Faculty Meeting

Tuesday, December 10, 2013

Present

Faculty: Phil Ackerman, Richard Catrambone, Audrey Duarte, Frank Durso, Susan Embretson, Chris Hertzog, Ruth Kanfer, Rustin Meyer, Scott Moffat, Wendy Rogers, Eric Schumacher, Dan Spieler, Davood Tofighi, Paul Verhaeghen, Bruce Walker, Howard Weiss (Chair)

Student Reps: Patrick Bradshaw, Victor Ellingsen, Jonathan Schuett

Administrative: Dawn Franklin, Jan Westbrook

I. An overview of the school’s budget was presented by the Chair.

II. Salary Savings Program (Howard Weiss)
   a. Institute is implementing a program wherein a portion of the funds that are saved when academic salary is bought out will stay in the department. These funds are put in a permanent research account and are shared 50/50 by the department and the PI.
   b. The overhead and fringe on these funds come back to the department/PI as well.
   c. These funds can be used for anything that is operational under state funds (i.e., cannot be used for alcohol purchases for an event, etc.)
   d. Summer salary is not relevant to the program nor are savings from course buyouts.
   e. Cannot use NSF funds for this program as NSF does not allow you to buyout time on a grant (NSF’s policy, not Georgia Tech’s)

III. Library (Howard Weiss)
   a. The books in the library are being moved out and archived to make room for an interactive classroom space. You will need to request a book from the library if you want to check the physical copy after the archive.
   b. Ideas about how to use the freed space are being collected. One idea proposed by the college is the creation of active learning classrooms.

IV. Internal Staff Review (Howard Weiss)
   a. An internal staff review will be conducted in the spring semester.
   b. The Review Committee will consist of Phil Ackerman (chair), Jenny Singleton, and Scott Moffat.
c. The review will be designed to take a look at our processes and procedures (not people) to identify what we are doing right, and where (if anywhere) that we may want to make some changes

V. Status of “Big Ideas” discussed at the Faculty Retreat
   a. Audrey Duarte and Eric Schumacher have sent Howard a mini white paper
   b. Chris Hertzog, Ruth Kanfer, and Howard Weiss are working on an idea that has morphed into the Science of Human Optimization

VI. Revised Faculty Meeting Schedule
   a. The faculty meetings are being moved from the 1st Tuesday to the 3rd Tuesday of each month. They will still be at 11:00am. The revised schedule for 2014 is below.
      January 21
      February 18
      April 15
      September 16
      October 21
      November 18
      December (To Be Determined)

VII. Engineering Psych Faculty Search (Frank Durso & Jonathan Schuett)
   a. 4 finalists brought in to interview for the Eng. Psych faculty position: Glenn Gunzelmann (Air Force Research Laboratory), Richard Holden (Vanderbilt University), Rick Thomas (University of Oklahoma), and Jeremy Schwark (New Mexico State University)
   b. After discussion the faulty voted on and unanimously passed the search committee’s recommendation to offer the job to Rick Thomas.
   c. Dawn Franklin will look into what additional information is needed to offer Rick Thomas an appointment with tenure

VIII. Graduate Policy Committee (Paul Verhaeghen)
   a. Committee was tasked with looking at the timeline for students coming in with a Bachelor’s vs. students coming in with a Master’s.
      i. Polled 32 of the most recent graduates: average length for those coming in with a Master’s was 6 years and average length for those coming in with a Bachelors was 6.7 years (so took approximately just 1 semester longer).
      ii. Committee proposes not having a separate timeline for people coming in with a Master’s.
         1. Faculty voted unanimously in favor of this proposition
   b. Provost Meeting
i. Noted issue across institute with students complaining that they are not seeing their advisors.

ii. In response, Institute is asking advisors to document every appointment they have with a student.

c. Online Assessment System

i. Institute-wide system used to evaluate progress of students, which is also used for accreditation.

ii. Online Assessment System is useful for undergraduate students but not very useful for graduate students.

iii. Committee proposes using the Thesis/Dissertation Quality Assessment (see Appendix A) for graduate students, which meets the minimum accreditation requirements
   1. Faculty voted unanimously in favor of this motion

IX. Other Business

a. Dean’s office has given us funds to hire an Academic Professional. This would be a non-tenure track position.

b. Reminder that Art Kramer (Beckman Institute, University of Illinois) will be visiting on Monday, December 16.
THESIS/DISSERTATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

School of Psychology

Student:
Advisor:
Title of document:

Type of document (please circle):  MS thesis  PhD dissertation

Assessment of quality of components (place a tick mark):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Committee Chair:

Date:

(Form Dec. 2013)
### TABLE 12.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Quality Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

