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A. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Overview

In one sense, the Department of Psychology at Georgia State University is fairly young: Our first faculty members were hired in the 1950s, and we began awarding PhDs in the late 1960s. In another sense, we are not so young: We were the first department in the College of Arts and Sciences authorized to award doctoral degrees.

One consistent theme, which has been congruent with Georgia State’s urban research mission, has been the application of psychology, and one of our five programs is in clinical psychology. Clinical psychologists were among the founders of the graduate program, the Clinical Program has been APA accredited since 1973, and a majority of the PhDs that we have awarded has been in clinical psychology. Today, 37% of our tenure-track faculty members are associated with the clinical program as are 53% of our graduate students.

The Community Program shares an applied bent with the clinical program (and some graduate students are jointly enrolled in both programs). We hired our first community psychologist in the early 1980s; today 20% of our tenure-track faculty members are associated with the Community Program (and 14% each with the remaining three programs).

In less directly applied areas, perhaps the research done at GSU that is most broadly known is the Rumbaugh’s work with primates and language. That heritage (Duane Rumbaugh is now emeritus) is reflected today in two of our programs: the Developmental Program, which includes interests in communication and communication disorders, and the Social/Cognitive Program, which includes interests in cognition as it is manifested across species and which remains associated with the Language Research Center (LRC) founded by Duane Rumbaugh. Current interests of the Social/Cognitive Program also include emotion, memory, and prejudice.

The fifth program, Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience (NBN), whose first members were hired in the 1980s, reflects another important emphasis of our department. This program is characterized by collaborative, interdisciplinary work. Some members of this 2-track program have clinical interests (and some graduate students are jointly enrolled in both clinical and NBN programs), while others stress basic neuroscience; some have joint appointments with the biology department and many are involved in the NSF-funded Center for Behavioral Neuroscience (CBN). Such boundary crossing is not confined to NBN but occurs, and is encouraged, in our other programs as well.

Climate

During the 1990s something of a cultural shift occurred within the department, the college, and the university. The current President, Carl Patton, was named (in 1992), and encouraged the physical expansion of the campus. Ahmed T. Abdelal served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (1993–2002) and put in place, among others, new promotion and tenure procedures, including third-year and post-tenure review of faculty. Further, the department endorsed a new promotion and tenure manual in 1999. A quote from the May 1994 self-study captures the essence of this shift: Referring to the earlier years of the department, the report stated, “The Boulder model of the scientist-practitioner was espoused, but the emphasis was more on the practitioner than on the scientist. The tension between the focus on clinical training by some of the faculty and on research and publication by others of the faculty was and still is evident. However, driven partly by shifts in the focus of the university as a whole, and particularly the College of Arts and Sciences, there has developed a much stronger emphasis on research and scholarship.” Today, most of our current faculty would agree that tension lingering in 1994 has largely dissipated.
Faculty

The number of tenure-track faculty has remained relatively constant for the past 25 years. For 1980 to 2004, the average number was 32; for the period of this self-study (FYs 2003-2005) it has averaged 31. Since 1995, the number of associates and, since 2000, the number of professors has declined, largely as a consequence of retirements of many faculty members hired in the 1960s (see Figure A.1). Nonetheless, support for hiring from the college and university has been strong, and since 1997 we have hired 27 new tenure-track faculty members (8 during FYs 2003-2005 and an additional 5 for FY 2006); thus, once again, we are a “young” department. The current department (Fall 2005) includes 35 tenure-track faculty (shown in Figure A.1), one clinical professor, and three lecturers. Of the tenure-track faculty 37% hold the rank of assistant, 40% of associate, and 23% of professor.

Figure A.1 overstates the number of full professors available for departmental instruction and service. It shows all tenure-track faculty members, whereas most tables in Section B are based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and include instructional faculty only. These tables include non-tenure track faculty members but often exclude four professors who have major administrative responsibilities in the university. However, all of these 4 administrator-scientists still have external grants and are active researchers, mentor their graduate students, and participate in their program areas in the department and to the extent appropriate in the department’s governance.

Programs

The program structure of the department has been perhaps more fluid than stable. At the beginning, in the 1960s, there were three programs (clinical, experimental, and social), but in the 1970s, these programs differentiated into a number of separate programs, each with from one to a few faculty members (e.g., psychotherapy, family therapy, behavioral therapy, learning, organizational, physiological, cognitive, comparative, developmental, and social psychology); in the early 1980s a community program was added.

In the mid-1980s, with encouragement from an APA clinical accreditation team, the various clinical programs were consolidated into one clinical program although the previous programs remained as clinical subspecialties. At the same time, the various small, non-clinical programs consolidated into a Psychological Foundations (later Psychological Sciences) Program. Then in the early 1990s, before the 1994 self-study, the Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience Program (NBN) was established with two tracks: specialization in clinical neuropsychology (Track 1, also referred to as the joint Clinical-NBN program) and specialization in behavioral neuroscience (Track 2). Thus in 1994 the department comprised four program areas: clinical psychology (but with subprograms in general clinical, clinical child and family, psychotherapy, and clinical neuropsychology), community psychology, neuropsychology and behavioral neuroscience, and psychological sciences. Following the 1994 self-study, and anticipating the 1997 APA clinical accreditation visit, the various clinical subprograms combined into a single clinical program. Also in the late 1990s, a second joint or dual program, clinical and community, was defined.

In the 1990s three other related changes occurred: Physiologists in Psychological Sciences moved to NBN, developmentalists formed their own program, and Psychological Sciences was renamed and refocused as the Social/Cognitive Program. Thus, since the late 1990s, the department has offered five graduate programs: Clinical, Community, Developmental, NBN, and Social/Cognitive, and two joint or dual options, Clinical-NBN and Clinical-Community. The number of faculty members primarily affiliated with each of these five programs areas since 1980 (with some assigned retroactively) are portrayed graphically in Figure A.2. The current tenure-track faculty are relatively evenly divided by primary program area: 8 in clinical and another 5 in clinical neuropsychology, 7 in community; and 5 each in developmental, behavioral neuroscience, and social/cognitive.
B. CURRENT CONTEXT

The current department (Fall 2005) consists of 35 tenure-track faculty members, 3 lecturers (one of whom will be promoted to Senior Lecturer effective fall 2006), and a clinical professor. Figure B.1 lists these current faculty members and portrays graphically the year they joined the department and any subsequent promotions. In particular, Figure B.1 shows the steady and relatively steep increase in hiring beginning in 1997; since then we have added an average of 3 new tenure-track faculty members each year. Not shown in Figure B.1 are 2 fulltime visiting lecturers and 8 halftime visiting lecturers; for these and additional details see Appendix B4 (current faculty roster).

B.1 Number of faculty by rank, tenure status, gender, and minority status

Counts of faculty members for the last three years, separately for tenured, tenure-track, and non tenure-track, and separately for female and minority faculty members, are given in Tables B-0 and B-1. Table B-0 is based on departmental records, whereas Table B-1 was provided us by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and is based on university records. From the departmental point of view, Table B-0 provides the more accurate picture.

The two tables differ for a number of reasons: (a) some tenured faculty members who hold administrative positions are counted as non-tenured Other in Table B.1; (b) one tenured faculty member with an administrative position who does not generate instructional hours as defined by university records is not counted in Table B.1 and another who holds a joint appointment with biology is likewise not counted; (c) a number of individuals who hold staff positions but whose names are associated with few instructional hours (usually clinical supervision) are counted in Table B.1 as Other and due to a change in recording practice more of these were counted in FY 2005 than in previous years; (d) some individuals continue to be counted in the year after they leave, and (e) there are some errors in university records (e.g., errors in rank and errors in minority status that occur in one year but not another). Moreover, Table B.1 counts anyone associated with any instructional hours no matter how few, whereas Table B.0 counts only faculty members and visiting lecturers who taught more than one course and does not include individuals who taught only one course or who were associated with supervision as part of their staff duties.

Table B.0 shows counts for the past three academic years. Of the 35 current tenure-track faculty members (2005–2006), 8 are full professors (8), 14 are associate, and 13 are assistant; 17 are female and 4 are members of racial/ethnic minority groups. Of the 4 current non tenure-track faculty members, all are female and half are racial/ethnic minorities. Of the current 10 visiting lecturers, 8 are female and 2 are racial/ethnic minorities.

B.2 Faculty Productivity for 2002 – 2004, see Table B-2.

B.3 The identities of graduate, undergraduate, non-degree, and other programs, see Tables B-3a, B-3b, and B-3c.

B.4 Number of credit hours generated per year for the previous three years, by faculty type and level (undergraduate core, undergraduate lower division, undergraduate upper division, and graduate), see Tables B-4a, B-4b, and B-4c.
B. Current Context

B.5. Evidence of program relevance and the degree to which community, student, and professional needs are served by the program.

Psychology is an extraordinarily broad field. It comprises a number of vigorous areas of scholarly inquiry and research as well as professional service and practice. Undergraduates seek out psychology courses to learn, to name just a few topics, more about their own and others’ behavior; how children grow and develop; and how people behave in groups, organizations, and communities. Some undergraduates major in psychology as a way to acquire a liberal arts education, others hope to enter the helping professions directly or acquire advanced degrees that lead to careers in the helping professions. Graduate students seek out entry to the graduate program hoping to become licensed clinical psychologists; psychologists in community, non-profit, or governmental organizations; college teachers; and researchers. Both the number of undergraduate majors (in excess of 1,000) and the number of applicants to the graduate program (over 500 in 2004 for 20 slots), indicate the demand for, and the relevance of the program and the extent to which community, student, and professional needs are served by the program. Much of our research serves in the community, from HIV prevention programs in the community, to school based interventions for at risk adolescents.

Additional detail is provided in other sections of this report. For example, Table F.4 details the numerous community agencies to which faculty members have contributed service. Similarly, Section E (graduate students) details community agencies to which graduate students have contributed service. Section E (undergraduate students) describes the Psychology Undergraduate Research conference (PURC), which department sponsors annually, and that serves undergraduate students throughout the metropolitan Atlanta area. Our undergraduate applied practica provide services to a wide variety of agencies. Finally, Section F details, both in text and in its appendixes, the numerous lectures and presentations faculty give to community and professional organizations, and the extensive service faculty members provide to the profession in the form of journal editing and reviewing and grant reviewing. The Psychology Clinic provides services to the community and a continuing education professional development program that run annually.

B.6. Information on programs at other institutions needed to provide sufficient context for any comparative data presented in the Self-Study Report.

For comparative purposes, the university defines aspirational and peer institutions (list supplied by R. Morris, VP for Research). The aspirational list is Arizona State; Rutgers, SUNY-Albany; University of California, Irvine; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of Pittsburgh; and University of Washington, Seattle. The peer list is George Mason University, Temple University; University of Cincinnati; University of Houston; University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Louisville; University of South Florida; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; and Wayne State University. For purposes of this self-study, we selected three departments of psychology from peer institutions to use for comparative purposes because their psychology departments included programs similar to ours. They are the University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Houston; and University of Louisville.

