

Introduction

The Department of Educational Psychology, in the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison has enjoyed tremendous success for decades. It is generally considered the premier Educational Psychology department in the nation that produces high volumes of rigorous and impactful research, skilled doctoral students, and a faculty of international renown. This external review highlights the tremendous accomplishments of the department and its faculty over the last 10 years, provides a critique of where the review team feels improvement could be made, and projects the continued successes of the department well into the coming decade.

Review Process

As part of the 10-year review process, a team of three senior faculty from peer institutions, James A. Middleton (Arizona State University), Michelle Perry (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), and Matthew Burns (University of Missouri) were invited to interview faculty, students, staff, and administration of the Department and School of Education, and to review policies and practices of the Department. In addition, Tracy Schroeffer, a member from the UW-Madison Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC), also served on the review team with a specific focus on reviewing the department's graduate programs. The team received documentation from the Department Chair, including the departmental self-study, program requirements, faculty vita, sample syllabi, and results from the previous 10-year review, and so on.

The first major section of the report provides basic background on the Department, its faculty and programs. The second section reflects our judgment that the Department is highly productive, adaptive to new needs and thinking in the psychology of education and its applications, and effective in its graduate programs. The third section is organized around concerns expressed by Department representatives, and opportunities that may present themselves should the Department, along with the School and University, elect to address these concerns. The final section consolidates our assessment to addresses specific questions posed by the Department. These questions include:

Mission

1. How well is our mission statement (current or proposed) aligned with important current or likely future issues in Educational Psychology?
2. In what ways could we re-vision our identity and program offerings to better reflect our mission?
3. What should be our priorities in new faculty hires to foster our mission and maintain the program's reputation?

Graduate student recruitment and support

1. How can we improve our recruitment efforts and expand student funding, given the current climate?
2. How might the Department leverage its resources and those of the University to provide 4-5 years of support for doctoral students?

3. Should the Department offer multiple-year funding guarantees to more incoming students, even if sources of funding are not certain?

Diversity

1. How can we increase diversity in the Department's students, faculty, and staff?
2. How effectively are equity and diversity addressed in the program/coursework?
3. How should diversity fit into the research mission and activities of the Department?

Budget

1. What are the best ways to grow our program to benefit from the new budget model? Should we concentrate on increased undergraduate instruction, new degree programs (e.g., Special M.S. or capstone programs), innovative educational approaches (e.g., distance education), or something else?
2. With regard to undergraduate instruction, are the best opportunities for revenue growth in basic courses (freshmen and sophomores) or more advanced courses?
3. What activities would be most beneficial to consider to enhance earnings under the summer budget model?

Instruction and graduate training

1. How well are we meeting the learning and professional development needs of current students? What improvements would you recommend?
2. In what ways can the Department better support the needs of a clinical training program?
3. Given the need to maintain and increase overall enrollments, how might the Department best balance its undergraduate presence without sacrificing the graduate program?
4. What educational innovations or improvements in instruction would you recommend to boost course enrollments or enhance graduate and undergraduate student training?

Because many of these questions overlap in scope and in strategy, we provide our recommendations, not as specific answers to each question, but as a comprehensive set of observations and recommendations that, we feel, if given attention and resources, could help Educational Psychology not just maintain its excellence, but grow, prosper, and become a better place to work for all its faculty, staff, and students.

Program Information

The Mission Statement of the Department of Educational Psychology reads:

Our mission is to advance education-related theory and methodology; to improve knowledge about the biological, psychological, technological, and social processes of learning, development, and mental health in diverse populations; and to enhance learning and mental health in educational and community contexts through innovative educational interventions and effective prevention/ intervention programs.

This statement implies not only excellence in research and theory, but also excellence in the improvement of educational practices.

The Department of Educational Psychology currently employs 20 tenure-track faculty (5 Assistant, 3 Associate, 12 Full Professors), 1 clinical faculty, and 4 support staff. Searches are underway to replace retiring faculty. The Department also has 21 affiliate faculty, housed in complementary units across campus.

Roughly equal numbers of faculty are employed in four program areas: Human Development (6.5), Learning Sciences (4.5), Quantitative Methods (5), and School Psychology (4 + one Clinical). These faculty serve a total of 98 graduate students, making a student:faculty ratio of just under 5:1. An additional 28 students are served by the online Masters of Science for Professional Educators (MSPE) program. These students also enroll in required undergraduate service courses in elementary and secondary teacher education, which are administered by the department of Curriculum and Instruction.

