

Academic Program Review Self Study
Department of Economics

Table of Contents

Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses 2

 Quality of the instruction, research, and service associated with the department 2

 Centrality of the programs to the university 3

 Viability of programs..... 4

 Strategic focus 4

 Financial resource analysis..... 5

Section B: Historical and Current Contexts..... 5

 Department overview: faculty, research, teaching 5

 Evidence of program relevance and the degree to which community, student and professional needs are served by the program 6

 Information on programs at other institutions 7

Section C: Progress towards goals and objectives 7

 Action Plan as of 2003..... 9

 Budget..... 9

 Teaching 10

 Research: Creative and Scholarly Activity..... 11

 Service and Outreach..... 11

Section D: Curricula Quality 12

 Undergraduate Program..... 12

 Graduate Program..... 14

 Survey Results 16

Section E: Student Quality 17

 Undergraduate Program: Economics Majors 17

 Master of Arts in Economics 17

 Ph.D. in Economics 18

Section F: Faculty Quality..... 19

 Quality and quantity of scholarly and creative productivity 19

 Faculty honors 20

 Results of promotion and tenure and reviews 21

 Dollar level and source of sponsored research 21

 Community involvement – service and outreach contributions 21

 AYS collaboration and collaboration across universities..... 22

Section G: Resource Adequacy..... 23

 Faculty Resources..... 23

 Administrative Resources..... 23

 Technological Resources..... 23

 Space Resources 24

 Laboratory Resources..... 24

 GSU Foundation Resources..... 24

 Library Resources..... 24

Section H: Goals and Objectives 25

 Teaching 25

 Creative and Scholarly Activity 27

 Service 30

Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses*Quality of the instruction, research, and service associated with the department*
Strengths**INSTRUCTION**

The department has a core group of clinical professors focused on providing exceptional undergraduate teaching and advisement. The new Global Economy course was instantly successful and is now a core curriculum course offered in multiple sections every semester (seven sections in fall 2008). Also, the department has developed an innovative major, International Economics and Modern Languages (IEML). This addition has increased the total number of declared Economics majors in the department.

Now required for all newly declared undergraduate economics majors is a newly developed course, Econ 4999 Senior Capstone in Economic Policy (a Critical Thinking through Writing course). Each fall, the department provides a workshop on credit card use; this workshop, aimed primarily at freshmen, informs students of the risks and benefits of credit cards. Finally, we have expanded our course offerings in the university honors program.

At the graduate level, the department has continued to deepen its core fields adding senior scholars in labor and experimental economics. Since the previous review, we have increased the quality of the students enrolled in our Master's program, as measured by the increase in the test scores of our incoming students. Additionally, the quality of job placements of the graduates of our Ph.D. program continues to improve (see Section E). This was also a goal of our previous strategic plan.

RESEARCH & FUNDING

Faculty research and publication is a measurable strength of the department. As presented in Section F, the department is ranked number one in faculty productivity in Georgia and 9th in the Southeast and 50th in the nation (out of a total of 129 ranked departments with Ph.D. programs).

The department's faculty is very successful at generating external funding. In the three years covered by this report, the faculty has generated \$17.7 million in new grants.

The Economics Department ranked 8th among all economics departments in *federally* financed R&D research (NSF tabulation for 2006), this is substantially higher than that of our peer institutions. NSF's tabulation of *all* R&D expenditures by department ranks GSU's Economics Department 14th nationally.

SERVICE

Members of the department's faculty are recognized in the profession, as evidenced by being asked to serve as editor or co-editor of academic journals; six different journals are edited or co-edited by the department's faculty. Several faculty members hold prestigious research associate positions at the National Bureau of Economic Research, and all research faculty perform refereeing activities for academic journals. Faculty also are recognized by the non-academic policy community as evidenced by the numerous awards and honors received by members of our faculty and from the board seats and other advisory roles held by our faculty members (see Section F).

The activities of the research centers have increased the opportunities for our faculty to be engaged in actual policy work and outreach activities, both domestically and internationally.

Faculty service to the department, college, university, and professional and non-academic communities continue to grow as reported by data in Table F-1. The department's outreach activities include work with important state and local policy makers (e.g., the General Assembly,

Governor Perdue, Mayor Shirley Franklin), universities throughout the U.S. and abroad, and other national and international institutions, including the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the United States Agency for International Development and the United Nations.

Weaknesses

The department is strained to meet demand for undergraduate classes. This is evidenced by the number of classes that are taught by part-time instructors.

We have not achieved our goal of increasing the quality of our entering Ph.D. students insofar as it is measured by the GRE scores of students entering the program. This is a consequence, at least in part, of increasing the size of the program and our inability to offer stipends that are competitive with offers from other universities (revisited in sections of this report).

Many faculty feel that travel funds and grant development support are limited, thus reducing the opportunities to present their research, develop relationships with faculty in other universities, and seek out and develop grant applications.

Faculty sometimes face time conflicts due to the competing demands for their time with regard to center activities and academic research because some center activities do not have a direct tie to academic research. This has led to a concern among some faculty over the appropriate mix of activities that lead to tenure and promotion.

Centrality of the programs to the university

Strengths

The school's mission is met by the department through academic publications and presentations, outreach to the policy and business community, and teaching. Our success in each of these areas is documented in the following sections.

The department also contributes to the over-all mission of Georgia State University. Economics plays its part as a focused area with strong peer ratings (see above and Section F). Two of the university's specific goals are to further the aims of "graduate and research programs with national and global recognition that benefit the interests of the state and region" and to serve "as a resource to local, state and federal entities." Our programs benefit the state and region in a variety of ways. For example, the Fiscal Research Center provides nonpartisan research, technical assistance and education in the evaluation and design of state and local fiscal and economic policy, including both tax and expenditure issues. It hosts the State of Georgia's Fiscal Economist and its faculty and staff frequently provide input to the Governor and the state legislature.

Our department also contributes to undergraduate programs as noted above and through support of RCB and other schools within the university.

Weaknesses

Our department has been less successful in the university's call for interdisciplinary research and programs. We currently have no faculty with joint appointments outside the college. This is unfortunate given that many of our policy areas of focus are potentially inter-disciplinary in nature (e.g. health, urban and environmental policy). We have made some gains: the ISP has engaged three Political Science professors from the College of Arts and Sciences in its work in Egypt with USAID and Bruce Kaufman is a member of the W.T. Beebe Institute of Personnel and Employment Relations in the Robinson College of Business.

*Viability of programs***Strengths**

The number of undergraduate majors in economics (including economics majors in the Robinson College of Business) has increased from 475 in FY06 to 826 in FY08. We have successfully implemented a more binding time constraint on Ph.D. funding and this has increased the number of Ph.D.s awarded from 4 in FY06 to 22 in FY07 and 15 in FY08.

The number of degrees awarded in the master's programs has increased from 38 in FY06 to 43 in FY08.

Faculty members have been successful in funding an active Ph.D. program with funds from sponsored research and centers. Fifty percent of Ph.D. stipend funding comes from the university and 50 percent is generated via grant activity of the centers and faculty.

AYS's model of department and center-based activities has been successful in creating synergies and economies of scale in grant development, research collaboration, graduate student research and funding, and service. This model differentiates the department among other economics departments in an important way.

Weaknesses

The department loses some good quality graduate students to other universities due to the low level of our stipends and the lack of fringe benefits, especially health insurance. Also, further expansion of the Ph.D. program to approximately 20 students per year has not been accomplished. To date, the department does not have the resources to support this expansion in terms of competitive stipends and benefits as well as the necessary net increase in faculty in core areas.

Over the last three years, we have had a net increase of 3 tenure-track faculty. We are facing more senior retirements and/or movement to responsibilities. With the increased enrollment, student-teacher ratios are higher than at some peer institutions (see Section G) and the dissertation load in the core-applied fields is high for faculty in those areas.

Given the nature of grants, sponsored funding is not always smooth in terms of budget. The department relies heavily on grants to provide faculty buy outs that help pay for graduate students and other activities of the department. The ability to leverage these resources over the next five years is limited unless we engage more faculty to participate in grant activities.

*Strategic focus***Strengths**

The university's action plan specifies the goals of becoming a premier resource for analyses of problems facing the citizens of Georgia and the pre-eminent think-tank in the South on policy issues. Many of the university's policy goals and decisions have economic dimensions, often requiring expertise of the economics faculty.

The Economics Department continues to focus on five core areas (labor, public finance, urban/regional, environmental, and experimental methods). These core areas are consistent both with the university's mission and the mission of a policy school.

We continue to play an important role in contributing to the education in the Business School with our course offerings for its programs. The IEML program serves a growing demand for the internationalization of the curriculum. The program has been successful in attracting new economics majors.