For a complete list of references and further details, please refer to the original source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Creative, inclusive, comprehensive, sparkling; shows critical thinking about the literature; has breadth and depth; uses the primary literature, including classic papers, to make valuable points and generate hypotheses; has a lot of theory in it; is expansive, brings in different points of view, is not limited to the particular substantive area, integrates material from related fields; shows where all the pieces of the hypothesis come from; places the work within a larger context, makes reader look at the literature in a different way.</td>
<td>A very critical review of the relevant literature; shows insight into the field and propose new points; points out methodological flaws in studies; compares studies and draws conclusions between them; integrates things in a new way; draws conclusions explains its relevance for the problem; demonstrates that the student can use the material, apply it to a problem, and develop hypotheses.</td>
<td>Adequate coverage of the literature; mentions everything; talks about what others have said; student does not put himself or herself into it; is a laundry list of prior findings; lacks critical analysis; synthesis critiques are derived from other people; makes obvious points.</td>
<td>Incomplete; misses or omits important studies or whole areas of literature; does not go back far enough in the literature; leaves out the most recent literature; does not make clear distinctions between theory and method; talks about them or if they were the same; the literature's relevance to the question and methods is unclear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Creative, original; has a theory; discusses and works with more than one theory or model; articulates and compares competing theories; shows how competing theories are complementary; uses competing ideas to make hypotheses and develop studies; identifies and critically analyzes key theoretical assumptions and boundary conditions; identifies the theories' implications for the student's study; advances theory.</td>
<td>Student has a sophisticated knowledge of and ability to use relevant theories; figures out where the gaps are in the theories and extracts what is useful; uses theory to inform the research questions and measures; discusses how observations are consistent or inconsistent with prevailing theory; suggests how diverse observations can be pulled together; makes some progress.</td>
<td>No clear theoretical framework; provides a laundry list of relevant theories; question is not integrated into a theoretical perspective; does not critically analyze the theories' underlying assumptions or boundary conditions; accepts theories at face value; hypotheses are not logical deductions from theoretical premises; hypotheses do not synthesize multiple theories or test competing theories.</td>
<td>Has no theory; does not have a good guiding theory; theory is misunderstood, misclassified, or undeveloped; overlooks a certain body of theory; theory is unrelated to the literature review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12.A. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>High quality: a well-designed experiment with proper controls; has a level of complexity that goes beyond the obvious; has done some pilot testing to nail down the characteristics of the methods; creatively applies an existing method to a new question; uses a new method grapples up with useful measures.</td>
<td>Applies methods in correct and creative ways; describes why they are using a particular task, what it does, and how it fits with the study; creates new tasks; uses multiple measures of the same construct; shows interest in convergent and divergent validity issues.</td>
<td>Shows basic level of competence; method fits the problem; follows the rules for samples; measures, and analyses; uses one measure for each construct.</td>
<td>Uses wrong or poor methods to answer the question; has a major confound; uses an inappropriate population to test a theory; does not have appropriate controls or control groups; does not have controls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results/data analysis</td>
<td>Creative, uses proper, defensible statistical and analytical methods; uses best, most powerful, and sensitive analytic procedures to address the experimental question; uses cutting-edge techniques; takes existing commercial software and develops new models; applies newer and different models to the data set; provides information about why each analysis is being conducted; analysis is thorough and transparent; integrates among and across levels of analysis; develops new ways to look at the data and makes the most of the data; tells a story; makes a theoretical argument; analyses map back to the hypotheses and answer the questions; shows curiosity through relentless exploration of the data; iteratively explores questions raised by each analysis; pays attention to detail; communicates analyses very clearly; discusses the limitations of the analysis.</td>
<td>Appropriate; clear; does not conduct supplemental analyses; leaves open data analysis opportunities.</td>
<td>Meets the standard of thoroughness or comprehensiveness; has done the minimum analysis required to address the original question; results go back to the hypothesis; does not develop a meaningful story.</td>
<td>Analyses are wrong, inappropriate, or not well matched to the research question; analyses are not reported completely enough; prevents the results; poorly, does not follow up on alternative interpretations allowed by the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and conclusion</td>
<td>Deep, accurate, creative, enthusiastic; goes beyond summarizing the findings; draws things together; goes back to the introduction; states the hypotheses and answers each one; provides an in-depth account of the findings; develops a novel framework or explanation for unanticipated results or results that have internal contradictions; goes back to the literature and discusses the differences between study's findings and others' findings; discusses big surprises and the strengths and limitations of the current design or research; puts the study in a larger context; says what it means for the rest of the field; identifies future directions; speculates on why and how the field might need to change; moves the field forward</td>
<td>Less of the same; does not close the circle; does not come back to the beginning and address the problem</td>
<td>Summarizes the results; provides a superficial interpretation of the findings; references to the literature simply state that the findings are consistent with other people's findings; has a raw discussion of strengths and limitations; provides some very general directions for future research that do not provide structure for the next study; makes wild speculations that have nothing to do with the topic</td>
<td>Shows lack of understanding and careful thought; the discussion and conclusion do not adequately reflect the journey; it's a disconnect between data and conclusions; states the results without providing any interpretation; misinterprets the results; interprets the results beyond what the data allows; generalizes too broadly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>