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This evaluation is based on our review of the self-study materials provided by the Department as well as our conversations with over 50 individuals, including the interim chair, faculty (across all ranks), and students (across all programs) during our site visit on April 6-8. We evaluated this collective information against the backdrop of our combined experience, which tallies nearly 50 years as business school faculty at various large public universities, including Arizona State University, Clemson University, Michigan State University, University of Arizona, University of Illinois, and University of Wisconsin. None of us are engaged in any research or other forms of cooperative endeavors with any faculty in this department. Thus, we believe that we are in a position to provide a fair and objective assessment of the Department of Managerial Sciences.

This report first addresses the eight questions detailed in the Program Review Guidelines and then concludes with a set of six specific recommendations. We strongly encourage both the new dean of the Robinson College of Business and the new chair of the Department of Managerial Sciences to seriously consider these recommendations and share them (as well as the rest of this report) with departmental faculty. Due to concerns about confidentiality, the information contained in this report does not cite any specific individuals; we were careful not to report isolated or idiosyncratic views. Thus, the observations documented in this report were based on either empirical data or views expressed by multiple individuals. These observations and recommendations are broadly shared by all three members of our review team.

Historical and Current Context: The Department of Managerial Sciences is one of 10 departments in the Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University. This is a large department comprised of 11 tenured faculty, 7 tenure-track faculty, and 16 non-tenure track faculty. In addition to having a large number of faculty, this department also has a large portfolio of educational program offerings, including a Bachelor of Managerial Sciences (averaging 961 students over three year period 2010-2012), Master of Science (averaging 37 students over same period), and a Doctor of Philosophy (10 students currently). In addition, the department teaches a large number of service courses in support of both the College’s MBA programs (dropping from 114 to 40 students over the three year period) as well as several undergraduate programs across GSU.

This department is multidisciplinary and is comprised of faculty in Business Analysis, Entrepreneurship, Human Resource Management, Operations Management, Organizational Behavior, and Strategic Management. Although these six disciplines share a common connection to the broader management domain, they differ in terms of their disciplinary training, academic organizations, and publication outlets. Thus, weaving these disparate disciplines into a coherent and cooperative unit is a considerable leadership challenge. This challenge is further complicated by the fact that the current unit structure (which has been in existence for approximately a decade) was created via a top-down edict from the College. Based on our interviews with several long-standing faculty, it appears that this forced marriage ruffled a number of feathers and that College leadership devoted little effort to ensure a harmonious union. Thus, not surprisingly, the Department still appears to be a work in progress in terms of key organizational-related dynamics, including group cohesion, collective sense of purpose, and teamwork. This current state of affairs is both unfortunate and ironic for a unit that studies and teaches organizational behavior.
Although the Department is comprised of six nominal disciplines, two areas (i.e., Strategy/Entrepreneurship & Organizational Behavior/Human Resources) have emerged as the center of academic influence. These two areas account for: (1) all of the Department’s doctoral students, (2) six of its seven assistant professors, and (3) all of the authorized positions for its current faculty searches. As a result, faculty operating in the remaining two areas of the department (i.e., operations and business analytics) appear to feel somewhat marginalized and are left wondering about how they fit into the Department (and College’s) long-term plans. In our opinion, this uneven resource distribution exasperates the long-standing divisions among departmental faculty and is a key area of concern. In addition to its negative impact on organizational dynamics, this strong emphasis on Strategy/Entrepreneurship & Organizational Behavior/Human Resources may also limit the Department’s ability to maximize its educational offerings, as operations and business analytics appear to be areas with considerable market demand and growth potential.

In addition to these internal organizational concerns, the Department of Managerial Sciences also faces a number of other challenges, including an increase in research expectations as part of GSU’s objective of enhancing its academic reputation, a declining enrollment of masters students, and a changing academic landscape in which online education is gaining prominence. To date, departmental leadership seems most focused on the academic reputation challenge and least focused on the online education challenge. The Department’s ability to satisfactorily address all of these challenges would be enhanced by both greater faculty cohesion as well as an influx of senior faculty. Although this department has a relatively large number of faculty, there are relatively few research active tenured faculty, a high percentage of non-tenured track faculty burdened by heavy teaching loads, and the current faculty are spread across a wide range of teaching demands. As a result, without more senior faculty, the Department will have difficulty implementing any new initiatives; they are too busy treading water. We discuss this concern in greater detail later in this report.

