2006-2007 :: Ph.D. in Psychological Sciences

1. Mission Statement: The mission of the Psychological Sciences program is to prepare doctoral students for leadership roles in research, teaching, and applications of psychology, and to conduct exemplary research in developmental processes, cognition, or social/personality psychology. Through disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and teaching, we seek to create improved understanding of mechanisms influencing social and cognitive behavior and development.

2. Objectives:

2.1 Foundation in Psychological Sciences: Students will analyze and apply fundamental concepts and theories in psychological sciences

2.1.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 10. Foundational Knowledge in Discipline(s)

2.1.2 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.2 Critiquing Research: Students will compare/contrast, interpret, and critically evaluate research findings and theories in their major area of study

2.2.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 11. Advanced Knowledge in Discipline(s); 16. Independent Thought

2.2.2 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.3 Analysis and Experimental Design: Students will apply and evaluate appropriate analytic and experimental design methodologies

2.3.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 15. Research & Design

2.3.2 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.4 Designing and Implementing Research: Students will design, implement, and interpret research studies and communicate research findings

2.4.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 15. Research & Design

2.4.2 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

2.5 Teaching: Students will demonstrate the ability to teach in psychological sciences

2.5.1 Related General Education Outcome Item(s): 11. Advanced Knowledge in Discipline(s); 16. Independent Thought

2.5.2 Student Related Objective: Yes - This is a student related objective.

3. Measures & Findings:

3.1 Exam questions: Essay, short answer, & multiple choice questions assessing target content of core courses

3.1.1 Assessment Timeframe: During semester each course is offered.

3.1.2 Success Criteria: 80% of students will earn more than 80% of points on criterion items

3.1.3 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Psychological Sciences; Critiquing Research; Analysis and Experimental Design; Designing and Implementing Research

3.1.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: The two core courses on which these findings are based are HCS 6331, Cognitive Development, and HCS 6346 Systems Neuroscience.

HCS 6331: Multiple choice questions; assessed on two exams; 10 on midterm and 8 on final exam.

Criterion for success: 80% of Target questions will be answered correctly by an average of greater than 80% of students. Criterion met.

Essay questions assessing theories and research findings in cognitive development: Students administered take home essay question on Exam 2 scored via rubric. Criterion for success: 80% of students earn 80% of points. Criteron met.

HCS 6346: Multiple choice and short answer questions; .22 target questions assessed performance on 5 criterion measures. Criterion for success: 80% of students earn more than 80% of points on target items/criterion measured. Criterion met.

3.1.5 Numerical Results: HCS 6331: Multiple choice questions: On average, 80% of students correctly answered 18 target items. Essay question: 100% of students earned greater than 80% of points. HCS 6346: Multiple choice and short answer questions: On average, 89% correct response for 22 items assessing 5 learning orjectives.

3.1.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.1.7 Further Action: No

3.2 Independent Study Activities Evaluation: Independent Study Activities Evaluation (HCS 8V80)

3.2.1 Assessment Timeframe: During semester in which student enrolled in Independent Study.

3.2.2 Success Criteria: 100% meet or exceed expectations

3.2.3 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Psychological Sciences; Critiquing Research; Analysis and Experimental Design; Designing and Implementing Research; Teaching

3.2.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: Criterions for success is 100% students meeting expectations.

Eight of nine students who enrolled in Independent Study Research Activities met expectations.

3.2.5 Numerical Results: 8/9 or 89% of students met or exceeded expectations; 1/9 failed to meet expectations

3.2.6 Achievement Level: Partially Met

3.2.7 Further Action: Yes

3.3 Papers & Written Exercises: Papers and Written Exercises in core & advanced courses scored via rubrics

3.3.1 Assessment Timeframe: During semester each course is offered.

3.3.2 Success Criteria: 80% score > 80%

3.3.3 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Psychological Sciences; Critiquing Research

3.3.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: HCS 6331: Students' interpretation and communication of research findings was assessed via rubric. Criterion for successful performance was that 80% of students score greater than 80%. Class performance failed to meet criterion.

