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Introduction

Before addressing the points in the structured report template, we begin with a discussion of what we see as a set of critical issues facing the Department of Economics as it moves forward.

Successful recruiting in recent years, especially at the tenured level, has greatly strengthened the caliber of the Department of Economics at Georgia State. In fact, the Department is probably one of most improved nationwide over this time period. While this improvement has been facilitated in part by strong support from the campus administration, it has also relied on financial resources generated by several of the research centers housed in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. These resources have helped to support the department’s graduate program while covering other aspects of its operations, leveraging the productivity of the campus’s investment in the unit.

Generation of these financial resources requires large inputs of faculty time to execute the various contract and grant-supported projects carried out by the research centers. This large claim on faculty time is atypical among the top-50 economics departments, where funded research is more commonly of the non-contract variety and is carried out by individuals rather than through organized departmental centers. Given the Department’s location in a policy school, the extent of these center-driven activities is natural. But the activities may impede, to some degree, the Department’s pursuit of a higher standing in the economics profession at the same time that they generate the financial resources that allow such a pursuit to be undertaken. In particular, center-related activity involving contract research has the potential to limit the volume and quality of the academic research of participating faculty.

In an ideal setting, center activity would not compromise research productivity at all. With suitable buyouts, these activities would simply replace some of the faculty’s teaching and administrative burden, with no loss of research time. These activities may and even stimulate new research projects arising from exposure to interesting applied issues. While this model may describe the situation of some of the department’s faculty, research productivity has apparently suffered for others. Center-related activity can limit the amount of time a faculty member is able to devote to research intended for publication in economics journals, thus reducing the quantity of published work. This limitation is less germane when the center-related research has appreciable academic relevance, in which case center-related efforts yield a dual output, yielding published articles as well as fulfilling contract goals. But even when publication spinoffs emerge, the strongly applied nature of the center’s focus may limit the purely academic value of the resulting papers, making publication in top journals difficult. These concerns apply most directly to the International Studies Program, the Fiscal Research Center, and the Center for
Health Policy, being less relevant for the Experimental Economics Center, which has more of an academic mission.

As noted above, the centers’ potential adverse effects on the volume of research output can be addressed, in part, through steps to replace lost faculty time, including course buyouts and release from other departmental duties. But some center activities, particularly extensive international travel, are so consuming of time and energy that offsetting compensation is hard to achieve. Nevertheless, the department should strive to provide buyouts and other compensation sufficient to preserve adequate research time for faculty. If fulfillment of the centers’ missions requires so much faculty input that research output is unavoidably and seriously compromised for some individuals, the department should consider expanding the centers’ professional research staffs so as to reduce the faculty burden.

The centers’ potential adverse effects on research quality can be addressed, to some extent, through the faculty’s own efforts rather than through organized steps. Faculty members could exert more effort to develop research topics of general interest out of more-narrowly focused center work, with the goal of parlaying center activities into publications in top economics journals. Younger faculty could be counseled on the need to strive for publications in recognized outlets, rather than settling for publication of center-related work in journals that are not very visible to the general economics profession. Such a publication pattern may also arise independently of the influence of center work, and the department must impress on its young faculty the need for visibility in mainstream economics outlets if it wants to preserve the recent gains in its reputational standing as these individuals move upward through the ranks.

*Evaluation of center-related contributions*

Economics departments typical evaluate faculty members along the dimensions of research, teaching and departmental service. In Georgia State’s department, a fourth distinct dimension exists, namely, contributions to the activities of the research centers. Explicit evaluation of this dimension has not been included in the department’s personnel review process, and steps should be taken to remedy this omission. Ideally, center activity should be evaluated both in terms of its volume and the quality of the outputs produced. The center director is in the best position to offer such an evaluation to the department, and a written evaluation of the quality and extent of center participation should be part of the review process.