The Department also has a historically strong connection to the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (WCER), which is one of the premier educational research centers in the country. Although the current Director of the WCER is not a member of the Department's faculty, as the previous Directors were, the Department remains physically housed within the Center and faculty are supported by it.

The Department has historically been research-extensive. It reports a 10-fold increase in sponsored projects since the last 10-year review. One issue mentioned in the Departmental self-study is that this emphasis has resulted in faculty buy-out of teaching load, leading to more opportunity for graduate assistants, but also difficulty, particularly in Quantitative Methods, for hosting advanced courses in the major.

Concerns reported in the Department self-study include the following:

1. Adjusting to a new University budget model that focuses on tuition-paying, undergraduate enrollment, and different allocation of summer revenues;
2. Integrating efforts across program areas;
3. Faculty reward and retention;
4. Obtaining multi-year funding for graduate assistants; and
5. Enhancing and supporting diversity among faculty and students.

Department Strengths and Areas of Concern

Strengths

As stated in the introduction to this report, the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison is a *premier* unit, delivering exceptional graduate training, and operating as a leading knowledge enterprise in the world. No fewer than *twelve* characteristics were assessed to be outstanding, both in absolute magnitude and in

comparison with other departments in the nation.

1. **Productivity, outstanding national recognition.** In terms of volumes of published work, and counting the quality venues in which this work is disseminated, the faculty and students in the Department are clearly world-class leaders in education and related fields. With an average publication rate of over 4 refereed publications per faculty member per year, this ranks among the highest volume of productivity amid peer institutions.
2. **Culture of collaboration.** Faculty, students, staff and administration agree that the Department not only allows, but also actively supports research collaboration. An excellent example is the new research focus on neuroscience, whereby young scholars in both Human Development and the Learning Sciences program areas were hired, and administrators from the Department, School, and WCER actively helped them gain support to create projects and proposals that integrated their work. As a second example, in the Quantitative Methods program area, faculty, partly as a function of the nature of their work, are extremely active consulting with their colleagues, taking leadership in collaborative research projects.
3. **Collegiality and care.** The faculty, staff, and administration in the Department should be extremely proud of the kind, supportive, and critical space they have created for each other, and for students. The vast majority of students we interviewed maintained that faculty were always there for them, not just for academic advising, or review of their work, but to help them personally and professionally, to succeed and be happy. Students and staff provided many examples of faculty going out of their way to help them in both professional and personal matters. Students especially wanted to highlight how helpful the staff have been to them. The chair of this review committee is an alumnus of the Department, and remarked that, although this has been a characteristic of the Department for nearly 30 years, it has grown to be exceptional.
4. **Quality of students.** The students we spoke with seemed to be highly motivated, articulate, and knowledgeable about their respective fields, which is a boon for both themselves and their faculty. They were also exceptional in their desire for epistemological and methodological breadth. The programs are set up for rigorous training, and students, by and large, take advantage of this structure.
5. **Quality of methodological training.** The quantitative methods expertise in the Department is not limited to the Quantitative Methods program area faculty. Administration, faculty in all areas, and students agreed that the training students receive, at all levels, was superior to that found in other social and behavioral sciences programs across the University, and across the nation. The perception exists among administrators that the Quantitative Methods program area could be “THE program in the country” in terms of preparing the next generation of faculty and quantitative researchers.
6. **Optimizing connections across campus through affiliate faculty.** Affiliate faculty we spoke with highly value the department, its faculty, and its students. This practice of affiliating with colleagues across other units is clearly adding value across campus. Moreover, it seems to add value to the Department by