The M.A. program, which is often linked to the work done by the International Studies Program, has been successful in bringing large number of international students who are either self-sponsored or sponsored by their governments. This has contributed to the school's goal of

becoming more diverse internationally and strengthening the school's international connections and the reputation.

Weaknesses

In line with the school's interdisciplinary interests, the existing synergies between the Economics Department and the Public Management and Policy Department could be strengthened further to advance joint collaborations on research and course offerings.

The department could compete more in the study abroad market. The department should be in an advantageous position to start study abroad programs in countries like, among others, China, Indonesia, India and Jamaica and collaborations with other departments in the university can be strengthened including Criminal Justice, Education and Political Science.

Financial resource analysis

Strengths

During CY05, 2006 and 2007, Department of Economics faculty was awarded external grants and contracts with a total value of \$17.7 million. (See Appendix F-5.) The total state appropriation (FC 10 funds) to the department for FY05, 2006 and 2007 was \$10.3 million. In this way, the department was a major profit center for the university: the ratio of external grants and contracts to state appropriation was above 1.72.

Revenue from academic-year course buy outs associated with grants is used primarily to provide funding for graduate students. During FY07 – FY09, the total dollar amounts of academic-year course buy outs was \$334,669 in FY07, \$281,057 in FY08, and \$286,619 in FY09.

The department was very productive in its use of state appropriations for generating student credit hours. Total student credit hours during FY06, 2007 and 2008 were 68,947. (See Table B-5 in the Appendix.) Student credit hours per thousand dollars of state appropriations were above 6.3. During FY05 to FY07, faculty publications increased by 43 percent while state appropriations to the department during that time increased by 24.5 percent.

Weaknesses

Awards of research grants and contracts were concentrated among a relatively small proportion of senior faculty.

Section B: Historical and Current Contexts

Department overview: faculty, research, teaching

When Georgia State College was established in 1955, economics was in the College of Business Administration as part of the Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics. Its faculty at that time numbered 21. In 1961, Finance and Statistics was split off, leaving the Department of Economics as a separate unit, with 11 faculty members. The department began offering a Ph.D. program in 1965. By 1970, the size of the department had more than doubled to 27 faculty members. A substantial proportion of this increase in faculty was driven by the growth of the Urban Life program, and many of the new faculty taught urban economics.

In the following years, the Department of Economics offered a major within the B.B.A. degree, as well as a B.A. degree through the College of Arts and Sciences. It provided a substantial service role since all undergraduate business majors had to take Principles of Economics (a requirement that is still in place), and all M.B.A. students, until recently, had to take two eco-

nomics courses. In addition, the department offered urban economics to a growing number of Urban Life students. When the university started offering a master's degree in governmental administration (a degree that eventually became the M.P.A. degree), the department taught the required economics course in that program. Throughout the 1970s and most of the 1980s, the junior core electives for the B.B.A. degree were narrowly defined, and included two economics courses, money and banking, and labor economics.

From 1970 to the late 1980s, the emphasis on research as well as the quality of the faculty and of the Ph.D. students increased. In 1988, the College of Business Administration established the Policy Research Program. This event initiated a major change in the function and level of activity within the department. Within three years, several new faculty members were hired, research productivity increased more rapidly, and there was an increased focus on recruiting high quality Ph.D. students.

In 1996, a decision was made at the university level to disband the College of Public and Urban Affairs and to form the School of Policy Studies. As part of this plan, the Department of Economics was moved from the College of Business Administration to the new School of Policy Studies. The department continues its role of teaching service courses, but it now offers a B.A. and B.S. in Economics through the AYS. It also continues to offer a B.B.A. in Economics in the College of Business Administration. It was at this time that the department decided to focus on four subareas, strengthening those areas in which it already had recognized strength and focusing on policy issues within these four subareas. In addition to a substantial increase in research output, as documented in Appendix F, there was a major change in the composition of the faculty. Of the current faculty members, 14 were not here when the school was formed. Since then the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty has grown significantly to today's total of 29.

Until 2004, the faculty was spread between two different locations in the campus (the Urban Life and the RCB Buildings). In 2004, the department moved into the school's new building, which now houses the economics and the PMAP departments as well as various centers.

The economics department currently offers the following two undergraduate degrees: Bachelor of Arts with a major in Economics and Bachelor of Arts with a major in International Economics and Modern Languages (IEML). At the graduate level the department offers an M.A. program and an M.A. program with policy track as well as a Ph.D. program. In addition to these programs, there are two undergraduate degrees (B.S. with a major in economics and a B.B.A. with a major in economics) and an M.S. program with a major in business economics that are administered by the business school. The most recent of these programs is the IEML program, which started in 2006.

The Academic Program Review for the Economics Department will cover the period of 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 (fiscal or calendar years as data are available). We cover up to 4 years in certain areas to provide adequate comparative information. Our last report was submitted in 2005 but did not cover 2005 in total and this report drafting began in late summer 2008 (the 2009 fiscal year).

Evidence of program relevance and the degree to which community, student and professional needs are served by the program

The Economics Department is an essential part of the university contributing significantly to its needs in the areas of research, teaching and service. As illustrated in Table B-6 (found in the appendix), the annual average credit hours have exhibited an upward trend over the review period while the graduate credit hours have remained about constant. The number of undergraduate majors increased from 161 in 2006 to 319 in 2008. The certificate program, the

re-institution of the Economics tutoring laboratory, and the increased use of technology in the classrooms are just a few examples of how the program serves student needs. Other achievements are discussed in Sections D, E and F.

Information on programs at other institutions

In term of the number of tenure-track faculty, the Economics Department at GSU ranks towards the high end of the group compared to its peers. The economics departments at our peers have the following numbers of faculty: 16 at UGA, 21 at Emory, 15 at U of Tennessee, 13 at Southern Carolina, 28 at FSU and 30 at GWU. In terms of the number of undergraduate majors, our peers have the following figures: 170 at UGA, 405 at Emory, 114 at Tennessee, 257 at Southern Carolina, and 412 in the fall and 450 in the spring at FSU. In terms of the number of graduate majors, the Economics Department at GSU has 130 students compared to 29 at UGA, 20 at South Carolina, 70 at FSU and 100 at GWU. These figures indicate that while the Economics Department at GSU compares relatively well with its peers in terms of its number of tenure-track faculty, the number of graduate and undergraduate students per tenure-track faculty is usually higher than its peer institutions due to the relatively large numbers of undergraduate and graduate majors. The number of undergraduate majors per tenure-track faculty has increased every year between 2006 and 2008.

Section C: Progress towards goals and objectives

The Department of Economics Action Plan in 2003 was derived from the department self-study, the chair's supporting and overview letter, the dean's overview report, the External Review Team Report and the APACE report. The Action Plan was approved by everyone.

Our former progress report stated that we were in the process of:

Continuing to emphasize research activities and faculty hiring in demonstrated "areas of excellence," especially areas that complement the various research centers of the AYS. The Economics Department has met this goal. We have developed a fifth area of excellence in the field of experimental economics. We hired faculty over the past five years that complement the research activities of the department and the various research centers. The following hires have specific ties to the centers and areas of excellence: Spencer Banzhaf and Kurt Schnier (Environmental), Jon Rork and Andrew Hanson (Domestic Programs), James Cox, Todd Swarthout and Vjollca Sadiraj (Experimental), Jim Marton (Health Policy), Jenny Lighthart (Visiting Professor, International), and Barry Hirsch and Rachana Bhatt (Labor).

Encouraging greater faculty involvement in the research centers of the AYS by providing incentives to faculty to work on center projects and by making such involvement part of the faculty (and center director) evaluation. Incentives to faculty to work on center projects are largely at the discretion of the center directors. Most faculty actively working on external projects carried out by the various centers receive course releases to buy out time, or provide summer support for the time spent on a particular project. Centers also support faculty via research buy outs. We have made mixed progress towards making center involvement part of faculty and center director evaluations. Annual evaluations report on center involvement and evaluation letters from the department chair speak to this, but it is not part of our department's tenure and promotion criteria.

Improving graduate student funding using resources provided by AYS fundraising activities, especially through the Dean's Fellowships and the Andrew Young Fellowships. We have made substantial progress in this area, although our offers still do not, on average, match competing institutions – details are provided below.

Improving undergraduate and graduate programs. In 2003-04, the department tried the strategy of offering large principles lectures, with much smaller breakout sections; this strategy was not successful. Principles classes were scheduled for M-W-F, with two lectures given by the instructor and smaller discussion sections led by TAs. GSU students were very averse to signing up for three day a week classes, and we dropped the idea after about two tries.