Rankings of departments always provide only part of the picture about a department’s standing in the field or even within its own university. Where a department is ranked depends largely on the variables that get measured and the weights assigned to these measures. Nevertheless, it might be useful to consider some of this information as imperfect indicators of where the Department of Psychology at Georgia State University stands, especially with respect to these peer departments.

The most recent National Research Council (NRC) rankings of 185 doctoral-level psychology departments were published in 1995, and so obviously they capture one picture of “where we were as a
department” around the time of the last self-study. A new NRC report should be available in 2008, until which the 1995 NRC data are the most recent comprehensive departmental rankings. According to those data, the psychology department at GSU was ranked 103.5 (in a tie with U. New Hampshire, U. Texas Arlington, George Washington U., Loyola U. of Chicago, and George Mason U.) The University of Illinois, Chicago was ranked 65th overall, just above the University of Houston (69.5). The University of Louisville was tied with seven other departments (including U. Cincinnati and U. Maryland-Baltimore County) one step below GSU, at a ranking of 110.5

In the 1995 data, GSU ranked 84th in faculty publication rate; Houston was 98th, Louisville was 117th, and UI-Chicago was 130th. In terms of the percentage of faculty members with external research support, GSU ranked 52nd in 1995, with UI-Chicago at 46, Houston at 121, and Louisville at 150. On the effectiveness of educating researchers, GSU ranked 126th, behind Louisville (123rd), UI-Chicago (81st), and Houston (68th). With respect to the average time for graduate students to earn a PhD, GSU was ranked 171, with Louisville at 103, Houston at 89, and UI-Chicago at 71 (although, as noted in Section E, median years to PhD has decreased at least a year since 1994).

In the 1995 NRC survey of faculty quality and graduate program effectiveness, the psychology program scored higher within its discipline than did any other GSU department surveyed. Although this is but one of many indicators of quality, its members consider the department to be one of the most productive, active, and outstanding departments in the university, and collectively aspire to a higher national reputation than the 1995 NRC ranks suggest.

Another limited source of data is National Institutes of Health (NIH) rankings. During FY 2000 (the last year this data was provided at this level), the Department of Psychology at Georgia State ranked 46th in NIH funding out of the 224 Psychology departments who received any funding. This was above the ranking of our peers used for comparison (Univ. of Houston was #50, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago #63, and Univ. of Louisville #68).
C. PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SINCE THE LAST ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The department’s last self-study was completed in May 1994 and yielded a number of valuable recommendations, which in turn helped the department establish a set of goals and objectives. The primary need in 1994 was for more and more adequate space. In a preface to the specific recommendations, we wrote:

Four issues are in need of urgent solution: space, understaffing (both faculty and support staff), poor student support, and inadequate financial support. Other issues include a rational plan for faculty hiring that considers both strengthening key programs and undergraduate teaching, a consideration of restructuring the department more around faculty interest-based programs, and continued efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty and graduate students. … At several levels—faculty, graduate student, laboratory—space is critical.

The nine specific recommendations made in 1994 have guided the department’s program activities and resource allocations since. Those recommendations and the progress toward achieving them are detailed in following paragraphs.

1. **In order to function as a department, 60,000 square feet of contiguous space is needed.**

At the time of the last self-study, the Psychology Department occupied 26,000 square feet of space, primarily in Kell Hall. During 1998 the department moved to the 7th and 11th floor and during 2000 the Psychology Clinic moved to half of the 6th floor of the Urban Life Building (UL). With 2½ floors in Urban Life (40K), research space a few blocks away (1 Park Place), and space in Kell Hall (although not yet renovated) we achieved our goal of 60K, albeit not contiguous and with the space in Kell Hall not fully functional.

Over the next several years, space in Kell Hall was remodeled for wet labs, laboratories, and offices for neuroscience and biology faculty. Then, during summer 2005, the Psychology Clinic moved from the 6th floor of UL to the 10th floor, the Regents Center for Learning Disorders (RCLD) likewise moved to the 10th floor (the two share a common reception area), and much of the remainder of the 10th floor was remodeled for clinical faculty research laboratories, which allowed the research activities in 1 Park Place to move to Urban Life.

Today the Psychology Department occupies the complete 7th floor (developmental, clinical neuropsychology, and social/cognitive faculty offices and laboratories) much of the 10th floor (excepting RCLD and the Women’s Studies Institute), and the complete 11th floor (clinical and community faculty offices, community laboratories, administrative offices, and departmental support functions) of the Urban Life Building, in addition to bench laboratory and other space in Kell Hall. In sum, the University provided the necessary space recommended, consolidated in only two locations—a significant improvement over the situation in 1994.

2. **Eight to ten (net, i.e., assuming no retirements or resignation) additional faculty positions, phased in over a period of three to four years, are needed to meet our obligations to our students and to provide excellent research and scholarship in the areas represented in the department.**

This goal has only partially been met. At the time of the previous self-study, we had 33 tenure-track faculty. Fall 2005 we have 35 tenure-track faculty members plus three lecturers and a clinical professor. To meet our teaching obligations, these 39 permanent positions are supplemented with 2 full-time visiting lecturers, 8 half-time visiting lecturers, and about 23 graduate teaching assistants.
3. **Full-time support for 10 to 20 graduate students, beginning at $12,000 per year, is needed to allow us to complete with other universities for the best students.**

We have met and exceeded this goal but only partly due to university funding. A large portion of the available funding has come from “soft money”—indirect cost recovery and external funding. A floor of $12,000 per year for all graduate students (who are all full-time as almost all are) has been established. The mean annual stipend for other than first-year graduate students is a bit less than $15,000 for clinical students and about $17,500 for non-clinical students.

4. **At least three additional support positions are needed: A grant facilitator, a computer expert, and a word processor.**

A computer specialist, Terence Collis, was hired in October 1997; the technical support team now consists of three people, the last hired Fall 2005. A grants business manager has been hired but not necessarily the grants facilitator envisioned. No word processor was hired, and technology has now shifted essentially all document preparation to individual faculty. Funding for some or parts of these positions was developed internally using indirect cost recoveries.

5. **Additional operational budget to allow for increased numbers of faculty and to provide travel for each faculty member.**

Each faculty member has an allocation of $1300 per year for professional development; in 1994 we had essentially no travel funds for faculty.

6. **Immediately address the matter of core curriculum and other requirements in the graduate program.**

The core curriculum for the department and requirements for the various programs were significantly revised in the late 1990s during semester conversion and has been relatively stable since.

7. **Develop a serious dialog with the administration on the matter of reward for undergraduate instruction and its implications for promotion and tenure decisions.**

In 1994, there was almost no involvement of various program areas and many senior faculty in undergraduate instruction, while a small group of faculty carried the undergraduate teaching load. During that self-study, and following discussions, the department developed an internal policy that all faculty members would teach at least one undergraduate course as part of their instructional course load each year except when their administrative responsibilities limited their availability. This policy led to a significant increase in the percentage of tenure-track faculty teaching at the undergraduate level. Moreover, in a subsequent revision of the department’s promotion and tenure manual, promotion to associate with tenure required that one be either very good or excellent in instruction, and promotion to professor required that one be excellent in instruction.

8. **Continue strongly the annual effort to hire minority faculty.**

At the time of the last self-study, 3 of 33 tenure-track faculty members were members of ethnic/racial minorities. One has since retired and one left for another university position. Today (Fall 2005) it is 6 of 39 regular faculty members. As might be expected in today’s competitive market, several offers have been made to members of ethnic/racial minorities but not accepted.

9. **Review the current promotion and tenure guidelines, informed by new expectations at the university and college levels.**

The departmental Promotion and Tenure Manual was extensively revised. The current version was accepted by the faculty in November 1999 after extensive discussion both in the department and across departments in the college. It has not been modified since.
D. QUALITY OF THE CURRICULUM

The Undergraduate Curriculum

The 1994 self-study concluded with no recommendations regarding the undergraduate program, reported only on progress on goals from the 1990 plan, and was pessimistic with respect to the faculty’s ability to engage in undergraduate instruction. Since then, the department has experienced a cultural shift. All faculty participate in undergraduate instruction by teaching at least one undergraduate course each year. However, visiting lecturers and graduate teaching assistants taught more undergraduate sections than tenure-track faculty in academic years 2004-05 and this year. The Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) is well established and now includes a chair (the Director of Undergraduate Studies), three tenure track faculty, two lecturers, and one clinical professor. The undergraduate program coordinator and the undergraduate advisor provide support. All programs are represented on the committee. Psychology has substantially increased its involvement in the College of Arts and Sciences Honors Program. Beginning in Fall 2004 the Department began offering stand-alone honors courses/sections on a regular basis. To date we have offered one honors section of PSYC 1101 (Introduction to Psychology) and PSYC 4620 (Psychology of Women) and we plan to continue this level of involvement. Faculty members continue to work with honors students on theses. Since 1994, the Department has directed at least 25 honors theses.

The Department hired a permanent full-time faculty member as a lecturer in 1999 whose workload consists of undergraduate teaching and service. In 2000 the department hired a full-time staff member who provides advisement and supervises two graduate assistant advisors to provide timely and consistent guidance to majors and those considering psychology. Other efforts to keep majors informed about requirements, policies, procedures, as well as opportunities within the department, college, and university include an extensive undergraduate website, a comprehensive student handbook available online and in hardcopy, and a regularly published student newsletter.

The University-wide mandate to develop learning outcomes and assessment plans for the general education core and major curriculum led to the department’s plan developed in 2004. Data from the first year of assessment are included in Appendix D. Overall findings show mixed progress.

Graduate Curriculum

The self-study recommended addressing the matter of the core curriculum and other requirements in the graduate program. The core has been streamlined and consists of five courses (see Appendix D). Meeting needs and expectations of students (and faculty) in these courses, given the breadth of research foci in the department, is a challenge. Joint programs (Clinical-Community and Clinical-NBN) are constructed so that there is overlap in required coursework for students enrolled in both; however, jointly enrolled students essentially complete curricula for two programs and are expected to meet the same progress guidelines as students enrolled in one program—this creates student frustration. Joint programs have also faced problems related to admissions, funding, and philosophical tensions between programs.

As with the undergraduate program, a university system mandate stimulated the development of learning outcomes and an assessment plan for the graduate program (see Appendix D). As with the undergraduate program, some changes in assessment procedure have been specified, but no curriculum revisions based on one cycle of data.
E. STUDENT QUALITY

Undergraduate Students

Psychology is one of the most popular majors (1,411 majors in 02-03, 1,420 in 03-04, 1,437 in 04-05), with majors more than doubling since the 94 self-study (680 majors). More of the current students are full-time than were at the time of the 94 self-study. An estimate of the quality of our majors is via SAT, high school GPA (HSGPA), and Freshman Index (FI = HSGPA*500 + SAT) scores. The average SAT score for the 3-years was 1029, which is slightly below Arts and Sciences (A&S) (1052) and the University (1039). The average HS GPA was 3.11, comparable to that of A&S (3.12) and the University (3.14). The average FI was 2631, just below the FIs of A&S (2654) and the University (2651).