Strengths and Weaknesses: Like any unit (ours included), this department has a number of strengths and weaknesses. In our opinion, the greatest strength of the Department of Managerial Sciences is its faculty, especially its junior faculty and non-tenure track faculty. The Department’s seven assistant professors hold doctorates from strong research institutions, appear highly research active, and are quite collegial. They all seem to have bought into the University’s objective of raising research expectations and are determined to meet these expectations. The large cadre of non-tenure track faculty is another strength. Many of these faculty have been members of the Department for over a decade, possess a high level of institutional knowledge, and are important teaching assets. The students we spoke with mentioned several of these faculty by name as among their favorite teachers. In addition to these two sets of faculty, another strongpoint of the Department is its doctoral program. This program, which was recently restructured, is led by a caring and dedicated faculty member, has a good crop of current students, and a boasts an impressive placement record in recent years. This appears to be a program on the rise.

Another notable strength is the Department’s two Centers/Institutes (i.e., the W.T. Bebe Institute of Personnel and Employment Relations and the Herman J. Russell Sr. International Center for Entrepreneurship). The Russell Center is an interdisciplinary entity with a director who reports to
the Department Chair. The Center has a $500,000 endowment and receives additional funding from the State of Georgia. The center’s primary efforts are in supporting entrepreneurial education (e.g., business plan competitions, elevator pitch competitions, experiential courses in entrepreneurship, business plan workshops), and fostering outreach to entrepreneurs and local entrepreneurial organizations. Thus, the Center is primarily focused on applied entrepreneurship activities and outreach to the local community, which we believe under-utilizes its potential. We discuss this issue as part of our recommendations.

The Bebe Institute is a cross-departmental unit with a director that reports directly to the Dean. As a result, the Managerial Sciences Department appears to be only thinly connected to this entity. Indeed, its main connection appears to be the fact that the director of this institute is a member of the Department’s faculty. The Institute appears to have a considerable amount of traction and has been successful in promoting research around the theme of “People at work.” This evidenced by several projects involving faculty from a variety of departments including not only Managerial Sciences, but also Computer Science, Information Systems, Marketing, and Risk Management and Insurance. In addition, the current Director has been successful in attracting research grants to support research and in hosting multidisciplinary research colloquium and conferences. This is another key resource that we believe could be leveraged in a more strategic manner to benefit the Department.

This department also appears to have a number of weaknesses, especially in comparison to peer departments at research universities. As noted earlier, the Department’s lack of organizational cohesion is a major weakness. As a related concern, the Department appears to have long suffered from a lack of strong leadership and has exhibited little strategic focus for the past decade. As far as we could discern, there is no semblance of a strategic plan and the Department lacks adequate governance (i.e., no bylaws or advisory board). As a result, departmental members appear to be engaged in largely autonomous activities with little coordination or oversight. On top of this, communication among department members appears to be rather haphazard, department meetings are infrequent at best, and there is a low degree of transparency regarding departmental activities. For example, faculty exhibited little knowledge about the state of the dean search or how many current faculty searches are taking place.

Faculty research productivity is another weakness. Although the Department’s junior faculty appear to be quite research active, its overall productivity in recent years has been rather sparse with relatively few publications in top-level management journals. Although the Department’s self-study indicates that its recent research ranking was in the Top 20 (based on UT-Dallas journals), some of the faculty who contributed strongly to this ranking (e.g., Ben Tepper, Denis Gregoire) are no longer at GSU. Moreover, this claimed ranking also appears to be inflated by the inclusion of GSU faculty outside of the department (e.g., V. Kumar). Based on our own analysis of the UT-Dallas rankings, it appears that current Department of Managerial Science faculty have published only five articles in UT-Dallas journals since 2011. This level of overall research productivity (i.e., one top-level journal publication for an entire department) is considerably below the norm at most research universities and incongruent with GSU’s ambitious research objectives.
In our opinion, the Department’s assessment of degree program effectiveness is weak in many cases and nonexistent in others. We provide more specific comments about this concern in a later section of this review. The available evidence suggests that the assessment and continuous improvement loop is not closed, and faculty members are not routinely engaged in assessment activities. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, assessment of the doctoral program is nonexistent. Likewise, there does not appear to be any formal assessment of the effectiveness of either the Beebe Institute or the Russell Center. This lack of assessment is not consistent with most AACSB-accredited programs.