Another way we thought to improve our programs was with increased offerings of Perspectives courses. We have accomplished this in two ways. First, the Global Economy courses were changed from Perspectives courses to a regular Economics course in the 2003-04 academic year. In addition, we introduced a number of other Perspectives courses, including Contemporary Economics and Policy Issues, Science and Technology, and Comparative Culture (Economics for Life). In the fall of 2005, 117 students enrolled in two Perspectives courses. In the spring of 2007, 41 students enrolled in one Perspectives course. We are in the process of creating a new course: Common Sense Economics, to be offered in either fall 2009 or spring 2010.

We continue to offer the Summer Intern Program for rising seniors funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation. We established a South Africa Study Abroad Program jointly with Morehouse College. To develop an understanding of South Africa's role in the global marketplace, the program participants are engaged in a series of lectures, in-country discussions with industry and public officials, and site visits.

The department has re-instituted the Economics tutoring laboratory for undergraduates. The tutoring lab is a regular feature of our undergraduate programs. It is open for business about 25 hours per week and is staffed by our doctoral students. Finally, the department has streamlined and updated its course offerings in a number of ways and the detailed information is provided in Sections D and E.

Improving graduate teaching assistant and part-time instructor training. Building on its prior GTA mentoring program, the department has instituted a formal training program for GTAs. There is no formal training program for PTIs.

Improving the faculty development and mentoring program to help junior faculty make the transition to productive tenured senior faculty – there is no formal program in place, but most senior faculty make an effort to spend time with junior faculty.

Developing collaborative programs with other universities, in Georgia, in other states and in other countries. A number of collaborative programs have been in place over the years. As previously mentioned, we offer a study abroad opportunity that is a collaborative program with Morehouse College. The International Studies Program has coordinated programs with Anambra State University in Nigeria, offers training programs bringing together faculty from economics, public administration, political science and education, and also offers the Summer School in Public Economics with renowned public finance professors from around the world. The Experimental Center has substantial connections with faculty in other universities (Emory, Agnes Scott and Kennesaw State for example).

Action Plan as of 2003

The following states the recommended items (all of which were strongly endorsed by the External Review Team) and indicates the extent to which each was accomplished.

More funding to hire 12 additional faculty (eight research lines in targeted areas and four teaching faculty)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We have worked toward achieving this goal by hiring Jim Cox, holder of the Noah Langdale, Jr. Chair of Economics as a replacement for Ron Cummings (retired), and Barry Hirsch, holder of the W.J. Usery Chair of the American Workplace, time series econometrician Yuriy Kitsul, public finance economists Jon Rork and Andrew Hanson, health economists Inas Rashad and Jim Marton, and public economists with an interest in international economics Klara Sabirianova-Peter and Jenny Lighthart (visitor). We have been fortunate to add Paul Kagunda and Grace O to our clinical faculty, so that we now have four clinical faculty members. We remain two short of our clinical hire goals and four short of our research faculty net additions.

Needed more funding to attract higher quality graduate students

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Our average stipends have risen from \$12,000 in 2002 (and that was for the year, not the academic year) to over \$16,000 per year. In 2004, the average amount increased to around \$15,000 annually. For the entering class of 2008, international students were awarded \$18,000 annually and domestic students received, on average, \$16,000 per year. In part, fellowships such as the Caroline Young Fellowship, and the Andrew Young Fellowship account for the increases. We have also made funds available so that graduate students can travel to conferences to present their research. Each doctoral student can apply for travel funds to present a paper at a professional conference.

More funding to provide better administrative support for graduate and undergraduate student programs

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We hired a single staff member to assist in the advisement of both undergraduate and graduate students. Faculty still spend substantial time on these tasks, especially advisement for courses and advisement for the placement of our graduate students. Our hire, Ms. Bess Blyler, advises students on program requirements.

Budget

The department faces difficulties in retaining productive faculty. The department needs additional salary support to address salary “compression.”

The department received some funds from the university to address salary compression in FY07, 2008 and 2009. These funds were augmented by discretionary funds from the dean’s office. The amounts are as follows:

FY07: \$200 (GSU), \$5,000 (dean’s office)

FY08: \$74,000 (GSU), \$10,000 (dean’s office)

FY09: \$24,000 (GSU), \$15,000 (dean’s office)

Although these funds were not sufficient to bring more senior assistant professors and associate professors up to market pay, they improved morale.

**Department of Economics Self-study for Academic Program Review,
Goals and Strategic Objectives (2003)**

*Teaching***Undergraduate Education****GOAL T1**

Prepare our undergraduate economics majors for graduate study in economics or for careers in the public, business or nonprofit sectors.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T1

Increase the quality of our undergraduate degree program: We have increased the quality of our undergraduate programs in several dimensions as discussed in Sections D and E.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T2

Assess the learning outcomes of our majors, as well as the success of our programs in meeting our primary goal: We have established learning outcomes for each course and for our economics majors. We also established a special course for all senior economics majors, Economics 4999, Senior Capstone Economic Policy. The details of these changes are provided in Sections D and E.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T3

Increase by 25 percent the number of undergraduate majors over the next five years, while maintaining academic standards: This goal has been met and surpassed, with a 44 percent increase in economics majors just since 2006. Further details are provided in Table B-3.

GOAL T2.

Provide non-economics majors who take economic courses with an understanding of the economic paradigm and a knowledge of economic institutions, both in the United States and elsewhere. There are three courses that are very often taken by non-majors: two principles courses, Econ 2105 and 2106, and the Global Economy course, Econ 2100. Details of all are provided in Section D.

GOAL T3.

Provide strong discipline-based elective courses in the core curriculum of GSU and service courses to other departments and colleges. Non-majors very frequently appear in all the 4000 level courses, including Econ 4080, History of Economic Thought; Econ 4210, Health Economics; Econ 4220, Environmental Economics; and Econ 4350, Economics of Poverty and Public Policy.

Graduate Education**GOAL T4.**

Increase the size of all of our graduate programs, while maintaining the academic quality of the students.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T4.

Over the next five years, increase the average annual size of the incoming class of Ph.D. students to 20 and increase the proportion of domestic students, while maintaining the current level of average entry test scores: The goal of 20 incoming Ph.D. students per year has not been attained, although the program has grown substantially since the time of the previous self-study. Additional information is provided in Section E.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T5.

Over the next five years, increase the average annual size of the incoming class of master's students to 20, while maintaining the current level of average entry test scores: Our goals have been achieved for master's students with the number of applicants averaging about 72 over the last three years and about 25 enrolling in the program each year since 2006. See details in Tables E.1 and E.2.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE T6.

Improve the job placement of all our graduates: The department has made substantive progress in improving job placements for our Ph.D. students as noted in Sections D and E.

*Research: Creative and Scholarly Activity***GOAL R1.**

Increase the external ranking of the Department of Economics to the top 50 of Ph.D.-granting departments.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE R1.

Increase the number of faculty publications in the leading general interest and field economic journals and in the top policy journals: We have certainly made substantial progress towards this goal as noted in Section F.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE R2.

Maintain the current amount of external funding and increase the number of faculty who prepare and are involved in proposals for external funding: Our progress here is extremely good as detailed in Section F.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE R3.

Increase the external recognition of the department: The Department of Economics has achieved substantially greater external recognition over the past five years as detailed in Section F.

*Service and Outreach***GOAL S1.**

Contribute to the strategic goals of the university, as well as to the enhancement of the reputation of the department, the AYS and the university.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE S1.

Maintain our current levels of service within the university, the AYS and the Department of Economics: The Economics Department faculty has stayed very active in departmental, college and university service activities.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE S2.

Expand our outreach activities to the external community (e.g., professional organizations, external stakeholders), so that the AYS maintains its position as the place that people approach for policy advice: Our faculty have been heavily involved in providing expertise to community groups, public school districts, state governments and international agencies. Details are provided in Section F.

Section D: Curricula Quality

Undergraduate Program

Degree Programs

The Department of Economics offers four undergraduate degrees in economics: B.A., B.S., B.B.A. and B.A. with a major in International Economics and Modern Languages. All students who are in good standing with the university may declare economics as their major and enroll in economics courses. The curriculum for each degree varies. (See Appendix D for the undergraduate curriculum, as well as the graduate curriculum, for all degrees.) In each undergraduate degree, the student takes 4 required courses: principles of microeconomics and macroeconomics, and intermediate microeconomics and macroeconomics. These four courses are the foundation courses upon which every sub-discipline in economics is built. In the B.A. and B.S. degree, students choose 18 hours of 4000-level economics courses (15 hours for the B.B.A. students) to complete their major requirements. Students must make a C or better in their economics courses for them to count toward their major.

Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

The department has several outcomes for the four undergraduate degree programs.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

- To demonstrate knowledge of basic theories, concepts and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics.
- To be able to apply theories, concepts and analytical methods of microeconomics and macroeconomics to specific fields of economics.
- To be able to identify the relevant benefits and costs to consider when comparing policy choices.
- To be able to communicate, using appropriate writing and oral conventions, basic economic theories, concepts, analytical methods and policy choices.

