MEMO TO: Psychology Faculty
FROM: Dan R. Kenshako
SUBJECT: Psychology Department Position Paper on University Organization

Attached is the Policy Statement formulated by the "Crystal-ball" committee that I briefly described in our last faculty meeting.

It is placed in your box at 9:00 A.M. February 22. Unless Barron or I hear otherwise from you it goes forward to the members of the Ad hoc Committee on University Organization and the Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at 9:00 A.M. February 23, 1973.

DRK/jr
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY POSITION PAPER ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION

The faculty of the Department of Psychology is prepared to accept the proposition that there may be some schools and programs within the university, and even within Arts and Sciences, that may need careful study and evaluation in terms of their productivity as compared to their costs. We are also prepared to accept the proposition that there may be some departments in the College of Arts and Sciences that may be better served in a separate college. For example, a College of Fine Arts may be established that would include the School of Music, the Departments of Drama and Art.

We are, however, not prepared to accept the proposition of any major revision of the College of Arts and Sciences for the following reasons:

1. In the first place the recommendation for scrutinizing the present university organization was a weakly supported report of the Self-Study Steering Committee (vote 3 for, 2 opposed, and 4 abstentions) and was suggested by no other Committee of the Self-Study. While it might be construed as representing the feeling of a few people that some reorganization may be necessary, it hardly carries the weight of a mandate that reorganization is essential.

2. President Marshall has stated that the new Dean should have a "strong interdisciplinary orientation" (Tallahassee
Democrat, Dec. 28, 1972). It is not likely that interdisciplinary programs can better flourish by establishing smaller units in the form of colleges. Departmental lines are serious enough barriers to overcome in trying to administer an interdisciplinary program. The extra problems imposed by multiple college cooperation and funding would pose almost insuperable problems and create quite the opposite affect: it would stultify, not promote interdisciplinary programs.

The Self-Study Steering Committee Report recommended that the university's present academic structure be "replaced by the formation of colleges which mirror the functional grouping of disciplines and interdisciplinary programs." (Tallahassee Democrat, Dec. 28, 1972). This committee cannot be so naive to assume that simply grouping disciplines together fosters interdisciplinary activities. Interdisciplinary activities grow out of mutual interests, and complimentary skills across disciplines, on the part of faculty members. They do not arise because an administrator places two or more disciplines together and instructs them to develop an interdisciplinary program.

Interdisciplinary programs are extremely difficult to establish. Not only do they require mutual interests on the part of the faculty members, they require additional faculty members to cover areas not represented by the present faculty, they require additional staff personnel in the form of secretaries and technicians. Small units, even small colleges do
not have the necessary flexibilities of faculty position, staff positions, or funding, to support adequately the growth of a new interdisciplinary program, no matter how exciting its prospects might be. Far better, is the large college which has greater flexibility in assignments of faculty positions, staff positions, and dollars, because of its greater resources.

3. With the advent of President Nixon's fiscal 1974 budget presented to the public on January 29, 1973, it is abundantly obvious that we are in a period of a new federalism. The look of this new federalism is one in which there will be decreasing amounts of federal support for various projects and increasing reliance on state and local governments to take over these programs. This is certainly true for education as well as other kinds of programs. While we have a fair estimate of the extent to which the federal support for education will be decreased, it is not at all clear what the total impact that this decrease will have upon presently operating programs within universities in general, and Florida State University in particular. This has led to a general feeling of insecurity among many of the faculty because of the uncertainty of funding of their various programs. The additional uncertainty engendered by the prospect of a reorganization of the university represents extremely poor timing for such an undertaking. Furthermore, in order to minimize the effect of decreased federal dollars, the flexibility of a large college (such as
Arts and Sciences presently represents in the assignment of its resources) is an absolute necessity.

4. The College of Arts and Science, as it is presently constituted, has had some notable successes in developing programs of national and international stature. Its effectiveness has been demonstrated. To change from a winning game plan to some other, as yet undemonstrated to be effective, requires considerably more justification than we have yet seen.

