, and is a consultant on a grant by a faculty member in the Department of Pediatrics at Children’s Hospital. Opfer is a co-PI on an NSF-funded research project with faculty members in the Departments of Biology, Statistics, and Education. Sloutsky has co-authored papers with faculty members in Linguistics and Occupational Therapy. Wagner has co-taught a course in the Department of Linguistics (the Language Acquisition Seminar). In addition, she has been Co-Investigator on both a Cognitive Science Seed grant with a faculty member of the Linguistics department, as well as on an OSU Innovation grant with faculty members from the departments of Linguistics and Spanish & Portuguese. She has also presented work at conferences with members of the departments of Linguistics, Speech & Hearing Sciences, and Spanish & Portuguese.

**Developmental Area Strengths and Weaknesses.** In a previous report, the Area wrote, “To achieve national visibility and competitiveness, the Area must: (1) increase its grant funding and research productivity; and (2) increase the number and quality of undergraduates who apply for admission to Developmental.” Since then substantial progress has been made towards achieving both goals. As mentioned above, the Area now fares well nationally on important benchmark
indicators (i.e., external funding, research productivity, citations, etc), and it has succeeded in greatly improving the number and quality of undergraduates who apply to the Developmental graduate program. An additional strength of the Area comes from the strategic nature of the hires that have been made. Specifically, the formation of a small group of faculty members with research interests in cognitive development (Drs. Johnson, Opfer, Sloutsky, and Wagner) has led to a coherent set of expertise that has resulted in productive cross-fertilization, including collaborative research in the Area and improved training of graduate students.

Although the Developmental Area is strong relative to its peers, it is weak relative to its aspirations. In order to move from the top 15% (of 97 developmental programs) to the top 10 programs, the Area must improve in all its benchmark indicators. Looking to programs that have succeeded in doing so and currently enjoy the best national reputation, it is clear that the small number of Developmental faculty is an important factor hindering the national reputation of the OSU program. Programs with the highest reputations among their peers in the most recent U.S. News and World Report survey (Minnesota, Michigan, Yale, Berkeley, Virginia, Harvard, Stanford, Illinois, Wisconsin, UCLA, and UNC) have an average number of 10 (median = 8) faculty members whose primary affiliation is Developmental. Given that the six current OSU Developmental Area faculty members cannot individually increase their research output by 67% (especially while teaching 54% more students and 31% more courses than average), the overall size of the Area is a weakness in its ability to contribute collectively to the discipline and to the reputation of the program.

**Developmental Area Strategic Plan.** Becoming one of the national leaders in developmental psychology will require (1) making several strategic hires (possibly in collaboration with other areas) and (2) securing potentially transformative funding (e.g., training grant or center-type grant). We view (1) and (2) to be interrelated.

Given the relative size of the Developmental Area compared to leaders in the field, another 3 to 4 faculty members in the Developmental Area are needed to make the area competitive nationally. These additional hires, however, must be strategic and lead to cross-fertilization. Adding a faculty member with interests in infant perception, for example, would broaden the research portfolio of the Developmental Area. An even more transformative hire would be in the area of cognitive developmental neuroscience and/or biological foundations of development. Given that at least three area members (Johnson, Opfer, and Sloutsky) have an emerging body of research on the biological origins of cognition and development, such hires could have the desired multiplicative effect.

While it is important to increase funding of individual members of the area to achieve incremental progress in research productivity, transformative results also require securing high-impact funding. One example of such funding is an NIH pre-doctoral training grant. Such funding is potentially transformative because it would simultaneously improve the ability of the area to attract top talent to our graduate program and to make graduate students highly competitive nationally. Another example is a multi-PI center-type grant that results in integrative research activities of multiple faculty members. Each of these types of high-impact funding, however, requires a critical mass of Developmental faculty as well as a coherent set of expertise.

**BRIEF DEVELOPMENTAL AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES**

1. **John C. Gibbs** (Professor, Ph.D., 1972, Harvard University). Dr. Gibbs’s research and theoretical work pertains to cross-cultural sociomoral development, parental socialization, empathy, prosocial behavior and antisocial behavior. With students and colleagues, he has
developed assessment measures of moral judgment, moral identity, social perspective-taking, self-serving cognitive distortions, social skills, and parental discipline techniques. His assessment and intervention work with antisocial youth has not only seen widespread use in the United States but in several other countries. Dr. Giffs serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of Near-Death Studies*. His books include *Moral Development and Reality*, *Moral Maturity: Measuring the Development of Sociomoral Reflection*. In addition to his books, Dr. Gibbs has published more than 70 book chapters and journal articles pertaining to his research and theoretical interests.

2. **Susan C Johnson** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1994, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cognitive Science). Dr. Johnson studies the relationship between cognition and social development from infancy to adulthood. She is author of over 25 publications and is currently PI on 1 NIH grant and past PI on 3 NIH grants and 1 NSF grant.

3. **Raymond Montemayor** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1974, Michigan State University, Developmental Psychology). Currently Dr. Montemayor is studying the influence of parents on adolescent risky behavior. He is the author of 48 professional articles and chapters, and has given 67 conference presentations. He has co-authored one book and was the co-editor of a 10 volume series, *Advances in Adolescent Development*.

4. **John Opfer** (Assistant Professor; Ph.D., 2000, University of Michigan, Psychology). Dr. Opfer studies the development of concepts and reasoning. His particular interest is in the process of change in numerical and biological concepts and linking these to fundamental mechanisms of cognitive change. He is author of over 20 peer-reviewed publications and is currently a PI on an NSF grant.

5. **Vladimir Sloutsky** (Professor, Ph.D., 1986, University of Moscow and Russian Academy of Education, Developmental Psychology). Dr. Sloutsky studies the development of cognition and interrelations between language and cognition. His particular interest is in the development of categorization – an ability critical to human and animal cognition. His research focuses on the development and mechanism of categorization from early infancy, the role of language in this process, and the way attention and memory may sub-serve categorization. He is author of over 100 peer-reviewed publications and is currently a PI on an IES, an NSF, and an NIH grant.

6. **Laura Wagner** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 1998, University of Pennsylvania, Linguistics; M.A., 1997, University of Pennsylvania, Psychology). Dr. Wagner studies children’s language development, particularly their developing understanding of meaning. Her research focuses on children’s understanding of verbs and verb morphology, as well as on the concepts that support verb learning. She is the author of over 18 publications and has received grant support from the NSF and the NIH.

(5) **IDD AREA SELF STUDY**

(Luc LeCavalier, Area Coordinator)

**IDD Mission and Goals.** The Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) division of the Psychology Graduate Program has a unique status among the seven areas in the Department of Psychology. Its faculty members are housed at the Nisonger Center and contribute to the missions of both the Department of Psychology and the Nisonger Center. The Nisonger Center is one of 67 federally funded University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) in
the country. UCEDDs are interdisciplinary centers with a mandate of conducting research, providing training, and giving service in the field of developmental disabilities. Administratively, the Nisonger Center falls under the OSU Medical Center’s Office of Health Sciences. Although its Psychology faculty members are employees of the Nisonger Center, their tenure initiating unit (TIU) is the Department of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences, and they are held to the same standard of scholarly excellence as the rest of the Department of Psychology. Therefore, they have the same privileges and responsibilities as other faculty members in the Department of Psychology, but they also operate within the context of UCEDDs and OSU’s Medical Center.

The science of psychology fully applies to individuals with IDD, just as in non-disabled groups, although it is a specialization in its own right. The IDD population comprises individuals with intellectual disability (about 1% of the U.S. population), autism spectrum disorders (approaching 1%), and a myriad of other conditions, such as cerebral palsy and epilepsy. Although only about 3% of the US, this clinical population is very important because of the extensive services it requires (educational, behavioral, psychiatric, occupational, and physical) and because most of these individuals will require various forms of support throughout their lifetimes.