To implement these outcomes, the department has developed a new course, Econ 4999 Senior Capstone in Economic Policy, which is now required for all newly declared undergraduate economics majors (with the exception of the IEMML students). Basic tools and methods of economics are used to understand and analyze a variety of contemporary economic problems and policy issues. This course has been designated as a Critical Thinking through Writing course.

The objectives of the course are to integrate and solidify the student’s knowledge of economic theories, methods and reasoning and their application to contemporary economic problems and policy issues. In addition, emphasis is given to critical thinking skills, individual and team projects, effective oral and written communication, and effective use of computers and other modern information technology.

Assessment

To assess the learning outcomes of economics majors using Econ 4999, several measures were implemented.

Measure	Target	Finding
Tracking Exams	Average score on each exam > 60%	Micro TE 73% Macro TE 65%
Group Project	Average grade > 75%	Average grade 95%

Exams & Quizzes	Average score for each exam and all quizzes > 75%	Exam 1 88% Exam 2 85% Quizzes 93%
Book Review	Average grade > 75%	Average grade 90%
Student Portfolio	Average grade > 75%	Average grade 90%

The students assessed in Econ 4999 appear to be doing quite well, demonstrating competence in most of the undergraduate learning outcomes as all targets are met. Since this is a requirement for all newly declared economics majors, we expect increases in enrollments as the new requirement is applied to more students.

Curriculum and Course Development

Our curriculum is similar to peer institutions and the topics in our 4000-level courses cover most of the major sub-disciplines within economics: econometrics and mathematical methods, environmental economics, experimental economics, industrial organization, international economics, labor economics, health economics, public sector economics and urban economics.

In 2006 the department introduced a new degree program, International Economics and Modern Languages (IEML). This program provides students with the analytical tools to do economic research, consulting and policy analysis on global issues, along with the language skills needed to work with the United States' major trading partners. The Andrew Young School is gaining worldwide visibility as a leading source of expertise on global policy issues while the department of Modern and Classical Languages at Georgia State has an innovative curriculum in French, German and Spanish languages designed to prepare international professionals. IEML majors complete an Economics common core, including macro, micro, three upper-level classes focusing on international issues such as international trade and finance and economic development, and three classes selected individually with the faculty advisor. After attaining intermediate-level competency in either French, German or Spanish, they also complete a common core in that language, with classes focusing on spoken and written language skills, translation and use of the language in business and professional settings.

Graduate Teaching

With our increased reliance on graduate students to teach principles classes, in 2005 the department formalized the graduate teaching process to improve the quality of undergraduate teaching across the curriculum. Economics graduate students in the AYS wishing to independently teach economics courses at the undergraduate level must satisfy the following requirements:

- Have a master's degree in economics or the equivalent in coursework and exams
- Pass Econ 9520 Seminar in University Teaching
- Non-native English speakers – Take and pass the ESL 7500 course (final class presentations reviewed by members of the economics department GTA undergraduate teaching committee)
- Attend a WebCT training session and/or demonstrate proficiency at designing and maintaining a WebCT site
- Serve at least one full semester as a teaching assistant to a professor in an economics principles course (Econ 2100, 2105 or 2106)
- Take and pass the economics department Undergraduate Teaching Qualification Test (administered by the economics department GTA undergraduate teaching committee)
- Be approved by the Board of Regents

Econ 9520 Seminar in University Teaching was developed to train graduate students for teaching undergraduate principles classes. The course consists of two major components, a series of four sessions that cover general issues related to teaching in higher education, and two sessions that cover teaching within Economics. Each initial session covers the basics of planning and instructing. Then the focus shifts to providing more individual help and support for each participant.

During the semester, participants develop the following skills:

- Planning skills in preparing a lesson and university course
- Instructional skills for teaching in a university classroom
- Assessment skills for documenting student learning
- Revising skills for collecting and integrating formative assessments and making modifications in the course

In addition to the seminar, graduate students wanting to teach must go through a certification process that includes a qualification test. Members of the Graduate Teaching Committee videotape a student's lecture before an actual principles class and critique the performance. Students in GTA sections fill out SEIs – student evaluation of instructor forms. These evaluations are sent to the chair of the department and to the Graduate Teaching Coordinator. Master's students are not hired as GTAs.

An additional way in which graduate students can obtain training for their own teaching (along with improving their understanding of the subject) is through participation in the tutoring lab for students in principles courses. This was re-introduced in 2003 and is staffed primarily by graduate students to help undergraduate students with specific issues and problems.

Graduate Program

Degree Programs

The Department of Economics offers two graduate degrees in economics: M.A. and Ph.D. The curriculum for each degree varies (see Appendix D for the graduate curriculum for each degree). The Economics Department also supports a Master of Science in Business Economics that is offered through the Robinson College of Business.

M.A. Learning Outcomes

LEARNING OUTCOMES

- To learn and grasp basic analytical skills of microeconomics, macroeconomics and econometrics.
- To learn to identify various disciplines of economics and their ways of thinking about economic issues.
- To be able to understand, use and analyze economic data.
- To be able to use and develop economic models to analyze various economic issues and to make policy recommendations.

M.A. Learning Outcomes Assessment

In the M.A.-Econ program, the exit examination element of assessment evaluates the first learning outcome of the program. The data analysis showed that this learning outcome was achieved with passing grades by a majority of the students who took the exams (89% for Macroeconomics, 88% for Microeconomics, and 93% for Econometrics).

Ph.D. Learning Outcomes

LEARNING OUTCOMES

- To achieve a high level of competence understanding and using the analytical skills of microeconomics and macroeconomics.
- To achieve a high level of competence understanding the most recent theoretical and quantitative methods in economics.
- To demonstrate mastery of the issues, theories and latest advances in one of the sub-fields of economics offered by the program.
- To demonstrate ability to conduct independent and original basic and applied research in economics.

Ph.D. Learning Outcomes Assessment

The major elements of assessment for the Ph.D. outcomes are: comprehensive examinations (in microeconomic and macroeconomic theory), field examinations (required in one field), dissertation research and alumni surveys (which are now administered annually). The desired outcomes are generally being met quite well. In terms of learning outcomes #1 and 2, the comprehensive exams show that we are meeting our goals. In the Microeconomics comprehensive exam, the students who did not pass on the first try and had a second attempt showed a significant improvement and all passed. In Macroeconomics, 6 of 13 students passed in the first attempt. The passing students performed about as well as those who passed the year before. Learning outcome #3 is being met quite well. Data from the field exams offered during the past year show students are generally performing well and passing these exams without any areas of concern.

Learning outcomes #2 and #4 are clearly being met as indicated by the evaluation of dissertations. Fifteen dissertations were successfully defended during the past year with the dissertation committees rating 6 of 15 likely to be published in a top field journal. Two of the responses to the Alumni Survey questionnaire gave us an indication of actual research output about five years after graduation. Both alumni are professors at universities. One has six refereed publications in five years. The papers were published in good journals like *Journal of Industrial Economics*, *Public Finance Review* and the *Southern Economic Journal*. The other alumnus has three refereed publications in international finance field journals and two book chapters.

M.A. and Ph.D. Curriculum and Course Development

The basic sequence of courses for the Master's and Ph.D. programs is quite similar to those of peer institutions. The department continues to focus in select areas that reflect where it has faculty and research depth: public economics, labor, urban/regional, environmental and experimental economics. In 2006-07, the department changed the content of the econometrics sequence to include increased coverage of data management topics. This was done in response to concerns from the annual Alumni Surveys. Potentially, this course will have a "lab" component covering hands-on data management issues. We also intend to keep refining some of the questionnaires that provide data on the learning outcomes to obtain yet more in-depth information on how the objectives are being met.

As of 2008, we have consolidated the micro-theory sequence (from 3 to 2 courses) to give Ph.D. students uninterrupted time to study for their comprehensive exams and to reduce the amount of overlap among the courses. We have also moved away from summer courses for the Ph.D. students, which gives them time to develop and execute their own research projects. The

department sponsors (since 2006) a regular brown-bag seminar for the graduate students, where they can present work in progress to faculty and other graduate students.

The department added a second econometrics course in the master's program to strengthen the quantitative skills of the master's graduates. Many of the job opportunities for the master's students require good quantitative skills, so enhancing their program of study with an additional econometrics course was considered necessary to increase employment prospects. Also at the master's level, while a writing intensive course is not required, a master's paper or thesis is required and evaluated. The dissertation committee also does an evaluation for Ph.D. students at the completion of their dissertation and defense.

As noted above, to enhance graduate teaching, we have developed a rigorous seminar in University Teaching that is required of our graduate instructors.