HCS 6331: Students' ability to summarize and evaluate resaerch findings was assessed with a written exercise. Criterion for successful performance was that 80% of students score greater than 80%. Class performance failed to meet criterion.

3.3.5 Numerical Results: Written paper assessing interpretation and communicaiton of resaerch findings: 8/13 students or 62% scored 80% or above. Failed to meet criterion Written paper summarizing and evaluating resaerch findings: 9 of 13 students or 69% scored 80% or above. Failed to meet criterion.

3.3.6 Influencing Factors: Few target items used to assess performance on this measure.

3.3.7 Achievement Level: Not Met

3.3.8 Further Action: Yes

3.4 Class Presentations & Class Participation: Class presentations and participation scored via rubric

3.4.1 Assessment Timeframe: Semesters during which course occurs.

3.4.2 Success Criteria: 80% score > 80%

3.4.3 Related Objective(s): Critiquing Research; Teaching

3.4.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: Two courses during spring semester assessed class participation and contributions, HCS 6331, Cognitive Development and HCS 6303, Issues in Behavioral and Brain Sciences. Criterion performance is that 80% of students will actively participate in class discussions or earn 80% of points for class presentation.

For one core course (HCS 6303), 80% of students met the course objective of actively participating in the discussions and posing questions indicating ability to synthesize research findings. 100% of students in this class met expectations on 3 of 5 measures of performance on an oral presentation of preliminary research results.

For the second core course (HCS 6331), all students scored greater than 80% on class participation. All students (n=13) scored greater than 80% on a class presentation scored via rubric.

3.4.5 Numerical Results: Class participation: 80% & 100% students met criterion in two core courses. Class presentation: 100% and 100% students met criterion in two core courses.

3.4.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.4.7 Further Action: No

3.5 Teaching Assistant Evaluation: Teaching Assistant Performance assessed via Instructor Evaluation

3.5.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs at end of each semester.

3.5.2 Success Criteria: 80% score > 80%

3.5.3 Related Objective(s): Teaching

3.5.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: Evaluations for three students were completed. Two students met and 1 student exceeded expectations. Criterion for this measure is that 100% of students meet expectations.

3.5.5 Numerical Results: All students met expectations; 2 met and 1 exceeded expectations.

3.5.6 Influencing Factors: Evaluations for all students were not submitted. More administrative support is needed to distribute evaluations to faculty and to compile the completed forms.

3.5.7 Achievement Level: Partially Met

3.5.8 Further Action: Yes

3.6 Conference Presentations: Conference presentation assessed via student Annual Report

3.6.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs biannually.

3.6.2 Success Criteria: 75% present conference paper

3.6.3 Related Objective(s): Teaching

3.6.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: 35% or 7 of 20 students prepared and presented a paper or poster at a regional or national academic conference during calendar year 2006 and 6 of 20 students or 30% presented a paper during Spring 2007. These 13 students presented a total of 17 papers. One student received the award for Outstanding Graduate Student Paper, awarded by the Society for Research in Human Development at the 15th Biennial Conference, Fort Worth, Texas, March 2006. This goal is to be assessed

biannually because the major child development conferences are held biannually. The data presented here are based on 1.5 calendar years rather than two.

3.6.5 Numerical Results: During calendar year 2006 and spring 2007, 13 of 20 students or 65% of students presented a conference paper. Performance did not meet the goal of 75% participation; however, it should be noted that the 65% participation is based on 1.5 years rather than 2 years.

3.6.6 Influencing Factors: This assessment is based on 1.5 years data rather than 2 years.

3.6.7 Achievement Level: Partially Met

3.6.8 Further Action: Yes

3.7 Qualifying Thesis : Qualifying Thesis scored via rubric by 3 faculty

3.7.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs following completion of Qualifying Thesis.

3.7.2 Success Criteria: 100% meet or exceed expectations

3.7.3 Related Objective(s): Critiquing Research; Analysis and Experimental Design

3.7.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: One student successfully completed the Qualifying Thesis. The thesis was judged as satisfactory by 3 faculty committee members.

