

# Final Assessment Report

## Economics

### Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (reviewed 2015/16)

#### A. Summary

1. The Department's Self Study was considered and approved by the Academic Review Committee of Senate on January 3, 2016.
2. The Review Committee consisted of two external reviewers: Steffen Ziss (Wilfrid Laurier University), Swapan Dasgupta (Dalhousie University) and an internal reviewer, Carmela Patrias (Brock University).
3. The site visit occurred on February 10-12, 2016.
4. The Reviewers' Report was received on March 31, 2016.
5. The Department's response was received on May 2, 2016.
6. The Senate Undergraduate Program Committee response was received on April 22, 2016.
7. The Senate Graduate Studies Committee response was received on April 30, 2016.
8. The Dean of Social Sciences response from Tom Dunk was received on May 25, 2016.
9. The Dean of Graduate Studies response from Mike Plyley was received on May 23, 2016.

The academic programs offered by the Department of Economics which were examined as part of the review were:

BA in Applied Economics Analysis\*  
BA in Economics (Honours\* and Pass program)  
Bachelor of Business Economics\* with streams in Consumer Economics and Financial Economics  
Master of Business Economics\*

\*Includes Co-op programs

This review was conducted under the terms and conditions of the IQAP approved by Senate on June 6, 2011.

The reviewers assigned the specific programs varying outcome categories:

Outcome Categories:

Excellent Quality	Good Quality	Good Quality with Concerns	Non-Viable
BA Economics (Honours) Bachelor of Business Economics Master of Business Economics	BA Economics (Pass)		BA in Applied Economics Analysis

## B. Strengths of the Program

The reviewers identified 3 strengths:

**Co-op programs.** The co-op program attracts lots of applications and first year registrants and offers plenty of good job opportunities for students and is therefore a strength as it attracts students to Brock and offers experiential learning for students in the program. The obvious caveat is that only a few undergraduate students graduate in the co-op program due to the difficulty in meeting the grade requirements. Respondents to the MBE Alumni survey commented very favorably on the co-op experience.

**Business Economics Program.** Just like the co-op program the Business Economics Program attracts a lot of applications and a lot of first year registrants. The obvious caveat is that there is a substantial net attrition out of this program from first to second year due to the difficulty of maintaining grades. On the other hand the students that remain appear to be the better students.

**Teaching.** Surveys of current students and alumni reveal that teaching is well received. Moreover several faculty members have tried innovative teaching techniques and/or have won teaching awards. The programs are also well supported by marking, TA and computer lab resources. The only caveat is that some of the international student TAs have problems being effective TAs due to language difficulties.

## C. Opportunities for Improvement and Enhancement

### Recommendation 1

Add a second math admission requirement. One option is to add Data Management at 60. Another option is to require any two of (Functions, Vectors and Calculus and Data management) at 60 and 65.

In its response, the Department stated:

This change was recommended “in order to reduce the high attrition from first to second year” (p.4) After considering the matter, the department believes that the change would limit flexibility in admissions and reduce the potential pool of applicants while not helping to improve the year 1 to year 2 retention in its programs. The change would not help improve retention because:

- Many of our admissions are Goodman School of Business (GSB) applicants who are not offered admission into the GSB but are offered admission into Economics programs instead. These students will already have two High School Math credits so changing the requirement would not affect them.
- The Data Management course is the least challenging of the High School mathematics courses. Requiring students to have completed the Data Management course, in addition to Functions, is not going to provide students with much more ability to succeed in the Economics or BBE programs.
- Requiring students to have completed both Functions and Calculus and Vectors would provide students with more ability to succeed in the Economics or BBE programs, but that would put our admission requirements far above those of our comparator schools and drastically restrict our potential pool of applicants.

For these reasons the department does not agree with the recommendation and we argue the our admission requirement should remain unchanged at

- English (ENG4U),
  - Advanced Functions (MHF4U) (min. 65%) or Calculus and Vectors (MCV4U)\* (min. 65%)
- \* Brock will use the better of the MHF4U and MCV4U grade

The Faculty Dean stated:

While I appreciate why the Department rejects this recommendation, I would like to see it given a little more consideration. The rate of retention for students in the undergraduate economics programs is not as positive as it ideally should be. More work needs to be done to determine the exact nature of the problem. I note that Wilfrid Laurier and Western both require two high school math courses. Other universities in the province do not. Also, the Department outright rejection of this proposal seems at odds with its response to recommendations three and four. See my response to those two recommendations.