- extending the expertise of participating faculty beyond those whose salaries are paid for by the Department.
7. **New certificate programs and coursework.** Although these programs, like the MSPE program, are relatively new, and some are only just now being proposed (e.g., prevention science), we see this move as strength, particularly with the new funding model being instituted at the University. Such programs can provide a nimble and sustainable source of funding to the Department, and additional value to the State of Wisconsin through enhancing the expertise of educators and practitioners.
 8. **Staff.** This critical group has been reduced by 20% recently. From all indications, this has happened with little added stress or disruption. New job duties allow staff to focus in areas of expertise, but the collaborative model for their work allows for cross-training and mutual support in crunch-time. In general, we found the knowledge and attitude of staff to be very positive. This is supported by the enthusiastic and grateful response of faculty and students when we asked them about staff quality.
 9. **Open faculty lines do not revert.** Although not a strength of the Department per se, the fact that open faculty lines do not revert to the University or College allows for flexible use of funds, and more strategic thinking within program areas.
 10. **Quality of junior faculty.** The committee envies the quality of the junior faculty we met. It is no wonder that faculty retention is an issue, when the Department hires such excellent and creative scholars.
 11. **Sense of community among the students.** As stated earlier, the advising and mentorship of students is generally excellent and most students feel appreciated and well-mentored. The positive relationships among the students were also notable. There is an active student group, EPSA, that keeps students engaged with frequent activities, and Department and School administrators have worked with students to build a seemingly strong sense of community.
 12. **First-year project program is impressive.** Students are required to complete a research project in their first year of the program. The project requires students to collect and analyze data, and then present those data as a poster to the faculty and their fellow students. Students report feeling that this program is very important because it builds community and it helps them to develop an understanding of research in Educational Psychology. They expressed that not only did they find doing their own first-year project influential, but also they enjoyed seeing *others'* first-year projects, across labs and across different areas of Educational Psychology. The exception to this will be noted in Concerns, below. Additionally, Learning Sciences has a program-specific second-year project program. Course-based research projects may be generalizable opportunities to have students take a course for a credit-bearing seminar, but also work with faculty in labs, reducing overall load and increasing overall productivity.

Concerns about the Department

Being a top-ranked Department, in a public institution in times of fiscal stress and uncertainty, involves addressing concerns regarding how to maintain academic and intellectual quality while responding to opportunities and constraints imposed by fiscal, cultural, and technological change. In addition, the bureaucracies of a major institution present constraints to many faculty. The following 10 concerns percolated up as consensus in our conversations.

Recruiting and retaining talent. Recruiting and retaining both faculty and graduate students is the number one problem for chairs in the School of Education. For faculty retention, there seems to be little discretion at the Departmental or School level for proactively rewarding successful faculty without “playing the game” (for example, faculty going out and getting a job offer, to request a market equity adjustment). For student recruitment, “Just reassuring students that the University of Wisconsin-Madison is still the University of Wisconsin-Madison!” was cited by one chair as an issue, given the current Wisconsin political climate and budget. All Program Chairs in Educational Psychology were concerned about how to deal with questions such as, “how stable is state funding?” or “are faculty fleeing the University?” They expressed a need to be creative in how they recruit students, and how packages and funds are utilized and marketed to students. Students told the committee that it would be very helpful to them if the Department continuously provided information regarding available funding sources, and how to apply.

Signature innovation-brand. It was a concern of the committee that none of the interviewees (faculty, staff, administration, or students), with the exception of one faculty member, came up with a response to the question, “What is your signature innovation?” The question was meant to identify the innovative characteristic that marks Educational Psychology as unique. This notion, we feel, was hinted at by many, but not owned by any. The Department has an opportunity to collectively describe what it is that marks Educational Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison as *different*, as *unique*, conceptually, and not just as a unit that does what every other department of Educational Psychology does, only better.

Reaction to the new University funding model. There is a concern among faculty that the lack of undergraduate programs and/or lack of high enrollment service courses could limit Educational Psychology’s resource allocation. One faculty member said, the new funding model “keeps Ed Psych out of the competitive arena.” However, the committee notes that faculty concerns about the budget seem to be based mostly on speculation. In our conversations, staff in the department appears to have a much closer and more nuanced understanding of the situation. Asking staff to provide faculty with a better understanding of the new budget, how it is phased in, and the possibility that the situation is not quite so dire as the speculation suggests, could have a calming effect. Nevertheless, the Department must begin to deal with the new reality of funding *proactively*, and how courses, programs, and faculty load will be impacted.

Learning Sciences is fragmented across School of Education departments. Although it is unclear to the committee what the underlying issues are, there seems to have been a strange “wrestling match” between Learning Scientists in Curriculum and Instruction and Learning Scientists in Educational Psychology. The collective expertise of these faculty is perhaps the greatest in any institution across the country. This separation should be explored, so that some meaningful value can be gained from their interaction.

