

June 2013

University of New Mexico, Department of Political Science External Review Report

Rodney Hero, University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Political Science
James Meernik, University of North Texas, Professor of Political Science
Sharon Erickson Nepstad, University of New Mexico, Professor and Chair, Department
of Sociology

INTRODUCTION

The APR External Review Team was impressed by the many fine accomplishments and traits of UNM's Political Science program. It is clear to us that the department faculty are very talented and dedicated; they have an established record of scholarly productivity that is well beyond expectations, given the relatively small size of the faculty and the overall resources available to them. The graduate students are professionally engaged, well trained, and quite successful on the job market. The quality of undergraduate teaching is also impressive. In short, the department has numerous strengths and we commend the faculty for its achievements.

Yet through our campus visit and reading of the department's self-study report, the External Review Team was able to identify a variety of issues that affect departmental life and work. In this report, we summarize some of the key issues the department faces and we make recommendations that we believe will sustain the department's existing strengths and improve it even further. One of the most significant and overarching problems is the lack of resources. This is evident in the small numerical size of the faculty, diminished operating budgets, insufficient office space and technology, graduate student stipends that are below the national average, and challenges with faculty hiring and retention. In fact, in light of the scarce resources, the External Review Team wishes to commend the department for what it has been able to accomplish under these circumstances.

We urge the university to invest more resources in the Political Science department since we believe that such an investment is definitely merited and would yield strong results. However, we acknowledge the reality of limited budgets at state universities. Hence our report also focuses on non-monetary issues and creative solutions to pressing departmental matters. Specifically, this report will highlight three key areas of concern: people, policies, and planning.

PEOPLE, RESOURCES, AND RELATED ISSUES

Over the course of our meetings during the review team's site visit (of April 30 and May 1) we received a great deal of information and comments that helped us place in context and better understand the views and assessments of the department presented in

the self study report. Not surprisingly, what we learned about ‘people’ and ‘culture’ issues in the department were much more complex and nuanced than what the self-study indicated. In this section we seek to distill, highlight, and articulate these issues, points on which there is agreement and disagreement among the faculty (and others), and the aspects which are positive, negative, and in-between.

The faculty is generally proud of its research and teaching accomplishments in terms of the level and quality of its scholarly productivity. It is likewise pleased with the nature and success of the graduate program and feels it has achieved excellence in undergraduate teaching. The evidence in the self-study and our interviews and general impressions are consistent with these views. But there is also agreement that the department faces some problematic matters as well.

Size of the Faculty

There is overwhelming consensus on an obvious point and one strongly emphasized in the self-study as well: that the number of faculty is too small for the department to (begin to) do all that is expected and desired of it and that it expects and desires of itself. Whether one counts 16 or 12.5 faculty (due to partial appointments, etc.) or some other similar number of ‘Political Science’ faculty, the numbers are universally seen as clearly insufficient to provide the quality and quantity of research, teaching, service, and other activities for which the department feels deeply responsible and to which it has been admirably dedicated. The Review Team shares that view, and believes a more appropriate and reasonable faculty size for the department to fully achieve its goals, as suggested by disciplinary standards for similarly situated departments, would be about 20 members. Moreover, operational funding and staff support is well below what is needed (and these have in fact declined in recent years).

The small size of the faculty has major implications across and within the department’s fields in general and in specific ways. In addition to a strongly felt need to bolster the research profiles within their fields, each field identified areas of undergraduate and graduate teaching that have unfortunately suffered and been neglected. The American Politics faculty noted a need and desire to offer more Public Policy courses as well as one on Gender and Politics. The Comparative Politics faculty expressed concerns that there are not nearly enough faculty to teach the appropriate range of undergraduate and graduate classes. In fact, the recent failures of several graduate students on their Comprehensive exam were attributed to the lack of classes. Similarly, International Relations faculty lamented the “lack of bodies” and that courses on many parts of the world were not being covered. The graduate students feel there is a lack of faculty ‘presence’ and/or leadership in some fields, which they attribute partly to the small number of faculty.

Faculty and graduate student recruitment are affected by resource constraints in various ways, of course. It seems that faculty receive reasonable starting salaries but those flatten out over time rather quickly; issues of salary ‘compression’ were mentioned but not elaborated on much. Several faculty members expressed frustration that recent hiring efforts had been hampered by the slowness of higher level administrators to

approve positions in a timely fashion that would permit early (earlier) advertising and help the department 'get a jump' on the 'market.'