### **ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted for the reasons stated by the Department. The Committee understands this recommendation as a attempt to address the issue of attrition from first to second year. ARC expects that the Department will consider attrition in the context of a larger discussion about progression, retention and curriculum.

The Committees believes that recommendations 1 through 4 point to the need to utilize the curriculum map and consider changes to the undergraduate program to ensure that course content and delivery are addressing the course-level and program-level outcomes. The Committee encourages the Department to undertake an ongoing process of curriculum review and revision.

<b>Implementation Plan</b>
----------------------------

Recommendation not accepted.
------------------------------

## Recommendation 2

Consult with instructors teaching marketing courses to determine which topics (e.g. mergers, vertical restraints) might be useful to cover in ECON 3P06.

In its response, the Department stated:

Will do.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the recommendation and the Department response.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. ARC expects that the Department will consider topics in ECON 3P06 in the context of a larger discussion about curriculum. Please see also recommendation #1 with respect to curriculum review.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### Recommendation 3

Instructors of Mathematics for Economics classes consider striking a balance between emphasis on proofs of mathematical theorems in general vs the working out of illustrative numerical as well as theoretical examples from economic theory where the mathematics being taught is helpful. Content of the Mathematical Economics Courses should focus on the material that will be of direct relevance for the advanced theory and econometrics courses. If possible consider reducing the amount of material to a single 3rd year math econ course. Having said that, the objective should be to prepare the student well for theory and econometrics courses, which should include developing the ability of students to handle proofs and abstract logical reasoning that arise in economics, as well as the ability to employ such methods in their own analytical work.

In its response, the Department stated:

The instructors for the mathematical economics classes will reconsider the current balance between the emphasis on proofs of mathematical theorems in general and illustrative examples from economics.

The department disagrees strongly with the recommendation that we consider going back to having a single 3<sup>rd</sup> year mathematical economics course. Reducing the material so that math econ may be taught as a single 3rd year economics class is not feasible. Not only does this displace mathematical economics as a parallel core stream within economics but it also introduces a gap in the second year for all our students where no math courses are required. Furthermore, even with reduced material, a single course will be much too condensed and demanding on the students, as was our experience in the past. The current structure of having a second and a third year mathematical economics course, as recommended in the previous academic program review, has served to bridge the gap from the first and the third year well. It also provides students with the class time required for them to learn the topics required for their third and fourth year required courses.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with these recommendations [#3 and #4] and the key action in the Departmental response to this recommendation; namely, instructors should consider the balance between mathematical proofs and illustrative and theoretical examples.

One statement in the Departmental response is confusing, at least for non-economists. In defence of the current focus on pure econometric theoretical material and math proofs, the Department says: "mathematical economics is a parallel core stream within economics." The program description in the Brock calendar does not mention such a stream. It focuses on micro and macro economics.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be in two parts.

- a. The Committee considers the recommendation to strike a balance between the emphasis on mathematical proofs vs illustrative and theoretical examples to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee expects that the Department will address this recommendation in the context of a larger discussion about curriculum. Please see also recommendation #1 with respect to curriculum review.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>
--

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

- b. The Committee considers the recommendation to reduce the amount of materials in Mathematical Economics Courses to a single 3<sup>rd</sup> year math econ course to be not accepted for the reasons stated by the Department.

<b>Implementation Plan</b>
----------------------------

Recommendation not accepted.
------------------------------

#### Recommendation 4

Instructors of Econometrics classes consider reducing emphasis on pure econometric theoretical material and proofs of formulae and theorems and introduce a heavier component of applications of econometric methods to statistical studies undertaken as part of projects and applications.

In its response, the Department stated:

The instructors for the econometrics classes will reconsider the current balance between theoretical material and proofs of formulae and theorems and applications of econometric methods undertaken as part of projects and applications.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with these recommendations [#3 and #4] and the key action in the Departmental response to this recommendation; namely, instructors should consider the balance between mathematical proofs and illustrative and theoretical examples.