Just as outstanding teaching can substitute to some extent for research shortcomings in a personnel case, outstanding center contributions might overcome deficiencies elsewhere in an individual’s record. Just as good teachers with short vitas sometimes are awarded tenure, the department (recognizing the key contribution of center resources) could occasionally use outstanding center activity to reward individuals with less-than-stellar research performance. However, if the department wishes to continue its pursuit of a higher reputational standing, center activities cannot routinely be a substitute for research productivity in faculty evaluations.
Looming life-cycle issues

Future retirements of their directors could affect the centers’ contributions to the department. This concern is particularly acute in the case of the International Studies Program, whose financial contribution is large and whose director (Professor Martinez) serves as a “rainmaker” to a greater extent than appears to be case in the other centers. Given that the volume of ISP contracts is likely to fall with a transition to a new director, a major source of departmental funding could be jeopardized. The campus would then need to substantially increase the department’s allocation of state funds to forestall a financial crisis, but such an increase may not be feasible given lean budgets. Obviously, the department and the campus administration must ponder their responses to this impending shortfall.

1. Strengths and Weaknesses

In this section we comment on the Department’s self-assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. We believe the Department has done a good job of evaluating its strengths and weaknesses in its self-study report.

Quality of the instruction, research and service associated with the department

Instruction. An important strength of the Department is its creativity in addressing its undergraduate teaching mission. The introduction of clinical faculty, refinements to the undergraduate curriculum, and the new degree program in International Economics and Modern Languages are manifestations of this strength. We anticipate that over the next review period the Department will focus this creativity on its PhD and especially Master’s program (see below).

Research and Funding. The Department has successfully employed a strategy of leveraging center-generated grant and contract research funding to grow its faculty and graduate programs. However, this strategy comes at a potential cost, as noted above. The Department faces a challenge in using its funding in a way that better supports the research activities of faculty whose affiliation with the centers is less central to their research agendas.

Service. Professional and internal service seem appropriate to a department of this size and scope.

Centrality of the programs to the university

While the programs are clearly central to the AYS and the university, the Department faces a challenge in meeting the university’s goal of interdisciplinarity. It seems to us an attainable and desirable objective to increase joint appointments and collaboration with the other department in the AYS as well the business school.

Viability of programs

The Department’s success in attracting more undergraduate majors and master’s degree candidates has created additional pressure on the teaching resources in the department. The viability of the PhD program relies on funding from the research centers.
Strategic focus

We believe that the Department has done a great job of focusing on a few key research areas. Links to other programs and departments could be strengthened. Several faculty suggested expanding into an additional area (industrial organization) that is complementary to existing strengths.

Financial resource analysis

As mentioned previously, the research center model has strengths and weaknesses, already well discussed. We elaborate further in section 7 below.

2. Historical and Current Context

Over its relatively short history, Georgia State’s Economics Department has done extremely well relative to its peer institutions. Good leadership, the decision to focus on a limited number of fields, and a strategy to leverage financial support gained from extensive involvement in policy-related activities has advanced the Department to a leading position in the state system and to a degree of national recognition in the discipline. Since the formation of the School of Policy Studies in 1996, the Department has grown remarkably in stature and recognition. While we raise questions elsewhere about the current transitional problems facing the department and to some extent about the long-term sustainability of this model, we recognize and commend the achievements to date.

While greater faculty involvement with the research centers has supported the centers’ programs and facilitated growth in the faculty and graduate programs, this has not been without cost, as discussed above. The Department has succeeded in its goal to increase faculty involvement, and much has been gained by this approach, but to some extent at the expense of shaping faculty research towards work that is more difficult to place in top journals.

In addition to research, a good economics department must meet standards in terms of teaching the subject to non-majors, developing good undergraduate majors and a sound graduate program. We believe the Department has worked hard to develop programs that are relevant to the current context in the school. These include a solid undergraduate program, bolstered by the highly-successful introduction of clinical faculty whose charge is solely teaching, and by careful attention to offering courses for non-majors. The introduction of a new major in International Economics and Foreign Languages has attracted a previously unaddressed population of majors, and has increased undergraduate enrolment. The PhD program has increased in size, and clearly is a leading program in the south. The Master’s program also has grown. We provide suggestions below on how the Master’s program might exploit strengths in the AYS to move toward a more policy-oriented product that might better meet the needs of the community. On the whole, however, we think the department has done a good job in meeting the needs of students, the community, and the profession.

In general, the number, composition and research productivity of the faculty are appropriate. However, as we note elsewhere in this report, some changes in each of these aspects would both help the department meet its goals more satisfactorily and sustain and improve the department’s ranking. In
particular, since the department is at a critical stage in the ‘life cycle’ of its faculty, it will need to make some critical appointments in the near future.