Department Administration

Beyond the faculty and resource issues, a number of topics regarding the department's general operations were raised in our discussions. On the one hand, there was basic agreement that the day-to-day administration of the department works pretty well (particularly if one takes the imposing resource constraints into account). On the other hand, there was also a perception that broader issues of a 'vision' and about the big(ger) picture and future of the department did not receive the attention they require and deserve. In a somewhat different vein, the view was expressed that there needs to be wider involvement of faculty in the department on committees and other activities which could be facilitated by simply more frequently asking for participation from the faculty (particularly senior faculty). Some faculty felt that it would be fruitful for there to be more public acknowledgement and compliments regarding faculty activities and successes, and that the successes that are recognized could be done more even-handedly, i.e., some individual perceived that some notable accomplishments are recognized while other achievements are not.

Mentoring

Mentoring of junior faculty was also raised as a very important issue. Junior faculty often expressed appreciation for the mentoring they had received, both that which senior faculty initiated on their own, which appears to occur with some frequency, and that which the junior faculty member received in response to requests. On the whole, however, there was a concern that mentoring was mostly informal, not regularized temporally, and that they not infrequently received different or conflicting advice from different faculty, or, occasionally from the same faculty person at different points in time. And some junior faculty felt that the substantive content of the comments received were not always 'constructive.' In short, a clear desire for more systematic mentoring of junior faculty emerged in our conversations.

Climate

Another array of issues emerged which are related broadly to the department 'climate' or 'culture.' The department's culture is viewed quite differently by various individuals; indeed, at times it seemed that two different departments were being described to us. Some view the department as highly collegial, with open doors and frequent conversations, and supportive of faculty research and professional development. Others describe a decidedly difficult environment, of faculty with closed doors or "not around," and who seem dismissive of research questions and agendas that some of their colleagues are pursuing. Some claimed that personal feelings, rather than appropriate, professional judgment, affect important decisions. This perspective is also said to be manifest in other department activities, according to some. There is a perception of negative attitudes about hiring minority faculty, and such attitudes are thought to be influenced by or are part of an inhospitable environment in general. This is thought by some number of individuals to be yet more significant for women (and women of color).

And comments were made about the ‘tone’ of how certain matters are discussed, and conversations that take place; information conveyed was described as not being communicated in ‘personable way.’ In short, *prima facie*, these concerns are serious ones and merit attention. While these differing views did not necessarily always follow professorial rank (junior/senior), gender, and/or other categories, they were not entirely random, either.

Another set of concerns identified had to do with how co-authored publications involving a junior and a senior faculty member(s) are viewed and valued in terms of credit for the quality and quantity of the junior faculty’s research accomplishments. Specifically, it is perceived by some that the (informal) acknowledgement and acclaim given for contributions to published work is not the same across (junior) faculty when the extent of contributions is ostensibly similar. Those who interpret the situation this way find it discouraging. (Whether and, if so, how much and how such perceptions affect the department’s formal evaluation processes is not easily ascertained and in any case is more appropriately discussed in the ‘Procedures and Rules’ section of this report).

Niche Strategy

Along with the range of issues the department identified just above, it is also having to come to grips with other transition(s). Central to its longstanding ‘niche strategy’ has been the prominence of two fields, Comparative Politics, with some emphasis on Latin America, and American Politics, with some heightened standing for the study of Minority (particularly Latino) Politics. Seeking to maintain the strength of each of these emphases has proved challenging in light of resource limitations, including faculty size and the need to hire additional faculty, and related factors. Indeed, one person referred to the situation as a “niche strategy without niches.” The legacy of and desirability to continue that strategy it has as traditionally shaped the department is a source of some disagreement, which affects the department’s sense of itself, its identity and future directions, including as it pertains to faculty recruitment. Some faculty perceive that the American Politics field has emerged as the department’s strongest, though they believe the department has generally been unwilling to acknowledge, much less ‘embrace’ this. At the same time, some feel nurturing other, additional areas or niches should be seriously considered. Some think that ‘Peace and Conflict studies’ is a plausible and attractive addition, and might be feasibly done by building on and coordinating existing faculty expertise. Others think the place of Health Policy could be elevated because faculty hiring can be supported through the RWJ initiative. Clearly, addressing and deciding on these possible directions and scenarios affecting ‘identity’ present real challenges, which the department will have to take on. It would seem most effective, indeed necessary, to confront these within the context of larger strategic planning (the theme of ‘planning’ is discussed in a later section of this report).