...There also may be an inconsistency between the Departmental responses to Recommendation One and Recommendation Three. One downplays the importance of preparation in math skills for entry to the program while the other suggests success in the program requires a level of math skill that may be a challenge for many students.

#### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee expects that the Department will review this recommendation in the context of a larger discussion about curriculum. Please see also recommendation #1 with respect to curriculum review.

#### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

## Recommendation 5

In order to improve student performance in the Statistics/ Econometrics sequence offer Math 1P98, Econ2P90 and Econ 3P90 in consecutive terms.

In its response, the Department stated:

We presume that the reviewers intended to include MATH 1P97 in the Math sequence in Recommendation #6 to make it analogous to the Statistics/Econometrics sequence in Recommendation #5.

Accomplishing Recommendations 5 and 6 is complicated by three things:

- MATH 1P97 and MATH 1P98 are offered by the Mathematics Department and we have no control over when they are offered.
- The three courses listed in each sequence are first, second, and third year courses. Thus their respective contents and levels of difficulty are pitched to their year level.
- Further to the notion that each trio of courses is a sequence of first, second, and third year courses, ECON 2P90 has first year micro and macro as prerequisites; and 3P90 and 3Q91 has intermediate micro and macro as prerequisites.

Notwithstanding the above, the general point is well taken. ECON 2P90 and ECON 3P90 have been and will continue to be offered in both the Fall and Winter terms. Similarly, ECON 2P30 has been and will continue to be offered in both the Fall and Winter terms, and ECON 3Q91 will be offered in both terms starting in 2016/17. The Department is also planning to offer more required courses (including some of those listed above) in the spring terms. So students will have lots of opportunities to enroll in the Math and Statistics/Econometrics sequences of courses in consecutive terms.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the recommendations [#5 and #6] and with the Department's response to them, including the complications involved in offering all of these courses in the order recommended. The plan to offer more required courses in the spring terms is wise. Please note that funding spring and summer offerings continues to be an issue that needs to be addressed by the university budget model and processes.

The Senate Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) stated:

The intent of this recommendation was to minimize the gap in terms between which students take these courses (e.g. MATH 1P98 usually offered fall (D2) leaving a two term gap (fall D2) or three term gap (winter D3) before ECON 2P90 is taken), to better ensure retention and carry-over of skills/information. UPC comments that the scheduling of MATH 1P98 is the responsibility of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, and is not within the purview of the Department of Economics. The Department of Economics will have to think if consecutive term scheduling of ECON 2P90 and 3P90 within program requirements is feasible, especially given the number of second year prerequisites required by ECON 3P90.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to improve access to these courses to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee acknowledges that the scheduling of MATH courses lies outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Economics, but would encourage a dialogue between the two Departments to explore possibilities.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>
Responsible for approving: Department
Responsible for resources: Department
Responsible for implementation: Department
Timeline: Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### Recommendation 6

In order to improve student performance in the Math sequence offer Econ2P30 and Econ 3Q91 in consecutive terms.

The Department responded to Recommendation #5 and 6 together, therefore please see the response to #5.

The Faculty Dean responded to Recommendation #5 and 6 together, therefore please see the response to #5.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to improve access to these courses to be accepted and in the process of implementation. As with recommendation #5, the Committee would encourage a dialogue with the Mathematics Department to explore synergies.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

## Recommendation 7

In future reviews, the Department should consider incorporating some samples of exams, assignments, quizzes, answer keys, project topics etc., as part of the information package provided on course content within its self-study.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees with this recommendation and will do so in future reviews.

The Department would also like to point out that this is relevant for Recommendations 3 and 4 above. While discussing those recommendations, the reviewers' wrote:

In this context, we have to recognize that our information is incomplete. The reviewers did not have any samples of assignments, quizzes, exams and their answer keys etc. to form a proper opinion as to whether the view point of the students is merited or not. [emphasis (underlining) in the original]

The Department will reconsider the balance between theory and proofs and more applied topics in the Mathematical Economics and Econometrics courses. But the caveat to Recommendations 3 and 4 should be noted.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the recommendation and the Department response.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted as stated. While the Committee does not agree that such material should be included in the Self Study, the Department is encouraged to have such material available for reviewers during future site visits.