Between 02-05, 238 students enrolled in research practica and 143 in applied practica. In 94 there were less then 20 students involved in practica, and most were research practica. These students co-authored articles (5 in 02-03; 2 in 03-04; 2 in 04-05) and presentations (18 in 02-03; 13 in 03-04; 23 in 04-05). The Psychology Undergraduate Research Conference (PURC) is held annually and showcases student research and practicum posters, panels, symposia, and an invited speaker.

There are approximately 50 Psychology majors participating in the Honors Program per semester, which represents 10% of the approximately 500 students in the Honors Program per semester. There were 15 University Scholars in Psychology 02-03, 13 in 03-04, and 19 in 04-05. Psychology undergraduates have won various awards including research awards, outstanding student certificates, and McNair scholarships.

Graduate Students

Currently there are 109 graduates in the department, which is a decline from the 200 graduates at the time of the 94 self-study; however, in 94 many were inactive or part-time students. At the time of the 94 self-study, the student-faculty ratio was 6 to 1 and currently the ratio is 4 to 1.

The graduates enter the programs with high GPAs and the GRE scores of Psychology graduates are higher than the average of all of the graduates in A&S and the University as a whole (see Table E-2). The student body across 02-04 has been predominately female (73%) and European American (69%), with smaller numbers of African American (14%), Asian (8%), Latino (7%), and other ethnicities (1%).

All graduates are funded during their tenure. Whereas many are funded via teaching assistantships, a number are paid from indirects from grants. The stipends include a tuition waiver and the average amount is approximately $15,000 annually. There is concern in the department that most students are supported on “soft” and unpredictable money (i.e., grant indirect dollars); this has improved recently. Although students do not currently receive health insurance, the Board of Regents is working to correct this.

Students were involved in 138 presentations in 02-03, 105 in 03-04, and 104 in 04-05; and they were involved in 39 peer-reviewed publications in 02-03, 29 in 03-04, and 36 in 04-05. Graduates have received numerous honors and awards and are actively involved in the community in numerous locales.

There is variability in graduation rates across years, and approximately 16 students earn their doctorate annually (22 in 02; 11 in 03; 14 in 04). The number of years our graduate students spend in the program varies, but the median is approximately 7 years. This is 1 year shorter than the 8 years reported in the 1994 Psychology self-study report, and 4 years shorter then the data presented in the 1995 NRC report.
F. FACULTY QUALITY

This faculty has been active in research, publishing 204 peer-refereed articles in 131 journals (see Table F-1), 5 books, 43 book chapters, 51 abstracts or proceedings papers, 13 technical reports, and 20 contributed publications during the review period. Faculty members presented 377 papers or posters at regional, national, or international meetings of professional associations during this period. These figures compare favorably to those from our peer institutions (Figure F-1), and to the data from the 1994 departmental self-study (e.g., 56 articles and chapters + 3 books + 66 conference presentations in 1993). During the review period, 94% of the tenure-track faculty (excluding members who were in the department less than one year) published at least one paper.

Over 90% of the tenure-track faculty had research support from external or internal sources during the 2002-2004 period. Table B-2 indicates the internal and external grant support associated with each faculty member. Adjusting for grants that are collaborative and shared between faculty members or departments, the psychology department received over $16 million in external support (approximately $13 million in direct costs) during the review period. Key frequency statistics are reported in Table F-2. Comparison figures for external grant support per faculty member are provided in Table F-3 for our department and for the psychology departments for three of our peer institutions. Table F-4 lists the sources for this external support.

Internal grants provided more that $1.4 million in support to this faculty during the review period. Many of these internal grants supported collaborative research, with over 70% of the faculty supported for research with collaborators from another program area or department. The Psychology Department faculty has also been very active in international collaborations (supporting the university’s strategic plan regarding international partnership), with research and instructional exchanges with South Africa and other countries. The faculty of this department value collaboration (23 publications and 60 professional presentations were co-authored by members of the faculty, often crossing program boundaries).

This faculty is extremely active in university service, service to the discipline, and in service to the community, Table B-2 also lists some of the ways that the discipline has recognized the quality of the faculty, for example, by selecting faculty members for service roles to the field. Faculty members serve on the editorial boards of 29 journals and as the Senior Editor or Associate Editor of 5 journals. Departmental faculty members serve on dozens of external advisory panels and have held elected and appointed offices in numerous professional organizations. At least 15 members of the faculty have served on one or more study sections or other grant-review panel. Departmental faculty members have also been active in community service. Table F-5 lists some of the community agencies that have benefited from leadership, consultation, training, lectures, or other aid in the 2002-2004 period.

During the review period, Robin Morris was nominated by the President of the United States and approved by Congress to the Advisory Board for the National Institute for Literacy. Robin Morris also received a Community Service Award from the Georgia branch of the International Dyslexia Society. Two faculty members (Peterson & Washburn) were named Fellows by the American Psychological Association, bringing the number of APA fellows in the department to 7. John Peterson was also named a Fellow in the Society for Community Research and Action. Psi Chi, the National Honor Society for Psychology, honored two members of our faculty (Kuperminc, in recognition of his service to the organization; and Washburn, as the 2003 Distinguished Scientist speaker).

The results of promotion and tenure reviews provide another measure of faculty quality. During the review period, seven faculty members have been considered for tenure, five of whom were considered at the same time for promotion. As listed in Table F-5, all of these candidates were reviewed favorably.
G. RESOURCE ADEQUACY

1. Faculty Resources

A recommendation was made in 1994 that the Psychology Department have at least 40 full-time faculty members to adequately meet its existing demand and as many as 8 additional faculty members if the department was to achieve real excellence in the areas it supported. The College and University have been extremely supportive of recruiting more faculty and the department has been successful in these searches. Unfortunately, this success has largely been offset by the retirement of many of our more senior faculty members (see Figure A.2, Section A) and failure to retain some of our more junior faculty members. The Department of Psychology currently has 35 tenure-track faculty members (8 Full, 14 Associate, 13 Assistant), 3 lecturers, and one clinical professor who are responsible for 1437 undergraduate majors and 109 graduate students (all of the latter are full-time students who register for at least 12 credit hours per semester). Statistics provided by OIR are shown in Table G-1. Thus, a faculty that is almost the same size as in 1994 today is responsible for about the same number of active graduate students but more than twice as many undergraduate majors. The number of undergraduate course sections taught for fall and spring semesters, for academic years 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, by type of instructor, is shown in Table G-2. Table B-4 shows a similar picture, although the OIR data does not distinguish between lecturer and visiting lecturer, lumping both as non tenure-track.

2. Administrative Resources

Currently 12 core departmental staff positions are defined and are listed in Table G-3, which shows that the ratio of FTE instructional faculty to staff is 41:12 or 3.42:1. Inadequate staff support was a frequent complaint on our departmental survey. Effort must be made to optimize the use of staff and to add a staff member who serves as a grants administrator. The Psychology Departments at our peer institutions currently support at least one staff member that is identified as such (see Table G-4).

3. Technological Resources

Currently all faculty members have up-to-date office computers. This equipment, as well as our technology support, is updated regularly and is on par with or superior to equipment in other similar departments. We have excellent equipment for our laboratories due to strong extramural funding. One limitation is additional space for growth and lack of funds to maintain this equipment. Other similar units in the University (i.e., Biology) have budgets that allow these units to maintain service agreements and to allow repairs to equipment as well as a technical staff person who can help maintain the valuable equipment currently in use in the neuroscience laboratories and common use areas.

4. Space Resources

Our current space is vastly improved over that available in 1994. It is important that we continue to access additional space as additional faculty members are recruited.

5. Laboratory Resources

Money brought into our program through the Center for Behavioral Neuroscience, the Georgia Research Alliance, and the Brains and Behavior Program (each a direct result of the excellence and recognized potential of our neuroscience community) has paid for the renovation of the old space in Kell Hall into modern, well-equipped laboratory space. More senior faculty in Kell Hall have spent considerable effort overseeing these renovations at the expense of their own research programs. The funding sources listed above have included substantial funds for salaries and setup for the recruitment of each of our new faculty
members in behavioral neuroscience over the last seven years. These sources will also allow the University to recruit as many as six additional behavioral neuroscientists over the next three or so years.

6. **GSU Foundation Resources**

The department does not receive major support from the GSU Foundation. However, since the late 1990s we have been placing a portion of indirect funds from external grants into a GSU Research Foundation (GSURF) account, initially thought of as an account to cover budget short-falls, but also to provide the basis for making significant investments in the research faculty and infrastructure needed to move the department to an increased level of external funding competitiveness. This account now holds significant resources. The department is currently discussing appropriate ways to begin using these funds productively.

7. **Library Resources**

Online access to many relevant journals has improved our library resources considerably in the last few years. Every effort should be made to continue to increase the number of electronic journals that are supported by the University and to stabilize these offerings once they are obtained. Due to variations in the budget for the library, journals are added and then dropped from year to year. Every effort should be made to keep the offerings consistent and to make sure that Psychology is part of any decisions to acquire or terminate psychology journal contracts.

8. **Graduate Student Funding**

Another resource issue concerns graduate funding. Funds for graduate students come from a variety of sources, with 37% from committed university funds in FY2005 ($480,000 from the department base budget, $104,000 in fellowships). Thus, last year, the university provided about the same as two of our peer institutions but about 17% less than a third institution (see Table G-4). It has been the case for a number of years that 50% of our grant-generated indirect funds have been returned to the department, and these funds have been used to support a substantial portion of our graduate student stipends. This situation is inherently unpredictable and, other sources of funds for doctoral graduate student stipends will need to be identified, particularly ones that provide stable long-term support. Effective FY07, additional hard dollars will be available based on the movement of internal grant funds (i.e., RPE or Research Program Enhancement grants) into permanent departmental budgets. With this change we will be able to cover 56% of our grad student stipends from university funds, assuming stable enrollment and stipend levels. Still, we need to keep increasing the portion of graduate funding that is stable.

9. **Faculty Salaries.**

Inadequate salary levels at all ranks, but particularly at assistant and associate levels, are seen as one of the most important threats to the continued success of the psychology department. We are considerably below APA published national and regional averages for psychology departments even if this is restricted to similar sized public institutions. Our salaries are also considerably below Georgia State University averages at all ranks and below similar productive departments within the college of Arts and Sciences at GSU (e.g., Biology Department). A comparison of salaries by rank for the current academic year is shown in table G-5. This table includes the average 9-month salaries for psychology faculty at our peer institutions (see B.6 for more information about selected peer institutions).
H. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM

Strengths and weaknesses of the program, as viewed by the psychology faculty, are detailed here. They are presented in alphabetical order.