Survey Results

While the Department of Economics has not formally tested either the undergraduate or graduate curricula through standardized testing of its majors, surveys of our undergraduate majors indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the curriculum and teaching methods (see Appendix D for the Questionnaires and Findings). Seventy-eight percent of current undergraduate students indicated that the undergraduate program of study is academically challenging, and 72% indicated the faculty members are appropriately prepared for their courses. Almost 60 and 75% of graduate students expressed similar views for the above respective questions.

For both current graduate and undergraduate students, the major dissatisfaction with the faculty and program was in the frequency and variety of course offerings. This has been almost entirely the result of resource constraints. In recent years, the number of sections of "service" courses (Principles and M.B.A. courses) has been continually increasing. In the last academic year (2007-08), the Department of Economics offered over 190 different sections of undergraduate and graduate classes; of these, the department offered 74 "service" courses, of which 65 were principles and global economy courses, and another nine were M.B.A. courses required of RCB students.

The department has developed a "Capacity Model" to estimate these resource constraints. As noted above, there are 36 faculty members currently available for teaching. Of these, 30 are research faculty whose regular teaching load is four courses per year. The department chair has a regular teaching load of two courses per year, four faculty members have a two course per year load because of an endowed professorship, and there are 4 teaching faculty each of whom has a course load of seven courses per year. The regular teaching capacity of the department can be estimated as 158 courses ($[30 \times 4] + 2 + [4 \times 2] + [4 \times 7]$). However, this considerably overstates the actual number of courses taught by the faculty, given the large number of course reductions generated by external funding, directorships and advisory releases, which in the last several years have averaged over 12 per year. The teaching responsibilities of graduate teaching assistants should also be included. In the last several years, these have averaged four courses per year. The "total capacity" of the department faculty and graduate teaching assistants is therefore 150 courses per year. Given that the total number of courses offered by the department is 190 per year, the department has been operating well above capacity. As a result, the department has had to rely upon part-time instructors to an extraordinary extent to teach its courses. For example, in the 2007-08 academic year, the department staffed almost 30 courses with PTIs.

Section E: Student Quality

The Department of Economics in the Andrew Young School has been able to attract high-quality students in its undergraduate, master's, and Ph.D. programs. This section discusses student abilities and achievements in each program.

Undergraduate Program: Economics Majors

Our bachelor's in economics programs do not have any GPA requirement: all students who are in good standing with the university may declare economics as their major and enroll in economics courses. However, the B.A. has a foreign language requirement and the B.S. requires elementary statistics and two semesters of calculus. These demands ensure minimum quality for our students. See Section D for the course curricula for these degrees. Judging by the SAT scores of our majors, they are of above-average quality within the university. Table E.1 shows the average SAT score for all incoming students in the fall semesters of each year from 2004 to 2008, the average for declared economics majors, and the difference in the two. The table shows that economics majors have average SAT scores about 92 points higher than the university as a whole.

Table E.1 New Freshman Average SAT (Fall semester)

Year	University Wide	Econ Majors	Difference
2008	1081	1106	25
2007	1091	1137	46
2006	1091	1237	146
2005	1090	1310	220
2004	1093	1115	22
5-year Average	1089	1181	92

Master of Arts in Economics

As noted in Section D, the Department of Economics currently offers two M.A. degree programs.¹ The first is the traditional M.A. program, which requires a core group of microeconomic and macroeconomic theory courses plus several quantitative courses. The second master's program is the Master of Arts Policy Track. This program is aimed at students who are preparing for careers that require the evaluation and interpretation of policy. This program track requires analytical thinking, but with substantially less mathematical preparation required. See Section D for the course curricula for both of these degrees.

The numbers of students entering our M.A. programs has shrunk in recent years, but at the same time the average quality of these students has improved markedly. Table E.2 summarizes the number of students applying, accepted, and enrolled by program, for FY06-8. In FY06, 70 students applied to the two M.A. programs, and we accepted 32, for an acceptance rate of 46 percent. Thirty of these 32 enrolled, a high rate of 94 percent. In FY07, the patterns were fairly similar. Seventy-five students applied to the M.A. programs, with 39 accepted, for a combined acceptance rate of 52 percent. Twenty-nine of these 39 enrolled, a rate of 74 percent. In FY08, 71 students applied to the M.A. programs, with 43 accepted, for an acceptance rate of 61 percent. However, only 16 of these students enrolled, for an enrollment rate of only 37 percent.

¹ In addition, the Department of Economics also offers a Master of Science/Business Economics through the J. Mack Robinson College of Business.

Table E.2 Graduate students applying, accepted and enrolled, FY06-08

	FY06	FY07	FY08
M.A.			
Students applying	70	75	71
Students accepted (% of applicants)	32 (45.7%)	39 (52.0%)	43 (60.6%)
Students enrolled (% of accepted)	30 (93.8)	29 (74.4%)	16 (37.2%)
Ph.D.			
Students applying	91	120	83
Students accepted (% of applicants)	19 (20.9%)	12 (10.0%)	15 (18.10%)
Students enrolled (% of accepted)	17 (89.5%)	12 (100.0%)	14 (93.3%)

Nevertheless, the average quality of these students, as measured by GRE scores, has improved. Table E.3 summarizes the GRE scores of students applying and enrolling in FY06-08. Each cell in the table shows the mean score, the inter-quartile range and the percentile of the mean score. In FY06, the average enrolled student in the M.A. program had a verbal GRE of 443 (44th percentile) and a quantitative score of 653 (61st percentile). In FY08, these scores improved to 520 (65th percentile) and 693 (71st percentile) respectively. Notably, as the enrollment has shrunk, the bottom end of the distribution has especially improved. Table E.3 shows that the 25th percentile of the verbal score of enrolled M.A. students has increased from 390 to 455 from 2006 to 2008, while the 25th percentile of the quantitative score has increased from 620 to 670.

Table E.3 GRE scores of graduate students applying and enrolled, FY06-08

	FY06		FY07		FY08	
M.A. in economics	Applying	Enrolled	Applying	Enrolled	Applying	Enrolled
Verbal Score – mean	464	443	468	492	479	520
Inter-quartile range (Percentile of mean)	400-550 (50)	390-490 (44)	380-550 (51)	430-550 (58)	400-600 (55)	455-480 (65)
Quant. Score – mean	668	653	674	674	706	693
Inter-quartile range (Percentile of mean)	620-730 (65)	620-730 (61)	620-760 (67)	630-750 (67)	660-780 (74)	670-730 (71)
Ph.D.						
Verbal Score – mean	503	544	461	497	457	459
Inter-quartile range (Percentile of mean)	380-600 (601)	480-600 (72)	370-560 (49)	410-595 (59)	365-530 (48)	370-550 (49)
Quant. Score – mean	725	745	732	703	714	717
Inter-quartile range (Percentile of mean)	670-800 (78)	730-800 (83)	690-790 (80)	660-745 (73)	680-800 (76)	680-770 (76)

After GRE scores, undergraduate GPA is probably the next most measurable indicator of graduate student “quality.” The average GPA of our incoming M.A. students over 2002-2008 period was 3.17. This improved to 3.32 over the last two years.

Ph.D. in Economics

The second panel of Table E.2 summarizes the number of students applying, accepted and enrolled in the Ph.D. program, for FY06-08. In FY08, 83 students applied to the Ph.D. program

and we accepted only 15, for an acceptance rate of 18 percent. However, 14 of these 15 enrolled, which is a high rate of 93 percent. These numbers have remained fairly constant over the past few years.

Unfortunately, the relative quality of these students, as measured by GRE scores, is probably lower than other comparison programs and has not improved in recent years. The average quantitative GRE score for enrolled students has fallen from 745 (83rd percentile) in 2006 to 703 (73rd percentile) in 2007 and 717 (76th percentile) in 2008. The average verbal GRE score has fallen from 544 (72nd percentile) in 2006 to 497 (59th percentile) in 2007 and 459 (49th percentile) in 2008. Moreover, the bottom quarter of the class had quantitative GRE scores below the 68th percentile and verbal scores below the 24th percentile.

On the other hand, average GPAs have improved slightly over time. Over the past two years, the average undergraduate GPA of our enrolled Ph.D. students was 3.55, compared to 3.28 from 2002-08.

Once here, our students have shown their abilities and dedication by publishing, presenting their research and receiving awards. From 2005-07, our Ph.D. students published or co-published nine articles per year in books and in journals such as the *National Tax Journal* and *State Tax Notes*; presented their work at an average of ten conferences and workshops per year at such places as the National Tax Association, the Southern Economic Association, the Kiel Institute for World Economics and Emory University; and won an average of ten awards per year, including Fulbright Scholarships and NSF dissertation grants.