The peer institutions chosen by the Department are the University of Georgia, Emory University, Florida State University, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, and George Washington University. These institutions were chosen because of their similarity to Georgia State in ranking and location, which are reasonable criteria for choice. The Department compares very well with them: it is one of the larger economics departments in the south, has strong research productivity relative to its peers, and has a very high level of external funding compared with its peers. However, given the focus of the department on a few specific fields, it also might be useful in future to consider field focus as one of the criteria for selecting peers.

3. Progress toward goals and objectives

In this section we are asked to assess the Department’s success in meeting its goals and objectives as stated in its previous review. These goals include: increasing the external ranking of the Department by increasing publications in leading journals and research funding; increasing the quality and enrollment in the undergraduate degree, and improving teaching quality for majors and non-majors; increasing the size of the graduate program while maintaining quality; and improve service by increasing outreach.

From a strictly disciplinary perspective, an academic economics program is properly assessed primarily from the perspective of its contribution to academic research, and the Department has rightly focused on enhancing quality research publications and external funding to achieve its goal of increasing its ranking among economics departments. Its success in improving the external perceptions of the Department is notable. Publication in top outlets has increased, but at the same time the research portfolio of the department is much more “applied” than a standard economics department. This focus on policy-oriented research is deliberate, but it means that a larger portion of research publications are in journals that are not in the top-ranked research outlets that are recognized by other, more mainstream departments. External research funding in the Department is much higher than its peer group, but much of this is contract research rather than basic research funding. In this respect the research portfolio of the Department more closely resembles traditional resource or agricultural economics departments, rather than the peers chosen by the Department. Recently, however, basic research funding has been significantly expanded as a result of new senior appointments in labor and experimental, and the activities of the Center for Experimental Economics. We are aware that plans are underway to develop a center focused on labor economics, to staff a newly-approved center for risk and insurance, and that there is a move to try to secure a Census data center.

On the whole, the Department has done well in reaching its goals to improve its instructional programs. In particular, the recruitment of full-time clinical faculty who focus on undergraduate teaching (in lieu of relying increasingly on part-time instructors) has had very favorable results in both improving undergraduate teaching, and freeing more research time for tenure-track faculty. Similarly, the Department has done a good job of refining the undergraduate curriculum, including the
development of a popular capstone course (also taught by clinical faculty), and the development of an innovative and popular new major, International Economics and Modern Languages. This new program illustrates the Department’s role in contributing to and improving undergraduate instruction at the University. On the whole, the Department appears to have made considerable progress toward its goal of improving undergraduate teaching and deserves support in expanding and improving these efforts.

At the graduate level, the Department has grown considerably. Although it has not reached its goal of supporting 20 PhD students per year, it has exceeded its goal for master’s recruitment, with about 25 enrolling in the program since 2006. (However, note while the number of applicants was steady at about 70 and the number of accepted students also steady at about 40, the number who enrolled in FY2008 was sharply down from about 30 in the previous two years to 16.) The centers are the primary source of the major increase in funding for graduate students – both in the number of students funded and the level of support. Clinical faculty have been effectively utilized to improve the teaching skills of graduate teaching assistants, though some graduate students seemed to feel that this training could benefit from some fine-tuning to address the differential needs of the students. Teaching training is also likely to improve the marketability of graduate students, many of whom are likely to seek positions in teaching-focused institutions such as liberal arts colleges.

In its self-study, the Department notes that it has not succeeded in hiring as many clinical and research faculty as set out in its 2003 plan. As noted elsewhere, we think that at least one additional clinical faculty member and, if the center model is to be both sustainable and compatible with improving research quality, in all likelihood several research professors would bring the Department to a more appropriate staffing level.

The Department’s self-study document also emphasizes the need for more funding to attract more and better Ph.D. students. As we discuss later, although we are less convinced that larger stipends are the major concern, we certainly agree that some increased support in various forms would help strengthen and improve the graduate program.

4. Quality of the Curriculum

Undergraduate Programs

The Economics Department has implemented two positive changes to the curriculum for undergraduate students. First, in 2006, the Department instituted a new degree program International Economics and Modern Languages (IEML). This program provides students with the tools to conduct basic economic analysis along with an intermediate-level competency in French, German or Spanish. This degree program is designed to appeal to students desiring to use economic analysis in an international context. This has proved to be a very popular degree program. Second, the Department has developed a new course, Econ 4999 Senior Capstone in Economic Policy, which is now a required course for all undergraduate economics majors (except for IEML students). The course uses the basic tools of economics to analyze current economic issues. This course is a Critical Thinking Through Writing course. This innovation is important because it teaches students how to apply the tools of economic analysis as well as develop their writing skills.
Students appeared to appreciate very much the capstone course. However, they desired to have two sections of the course offered at different times rather than offering both at the same time to better accommodate student schedules.