Strengths

1. **Collaboration.** Psychology faculty members have been active contributors to the sorts of collaboration the department, the college, and the university actively encourages and support. For example, Section F illustrates the faculty’s commitment to collaboration as evidenced by the number of internal grants on which the co-investigators come from different programs, departments, and even colleges within the university. Psychology faculty members have also been key participants in the NSF-funded Center for Behavioral Neuroscience (CBN) and two recently organized and provost-supported university-wide initiatives, Brains and Behavior and the Partnership for Urban Health Research. In addition, our departmental members are actively involved in professional initiatives in the greater Atlanta community as well as at the state, national, and international levels. With respect to international initiatives, 1 grant and 3 dissertations have emerged already from the interactions between departmental faculty and corresponding faculty and students in South Africa.

2. **Diversity.** The department has made important strides toward diversity. For example, bylaws provide for a departmental diversity committee, two graduate programs require courses related to diversity, our graduate student population is increasingly racially and culturally diverse, and our undergraduate majors as a group are more diverse than the college. Equally important is that the topic of diversity and its multiple dimensions has been the focal point of departmental conversations, usually with regard to recruitment. Faculty members experience the department as open and tolerant. These gains notwithstanding, we desire a faculty more representative of the students we teach and mentor, and curriculum/programs infused with attention to multiple forms of diversity.

3. **Faculty productivity.** Faculty productivity, especially the number of faculty members who are active in research, has increased since our last self-study and is detailed in Section F. The visibility of our faculty has increased considerably, and several faculty members serve on grant review panels, as journal editors and reviewers, as officials of national professional organizations, and as contributors in numerous ways to a variety of community organizations.

4. **Graduate students.** The quality of our graduate students has increased steadily since our last self-study and our current graduate students are generally of excellent quality. Over 500 students apply annually, only 30 are so are accepted, and 20 enroll. GRE scores typically average around 1200 or better (verbal and quantitative combined). Over the past five years we have awarded an average of 17 PhDs each year. Our ability to continue to attract graduate students of increasing quality depends on our continued ability to provide competitive funding and tuition waivers.

5. **Morale.** Faculty morale seems generally excellent and a sense of positive collegial relations prevails. When asked whether faculty members in the department work together toward program goals, the mean response of the psychology faculty, 4.8 on a 5-point scale, was higher than 21 of 22 other comparison departments in the university. High mean ratings also occurred when asked whether they had adequate opportunities to influence departmental decisions (4.7) and whether guidelines regarding job performance were clear (4.6; see appendix D5).

6. **Space.** To a remarkable degree the university has been responsive to the needs of the department for relatively contiguous and appropriate space. We are no longer in the embarrassingly dire circumstances detailed in the 1994 self-study with respect to space.
7. **Undergraduate instruction.** The increasing involvement of faculty members in undergraduate classroom instruction, including honors courses and the provision of research experiences, as well as extra-curricular activities (e.g., Psi Chi, PURC), is a significant strength. In addition, the department has devoted resources in terms of faculty service to fully support the Undergraduate Program Committee.

**Weaknesses**

1. **Faculty compensation.** During the last three years the Board of Regents has allocated annual salary increases of 0%, 2%, and 2%, and the 2% increases have been offset by 6 months making the effective raise even smaller in those years. These small raises have been accompanied by increases in health care premiums, parking fees, and child-care costs that have not been offset by 6 months. Thus, faculty income during this period has effectively decreased. APA data show that we are substantially below national averages, comparison with our peer institutions show that we are paid measurably less (see Table G-5), and the Psychology Department is substantially below Georgia State University average salaries at all ranks. Increasingly, salary is an issue in our hiring—and salary compression is a problem as we strive to maintain an equitable salary structure. Not all of our recent offers have been accepted; reasons for this are complex, but increasingly the inadequate salary scale is mentioned as the critical factor. It is also the reason why some colleagues whom we have encouraged to apply have chosen not to do so. It is difficult to know what role compensation plays in retention, but over the last 9 years we have had 9 resignations (not counting the 16 retirements). Benefits remain an issue as well. Georgia State offers neither a comprehensive family-leave package attuned to an academic schedule nor domestic partner benefits, nor does the university offer graduate students health insurance. Thus, the department feels that inadequate compensation is a critical threat to the morale and future success of the Psychology Department.

2. **Faculty workload.** Independent of faculty compensation is the issue of faculty workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty members—although both affect recruitment and retention. Workload can especially affect the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority faculty members, who often are the object of strenuous recruitment campaigns from other institutions. The current workload policy is clearly articulated; it specifies five-courses per year and although this is not out of line with our peer institutions, our aspirational institutions typically specify 4 or fewer courses. Our concern is that, as with faculty compensation, we are moving into a less competitive position due to our current workload policy.

3. **Graduate curriculum.** A perennial problem is the complexity of the graduate curriculum and the number of required courses, coupled with a paradoxical lack of elective advanced or specialty courses in some programs. This was mentioned in our previous self-study and was partially addressed in curriculum revisions of the 1990s, but incremental changes in curriculum have a tendency to move towards more required courses and greater complexity. A thorough review and pruning may again be in order. This is especially true for our two joint or dual programs, clinical-community and clinical-NBN. Clinical-community, in particular, which can be characterized as a dual program because students are essentially asked to meet all requirements of both programs, is often seen as too demanding and the progress of clinical-community students as problematic.

4. **Graduate student funding.** Since the last departmental self-study, remarkable progress has been made in providing competitive funding for graduate students. Without disparaging these impressive gains, the current graduate funding model remains inadequate to the needs of the department—its students and faculty alike. Recruitment of outstanding graduate students requires the ability to offer competitive stipends and health insurance. With the cost of living in Atlanta continuing to escalate, we are in danger of regressing to the days when our graduate students had to supplement their stipends with outside income. Additionally, the burden of providing even the current level of support places a tremendous strain on the time, energies, and resources of the faculty. Faculty members must try to anticipate each
year where funds might be available for present and future graduate students, and these projections cause the faculty (and particularly junior faculty or faculty members without long-term grants) to be conservative with respect to graduate-student admissions. Thus, faculty members are unlikely to have excellent graduate assistants at the time when those students may be needed the most for research and instruction. Our reliance on sponsored funds and indirect-cost recovery for graduate-student support is a major threat to the quality of the graduate programs and the productivity of the graduate faculty.

5. **Instructors for undergraduate courses.** The current number of regular faculty members (tenure- and non-tenure-track) is inadequate to teach the number of undergraduate course sections we offer. During the current and previous academic year, for example, 25–26 tenure-track faculty members taught about 30% of the undergraduate course sections offered (the remaining tenure-track faculty members did not teach an undergraduate section due to demands to teach graduate courses, administrative appointments, university service responsibilities). Another 10% of undergraduate courses were taught by non-tenure-track faculty members, Graduate Teaching Assistants taught 28%, and half- and full-time visiting lecturers taught 32% of the undergraduate sections. Thus, we are currently dependent on visiting lecturers to teach about a third of our undergraduate sections.

6. **Office and laboratory space.** The woefully inadequate space of the early 1990s has been replaced with much improved space today, which we view as a strength. Notwithstanding, the space we now have does not easily allow for growth, which is a weakness. At the time of the 1994 self-study we had 33 tenure-track faculty members and the self-study called for an additional 8 to 10 faculty positions. Currently we have 35 tenure-track faculty members, 2 more than in 1994, but little space to hire more. Office space in Urban Life is tight but the issue is more critical for laboratory space. There is no currently identified space in Kell Hall for additional wet labs and no space in Urban Life for additional clinical, community, developmental, social, or cognitive laboratory space without compromising current research effectiveness. The new buildings that are currently planned will potentially mitigate this weakness if the allotted space is greater than what we currently have in Kell Hall (if Kell Hall is to be demolished) or if this space is to be combined with what is currently being occupied in Kell Hall.

7. **Staff support.** Routine departmental administration as well as the research and instructional needs of the faculty receive what is generally perceived as inadequate staff support. Although some individuals work admirably, the support staff as a whole functions at an inadequate level. As a consequence faculty effectiveness and productivity can be compromised as faculty perform tasks better left to trained staff. When asked about the level of clerical staff support, the mean response of the psychology faculty, 2.7 on a 5-point scale, was lower than all but 2 of 22 other comparison departments in the university. Part of any solution should include increased staff compensation.

8. **Undergraduate program.** The department attempts to serve more majors with respect to classroom instruction, advisement, and extra-curricular experiences than is possible with current resources. Because all faculty members are required to help meet the demand for basic required courses, curricular innovations, in the form of new courses, accompanying lab sections for advanced courses, or revamped courses, occur rarely. The current undergraduate curriculum needs to be reviewed in comparison with trends at peer institutions, the advisement system needs greater oversight and perhaps revision, and the number of majors needs to be managed at a level that can be served effectively.
I. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT APR CYCLE

Quality and balance are terms that inform and shape the department’s vision for itself. Consistent with the university’s Strategic Plan 2005-2010, quality is paramount. The university’s strategic plan (www.gsu.edu/~wwwact/pdf_plan_archive/2005_strategicplan.pdf) emphasizes that the “overarching aspiration of Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premier research universities in focused areas that maximize our unique strengths,” and that an important part of our mission is “providing undergraduate and graduate programs of the highest quality … for traditional and non-traditional students.” Paralleling this vision, the psychology department seeks to achieve balance: balance among faculty research excellence, graduate student education and training, and innovative and high-quality pedagogy for undergraduate instruction.

Like the university, the department seeks to maximize our unique strengths in focused areas. We recognize that our unique strengths include being strategically located in an urban setting; having an applied tradition; and honoring and fostering interdisciplinary, intercultural, and international perspectives in both research and instruction. For the department, our focused areas are defined by the current five program areas as they have coalesced over the past ten years; it reflects our history and our strengths and, except for possible fine-tuning, is integral to our future vision. Again, departmental goals seek to achieve balance among the programs, which includes encouraging collaborative arrangements when productive and feasible.

Departmental goals are also informed by the Provost’s Areas of Focus initiative, which resulted from the general university goal of encouraging interdisciplinary interaction. Three areas are particularly relevant to the department’s vision: Brains and Behavior, Language and Literacy, and Urban Health Research. Faculty members in psychology have made important contributions to developing these initiatives and, to a remarkable extent, these initiatives integrate with the department’s existing programs and strengths. To the extent feasible, and without compromising our goal of maintaining quality undergraduate instruction in all areas of psychology, the vision of the department includes continuing to make substantial contributions to these three initiatives.

These considerations inform the departmental vision and lead to the following specific goals and objectives.

I.1 Instruction

Goal 1. Improve the quality of the undergraduate experience for psychology majors

Objective 1. Increase the percentage of undergraduate course sections taught by permanent faculty from the current 40% to over 60%.