The IDD Psychology area offers two possible graduate training tracks: a “general” IDD track and a dual “Clinical-IDD” track. The general IDD track is designed to train scientific research psychologists in the area of IDD. Students who graduate from this program are well equipped to pursue an academic or research career in the field of IDD psychology. They have experience in conducting original research and presenting results at professional conferences and publishing in peer-reviewed scientific journals. They are particularly knowledgeable in areas such as etiology of developmental disabilities, psychological and physical characteristics of these populations, and prevention and treatment approaches. Students in this program are expected to be proficient in some additional area such as measurement/test development, psychopharmacology, psychobiology, quantitative methods, applied behavior analysis, or psychosocial interventions.

The IDD-Clinical track espouses the scientist-practitioner model of education and training. An integrative approach is employed by which science and clinical practice continually inform, extend, and verify each other. Students who graduate from this program are well equipped to pursue an academic or clinical career in the field of IDD psychology. In addition to having experience in conducting scientific research and becoming knowledgeable in the abovementioned areas, they receive in-depth clinical training. From a clinical standpoint, they are expected to be proficient in functional behavior analysis, diagnosis, and treatment of behavioral and/or psychological problems often encountered by people with IDD. They develop solid knowledge and skills in evidence-based clinical practice, and they have research skills to extend the boundaries and application of this knowledge.

A major goal for the area includes continued expansion of research and clinical activities in autism spectrum disorders and what is known in the IDD field as “dual diagnosis,” namely the co-occurrence of IDD and behavior/mental health problems. The IDD area strives to attract the best graduate students with the best possible faculty and be among the leading UCEDDs in the country.

**IDD Focus and Quality.** The IDD area consists of three tenured psychology faculty (Professor Michael Aman, Associate Professor Luc Lecavalier, and Professor Marc J. Tassé). In addition, there are three joint professors: Betsey Benson, Ph.D. (Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry), Susan Havercamp, Ph.D. (Associate Professor of Psychiatry) and James Mulick, Ph.D. (Professor in Pediatrics). Our joint Professors contribute substantially to the training and research efforts of the IDD area. All three joint faculty members are active scholars and clinicians.
in the IDD field and participate extensively in the supervision and training of graduate students. With the exception of Dr. Mulick, who is housed at Nationwide Children’s Hospital, all faculty carry out their responsibilities at the Nisonger Center.

The Psychology of IDD is represented in some form in most of the top psychology programs in North America, with faculty usually associated with either the Developmental or Clinical areas. However, there are few designated “IDD divisions” within Departments of Psychology across the United States or the world, for that matter. OSU’s program is clearly unique. It is among the largest and it is well-respected in the field.

Over the years, the IDD faculty members at OSU have developed national and international reputations in psychopathology, psychopharmacology, instrument development, and autism spectrum disorders. Because of the high currency of some research tools developed by several of our faculty members, the IDD division of Psychology enjoys much national and international visibility.

Dr. Aman is one of the most highly cited researchers in the field. According to the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), between 2005 and 2009 his studies were cited on average 365 times per year. He is the lead author on one of the most highly used rating instruments in the field, the Aberrant Behavior Checklist (ABC). The ABC has been translated in more than 25 languages and is used in many clinical settings and extensively in research studies. For instance, the ABC was recently used as the primary outcome in pivotal clinical trials conducted by Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceuticals and by Bristol-Myers Squibb, resulting in Food and Drug Administration labeling of risperidone and aripiprazole for treating children with autism and severely irritable behavior. In 2003, Dr. Aman won the lifetime achievement award given by the American Academy on Mental Retardation.

In 2002 and 2010, Dr. Tassé co-authored one of the most influential manuals in the field of intellectual disability: The Terminology and Classification Manual put forth by the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD). According to Google Scholar, the 2002 manual was cited 670 times in a period of about seven years. This manual is used by federal and state agencies, school systems, the courts, clinicians, and researchers to determine presence or not of intellectual disability. It has been translated in more than a dozen languages and has enormous day-to-day impact on the lives of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Since the 2002 US Supreme Court ruling in Atkins v. Virginia, the accurate diagnosis of ID can literally have life-or-death consequences in our courts of law, and several IDD faculty have been active as expert witnesses in capital cases. Such determinations are based in part on the Manual.

In 2008, Dr. Lecavalier was awarded two prestigious national awards. He was the recipient of the Early Career awards from the American Association of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and by the American Psychological Association (APA) – Division 33 (Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities). He is currently a Co-Principal Investigator on a R01 NIH-funded study on behavior problems and young children with autism spectrum disorders.

Collectively, the faculty and students have developed some of the most influential instruments in the IDD field. The following are examples of such instruments: Aberrant Behavior Checklist (Aman); Nisonger Child Behavior Rating Form (Aman, Tassé, Lecavalier); Diagnostic Adaptive Behavior Scale (Tassé); Supports Intensity Scale (Tassé); Developmental Disabilities – Children’s Global Assessment Scale (Lecavalier & Aman); Children’s Scale of Hostility and Aggression: Reactive/Proactive (C-SHARP: Farmer (student) & Aman); Adult Scale of Hostility...
and Aggression: Reactive/Proactive [Matlock (student) & Aman]; Behavioral Evaluation of Disorders of Sleep Scale [BEDS; Schreck (student) & Mulick], and Assessment of Depression and Mood Scale [ADAMS: Esbensen (student) & Aman].

In the past 5 years, IDD faculty have received funding from a number of federal agencies. These include the National Institutes of Health, Autism Speaks, Center for Disease Control, Administration on Developmental Disabilities, and American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. In addition, they have received funding from state and local agencies as well as funds to conduct a number of industry studies. At any given time, Dr. Aman is typically involved in 2-4 pharmaceutical industry contracts. Drs. Benson and Lecavalier direct a clinical unit funded through the County Board of Developmental Disabilities that treats approximately 400 individuals with disabilities and behavior problems per year. This ongoing contract is worth about 1.3 million dollars per year and hires about 20 full-time behavior specialists and staff and serves as a training opportunity for psychology graduate students.

In the last 5 years (2005-2009), the three professors tenured in psychology (Aman, Lecavalier, Tassé) have authored or co-authored 16 book chapters and 86 peer-reviewed papers. They have served on a several Editorial Boards and regularly review papers for a number of high-impact scientific journals. For instance, Dr. Tassé is currently an Associate Editor for the American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. Dr. Lecavalier is currently on the Editorial Board of the Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders and has reviewed journal articles for 18 different scientific journals in the last 5 years. Dr. Aman is currently an Associate Editor for the Journal of Mental Health Research in Intellectual Disabilities and on the Editorial Boards of seven other scientific journals. Finally, our faculty are quite active with grant panels. Dr. Aman regularly takes part in study sections at the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Lecavalier has reviewed grants for Autism Speaks, and Dr. Tassé has reviewed grant applications for the Maternal Child Health Bureau and the Administration on Developmental Disabilities.

**IDD Involvement in Undergraduate Education.** The IDD faculty members have had limited involvement in undergraduate teaching. However, Dr. Lecavalier teaches a unique advanced undergraduate course on a yearly basis, the Psychology of Developmental Disabilities (PSYCH 571). This 4-credit class enrolls about 50 students and includes a 20-hour hands-on practicum. The objective is to expose students directly to children and adults with developmental disabilities.

**IDD Graduate Training.** One objective of the IDD area is to recruit very bright and accomplished graduate students. Historically, the area has been quite successful in this regard. Several program graduates have accepted university-based positions and been awarded prestigious awards. For instance, in 2004 Anna Esbensen won the Academy on Mental Retardation Dissertation Award. In 2009, Yona Lunsky was awarded the Early Career Award from the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. Dr. Lunsky is now on faculty at York University in Toronto. Dr. Tassé began his career as a Nisonger postdoctoral fellow and Susan Havercamp is a graduate of the program and has recently returned to O.S.U. from faculty positions at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and University of South Florida.