3.7.5 Numerical Results: One student reached this milestone and successfully completed this requirement.

3.7.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.7.7 Further Action: No

3.8 Presentation of Qualifying Thesis: Presentation of Qualifying Thesis scored via rubric by 3 faculty

3.8.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs immediately following presentation of Qualifying Thesis.

3.8.2 Success Criteria: 100% meet or exceed expectations

3.8.3 Related Objective(s): Designing and Implementing Research

3.8.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: One student successfully presented the Qualifying Thesis projects in a public seminar series. This presentation was judged by 3 faculty committee members and scored via rubric.

3.8.5 Numerical Results: One student met this milestone and was successful.

3.8.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.8.7 Further Action: No

3.9 Dissertation Proposal Defense: Defense of Dissertation proposal scored via rubric by 4 faculty

3.9.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs immediately following proposal defense.

3.9.2 Success Criteria: 100% meet or exceed expectations

3.9.3 Related Objective(s): Critiquing Research; Analysis and Experimental Design; Designing and Implementing Research

3.9.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: No student defended the dissertaton proposal during spring 2007.

3.9.5 Numerical Results: There are no data in this category for Spring 2007.

3.9.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.9.7 Further Action: No

3.10 Defense of Final Dissertation: Defense of completed Dissertation scored via rubric by 4 faculty

3.10.1 Assessment Timeframe: Assessment occurs immediately following dissertation defense.

3.10.2 Success Criteria: 100% meet or exceed expectations

3.10.3 Related Objective(s): Critiquing Research; Analysis and Experimental Design; Designing and Implementing Research; Teaching

3.10.4 Results Related To Success Criteria: One student successfully completed the Dissertation project.

3.10.5 Numerical Results: One student completed the Dissertation.

3.10.6 Achievement Level: Met

3.10.7 Further Action: No

3.11 :

3.11.1 Achievement Level: Met

3.11.2 Further Action: No

5. Closing the Loop:

5.1 Take steps to improve student performance on written exercises and papers.: Faculty will discuss writing assignments for coursework and mechanisms for providing more opportunities for writing and explicit and detailed feedback for student writing. However, it should be noted that the students completing the writing exercises assessed Spring 2007 were primarily first-year graduate students for which these were among their earliest writing expriences.

5.1.1 Related Objective(s): Foundation in Psychological Sciences; Critiquing Research

5.1.2 Related Measure(s): Papers & Written Exercises

5.1.3 Responsible Person: Program Faculty

5.1.4 Target Date: Discsusion of this action will occur throughout the 2007-2008 academic year, but is an ongoing action.

5.1.5 Priority: High Priority

5.2 Improve collection of student teaching assistant evalution data and other measures relying on evaluation forms.: Development of a new method for disseminating and collecting the evaluation forms will be discussed with program faculty.

5.2.1 Related Objective(s): Teaching

5.2.2 Related Measure(s): Teaching Assistant Evaluation

5.2.3 Responsible Person: Program Faculty

5.2.4 Target Date: Fall semester 2007

5.2.5 Priority: High Priority

6. Analysis:

6.1 Program/Unit Strengths:

6.1.1 Objectives/Outcomes Exceeded or Met: Exam Questions
Class Presentations & Class Participation

Qualifying Thesis
Presentation of Qualifying Thesis
Dissertation Proposal Defense
Defense of Final Dissertation

6.2 Program / Unit Weakneses:

6.2.1 Objectives / Outcomes Partially or Not Met: Independent Study Activities
Papers and Written Exercises
Conference Presentations
Teaching Assistant Evaluations

6.3 Other Areas Needing Improvement: Additional infrastructure to support and assist with compiling of documentation is necessary.

