

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.79-76

MEMORANDUM

To SENATE

As amended and approved by Senate
at its meeting July 9th, 1979
From SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

Subject REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

Date JUNE 22, 1979

MOTION:

"That Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the following recommendations of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, as set forth in Paper S.79-76:

1. That the Department of Economics and Commerce be reorganized into a School of Economics and ~~Administrative Studies~~ to be affiliated with the Faculty of Arts, and that the Department of Economics and Commerce be discontinued upon the establishment of the School.
2. That the School be made up of two departments, Economics, and ^{Commerce} ~~Administrative Studies~~, each with its own Chairman.
3. That the School of Economics and ^{Commerce} ~~Administrative Studies~~ will have one undergraduate studies committee and one graduate studies committee to serve both departments.

For Information: The School of Economics and ^{Commerce} ~~Administrative Studies~~ will be administered by a Director who will also hold the position of Associate Dean for the Faculty of Arts.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To..... H. D. NAGEL
.....
..... ACTING REGISTRAR
.....
Subject..... REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
..... ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

From..... J. M. MUNRO
.....
..... VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC
.....
Date..... JUNE 22, 1979

Attached is the report of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning containing the recommendations of the sub-committee pertaining to the proposed reorganization of the Department of Economics and Commerce.

Would you place this on the agenda for the consideration of Senate at its meeting of July 9, 1979.

encl.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To..... SENATE

From..... SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

Subject..... REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

Date..... JUNE 22, 1979

At its meeting of June 13, 1979 the Senate Committee on Academic Planning accepted the report of the sub-committee to examine the rationale and organizational structure of all departments and faculties within the University. The Senate Committee on Academic Planning supports the following recommendations pertaining to the reorganization of the Department of Economics and Commerce:

1. That the Department of Economics and Commerce be reorganized into a School of Economics and Administrative Studies to be affiliated with the Faculty of Arts.
2. That the Department of Economics and Commerce be discontinued upon the establishment of the School of Economics and Administrative Studies.
3. The School to be administered by a director who will also hold the position of Associate Dean in the Faculty of Arts.
4. The School to be made up of two departments, Economics and Administrative Studies, each with its own chairman. Terms of reference for the chairmen will be analogous to those of chairmen as specified in Senate document S.71-80.
5. The two departments will share a common undergraduate studies committee and a common graduate studies committee. The existing department committees will continue.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

If approved by Senate at its meeting of July 9th, these recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of Governors for approval at their meeting of July 24th. Additional matters requiring Board approval will also be presented (these are outlined elsewhere in this document). Following these approvals, the reorganization proposal requires the approval of the Universities Council of B.C. We will be seeking this at September meetings of the Program Coordinating Committee and the full Council. We would expect to implement the reorganization on October 1, 1979.

MEMORANDUM

To Bob Brown, Tom Calvert, Colin Jones

From Daniel R. Birch
Acting Vice-President, AcademicSubject Departmental Reorganization,
Economics & Commerce Dept.

Date 1979-03-19

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a task force to prepare a recommendation for SCAP on the reorganization of the Department of Economics and Commerce. Please feel free to consider the larger question of separate faculty status incorporating one or both of the units which would result from a division, and the question of reorganizing existing faculties with the transfer of some departments. However, it may be that consideration of these questions requires a more comprehensive procedure and a longer time. The essential question is whether Economics and Commerce should separate and should you recommend that you may wish to suggest several separate steps through which reorganization could be achieved.

Please consult with representatives of the DEC and feel free to call on the Registrar, the Director of Analytical Studies and on me. I trust your recommendations can be brought before SCAP quite soon.

Attached for your information are the paper brought before SCAP and a memo from Cal Hoyt to Peter Kennedy.



Daniel R. Birch

att.
:jehcc. K. G. Pedersen
H. M. Evans
J. Chase
P. Kennedy
G.C. Hoyt

BACKGROUND

On November 20th, 1978 the Chairman of the Department of Economics and Commerce submitted to the Acting President a formal request from the Department for approval in-principle of Faculty status for the Department. This request reflected the result of extended discussion and referenda within the department which indicated that:

- (a) a majority of the department was in favour of a re-organization of the department into two separate departments and,
- (b) the majority of the department felt that the proper administrative structure for such a re-organization should be that of a Faculty consisting of the two departments.