Rationale. The continuity of classroom instruction is hampered by our dependence on graduate students and visiting lecturers to help us meet our undergraduate course load. Frequently, undergraduate students report that they have experienced only one or no regular faculty instructors during their career at Georgia State. We expect that this is also a factor in our ability to retain the best and brightest undergraduates.

Resources. Hiring an additional 8 tenure-track faculty members and an additional 4 lecturers, and maintaining a total of 43 tenure-track faculty members and 7 lecturers (so that only 14% of regular faculty would not be tenure-track) would let us meet this objective, assuming a relatively constant
number of undergraduate sections for the next several years. There is already a commitment to hire 2 additional tenure-track faculty members this year. A commitment from the College and the University to hire 6 additional tenure-track faculty members and 4 additional lecturers, and to maintain these numbers, would be needed. This would decrease substantially the current dependence on visiting lecturers and provide increased continuity in undergraduate instruction.

Implementation. Given agreement on the part of the university and the dean, we would proceed to hire the needed regular faculty members (lecturers and tenure-track professors) over the next few years. At the same time, we would advocate for a policy to retain highly effective, half-time visiting lecturers more than the current three-years, because this would likewise serve the goal of increased continuity in undergraduate instruction and would make effective use of a valuable resource.

Objective 2. Fill gaps in the undergraduate curriculum with respect to critical thinking, careers in psychology, human diversity, and capstone courses.

Rationale. The department’s evaluation of learning outcomes by courses shows little attention to outcomes related to careers in psychology, critical thinking, information literacy, etc. Student survey responses, in particular, demonstrate a need for more information about careers in psychology and related fields. In addition, the curriculum lacks an integrative learning experience that a capstone course would provide.

Resources. Five percent summer funding for 4 faculty members to develop courses in careers, critical thinking, and a capstone would help considerably. Recently a graduate student developed a course in human diversity, which is being taught and evaluated as a special seminar. If successful, few resources, other than a committed regular faculty member, would be required to establish this as a permanent course.

Implementation. Courses would be taught first as special seminars, then evaluated and refined before being proposed as permanent to the college Curriculum Committee.

Objective 3. Promote curricular innovation in upper-division (4000 level) courses with the use of laboratory sections.

Rationale. Students desire applied learning experiences and faculty wish to incorporate them across a range of 4000 level courses including social, cognitive, developmental, community, behavioral neuroscience, and learning. Applied experiences, within actual laboratories or in communities and organizations, give students an opportunity to experience research and action, apply knowledge, and practice skills they have learned in the classroom setting.

Resources. Summer funding could serve as an incentive for faculty members to develop such courses and their associated laboratory experiences.

Implementation. The Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) will work in conjunction with the chair and program areas to determine priorities for developing laboratory sections. Some may need to wait until the new science teaching laboratory building is completed.

Objective 4. Maintain and increase stand-alone honor courses/sections offered in psychology and the number of students and faculty involved in honors theses.

Rationale. As a popular major, psychology increasingly draws honors students. Honors courses provide students with a competitive edge for graduate school. Because our majors are quite diverse, we can
serve as a pipeline to increase graduate school applications by minority students. Honors courses/sections also provide alternative instructional experiences for faculty.

Resources. Continuing dedication of one 1101, and two 4000 level courses per semester at a minimum. As possible, add one honors course/section per year to regular course offerings. This objective would require faculty members who are willing to chair honors theses.

Implementation. The chair, in coordination with the Honors Program Chair and UPC chair will determine honors course offerings and will make faculty members more aware of opportunities for chairing honors theses.

Objective 5. **Determine an appropriate method for managing the number of psychology majors that does not negatively affect any particular group of students.**

Rationale. The department cannot continue to serve a growing number of majors effectively. At current, or even proposed levels of faculty resources, we cannot provide the high quality advisement, classroom teaching, individual laboratory/research instruction, or extra-curricular experiences we wish, given the number of undergraduate psychology majors.

Resources. A proposal for establishing minimum standards for psychology majors is already in process. Two faculty members have been reviewing institutional data and information from peer institutions to develop an informed policy.

Implementation. Implementation will require time resources from the undergraduate program coordinator (this position is funded but currently vacant).

**Goal 2. Continue to grow and to improve the quality of our graduate programs to ensure that our national position among psychology departments continues to improve.**

Objective 1. **Increase the number of graduate students in our department as we continue to add new faculty members.**

Rationale. As detailed in Section E, approximately 500 students apply for the 20 slots that we have available each year. Therefore, we have an excellent applicant pool that would allow us to grow the size of our graduate program rapidly while continuing to maintain or even improve the overall quality of our students.

Resources. Increased institutional support for graduate student stipends would be needed. We would like to increase the number of students accepted per year by 50% over the next three to five years (from 20 to 30 doctoral students a year). Under the current funding model (however, see also Objective 2) this would cost the university $150,000 - $240,000 in graduate student stipends per year for 5 years.

Implementation. If funded, the Graduate Program Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Chair will work on a model for increasing the number of doctoral students in the department over a 3–5 year period (funding, courses, advisement needs, etc.)

Objective 2. **Obtain fixed funding for our graduate students that decreases our dependence on indirect cost recovery.**
Rationale. As detailed in Section G, university-allotted funding for graduate students is below that of our peer institutions. Inadequate funding forces us to rely on unstable sources in order to maintain our competitive graduate stipends. The sustainability of adequate funding for quality graduate students impacts our ability to recruit these students but also impacts faculty recruitment, retention, productivity, and morale.

Resources. Increased institutional support for doctoral graduate student stipends at least to the level of our peer institutions. Our current funding model, with recent increases, includes $8,685 per student from state funds. This should be increased to at least $10,000 per student, and we should continue to work to increase this number over time as we seek to remain competitive at attracting high quality graduate students.

Implementation. The Graduate Program Committee and the admissions committees of our programs will continue to maintain or increase standards for admission.

Objective 3. Advocate for health insurance and other benefits for graduate students.

Rationale. Increasingly, graduate schools with whom we compete for top students are offering health insurance and other benefits as part of their compensation packages. Our ability to recruit the top students will depend on our being able to offer health insurance and housing options.

Resources. Increased funding to provide health insurance benefits or to reimburse students for at least part of the coverage they have obtained independently. Continue to encourage the university in its current efforts to build graduate student housing that could be offered as part of our compensation packages.

Implementation. Our Chair and Graduate Program Committee will work with the Dean and other administrators to seek coverage for comprehensive health insurance and other benefits for GRAs and GTAs.

Objective 4. Evaluate whether joint programs should be simplified, restructured, or disbanded.

Rationale. Students enrolled in joint (or dual) programs must complete numerous courses and as a result, these students often make slower progress than do their peers. This problem seems more acute for the joint clinical-community program than for the joint clinical-NBN program. At the same time, jointly enrolled students are held to the same progress guidelines as students enrolled in a single program. This state is untenable and is a factor that contributes to stress, anxiety, and lower morale among jointly enrolled students. Furthermore, philosophical and epistemological tension between programs, particularly clinical and community programs, exacerbates the situation. Joint programs have also suffered from neglect. No real efforts have been made in the last 3 years to resolve these issues.

Resources. Faculty involved in joint programs will need to meet to determine the viability of continuing to offer joint enrollment as currently conceived. If the faculty determines that programs should be disbanded, methods of supporting currently enrolled students need to be developed. If programs are deemed viable, but in need of extensive repair, the faculty must dedicate time and effort toward developing solutions to perennial problems.

Implementation. In coordination with the Chair, an ad hoc task group should be appointed to study the feasibility of each of the joint programs. Faculty members in the clinical and community programs have already begun initial discussions. Solutions may be quite different for the two joint programs.
I.2 Scholarship

Goal 3. Enhance the productivity and national and international visibility of research and scholarship performed by our faculty members.

Objective 1. Review and, as necessary, revise the staffing model for departmental administrative, fiscal, technical, and instructional support.

Rationale. Although some departmental needs are expertly supported, other aspects of staff support are inefficient or absent. Faculty productivity is compromised whenever faculty members must perform duties better assigned to staff, and whenever overall staff performance is ineffective. Outstanding current staff members must be supported and retained. The definition, function, and management of other staff positions must be improved. Where staff support at the university level is deemed inadequate and out of our control, departmental resources must be utilized to support faculty productivity.

Resources. The recruitment and retention of outstanding staff members requires funding from the University and College, and from sponsored support (e.g., indirect-cost recovery, direct costs for staff services). The support we receive already from these sources must be enhanced, and a new model for managing staff and distributing effort is required.

Implementation. The Chair and the Executive Committee should develop and propose a new structure for staff services. The College has already approved advertising a current staff vacancy at a higher pay grade in an effort to attract an excellent and experienced staff manager. In response to recommendations by independent consultants, the university has endorsed a regionalized or distributed model for research administration. Discussions have begun regarding hiring a Ph.D.-level grants facilitator, possibly utilizing GSURF funds as a mechanism to partially support this hire.

Objective 2. Continue to recruit productive faculty members.

Rationale. The productivity and visibility of the faculty will continue to improve in part as additional productive scholars are added to our numbers and our new faculty members have the opportunity to get their research programs established. Despite tireless and successful recruitment efforts in recent years, the size of the faculty still lags behind the goals articulated in previous self-studies. The need for additional faculty members is described in many sections of the present document, including Goal 1 above. Funds are available for hiring new faculty members, particularly those with established research programs in behavioral neuroscience.

Resources. Whereas the space available appears to be adequate for the current needs of the faculty, it is unclear where laboratory, animal-housing, office, and support space is available to house new faculty researchers or to support major expansion of the research programs of the current faculty. It is likely that new contiguous space will need to be identified and renovated and that faculty members may be required to take advantage of noncontiguous space where available. The department, college, university, and research centers or programs must also commit the resources necessary for new-faculty salaries and start-up packages, particularly if one or more of these new hires is a senior colleague.

Implementation. A plan to leverage enhanced visibility, productivity, and program growth from the recruitment opportunities provided by the Center for Behavioral Neuroscience and the Provost’s areas of focus (Brains and Behavior, Urban Health, and Language and Literacy) is imperative. In consultation with the program areas, the Executive Committee and the Chair should develop priorities
with respect to future faculty recruitment needs. Departmental space (e.g., for offices and laboratories) must continue to be reconfigured and re-allocated. Animal housing space and laboratory space discussions are underway, with designs already generated for new modular housing facilities and the new science teaching and research laboratory buildings.

Objective 3. Re-integrate the Language Research Center into the department.

Rationale. Throughout the years, research with nonhuman primates at the Language Research Center (LRC) has garnered considerable attention, both within the popular media and the scholarly community. Although the LRC has always been affiliated with (and at one time was administered through) the Psychology Department, it is currently administered as an interdepartmental resource directly under the College of Arts and Sciences. This creates unnecessary ambiguities, such as whether LRC grants and publications count towards or promote the visibility of the Psychology Department, even when the investigators have departmental appointments. In this period of change at the LRC (documented in Appendix B5b), this is the appropriate time to return the administration of the LRC under the umbrella of the department.