### Implementation Plan

Recommendation not accepted.

### Recommendation 8

The Department consider broadening its pool of faculty members from which to draw upon when assigning teaching duties for first year classes.

In its response, the Department stated:

Will do.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation and the Department response. I have discussed this with the Chairs over the years. A forthcoming retirement offers an opportunity for the Department to develop a plan for this. To assist with this, however, it is imperative that full-time faculty who retire are replaced and that ILTA positions be converted to tenure-stream.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

## Recommendation 9

The Department try to improve its communication with the library via its liaison to resolve issues which are of importance to the faculty.

In its response, the Department stated:

Will do. The department will renew its book ordering activities and follow-up on the execution of the orders/acquisitions with the Library Liaison.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation. ARC should note that the composition of the FOSS Faculty Council was revised last year to include a library representative so that there are formal regular meetings (eight per year) that include Chairs and Directors and a library representative.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

The Dean, FGS agrees with the recommendation. For the graduate program, perhaps the GPD can make it a regular item on his/her activity list to survey the students and faculty regarding their library needs, and then meet with a Library representative to ensure that these needs are communicated, and a response from the Library received.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee would encourage the Department Library Representative to annually review library needs and communicate with the Liaison Librarian.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

## Recommendation 10

The Department encourage faculty members to actively bring to the attention of students, in each of their classes, the services offered by library staff which can be useful when conducting research and writing term papers and encourage them to take advantage of these.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees with this recommendation and faculty will be encouraged to include the Library Liaison and Library resources on course outlines.

The Department would also like to point out that:

- many Economics courses (e.g. theory courses) do not generally require the types of library services cited in this recommendation
- as noted in the text of the report, the courses for which those Library services are most suited (e.g. ECON 3P10, 4P10, and 5P04) already take advantage of the library services; including having the Economics Library Liaison and Data Librarian give talks and demonstrations to students during lecture time.
- students are being directed to, and are using, the on-line services that have been put into place by the Library and so the Library services are being utilized in courses without the direct involvement of the Librarians.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the recommendation and with the Departmental response.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

The Dean, FGS agrees with the recommendation. For the graduate program, perhaps the GPD can make it a regular item on his/her activity list to survey the students and faculty regarding their library needs, and then meet with a Library representative to ensure that these needs are communicated, and a response from the Library received.

## ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee expects that the Department Library Representative would be involved in encouraging faculty members to bring library services to the attention of students in each of their classes, as part of the annual review of library needs suggested in recommendation #9.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### **Recommendation 11**

The Department develop a set of tenure guidelines which provide a journal ranking and an expectation of the level of teaching performance and research output required for tenure.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department will work towards developing a set of tenure guidelines, subject to the provisions of the collective agreement.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with what I take to be the spirit of this recommendation; namely, that tenure stream faculty members need to be provided with clear expectations for tenure and promotion. Whether or not the specific suggestions are consistent with current language in the Collective Agreement needs to be determined. I also want to register a caveat: tenure-stream colleagues also need to be well informed about the tenure and promotion process. Under the current Collective Agreement, the decision is made by the Provost with input from the Department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean, and, of course, the information in the candidate's file. Thus, a Department does not have the authority to declare tenure requirements, although it provides important input to the process. It is imperative to insure that no candidate is misled in this regard.

### **ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted as it lies outside the jurisdiction of the Committee and has implications with respect to the Brock University/Faculty Association collective agreement.

### **Implementation Plan**

Recommendation not accepted.

## **Recommendation 12**

Replace both ILTAs when they retire.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees with this recommendation and would like very much to be able to accomplish it. But the replacements must not be at the expense of probationary positions. Further, it will be subject to budgetary approval.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I believe this recommendation is beyond the reviewers' mandate. The current two ILTAs provide a significant portion of the Department's teaching at the undergraduate level. Their retirement will pose a significant challenge to the Department, although it will also create an opportunity for the Department to re-evaluate teaching responsibilities as per recommendation number eight and perhaps address some issues related to retention. My preference is to reduce reliance on limited term appointments. If there are going to be faculty with teaching loads beyond the current Collective Agreement specified limits, I would prefer them to be full-time teaching-only faculty as at a number of other universities. As the Department points out, ultimately any decisions about faculty hires will be subject to budgetary approval.