Currently, there are 11 graduate students in the program, with three more to arrive in Autumn, 2010. Seven students entered the program between 2005 and 2009. Their average GRE scores (total of Verbal and Quantitative) was 1309. Five of the seven students had GPAs above 3.82/4.0 and all seven students received a University Fellowship or a Graduate Enrichment Fellowship. Required IDD graduate classes include two seminars on psychopharmacology and one on assessment. In addition, students are also required to take an interdisciplinary seminar on
developmental disabilities and a research forum which is held 15 times a year throughout the student’s graduate tenure. With the exception of the research forum, graduate students from other areas have taken IDD graduate courses (mainly Clinical and Developmental students).

Since 2004, seven students have graduated from the program. Three of these seven students went on to academic positions: Anna Esbenson (postdoctoral fellow at the University of Wisconsin), Kristen Lam (research associate at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), and Anne Snow (postdoctoral fellow at Boston University; now at Yale University).

Graduate students in the IDD area are active in research and publishing scientific papers. In the past 5 years (2005-2009), they have co-authored 39 peer-reviewed papers.

**IDD Interdisciplinary Connections and Outreach.** The Nisonger Center is an interdisciplinary center with approximately 25 faculty members from more than 12 disciplines across four O.S.U. Colleges. Several of the Psychology faculty are also involved in training fellows who are part of the Nisonger Center’s federally funded Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental Disabilities (LEND) training grant. Many of the Center’s clinics and research endeavors are interdisciplinary in nature. For instance, Dr. Aman’s psychopharmacology research unit contains four psychologists, three child psychiatrists, one geneticist, and a nurse practitioner. Currently, the research unit has eight full-time research coordinators. The Nisonger Center’s Autism Diagnostic Clinic, a practicum site for graduate students in psychology, has professionals from the following disciplines who work together: pediatrics, speech and hearing, occupational therapy, and social work. Since 2003, Dr. Benson has been involved in the Outreach – Coordinating Center of Excellence in Mental Illness and Developmental Disabilities project, which is a statewide initiative to improve services and support for individuals with developmental disability and comorbid mental illness. This project is funded by the Departments of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities, and the Developmental Disabilities Council and includes psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers. Dr. Havercamp provides disability training for physicians, nurses, and health educators and serves on a behavioral and social science task force to support the revision and implementation of a new undergraduate medical education curriculum for the O.S.U. College of Medicine’s undergraduate medical education.

**IDD Strengths and Weaknesses.** The IDD area comprises a group of respected researchers and clinicians who are committed to contributing to the IDD field and training students. The area has an international reputation in dual diagnosis, autism spectrum disorders, and instrument development. National appointments and recognitions have validated faculty leadership and increased the visibility of IDD psychology at O.S.U. One potential weakness of the area is its size (with only three regular members, it is the smallest area). There is also the fact that there are no junior-level faculty members (i.e., no Assistant Professors). On one hand, it suggests seasoned faculty. On the other hand, the area will eventually benefit from “new blood.” However, in 2010, both a junior psychologist and a postdoctoral fellow joined other psychologists at the Nisonger Center.

**IDD Strategic Plan.** One of the area’s main objectives is to contribute to the establishment of a National Institute of Health (P30) Developmental Disability Research Center (DDRC) at O.S.U., likely to be focused at Nisonger Center. Of necessity, this must involve researchers who hold at least 10 active research grants, usually of NIH R01 status. The average number of R01s held by the currently funded DDRCs is 20. Consequently, to be competitive for the DDRC, a major organizational undertaking involving numerous investigators at O.S.U. will be necessary.
In addition, the IDD area is planning to reexamine its curriculum, with the possibility of adding graduate classes (e.g., ethics, behavior modification course, and a business course). We hope to increase the number of postdoctoral fellows.

BRIEF IDD AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES

1. **Michael Aman** (Professor, Ph.D., 1979, Auckland University, N.Z., Psychology and Psychiatry). Dr. Aman studies the effects of psychotropic medicines in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders, intellectual disabilities, disruptive behavior disorders, and ADHD. He also conducts psychometric studies of standardized instruments, and he has developed or co-developed four instruments for assessing problem behaviors, including the Aberrant Behavior Checklist, widely used in developmental disability research. He is author of over 230 publications and currently is PI on 2 NIH grants. Dr. Aman is recipient of the American Academy on Mental Retardation’s Career Scientist Award.

2. **Luc Lecavalier** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 2001, Université du Québec à Montréal, Psychology and Psychiatry). Dr. Lecavalier is interested in behavior and emotional problems in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders and intellectual disability. He is also interested in diagnosis and measurement in these populations and conducts psychometric studies of standardized diagnostic instruments. He has received state and federal grants to study these topics and has authored more than 50 scholarly publications. Dr. Lecavalier is the recipient of Early Career Awards from the Association of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD) and Division 33 of the American Psychological Association.

3. **Marc J. Tassé** (Professor, Ph.D., 1994, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada - Psychology). Dr. Tassé is Director of the OSU Nisonger Center, a University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD). Dr. Tassé has more than 20 years of experience in conducting research and providing clinical services in the field of intellectual disability (formerly known as mental retardation), autism spectrum disorders, and other related developmental disabilities. His publication record includes more than 75 articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters, and books in the area of intellectual and developmental disabilities. He is a co-author of the AAIDD (2002 and 2010) Terminology and Classification Manual and AAIDD User’s Guide. Dr. Tassé is President-elect of the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

(6) QUANTITATIVE PSYCHOLOGY AREA SELF-STUDY
(Michael Edwards, Area Coordinator)

Quantitative Psychology as a Discipline. The American Psychological Association’s (APA) Task Force for Increasing the Number of Quantitative Psychologists (hereafter referred to as APA’s Quant Task Force) has defined quantitative psychology as “...the study of methods and techniques for the measurement of human attributes, the statistical and mathematical modeling of psychological processes, the design of research studies, and the analysis of psychological data.” As psychological research has shifted emphasis from exploration and description to specification and testing of theories, quantitative methods have taken a more central role in the field. The most important aspect of this endeavor is the translation of psychological theories into formal mathematical representations and the development of methods for testing the correspondence of
those mathematical models to empirical data. Thus, quantitative psychology provides a foundation for the formal specification and evaluation of psychological theories, thereby moving beyond routine analysis and description of data.

Quantitative Psychology in the United States. Quantitative psychology has attracted national interest over the past several years. In particular, the No Child Left Behind Act, signed into law in 2002, has created a huge demand for psychometricians and quantitative psychologists. Articles in the New York Times (Herszenhorn, 2006) and the APA Monitor (Clay, 2005) have highlighted the importance of quantitative psychology to psychological research and the critical shortage of people trained in quantitative psychology.

Including OSU, there are fewer than 25 psychology departments in North America which offer a Ph.D. in quantitative psychology. The field graduates roughly 21 Ph.D.s every year and the demand has consistently exceeded the supply. In addition to the high demand in academia for quantitative psychologists, the few new Ph.D.s produced each year are frequently courted by private industry where starting salaries can exceed $100,000. The APA has recognized that the lack of quantitative psychology Ph.D. programs in the United States is precipitating a crisis for the rest of academic psychology. As psychology matures as a science, its theories become more quantitative, and its analyses of data employ more complex statistical models and methods. Without quantitative psychologists to train the next generation of academics, Steven Breckler, Executive Director for Science at the APA states, we run the risk of “not understanding our own work... There are a lot of new developments on the horizon and not enough brainpower being put to bear on them” (in Clay, 2005). As part of its efforts to encourage the growth of the quantitative field, the APA formed the Quant Task Force to assess the feasibility of training increased numbers of quantitative psychologists. Throughout this document we will pull data from the report of the Quant Task Force, as it represents the most recent data acquired regarding the state of quantitative psychology in North America.