The Acting President referred the request to the Senate Committee on Academic Planning who, in turn, considered it at its meeting on December 6th, 1978. The proposal was placed before the Committee for consideration at that time in order to identify the range of possible responses and to determine the most appropriate method for examining the issues raised by the proposal.

Following discussion, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning unanimously agreed to the following motion:

"To establish a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning to examine the rationale and organizational structure of all departments and Faculties within the University. Further, that the Chairman of the Committee be requested to select the members of the sub-committee, provide them with specific terms of reference and a time frame for completion of their deliberations."

In March, 1979, the Acting Academic Vice-President struck a sub-committee consisting of R. C. Brown, Dean, Faculty of Arts, T. W. Calvert, Dean, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies and C.H.W. Jones, Department of Chemistry to serve as members of the sub-committee. Dr. Jones was appointed Chairman of the sub-committee. The terms of reference for the sub-committee are shown as Attachment A.

On June 5th, 1979, the sub-committee submitted its report which was considered by the full Committee at its meeting on June 13, 1979. (Attachment B). The Committee voted to accept the report. The motions presented above are designed to implement its recommendations.

RATIONALE

In considering an appropriate course of action, the sub-committee was faced with a major dilemma. For a variety of reasons, which are enumerated below, it was desirable that some form of reorganization be initiated as quickly as possible. At the same time, the proposal from the department for the establishment of a new Faculty raised a variety of issues relating to the most appropriate long-term academic organization of the University. The problems and issues associated with the latter cannot and should not be resolved quickly. Thus, the sub-committee was faced with providing an interim solution to the needs of the department without foreclosing any long-term reorganization options.

The solution proposed is to establish a School of Economics and Administrative Studies within the Faculty of Arts encompassing the two existing departments. This will allow for separate decision-making processes for those areas which are most contentious within the Department while ensuring that curricular issues remain the responsibility of an integrated body.

Why is Change Required?

The major reasons justifying the need for change are the following:

(1) Size and Diversity

In terms of faculty, programs, staff and student enrollment, the Department has grown to the point where administrative burdens have become unacceptable. It is not sheer size alone that has caused this, but rather the combination of size, the diversity of faculty backgrounds and interests, and the complexity of the Department's academic programs. Faculty in the organizational behaviour area have little in common with the faculty in economic theory, for example, and in a large department their administrative and social contact is less frequent. As a result the department has become badly fragmented as it has grown.

There are also different perspectives characterizing the two disciplines in question. Economics is largely research and graduate-work oriented with an outlook inclined toward the international market place. On the other hand, the discipline of Commerce is work-place and practitioner oriented in teaching with an outlook inclined more towards the local than the international market. Further, departments of business traditionally grew out of applied economics. This is no longer true. The parent disciplines for many faculty in Commerce are Psychology and Sociology. Thus, there can be a quite different focus for faculty in Commerce than for those in Economics. This general problem has existed in the department for a long time.

(2) Complexity of the Department's Program

The Department's academic programs are many and varied. There are undergraduate degree programs in Economics, in Commerce and in Economics and Commerce, with corresponding Honours Programs. At the graduate level there is Masters of Business Administration Program, Masters and Doctoral Programs in Economics, and an innovative academic program combining Economics and Commerce. In addition to this, the Department must co-ordinate with off-campus programs associated with professional institutes such as the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Institute of Canadian Bankers as well as respond to the needs of their own Continuing Studies programs.

(3) Conflict

In the past few years the differences of opinion between the two major disciplines within the Department have become serious. Although this escalation has not directly involved more than a minority of faculty it has touched off in the minds of others a review of the areas associated with these differences. The most serious issues relates to appointments. Conflicts between the two sides concerning whether or not additional appointments should be made in the Economics or the Commerce area has reached an all-time high; neither side is willing to place a premium on people with a background in both the Economics and Commerce areas. Furthermore, both sides have developed specific (and opposite) views on the relative desirability of certain types of appointments and on the criteria by which prospective faculty members should be judged. This latter problem also arises within the Departmental Tenure Committee. Interpretation by the two sides of the Department of the criteria used to evaluate their colleagues can be different and as a result each side feels that some decisions are inappropriate.