Resources. At one level, this re-organization requires no resources other than agreement between the director, the department, and the Dean. As with any research center, however, the department does assume some resource-related risks in this re-integration, perhaps including security risks, demands on staff and other support, and commitment to the future success of the center. Conversely, of course, the LRC brings resources to the department, including grant support, opportunities for research and instruction, and space for growth.

Implementation. The recent hiring of a comparative psychologist in the department illustrates the commitment to building in this area of strength for Georgia State. Initial discussions regarding the reorganization of LRC administration have taken place, and will continue in the coming months.

Objective 4. Increase journal publications to over 100 per year with individual publication rates averaging over 3.0 per year, increase external support by 12% each year, and provide increased incentives for faculty accomplishments

Rationale. Although the current faculty is very productive, particularly considering how many new and junior faculty members have joined the department in recent years, we have yet to accomplish the goal of doubling productivity relative to 1990. To move our department into the top 100 psychology departments nationally, and to contribute to the university’s goal of topping $100 million in annual external funds, we need to articulate challenging but attainable goals. These goals may help to guide the department in resource-allocation decisions (with respect to time and effort as well as money).

Resources. Increasing faculty productivity requires support for writing grants and papers, support of graduate students and staff, and incentives (e.g., sabbatical leaves, increased professional development funds) for faculty members to engage in activities that increase the visibility of the department, such as publishing in more prestigious journals, authoring books, and service to the discipline or community (e.g., serving as editor of journals, holding offices in national or regional professional organizations).

Implementation. Obstacles and disincentives to productivity must be identified and, where possible, eliminated. Each program area should be challenged to set reasonable goals for increases in productivity from the current faculty members. Boosting publication rate over 3.0 requires each tenure-track faculty member in the department to publish an additional two articles every three years. To increase the level of grant support, particularly in the current funding environment, each faculty
member must take full advantage of every grant/contract opportunity available. The faculty and staff
hires discussed above will also help with this objective, as will continued participation in the
Provost’s research initiatives and other internal and seed- or venture-grant mechanisms.

Goal 4. Ensure that our environment is stimulating, collegial, and satisfying to faculty
members as well as graduate students and staff in order to optimize productivity,
recruitment, and retention.

Objective 1. Advocate for competitive salaries for faculty members and staff.

Rationale. First, despite the Dean’s recent efforts to address salary compression, our average salaries at
all ranks are significantly below the averages in the college, the university, in psychology
departments of our peer institutions, as well as psychology departments in the southeastern region and
the United States as a whole. Second, our salary increases for the past 3 years have averaged 1.33%.
This state of affairs deflates morale in the department, obstructs our recruitment and retention efforts,
and undermines productivity as faculty are forced to seek out extracurricular activities to supplement
their income.

Resources. Funds to increase salaries for current faculty members and staff whose salaries are below
average and increased funds allocated for new hires.

Implementation. The Chair will work with the Dean and other administrators to identify appropriate
salary ranges based on rank. Subsequently raises will be made for those faculty members and staff
with salaries below the identified averages. Separately, the Chair, Dean, and other administrators will
work to increase the funds allocated to hiring new faculty in the department.

Objective 2. Advocate for a realistic family leave and personal medical leave policy and for
domestic partner benefits.

Rationale. The current Family Leave and Personal Medical Leave policy allows for 12 weeks of unpaid
leave. Unfortunately, a 12-week period is a few weeks short of a typical semester making this a
cumbersome personal and administrative arrangement. Given our low salaries, unpaid leave poses
other difficulties to our faculty. Similarly, a lack of domestic partner benefits poses difficulties and
introduces inequity in benefits that affects morale negatively.

Resources. Additional financial or other resources to support a more comprehensive Family Leave and
Personal Medical Leave policy and domestic partner benefits.

Implementation. Explore resolutions and advocate in the University Senate to improve the Family
Leave and Personal Medical Leave policy and to introduce domestic partner benefits that are
equivalent to other partner benefits offered. For example, solutions might involve the establishment of
paid family and medical leave or arrangements that are more flexible.

Objective 3. Ensure that the next several tenure-track faculty hires include individuals from
groups demographically underrepresented in our faculty or whose research focuses on
understanding human diversity in a given research area.

Rationale. Diversity enriches all functions in an academic department. Demographic diversity is one
critical dimension of diversity. Our diverse student body should be taught by a faculty who reflect
their diversity. However, demographic diversity alone is insufficient. The department also desires
faculty whose research explores rich dimensions of diversity.
Resources. Funds for competitive salary offers are needed because underrepresented faculty members are often heavily recruited.

Implementation. The department has already implemented strategies to attract a diverse pool of applicants for faculty positions. The Diversity Committee has led faculty discussion about how to consider and look for diversity when reviewing applications and has developed tools for this purpose. Continued discussion is needed to support these objectives. Funds to support these new hires need to be identified, coupled with faculty discussion as to how best to balance a need for diverse faculty and a need to maintain an equitable salary structure.

Objective 4. Enhance faculty ability to incorporate diversity in research activities, graduate and undergraduate curriculum, and professional training.

Rationale. Our students require more sophisticated treatment of diversity issues than many faculty members were trained to provide. Further, diversity is not a static concept and requires continual thought and discussion.

Resources. Funds to support professional development seminars for faculty by local or national professionals are needed. Current resources could be better utilized.

Implementation. The Chair, in conjunction with the Diversity Committee, will identify needs and potential professionals to provide seminars and individual consultation. Similarly, the diversity committee will make faculty members aware of relevant training opportunities and encourage them to spend professional development funds already available on such activities.

I.3 Service

Goal 5. Enhance our regional, national, and international presence via professional service activities.

Objective 1. Encourage faculty to serve as officers and committee members for professional psychology organizations, on editorial boards of journals and other publications, and as reviewers on granting agencies.

Rationale. Professional service is part of our identity as scholars. In addition, these activities enhance the reputation and presence of our department in the psychology community, which has beneficial effects (e.g., recruitment of graduate student and faculty).

Resources. Advocate for increased funds (e.g., for professional development and travel, including international travel) and rewards for involvement in professional service.

Implementation. The department will work to identify appropriate compensation in terms of workload and financial support and rewards for high involvement in professional service. For example, the current $1300 provided for professional development is not sufficient to support these endeavors.

Objective 2. Increase our involvement in international activities.

Rationale. Our department and the university as a whole are increasingly involved in professional activities on the international level. It would benefit the department to capitalize on the opportunity of being situated in a fast-growing global city and to increase and expand our international service
activities. In addition, these service activities are often tied to scholarship, which brings its own rewards.

Resources. Advocate for increased funds to support and reward involvement in international service work.

Implementation. Encourage, facilitate, and reward faculty for international service work, such as participation in international conferences and membership on international committees and boards. For example, there should be funds specifically earmarked for international meetings and service activities.

Goal 6. Increase our service to the community while maintaining equitable service assignments.

Objective 1. Encourage faculty and students to provide their skills and time as board members, officers, consultants, and speakers for local agencies, organizations, and activities in the Atlanta area.

Rationale. Our strategic location in downtown Atlanta provides an excellent opportunity to capitalize on involvement in our immediate community. Applying our psychological expertise to help solve problems and improve Atlanta is a valuable contribution we can make to our community. This activity will also enhance our reputation within Atlanta and the University. In addition, this type of service can provide entrée to communities and participants for potential scholarship activities.

Resources. Advocate for university funds to support and reward community service.

Implementation. Identify, encourage, promote, and reward our community service-related activities. For example, we might increase media attention for our service activities in the community, including undergraduate and graduate practica, faculty community involvement, and additional work that contributes to our immediate environment. Recognizing and advertising this quality of our program might prove beneficial in a number of arenas (e.g., helping to secure local funding and contracts, recruitment of graduate students and faculty). The Chair will work with the Dean and other administrators to identify funds to encourage and reward community service. In line with the college’s workload policy indicating that exceptional professional service can count as workload units, the Chair will continue to adjust the workload of faculty members who meet these requirements.

Objective 2. Equally distribute service activities.

Rationale. Along with an increase in service activities comes a decrease in time and energy for scholarship and teaching. In addition, there is a perception in the department that some service activities, at a number of levels (i.e., departmental, institutional, community, and national), go unrecognized and unrewarded.

Resources. No additional resources would be needed for this objective.

Implementation. The Chair and Executive Committee will develop a system to recognize, quantify, and distribute service assignments among the faculty. This system could be used in assigning service activities and could be periodically checked in order to redistribute activities in an equitable manner.
### APPENDIX: TABLES AND FIGURES

#### Figure A.1
Faculty members since 1980; **F** = professor, **A** = associate, **a** = assistant, **c** = clinical professor, **l** = lecturer (each letter represents one faculty member). Year is fall of an academic year, so 2005 = 2005–2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure A.2
Tenure track faculty by area since 1980; **m** = community, **C** = clinical, **n** = clinical neuropsychology, **N** = behavioral neuroscience, **s** = social/cognitive, **d** = developmental (each letter represents one faculty member). Year is fall of an academic year, so 2005 = 2005–2006.
### Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Garfin D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>McClure E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Owren M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Parrott D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Wilczynsk W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Cohen L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Culley M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Kleider H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Robins D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Stewart T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Anderson P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Petrulis A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>King T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l1l1l1l1l1</td>
<td>Sehgal A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Henrich C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaa</td>
<td>Parent M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaa</td>
<td>Sevecik R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaa</td>
<td>Vanman E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaa</td>
<td>Washburn D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaa</td>
<td>Watts R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l11111111</td>
<td>Darnell K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAAAAA</td>
<td>Floyd F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cccccc</td>
<td>Jackson L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaa</td>
<td>Lilienfeld L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Riso L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Armistead L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Cook S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Huhman K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Kupermine G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rrrrrrrrrrrr</td>
<td>Perilla J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Peterson J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Morris M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaaaa</td>
<td>Clarkson M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAA</td>
<td>Albers E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAA</td>
<td>Emshoff J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Emshoff J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Morris R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Adamson L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Jurkovic G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aaaaaaaaAAAAAAA</td>
<td>Bakeman R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B.1.** The current department by length of service and rank. Each column represents an academic year; e.g., the column labeled 2005 is for 2005–2006; c = clinical professor, l = lecturer, s = senior lecturer, a = assistant professor, A = associate professor, F = professor. Year is fall of an academic year, so 2005 = 2005–2006
### Table B-0. Faculty Distribution by Numbers for 2003-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non Tenure-Track</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unlike Table B.1, counted under non tenure-track are only persons who taught more than one course. Minority includes only racial/ethnic minority members.