Quantitative Psychology at Ohio State. The Quantitative Psychology program is structured in terms of two distinct but related areas of study. One could be defined broadly as Psychometrics. The focus of this group (four faculty members) is on methodology for the analysis of multivariate data, with particular attention to the development and testing of models for correlational (non-experimental) data. We model correlational or observational data using approaches such as structural equation modeling, multilevel modeling, and latent curve modeling, with a special interest in the study of change over time. These methods are heavily used throughout psychology and among other social sciences (and in some cases increasingly in the physical sciences).

The second focus within our program includes Mathematical Psychology and Judgment and Decision Making (JDM). The Mathematical Psychology group (two faculty members) features researchers interested in developing new statistical models of cognitive processes such as JDM, categorization, learning, and memory. The JDM group (three faculty members) is interested in experimentally testing theories of JDM including risk perception and risk attitudes, cross-cultural differences in risky choice, roles of emotion and memory in decision making, medical decision making, economic decision making, and contextual and task effects in decision making. The JDM faculty are part of a larger JDM initiative in Social and Behavioral Sciences at OSU.

Quantitative Area Focus and Quality. After several years of building and as the results of effective strategic hires, quantitative psychology at OSU is one of the strongest programs in the United States. Faculty members in our program are productive researchers with international visibility and contribute to the increase in the scholarly reputation of the department as a whole. While traditional rankings of graduate programs (e.g., by the U.S. News and World Report and
the NRC) don't separate out quantitative psychology programs for consideration, OSU's quantitative psychology program is usually, based on informal conversations among colleagues, ranked in the top three programs.

Another source of our strong reputation is the ranking of our JDM offerings. In 2004 our “Prescriptive Graduate Decision Program” was tied for 11th in the nation, and our “Descriptive Graduate Decision Program” was tied for 26th.¹ We compete very well with universities that have larger, free-standing JDM programs. In addition, a Behavioral Decision Making Initiative has been funded by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. This has enabled us to strengthen our JDM offerings further by hiring two additional faculty members in quantitative, hiring a new faculty member in social, hiring a post-doctoral scholar, and by sponsoring colloquia in the JDM domain.

Faculty Quality. The scientific reputation of the Quantitative faculty is excellent. Recent papers written by area members have appeared in important outlets: the Annual Review of Psychology (Cudeck, 2007), the Journal of the American Medical Association (Peters, 2009), Psychological Methods (Browne, 2002; Edwards, 2007), Psychological Review (Myung, 2009), Psychological Science (Browne, 2005; DeKay, 2005; Peters, 2006, in press), Psychometrika (Browne, 2007; Cudeck, 2005, 2009; Edwards, in press; Van Zandt, In Press), to name but a few.

Another measure of excellence is the average number of citations to our faculty's work per year, which is 98 citations per faculty member (2007-2009; 124 w/o untenured faculty). Half of our faculty have been funded in the last five years (2005-2009) and Dr. Peters has recently arrived at OSU with several active NSF grants.

The area faculty have held or currently hold several leadership positions in national societies. These are: the Society for Judgment and Decision Making (Peters, Executive Board), the Psychometric Society (Browne and Cudeck, President), the Society for Mathematical Psychology (both Myung and Van Zandt have served on the Executive Board and held the office of Society President), and the Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology (Browne and Cudeck, President). Faculty in the program have served or are currently serving as Editors, Associate Editors or Guest Editors for prominent journals in the discipline. These are: Health Psychology (Peters), Journal of Mathematical Psychology (Myung, Van Zandt), Journal of Vocational Behavior (Betz), Journal of Behavioral Decision Making (Peters), Multivariate Behavioral Research (Cudeck), and Psychometrika (Browne, Cudeck). Faculty have served and presently serve on many editorial boards (see Table 5 in Appendix A for a complete list).

Several members of our faculty are currently serving or have served on grant review panels for the NSF (Browne, Cudeck, DeKay, Myung, Nygren, Peters, Van Zandt) and the NIH (Cudeck, Peters, Van Zandt). Dr. Myung has received the New Investigator Award from the Society for Mathematical Psychology (Myung) and Dr. Browne has received two lifetime achievement awards: the Sells Award for Lifetime Achievement from the Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Psychometric Society. Dr. Van Zandt is a PECASE award winner. All of these awards and activities serve to advance our field as well as to lend visibility and prestige to Ohio State University and our Psychology department.

Diversity. Of the nine faculty in the quantitative area, three are women and one is Asian. Increasing diversity is a perennial concern - unfortunately there are very few women and under-

represented minorities in quantitative psychology, and our numbers reflect the larger problems in
the field as a whole. Our current efforts to increase the diversity of the applicant pool have
focused on increasing the diversity of the graduate student body and are described below in
section 4.5.

Quantitative Area Contribution to Undergraduate Instruction. The Quantitative area, in the
past seven years, has focused a great deal of attention on teaching and curriculum development of
undergraduate courses. In the past five years the quantitative area faculty have taught more
courses (151) to more undergraduates (4,791 students) than any other area in the department. The
courses that we teach are, for the most part, “service” courses that satisfy requirements for the
Psychology major. Four courses have large enrollments and are offered throughout the academic
year (220, 321, 508 and 511), and 220, 321, and 508 are also offered as honors classes. In 2004,
enrollments in the critical data analysis sequence (320, 321) were much smaller than they are
now. Typically, the enrollment for 220 reaches its limit of 120 every quarter; the availability of
larger classrooms has been limiting us from increasing the cap on many courses. Part of our
increase in credit hours can also be attributed to curriculum development. In particular, Dr. Van
Zandt has taught Psychology 301, a 5-credit course that attracts approximately 250 students per
year. One happy byproduct of our undergraduate teaching efforts is an increased visibility of
quantitative psychology among the undergraduate students. We have admitted at least three OSU
undergraduates into the quantitative psychology Ph.D. program over the past several years.

Quantitative Area Graduate Training. As is typical of quantitative programs, each student’s
program of study is highly customized to fit their specific interests. Regardless of focus, our PhD
students take most, if not all, of the courses offered by any of the quantitative faculty. To build on
this core, students usually seek additional coursework in an allied area (e.g., cognitive
psychology, economics, statistics, etc.). The area has been concerned about the lack of consistent
upper-level coursework for our own PhD students - a concern we hear from our colleagues in
other quantitative program. We have proposed an advanced quantitative seminar for the semester
conversion that will run once a year and rotate among the quantitative faculty. This will insure
that our students will have access to at least one upper-level course every year. Much training
also takes place outside of the classroom in labs or one-on-one with an adviser.

OSU has a reputation for training graduate students with sophisticated research skills, and our
program makes a major contribution to such training. OSU trains graduate students in all areas of
psychology in the intelligent use of quantitative methods in their research. All graduate students
in the Psychology Department complete at least three courses in the Quantitative area (the
statistical methods sequence 826, 827, and 828), and many students choose to take a minor in
quantitative psychology, which requires three additional courses. We grant approximately 10
minors per year. Dr. Betz also teaches 864.06 (Psychological Measurement), which is a required
course in other areas and departments. The quantitative area has taught more graduate courses
(48) and graduate students (1,473 students) than any other area in the department.

Applicants. The number of applicants to the Quantitative program has grown since 2000, with a
high of 32 in 2009. The average number of applicants from 2000-2005 was just over 17. Since
then, the average number of applicants had grown to 25. We attribute this to the visibility and
quality of the program, as well as the attention currently being paid to the job opportunities in
quantitative psychology and the increase in demand for qualified graduate applicants.