### **ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted as it lies outside the jurisdiction of the Committee. ARC expects that the Department will proceed through normal channels of advocacy for ILTA positions.

### **Implementation Plan**

Recommendation not accepted.

### Recommendation 13

Continue to be aggressive in pursuing co-op student registrations and in encouraging students to consider switching into co-op in second year.

In its response, the Department stated:

Will do.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation provided there is support from the Co-op Office and good placements are available. I support experiential learning in all its forms but it must be high quality. Students may also need other supports beyond that currently provided. English language skills, for example, pose a challenge for some students' success attaining placements. The Department also needs to develop an action plan: "will do" is the correct response to the recommendation in my opinion but I want to know how it intends to do so.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted. The Department is encouraged to work with the Co-op, Career and Experiential Learning Office with regard to co-op registrations.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### Recommendation 14

Add a BA with Major Non-Honours Economics Program (20 credits, 60% minimum major average) which does not require advanced theory and math econ courses.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department will submit a proposal for such a program.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation and the Department response.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee encourages the Department to submit a request for major modification to introduce this new pathway.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### Recommendation 15

Offer more sections of required courses in the undergraduate program. If budget constraints do not allow for more sections to be offered then reduce the number of third year electives (especially ones with enrolments below 50).

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees with this recommendation and will offer more sections of required courses. For example, ECON 3Q91 and ECON 3P95 are scheduled to be offered in both the Fall and Winter terms of 2016/17 and several more required courses (ECON 3P21, 3P22, 2P90, and 2P91) will be offered in the Spring term of 2016.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I am ambivalent about this recommendation. It appears to have been generated by student comments. I need more information about the student concern before I accept or reject it. Is it a comment about class size? Is it about scheduling? Is this part of the concern noted in other recommendations about sequencing of required courses? The list of student concerns that precede this recommendation in the reviewers' report does not indicate why this is necessary. I am not opposed to the Department's response provided there are no budget implications but I do think a deeper understanding of the problem that this is attended to address would be useful.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted. The Committee expects that the Department will work with the Dean to determine the underlying data and develop strategies to move forward on this issue.

### Implementation Plan (2<sup>nd</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2017/18

## Recommendation 16

Cross list 4th year electives and MBE courses. If cross-listing is not allowed then simply offer the undergraduate and graduate course at the same time taught by the same instructor. This is a costless way of increasing the number of MBE electives.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department does not agree with this recommendation.

The Department does not believe that we should cross-list graduate and fourth year undergraduate courses. When the MBE program was approved by the OCGS, it explicitly prohibited the cross-listing of graduate and undergraduate courses. Later reviews of the MBE cited the lack of cross-listed courses as a strength of the program. The Department believes that having no cross-listed courses remains a strength of the program that it should maintained, and that it sends a strong positive signal about the quality of the MBE.

The Department strongly disagrees with the suggestions that we effectively, but not officially, cross-list courses by scheduling them at the same time, in the same room, and with the same instructor. We do not believe that we should do anything surreptitiously that we would not do openly.

The real issue addressed by this recommendation is the lack of elective Economics credits for students in the MBE program. The obvious solution is to offer more graduate level Economics courses and we request additional resources to offer those courses.

The Faculty Dean stated:

My understanding is that no more than 25 percent of the courses that comprise an MA program may be cross-listed with undergraduate courses but I defer to the Dean of Graduate Studies on this. There are some other programs that do this successfully (Political Science for example) as a way to make more options available both to fourth-year honours students and MA students. Thus, I support the first part of the recommendation, although with the understanding that it must be managed carefully. Despite this difference with the Department response, I do agree that we should not do anything surreptitiously. However I also note that simply offering more graduate level economics classes has serious budgetary implications that must be considered, especially given the small number of students enrolled in these courses.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

The Dean, FGS supports this recommendation. The regulations surrounding graduate courses allows any graduate student to take up to 1/3 of his/her program requires via courses that are a mixture of graduate and senior undergraduate students (so-called 4/5 courses).

