

Carsten's comments

Meeting Summary

Date: 2 June 2014 [3 June 2014]

Time: 2:30 pm to 3:00pm

Venue: President's Office

Participants:

- President Tony Chan
- Prof Carsten Holz
- Ernest Chan (observer)

Key Points of Understanding

- President summarized Prof Holz's real "grievance" as follows:-
 1. dispute on economic course offerings between ECON and SOSC
 2. "double-standard" of UASC in evaluating Prof Holz as an economist but he was not allowed a free hand in teaching economic courses
- Prof Holz agreed with President's summary and gave the following responses:-
 1. he does not intend to pursue the issue with UASC; and
 2. he agrees that the dispute on economic course offerings is an academic matter and should be resolved under the university's academic procedures.

Ad 1: he regards the UASC issue as closed, and as having clear implications for teaching today.

-- My original grievance is not about the UASC. I stated in the original grievance "I request that ECON and the Business School be categorically denied a veto right over course offerings by SOSC faculty members." The UASC decision sets a standard that is continually violated by ECON blocking the 6.6 economics PhDs in SOSC from teaching courses in their discipline (economics), the discipline in which they are evaluated by the UASC and in other reviews. (It is also violated by self-censorship imposed by the SOSC division head in light of the ECON blockage.)

Ad 2: he agrees that the dispute on teaching economics courses is a structural problem.

-- I was (and am) lost re the "academic matter" (I don't know the full meaning), and may have shrugged my shoulders, and I don't think I agreed verbally. What I explicitly agreed to was the President's term *structural problem.* (A failure in system design.) I have no views on how the matter should be resolved, my original grievance simply asks that it be resolved.

- President referred to the 3 principles as formulated between the SOSC and ECON curriculum committees on January 21, 2014.

As I recall, the President may have referred to the communications between SOSC and ECON, but no 3 principles. In my understanding, there exist no 3 principles. There are 3 dictates by ECON, noted by Kellee in an email to us, and there are at least 3 more dictates listed in a response from ECON. There are no agreed principles as there were no negotiations. ECON is the master, sitting on all economics courses (except Introductory Economics) and systematically blocking economics PhDs in SOSC from teaching in their discipline. In order to have principles

obtained in fair negotiations/communications, ECON first needs to be stripped of the possibility to block economics PhDs in SOSC from teaching economics courses. For example, *unlist* all ECON courses and start from scratch. Or deny ECON the right to veto economics course offerings from SOSC.

- In response, Prof Holz opined that these principles do not resolve his core concern that ECON retains the ability to prevent SOSC economists from teaching certain types of economics courses. He added that SOSC should not act as a service department to ECON in teaching Common Core courses and it falls short of academic freedom by asking SOSC to have to use ECON's course number, text book, syllabus and grading method.

In response, Prof Holz opined that these communications do not resolve his core concern that ECON retains the ability to prevent SOSC economists from teaching economics courses. He added that SOSC should not act as a service department to ECON in teaching economics courses and it falls short of academic freedom by asking SOSC to have to use ECON's course number, text book, syllabus and grading method.

- Prof Holz supplemented that his views are being shared by all other economists in SOSC although he is not representing them as a group.

Please replace the word "all" by the word "the."

-- I don't think I used the word "all." While I have the impression that all economists in SOSC share similar views, I have not presented to everyone an explicit formulation of my views and requested an explicit agreement.

- Finally, President and Prof Holz reached understanding that:-
 1. It would be best for the EVPP to bring ECON and SOSC together to see whether a compromise can be made over the 2 units' disputes on economic course offerings; and
 2. If a compromise is not possible, then SOSC or Prof Holz himself could consider bringing the case up with Senate starting with CUS.

Ad 2: I have no recollection of such a statement/agreement. My recollection is that the President would bring the case up with the Senate, possibly by setting up a committee.

- Given the above understanding, Prof Holz agreed to drop the grievance against the President.

I did not make such a statement.

I agree to the following:

In my understanding, the President is addressing my original grievance by choosing to proceed with the original grievance according to 17c of the grievance procedures (where the President refers the matter to the EVPP for consideration), and possibly 17d(?) should he, as Chair of the Senate, bring the matter to the Senate or establish a Senate committee.

In my understanding, this action of the President resolves my grievance against the President lodged with the Council Chairman in that the action substantively addresses my original grievance, in accordance with the grievance procedures. I refer to paragraph 9 of the grievance procedures: an informal resolution of my grievance against the President has been achieved.

ENDs