Finally, as economists we believe in market tests. Accordingly, the most important bottom line is that our students have succeeded in the job market, finding jobs in teaching colleges, academic research institutions, government agencies, research universities and the private sector. Placements in the last two years include tenure-track positions at Coastal Carolina University, Georgia Gwinnett College, Southern New Hampshire University, Tunghai University (Taiwan), University of Chile, University of Georgia, University of Indonesia and University of Minnesota at Duluth; and research positions at the RAND Corp., World Bank, CDC, Colorado State University, the National Bank of Serbia and the International Food Policy Research Institute.

Section F: Faculty Quality

Quality and quantity of scholarly and creative productivity

As noted in Sections B and C above, the Department of Economics is ranked as the number one department of economics in Georgia, and the 9th highest department in the Southeast, and 50th among 129 departments nationwide according to a detailed analysis reported in the *Southern Economic Journal* (Grijalva and Nowell, 2008).² Nationally, the department ranks highly in several subfields that our Economics faculty has selected as primary areas of concentration. These are: Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics 8th, Public Economics 11th, Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics 20th, Labor and Demographic Economics 23rd, General Economics and Teaching 14th, and Methodology and History of Economic Thought 16th. Based on these rankings, GSU's Department of Economics is more highly rated than most of our chosen peer group

² The ranking is based on analysis of faculty publications (weighted by quality based on the Social Science Citation Index scores) of universities offering doctoral degrees in economics.

(University of Tennessee, University of Georgia, Florida State University, Emory University, George Washington University), and close to Georgetown University (ranked 36th overall).³

In addition, *U.S. News and World Report* (2009 edition) reports that the AYS is ranked 5th in public finance and budgeting, 12th in city management and urban policy, and 18th in public policy analysis. The overall academic and service record of the department's faculty are reported in Table F-1, which is based on a survey of faculty activities. Using those data, we find that over the past three years, the faculty has published an increasing number of articles in refereed outlets. The total number of refereed academic publications has risen from 48 in 2005 to 82 in 2007. The increased number reflects both the slight increase in full-time tenure-track faculty (a net of 3 new faculty) as well as a continued expansion of productive activity of existing faculty, increased synergies among faculty and graduate students, and continued expansion of research activities with colleagues from around the university as well as throughout the profession. The publication outlets include highly rated general interest journals in economics (*Review of Economics and Statistics*, *Southern Economic Journal*, *Economic Inquiry*, *Journal of Macroeconomics*), top rated economic field journals (*Journal of Labor Economics*, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *Journal of Urban Economics*, *National Tax Journal*, *Games and Economic Behavior*), and other important policy and specialized journals (including *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* and *Advances in Health Economics and Health Services Research*). In addition to these journals, faculty books and book chapters were published by Elsevier, Cambridge University Press, Springer Verlag, and Edward Elgar, among other presses.⁴

Faculty honors

Faculty honors come in many forms and include department, school, university, and honors from throughout the profession. The trend in honors awards shows a substantial growth over the period covered in this report (Table F-1) increasing from 14 in 2005 to 46 in 2007.

The honors and awards received by the faculty include⁵ those conveyed within the Georgia State University community (Office of International Affairs, Regents Professors, faculty mentoring, university medallion for service), regional and national honors related to academic research and service (National Tax Association), editorial board appointments (*National Tax Journal*, *Review of Regional Studies*, *Public Budgeting and Finance*, *State Tax Notes*, *Experimental Economics*, *Atlantic Economic Journal*) and advisory board appointments (Technical Advisory Panel for the Global Environment Facility, Internal Revenue Service, Atlanta Mayor's Panel for Child Care Reform). Paula Stephan, Erdal Tekin and Inas Rashad are all associates of the National Bureau of Economic Research. The department also houses the journal *Public Finance Review* (James Alm, editor) and James Cox is associate editor of *Economics Bulletin*. Other examples of honors that show the breathe of faculty impact include Paul Ferraro being named the Kathryn Fuller Science for Nature Fund Visiting Scientist and Jorge Martinez being named Honorary Professor of China Public Finance and Public Policy Academy, Central

³ These rankings are based on information through 2004 and thus do not include the substantial contributions of new faculty (including two senior scholars, James Cox and Barry Hirsch). We cannot develop an updated comprehensive comparison of departments across the country, but we believe that with the addition of our new faculty, the Department's ratings would be even higher than reported based on the data through 2004.

⁴ The Department continues to publish in the top journals with three publications in 2008 in the top-rated general interest journals in economics—*Econometrica*, *American Economic Review* and *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.

⁵ We do not list all of the specific honors and awards, but report some select honors and awards to illustrate the depth and breathe of awards.

University of Finance and Economics. From the list of honors, awards and appointments, it is obvious that the faculty have been recognized for their expertise in their areas of specialization worldwide.

Results of promotion and tenure and reviews

The success of targeted recruitment, hiring, mentoring and evaluation is revealed in the results of recent promotion and tenure cases, third-year reviews, and post-tenure reviews. Over the last three years, the Department of Economics reviewed two cases for promotion to “Full Professor” (Julie Hotchkiss and Sally Wallace) and three cases of promotion to “Associate Professor with Tenure” (Neven Valev, Paul J. Ferraro and Erdal Tekin). All five cases were approved as applied for. The fields covered in these promotions include labor economics, public finance, macroeconomics and environmental economics, thus increasing the more senior ranks in critical fields in the department. In addition, the department held five “third-year review” cases for tenure-track Assistant Professors. In four of those cases, the faculty members were renewed, and in one case, the department recommended that the faculty member be re-evaluated. Finally, over the last three years, four post-tenure cases were reviewed.

Dollar level and source of sponsored research

The faculty of the Department of Economics has been effective in generating substantial amounts of funded research. The partnerships between the research centers and department faculty have been especially successful in generating funded research. Active grants during this period totaled \$31.7 million—or approximately \$881,000 per graduate faculty (average number of graduate faculty over the period was 36). New awards over the period totaled \$17.7 million, or 11% of total university funding while the department has only about 4.5 percent of the GSU faculty (36/808).⁶ The funding agencies for these grants came from a wide-range of sources including national, international and local: National Science Foundation; TIAA-CREF; U.S. EPA; USAID; the World Bank; the governments of Jamaica, Tanzania, Sudan and Guyana; Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning; Georgia Department of Human Resources; and more (Appendix F5A and F5B provide details). Members of the department also participate in sponsored research through other colleges at GSU or the Georgia Health Policy Center, but those research dollars are not included in this specific analysis.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) regularly publishes information on research and development (R&D) expenditures by department. The most recent NSF report covers 2006 and ranks the Economics Department 8th in the national for federally funded R&D expenditures. This ranking is higher than our peer group. NSF also reports all R&D expenditures by department and, in 2006, the Economics Department ranked 14th, with two peers (University of Georgia and all campuses of the University of Tennessee) ranked higher at 4th and 11th.

Over the last three years (accounted for on a fiscal-year basis), the faculty received three internal grants (Research Initiation) and continued to encourage applications for additional internal grants, which helped to double the awards from the FY05-07 period to FY08 and FY09.

Community involvement – service and outreach contributions

As members of an academic department in a policy school, the economics faculty are uniquely interested in and uniquely qualified to participate in service and outreach to a variety of “communities.” Community in this sense is taken to be the non-academic communities in the Atlanta

⁶ Grant totals for the department are from CY05-07 and for the university are from FY05-07.

metro area, Georgia the Southeast, and national and international communities. Expertise was delivered to a large variety of community groups in the form of lectures, serving as panel moderators, providing expert analysis of public policy issues and reviewing draft legislation, among other activities. According to our survey of faculty activity, these important connections increased from 52 activities in 2005 to 81 in 2007.

We highlight just a few specific contributions as evidence of the depth and breadth of the faculty’s commitment to service and outreach. Geoffrey Turnbull served on the Sandy Springs Central Business District Economic Analysis Study Group; Paul Ferraro advised Mexican government on design of a fishery buyback auction and also works for the World Bank-UNDP Global Environment Facility; David Sjoquist, Roy Bahl, Sally Wallace, Mark Rider and James Alm advised the Kentucky Legislature on the prospects of tax reform; Inas Rashad is an affiliate of the Partnership for Urban Health Research; and Shelby Frost and Paul Kagunda have participated in development programs for economics education at the high school level. These illustrative cases demonstrate again the level of commitment the faculty have to the non-academic community.