**Progress Towards Goals and Objectives:** As noted above, the Department lacks strategic direction and there are few apparent goals and objectives. Thus, we had considerable difficulty discerning progress on this front. When we asked faculty to identify the Department’s goals, they most often mentioned the goal of raising the department’s research standing, the search for more senior faculty, the desire for a higher degree of interdisciplinary initiatives, and the need to revamp the department’s Masters of Science program. Thus, faculty members appear to share a broad set of common objectives. However, there also appears to have been little progress on these objectives to date. Although in fairness, many of these objectives appear to be quite recent. Thus, it may be too early to chart progress on these fronts. We discuss the issue of goals and objectives at greater depth later in this report.

**Quality of the Curriculum:** This portion of our review examines the quality of the Department’s curriculum, the appropriateness of its learning outcomes, the assessment of these outcomes, the impact of this assessment on the curriculum, and the effect of curriculum modifications on student learning outcomes.

*Quality of the curriculum from a disciplinary perspective.* At the undergraduate level, the Department offers a major in Managerial Sciences. The curriculum for this major requires completion of a set of seven courses for 21 credits. Students are required to complete an introductory course in each of the following subjects: human resource management, managerial decision-making, and operations management. In addition, students are encouraged to select and complete one of four career tracks – Human Resource Management, Business Analysis, Operations Management, and Entrepreneurship. However, only a small percentage (approximately 25% of students) select any of these tracks. Based on our student interviews, it appears that due in part to uneven advising, many students may not be aware of these options.

The number of courses required for each track varies. For example, the HRM and entrepreneurship tracks require completion of three courses whereas the BA and OM tracks require completion of four courses. All tracks require students to complete at least one course designated as a Critical Thinking through Writing. The overall design of the major appears adequate and consistent with the typical curriculum found in comparable programs at many research institutions. However, it appears that the courses required to complete these tracks are not offered on a regular schedule. This is likely due to the fact that departmental faculty are also engaged in offering a large number of service courses for the College’s MBA programs as well as several undergraduate programs across campus. This may be another reason why few students complete any of the four tracks. This inability to offer these essential courses makes it difficult for the department to meet its program goals as well as its stated learning outcomes.
In addition to its large undergraduate program, the Department also offers several concentrations within the College’s MBA program and also offers a specialized masters’ degree program with concentrations in Business Analysis, Human Resource Management, Operations Management, and Organizational Change. The curricula for MBA concentrations and the specialized masters’ degree (and its concentrations) are consistent with those found at many research institutions. Much like its undergraduate program, the regularity of offering of courses within each of the MS concentrations does not appear to be satisfactory; several students noted this as a particular challenge. As noted in the Department’s self-study, this lack of adequate course offerings is in part due to the recent decline in its number of MS students. This results in a vicious cycle, which the Department is trying to exit by revamping its MS program.

Finally, the Department also offers a doctoral degree with two concentrations – Organizational Behavior and Strategic Management. This concerted focus appears to have adversely affected the morale of faculty in the Business Analysis and Operations domain, some of whom appear to feel that their intellectual domains are being marginalized by this focus. On the positive side, this focus appears to be yielding some positive outcomes as the doctoral program seems quite rigorous, is being led by a dedicated program coordinator, has a good cadre of current students, and boasts a recent placement record that is comparable to many research universities.

**Appropriateness of learning outcomes.** The Department’s self-study included the learning outcomes and rubrics for mainly its masters’ programs. There was little information on the learning outcomes for its undergraduate or doctoral programs. For example, the self-study included learning outcomes for only three undergraduate courses. These learning outcomes were stated in measurable terms emphasizing specific skills. This is appropriate. However, it would have been more valuable to review a larger sample covering courses for the various programs. As a result, we were unable to provide a careful analysis of the appropriateness of the Department’s learning outcomes.

**Assessment of learning outcomes.** As noted above, the learning outcomes documentation supplied by the Department was incomplete. First, much of the information supplied focused on masters’ level programs with little information about the undergraduate and doctoral programs. Second, the evidence provided stops at the planning stage with little information on the results, conclusions, or follow up actions. Third, faculty members do not appear to be fully engaged in the assessment process, as the burden falls almost entirely on Program Coordinators. This lack of broader faculty engagement fails to create an environment where the faculty owns not only the curriculum but also the assessment process.