The SGSC Committee stated:

members of the committee highlighted recommendation #16 as problematic. ...Committee members wish to point out that this is not in fact a costless measure. There were also concerns raised as to the number of cross-listed courses and whether there would be too many of them. Furthermore, there is a limit on the number of undergraduate courses that count as degree credits for graduate students. Cross listing undergraduate courses as graduate courses would not necessarily remove this condition.

UPC stated:

Graduate and undergraduate courses cannot be cross listed but may be offered in conjunction, i.e. both courses offered at the same time, taught by the same instructor.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted as stated, for the reasons given by the Department. However, the Committee would like to clarify that under existing rules, graduate and undergraduate courses can be taught in conjunction but cannot be cross-listed in the two calendars. A graduate program can allow for this type of course to be accepted towards degree completion. The Department is invited to explore this option as one way to increase the number of MBE electives.

**Implementation Plan**

Recommendation not accepted.

### **Recommendation 17**

Keep GretL as an introductory software and introduce a second software (e.g. R, Eviews, MatLab, STATA) in upper year courses.

In its response, the Department stated:

The department will follow this recommendation. It will keep GretL as an introductory software and introduce other software for the quantitative analysis in upper year courses.

Some progress has already been made in accomplishing this recommendation.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation and the Department response.

### **ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be already accepted and implemented.

### **Implementation Plan**

No further action required.

## Recommendation 18

Upgrade the Academic Advisor to an Undergraduate Director who is responsible for advising students, communicating with students about policies and events via a designated web- site, leading curriculum development, taking over the INPE and BBE coordinator roles and making recommendations to the Chair regarding course offerings.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees in principle with this recommendation. But the Department believes that the Undergraduate Director should not be a faculty member. A new staff position should be created to serve as Undergraduate Director.

...the department agrees in principle with designating a new position/title, and a more efficient alignment of the administrative responsibilities, in regards to the current position of Academic Advisor. However, the department does not believe that, if superficially implemented, such changes can effectively address; i) the unwillingness of faculty to play this role, ii) the lack of resources for the designate to employ in executing their responsibilities, or iii) the inherent mismatch of skills between the position envisaged and the Professors within the department who would fill it.

Thus the department accepts this recommendation if it is implemented by creating a new staff position whose responsibilities would include:

- academic advising and routine permissions,
- communicating with students about the policies and events via available channels,
- participating in curriculum development and maintaining the Calendar entries for programs,
- coordinating for the ECON, ECAN, INPE and BBE programs, and
- making recommendations to the Chair regarding course offerings.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree in principle with the Departmental response to this recommendation. I have a couple of small disagreements with the Departmental description of the background of the position. I am not aware of any evidence for the claim that the "workload for an advisor in Economics is much higher than in the other Social Sciences because of the larger number of students transferring into our programs from Business and other programs." If the Department has such evidence I would like to see it. The Department also fails to mention the substantial assistance that the Faculty of Social Sciences Undergraduate Affairs Officers supplies to the academic advisor in Economics.

Nonetheless, I do agree that the Department needs support in the form of a position dedicated to academic advising and the coordination of communications and/or information and programs as indicated. All of this needs to be factored into some of the other issues related to human resources in the department that have been raised in regards to other recommendations.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be not accepted as it would require budgetary resources and therefore lies outside the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee expects that the Department will proceed through normal channels of advocacy for these resources.

**Implementation Plan**

Recommendation not accepted.

### Recommendation 19

Students be allowed to elect at least one representative, from the student body in each of the programs within the Department, who will be allowed to attend regular Department meetings as voting members, perhaps with the exception of a few select categories of agenda items from which they would be excluded. They should also be considered for membership in some of the standing committees of the Department, especially those which pertain directly to student interests such as program and curriculum matters.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department will work towards developing policies/procedures to allow students to represent the Economics, BBE, and MBE programs in Department meetings and on some Department standing committees.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the Department response to this recommendation and would just point out that student participation in Departmental committees must also be consistent with the Collective Agreement and other university policies.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

From the graduate program point of view, the Dean, FGS would strongly support this recommendation, i.e., that a graduate student representative also sit in on such meetings, including graduate program governance meetings (except admissions).