### Table B-1. Faculty Distribution by Numbers for 2003-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non Tenure-Track</th>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>PT**</th>
<th>Other*** (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes instructor, lecturer, clinical, research  
**Includes PTI and partial contract  
***includes academic professional, academic administrator, general administrator, adjunct

*Note.* Compiled by OIR and based on university records. See text for reasons these counts differ from departmental records, as reflected in Table B-0. Minority includes only racial/ethnic minority members.
## B.2 Faculty research productivity

### Table B-2. Faculty Productivity for 2002 - 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th># Refereed Publications</th>
<th># Creative/Scholarly Works (specify types)</th>
<th>Amt. Ext. Funding</th>
<th>Amt. Int. Funding</th>
<th>Conference Presentations</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Dabbs, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 book translated into Japanese</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate Editor Infancy; 2 editorial boards; member SRCD Program Committee; Chair, Advisory Board, NICH, NIH, Study of Early Child Care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bakeman, R.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$767,087</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clance, P.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,113</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Editorial Board for 4 journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deCastro, J.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adamson, L.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>535,135</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chair, NIH study section (BBBP-6, Developmental Disabilities and Child Psychopathology); Treasurer and Board Member, ISIS; 2 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris, R.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 chapter, 6 conf. Proceedings, 1 contributed paper</td>
<td>2,171,035</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Presidential Nominee to NIFL Advisory Board, two review panels; 1 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albers, E.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 contributed papers, 1 chapter</td>
<td>5,124,849</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 external advisory boards, 1 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,330</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Editorial Board for 2 journals; NIH Scientific Working Group; CDC Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd, F.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>838,301 direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assoc. Editor, 2 journals; nih review panel, 2 niaaa review panels, nichd review panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster, M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GPA ethics committee, APA division CE chair, Head Start Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td># Refereed Publications</td>
<td># Creative/Scholarly Works (specify types)</td>
<td>Amt. Ext. Funding</td>
<td>Amt. Int. Funding</td>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Jurkovic, G.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,161</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Editorial Board, 1 journal; Vice President, International Academy of Family Psychology; Co-chair, Family Systems Special Interest Group, International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emshoff, J.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 chapter, 2 tech/research reports</td>
<td>503,945</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Editorial Board, 1 journal; program chair, GA Psych Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarkson, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,485</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris, M.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 abstract</td>
<td>8,597</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program committee, INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armistead, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312,268</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SRA review panel Consultant to Curriculum Development, American Psychological Association’s HIV Office for Psychology Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook, S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>119,398</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Editorial board, 1 journal; 2 advisory panels; 1 review panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huhman, K.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>250,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Executive committee, Soc. Neuroscience Atlanta chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuperminc, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 tech reports</td>
<td>158,370</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Soc. Community Research and Action selection, nominations, dissertation award committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lilenfeld, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,563</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Publications Council, Academy for Eating Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent, M.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 abstracts</td>
<td>178,650</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSF reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td># Refereed Publications</td>
<td># Creative/Scholarly Works (specify types)</td>
<td>Amt. Ext. Funding</td>
<td>Amt. Int. Funding</td>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Sevcik, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 chapters, 2 contributed papers, 3 policy/position statements</td>
<td>1,509,814</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 editorial boards; NIH reviewer; AAMR 2 committees, ASHA representative member; Leadership Conference chair; 2 advisory boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washburn, D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 book review</td>
<td>324,436</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>President, Soc. Computers in Psych, Secretary, Southern Soc. for Phil and Psych, 2 program committees, 5 editorial boards, FAA advisory taskforce; NIH review panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watts, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APA Urban Initiatives committee; Senior Editor, Am. J. Community Psych; 1 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burge, K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 editorial boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riso, L.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 editorial boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson, B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>$51,600</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanman, E.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 editorial board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrich, C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 chapters, 2 reports/fact sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, P.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King, T.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 chapter, 1 abstract</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petrulis, A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.66</strong> chapters</td>
<td><strong>442,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.92</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** See Section F for totals and averages that adjust for collaborative publications, presentations, and grants; faculty members who joined the department in Fall, 2002 were counted 0.5 FTE in averages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th># Refereed Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Creative/Scholarly Works (specify types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dabbs, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bakeman, R.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Adamson, L.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albers, E.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson, J.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd, F.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster, M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurkovic, G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emshoff, J.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarkson, M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td># Refereed Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Morris, M.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armistead, L.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook, S.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huhman, K.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuperminc, G.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lilenfeld, L.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent, M.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sevcik, R.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washburn, D.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td># Refereed Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Watts, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riso, L.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson, B.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanman, E.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrich, C.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, P.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King, T.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petrulis, A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart, T.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong> <strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.42 chapters</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** See Section F for totals and averages that adjust for collaborative publications, presentations, and grants; faculty members who joined the department in Fall, 2003 were counted 0.5 FTE in averages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Publications Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeman, R.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 book, 3 chapters, 1 encyclopedia entry</td>
<td>$1,095,077</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate Editor Infancy; 3 editorial boards; Co-chair SRCD Program Committee; Advisory Board Member, NICHD, NIH, Study of Early Child Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamson, L.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>567,986</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treasurer, Board member ISIS, 1 editorial board, 1 advisory board, 2 program committees, NSF, NIH, and Italian Ministry of Education grant reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 book, 1 chapter</td>
<td>2,171,035</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 advisory boards, 1 program committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albers, E.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 abstracts</td>
<td>6,267,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 external advisory boards, 1 editorial board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, J.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial Board for 2 journals; NIH Scientific Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd, F.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 chapters</td>
<td>838,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, M.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurkovic, G.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>VP, Inter. Acad. Fam. Psych, 1 editorial board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emshoff, J.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter, 1 technical report</td>
<td>466,115</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Technical committee, Acoustical Soc. Am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson, M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, M.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armistead, L.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>375,869</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assoc. Editor, Child &amp; Family Studies; 1 CDC grant review panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Item(s)</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APA Regional Federal Education Advocacy Coordinator; APA Div. 27 Secretary, 1 editorial board, 1 advisory panel; 2 NIJ review panels; NSF grant reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huhman, K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 chapter, 8 abstracts, 1 book review</td>
<td>252,730</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NSF grant reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuperminc, G.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 technical report</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Soc. Community Research and Action selection, nominations, dissertation award committees, 3 editorial boards; grant reviewer for NSF, 2 foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilenfeld, L.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 chapter, 1 abstract</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Member of 2 national scientific committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent, M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 abstracts</td>
<td>178,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 editorial board; ASHA award committee, 2 NIH grant panels; chair of 2 program committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevcik, R.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 encyclopedia entries, 1 contributed paper</td>
<td>1,665,521</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Past-president, SSPP; Executive Committee, SEPA; HFES program chair; 6 editorial boards,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn, D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 book review</td>
<td>646,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts, R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter, 2 technical reports</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sr. Editor, Am J Community Psych; 1 editorial board;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riso, L.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GPA task force; 3 editorial boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 book, 1 chapter</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Editorial Board, 1 journal; grant reviewer for MRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanman, E.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NIMH grant reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrich, C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>209,987</td>
<td>116,446</td>
<td>1 editorial board; NSF grant reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, P.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>355,735</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1 editorial board; NIMH review panel; APA Div. 12 Committee for Sci. &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004 Average</td>
<td>3-Year Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petulis, A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 abstract</td>
<td>0.60 chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, T.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 chapter</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, L.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 book review</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culley, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2 editorial boards; APA Div 54 program and awards committees; Member-at-Large APA Div 54; 2 guest editor for special issues in journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleider, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robins, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dictionary entry</td>
<td>DHHS Special Emphasis Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>502,868</td>
<td>34,897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Average</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>498,157</td>
<td>32,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: See Section F for totals and averages that adjust for collaborative publications, presentations, and grants; faculty members who joined the department in Fall, 2004 were counted 0.5 FTE in averages.
### B.3 The identities of graduate, undergraduate, non-degree, and other programs

#### Table B-3a. Graduate Degrees Completed by Concentration, per Departmental Records, FY 2003–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>CLG</th>
<th>CLN</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>NBN</th>
<th>SCG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year mean</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PhD defense passed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>CLG</th>
<th>CLN</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>NBN</th>
<th>SCG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year mean</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PhD conferred**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>CLG</th>
<th>CLN</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>NBN</th>
<th>SCG</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year mean</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table lists numbers of graduate students who passed their MA defense, passed their PhD defense, and had their PhD conferred by FY year, separately by concentration (i.e., program area), based on departmental records. Year PhD defense passed and year PhD conferred can be different, depending on when the defense was passed and on whether or not a clinical internship year intervened.

In Tables B-3a-c, CLC = community clinical dual program, CLG = general clinical, CLN = joint clinical-NBN program, COR = community, DEV = developmental, NBN = neuropsychology and behavioral neuroscience, and SCG = social/cognitive. In Table B-3c PSP = psychological sciences; it is pooled with SCG in Table B-3a.

#### Table B-3b. Currently Enrolled Graduate Students by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY entered</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>CLG</th>
<th>CLN</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>NBN</th>
<th>SCG</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-3c. Program Types by Majors and Concentration and Unduplicated Number (Headcount) of Major Students and Degrees Conferred, FY 2003–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>FY 2003 Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
<th>FY 2004 Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
<th>FY 2005 Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
<th>3 Year Average Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>883</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>864.0</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA PSY CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA PSY ETK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA PSY MED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA PSY NOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>896</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>892.3</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>468</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>446.7</td>
<td>132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS PSY CYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS PSY MED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS PSY NOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>530.3</td>
<td>138.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PSY CLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PSY CLG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PSY CLN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PSY COR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY CLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY CLG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY CLN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY COR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY DEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY NBN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY PSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD PSY SCG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Concentrations for AB and BS: CYP = community, ETK = pre-education, MED = pre-medicine; see Section D for details. This table is based on university records and was prepared for us by OIR (as were most tables in this section). No concentration was noted for MAs and PhDs for a large number of graduate students, which is why departmental records were used to compile Table B-3a.
B.4 Number of credit hours generated per year for the previous three years, by faculty type and level (undergraduate core, undergraduate lower division, undergraduate upper division, and graduate).

