
Report of the Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee

Into the **Department of Economics** at the University of Manitoba

January 2015



Canadian Association of University Teachers
Association canadienne des professeurs et professeures d'université

www.caut.ca

Report of the Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee into the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba

Allan Manson, CHAIR
Professor, Faculty of Law, Queen's University

Pamela McCallum
Professor, Department of English, University of Calgary

Larry Haiven
Professor, Faculty of Management, Sobey School of Business,
Saint Mary's University



Contents

- 1| Introduction
- 2| Methodology
- 3| Academic Freedom and the Modern University
- 4| Economics and the Challenge of Heterodoxy
- 5| Narrative of Events
- 6| Findings
- 7| Recommendations

1 | Introduction

In the spring of 2013, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) established The Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee to Examine Academic Freedom in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba.

The members of the committee and the authors of this report are the following senior scholars:

- Allan Manson, Professor, Faculty of Law, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, CHAIR
- Pamela McCallum, Professor, Department of English, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta
- Larry Haiven, Professor, Department of Management, Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

The mandate of the committee is:

- To investigate whether there has been an attempt to eliminate or significantly reduce the heterodox tradition in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba;
- To determine, if such an attempt is found to have occurred, whether it constitutes a violation of academic freedom;
- To make any appropriate recommendations.

The Committee began its investigation in May 2013. It examined documents associated with the matter; it travelled twice to Winnipeg to interview informants, from June 10 to 12 and from August 25 to 27. We also conducted telephone interviews with informants.

The Committee undertook its work as specified by the *CAUT Procedures in Academic Freedom Cases* — See <http://www.caut.ca/about-us/caut-policy/lists/administrative-procedures-guidelines/caut-procedures-in-academic-freedom-cases>.

Officials of the University of Manitoba reacted negatively to the establishment of the committee. University President David T. Barnard wrote to CAUT Executive Director James Turk on May 16, 2013:

... while the situation in the Department is unfortunately strained, your characterization of the issues being addressed by the Dean and the members of the Department is both simplistic and flawed. In particular, there is a diversity of views internal to the Department of Economics and a complexity that is not represented by your posing of the situation as one wherein a minority, viz., those holding "heterodox" views, are at risk of having their academic freedom curtailed by the majority. I understand from the Dean that many members of the Department find this polarization to be an over-simplification of the range of views to be found among them. Further, I am puzzled by the apparent commitment on the part of CAUT to looking out for the interests of one named group without mention of the others in the Department. You appear to be taking a position on a matter that the colleagues have not yet resolved themselves, and to be committed to an inquiry that will be shaped by that predisposition. If any involvement from CAUT were warranted — which I do not believe — surely an unbiased involvement would be required. Your letter suggests bias.

In a subsequent letter to members of the Economics Department, and others concerned with the case (see "Methodology" below), the University President, repeating some of the arguments above, recommended that they refuse to co-operate with the CAUT Inquiry. The President referred to an ongoing Working Group convened by the Dean of Arts to examine the internal situation.

Despite the President's actions, the Committee wrote to all Department members, the President, the Dean and several others who may have knowledge about the matters being investigated, requesting interviews.

Some Department members declined to meet with us; others did agree to meet, either in person or electronically. This included Dean of Arts Jeffrey Taylor.

We conducted interviews during the term of the Dean's Working Group, but did not meet with it. In no way did we interfere with their considerations. We have learned that the Working Group did not manage to resolve the situation and that its mandate has expired.

It should be remembered that a CAUT Ad Hoc Investigatory Inquiry has no power to compel anyone to agree with its findings or comply with its recommendations. Our purpose is to take an independent look from outside the particular academic institution. We knew when we began that we were looking at a department that was experiencing serious internal conflicts. However, the question for us was not simply about how the Department was functioning but, rather, whether any events, singularly or cumulatively, implicated or violated academic freedom.

2| Methodology

Upon receiving our mandate from CAUT, we also received a small package of documents including letters, reports, minutes of meetings, etc. With this background, we developed a methodology on three fronts: interviews, document review, and academic freedom literature review.