AYS collaboration and collaboration across universities

The faculty has been engaged across the Andrew Young School by work within the research centers. Across all of the college’s centers, faculty report an increasing number of collaborative activities – increasing from 21 activities in 2002 to 37 in 2006. These activities include joint grant research, academic publications, seminars and other outreach activities, and classes and training for the GSU and external communities. In addition, the faculty has nearly doubled their cooperative arrangements and activities with other universities. Members of the faculty have developed academic programs for the University of Guyana (Mark Rider and Mary Beth Walker) and Cairo University; the Experimental Center has worked with the University of Economics, Bratislava; and Roy Bahl was a fellow at the National Chengchi University. Nationally, faculty have engaged in cooperative research, seminars and teaching at the Medical College of Georgia, University of Georgia, Indiana University, Emory University, College of William and Mary, Georgia Tech, University of Pittsburgh, Agnes Scott College, the University of West Georgia, University of Michigan and Ohio State University, among other institutions. Many of these collaborations are on-going and demonstrate the far reach of the faculty of the Department of Economics.

Table F-1: Summary of Faculty Activities, By Year

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Scholarly refereed publications	NA	NA	NA	48	58	82
Other publications	NA	NA	NA	47	51	53
Honors and awards related to academic work	NA	NA	NA	14	21	46
Community involvement	NA	NA	NA	52	55	81
Participation in collaborative programs with other universities	27	24	32	35	50	NA
<i>Participation with AYS Centers</i>						
Georgia Health Policy	4	3	4	4	4	NA
Environmental	3	3	4	4	2	NA
Experimental Policy	–	–	–	–	8	NA
Fiscal Research/Domestic	6	7	11	11	13	NA

International Studies	8	8	8	10	10	NA
TOTAL Centers	21	21	27	29	37	NA

NA: Not asked for that year

Section G: Resource Adequacy

Faculty Resources

The number of undergraduate majors (UG) increased from 161 in FY06 to 319 in FY08, while the number of tenure-track (TT) faculty members increased from 24 to 27. As a result, the UG/TT ratio increased from 6.7 to 11.8, a 76 percent increase. Peer institutions report the following UG/TT ratios for FY08: University of Georgia, 10.6; Emory University, 19.3; University of Tennessee, 7.6; University of South Carolina, 19.7; and Florida State University, 14.7/16.1 for Fall/Spring.

The number of Ph.D. students decreased from 80 in FY06 to 71 in FY08 while the number of graduate faculty (GF) increased from 26 to 27. As a result, the Ph.D./GF ratio decreased from 3.1 to 2.6. The number of graduate majors (M.A. and Ph.D. students) decreased from 133 to 130 from FY06 to FY08. As a result, the Grad/TT ratio decreased from 5.5 to 4.8. Peer institutions report the following ratios: University of Georgia, Ph.D./GF = 1.7; Emory University, Ph.D./TT = 0.7; University of Tennessee, Ph.D./TT = 2.6; University of South Carolina, Ph.D./TT = 0.6; Florida State University, Ph.D./TT = 1.5; and George Washington University, Ph.D./TT = 2.5.

Administrative Resources

The Department of Economics currently has three full-time staff members to assist the department's 38 full-time tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members. The current set up of the department staff is as follows: Caroline Griffin, Administrative Specialist-Managerial, oversees staff, human resource matters and all financial transactions for the department. Brenda (Bess) Blyler, Administrative Specialist-Academic, handles student-related issues such as course scheduling, GRA hires, registration issues, etc. Mary Kenyatta, Administrative Coordinator-Senior, handles all general admin work such as copying, textbook ordering and arranging travel accommodations for visitors, etc.

In comparison to other academic departments on campus, the Department of Economics has a comparable amount of staff support per faculty member for the department. It is important to note that the Centers that are housed within the Andrew Young School have their own staff members to support their Center's missions. This section only addresses staff currently hired to handle the business of the academic department. For comparison, reports on staff support from several departments at Georgia State are as follows: Economics, 3 full-time staff for 38 full-time faculty; History, 4 full-time staff for 43 full-time faculty; Political Science, 3 full-time staff for 17 full-time faculty; Sociology, 3 full-time staff for 27 full-time faculty; Modern & Classical Languages, 4 full-time staff for 28 full-time faculty; and African-American Studies, 2 full-time staff for 8 full-time faculty.

Technological Resources

The Economics Department has 43 PCs, 1 Apple, 19 laptops and 2 network printers. For comparison, the Criminal Justice Department, with 19 faculty and staff has 18 PCs, 1 workstation, 1 Apple, 20 laser printers and 17 notebooks.

Space Resources

Office space for the Department of Economics is assigned on an “as needed basis” by the AYS dean’s office. In addition to the full-time faculty, the department employs three full-time staff members. The staff supervisor, Caroline Griffin, is housed in the smallest office on the department floor and the two remaining staff members are in cubicles. All part-time instructors (from two to four per semester) are assigned one office to share among themselves on the ground floor. This office has three computer stations and a worktable. Visiting faculty members (two to date) must also share office space and schedule their office hours accordingly.

The Department of Economics assigns workstations for their graduate research assistants. This space may be shared, or not shared, according to the GRA’s number of appointments, type of assignment, etc.

Laboratory Resources.

The Department of Economics does not have exclusive use of laboratories. The Econometrics Lab is shared with the department. The Experimental Economics Lab is a facility of the Experimental Economics Center that provides teaching support to the Department of Economics and research support to the department and affiliated faculty of the center from other GSU colleges and surrounding universities. The principal users of the laboratory are, however, faculty and Ph.D. students in the department.

The Econometrics Lab has 33 workstations and an instructor’s workstation with a projector and document camera. The Experimental Economics Laboratory has 40 experiment subject computers, three development and backup computers, one Apple development computer and a video projector. The Experimental Economics Center also has a Portable Laboratory with 35 ultra portable notebooks, travel cases for the notebooks and a portable video projector that are available to support department faculty and graduate student research.

GSU Foundation Resources.

The department has nine foundation accounts. The sum total operating balances in the nine accounts is currently about \$52,000 (FY09).

Library Resources.

The Department of Economics is fortunate to have a rich collection of resources available for teaching and research needs, necessary due to the cross-disciplinary nature of this discipline. Despite the high budget allocation, the university library is only able to collect between 25%-32% of the relevant titles published in this area annually.

In the area of electronic resources, a scan of peer-level institutions⁷ and top-tier institutions⁸ indicates that the electronic database and CD-ROM resources available at Georgia State University are comparable to these institutions. The time-series data needs of this discipline, however, are so great that it is difficult for most libraries to acquire all of the data resources needed for effective research. To become more competitive with top-tier institutions, the library would benefit from funding for the acquisition of additional international financial data tools such as Global Insight, Global Financial Data, and additional modules of Euromonitor’s Global Market

⁷Peer institutions: George Washington University, Louisiana State University, George Mason University and State University of New York at Albany

⁸Top-tier institutions: Columbia University, Northwestern University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and New York University

Information Database (GMID). A more in-depth analysis of the gaps in the current data collection is needed to create an accurate list of collection priorities.

In addition to the collection of resources provided by the university library, the Andrew Young School invests heavily in resources more directly related to the research needs of the faculty and doctoral students. The Andrew Young School research center houses and licenses these resources and has a full-time librarian/researcher on staff to help faculty, GRAs and doctoral students find the information they need. The research center librarian works closely with the university library to ensure that the collections do not duplicate resources. Outside of professional collaborations, the research center is not affiliated in any way with the university library.

Section H: Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives presented below are chosen such that they play up the strengths of the department, addresses the weaknesses presented in Section A, and are consistent with the college and university strategic plans. We adhere to the template offered by the University, presenting teaching goals first, creative and scholarly second, and service third. Georgia State University's Strategic Plan 2005-2010 provides an important set of overarching goals and objectives of the university. The department's goals and objectives provided below are complementary to the university's vision for the GSU community. The AYS Strategic Plan 2002-2007 provides guidance to the department regarding the overall goals and objectives of the college.

Teaching

Goal One: Increase the quality and size of our Ph.D. program

OBJECTIVE 1

Continue to move towards our goal of 20 incoming doctoral students per year.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The graduate committee, along with staff, will examine average graduate student stipends and benefits offered by other similarly ranked institutions. A feasibility study will be performed that will consider funding sources, including university resources, external funding of scholarships from donors (such as the Carolyn Young scholars), and funding from the research centers. In order to sustain a doctoral program of this size, we need to hire additional research faculty, to mentor students and chair doctoral dissertations.

RESOURCE NEEDS

Specific recommendations and numbers will come from the feasibility study.

OBJECTIVE 2

Improve the class offerings of field courses for doctoral students.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Graduate coordinator and staff will examine the feasibility of offering all field courses each year, instead of rotating every other year. Because the university requires that each doctoral level course have five students registered in order for the course to count as an actual course, we need a rough estimate of how many courses would fail to have sufficient registration in an average year.

RESOURCE NEEDS

The chair needs the ability to grant ‘course releases’ to faculty teaching a graduate field course with only three or four students in order to offer each field each year. This is a short-term need, as increasing class sizes will lower the probability of this happening.