7. Report:

7.1 Executive Summary: The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is a research intensive unit, best characterized in the content foci of its mission by the domains of its Ph.D. programs. Those include Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences. The School emphasizes interdisciplinary training and faculty often functions in two or more of the above domains. The School s activities are shaped by the presence of two major, free-standing centers: the Callier Center for Communication Disorders and the Center for BrainHealth. The distinctive character of these Centers, with their mixture of research, clinical service and professional training, significantly enhance the activity of the School. Student training occurs at all levels and consists of a mixture of general academic and professional training programs. Further distinguishing characteristics include:

- The School s two major Centers are located 18 miles from the main campus, adjacent to Southwestern Medical School. Approximately 1/3 of the School s faculty are housed in these Centers.
- It is currently the smallest of the Schools, in terms of faculty, but has the 4th largest number of majors, and relatively smaller numbers of lower division semester credit hours.
- The School s ratio of graduate hours to total hours is one of the highest in the University.
- The breadth of research and training in the School is unusually diverse, ranging from infant cognition to Alzheimer s disease; from aggression in adolescents to neuroplasticity in rats; from computer modeling of face perception to the development of literacy; from the optimal timing for cochlear implantation to fMRI in memory. What is common is that the work is laboratory-driven and extramural support eligible.
- The School is currently #3 in extramural support and #2 in per faculty support.
- The mix of research training and professional masters training, while not unique in the University, does present particular challenges in terms of faculty mix and course staffing.
- The nature of its programs and the proximity of Callier to UT Southwestern has enabled the School to form many collaborative efforts with the medical school, primarily with departments of Neurology, Psychiatry, Radiology, Otolaryngology and Pediatrics.
- The Callier Center and Center for BrainHealth each have active, independent boards which have been very supportive and have generated substantial private support for these enterprises. Also, these boards tap into a more Dallas-based constituency than has been typical in the University.
- In spite of being the smallest of the Schools, the faculty is housed in five buildings.

Our strategic plan outlined several primary objectives.
Strategic Initiatives
A. Enhancing the health, education, and quality of life of children and families.
Create a Center for Children and Families
Establish new Callier Center programs in Pediatric Hearing, Autism, and Communication Needs of an Aging Population
B. Understanding the mind and brain.

Become an internationally recognized center for research in cognitive neuroscience and in the diagnosis and treatment of cognitive disorders.

C. Create and implement technology that repairs and strengthens human abilities.

Develop neurotechnology in collaboration with the UT Dallas School of Engineering and Computer Science, U.T. Southwestern Medical School and area high-tech industry

Psychological Sciences Ph.D. program

The Psychological Sciences Ph.D. program is relatively young; the course curriculum for the program was developed and adopted by the faculty in October 2005. The Psychological Sciences program was developed by merging faculty expertise from three former major areas of study within the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

Students enrolled in Psychological Sciences consist of those who were admitted directly into the program beginning in 2004 and students who transferred from the previous Ph.D. program in Human Development and Communication Sciences with a major in Developmental Psychology. Students who enroll in Psychological Sciences can major in Developmental Psychology or Cognitive Psychology. We also are developing courses that will afford students the opportunity to major in Social Psychology.

To assess program learning objectives, faculty adopted a variety of assessment measures. These measures allow assessment of student learning outcomes in organized courses, independent study research activities, teaching assistant duties, and formal research project requirements (i.e., thesis and dissertation). Faculty felt that it is important to assess student learning in research settings because so much of student training in our Ph.D. program occurs in these settings. The measures that were used in our assessment include exam questions, papers and written exercises, problem solving and computation, class participation and presentations, rubrics for assessing research activities and defenses of theses and dissertations, presentation at professional conferences, and rubrics for evaluating teaching activities.

The current assessment cycle includes data from one semester, fall 2006. This data indicated that student performance on written exams and essays requiring critical thinking and writing skills did not meet criteria in one core course. It should be noted that this course typically consists of first-semester students, so that the instructor expectations may have been set too high and/or students may require more feedback and scaffolding for development of these skills. Student performance in two other core courses did meet expectations established by the instructors. One of these courses was Research Methods and the second course was taken by second- and third-year students.

Evaluation of student research and teaching activities was conducting using rubrics completed by the supervising faculty member. The rubrics for evaluating research activities worked well, but faculty will continue to examine how to improve upon the data that can be collected with this measure. Teaching Assistant performance was evaluated using a rubric completed by the supervising faculty member of the course to which each student is assigned. The deadlines for submission of these rubrics, which is a School-wide deadline, are set at 6 weeks following the end of the semester. Consequently, the data needed to evaluate Teaching Assistant performance was not available for this assessment cycle. The deadline for submitting these evaluations will be shifted earlier so that these documents are submitted shortly after the end of each semester and the data will be available for assessments at the end of each semester.