To quote President Marshall again, the new dean should have "a feel for fund raising outside of state government."

"Traditionally we haven't done very well in attracting outside support, except in the Natural Sciences. Humanities, for example is one area where we should have outside support." (Tallahassee Democrat, Dec. 28, 1972) Deans may be helpful in raising funds outside of state government. But more helpful than deans are department chairmen and individual faculty members who know their programs well, who can, with the use of imagination, sell their programs better than any dean possibly could.

Arts and Sciences Reorganization

If it is inevitable that Arts and Sciences, as we now know it, is to be broken up (and we would consider it a tragic mistake in view of the above) the faculty of the Psychology Department proposes that a College of Life and Behavioral Sciences be formed. This college would incorporate the Departments of Biological Science, Psychology, the interdisciplinary Psycho-
biology Program, the Program in Medical Sciences, the School of Nursing, the Department of Habilitative Sciences, and perhaps also all or parts of the Departments of Sociology, Anthropology, and some parts of the School of Social Welfare. It should also include the currently jointly administered (with the College of Education) Educational Psychology program. We believe that we can demonstrate that this program can best flourish within the Department of Psychology.

The already existing interdisciplinary programs in Psychobiology and Program in Medical Sciences strongly recommend a continually close association between Psychology and Biological Science. There is also interdisciplinary research activity between members of the faculties of the Psychology Department and Habilitative Sciences. Furthermore, it would provide an opportunity to establish more interdisciplinary programs geared toward societal needs in the form of close cooperation between the experimental social psychology program and several programs within the Department of Sociology.

Of course, such an arrangement poses some drawbacks as well. It makes difficult the close interactions that have always existed between Biochemistry, Institute of Molecular Biophysics, and the Department of Biological Science. The Program in Medical Sciences likewise has ties outside of this aggregate in the Chemistry Department. It leaves dangling the Department of Oceanography, which operates programs in both physical as well as biological oceanography.
However, the faculty of the Psychology Department is not in a position to assess adequately all of the pros and cons of such a college, although we see many benefits to be derived from such an alignment.

**Psychology Department Integrity**

Regardless of the outcome of the university reorganization, the Psychology Department is unanimously and unalterably opposed to any division that would separate its faculty into other disciplines. The reasons are both philosophical and practical.

Our students, undergraduate and graduate alike, are known to bear the unique brand of our department, that is, well grounded in general experimental psychology with excellent training in our known specialty areas. These include:

- cognitive processes
- developmental psychology
- experimental psychopathology
- personality theory
- physiological psychology and sensory processes
- social psychology
- tests and measurements

A department of about 50 psychologists assures that all areas of psychology are represented in both undergraduate and graduate psychology programs. They work as a unit in formulating the requirements for majors, minors, and graduate core curricula, and in formulating policy as it affects the teaching
and professional relations of psychology. A group of this size represents many divergent views, ideas, and interests. From these, the best known procedures are chosen for the teaching of our undergraduate majors and graduate students, for the pursuit of scholarship by the faculty, and for the provision of an atmosphere in which research may flourish. Our faculty is unalterably committed to the pursuit of excellence, not only as individuals, but more importantly, as a department. Just as size of a college is directly related to the flexibility and efficiency of research investigation, so is size of a department. A case in point was the establishment of the social psychology program. The faculty of the Psychology Department identified a critical need for an experimental social psychology program in order to broaden our undergraduate and graduate instruction and research programs, and in order to respond to the needs of our society in this critical area. Outside funds were not yet available so departmental positions and resources were diverted to this purpose without jeopardizing the viability of other department programs.