Graduate Program

The Review Team also met with graduate students (about 12 grad students were at the meeting.) On the whole, the graduate students in attendance indicated they were quite pleased with the department in several respects. Most significantly, they perceive that professors are accessible, engaged, committed, supportive, and place a high priority

on nurturing and working with graduate students. Several students noted that professors' doors were open to them and that they are readily able to communicate and interact with them. Hence, there are some very favorable assessments of the graduate student experience. On the other hand, several concerns were expressed.

The Grad students said there was "not a lot of intellectual life" in the department, bemoaning the lack of speakers' series and that presentations by scholars from 'outside' the department are infrequent. Apparently there have been such series from time-to-time but they have not been sustained, i.e., institutionalized. The students view some aspects of the Comprehensive exams as problematic. There is the sense that the guidance students receive about Comprehensive exams is inadequate. The basic substantive expectations and standards are unclear and/or not (perceived to be) applied uniformly or 'fairly' across (and perhaps within) fields. Moreover, there is concern over a 'procedural' dimension; i.e., the lack of uniformity in the structure of the exams (see discussion in later section). This is another instance where discussion, deliberation and explanation of the reasons for whatever practices are ultimately decided upon (which might be the existing practices) would probably be helpful.

The graduate students also raised concerns about funding and identified some specific points. Most generally, there is unease about the 'unpredictability' of funding, which is manifested in several ways. The students generally felt that the assurance of funding "at the front-end" was reasonable, if not as definite as they might like, but they were clearly troubled about the funding situation at the "back end," i.e., in their latter years in the program. While such anxiety is understandable in the first place, it is heightened in the context of the very difficult job market which has characterized Political Science for the last number of years. The funding situation is further complicated, according to the students, because of the lack of clarity as to how and where to apply for internal and external grants. There is much uncertainty about the (un)availability of grants, the student's (non)eligibility for various grants, navigating the sometimes cumbersome processes associated with seeking out, applying for and receiving/administering grants. That said, various pieces of evidence brought to our attention suggest that the Political Science grad students have been fairly entrepreneurial in seeking out and obtaining funds, for which they are to be commended. The students also felt that help or support regarding applying for jobs is generally inadequate or at least not consistent. Lastly, questions were raised about the situation and orientation of students in the Political Science graduate program who are funded through the RWJ initiative. The *non*-RWJ Political Science graduate students perceived that the RWJ students were not as involved or engaged in the Department and were essentially a separate group -- in both their physical location on campus and in their intellectual orientation and interests (And the 'regular' Political Science students thought that the *non*-RWJ Political Science graduate students also viewed themselves this way). Moreover, there was some irritation expressed that the *non*-RWJ Political Science graduate students had very different, substantially higher, levels of funding and other resources than the 'regular' Political Science students.

Notwithstanding the numerous challenges regarding People, Resources, and Related Issues discussed in this section, there is ample reason for optimism that the situation can be dealt with and improved. In the Review Team's meeting with Full professors, the six faculty in attendance contended that the department has demonstrated an ability to address difficult circumstances in the past. Such outcomes and successes have occurred, according to these professors, when issues are discussed in terms of broader principles rather than immediate cases and problems. If this is correct, the department would almost certainly benefit from frank discussion of how to grapple with the complex and difficult issues of department culture, increasing participation, better mentoring of junior faculty, the future standing, status of the various fields and the implications for the department's identity, the structure of comprehensive exams, funding, and the intellectual life for graduate students, among other topics.

The myriad issues discussed in this section on 'people, resources, and related matters' are profoundly significant in their own right. Yet to some degree they clearly overlap and interact with, affect and are affected by, other factors. Specifically, the range of questions about culture and related concerns are affected by 'institutions,' i.e., policies and procedures. Accordingly, the following section on policies and procedures, especially, but also the later 'planning' section, engage those matters.

POLICIES, RULES, AND PROCEDURES

The External Review Team believes that the strength of a stellar academic unit rests heavily on a foundation of clear and consistent policies that facilitate faculty success and provide the faculty with a helpful guide to understanding key personnel and resource allocation decisions. Such policies also generally work best when they are developed and adopted in a democratic and transparent setting that encourages the participation and contributions of all faculty in the department. The work and debate that are invested in the creation of such policies also ensures that the faculty is invested in the success of these policies. Additionally, the development of department governance documents can 1) reduce the level of uncertainty that may exist, especially among junior faculty; 2) ensure consistency in the manner in which such policies are utilized as department leadership and personnel inevitably change; and 3) reduce friction and hallway gossip that often results when policies are unclear and/or inconsistent.