**Graduate Programs**

An additional econometrics course has been added to the Master’s curriculum. This is an important development since many of the jobs for master’s students require strong quantitative skills. This change will help improve the job prospects for the program’s graduates.

One issue with regard to the curriculum for Master’s students is a lack of guidance about which track to take in the program (i.e., the policy track or the traditional track). Given the difficulty in switching tracks after starting the program, it would be useful to provide more information early on to students regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the two tracks.

Previously, the Ph.D. program required more course work than programs at peer institutions. The department has reduced the number of micro core theory courses from 3 to 2 and eliminated summer courses from the program. This has enabled Ph.D. students to devote more time to preparing for their comprehensive exams and to pursue their own research projects. However there was some uncertainty regarding the value of the secondary field requirement, and the availability of courses to satisfy the requirements. (The faculty are aware of this need, which is addressed in the Goals section of the self-study.) Students mentioned that allowing courses outside the department to be taken for credit would be desirable. In addition, the students expressed a desire for more rigor in the theory courses.

It is important to note that students uniformly thought there was good interaction between students and the faculty.

5. **Quality of the Students**

**Undergraduate Program**

The undergraduate economics majors at GSU consistently have a SAT score that is above the university average. This appears to be the result of the B.A. degree requiring foreign language courses and the B.S. degree requiring elementary statistics and two semesters of calculus.

**M.A. Program**

The M.A. program has a mixed outcome over the last three years. On one hand, the number of students entering the M.A. program was sharply down in 2008. If this pattern continues, the Department will want to diagnose the cause of the dropoff. On the other hand, the quality of students has risen significantly over this period. Among enrolled students, the mean quantitative GRE score rose by 40 points and the mean verbal GRE score rose by 77 points. The mean undergraduate GPA also rose, reaching an average of 3.32 in the last two years.
Ph.D. Program

The Ph.D. program has had a mixed outcome as well. The number of enrolled students has stayed fairly constant. Interestingly, nearly all of the accepted students enroll, which is unusual for programs similar to GSU. However, the quality measures yield mixed results. The GRE scores of new students appear to have fallen somewhat in the last three years, and now may be below those of comparison programs. On a positive note, the average undergraduate GPA of enrolled students and the quality of the placements of graduates has been rising over time.

6. Quality of the Faculty

Clinical Faculty

We feel the clinical faculty are very effective and have improved substantially the level of undergraduate education at GSU. This is the results of the clinical dedication to undergraduate instruction and the use of innovative teaching techniques. Students appeared to appreciate very much the efforts of the clinical faculty.

The clinical faculty have responsibilities which extend beyond teaching. These include mentoring graduate assistants and providing advising to undergraduate students.

Tenure Track Faculty

The department is highly ranked relative to their peer institutions with regards to publications in referred journals. Based on data which ended in 2004, the department was ranked number one in Georgia, 9th in the Southeast, and 50th in the U.S. The department ranks highly in the areas in which it has specialized in: urban economics, public economics, natural resource economics, experimental economics, and labor economics. Furthermore, during the last several years its performance, particularly among recently-hired faculty, has been outstanding, and this is not yet reflected in the department’s external reputation or rankings.

The department has been every effective at generating external funds for its research. For 2005 through 2007, external grants totaled $17.7 million or about $500,000 per graduate faculty member (though in practice funding is highly concentrated among a few faculty). The most recent NSF report covers 2006 and ranks the department 8th in the U.S. for federally funded R&D expenditures. This ranking is higher than the department’s peer group.

Overall, productivity varies across faculty, but is generally acceptable to outstanding. Some faculty have are participating in considerable amounts of contract work which have limited opportunity for academic publications. As a result, their research output has been reduced.