Interviews

We wrote to all current members of the Department of Economics, a few retired members, the current head, the current Dean, the past Dean, and the President of the University of Manitoba. This letter explained our mandate and suggested some possible dates for meeting in Winnipeg to discuss the issue. Our invitation generated two significant responses. First, we received an e-mail from Dr. Bose, the Head of the Department, asking us to inform him of the “specific allegations,” and of the reasons why CAUT thought there was a *prima facie* case for further action. Chair Allan Manson responded as follows:

As far as the Terms of Reference, my understanding is that we are looking at an allegation of a pattern of decisions and actions over a period of time which may, or may not, have been an “attempt to eliminate or significantly reduce the heterodox tradition in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba.”

My understanding is that your Department has been unique in Canada in terms of the diverse traditions it has maintained. The allegation is that there is an effort to reduce that diversity and bring the Department more in line with the norm elsewhere. We will be looking at whether this is happening, and, if so, did it have the effect of violating the academic freedom and faculty rights of some of your department members?

Subsequently, Dr. Bose replied that our response was “uninformative” and he decided not to meet with us.

Secondly, the current Dean, Dr. Taylor, responded by agreeing to meet with us but posed several questions about our mandate, the nature of the alleged academic freedom violations, and the meaning of “heterodox” economics. In advance of our meeting with Dr. Taylor, Professor Manson provided the following substantive response:

Our committee has been given two investigative tasks: (1) whether there has been a pattern of decision and actions which, over time, have moved the department from its heterodox tradition to a more mainstream emphasis; and (2) if so, has this shift violated the academic freedom of any members of the department.

*My general understanding of “heterodox” is that it means “diverse”, in the sense of a “group of broadly comparable economic theories — specifically Post Keynesian/Sraffian, Marxist/radical, institutional/ evolutionary, social, feminist, and ecological economics” which can be contrasted to mainstream economics [See Frederic S. Lee, *The Pluralism Debate in Heterodox Economics. Review of Radical Political Economics* 2011 43: 540].*

On this basis, we conducted a productive interview with Dr. Taylor.

Thirdly, Dr. Barnard, the President of the University, wrote to all members of the Department of Economics advising them:

The most important thing about which you should be aware is that you are under no obligation whatsoever to participate in CAUT’s investigation. You need not meet with them, speak on the phone, reply to written correspondence, or provide any information or documents. You have each been provided with a copy of my letter to CAUT of May 16, in which I set out the reasons I believe that CAUT’s investigation is problematic and unwelcome. Should you agree with me (in whole or in part), you should feel free to refuse to participate.

I do recognize that there will be members of the department who feel differently. I believe you have the right to express your opinions, in whatever forum you wish, on issues impacting your academic pursuits. Please keep in mind that CAUT is a voluntary organization with no formal relationship with the University, and as such is a body external to our institution, having no official standing of any kind.

CAUT may ask you for information which is confidential, and you are obligated to ensure that you comply both with the University's policies and with legislative requirements. Given the ill-defined scope of CAUT's investigation it is difficult to guess what information might be requested from you; however, as examples, you should use caution in dealing with:

- *Information regarding confidential processes, such as recruitment and hiring;*
- *Personal or personal health information about anyone other than yourself; or*
- *Providing documents or information to a greater extent than would be available to CAUT on an access to information request.*

Moreover, you should not assume, if you are providing sensitive information, that CAUT has any willingness or ability to keep that information confidential.

Within the context of these communications, we began to receive responses to our invitation.

Eventually, over the period of two trips to Winnipeg, we met off campus with seven current members of the department, two former members, and Dean Taylor. Two members were interviewed twice. We spoke with members of the department who would describe their research as heterodox and with members of the department who would describe their research as orthodox/mainstream. Subsequently, we also communicated with two former graduate students.

Academic Freedom Literature

We recognized very early that the issues presented to us did not fit the classic format of allegations of academic freedom violations which are usually cases involving some form of alleged external interference. Here, it was apparent that the situation being described, while it did include decanal decisions, also raised the difficult question of whether collegial decisions and interactions within an academic unit could implicate the values of academic freedom. Accordingly, we needed to develop an understanding of the discourse of academic freedom, and how it may have evolved to go beyond simply issues of external interference.