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to have student representation in the Department to be accepted. The Committee expects that the Department will consult with the Dean about models in the Faculty of Social Sciences which might be appropriate or modified to meet the needs of Economics.

### Implementation Plan (2<sup>nd</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2017/18

## Recommendation 20

In future, Departmental Reviews should explicitly solicit student participation in the review process and keep student bodies informed, in a timely manner, of key events pertaining to reviews.

In its response, the Department stated:

The department agrees with this recommendation and will work to accomplish it better in the future. We believe that more student participation in the review process is a good thing.

But the department would like to point out that students were regularly informed of the review and student participation was explicitly solicited. Unfortunately the self study provided little information about the process followed to prepare for the review, so it did not document the steps undertaken to inform students about the review and solicit their input and participation.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the Department response.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

From the graduate program point of view, the Dean, FGS would strongly support this recommendation, i.e., that a graduate student representative also sit in on such meetings, including graduate program governance meetings (except admissions), and a communication method be developed to ensure that graduate students are informed as to the activities being undertaken by the unit.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be accepted. The Committee notes that the IQAP Section 2.7 states that the Self Study shall be prepared "Under the leadership of a Lead Author a committee comprised of faculty, staff and students, in consultation with all faculty, staff and students associated with the program".

### Implementation Plan (3rd Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2018/19

## Recommendation 21

The Department should consider having a set number of meetings every term with the proviso that if there are not enough agenda items a meeting may be cancelled. Input should be sought from faculty regarding possible agenda items.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department will work towards having a regular schedule of meetings in each term, with the understanding that meetings may be canceled if there insufficient agenda items. The Department also recognizes that department meetings are neither necessary or sufficient for appropriate communication with faculty and that faculty are also responsible for bringing forward agenda items.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with the recommendation and the Department response. The Collective Agreement (27.01.m) requires that Chairs call department meetings at least once in each of the fall and winter terms.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

From the graduate program point of view, the Dean, FGS would strongly support this recommendation.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation.

#### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

**Recommendation 22**

The Department should consider organizing retreats to have free flowing exchange of ideas in an informal setting about priorities, issues and direction of the Department.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department will consider organizing retreats. The Department has already started to investigate what is allowed for retreats under the current budget restrictions and collective agreement provisions

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree with this recommendation and the department response.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

From the graduate program point of view, the Dean, FGS would strongly support this recommendation. In addition, it would be advisable to meet with the graduate student body either prior to, or during, a unit retreat.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee believes that the Department is best-positioned to determine strategies to move forward with this recommendation.

**Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)**

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

### Recommendation 23

In future unit reviews, the Department should consider striking a small committee to spearhead its effort to produce a self-study and involve the entire department when assimilating input for the draft self-study and bring the draft for further consideration by the department as a whole prior to the adoption of the final version.

In its response, the Department stated:

The Department agrees that more involvement and participation by the Department as a whole is a good thing and the department will work to have more involvement in future reviews. Unfortunately the self study provided little information about the process used to prepare for the review, so it did not document the steps taken to involve faculty and other members of the Department. The Department provided many opportunities for faculty to participate in the preparation of the self study and consider the final draft.

...Last, accomplishing recommendation #23 is complicated by the incentive system put in place by the university. The lead author of the self study receives a half credit teaching release which, if taken as teaching release rather than cash (the usual practice), is indivisible.

The Faculty Dean stated:

I agree that as much involvement from the entire department as is possible is desirable. I am not clear what generated this recommendation. The Department response indicates that there were a number of opportunities for involvement by all members of the Department.

The Dean of Graduate Studies stated:

From the graduate program point of view, the Dean, FGS would strongly support this recommendation.

### ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted. Please see also the ARC response to recommendation #20.

### Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Social Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2016/17

## D. Summary of Recommendations:

First Priority:

Recommendations 2,3a,4,5,6,8,9,10,13,14,21,22,23

Second Priority:

Recommendations 15,19

Third Priority:

Recommendation 20

Not accepted:

Recommendations 1,3b,7,11,12,16,18

Not requiring further action:

Recommendations 17