Our applicants typically have very strong mathematics backgrounds and often have dual
undergraduate majors in psychology and mathematics. Predictably, students who applied and
were accepted to our program averaged at or near the top of the eight graduate psychology
programs on the quantitative component of the GRE, with means over the past five years ranging from 650 to 780. Mean GRE-Verbal scores are in the 550 to 680 range, but are still competitive with those from the other programs despite the fact that in any given year as many as approximately 40% of our applicants are international students for whom English is a second language.

Each year we admit 6-13 applicants into the Quantitative Program and 2-6 matriculate. The numbers are small, but the quality of the students is quite high. One indicator of the strength of our program is that when we do lose a very desirable applicant to another school, it is almost always to a school that is either a strong competitor with a highly visible quantitative program (e.g., University of Illinois, University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill) or that has a highly visible researcher in the student's particular area of interest (e.g., UCLA, Virginia, Indiana, Minnesota, in recent years).

As of September 2010, we will have nine faculty and 22 graduate students. Our student to faculty ratio (2.4) is higher than the median ratio at other quantitative programs in North America (1.6; APA Quant Task Force Report). In 2005-2009 we have graduated 6 Ph.D. students. This low number is a product of recruitment cycles and the fact that three quantitative faculty have not yet been at OSU long enough to graduate students. We have had three students leave the program in that same period. All three left prior to completion of the MA degree. Given the extremely limited exposure students have to quantitative psychology prior to their arrival in graduate school, we are not surprised that a small number find it not to their liking. In 2000-2009, our graduates finished their degrees in between four and nine years, with a mean of 5.7, a median of 5, and a mode of 5.

**Graduate Placement.** Over the past decade every graduate from our quantitative program has been successful in finding employment as a quantitative psychologist, and has been able to do so in his or her chosen career field. We have graduated 14 Ph.D.s since 2000. Six of these individuals now hold tenure track faculty positions at academic institutions including the University of Notre Dame (quant), University of Kansas (quant), and University of Colorado at Boulder (marketing/psychology). One is a post-doc at Indiana University and another is a research associate at the University of Chicago’s School of Business. The remaining individuals obtained positions with prestigious companies and institutions such as ETS, Batelle, NASA, and the Social Security Administration. As the demand for Quantitative Psychologists continues to grow, opportunities for our graduates will remain attractive.

**Diversity.** Currently 21 students are enrolled in the quantitative psychology program. Of those 21, ten are women. Eight students are international (Asian). Our area works diligently to attract women and under-represented minorities to the program, but few apply. Minority applicants that do apply are usually admitted to the program, and many such applicants have received Graduate fellowships. Unfortunately, programs at other universities are also very eager to recruit under-represented students, and so it is frequently difficult to attract them. To improve this situation our faculty are quite active in minority recruitment efforts. Drs. Browne and Van Zandt have been Summer Research Opportunities Program sponsors and many of us mentor minority undergraduate research projects (695 and 699).

**Quantitative Area Interdisciplinary Connections.** Quantitative psychology has always been an interdisciplinary field. Our work has far-reaching impact beyond Psychology in nearly every scientific field. Increasing the breadth of and access to quantitative expertise will be beneficial across the entire university in terms of scientific collaborations, student training, and the successful pursuit of grant funding. Technological developments have given scientists increasing access to tremendous amounts of data. To be used in the most effective ways, researchers must
understand how to analyze the data and interpret the results. This is especially true in the social sciences, where methods developed by quantitative psychologists form the bedrock for much of the current research. Within the department, quantitative faculty have active collaborations with researchers in almost every area in the department. Faculty in the quantitative area collaborate with various groups across the college and university as well. These groups include (but are not limited to): Children’s Hospital, communication, economics, educational policy and leadership, human development and family science, Institute for Behavioral Medicine Research, internal medicine, neuroscience, public health, speech and hearing, and statistics. Quantitative expertise is constantly sought out and the faculty in the quantitative area can only handle a small fraction of the requests for collaboration we receive from across the University community.

**Quantitative Area Strengths and Weaknesses.** The quantitative psychology program at OSU has long been regarded as one of the strongest quantitative programs in the world. In addition to its excellent reputation in the field, it has enjoyed strong support from the department and as of Autumn 2010 it will house nine faculty. This makes the OSU quantitative program the largest in the world. This is reflected in the content of our research, which is as broad or broader than most other quantitative programs. The area benefits from having close working relationships with researchers who share similar research interests within and across the campus. For example, the psychometricians have close ties with faculty in statistics, the mathematical psychologists work closely with cognitive psychologists and colleagues in statistics, and the JDM researchers have strong ties to the social psychology program.

In some senses, the size of the area is deceptive. First, we are acutely aware of the fact that three of our senior colleagues are likely to be retiring in the near future (two of the three in the immediate future). To maintain our reputation it will be crucial to replace these retiring faculty. Indeed, one search is currently underway. Given the breadth of coverage in the area is maintained with relatively small numbers of faculty in each foci, losses in any of these would have a significant negative impact on the area as a whole.

**Quantitative Area Strategic Plan.** The area was very pleased that we will be able to search for an Assistant or Associate level faculty member during the 2010-2011 academic year. This will allow us to smoothly transition through the announced retirement of one of our senior colleagues. We know of one other impending retirement and another likely to occur within the next three to five years. It will be important to quickly replace the impending retiree if we are to maintain the area’s reputation and productivity. Although the two imminent retirees are full professors, we would like to replace both with Assistant/Associate level faculty. We hope this will provide us with long term stability as an area by creating a cohort of excellent faculty who could potentially remain in place for two decades. The replacement of the third retiree will be an opportunity for the quantitative program to look for a researcher with interests that overlap the various foci within the quantitative program and hence may serve as a bridge to further strengthen those relationships within the program. In order to maintain some balance in rank in the area, and given likely targets for this position, we would like this to be an open rank search. We think this final hire would put us at a near ideal size (nine) and composition.

**BRIEF QUANTITATIVE AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES**

1. **Nancy Betz** (Professor, Ph.D., Psychology, 1976, University of Minnesota, Counseling Psychology and Psychometrics). Betz is currently involved in applications of item response theory and adaptive testing to career assessment. She has approximately 150 articles and chapters and two books on topics of vocational behavior and assessment, applications of self-efficacy theory to career behavior, and psychological measurement.
She has developed ten specific measures of vocational behavior and personality and three multi-scale inventories, two of vocational behavior and one of domains of the healthy personality. Dr. Betz is past Editor of the Journal of Vocational Behavior and recipient of the Leona Tyler Award for Distinguished Lifetime Contribution to Counseling Psychology and the Society of Vocational Psychology Lifetime Achievement Award.

2. **Michael Browne** (Professor, Ph.D., 1969, University of South Africa, Statistics). Dr. Browne's research has been primarily concerned with statistical modeling of multivariate psychological data. He has made contributions on asymptotically distribution free estimation in the analysis of moment structures, asymptotic robustness of multivariate normal theory against violation of assumptions, multiplicative models for multitrait-multimethod data, circumplex models for investigating the personality circle, nonlinear latent curve models, and rotational methodology for factor analysis. His main current interests are in multivariate time series and dynamic factor analysis. He is author of about 80 publications. Dr. Browne has served as President of the Psychometric Society and the Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology. His awards include the Sells Award for Distinguished Lifetime Achievement in multivariate experimental psychology from the SMEP and the Lifetime achievement award from the Psychometric Society.