We believe that there is a solid basis upon which to construct such policies and procedures in the Department of Political Science. There is a great deal of institutional wisdom as well as many good, current practices that can be codified into a set of department by-laws or another type of governance structure that would work best for the department. While we would not wish to prejudge in any manner the outcome of the development of policies and procedures, our knowledge of our own and other departments' can serve as a useful guide and set of examples that the department may find useful. Therefore, we would call attention to several types of policies that we believe have worked well in a variety of academic contexts. Our aim in this analysis is to

provide useful observation and information for the department, not to implicitly or explicitly criticize any particular current policy or practice.

Recruitment of New Faculty

The recruitment of faculty is one of the most important tasks of any department, and especially for a department such as Political Science that has confronted many challenges in recruiting and retaining faculty. We believe a guide to the recruitment of new faculty that would outline not only the steps involved in the process, which we all know well, but would also benefit from being clearly articulated, and that would also outline the kinds of characteristics that the department would look for in all prospective faculty would be extremely useful. We would be happy to share such policies that we are aware of with the Political Science department if the faculty would find it useful. By outlining such policies the department could, *inter alia*, ensure that all faculty are represented on search committee according to the area of expertise and availability, and that job offers are given careful consideration by the search committee in consultation with the chair. There will undoubtedly be other issues that have arisen during past faculty searches that could be addressed and codified in the context of the creation of a set of departmental by-laws.

Mid-Term Probationary Review

The External Review Team understands that UNM has recently changed policies with regard to its mid-term probationary reviews to make certain they are more intensive and meaningful. It is important that, in conjunction with this move, the Political Science department develop policies and guidelines to communicate to junior faculty the key steps and timeline in the process and the criteria by which such faculty are to be evaluated. We have found it useful to have such policies document, *inter alia*, the relative importance of research, teaching and service; expectations regarding the quantity and quality of journal placement; the relative importance of co-authoring, especially with senior faculty; the level of service expectations for junior faculty; how publications and accomplishments from institutions with which faculty may have been affiliated earlier are to be counted; how teaching experience and innovations are to be counted, and other issues that may arise. Mid Term Probationary Review is a critical point in the career of a junior faculty member as it both looks back to accomplishments thus far and looks forward to the potential productivity and promise of the faculty member. As such, key department personnel involved in the review process, most especially the department chair, the Executive Committee and the faculty mentor, must be sure to provide clear, consistent and helpful advice designed to allow the faculty member to build upon appropriate successes and make mid-course corrections when necessary. It is vital that all these parties understand thoroughly the policies, procedures and expectations during the review, which necessitates that they be written down and frequently communicated.

Promotion and Tenure

The Team believes that the points raised in the previous section on mid-term probationary review apply equally to the promotion and tenure process. The promotion and tenure expectations are also part of the mid-term review process and the critical decision point in the career of a faculty member. The department already has excellent

documentation of its P&T processes and expectations, but it should also consider how university and disciplinary norms and expectations may have shifted over time and thus may need to be reflected in these guidelines. The faculty might consider issues such as the weight given to co-authored articles, interdisciplinary articles, and emerging modes of scholarship, such as on-line publications. In addition, the department should also consider the role of stop-the-clock issues, health matters and how other, particular and varied issues that may arise in the P&T process can be considered in the departmental and external evaluations. Often, junior faculty may come with some level of experience at a prior institution that should be factored into policies and procedures that set out a timeline for the promotion and tenure decision. The department should communicate these standards continuously to junior faculty and to ensure that, given the inevitable differences in opinion amongst faculty regarding these standards, junior faculty receive as consistent and clear expectations as possible throughout their career. The department chair and faculty mentors should also encourage junior faculty to attend the college and university tenure and promotion workshops to communicate standards and expectations at every level.

Promotion to Full Professor

While policies and standards governing promotion to full professor currently exist, the department may wish to consider whether addressing the concerns raised above and providing additional information on such standards could better communicate department, college and university expectations.