(4) Other Concerns

The administrative burden in the Department is heavy and is being carried by a few people. The downtown contacts of the Commerce faculty are substantial. The business community is accustomed to dealing with the Faculty of Commerce at the University of British Columbia which is a separate entity with its own Dean. The implication of this arrangement is that, in comparison with U.B.C., the business community may perceive our Department of Economics and Commerce and our students as second class because of the dual curriculum in which they are involved and because they (the business community) can deal only with the chairman of a department rather than the dean of a Faculty. For a long period of time, the Commerce discipline at Simon Fraser lived in the shadow of the Economics discipline and this further exacerbated the perceptions of the Department by the downtown business community.

ORGANIZATIONAL ALTERNATIVES

Five options were contained in the proposal from the Department of Economics and Commerce:

- (1) Do nothing
- (2) Modified joint department (would allow the Department to structure two separate appointments committees, two completely separate promotion and tenure committees, and appoint two associate chairmen one of whom would be responsible for Commerce-related activities, particularly with respect to the development of a Commerce Faculty identity at the undergraduate level.
- (3) Two separate departments in the Faculty of Arts
- (4) New Faculty for Commerce; Economics in Arts
- (5) Two departments in a new Faculty

In discussion concerning these organizational options, the Committee came to the following conclusions:

- (1) A split of Commerce from Economics is inevitable. Thus, to pursue the first of the five options contained in the proposal from the Department is not viable.
- (2) There is a very strong desire to maintain contact between the two disciplines at the curriculum level, both undergraduate and graduate.
- (3) While splitting the Department appears highly desirable, the appropriate organizational location for each department is less clear.

There is some question of the administrative and legal feasibility of the proposals contained in the second option. Even ignoring these issues, however, one can anticipate the consequences stemming from either a Commerce or Economics Committee recommendation which is not acceptable to the affected party.

Creating two separate departments in the Faculty of Arts would permanently separate Economics and Commerce with no chance of ever re-uniting them. Their academic ties would over time drift further and further apart leading to the loss of the new Commerce graduate academic program that has been developed in conjunction with the Economics graduate program. Commerce would continue to grow and would encounter difficulty living within the Faculty of Arts, since

its basic professional orientation is not typical of Arts departments. It would eventually outgrow the Faculty of Arts and have to be relocated elsewhere.

Creating a new Faculty of Commerce while leaving Economics in the Faculty of Arts will likely result in a severe reduction of the articulation between the curriculum of the two departments; Commerce students would likely not enrol for Economics courses, and vice-versa, and students in other disciplines would not take as many courses in Commerce or pursue cross-disciplinary programs. The proposals would, however, solve the appointment, promotion and tenure, and salary issues facing the Department as well as providing for the Commerce student a degree more recognizable as a degree in Commerce and thus more acceptable to the business community than any of the alternatives.

The establishment of the two departments in a new Faculty recognizes the inevitability of the creation of a new Faculty. It compromises on the dilemma of split versus no-split by splitting yet keeping the two tied together. This proposal also retains the possibility of developing a viable "joint" structure, rather than giving upon on this problem. Removing Economics and Commerce from the Faculty of Arts will restore some balance to the relative sizes of the different Faculties at Simon Fraser. On the other hand, it might be difficult to find a high-quality dean willing to take on an Economics Department in addition to Commerce. Further, the Economics Department may lose some status if it is moved out of the Faculty of Arts.

Both of these last two proposals have one primary disadvantage in common. Specifically, they both limit future organizational options as well as foreclosing debate on the question of whether or not such an arrangement is the best possible organizational location for the two disciplines.