**The impact of this assessment on the curriculum.** The Department’s self-study did not provide any evidence on how or where the assessment results influenced curricular changes. Our conversations with faculty members suggest that they are not fully engaged in the assessment process, as they could not cite any example of where curriculum was changed as a result of findings from the assessment of learning outcomes. Program Coordinators, however, cited several instances where assessment of learning outcomes led to changes in individual courses as well as their program as a whole. These changes, however, are largely limited to masters’ programs. Thus, it is unclear if and how the Department’s assessment outcomes influenced
curricular activities in its undergraduate programs. In addition we were informed that doctoral program has yet to develop learning outcomes. In sum, there appears to be little evidence that learning assessment activities have had a substantial influence on the Department’s curriculum.

The impact of curriculum modifications on student learning outcomes. As noted earlier, there is no evidence of closing the loop at any of the programs offered by the Department. Consequently, we were unable to assess the effectiveness of curricular modifications.

Summary. Overall, the curriculum is satisfactory. However, there is a clear shortage of faculty, especially in the Business Analysis and Operations domains. The Department’s faculty is spread too thin in trying to serve all of its programs. This in turn has limited the Department’s course offerings and may potentially affect its ability to achieve its stated learning outcomes. The learning assessment process is patchy at both the course and program levels and there is little evidence of use of assessment results impact curricular changes and close the learning loop.

Quality of the Students: This portion of our review examines the quality of the Department’s students (both incoming and graduated) as well as the appropriateness of its quality standards.

Quality of the students (incoming and graduated). Our meetings with current students and recent graduates indicate that students are generally pleased with the quality of their programs. However, our meetings with various faculty suggests that there are concerns about the communication skills of their students. Moreover, several faculty share the impression that their undergraduate students are not well prepared for college and that their non-traditional status presents them with a range of life issues which limits the attention they can devote to their studies. However, despite these challenges most students appear to be strongly committed and highly motivated.

The quality of MBA and MS students varied considerably across programs and over time (using the three year period 2010-2012). Average GMAT scores of incoming MBA students pursuing one of the six concentrations offered by Management Sciences ranged from 533 to 670 with an overall average of 605. Average scores of incoming MS students also exhibited considerable variance, ranging from 480 to 720 with an overall average of 614. We could discern no clear pattern in scores across the different Master’s majors. One particular concern is the PMBA student population, which appears to have a false sense of entitlement, which makes them particularly difficult to teach.

On the plus side, the department has a much larger ratio of domestic doctoral students compared to most doctoral degree-granting institutions. This may be one reason why the placement record of the Department’s PhD program is quite impressive despite the lower than desired GMAT scores of many of their students.

The appropriateness of the Department’s quality standards. We are unable to comment on the department’s quality standards due to the absence of learning assessment results. Clearly, there are challenges with the undergraduate population in terms of their degree of preparedness for higher education and the challenging life circumstances faced by many students. However, we recognize that the target population served by GSU comprises a somewhat non-traditional student body. Thus, these challenges are not unexpected.
Quality of the Faculty: The quality of the Department’s faculty is mixed and its distribution is bottom heavy. Of particular concern is the inconsistent research productivity of its senior faculty (i.e., full professors). In general, the senior faculty members in this department rarely publish in top management journals. Moreover, two of the Department’s five senior faculty have moved into administrative positions. This has limited their research productivity in recent years. Among the three other full professors, one is still quite active, but the other two are publishing at a rather modest rate. Thus, in terms of both the number of senior faculty and their research activity, this department is quite thin. The Department (and College) seems well aware of this issue and is actively engaged in several searches on the senior faculty front. Unfortunately, these searches have yielded modest results, as the Department has had considerable difficulty making successful senior hires.

The Department currently has six associate professors. Among this group of faculty, half appear to have plateaued at the associate level and produce a very limited amount of research while the others are still active scholars and appear to be progressing towards eventual promotion to full professor. This ratio of active to non-active research associate professors is below disciplinary standards and is an area of concern.

In contrast, the department’s set of seven assistant professors are a strength, as these junior faculty have strong research training and exhibit a high degree of motivation to publish top-tier research. Thus, they exhibit good promise. Unfortunately, due to the limited number of research active tenured faculty to mentor the junior faculty and help further develop their research skills, there is a real danger that they will either fail to earn tenure or may leave for greener pastures.