OBJECTIVE 3

Improve both program advising and career advising for doctoral students. The size of the program as it currently stands already strains the ability of faculty and staff to appropriately advise students in terms of both program of study and career/job placement. Moving to an even larger program requires that we take appropriate steps to ensure that our graduate students are receiving the information they need to progress through the program and make informed job market decisions.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Hire an additional staff person for student advisement purposes. Our previous self-study requested resources to hire two Economics Department staff advisors, one for undergraduates and one for graduate students. We have successfully hired one, but a larger program with a greater emphasis on advisement requires additional help. We also want to sharpen our doctoral students’ focus on careers at an earlier stage, so that they can consider the alternatives of academic versus government or business careers.

RESOURCES NEEDED

We request funding for an additional staff advisor. This individual will manage graduate program of study advisement as well as coordinate career workshops, market information, etc.

OBJECTIVE 4

Improve the quality of job placement for doctoral students. While we have successfully placed students in a variety of positions, an earlier emphasis on different career paths can improve their choices of teaching, workshop participation and conference participation.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

We will focus on better preparation in job skills from an earlier stage in students’ programs and on research skills and presentation skills for both teaching and research so that our students appear more favorably. In addition, faculty must continue to increase our recognition among other economists, both inside and outside academics, through joint research, workshop presentations and conference attendance, so that our students are better recognized in the market.

RESOURCES NEEDED

The staff advisor can help to coordinate program goals, from first through fourth year, to ensure students get adequate exposure to research and teaching. Faculty need travel resources in order to participate in small conferences and workshops to strengthen our recognition in the field.

Goal Two: Increase focus on the master’s program**OBJECTIVE 1:**

Improve both program advising and career advising for master’s students. We have a sizeable population of M.A. students who largely feel that their interests and concerns are overlooked.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Establish specific career workshops for M.A. students. These workshops would utilize faculty and bring in economic analysts from business and government to inform students about job possibilities and job skill requirements. We can develop our many relationships with Atlanta

area and statewide policymakers to provide additional internship and career opportunities for our students.

RESOURCES NEEDED

The additional staff advisor requested above is critical to enact this plan without drawing on additional faculty resources for advisement and management. Some small budget for honorariums for guest speakers is needed.

OBJECTIVE 2

Develop a specialty track within the M.A. program that would focus on quantitative program evaluation and policy analysis.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Building on tools already taught in one required and one elective course within the M.A. program of study, we can expand course offerings in this area so that our students receive top quality training. We should explore possibilities for coordination with programs in PMAP.

RESOURCES NEEDED

Increasing our faculty strength in quantitative program evaluation will be important, not only for this specific goal, but to further strengthen our other core areas.

Goal Three: Continue to increase the quality of our undergraduate degree program

OBJECTIVE 1

Improve the quality of our entry-level classes by expanding the core group of clinical professors focused on undergraduate teaching. This will enable us to reduce our reliance on part-time instructors in these classes.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Hire one more clinical professor

RESOURCE NEEDS

Faculty-line funding

OBJECTIVE 2

Improve the quality of the non-classroom experience of our majors through an administrator offering counseling on career information, employment and graduate school. This administrator would also be able to coordinate course content and standards across multiple sections and supervise the internship program.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Hire a full-time undergraduate administrator

RESOURCE NEEDS

Staff salary

Creative and Scholarly Activity

Goal One: Increase national recognition of scholarship

OBJECTIVE 1

Establish a Census Data Center at GSU. We have recently learned of the opportunity to establish a U.S. Census Data Center here in cooperation with other Atlanta institutions. Such a center would increase the productivity and prominence of our existing research faculty in terms of

journal impact, external funding and policy impact and thereby increase the department's prominence in our areas of excellence.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

We currently have a group of faculty coordinating this effort. This team requires resources and faculty cooperation to complete their efforts. Nevertheless, we do recognize that in some respects achieving this goal may be outside our control, insofar as siting the facility is determined by inter-agency negotiations at the Federal level.

RESOURCE NEEDS

To be determined

OBJECTIVE 2

Increase the faculty budget for professional development to enhance research. Obtaining data, attending meetings and conferences, investing in new software, etc. are critical to support research activities. Such professional development activities benefit the school collectively, as it increases exposure to the Andrew Young School. It also benefits faculty individually, by providing opportunities to publicize their own work and to get constructive feedback and stay on the cutting-edge of research.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The budget for faculty research and development (for data, professional meetings, software, etc.) should be increased, subject to the constraint that faculty members are active participants in research. Options for funding include an increased allocation of indirect cost recovery funds from the dean's office or additional support from the university.

RESOURCE NEEDS

An estimated \$36,000 would provide a sufficient increase to support these activities.

OBJECTIVE 3

More forums should be hosted by the AYS. Just as traveling to meetings increases our profile, so do bringing people here. We have had several successful ventures in this respect, but more could be done in this dimension, including an increased number of academic conferences.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

At least one policy forum, modeled after the recent Fiscal Research Center Forum on Trauma Services, should be conducted each semester and, over the next several years, at least one topic from each of the department's areas of excellence should be covered. Faculty who are officers or members of academic associations (e.g. the National Bureau of Economic Research) should be encouraged to bring academic meetings to GSU.

RESOURCE NEEDS

The dean's office should continue to fund policy forums. Leverage could be made of GSU's Conference Grants Program as well as funding through academic associations.

OBJECTIVE 4

Attract well-known senior scholars with named chairs and professorships. Endowed chairs can bring nationally recognized scholars to GSU, as evidenced by our recent filling of the Noah Langdale Jr. Chair and the W.J. Usery Chair. Creating more such positions would continue to increase our visibility.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Solicit donations from large Atlanta corporations and wealthy individuals.

RESOURCE NEEDS

A substantial gift is required to create a named chair or professorship.

OBJECTIVE 5

Increase our external public relations. More effort could be given to news releases and media outreach.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Encourage greater cooperation between the faculty and external relations staff, and consider adding additional staff for development and external relations.

RESOURCE NEEDS

Additional staff may be needed.

Goal Two: Increase level of outside funding

OBJECTIVE 1

Extend successful grantsmanship to more faculty and increase total research awards above the already-high level.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Continue and expand the grant submission summer incentive program recently implemented by the AYS Dean. Expand grantsmanship mentoring as part of a more comprehensive mentoring program that matches faculty members with similar research interests. We also need qualified staff support for grant applications, including budgeting, entering files and forms into grantor web sites (such as NSF Fastlane), completing internal university grant application routing forms and interfacing with university sponsored programs.

RESOURCE NEEDS

To be determined

Goal Three: Clarify the relationship between the department and centers

OBJECTIVE 1

Provide an updated statement of the expectations for faculty involvement in the centers for new tenure-track professors as well as tenured professors

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Develop a committee of center directors, department chair, and faculty to draft a statement of the relationship between the department and centers that can be used in recruiting as well as in annual reviews.

RESOURCE NEEDS

No specific needs

OBJECTIVE 2

Define the role, importance and value of center activity in department annual reviews and in promotion and tenure documents.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Use the committee to review the weight of center activities in current annual evaluations and recommend revisions to the annual evaluation process, if necessary, to align expectations and incentives regarding center work and to provide more detailed evaluation of faculty's involvement in centers.

Assign the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the college to use the department's revised statement of center-department expectations and annual review documentation to revise accordingly the college's promotion and tenure documentation.

RESOURCE NEEDS

No specific needs

OBJECTIVE 3

Provide additional incentives for faculty to work with centers.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Establish a committee to analyze the potential to reallocate the college/department/principle investigator portions of the indirect cost recovery funds to provide incentives for expanding collaboration between the department and centers.

RESOURCE NEEDS

No specific needs

Goal Four: Organize strategy for progress in areas of excellence

OBJECTIVE 1

Identify a strategy for evaluating current state of core areas of the department, needs in these areas and possible expansion of the current list of core areas.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Develop an evaluation matrix of faculty by area and the area's success in achieving various objectives (such as journal impact, policy impact, external funding, etc.) to analyze current synergies, synergies not yet exploited that could yield new core areas of excellence, teaching needs, balance among various objectives within and among areas, and hiring needs.

RESOURCE NEEDS

No specific needs

Service

Goal One: Expand our service and outreach activities

OBJECTIVE 1

Organize regular forums and roundtable discussions on current policy issues. Do an effective job with the advertising of these events in the media, academia and policy circles.

IMPLEMENTATION

Build partnerships with think tanks, foundations and other relevant institutions in setting up these events. This would have advantages both in terms of increased visibility and cost-effectiveness. Think of organizing these events not only in the AYS building but also in other locations (e.g. a tax conference or roundtable with the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C.) and even internationally.

RESOURCE NEEDS

Seek out sponsorships from private firms and foundations. Partnerships with other institutions would also reduce the cost of these events.