3. **Robert Cudeck** (Professor, Ph.D., 1980, University of Southern California, Quantitative Psychology). Dr. Cudeck studies the application of psychometric models to psychological data. He is author of over 60 publications and currently is a consultant or co-investigator on 3 NIH grants. Dr. Cudeck is past President of the Psychometric Society and the Society for Multivariate Experimental Psychology. His awards include receipt of the Cattell Award for Applied Multivariate Research.

4. **Michael L. DeKay** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1994, University of Colorado, Social Psychology). Professor DeKay's research is focused on the psychology of judgment and decision making. Recent and ongoing research projects involve perceptions of health, safety, and ecological risks; precautionary reasoning; information distortion in risky decisions; the perceived fungibility of outcomes in repeated decisions; and applications in environmental and medical decision making. He is author or co-author of 31 peer-reviewed journal articles, 3 book chapters, and several other publications, including one National Research Council report. He has been the PI or Co-PI on 5 grants form NSF and EPA.

5. **Michael C. Edwards** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2005, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Quantitative Psychology). Dr. Edwards’ research focus is on the use and development of latent variable models. Within that wide range of models, most of his work has focused on item response theory and factor analysis. He is author of over 20 publications, contributed to the creation of three software packages, has been a consultant on seven different grants, and a PI on a contract with the College Board. He currently serves on the editorial board of *Psychological Methods*.

6. **Jay Myung** (Professor, Ph.D., 1990, Purdue University, Mathematical Psychology). Dr. Myung’s interests include model comparison, design optimization, Bayesian methods, and neural network modeling. He is author of over 50 publications and currently PI on 1 NIH and 1 AFOSR grant. Dr. Myung is past President of the Society for Mathematical Psychology and the current Editor of the *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*. 
7. Thomas E. Nygren, Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1975, University of Illinois, Quantitative Psychology). Currently, Vice Chair (2006-date), Interim Chair (2010-11). Dr. Nygren studies individual differences in decision making style and has developed the Decision Making Styles Inventory (DMI). Other interests include influence of affect and stress on perceived risk and risky choice, cognitive models of mental workload, and decision making under varying levels of mental workload. Current research investigates the relationships between self-report decision style (DMI), confidence, and self-efficacy. He is author of over 25 journal and proceedings articles and has been PI on four AFOSR (3) and NASA (1) grants.

8. Ellen Peters (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1998, University of Oregon, Psychology). Dr. Peters studies how affective, intuitive, and deliberative processes help people to make decisions in an increasingly complex world. She studies decision making as an interaction of characteristics of the decision situation and characteristics of the individual. Her research interests include decision making, affect and emotion, risk perception, numeracy, intuitive number processing, and aging, and she is particularly interested in the development and application of psychological theory to problems in health domains. She is author of over 70 publications and has been PI or co-PI on 15 grants. Dr. Peters is past recipient of the Jane Beattie Scientific Recognition Award for innovative contributions to decision research presented by the European Association for Decision Making.

9. Trisha Van Zandt (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 1992, Purdue University, Quantitative Psychology). Dr. Van Zandt studies choice and judgment and develops dynamic models of choice performance. She also works on the application of Bayesian methods to the analysis of response time data. She is author of 31 publications. She has been the PI or co-PI on 5 NSF grants. Dr. van Zandt is past President of the Society for Mathematical Psychology, and past recipient of a Presidential Early Career Award from the National Science Foundation.

(7) SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AREA SELF-STUDY
(Russell Fazio, Area Coordinator)

Social Area’s Mission and Goals. The Social Psychology Area defines its goals within the overall university and departmental mission. We are dedicated to the continuing pursuit of excellence in research, in teaching, and in service to the profession, university, citizens of Ohio and the nation. The area is committed to being at the forefront of the creation, transmission, and application of new social psychological knowledge and to educating the social psychological scientists of the 21st century. Like the Department as whole, the foundation of the area’s mission is research. The area is committed to maintaining its tradition as one of the very top programs in the country and to advancing the Department toward its goal of achieving a top 10 ranking among public universities.

The area’s undergraduate mission is centered on social psychology’s role as a hub discipline for other domains of psychology and for other social and behavioral sciences. We focus on maintaining a high quality undergraduate major. Preeminent research laboratories play a unique role in providing undergraduate students not only with the knowledge base of social psychology, but also with the opportunities to become involved in the actual creation of new knowledge. At the graduate level, the area mission is focused upon maintaining our position as a premier PhD training program. Both the undergraduate and graduate programs are research intensive in emphasis and both focus on the development of critical thinking, problem solving,
and communication skills.

Social psychology as a discipline. Social psychology is concerned with the scientific study of how individuals think about, influence, and relate to other people. As such, the focus can range from intra-individual to intergroup processes, and from a concern with basic, underlying mechanisms to a more applied, social policy perspective.

Social psychology at OSU. Our own program is focused on basic theory and research in experimental social psychology. The faculty share a commitment to laboratory research that is theoretically-driven and programmatic in nature with the goal of understanding the processes by which a given phenomenon occurs. Our strengths lie in the study of intra-individual processes, especially the area of attitudes and social cognition. This is actually the core of the discipline – the level of analysis that informs much of the research on interpersonal and group processes, as well as research pursuing more applied questions.

Emerging national trends. Now that the social cognition perspective has been firmly established, the discipline has shown increasing concern with how such processes are influenced by motivation, emotion, and self-regulation. This interface between affect and cognition is attracting considerable research attention. The discipline also is showing greater appreciation for the more molecular level of analysis represented by the emerging fields of social neuroscience and social genetics. Research involving brain imaging, electrical activity, neurochemistry, and gene assays is increasingly pursued in the interest of identifying the neural mechanisms that may play a role in social judgment and behavior. At the same time, the discipline is expanding in a more macro direction, with increasing attention to the influences of interpersonal relationships, social networks, and culture on the individual. Finally, changes in the funding priorities of the National Institute of Mental Health, which historically has been among the major supporters of basic research in social psychology, will place an increased emphasis on the relevance of basic theory and research to mental and physical well-being and, in particular, its implications regarding the development, assessment, and treatment of clinical disorders. Given the strengths and expertise of the current group, faculty additions (or replacements, in the event of resignations) sensitive to these emerging trends will position the program to remain at the forefront of the discipline.

Social Program Quality. A number of indicators point to the international pre-eminence that the social psychology program has achieved.

Rankings. The program was ranked #1 in two surveys conducted by Professor Don Carlston of Purdue University in the Fall of 2002. One involved a sample of scientists who had been identified by a 2002 published analysis as the 25 most-cited scholars in the field – a list that includes two current OSU faculty. The surveyed individuals were asked to identify and rank the 5 programs they “consider to be the best/strongest programs in social psychology today.” The data are summarized in Table 1 in this report. Although Carlston’s tabulations justifiably excluded individuals’ mentions of their own institutions, the OSU social program emerged as the top-rated. The same ranking was achieved in a second survey involving the editors and associate editors of the field’s major journals. In 2009, the US News and World Report’s survey of graduate programs ranked OSU’s social psychology program as tied for second best in the nation (see Table 2 in this report). This is a reputational ranking based on the opinions of psychology department chairs.
Table 1: Ranking of Social Psychology Programs from the Carlston Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percent listing program among the top 5</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo (Canada)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC - Santa Barbara</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Survey participants were asked to list the 5 “best/strongest programs in social psychology today.” For the ranking score, any school not listed was assigned a rank value of 6.