For many years, the Department has relied upon a large cadre of non-tenure track faculty, which collectively comprises nearly half of the department’s faculty. On the plus side, several of these non-tenure-track faculty are actively publishing and have successfully retained their AACSB classification as professionally qualified. They also appear to be excellent teachers and seem committed to supporting various outreach activities. However, this heavy reliance on non-tenured track faculty raises concerns in terms of both supporting the university’s goal in terms of raising its research profile and mentoring the department’s large number of junior faculty.

Resource Adequacy: It was difficult for us to discern the level of departmental resources. No faculty we interviewed seemed to have an understanding of the amount of overall resources available. Furthermore, the resource allocation process lacks transparency and resources appear to be unevenly distributed across unit members. Departmental faculty members do not have set research budgets and must make requests for resources from the Department Chair on a case-by-case basis. As far as we could tell, it appears the junior faculty and some tenured faculty members receive sufficient resources to attend conferences and conduct their research. However, this is not true of senior faculty and non-tenure track faculty who receive considerably less financial support for travel and research. Thus resources appear to be unevenly distributed in an ad hoc fashion, which results in a sense of unfairness among some departmental members.

Goals and Objectives: The Department (as well as the College) appears to lack clearly articulated strategic goals and objectives. Indeed, most of the faculty members are unaware of any goals for their unit, though many were aware of the university’s goals. This situation may be a function of
the recent turnover in leadership positions within the department and college. On the plus side, faculty members on the curriculum committee did seem to have a clear direction, echoed by the Department Chair to revamp the MS program by reducing the number of concentrations from four to two. However, this direction was not widely known among the faculty.

Although the department’s broader strategic goals seem to be lacking, its research objectives are in accord with disciplinary trends. Indeed, there appears to be a strong research culture developing among the junior faculty, many of whom have doctorates from leading research universities. This focus on publishing research in leading journals appears to be nicely aligned with broader university priorities. However, as noted earlier, this focus seems incongruent with the Department’s recent publication record.

**Recommendations:** As seen from the above review, the Department of Managerial Sciences faces a number of challenges. In order to help meet these challenges, we provide six specific recommendations. Some of these recommendations are already on the Department’s radar screen:

1. **Develop a coherent strategic vision:** As noted earlier, this Department appears to lack a coherent strategic vision. This condition does not appear to be new, as even long-standing faculty could not recall a time in which such a vision ever existed. As a result, faculty are left wondering where the Department is headed and what role they may play in its future. This lack of vision is especially problematic given this unit’s rather contentious history and its somewhat balkanized faculty structure. The incoming Dean and Department Head should make the formation of a new strategic vision a key priority. Although there appears to be the rough outline of such a vision based on the clearly articulated vision of GSU itself, the Department needs to operationalize these campus priorities in a more specific and tractable manner. In particular, the Department needs to come to grips with how it will manage its current faculty structure (i.e., will it support all six of its areas equally or strategically invest in a subset of these areas) and how it will revamp its current program offerings in order to keep up with changing market demands. These two issues are intricately tied together and must be carefully managed.

As part of this strategic visioning, we strongly recommend that the Dean and Department Chair seek to more strategically utilize both the Russell Center as well as the Bebe Institute. Both of these entities have strong ties with important external stakeholders and could be more effectively employed as channels for enhancing faculty research and supporting departmental program offerings. For example, the Russell Center and its external stakeholders could be leveraged to provide research opportunities in the area of entrepreneurship where data availability is frequently a limiting factor. We also recommend that the Russell Center leverage its relations with local entrepreneurs to increase its endowment. Likewise, the Bebe Institute lacks adequately funding. At present, the institute’s financial resources are limited to supporting one faculty director and providing minimal research support across a broad swath of faculty. Increasing the endowments of both the Center and the Institute should be a top priority. This increased funding could then be deployed to provide support for faculty research and offer new courses in support of its various program offerings.

2. **Clearly communicate this vision to the faculty:** This department has had a long history of irregular communications and several faculty appear to be outside of the communication loop.
This has led to misunderstandings and hurt feelings among some faculty members. Thus, as the Department develops its new vision, it is imperative that this vision be clearly and systematically communicated to all unit members. An increase in transparency appears to be much needed and would go a long way in terms of improving the department’s organizational climate.