A third student learning outcome that was not met was the goal that 75% of students present a paper at a professional conference within a two-year period. Presentation of research at professional conferences demonstrates accomplishment of multiple program goals and is an essential activity for professional development. Based on data from 2006, 35% of students presented a conference paper. To improve on this goal, practical aspects of professional presentations will be discussed among faculty and students within both career development brown bag sessions as well as between students and their faculty mentors. Students will be encouraged to submit papers to conferences, and to attend conferences whenever possible. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences provides partial financial support for attendance of one conference per year for students who present a paper; this support will need to continue and perhaps increase.

Because these data are based on small numbers of students who are various stages of program completion and because this assessment cycle was based on only one semester, faculty did not feel that major substantive changes in the assessment procedures should be made at this time. However, faculty will focus on the three action items defined based on this assessment cycle. During the coming year, we will also continue to monitor the assessment measures that we have adopted and discuss strengths and weaknesses and how these measures can be improved.

7.2 Top 3 Program/Unit Accomplishments: New Faculty hires-The past two years has seen significant additions to our family:

Dr. John Hart Cognitive Neuroscience
Dr. Tom Campbell Speech Pathology, Director Callier Center
Dr. Christine Dollaghan Speech Pathology
Dr. Christa McIntyre Neuroscience
Dr. Mandy Maguire Language Development
Dr. Shayla Holub Social Development
Dr. Candice Mills Social Development
Dr. Daniel Krawczyk Cognitive Neuroscience
Dr. Bart Rypma Cognitive Neuroscience
Dr. Deborah Wiebe Medical Psychology

Significance of hires - These hires, in various ways, advanced several important School and Institutional objectives:

1) develop the joint brain-imaging Center with UT Southwestern and UT Arlington (Hart, Krawczyk, Maguire, Rypma)
2) develop the Center for BrainHealth (Hart, Krawczyk, Maguire, McIntyre, Mills, Rypma)
3) develop strong new leadership and programs at the Callier Center (Campbell, Dollaghan, Maguire)
4) strengthen faculty range for proposed Center for Children and Families (Campbell, Dollaghan, Holub, Maguire, Mills)

Grants

PI Funding Agency Title Total Award
Assmann NSF Perception of Frequency-Shafted Speech 223,418
Atzori NIH/NIDCD Acetylcholine and Dopamine Modulation in Auditory 1,223,284
Cortex
Bharadwaj NIH Speech Production in Children with Cochlear Implants 200,310
Buckley NIH Cross-modal Plasticity in Pre-Lingually Deaf Children 83,490
Chapman Baylor Neurobehavioral Outcome of Head Injury in Children 396,968
Chapman Baylor Neurobehavioral Outcome of Head Injury in Children 45,587
Chapman NIH Genetic Factors in Outcome from Traumatic Brain 87,627
Dodd DEPT OF ED Projects FAMILY 2001+: Facilitating and Mentoring 1,206,914
Interdisciplinary Learning for the Years 2001+
Geers/Tobey NIH/NIDCD Long-term Outcomes of Cochlear Implantation in Early Childhood (Shannon Award) 100,000
Golden/Perwaiz NSF Doctoral Dissertation Research: Statistical Models of Hypertext Comprehension 10,560
Holub Timberlawn Foundation The Role of Parents Restrictive Feeding Practices and General Parenting Style in Children s Eating 27,357.00
Jerger, S. NIH Auditory Processing in Hearing Imparied Children 1,783,366
Katz, W. Veteran s Affairs Treatment of Apraxia of Speech Following Stroke 77,000
Kilgard JAMES S MCDONNELL Brain Plasticity and Neuro-Rehabilitation 446,000
Kilgard NIH Cortical Plasticity and Processing of Speech Sounds 224,250
Kilgard NIH Supplement Cortical Plasticity and Processing of Speech Sounds 41,711
King/Hart UNCF Merck Foundation Quantification of Cortical Atrophy by Fractal Dimension 85,000
Lomber NIH Cerebral Organization Following Cochlear Implant 224,250
Lomber NIH Dev of fMRI Compatible Reversible Deativation 380,290