Table 2: Number of Faculty Employed in the Social Psychology Programs Identified as in the “Top 10” in the US News and World Report Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Rank</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stanford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yale</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harvard</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. UCLA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Princeton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UC–Berkeley</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NYU</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Virginia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty Quality.** Departmental data provide strong indications of the stellar quality of the program faculty. The faculty’s average score on the Department’s index of internal points, which considers number of publications and impact ratings of the journals in which the publications appear, is very high, as is the percentage of area faculty who have been awarded external funding in the last 5 years (see Table 4, Appendix A). The average number of citations to the work of any given faculty member is very high (an average of 166 per faculty member per year, 2007-2009, and even higher, 226, when considering only tenured faculty members). Indeed, a 2002 publication listed two area faculty members as among the 25 most highly cited social psychologists in the world (Tesser & Bau, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2002). A more recent survey (Nosek et al., 2010) confirmed that two OSU social psychologists were in the Top 30. When adjusted for years since degree, the survey indicated that three OSU faculty were in the Top 45. Finally, a 2009 article in the Society for Personality and Social Psychology *Dialogue* listed one of our then assistant professors as among the top 10 cited young faculty in social psychology. This productivity has resulted in the area faculty having been selected for numerous local and national awards and honors, as well as their holding or having held positions as editors and associate editors of many leading journals in social psychology and psychology more generally. The departmental listing of faculty editorships and awards found in Tables 5 and 6 of Appendix A provides documentation of the many notable awards, editorial positions, and major professional service activities of the social area faculty.

**Faculty Diversity.** Defining diversity in terms of ethnicity, gender, and age, the social area has made efforts to increase diversity on all three of these dimensions in the last few years. Prior to 2004, the age distribution of our faculty was seriously skewed in the direction of senior faculty, many from the same cohort at the full professor level. For this reason, hiring of new and replacement faculty over the last 6 years has targeted primarily junior and mid-career hires. As of January 2011, we will have a distribution of 7:3 tenured to untenured faculty members. Moreover, with the recruitment of one young full professor and the recent promotion of an assistant professor, the 7 tenured faculty now include a wider age range. We remain concerned about the need to fill in the age distribution with younger tenured faculty (at advanced associate, early full stages) as retirements or resignations occur. With respect to gender, we currently have 3 (of 10) female faculty (1 untenured, 2 tenured), which is on a par with other graduate programs in social psychology in the U.S. Our ethnic diversity has also been increased with the hiring of an Asian-American assistant professor in 2006, but we have not yet been successful in our several attempts to recruit African-American social psychologists. We have targeted some very promising young African-American scholars for potential recruitment, but competition is very strong for these young stars and we have not been successful in our efforts. We will continue to remain alert for signs that any such minority individuals might be movable.

We have been somewhat more successful in the recruitment of minority students to our doctoral program. Minority applicants have constituted between 13 - 18% of the applicant pool for admission to the doctoral program each year over the past 10 years, and of these we have admitted and successfully recruited an average of one every other year. Minority students who have enrolled in the OSU social psychology program over the recent past have been highly successful. One was awarded an NSF minority predoctoral fellowship, and one African-American graduate student received the distinguished American Psychological Association Minority Fellowship.

---

2 According to statistics compiled by Ferguson & Crandall (2007), of 474 social psychology core faculty in 105 doctoral training programs in the U.S., 35% are female, but females comprise a larger proportion among younger faculty (46%).
Social Undergraduate Program. Social psychology courses account for a substantial proportion of the Department’s undergraduate enrollment (an average of 24% over the last five years). Psychology 367.01, Introduction to Social Psychology, enrolls a large number of students, and its status as a writing course makes it especially central to the Department’s teaching mission. Each quarter, 10-13 sections of this intensive writing course are offered by advanced graduate students in social psychology, under the supervision of one of the area faculty. The faculty also offer an array of lower level (e.g., stereotyping and prejudice, interpersonal relationships) and upper level undergraduate courses (e.g., the self, emotions, attitudes, persuasion) that contribute to the diversity of options available to Psychology majors. In addition, area faculty regularly teach an advanced laboratory course in experimental social psychology that exposes students to all phases of conducting research. Also noteworthy is the large number of undergraduates participating in supervised research under the auspices of Psychology 699 and the Departmental honors program. This involvement in a laboratory research team provides students with a truly unique educational experience.

Social Graduate Program. As indicated above, our doctoral program in social psychology has been ranked as among the very best in the country, and as a consequence we attract a high number of well qualified applicants to our program each year. Although there have been some natural fluctuations from year to year, the number of applicants annually to the graduate program has averaged about 105. The GRE scores and undergraduate GPAs of the enrolled students are excellent. Over the past 5 years, for example, verbal + quantitative GREs have averaged 1355, and the overall GPA has averaged 3.82 (see Table 4 in the departmental self-study document). In addition to being awarded a large number of university fellowships, many of the students prove competitive for external fellowships of one sort or the other. Three of the area’s current students have received NSF Graduate Fellowships, and two have been awarded graduate fellowships from the Department of Homeland Security.

The graduate curriculum includes both a substantive core sequence of courses on attitudes, social cognition, and social motivation, and a research methods sequence. Seminars on topics of interest to the faculty and students are also offered regularly. Students are immediately immersed in research, with the noteworthy milestones including completion of a first year research project, a masters thesis, and the dissertation. Two research groups (Group for Attitudes and Persuasion, and Social Cognition Research Group) meet weekly, providing students with many opportunities to present their research and obtain constructive feedback.

The area’s record regarding the placement of its PhDs continues to be excellent, with some recent graduates having obtained faculty positions at major research institutions, including Stanford, Michigan, Northwestern, Wisconsin, and Indiana. We also have a number of international placements, including faculty positions at INSEAD School of Business in Paris, the University of Birmingham in the UK, and the prestigious National University of Singapore. As testimony to the outstanding record of placement of graduate students, a recent publication [Ferguson, M. A., & Crandall, C. S. (2007). Trends in graduate training in social psychology. Training social psychology's trainers. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29, 311-322] ranked the OSU social psychology program as one of the top two (tied with University of Illinois) in placement of PhDs as tenure track faculty members in doctoral social psychology programs between 1991-2004 (ahead of Michigan, Columbia, and Stanford in the top five).

Social Area Collaborations and Interdisciplinary Involvement. The extent of cross-area collaboration on the part of social psychology faculty has increased substantially in the past few years. Area faculty have been actively involved in the department-wide strategic initiatives in health, judgment & decision making, and integrative neuroscience. At present, one or more area
faculty members are pursuing collaborations (including ongoing data collections, grant proposals, and/or co-authored publications) with faculty from the clinical, developmental, and behavioral neuroscience programs.

Area faculty are involved with the following interdisciplinary programs within the university: Cognitive Science Center, Mershon Center, Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, Institute for Behavioral Medicine Research, Institute for Energy and the Environment, and the Center for Law, Policy, and Social Science. Area faculty also are actively involved in organizing the ongoing Law and Social/Cognitive Psychology Speaker’s series. Various faculty also are engaged in collaborative research with colleagues in the School of Communication and the Fisher College of Business.

**Social Area Strategic Plans.** Our ultimate objective is to solidify and maintain the program’s outstanding quality and reputation. Retention of the existing and very strong core faculty is critical, as is immediate response to any unexpected resignations. A long-term perspective will require attention to the age demographics of the faculty so as to ensure an appropriate mix of senior and junior faculty to sustain its excellence.

In 2004 the number of faculty in the social psychology program had decreased from what we had viewed as its ideal size of 10 to 8. By 2007, we experienced two additional losses, one assistant professor (Payne) and one full professor (Brock), but had hired two assistant professors (Cunningham and Fujita). The new hires were consistent with our goals of keeping up with new emerging trends in the field as specified earlier. As a result of these appointments, we maintained our faculty size at 8, but adjusted at least partly the balance of junior to senior faculty in the program.

