

Hey Big Spender!

Examining the CoB Departure of Daniel Monchuk

As the CoB's economists depart the Joseph Greene Hall stage at the end of the 2009-10 academic year, USMNEWS.net will be examining the research credentials that will be leaving the CoB, if not the institution as a whole. This installment focuses on assistant professor Daniel Monchuk, who was one of the four mostly junior economists who were saved by the forced retirements of five mostly senior CoB economists. Monchuk is scheduled, as of fall 2009, to move from the CoB to USM's College of Arts & Letters after 2009-10.

What will the CoB (USM) lose with Monchuk's departure? The answer appears in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Monchuk's Journal Publications Trail

<u>Year</u>	<u>Journal Publications</u>
2010	<i>China Economic Review</i>
2009	<i>Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics</i>
2008	
2007	<i>Journal of Regional Analysis & Policy</i> <i>Review of Agricultural Economics</i> <i>Review of Regional Studies</i>
2006	<i>Nicotine & Tobacco Research</i>
2005	<i>Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics</i>
2004	
2003	

Monchuk's record is adequate in terms of quantity. It gets mixed reviews on quality. Looking at the nature of Monchuk's research program, it is now a bit more difficult to understand just how he fits into USM's CoAL; it seems that he may be a better fit for the College of Science and Technology (CoST) at USM. Monchuk may want to consider this line of reasoning if future rounds of budget cutting place ECO-CoAL in jeopardy. It may be his route to becoming the only remaining USM economist in the future.

As long-time readers of USMNEWS.net are aware, Monchuk's tenure at USM has not been without controversy. One of these is described in [What Does a "C-Publication" Cost These Days?](#), and this particular controversy involves Monchuk's 2007 publication in *Review of Agricultural Economics*. The RAE charges a publication fee of \$95 per page, meaning that Monchuk's pub there cost a whopping \$2,185. Of course, this sum makes RAE look like a vanity publication and Monchuk's resume look weaker than what Table 1 conveys.