3. **Foster stronger organizational cohesion**: Based on both our faculty interviews as well as the faculty survey results contained in the departmental self-study, it seems clear that this unit lacks cohesion across its various disciplines. Although the junior faculty appear to share a high degree of collegiality, this is likely a product of the fact that these faculty are largely comprised of two domains (i.e., organizational behavior and strategy). This collegiality does not appear to be shared by the tenured faculty, many of whom appear to be balkanized in their sub-disciplines or pursuing their own individual agendas without much sense of being part of a larger whole. This pattern of autonomy is also evident in the structure and operations of the Department’s Institutes and Roundtables, which appear to be operating as individual entities with little integration with the broader Department. This is an unfortunate situation, as these entities appear to hold considerable promise for linking faculty with the business community, which could lead to substantial opportunities in terms of both program development and faculty research. Thus, the incoming Dean and Department Chair should make faculty cohesion a top priority. In terms of actionable steps in this direction, we recommend an increase in transparency regarding departmental decision-making, the formation of a departmental faculty advisory council, and the creation of preset faculty research budgets.

4. **Revamp the Department’s Masters of Science program**: The MS program currently includes four distinct offerings. The demand for some offerings is declining due to a reduction in the number of available courses, which results in further decreases in student demand for these courses. It seems clear that the current MS program structure needs to be revamped. In order to achieve economies of scope, we suggest the MS program narrow its focus to two areas, which seems to be the thrust currently being pursued. The specific areas selected should be driven by market demand rather than by disciplinary preferences. Based on our conversations with many unit members, it appears that Business Analytics and Operations are areas that could attract substantial student interest. However, any analytics-based offerings must carefully navigate the College’s own fledging program in this domain.

5. **Hire a cadre of research active senior faculty**: The unit needs more senior faculty to adequately mentor junior faculty and to create a stronger research culture. Since this department is comprised of six disciplinary areas, it may be difficult to fully staff all of them. We recommend that the unit narrow its focus to three to four disciplinary areas that have the greatest potential for creating synergy and achieving research excellence. The Department appears to be already engaged in this type of focused excellence approach, as its current faculty searches, recent faculty hires, and current doctoral student composition indicates that it has chosen to focus on Strategy/Entrepreneurship & Organizational Behavior/Human Resources. While we are unable to fully evaluate the wisdom of this approach, we strongly recommend that the Dean and Department Chair consider placing a similar emphasis on strengthening the Operations/Business Analysis domain, as this portion of the department appears to have substantial promise in terms of developing new program offerings that have the potential to bring added resources to the
College and Department. In order to attract strong senior faculty, it would be helpful if the Department was able to offer chaired professorships or other incentives.

6. Close the assessment and improvement loop for all degree programs: The Department needs to develop an assessment plan for its undergraduate and doctoral programs. Presently the unit’s assessment focus seems to be limited to its masters’ programs. We were unable to find any evidence of learning outcomes and/or assessment metrics for its undergraduate or doctoral program. In addition, at the masters’ level there is a lack of documentation of how assessment results impact the program’s curricular or mode of delivery. At present, assessment activity appears to be done primarily by the program coordinators. It seems clear that faculty need to become more fully engaged in the assessment process at all levels. We strongly recommend that the Department create an incentive system to ensure fuller engagement of the faculty in the assessment of program effectiveness and in making improvements to close the loop.

In sum, the Department of Managerial Sciences appears to be a unit still trying to come to terms with the merger forced upon its faculty over a decade ago. In addition to this internal challenge, the members of this department are also facing rising research expectations, declining student demand for some of its historic program offerings, and a rapidly changing higher education landscape. In order to successfully deal with these challenges, this department will need to develop a coherent strategic vision, clearly communicate this vision to its collective faculty, develop stronger organizational cohesion, revamp its master’s program, and obtain an influx of new research active senior faculty. These are formidable challenges that any department would have difficulty enacting on its own. Thus, the support and guidance of College leadership is essential to this process. This department in need of help and the new incoming Dean needs to appoint a Chair capable of managing these varied challenges and clearly communicate a vision that will energize and mobilize departmental faculty. We believe that a strong Managerial Sciences department is essential to the long-term success of the Robinson College of Business and wish its faculty good luck in realizing their individual and collective goals.