Table B-4a. 2003 Credit Hours Taught by Department Faculty by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Undergrad Core</th>
<th>Undergrad Lower Division</th>
<th>Undergrad Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>3317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Tenure-Track</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>4195</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>3219</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>2907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4b. 2004 Credit Hour Generation by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Undergrad Core</th>
<th>Undergrad Lower Division</th>
<th>Undergrad Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>3258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>6586</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>4177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4c. 2005 Credit Hour Generation by Level and Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Undergrad Core</th>
<th>Undergrad Lower Division</th>
<th>Undergrad Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>3467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>4189</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>3753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>3987</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These numbers are provided by OIR from university records. As noted earlier, some tenured faculty members who hold administrative positions are categorized as Other in university records, and other changes in recording practices were introduced in FY 2005. As a result, seemingly large changes in hours taught between Non Tenure-Track and Other for various categories, when comparing different years, are primarily due to these changes in categorization and recording practice. In FY 2003 and FY 2004 several individuals the department categorized as visiting lecturers were categorized in university records sometimes as Non Tenure-Track and sometimes as Other, which includes visiting lecturers, whereas beginning in FY 2005 all visiting lectures were categorized as Other in these tables.
Table E-1. Mean Standardized Graduate Admission Test Scores and GPAs by Program for 2003-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical-Community Joint</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical-Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience Joint</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/Cognitive</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted students</th>
<th>Matriculated students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2. Selection Ratio of Applicant/Accepted Graduate Students for 2003-2005

**Clinical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical-Community Joint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical-Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience Joint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Developmental**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neuroscience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social/Cognitive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Applicants</th>
<th># of Accepted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure F-1. Journal publications and professional presentations

Table F-1. Journals in which peer-reviewed articles were published in 2002–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSU</th>
<th>Louisville</th>
<th>UIC</th>
<th>Houston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescence</th>
<th>Cognitive and Behavioral Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Chemical Nutrition</td>
<td>Cognitive Therapy and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Community Psychology</td>
<td>Comprehensive Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</td>
<td>Culture, Health and Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Psychiatry</td>
<td>Current Research in Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>Developmental Neuropsychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Speech and Language Pathology</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal on Mental Retardation</td>
<td>Disability and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Cognition</td>
<td>Elementary School Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of the New York Academy of Science</td>
<td>European Journal of Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal</td>
<td>Evidence-based Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Families in Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>The Family Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Folia Primatologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Gender and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Modification</td>
<td>Health Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Research Method, Instruments and Computers</td>
<td>Hormones and Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Therapy</td>
<td>In Session: Journal of Clinical Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
<td>Infancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Neuroscience</td>
<td>Information Technology and Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Pharmacology</td>
<td>International Journal of Behavioral Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovine Practitioner</td>
<td>International Journal of Eating Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Research</td>
<td>International Journal of Primatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Research Bulletin</td>
<td>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular Disease</td>
<td>Journal of Affective Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Studies</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>Journal of Chemical Neuroanatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Health Care</td>
<td>Journal of Clinical Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics in Geriatric Medicine</td>
<td>Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-1. Journals in which peer-reviewed articles were published in 2002–2004 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology</th>
<th>Laterality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Community Psychology</td>
<td>Learning and Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Comparative Psychology</td>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Movement Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Dental Education</td>
<td>Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</td>
<td>Neurobiology of Learning and memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Family Violence</td>
<td>Neureport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology</td>
<td>Pediatric Pulmonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Gerontological Nursing</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Gerontology and Medical Sciences</td>
<td>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Homosexuality</td>
<td>Perspectives on Augmentative and Alternative Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Physiology and Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Marriage and the Family</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Memory and Language</td>
<td>Psychological Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Multilingual Communication Disorders</td>
<td>Psychological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neuroendocrinology</td>
<td>Psychology of Men and Masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Psychology of Women Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences</td>
<td>Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Pediatric Psychology</td>
<td>Scientific Review of Mental Health Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Self and Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Psychosocial Oncology</td>
<td>Social Behavior and Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Research in Personality</td>
<td>Social Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Research on Adolescence</td>
<td>Substance Use and Misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior</td>
<td>The Community Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society</td>
<td>Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the National Medical Association</td>
<td>Violence and Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Traumatic Stress</td>
<td>Women and Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</td>
<td>Women and Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-2. Frequency distributions for refereed journal publications per year, refereed journal publications in the three-year review period, and cumulative frequency distributions for external grant dollars per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications per year</th>
<th>Publications per three years</th>
<th>External grant $ per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 publications = 17%</td>
<td>0 publications = 4%</td>
<td>$0 = 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 publication = 24%</td>
<td>1 to 3 publications = 11%</td>
<td>&lt; $25k = 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 publications = 19%</td>
<td>4 to 6 publications = 22%</td>
<td>&lt; $100k = 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 publications = 13%</td>
<td>7 to 9 publications = 41%</td>
<td>&lt; $500k = 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 publications = 11%</td>
<td>10 to 12 publications = 12%</td>
<td>&lt; $1m = 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ publications = 15%</td>
<td>13+ publications = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For the middle column, N = 27, those faculty members who were in the department all 3 years. For the first and last column, this table gives frequency distributions for publications per year and external grant dollars per year for 93 faculty-years (32, 29, and 32 faculty for 2002–2003, 2003–2004, and 2004–2005, respectively). Think of this as a 3-column matrix. The percentages for the first and last columns give the number of cells with the value indicated. The median yearly external grant is $25,000 (based on all faculty including those with no funding).
Table F-3. Mean external grant support per year per faculty member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSU</th>
<th>Louisville</th>
<th>UIC</th>
<th>Houston</th>
<th>GSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$176,288</td>
<td>$131,818</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$390,024</td>
<td>$40,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-4: External agencies that provided research support during 2002 – 2004

| National Institute of Aging | National Institute of Child Health and Human Development |
| National Institute of Justice | National Institute of Mental Health |
| National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke | National Institute on Deafness and Other Communicative Disorders |
| National Institute of Diabetes & Digestive and Kidney Disorders | National Science Foundation |
| Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | Georgia Department of Human Resources |
| Georgia Department of Education | Georgia Research Alliance |
| American Academy of Pediatrics | American Psychological Association |
| Bell Research Labs | Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement |
| Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS | Center for Substance Abuse Prevention |
| Cool Girls, Inc. | Deafness Research Foundation |
| Eli Lilly | Federal Aviation Administration |
| Ittleson Foundation | Juvenile Diabetes Foundation |
| Kansas City Local Investment Commission | Knoll Pharmaceutical Company |
| Maternal and Child Health Bureau | McDonnell-Pew Foundation |
| Russell Sage Foundation | Southeast Disability and Business Technology Assistance Center |
| The Mayday Fund | U. S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command |
| William T. Grant Foundation | |
Table F-5. Agencies that have received community service, 2002 – 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American Men’s National Leadership Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety and Mood Disorders Freedom from Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Girls’ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Partnership for Arts in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Planning Commission International Research Conference on the Role of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families in Preventing and Adapting to HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black AIDS Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caminar Latino, Inc., St. Joseph’s Mercy Care Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Partnership Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center, Central Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEANUP, Sugar Creek, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Campus Partnership for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resource Board of the Youth Special Services Program at Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Pride, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb Community Service Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County Superior Court Judges Trainer on Domestic Violence in Immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County Violence Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence and Homelessness Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Park Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County Violence Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuro Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Commission on Family Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Council on Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Domestic Violence Legal Benchbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Policy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Supreme Court Commission on Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Howard School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Advisory Committee of the National Association of Juvenile and Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Visitation Center Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Children of Alcoholics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Drug Prevention League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood and Commission Assessment, Kansas City, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Women’s HealthPartnership Against Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Phoenix Group Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent Child Abuse Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project FACTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravinia Club Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Heath and Wellness Coalition of Metro Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E. McNair Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Gender Domestic Violence Intervention Groups for Women Perpetrators and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims in Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science NetLinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciTrek Science Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoyah Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Georgia Cultural Competency Training Needs Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPESTRI, Immigrant and Refugee Coalition to End Gender-Based Oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way and Enterprise Foundation Community Safety Advisor Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthpride Center for Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgendered Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZooAtlanta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-6. Outcome of Promotion and Tenure Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Cook</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Kuperminc</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Parent</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Watts</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Tenured at Rank of Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Lilenfeld</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Sevcik</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Tenured at Rank of Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Washburn</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Promoted to Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G-1. Student/Faculty Ratios, FY 2003-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>FY 2003</th>
<th>FY 2004</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># TT (instructional) Faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Majors (All)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/TT Ratio</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/TT Ratio</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>FY 2003</th>
<th>FY 2004</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Faculty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ph.D. Students</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D/Grad Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G-2. Percentages of Undergraduate Course Sections Taught by Graduate Students, Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, and Tenure-Track Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># sections 2004-05</th>
<th>% by type 2004-05</th>
<th># instructors 2004-05</th>
<th>sections/instructor 2004-05</th>
<th># sections 2005-06</th>
<th>% by type 2005-06</th>
<th># instructors 2005-06</th>
<th>sections/instructor 2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTAs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** This table shows undergraduate course sections only; the number of sections per instructor for tenure-track faculty does not include graduate courses and so does not reflect the total number of courses taught by tenure-track faculty.

### Table G-3. Core Departmental Staff Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Tenagne</td>
<td>Mulugeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Specialist</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Specialist</td>
<td>Unfilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Specialist–Academic</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager I</td>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Radcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager III</td>
<td>Jakki</td>
<td>Gaither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Technology Manager</td>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>Collis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Systems Specialist–Assistant</td>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>McCauley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Systems Specialist–Intermediate</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Olowokere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Berry-Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Collie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G-4. Comparisons of Some Key Resources Among Georgia State University and Selected Peer Institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>GSU</th>
<th>U of Louisville</th>
<th>U of Houston</th>
<th>U of IL at Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># undergrads</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>800+</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># grad students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University funding for grad students (does not include indirect cost recovery)</td>
<td>$584,000*</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$587,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*In FY06, the university added an additional $284,500, a substantial increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (faculty)</td>
<td>35 + 3 lecturers + 1 clinical</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25 + 7.5 research</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (staff)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11 + 4 soft $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Grants administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3 accountants + 4 soft $ grant admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Tech support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 + 3 student assts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Extramural grant support per faculty member</td>
<td>$443,398</td>
<td>$197,634</td>
<td>$295,472</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department budget (non-grant)</td>
<td>$4,177,099</td>
<td>$2,740,678</td>
<td>$3,725,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table G-5. Comparison of Nine-Month Salaries Among Georgia State University and Peer Institutions and Psychology Departments Within These Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>GSU</th>
<th>Louisville</th>
<th>U Houston</th>
<th>U Illinois Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist.</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$51,300</td>
<td>$65,100</td>
<td>$63,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>$66,700</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
<td>$70,200</td>
<td>$72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$108,700</td>
<td>$88,100</td>
<td>$103,200</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>GSU Psychology</th>
<th>Louisville Psychology</th>
<th>U Houston Psychology</th>
<th>UIC Psychology</th>
<th>U.S. Dept of Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist.</td>
<td>$49,472</td>
<td>$56,752</td>
<td>$58,494</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$54,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>$58,997</td>
<td>$66,704</td>
<td>$65,687</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$64,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$82,888</td>
<td>$99,228</td>
<td>$105,720</td>
<td>$97,000</td>
<td>$97,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Salaries for U.S. Departments of Psychology were obtained from the *APA Monitor, 36:12, 2005* and reflect salaries from the 2004–2005 academic year. The other values show average salaries in the particular universities and departments during the 2005–2006 academic year.