Other Policies

Most generally, we believe that the department could profit from developing a set of by-laws on a number of different issues. Obviously, the department will know best which issues and decisions could most profitably be codified into such by-laws, but we would highlight a number of policies that we believe have worked well at other institutions. As well, several faculty communicated to us that there was need to clarify rules on course buy-out costs, reduced teaching loads, scheduling of courses, grievance procedures, committee appointments, and other issues that may have caused uncertainty or concern in the past.

We would especially call attention to the need to develop policies and departmental norms that protect junior faculty. In particular, it was brought to the APR Team's attention that junior faculty were involved in full discussions on sensitive personnel matters and were expected to vote publicly on some of these issues. Best practices would suggest that such issues should have been voted on using a secret ballot (without a junior faculty member having to call for such) or that junior faculty should have been recused altogether from such deliberations and voting. We all value the full input and engagement of faculty, and especially junior faculty who are still being professionally socialized. But it is critical that tenured faculty remain continually on guard for situations from which junior faculty should be excused from participation because of their sensitive or 'politically' fraught nature. As well senior faculty should protect junior faculty, especially those from under-represented groups, from requests for significant department, college or university service. Given the substantial amounts of

collaboration that already exist among all faculty, we would not anticipate that such recommendations should prove too controversial.

The Review Team also believes the department should consider the possibility of developing a more formalized Executive Committee that would involve that body more systematically and continuously in important departmental decisions involving personnel, allocation of resources, staffing of courses, the acquisition of external support and other matters. As we understand it, an Executive Committee does currently exist, but it is chosen late in the year and only provides advice to the chair on annual personnel evaluations. Often, having such committees take an active and semi-independent role in many of the decisions of the department can help the department. Greater consultations on a wider range of issues can create more faculty investment in the department; provide the chair with valuable sources of information on faculty concerns; and help the department present a united voice in critical matters that arise out of the department and are decided at higher levels of the UNM administration. Again, we do not prescribe any particular governance structure; rather, our intention is to suggest profitable avenues of department improvement that should be given consideration by the faculty.

Lastly, we would note that faculty and graduate students called our attention to the somewhat diverse policies that exist regarding comprehensive exams. Some fields may permit or require an oral examination after the written exam, especially in cases of less than stellar performance on the latter. That some students are afforded such opportunities to demonstrate their command of the material while others are not, and thus face more imminent dismissal from the program, seems somewhat unfair. While permitting some variations in the structure of comprehensive exams can be useful given the diverse fields, such procedural inequities can lead to inequitable outcomes. We believe the department would find it useful to examine the consistency of its comprehensive exam practices.

PLANNING

The Review Team believes that many of the issues described above require reflection, discussion, and, perhaps most significantly, planning. Beyond the formulation and codification of policies and procedures, we encourage the Political Science department to engage in strategic planning on a number of issues, which we outline below. As this planning occurs, we encourage the department to take an entrepreneurial approach, looking for new or alternative solutions to some of their challenges.

Innovative Teaching Solutions

It is clear that the department needs more faculty in order to expand its course offerings at the graduate and undergraduate level. However, until the department is fully staffed, we encourage the Chair to explore alternative teaching arrangements that can free up the regular faculty to periodically offer other classes. For instance, the External Review Team learned that the Political Science department has already been in conversation with the Sociology department about possibly sharing teaching

responsibilities for required seminars such as research methods and advanced statistical analysis. We also learned that there are numerous retired diplomats in the Santa Fe area who might be hired as Part-Time Instructors to teach an occasional course, thereby freeing up a regular faculty member to offer other classes. There may be additional venues for cross-listing classes, such as human rights courses at the Law School. We encourage the Political Science department to pursue these options, which may provide a temporary solution to the need for more teaching faculty.

Strategic Recruitment of Graduate Students

While the Political Science department is pleased overall with the quality of graduate students, several individuals commented on the small number of applications they receive and the desire to have a wider pool of applicants. On this front, we encourage the department to develop plans for strategic recruitment, in a similar vein to what the Robert Wood Johnson Center for the Study of Health Policy has done. While we concur that the reputation of faculty is often the main draw for potential students, we also propose that targeted recruitment strategies – particularly to high quality 4-year liberal arts colleges and regional schools that only offer a terminal Masters degree – may provide a larger pool to select from, thereby enhancing the overall quality of the graduate program. We encourage the department to develop a plan to widen the scope of their recruitment efforts.