Unclear performance review process for junior faculty. Junior faculty reported that the process of performance review is unclear to them. They indicated that their annual review letters did not seem to provide any extra value beyond the feedback given by their mentors. Each of the junior faculty reported very good relationships with their mentor, and they reported that the program is helpful to them, but they lack clarity regarding this very important process in their career. Especially in the current political climate of the State of Wisconsin, providing clarity and support to these talented faculty (who are vulnerable for recruitment elsewhere) should be made a priority.

Inequities in teaching assignments for junior faculty. There seems to be considerable inequities in teaching assignments and TA assignments for junior faculty across program areas. For example, one junior faculty member was teaching one course with one TA and only 7 students, while another faculty member was teaching one course with 120 students and only one TA. Perhaps Educational Psychology should adopt department-wide guidelines for assigning TAs and should more closely monitor equity of teaching assignments, especially for junior faculty.

School Psychology is at a critical point in its development. The School Psychology program within the Department, which is historically one of the top five programs in the country, is facing challenges. Over the next few years, a 60% faculty turnover is expected and accreditation issues have isolated the program from the rest of the Department and narrowed its curricular focus. School Psychology students report that they (a) do not engage with other program areas in the first-year-project program, (b) do not gain exposure to the breadth of questions, methods, and community afforded to their peers in the Learning Sciences, Quantitative Methods, and Human Development program areas, and (c) do not engage in research to the level of the other programs within the Department. The students also expressed concerns about the continued support from faculty given that the three who are, or soon will be, retiring are, in the students’ estimation, the three most supportive faculty members in the program. There appears to be a convergence of a potentially shrinking faculty, concerns raised about supportiveness of remaining faculty, already taxed resources, and inequities in training that could have long-term implications for the future of School Psychology.

Recommendations from the Visiting Committee

As noted above, the College of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison is home to arguably the top Department of Educational Psychology in the country. The committee was impressed by the Department’s extremely positive climate for innovative, high quality work. Collaboration and interdisciplinarity are encouraged and valued at the

University level, as well as at the School level. Research support is available and utilized. Our primary recommendation is to *continue doing what they are doing in terms of supporting and engaging in collaborative, interdisciplinary work*. The Department is strong, and the goodwill of its faculty, staff, and administration, and its positive reputation across campus and the country is based, to a great extent, on this defining characteristic. With this recognition in mind, we describe noted concerns below and outline potential remedies or thoughts for addressing the concern. Our recommendations are designed to better position the Department to continue to grow and thrive over the next 10 years. We focused our recommendations on contextualizing the Department to better position itself for providing high quality programs of instruction and for more efficiently using some of its existing resources and generating new ones.

Contextualization

The Department has operated as a pride point for the School and University for decades and has set itself up to be successful despite economic conditions within the University or the state. The current changing economic conditions, however, are unlike any that the University has experienced before. Thus, the Department would be wise to better contextualize itself within the School, University, state, country, and even the world.

School and University. The School of Education has identified the following three strategic initiatives, (a) Develop instructional and research programs to respond to interest in the link between human health and educational outcomes, (b) Produce high quality leaders for rapidly changing learning environments at all levels, and (c) Foster community-engaged scholarship to enrich lives, transform communities and better the world, with an emphasis on the opportunity gap. The Department's mission statement is consistent with these initiatives, but does not explicitly align with them.

Recommendations:

1. The Department should compare their mission statement to these strategic initiatives and use the initiatives in language that describes their programs, courses, and research.
2. All of the Department's programs should demonstrate how they align with at least one initiative, and the Department should outline how all four program areas work together to address the strategic initiatives. In other words, demonstrate to the School how these three strategic initiatives can only be fully implemented with the involvement of *each of the four* program areas.

Community of Practice in the State and beyond. It was noted by the committee that, although the Departmental Mission Statement explicitly states "*to enhance learning and mental health in educational and community contexts through innovative educational interventions and effective prevention/ intervention programs*" Not all program areas provide objectives that clearly and directly address this goal. The strong independent nature of the four program areas (only one faculty member has a dual appointment) appears to have created a lack of consistency and coherence in how the Department's stated mission is to be articulated in practice. The lack of a consistent answer to the branding question (i.e., signature innovation) also suggests a need to more clearly

articulate the relationship between faculty research and practice. Moreover, Administration told the committee that, for the amount of work being done in the Department, the importance of the scholarship is extremely high, yet the “visibility of the work is shockingly low.”

