

Psychology seeks affiliation with College of Science

Following is a memo from Psychology chair Marlyne Kilbey to Academic Senate President Charles Jeffries Dec. 24, 1991

I have just received a copy of President Adamany's memo of 12/18/91 addressed to you. As the President indicated, the faculty of Psychology feels a strong identification with the laboratory science component of the College of Liberal Arts and, in line with his memo of 10/28, voted by an overwhelming majority to become a part of a College of Science if one is formed at WSU. Not only are the research programs of most of our faculty carried out in a laboratory or clinical setting versus a field setting, but our curriculum is a laboratory-based curriculum as well. We require completion of at least 2 laboratory courses for majors although many students take 3, or more.

I am enclosing a copy of a memo that I wrote to President Adamany on 12/21/84 when the question of reorganization of the College of Liberal Arts first arose. It outlines some of my reasons why Psychology should be included in the unit housing the laboratory sciences at WSU. I also persuaded similar arguments to the commission chaired by Provost Williamson, which was persuaded of the similarity between Psychology and departments designated for the proposed College of Science. The points I raised in this memo remain salient to the present situation, as does the testimony we made to the Williamson Commission. Should the Academic Senate require additional information about the nature of the psychology program at WSU, I would be happy to provide it.

Enclosed with above memo was the following memo from Dr. Kilbey to President David Adamany written Dec. 21, 1984

I read your plan for academic reorganization with interest. It was discussed by the Department's Policy Advisory Committee and the faculty at their December meetings. The faculty and I are unanimously of the opinion that there are compelling reasons to request reconsideration of the placing of psychology in the proposed College of Social and Behavioral Sciences with its suggested configuration of departments, i.e., Anthropology, Criminal Justice, Economics, Geography and Urban Planning, History, Political Science, Sociology and several institutes. I have discussed some of the major reasons we in psychology are of this opinion with Interim Dean Henry Bohm, and he recommended that I write you directly about our concerns. Our overriding concern is that we feel that placement in this College will neither provide us with the type of collegial interactions nor administrative assistance that will permit us to maintain and improve our nationally recognized graduate program and to improve the level of extramural research support we generally achieve, i.e., a rank in the 70's among the top 100 research universities.

The strengths of the department's programs and our plans for increased research activity are spelled out in the recent self-study. The self-study material underscores the fact that psychology's closest ties are with the departments included in the proposed College of Science and with various departments of the Medical School. These ties must be maintained if we are to sustain the quality of our programs and to continue to increase our research support. I would like to list briefly some of the reasons that support our being included among the departments in the proposed College of Science.

1. Psychology has a laboratory-based curriculum and a commitment to training undergraduates and graduate students in laboratory experimental methodology. It shares this type of curriculum with several departments of the proposed College of Science while none of the other departments to be included in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has such a curriculum.
2. The majority of our undergraduate students are enrolled in programs leading to a B.S. degree.
3. We share the largest portion of our co-majors with pre-medicine, biology, computer science and other pre-professional programs.
4. Those mentioned in points 2 and 3 are students whose electives and cognates are being earned in departments in the proposed College of Science.
5. We share federally funded training programs with Biology and the basic science departments of the Medical School.
6. We share equipment, support services and grant funds with Biology, Chemistry, Pharmacology, Physiology, and Psychiatry.
7. We have grant applications pending or in process with a number of the departments listed in point 6 and other departments in the proposed College of Science and the Medical School. We have no training programs with, and have no proposals submitted, nor planned, with the units of the proposed College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, nor do we share equipment or specialized support services with them.
8. Our grant funding comes, in the main, from agencies of NIH and ADAMHA (i.e., NIA, NIDA, NIMH, NIAAA, NICHD) and from the National Science Foundation (Behavioral and Neural Science Branch). These are also the units to which Psychology faculty apply for Career Development Awards. We share this funding pattern with Biology and Chemistry and the basic and clinical

departments of the Medical School. Only a small portion of our funds comes from foundations that fund research in social science.

9. Internally, also, our funding pattern is similar to that of the departments of the proposed College of Science and Medical Science departments insofar as we compete for Biomedical Research and Neuroscience Research funds. This is not the pattern of internal funding for the other units of the proposed Social and Behavioral Science College.

10. The graduate program in psychology attracts a large number of exceptionally strong doctoral applicants, including a good number of minority students, from Michigan and throughout the United States. We run a large program, graduating approximately 25 Ph.D.'s each year, and feel that the special considerations of maintaining large programs, one of which is mentioned below, would be better understood by the administration of the proposed Science College. This College includes several large graduate programs, i.e., Chemistry and Biology, and its administration would be far more capable of the kinds of leadership you envision than would be the administration of the proposed Social and Behavioral Sciences College in which the largest program is Economics, whose entire graduate student population is approximately 25, i.e., fewer total students than we either admit or graduate each year.

As you know, changes in educational policy subsequent to the 1980 national elections caused psychology to lose five federally funded graduate training programs (i.e., research traineeships and over \$300,000 per year. As a consequence we have supported graduate students as graduate teaching assistants, which has resulted in lower student/faculty ratios for our department than would exist if these sections were taught by part-time faculty. This year we doubled the number of students supported by research assistantships, from 9 to 18, and we plan to continue to increase this number as additional outside research funds are obtained. However, we will need administrative support as we continue to recover from the devastating effect caused by the shift away from federal support for graduate training programs.

11. Growth areas for programs and research in psychology involve interdisciplinary work between psychology faculty and those in computer science, biology, and the basic science and clinical departments of the Medical School. Our ability to develop these programs and research areas will be facilitated by being included in the College of Science with whose faculty and administration we would be working.

In the interest of brevity I will not go into other points which I feel further establish our inter-relatedness with the departments to be included in the College of Science. However, on the basis of the points mentioned and in consideration of the fact that there is consensus among the faculty on this issue, we do request that you reconsider the designation of psychology as a department of the proposed College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Finally, when I discussed your proposals with Interim Dean Bohm he mentioned that it might be important for psychology to be included in the proposed Social and Behavioral Sciences College to maintain a similar size between the various Colleges. If this is an issue I would like to suggest that consideration be given to other alternative structures. For example, the establishment of a College of Life Sciences, which would include both biology and psychology, would allay many of our concerns. The inclusion of Biology with Psychology in a College of Life Sciences would assure the selection of a Dean knowledgeable about our potential sources of extramural research funds, our laboratory-based curriculum and our large graduate program.

The work that I undertook this term in completing the self-study convinced me of Psychology's strength at Wayne, and I am appreciative of your concern for providing an academic structure that will further strengthen good programs in a period of diminishing resources. I am looking forward to meeting with you January 4 to discuss your proposals and would, of course, welcome the opportunity to discuss my specific concerns with you at any time.

Public Hearings

The Academic Senate's Commission on the Reorganization of the College of Liberal Arts will hold public hearings for all interested persons in the university community on the question of the creation of a College of Science. The hearings will be held from 6 to 9 p.m. Tuesday, Feb. 28 and 3 to 5 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday, Feb. 26-27, in room 46, Lower DeRoy Auditorium.

Written comments on the issue, especially from those unable to attend the hearings, are welcome and may be sent to the Office of the Academic Senate, 1279 FAB.