Lomber NSF Cerebral Control of Aurally-Mediated Behavior 451,179
Lomber NSF supplement Cerebral Control of Aurally-Mediated Behavior 10,000
Malhotra NIH Cerebral Control of Sound Localization 31,069
Moore UTSWMCD Personality Theories and Dynamics 23,500
O Toole ONR Evaluating Face and Person Recognition Algorithims 325,545
with Human Benchmarks
O Toole ONR Face recognition performance: Humans vs Machines 175,000
Olness NIH/NIDCD Narratives in African Americans & Caucasians with 202,500
Aphasia
Owen Child Care Group Relationship-Centered Child Care & Children s Dev 82,012
Owen Timberlawn Relationship-Centered Child Care 37,165
Owen NIH/NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth 42,500
Roeser CALLIER FN Service, Training and Research for Cochlear Implant 795,898
Children
Stillman OHSU Validation of Evidence-Based Assessment Strategies 190,000
to Promote Achievement in Children who are Deaf-
Blind
Thompson RBC Life Sciences Nootropic Effects of Microhydrinand Microhydrin-Plus in Aging 101,132
Tobey UT AUSTIN Motor Control of Serial Organization of Speech 138,041
Tobey JOHN HOPKINS U Lang Outcomes in Pediatric Cochlear Implantation 1,531,219
Tobey MED EI CORP SPECT rCBF in Adult Cochlear Implant Users 12,000
Underwood NIH Social Agression: Precursors and Outcomes 1,470,400
Underwood NIH Social Agression: Origins, Development and Outcomes 597,320
Enrollment: School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences
(includes Ph.D. programs in Psychological Sciences, Communication Sciences and Cognition and Neuroscience)
Fall 2004 Fall 2005 Fall 2006
Doctoral 102 103 101

7.3 Research Activities or Publications: The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences conducts research both within and across its three subsuming divisions: Psychological Sciences, Communication Sciences and Cognition and Neuroscience. Additionally School faculty conduct collaborative projects with institutions around the country, most notably UT Southwestern Medical Center, but also such institutions as Johns Hopkins, University of California at San Francisco, University of Wisconsin, Baylor Medical Center, University of Dijon, and University of Hamburg among numerous others. Collaborative projects with industry provide a small but growing part of the School s research programs, particularly in the area of bioengineering. During 2006 research on cochlear implants, hearing aids, neural stimulation and neural interfaces for prostheses were conducted. School faculty generated approximately 100 scholarly articles, over 100 presentations at national conferences, 20 chapters in edited volumes and 10 books. Faculty were featured speakers at several national or university meetings. The School also hosts its own speaker series to enhance the scholarly life of its programs. The central vehicle for this is the School s colloquium series which hosted 6 nationally prominent speakers during 2006. The Callier Center s Bruton Conference also brings prominent speakers to campus, as well as providing outreach to the community. Similarly the Center for Brain Health s The Brain: An owner s Guide disseminates current research information to the lay public.

7.4 Instructional/Training Activities (presented or received): Psychological Sciences:
Number of students graduated Fall 2006: 2
Number of students graduated Spring 2007: 1
Number of students in degree program Fall 06: 20
Number of students in degree program Spring 07: 18
Number of new majors: 1
Major curricular changes: New core curriculum adopted Fall 2005

Teaching collaborations: Drs. Buhrmester and Owen team-taught core course, Social Development

Student engagement initiatives and activities: A student orientation session was held at the beginning of both fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters to update students on core curriculum, research requirements and deadlines, information about conferences and attendance, and other information.

Student achievement awards: One of our students received the award for Outstanding Graduate Student Paper, awarded by the Society for Research in Human Development at the 15th Biennial Conference, Fort Worth, Texas, March 2006.