Recommendations:

1. The program areas should review their objectives and revise them to embody the mission statement, particularly where it pertains to the ways in which programs enhance people’s lives.
2. Faculty and administration should work to increase visibility of faculty research, and subsequently increase the Department’s political capital in the State and its perception by the general public. A visibility campaign could be done in consultation and with the support of the WCER and the Associate Dean for Outreach.
3. The Department could conduct an annual event in which faculty research is highlighted to alumni, legislators, local schools and businesses, and/or potential donors. This event could coincide with the already extensive National Education Week activities sponsored by the School of Education.

Community of Science. Most external funding comes from 2 sources (NSF and IES). Although faculty have been successful with these sources, these sources are extremely competitive, causing some concern that this funding may become more difficult to procure in the near future.

Recommendations:

1. Department faculty could collaborate with the WCER to expand funding options (e.g., NIH, Department of Defense, NASA, Office of Naval Research), especially for Center-level, collaborative competitions. This would optimally involve collaboration across School of Education and other Schools in the University (e.g., Engineering).
2. As stated above, the Department should strategically position itself within the School of Education initiatives to present a research identity that focuses on important social issues. Doing so would position the Department as world leaders when seeking future funding. This is really a question of marketing and promotion because most of the funding agencies that focus exclusively on education (e.g., IES and NSF to a lesser degree) already perceive the Department faculty as leaders, but an explicit research focus strategy would position its faculty better for competitions that are less aligned with traditional educational objectives.
3. The WCER and Department administrators could create professional development opportunities, especially for junior faculty, to learn more about writing successful applications to different federal funding agencies.

Build on rich history. The Department should also better align with its rich history of impactful research and high quality training. Doing so would allow the Department to connect to and build from the legacy that already exists.

Recommendations:

1. Consider adopting a named professorship or lecture in honor of previous faculty.
2. Along those same lines, the Department could highlight alumni's recent accomplishments to be listed more prominently on the Department's website.
3. Programs should consider holding alumni events at their national conferences (in addition to the School-sponsored receptions) to continue to build connections to alumni who could eventually be potential donors.

Resources

One reason why the Department needs to better position itself within various contexts is because competition for resources will become more intense as resources become scarcer. The following recommendations center on allocating resources:

Faculty retention. Given the prominence of the Department and its continued #1 ranking, it seemed disappointing that so few Educational Psychology faculty held an endowed chair or named professorship. Moreover, retention offers are creating a sense of inequity across faculty members and the lack of diversity in the Department is especially problematic.

Recommendations:

1. Educational Psychology and School of Education administration should work to generate additional named professorships. Certainly endowed chairs would be preferred, but perhaps the Department could create some additional professorships with existing resources or with relatively small future gifts that could be given to highly productive faculty to make them feel even more valued. The monetary amount may not need to be large and the recognition of the Department would be the perceived benefit of the honor. Targeting faculty who are likely targets for competing offers with these small named professorships could, in part, prevent the need for future retention offers.
2. Given that lines revert to the Department with faculty departures, some sizeable portion of the next departure could be allocated to inequities in salary. This would likely only be possible if a high-paying full professor left and the new hire were targeted at the assistant level.
3. Efforts to address the lack of diversity among the faculty should be made at every opportunity. A relative lack of faculty of color is not unique to the University of Wisconsin-Madison and there are creative ideas that are being implemented elsewhere that could be considered (e.g., temporary exchanges with other institutions including Historically Black Universities and Colleges, focus on the professional and academic development of especially talented doctoral students of color hiring them for positions in their graduating institution, cluster hiring in which multiple faculty of color are hired and are allowed to interact with multiple disciplines/departments within the university, and intensive mentoring).
4. The Department could contact other faculty who have left to understand better their reasons for doing so (beyond primarily personal reasons for leaving).

5. Department administrators should have ongoing conversations about what would keep their junior faculty from leaving. Surprisingly, it may not be salary, but other issues such as providing funding for students, funding for travel, and reductions in teaching loads.

Institutional Review Board. The University's IRB was mentioned as a difficulty in virtually *every* meeting. Every group of students, faculty, and administrators described the IRB process as exceedingly problematic. Faculty members describe the Education and Social/Behavioral Science (ED/SBS) IRB at Wisconsin as a serious barrier to conducting their research and doing so in a way that honors their intellectual freedom. The committee was greatly concerned that many projects take 9 to 18 months for approval, which makes the ED/SBS IRB a resource issue even though it is not operated by or within the Department. Moreover, the barriers raised by the ED/SBS IRB will likely begin to affect faculty retention. A senior faculty member, for example, indicated that the only reason he would ever leave is the obstructionist practices of the IRB. Other faculty indicated that students are settling for lower-quality, easier research, because of IRB headaches.