Divorce between programs within the Psychology Department can only be justified if it can be shown that only by such a divorce can freedom be secured for both sides to grow and develop. We challenge anyone to make such a showing in the case of the present department. Imitation of systems used in other universities, e.g., multiple departments, School of Behavioral Sciences, university wide models (American Psychologist, 1970, pp. 387-452) is not relevant to our
department. These systems, without exception, arose as a result of professional animosities, not as a result of more favorable growth conditions. Our Psychology Department is unique in the fact that there are few, if any, professional animosities. It is the perception of the faculty that their best research, service, and teaching interests lie in a unified Department of Psychology. As at the college level, so at the department level, largeness allows flexibility in the assignment of positions and dollars to facilitate the start of exciting new ideas, programs, and societal endeavors. Some representative ones that are already in operation are:

The LARC Program - Dr. Jack May

Study of Day Care Centers - Dr. Dave Hoffman

Post-operative burn treatment of patients in the Tallahassee Burn Center - Drs. Mort Brown & Dan Keshalo

Establishment of clerkships filled by graduate students at such places as the Federal Correctional Institute, Florida State Hospital, Vocational Rehabilitation, Sunland, Leon County Guidance Center, and in various schools throughout the community which not only assist these agencies in the execution of their duties but provide supervised training for our graduate students in the school and clinical programs.

We provide part-time instructors to the Florida Junior College Program, throughout the state, allowing the administrators of these programs to meet the obligations of providing additional sections in psychology according to demand and on short notice.
Some models of organization of Departments of Psychology have suggested the separation of the professional and basic aspects of psychology. In this regard it is critically important to note that the American Psychological Association regulates the activities of the training programs for professional, clinical, and school psychologists in a careful manner. Programs throughout the nation are evaluated at regular intervals. Based on the report of the evaluation team, the APA Committee on Accreditation approves or disapproves the program. (We are, of course, on the approved list for conducting professional training of both clinical and school psychologists.) The importance of both the basic and professional aspects of training psychologists in accrediting training programs is shown by the following quote from Accreditation and Criteria manual published by the American Psychological Association.

"The professional practice of psychology draws its fundamental sustenance from the behavioral sciences with general psychology as the core. The application of behavioral science to the specific tasks of professional psychology is the unique aspect of a professional psychology training program. Consideration of the behavioral science faculty and the professional psychology faculty are equally important in evaluating a professional psychology training program." (p.15).

"Since good graduate training in general psychology is essential, most of the following areas should be included in the formal course offering: abnormal, developmental, individual differences, learning, motivation, physiological, personality, social, statistics, and research design." (Accreditation Procedures & Criteria, 1973, APA, p. 14).
It is clear that the APA committee on accreditation expects that training programs in the professional aspects of psychology not only include specialty skills in the areas of psychological assessment (group and individual) and interventional procedures that include counseling and psychotherapy, behavior modification, consultation, etc., but that they also expect to find training in behavioral science as well.

An important and practical aspect of APA approved training programs concerns legal certification or licensing laws for the practice of psychology. Forty-six of the 50 states (including Florida) have and enforce such laws. The Florida law states, in part, that in order to be licensed to practice psychology in the State of Florida the person "has received a doctor's degree with a major in psychology from a university whose program has been approved by the APA." (Florida Statute No. 490).

It is clear, therefore, that the present psychology department under the leadership of our chairman offers a well-balanced undergraduate course offering, tailored in large measure, to the interests of undergraduate students and graduate instruction and research opportunities that place us on almost every list of the 15 best departments in the country.

Finally, the consequences of a division or divisions of the present department would be extremely expensive especially in terms of additional faculty positions required to fulfill the general psychology offering so necessary to meet even the
minimum APA requirements for accreditation. It would lead to
a proliferation of "psychology" departments within the university, none of which could possibly be better than mediocre,
for many years to come.

Furthermore, because of our budgeting procedures, a
flurry of shallow psychology courses would undoubtedly follow
in a search for greater numbers of FTE's and their attendant
assets. Course content continuity and balance would be lacking
because of communication difficulties across departmental lines
to say nothing of the almost insuperable lines between colleges.
Out of all this, would undoubtedly, arise the struggle as to
which unit would be granted the title and degree granting
privilege for PSYCHOLOGY.