7.5 Public Service: The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences provides very extensive community service through numerous service programs of its Callier Center and Center for Brain Health, as well as collaborative efforts of various faculty. The Callier Center offered over 25 different clinical service programs generating over 40,000 patient contacts during 2006. Examples are its programs with such clinical populations as hearing impaired individuals across the age spectrum, language disorders, speech problems and autistic spectrum disorders. Similarly the Center for Brain Health offers service programs in Alzheimer s disease and Brain-injury in children. The School has extensive programs with numerous school districts providing educational programs for all hearing-impaired preschoolers in the Dallas Independent School District and audiological consultation with the Plano School District. Individual faculty in our neuroscience programs have also provided seminars for Plano and Richardson Schools in the area of brain research. The Center for Brain Health hosts an annual public lecture series on aspects of brain research and the Callier Center offered two Bruton Conferences in 2006 primarily for professionals in the field of communication disorders. Callier audiologists also participated in outreach programs for hearing assessments in Panama and Mozambique.

7.6 Other External Activities: The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences has a number of international collaborations both via its academic programs and through clinical initiatives. During 2006 visiting scholars came from the Czech Republic, Mexico, Germany, France and Britain to engage in collaborative research programs. We have agreements in place for exchange with the University of Dijon, University of Hamburg, University of Chile, University of Montpelier and the University of Guanajuato. Faculty from the School were invited speakers at numerous international conferences and were Scholars-in-Residence at Dijon, Prague, Oxford and Tokyo. Clinical initiatives through the Callier Center took place in Mozambique and Panama.

7.7 Contributions to UTD: The faculty within the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are unusually broad in the scope of their interests, subject populations studied, level of analysis employed in their work and the methodologies utilized. The diversity of these endeavors, coupled with the geographic proximity of two of the School s facilities to Southwestern Medical Center, has made the School a natural collaborator with other units of the University, the Medical School, as well as other institutions around the country. Examples of these efforts include investigations on developing new hearing technologies, combining efforts of surgeons, hearing, language and speech researchers and electrical engineers; developing new prostheses, engaging neuroscientists, computer science and electrical engineering faculty and neurosurgeons, and investigations on long-term consequences of pediatric brain injury, joining cognitive neuroscientists, pediatricians and virtual world engineers. In addition to these research partnerships, the School provides extensive direct service to the community through its various clinical programs. This community involvement has resulted in significant levels of philanthropic support for the School s programs.

7.8 Top 3 Program / Unit Challenges: The Psychological Sciences Ph.D. program is a young program and faces several challenges. One goal is to improve the quality of program applicants and admission standards. We have excellent students in our program, but we would like to have a larger pool of applicants who are competitive with those applying to other major experimental psychology departments. From this larger pool of

competitive applicants, we strive to increase our enrollment so that we regularly admit a cohort of 6 students each fall semester.

A second goal is to expand our faculty to achieve the breadth in research expertise necessary for developing a more outstanding Psychological Sciences program. We currently have excellent program faculty in the areas of Developmental and Cognitive Psychology. However, to enhance our national visibility, it is important to add faculty who have expertise in other topic areas, such as Social-Personality Psychology.

A third challenge is to improve support for faculty and programs in the areas of staff support and additional space and equipment for research and lab activities.

7.9 Detailed Resources Needed to Improve and Fulfill Mission: Resources that are needed to assist with meeting these goals defined by our assessment are the following:

1. If enrollment is to increase, additional financial resources are needed for student support and for funding student attendance of professional conferences.
2. Expansion of the program into areas currently not represented by our faculty will necessitate additional faculty hires.
3. A third resource needed is additional staff support. Currently, one staff person provides support for three doctoral programs in the School. This staff person handles admission files and paperwork, student funding documentation, and graduation certifications. However, the Psychological Sciences Ph.D. program does not have a dedicated support staff person to assist the program head with or to handle necessary tasks such as routine correspondence with potential applicants, publicity and public relations matters, compilation of program data, etc.
4. Additional office and lab space will be necessary when student enrollment increases as well as when additional faculty are hired. Currently, space for faculty labs and student offices is very limited. Additional space is needed for these purposes as well as for student computer resource areas.