Enhancing the Intellectual Life of the Department

The External Review Team agrees with the Political Science graduate students: more can be done to stimulate and enhance the intellectual life of the department. Although resource constraints limit the number of outside speakers that can be brought in, we encourage the department to plan and institutionalize an external speaker series, perhaps by sponsoring one guest lecture per year, rotating through the department's various area of specialization (e.g. American Politics, Comparative, International Relations, Health Policy). Perhaps part of the department's Extended University revenues could be used to support the proposed speaker series.

Re-assessing the Department's Past Niche Approach and Current Strengths

The most urgent need for planning deals with the department's identity and niche strategy for creating a national profile. The External Review Team heard numerous members of the department question whether the emphasis on Comparative/Latin America should be continued, given that there is currently a strong emphasis and expertise in American Politics. Some also noted that scholarly attention on Latin America has waned overall and, despite the strengths of UNM's Latin American and Iberian Institute, it no longer provides as a strong pipeline for doctoral students. The External Review Team is not making a suggestion about what the department's niche emphasis should be. Rather, we simply note the importance of bringing together the department faculty to discuss this issue since it has implications for future recruitment and hiring. We also believe that this conversation, which could happen at a retreat, might create a stronger sense of departmental identity. This, in turn, might help in finding faculty job candidates that are a good fit with the department and who would flourish at UNM.

CONCLUSIONS

In this report, we have sought to recount, articulate, and summarize the major observations we have based on our close reading of the extensive self-study report and on our many meetings with different constituents from different units of the university – department faculty, graduate students, university administrators, etc.

We reiterate that the UNM Political Science department has been historically strong and its strengths continue through the present day, as evidenced by the department's many admirable qualities and achievements. However, we are concerned about the department's ability to maintain its success in the face of significant resource problems -- namely, a small faculty, very limited staff support, operating budgets, and so forth. The External Review Team sees other important issues – summarized under people/resources, procedures/rules, planning – that the department should address in the upcoming months and years.

Our major recommendations include the following:

1. **More resources.** We urge UNM's administration to provide the department with more resources. We note especially the need for more faculty hiring, competitive graduate student funding, more office space, and updated technology. Many of the department's challenges are caused by or exacerbated by lack of funds and thus, in the External Review Team's opinion, this is the most pressing need.
2. **Formulation of department policies.** We note that the department practices and standards have largely been a reflection of historical tradition. However, by specifying and codifying policies around committee appointments, course buy-outs, voting procedures, personnel decisions, and the criteria for mid-probationary review, tenure, and promotion, there will be greater transparency in decision-making. We also urge the department to develop a policy that addresses the inconsistent practices within the graduate program's comprehensive exams. We believe that developing a uniform policy for all areas of specialization will secure a sense of fairness and predictability for the graduate students.
3. **Developing a formal mentoring system for junior faculty.** While much informal mentoring has occurred, this has at times generated new problems as junior faculty have sometimes received contradictory advice. As clear policies around tenure and promotion are formulated, some of these issues will be addressed. Nonetheless, we still maintain that a more formal mentoring system would be beneficial to junior faculty.
4. **Strategic planning.** We encourage the department to engage in strategic planning, particularly regarding the department's identity and assessment of its past and future niche approach. Given changes in the faculty composition – particularly with an increase in American Politics scholars and now the health policy emphasis linked to the RWJ Center – we believe that a conversation is needed regarding where the department wants to move in the future and how to create a national profile.

5. **Reflection on the departmental climate.** We were struck by the major discrepancies in people's views about the departmental climate, with some finding it a toxic and hostile work place and others describing it as highly collegial. Obviously, this is a difficult issue to address but it is very important to do so to avoid alienating members of the department. The department may wish to work with a university or outside consultant to formulate a plan to address this matter.

Minor recommendations:

1. **Exploring alternative teaching solutions.** We encourage the department chair to explore options such as the selective hiring of Part-Time Instructors from the local area and collaboration with other departments for joint courses.
2. **Make greater use of Executive Committee in department decision-making.** To increase participation in department governance, we encourage the chair to make greater use of the Executive Committee. For example, this group could be the driving force in the formulation of department policies and procedures and the selection of faculty for various committees.
3. **Enhancing the intellectual life of the department.** We encourage the department to bring in more outside speakers and institutionalize this practice to ensure that it becomes a regular part of department life.

The External Review Team wishes to once again reiterate that we are suggesting these recommendations in the spirit of making a strong department even better.