It is because this latter issue is so paramount that both the sub-committee and the full Committee were reluctant to consider recommending to Senate any organizational arrangement that does not continue to tie the departments together within the Faculty of Arts. Rather, the sub-committee sought an interim solution which would achieve the following goals:

- (1) To provide a greater "visibility" for Economics and Commerce in the outside community.
- (2) To allow Economics and Commerce faculty to achieve, where appropriate, separate goals in their separate disciplines while retaining undergraduate and graduate curricula; while providing a separation of administrative responsibilities in the key areas of appointments, promotion, tenure and salaries, the proposal avoids a complete split of the two departments by retaining common undergraduate and graduate programs.
- (3) To ease the heavy administrative load in this large and complex Department.
- (4) To provide a framework for immediate action.

The proposed arrangement provides an interim solution acceptable to the majority of members of the Department of Economics and Commerce. It also ensures that the University will have sufficient time to consider the larger question of the most appropriate long-term academic organization of the University

COST

It is intended that the Director/Associate Dean and the two Departmental Chairmen will be drawn from within the existing Faculty of the Department of Economics and Commerce. Because of the reallocation of teaching loads that will be required because of these administrative appointments, it will be necessary to authorize the establishment of one additional Assistant Professor position. Also, an additional Departmental Assistant will be required. Thus, the estimated incremental costs of the above recommendations amount to approximately \$45,000 per annum.

SCAP TASK FORCE REPORT ON THE RE-ORGANIZATION
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

In December 1978, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning met to consider a request from the Department of Economics and Commerce (SCAP 78-18) for in-principle approval of Faculty status for that Department. As a result of those discussions, the Acting Vice-President, Academic, established a task force to

"... prepare a recommendation for SCAP on the re-organization of the Department of Economics and Commerce."

The task force was also advised that it should feel free to

"... consider the larger question of separate Faculty status incorporating one or both units which would result from a division (of the Department) and the question of re-organizing existing Faculties with the transfer of some departments."

The task force met in an open forum with faculty from the Department on May 10th and this was followed by meetings with individual faculty or groups on May 17th and during the following week. In addition to the many oral presentations, a number of written briefs were also received.

the task force quickly focussed its attention on a possible restructuring of the Department as a School and a further meeting was held on May 31st with the Chairman and three representative members of the Department at which a preliminary proposal was outlined. A number of constructive criticisms and recommendations were made by the Department representatives and these have been taken note of in the present recommendations.

The present recommendations are an attempt to achieve the following important goals.

1. to provide a greater "visibility" for Economics and Commerce in the outside community.
2. to allow Economics and Commerce faculty to achieve, where appropriate, separate goals in their separate disciplines while retaining common undergraduate and graduate curricula; while providing a separation of administrative responsibilities in the key areas of appointments, promotion, tenure and salaries, the proposal avoids a complete split of the two departments by retaining common undergraduate and graduate programmes.

3. to ease the heavy administrative load in this large and complex Department.
4. to provide a framework for immediate action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Department of Economics and Commerce be re-organized into a School with the possible title: The School of Economics and Administrative Studies. (The Department may wish to select an alternative name for the School).
2. The School will be affiliated with the Faculty of Arts.
3. The School will be administered by a Director who will also hold the position of Associate Dean in the Faculty of Arts.
4. The Director will report to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, but will carry the major responsibility for reviewing, on behalf of the Faculty of Arts, recommendations on tenure, promotion, salaries and appointments for faculty in the School.
5. The School will be made up of two divisions, Economics and Commerce, each with its own Chairman. The terms of reference for the Chairmen will be analogous to those of Chairmen in the Faculty of Arts.
6. Each division will have separate appointments committees and separate departmental tenure committees. Recommendations on faculty salaries will be made separately by the two Chairmen.
7. The two divisions will share common undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees, the composition of which will be determined by the Director and the Chairmen of the two divisions. For the immediate future, the existing department committees will continue. The M.B.A. programme will be administered by the Commerce division.

In addition it may be noted that:

- (a) any additional office space implicit in this proposal will be made available from within the present Faculty of Arts allotment.
- (b) the estimated costs entailed in stipends and additional teaching allotments resulting from the implementation of this proposal, together with secretarial and D.A. support, will be approximately \$45,000.

(c) since the present proposal does not involve the creation of a new Faculty or the transfer of departments within existing Faculties, the more general question of the Faculty structure of the University remains to be considered.

/tb
1979-06-05

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
AND
ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES
(Affiliated with the Faculty of Arts)