One concern expressed to us by several faculty members was the need to clarify the way in which center activity was evaluated and in particular how it entered into promotion and tenure decisions. It appears that appointment letters explicitly referred to the fact that such activity was expected, but that the current promotion and tenure guidelines made no reference to it. Junior faculty in the tenure
stream appeared to be uncertain and confused about this issue and also concerned about how to balance center commitments with publications needed for tenure. Indeed, one recent negative tenure decision was quite puzzling to us as outsiders. While we discuss this issue at more length in the introduction, at the very least it would seem desirable both to make the guidelines clearer in this respect and also to require center directors to provide formal evaluations of center-related work to promotion and tenure committees whenever relevant.

7. Resource Adequacy

Faculty resources

The Department has done a great job of expanding its undergraduate and master’s program with modest increases in state funding. Like many universities that have expanded faculty in recent years, the Economics Department faces a problem of salary “compression” in the sense that recent hires are often paid more than those hired a few years ago and in some cases perhaps even more than those at more senior ranks. Obviously, this situation is not good for faculty morale. Some additional core funding seems necessary to address this issue as well as to support faculty in developing and carrying through more grant applications.

However, absent substantial gifts from outside donors – always to be hoped for, but never counted on -- the most critical factor in maintaining and improving its present commendable disciplinary reputation is likely to continue to be the ability to sustain and even increase the level of ‘soft’ support from the substantial policy research activities presently carried out mainly through the centers. Elsewhere we have indicated some of the current and anticipated difficulties arising from integrating such research with the more purely academic work of faculty, and made some suggestions that may help in developing a strategy to deal with this central issue facing the Department in the immediate future.

Teaching resources

Modest additional resources may be required to satisfy the teaching objectives of the Department as discussed above. First, an additional clinical faculty member would definitely help the undergraduate teaching program. Secondly, as noted in the next section, additional core faculty would strengthen both the graduate program and the research productivity of the department. In particular, adding strength in theory would be valuable for the training of graduate students, though care must be taken to integrate a theorist into the applied research environment in the Department. Finally, as also discussed elsewhere, more ‘research associates’ – however labeled - are almost certainly needed if the unique department-center model is to continue to sustain and be compatible with an improved disciplinary ranking for the department.

Support (administrative, technological, laboratory, and library resources)

On the whole, supporting resources seem adequate, although some graduate students understandably asked both for better space and more adequate computers. However, more
administrative support would likely be needed if the department expands its graduate advisory and placement services as it envisages in the self-study document. In addition, we were informed that the department is working with others to obtain a Census Data Center. Should this desirable initiative succeed, some additional support would likely be needed.

8. Goals and objectives

In this section, we are asked to comment on the appropriateness of the goals set by the department in its self-study. These are organized as the Department has presented them.

Teaching:

Goal 1. Increase the quality and size of our PhD program

At the Ph.D. level, it seems to us that further expansion of both quality and the size of its program will require a level of additional faculty positions and student support that may be very hard to achieve in the current economic climate. Choices will have to be made. From a disciplinary perspective, the right strategy would almost certainly be to choose quality over volume: that is, to focus available staff and financial resources in developing the quality of the graduate program in the Department’s chosen ‘focus’ areas in order to attract the best-quality students rather than dissipating efforts in an attempt to meet an arbitrary quantitative intake target. In addition, more attention should be devoted to developing strong relationships with other units of the University (or other Universities in the area) in a way that builds on the Department’s strength. For example, the Department could qualify more appropriate non-department courses as eligible for graduate credit (as suggested by several of the graduate students we interviewed). In addition, as mentioned above, additional faculty in theory would strengthen the core microeconomic theory graduate course offerings as well as the overall quality of the Department.

Goal 2. Increase focus on the master’s program.

Similarly, at the Master’s level, where most students are likely to go directly to employment as economists for public and private institutions, a clearer focus on specialization in program evaluation and policy analysis as well as more coordination with the sister department (PMAP) in the School could exploit synergies to attract high-quality, policy-oriented students. Moves in these directions could improve and distinguish the Georgia State ‘product’ from others in the region. If the Department decides to further strengthen its Master’s program by making greater efforts to develop internship and placement programs, some modest additional staff resources may be necessary.

Goal 3. Continue to improve the undergraduate program.

The department has, with limited resources, done a commendable job to date in improving the undergraduate program. As we mention elsewhere, an additional clinical faculty member would help a great deal in sustaining and furthering this activity.
Creative and scholarly activity:

Goal 1. Increase national recognition of scholarship.