The challenges that occupied us the past three years have centered on two critical faculty positions. We successfully recruited a very prominent scientist, Jenny Crocker, from the University of Michigan as the new Ohio Eminent Scholar in Social Psychology, a position vacated by the retirement of Marilynn Brewer in 2008. We also recruited Duane Wegener from Purdue University for a position targeted at the interface of social psychology and judgment and decision making. This appointment will enhance our participation in SBS’s targeted initiative in Behavioral Decision Making and encourage inter-departmental links to Economics and Political Science. Moreover, this recruitment of a young full professor represents a first step toward balancing the age distribution in our program and assuring continuity of senior leadership. These two hires also solidify our strength with respect to our core emphasis on attitudes and social cognition, broadly defined.

As of January, an additional assistant professor will be joining the program. This hire emerged from a departmental search in “health psychology.” Baldwin Way, currently completing a postdoctoral fellowship at UCLA, has an appointment that is split between the Psychology Department and the Medical School. He will strengthen the program’s expertise in social neuroscience and, more specifically, genetics. In addition, Way will contribute to SBS’s targeted initiative in Population and Health.

With these recent additions and replacements, the area has achieved its goal of returning to its ideal size of 10 faculty. Although two of these individuals have significant administrative responsibilities (Dean Weary and Chair Petty), we now feel much better positioned in terms of effectively operating our graduate and undergraduate programs. Moreover, the composition of the current faculty meshes well with our program goals of keeping pace with emerging trends in the field, linking to cross-area initiatives in the department and university, and at the same time
maintaining our core strength in attitudes and social cognition. Finally, our newly-achieved size restores our comparability to other prominent social psychology programs. For example, consideration of the size of those programs that achieved “Top 10” status in the *U.S. News and World Report* survey summarized earlier (see Table 2, above) shows our program to rank at the median.

The return to an area of 10 faculty is especially critical to the graduate program. The faculty shortage, coupled with the impact of the sudden economic downturn on the job market, had distorted our student/faculty ratio. Over the next few years, we plan to work toward a more appropriate balance of a fewer number of students across the larger number of faculty. We envision a 3:1 ratio as an ideal that will enhance opportunities for students to work with multiple faculty members, while maintaining the strength of individual laboratories and the continuity of the program.

A longer-term perspective regarding the composition of the area faculty forces attention to the fact that the 5 senior faculty are all within 6-8 years of traditional retirement age. Without appropriate planning for the future, the retirement of these senior faculty within a similar time frame would seriously affect the prestige and status of the program. Even with our excellent junior hires, it is unlikely that the program will come close to maintaining its current ranking unless we recruit one or two mid-level, young full professor stars in anticipation of the future retirements. This is an issue that needs to be addressed at the level of departmental strategic planning for all areas; we need a plan for hiring that anticipates retirements of our top senior faculty, so as to ease transition and sustain our strength.

**BRIEF SOCIAL AREA FACULTY BIOGRAPHIES**

1. **Robert M. Arkin** (Professor, Ph.D., 1976, University of Southern California, Social Psychology). Dr. Arkin studies the self in social interaction, with specific current work on self-doubt, self-handicapping, overachievement, and personal security and insecurity in the post 9/11 era. He is author of more than 75 publications and is past editor of *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.

2. **Jennifer Crocker** (Ohio Eminent Scholar, Professor, Ph.D., 1979, Harvard University, Social Psychology). Crocker’s research examines the consequences of pursuing self-esteem—having the goal to maintain, enhance, and defend self-esteem—for relationships, mental health, and self-regulation. She also studies alternatives to pursuing self-esteem, such as learning goals, compassionate goals, and self-transcendence. She is the author of over 120 articles and chapters in edited volumes. She is current President of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology and recipient of the Lifetime Career Award from the International Society for Self and Identity.

3. **William Cunningham** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., 2003, Yale University, Social/Personality and Cognitive Psychology). Dr. Cunningham’s studies the neural, cognitive, and motivational processes underlying emotional responses. Current research examines how motivation and emotion-regulation (which can occur at both automatic and controlled levels of processing) contribute to emotional and evaluative states. This work suggests that affective states are constructed moment to moment from multiple component processes that integrate relevant information from various sources such as automatically activated attitudes and situational contexts. He is author of over 26 peer-reviewed publications, and editor for *NeuroImage*, and currently PI on an NSF grant. He
is also recipient of the Sage Young Scholar Award from the Foundation for Personality and Social Psychology.

4. **Russell H. Fazio** (Harold E. Burtt Chair in Psychology; Ph.D., 1978, Princeton University). Fazio’s research focuses upon attitudes, their formation, accessibility from memory, functional value, and the processes by which they influence categorization, judgments, and behavior. Some current research examines the implications of these matters for the treatment and assessment of emotional disorders. He is the author of over 140 publications and currently PI or co-PI on two NIH grants. His numerous honors include the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award from SPSP (2010), the APA Early Career Award (1983), an NIMH Senior Scientist Award (1999), and the Thomas M. Ostrom Award for Outstanding Contributions to Social Cognition (2006). He is former editor of the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

5. **Kentaro Fujita** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2006, New York University, Psychology). Dr. Fujita studies why people make decisions to behave in ways that undermine their valued goals. For example, why do smokers continue to smoke when they know the health risks? Why do consumers spend more money than they can afford? Why are dieters so tempted by indulgent foods? To understand these self-control failures, Dr. Fujita’s research draws from a number of areas in psychology, including motivation, cognition, self-regulation, and judgment & decision-making. He is author of 11 publications and has received grant funding from the National Science Foundation.

6. **Lisa K. Libby** (Assistant Professor, Ph.D., 2003, Cornell University, Social and Personality Psychology). Dr. Libby studies the role of subjective experience in social cognition. One main line of research investigates visual perspective in mental images of life events. When people recall or imagine events they often see those events in their mind’s eye and may do so from either their own first-person perspective or an observer’s third-person perspective. The visual imagery perspective a person adopts determines the meaning they perceive the event to have, and thus determines the impact on later thoughts, feelings, and behavior. Dr. Libby is author of 13 publications and currently PI on an NSF grant.

7. **Richard E. Petty** (Distinguished University Professor and Chair, Ph.D., 1977, Ohio State University, Social Psychology). Petty's research focuses on understanding changes in attitudes and behaviors including the role of automatic, deliberative, and meta-cognitive processes. He has published 8 books and over 275 articles and chapters. His current work on the role of confidence in judgment is funded by NSF. Honors received include the Scientific Impact Award from the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Distinguished Scientific Contribution Awards from the Societies for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) and Consumer Psychology (SCP), and service as President of SPSP and the Midwestern Psychological Association. He is former editor of the *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.

8. **Baldwin M. Way** (Assistant Professor, as of January 2011, Ph.D., 2003, University of California at Los Angeles, Neuroscience). Dr. Way studies the neurochemical mechanisms by which social factors impact health using social psychological, neuroimaging, pharmacological, and genetic methodologies. He is author of 25 peer-reviewed publications and is a co-PI on an NIH grant and two grants from private foundations (Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and NARSAD).
9. **Gifford Weary** (Professor and SBS Dean, Ph.D., 1977, Vanderbilt University, Psychology). Dr. Weary’s theoretical and empirical work has been devoted largely to articulating the influence of various cognitive and motivational influences on conscious and unconscious social perception processes. She is author of 6 books, 28 chapters, and 60 journal articles. Her research publications have been cited over 1500 times. She is past president of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology and currently serves as Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

10. **Duane T. Wegener** (Professor, Ph.D., 1994, Ohio State University, Social Psychology). Dr. Wegener studies social information processing in various domains, including attitude change, impression formation, and decision making. His research also addresses the resulting biases in judgments, attempts to avoid or remove those biases, and the consequences of these processes for later thinking and behavior. This research helps to inform our understanding of the human side of social problems such as prejudice, health, and energy consumption. His is author of over 70 publications and is currently PI or Co-I on 2 interdisciplinary grants (one from NSF and one from NIH). He is recipient of the APA Scientific Award for an Early Career Contribution and is current editor of the *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 