Recommendations:

1. The Chair, Dean, and WCER Director, should enlist help from other social and behavioral units across campus to demand reform to the ED/SBS IRB procedures such that it maintains its ability to protect subjects and protect against liability of the University, but to do so in a manner that is both timely and less resource-intensive.
2. Department faculty should reach out to other universities to compare their procedures with those of the ED/SBS IRB. Other universities have figured this out, and it is incumbent upon the University of Wisconsin-Madison to do so or risk losing students, faculty, intellectual innovation, and grant dollars.

Student funding. Many faculty noted concerns about recruiting students, given that multi-year packages were offered at competing departments and other institutions, but not here. As one faculty member told us, "grad student funding is pathetic."

Recommendations:

1. The Department faculty could discuss ways to share/obtain resources from WCER to fund first-year students for research.
2. Department faculty and administrators could also create policies that provide funding. For example, all students could be a TA for 2 semesters, which (combined with a first year of research support) would give every student a minimum of two years of funding.
3. Department Faculty should seek more training grants either solely within Educational Psychology or in collaboration with other departments on campus (for example to receive an NICHD training grant).
4. WCER funding could be requested to help provide recruitment packages, as the Director made clear that pockets of money were readily available for the asking.

5. Each program could identify its top candidate each year and that potential student could be offered multiple years of funding. The Faculty within each program would have to commit to combine or reallocate resources should a shortfall occur in which that top student would need funding. This strategy is precisely how many competing programs across the country offer multi-year packages to their best applicants.

Budget. Some faculty members seemed distraught about the new budget model. As was noted in one of our meetings “Fear of fiscally driven models makes faculty think that scholarship doesn’t drive the university.” In some cases, such as the resultant cancelling of required summer courses for the School Psychology students, the despair seemed valid and creative solutions are needed (although none were generated in our conversations with faculty). In other cases, the despair seemed to be an over-reaction, or based on incomplete information and appeared to be interfering with conducting important work.

Recommendations:

1. The School and Department administrators, along with knowledgeable staff, need to provide faculty with a brief written document to outline changes that impact the Department. A town-hall-like meeting might be a sensible and productive follow-up to this document, to put the new budget model in perspective. Possibilities to handle *real* shortfalls should be offered and discussed with stakeholders, and a Department-wide reallocation plan be implemented to address current and future shortfalls.

Travel. Faculty and graduate students lack resources for funding their travel, unless they have a grant. This lack of travel funding inordinately penalizes junior faculty and their graduate students.

Recommendation:

1. The Department should leverage discretionary funds (e.g., intentionally retaining a pool of funds for this purpose when a line reverts to the department) or enlist support from WCER to provide better opportunities for junior faculty and students.

Revenue courses. The Masters of Science for Professional Educators program is intriguing and is well received by students and potential students. We were impressed, but wondered whether it was fulfilling its potential. We also saw potential for additional certificates etc. to generate revenue by taking advantage of what faculty are already doing rather than creating new courses or new programs of study.

Recommendations:

1. Department faculty would likely benefit from closer collaboration with and involvement in the program, and perhaps even expanding it to generate additional revenue, ideally with little additional work.

2. The existing MSPE program should be marketed better to teachers in other states, thereby increasing revenues. The Department administration could discuss marketing possibilities with the Office of Academic Planning.
3. Likewise, the Education and Education Services certificate should be marketed to other departments and Department faculty should consider adding additional certificates that leverage existing courses (e.g., Board Certified Behavior Analyst).
4. The Department does not seem to have much of an online presence despite University resources to do so. Faculty should consider developing appropriate online courses and even certificates as ways to reach a broader audience while generating revenue from students who would otherwise not have any connection to the University. Of course, support from the School or Continuing Studies for course development and management must be available.

Staff. Although staff is noted as a clear strength of the Department, it was also noted that these individuals are not always viewed as professionals.

Recommendation:

1. Make efforts to commend the professionalism of the staff, offer them opportunities to engage in professional development, and be more transparent about the nature and purpose of the scholarly work done in the department so that the roles of staff can be better understood and supported.