As discussed previously, increasing the national recognition of scholarship requires more publication visibility in top mainstream economics journals. Achieving this goal is somewhat at odds with the applied research orientation and requirement of extensive center involvement. Recent hires who have more typical academic orientations will improve rankings, but further progress in this area may require rethinking the role and rewards for center participation. Success in attracting a Census data center would be a major step in this direction. Investment in faculty development and more careful mentoring of junior faculty to help produce quality publications and attract external funding to support their research are also likely to pay off in this respect.

The strategy of building the Department by attracting well-known senior faculty has paid off for the Department. However, in the absence of major gifts, such a strategy may not be possible in the near future. To pursue this strategy long-term it may be necessary to focus for the next few years on building relationships with local organizations that have the potential to provide such gifts in the future.

In addition this strategy does tend to create predictable problems in a Department, which can be addressed. It seems to us that the Department contains accomplished senior faculty, whose attention is focused on their centers and their research, as well as promising junior faculty. But its associate professors need some attention. Because the senior faculty are committed to their centers, much of the work of running the department appears to fall on a few associate professors, some of whom have been in rank for some time. Salary inversion exacerbates the problem. We note the time-consuming task of Department head has been given to an associate professor, which is not ideal.

Goal 2. Increase outside funding

Increasing external funding is always desirable. Pursuit of this goal is more likely to improve the department’s visibility and ranking if it focuses on basic research such as NSF and NIH funded projects. We note that several faculty members believe that external funding that is not center-related is less valued by the Department.

Goal 3. Clarify relationship to centers

A unique feature of the build-up of the Department in recent years has been its focus on (as well as its financial dependence on) the large and successful activities of its major policy centers. Elsewhere we discuss the sustainability of this model in the face of both impending moves of senior faculty and the tension some perceive between the center emphasis and higher-profile scholarship. One strategy for relieving the perceived tension would be to develop further the ‘research’ track in a manner similar to that done for ‘clinical’ faculty. The current centers are unduly reliant on the efforts of a few senior people to secure funding, and on tenure-track faculty to deliver outputs. There may be a need for a small group of full-time active policy researchers – staff associates or ‘research professors’ – who could take on more of the considerable work load of the policy centers.
This strategy would emulate the model adopted a few years ago by Duke’s policy school and earlier followed by Harvard in appointing ‘professors of the practice’ or ‘lecturer and research associates’, respectively, recognized or promising faculty who prefer to work in policy-related activities and are hired on a multi-year contract basis, supported by project activities. In addition, several other approaches by which the department can sustain its current structure might also be examined. We collect here some of the ideas/recommendations mentioned throughout the report. Untenured faculty should, as a rule, only be involved in contract research work when it relates clearly to their scholarly interests and supports establishing a sustained research agenda.

- All faculty engaged in contract activities should be encouraged to develop the ‘deliverables’ required into papers for submission to academic journals whenever possible. To facilitate doing so, careful mentoring in conjunction with a larger buyout of teaching time than is currently offered may be needed.
- Faculty engaged in contract work should be encouraged and supported in applying for additional funding (e.g. NSF or other) to extend such work in directions more likely to yield academic papers whenever possible.
- Policy forums hosted by the centers have resulted in generally well-reviewed scholarly books. When possible, we suggest that junior authors be encouraged to submit revised versions of their conference papers to appropriate academic journals. The additional work (and possibly time delay) needed to succeed in such efforts might in at least some cases prove well worthwhile, given the value that the profession places on journal articles over book chapters.

Goal 4. Organize strategy for progress in areas of excellence

We agree that a major strategy planning exercise would be useful for the Department as it considers its path forward. We have done little more than identify areas of potential concern, and the faculty must decide its priorities in moving toward greater visibility and higher ranking in the profession. The tasks include identifying its core areas (including any new ones), addressing the sustainability and future of the center model, and exploring ways to increase research quality and productivity. Moreover, since at the faculty level there appears to be some sense of ‘balkanization’ along center lines, consideration should be given to appropriate ways to reach agreement on the future of the department as a whole.

Service

The goal of expanding service and outreach by organizing forums and roundtable discussions on policy issues seems reasonable. These forums acknowledge and build upon the notable regional, national and international reputation for professional service that is due primarily to the quality and commitment of the Economics Department faculty to these activities. This is an important part of the Department’s service portfolio, and should be acknowledged and discussed as such. We agree that these should not be focused locally, but should seek a broader audience.