University resources. Departmental faculty do not seem fully informed about programmatic resources within the University.

Recommendation:

1. Perhaps Educational Psychology and college administration could develop strategies for providing and updating information about resources (e.g., DCS), their potential benefit, and parameters for accessing them.

Programs of Instruction

One of our specific charges was to evaluate how well the Department is meeting the learning and professional development needs of current graduate students, while also balancing an undergraduate presence. We will comment on those programs of those instruction where we have specific recommendations.

School Psychology program. School Psychology students feel separated from the other 3 program areas, which they feel results in having few experiences with research outside their own dissertation experience. This separation is a considerable problem for a program with such storied researchers. Moreover, School Psychology is seen as a “practitioner program,” which sets it apart from the other program areas, and that School Psychology students no longer receive the breadth of research training that students in other programs do because of the number of APA-required courses. These issues are compounded given the extra work required for APA reporting and support needed for applying to internships, etc. School Psychology students expressed serious concerns, especially around the future of their program. They noted the following: (a) two faculty

members are retiring, leaving uncertainty as to the intellectual leadership, funding, and training for the students, (b) one more faculty member is slated to retire at the end of next year, which will leave *no faculty members who are licensed*, (c) current faculty are stretched to the point that some students do not have e-mails returned and some have not received feedback on dissertation drafts for months, (d) unlike almost every student in other program areas, the larger cohort size of the School Psychology students result in many not receiving funding, and (e) many of these students get almost no research experience until they embark on their own dissertations.

Recommendations:

1. School Psychology students need more opportunities to connect with other faculty. The Department should consider reinstating the requirement for School Psychology students to enroll in the First-Year Research Seminar.
2. To provide critical mass, and additional support for students and School Psychology, faculty should discuss, minimally, sharing courses or, maximally, merging School Psychology with one or both of the other two APA-accredited training programs in the School of Education.
3. School Psychology faculty should continue to have discussions about how to creatively meet APA requirements.
4. The Department should make it a priority to recruit a high-quality faculty member for their open search. Priority should be on finding a researcher who can bring or quickly procure external funding to support students and who can be a future leader for the program.
5. The current School Psychology Clinical Faculty search and future tenure-track faculty searches should make licensure a condition of employment.
6. The retiring faculty should dedicate time to mentoring their more junior colleagues about how to effectively and efficiently advise and mentor students.

Quantitative Methods. It is clear that students receive outstanding training from the Quantitative Methods program. In fact, the Quantitative Methods Program Area could be the preeminent program in the country.

Recommendation:

1. If Quantitative Methods is to be a strategic investment for the School, there needs to be a strategic plan and buy-in from multiple levels including programs that rely on the quantitative program for service courses. Department faculty should identify promoting the Quantitative Methods program as an area of priority for strategic investment, which may not involve adding or replacing lines, but dedicating other resources.

Neuroscience. Although not an independent program area, the newly emerging area of Neuroscience and Education (which draws on faculty across Human Development, Learning Sciences, and Quantitative Methods) is a strength in the Department and, like the Quantitative Methods Program, could be one of the best in the country.

Recommendations:

1. Drawing momentum from the Dean's conversation with a faculty member regarding a 20-year vision of neuroscience in education, Department faculty should promote and actively seek funding from foundations to support the programmatic efforts.
2. Department faculty should build on natural points of connection and could collaborate with WCER to start a center that focuses on the neuroscience of mathematical development.

Summary/Conclusions

The Advisory Committee was impressed at all levels with the quality and creativity of faculty work, relationships and professional support of students, and the friendly and collegial climate that we witnessed among all levels of faculty, staff, students, and administration. The Department is clearly in a good place!

Although current conditions in the Department are positive, the nature of the world of higher education is changing, and not just in Wisconsin. Formula-based funding systems are being replaced by "responsibility-based management" and other business models that place different constraints on faculty work, student support, and staff and administrative roles. Governance models are changing from bottom-up to more top-down in terms of decision-making and management of programs. The Department of Educational Psychology will have to not just weather these changes, but also *proactively* and *systematically* address funding, student support, retention, program requirements, and nimble economics to embody its mission statement. The committee, therefore, submits these reflections and recommendations as tools for the Department to begin this process of envisioning its future and generating new ways of working together, while maintaining its top-quality intellectual and collegial climate.