A small number of recently published collections provided us with an interesting background for this investigation[†] and generated lengthy discussions among us. This has resulted in the section below “Academic Freedom and the Modern University” which includes our conception of a test to evaluate when internal collegial decisions and interactions may reach the level of implicating academic freedom values. We are especially indebted to the work of Joan Wallach Scott[‡], an internationally known historian, who has served for many years as a member and chair of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors.

[†] See: Louis Menand (Editor), *The Future of Academic Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Len Findlay and Paul Bidwell (Eds.), *Pursuing Academic Freedom: “Free and Fearless”* (Saskatoon: Purich Publishing, 2001); Sharon E. Kahn and Denis Pavlich (Eds.), *Academic Freedom and the Inclusive University* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000).

[‡] She currently holds the Harold F. Linder Chair at the School of Social Science in the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton.

Supplementary Correspondence — After preparing our preliminary report, CAUT sent letters to each of the persons who could be affected in a material adverse way by findings in the Committee's report and gave each a summary of the information on which such findings could be based. They were invited to provide the Committee with any comment or material if they felt the preliminary findings were incorrect. Their responses were then considered and the report revised as the Committee felt appropriate in light of the responses and other information it had obtained.

3 | Academic Freedom and the Modern University

Academic freedom is a professional right of those who work within the academic community. Many scholars have attempted to define it. Distinctions in expression abound, especially depending on the extent to which someone considers or rejects the notion that academic freedom is but a *sub-specie* of freedom of speech. Regardless of differences, there is a common core to the contemporary understanding of what is meant and protected by the rubric “academic freedom.” As the American scholar Louis Menand has observed:

Most people share pretty much the same idea of the sorts of coercions academic freedom is freedom from. But the concept has different implications and yields different consequences in different contexts...†

The current investigation requires us to consider the evolving concept of academic freedom as it relates to a “different context.”

The policy of the Canadian Association of University Teachers on academic freedom contains the following widely-accepted statement:

Academic freedom includes the right, without restriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom to teach and discuss; freedom to carry out research and disseminate and publish the results thereof; freedom to produce and perform creative works; freedom to engage in service to the institution and the community; freedom to express one’s opinion about the institution, its administration, and the system in which one works; freedom to acquire, preserve, and provide access to documentary material in all formats; and freedom to participate in professional and representative academic bodies. Academic freedom always entails freedom from institutional censorship.

† Louis Menand, *The Limits of Academic Freedom, in The Future of Academic Freedom* [ed. Louis Menand], Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, at p.11

Here, we see the usual role of the concept of academic freedom as the protector of an academic’s freedom from external influence and censorship. It ensures that members of the academic community are free to hold, express, and teach dissenting or different ideas. However, academic freedom is broader than this protective role.

One need go no further than Article 19.A.1 of the Collective Agreement between the University of Manitoba Faculty Association [UMFA] and the University of Manitoba [U of M] for a definition which grasps the broader dimensions:

*The common good of society depends upon the search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom in the University in teaching, research and the dissemination of knowledge is essential to these purposes. The university faculty member is, therefore, entitled to freedom in carrying out research and in publishing the results thereof, freedom in carrying out teaching and in discussing his/her subject, and freedom from institutional censorship. **Academic freedom carries with it the responsibility to use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base research, teaching and the dissemination of knowledge in a search for truth.**‡*

[Emphasis added]

This conception of academic freedom embraces both the traditional protection from the interference of superiors as well as a less well-developed responsibility of the individual academic within the academic community. We will explain below our understanding of the importance of this notion of individual responsibility.

‡ Collective Agreement, 2010–2013

The Rise and Role of Disciplinarity

Long recognized as a fundamental tenet of university life, the concept of academic freedom has grown and evolved but perhaps not exactly in step with the changes and developments experienced by the modern university. Without embarking on an historical analysis, we can observe that the modern university is no longer based solely on the model of small colleges as governance and decision-making structures (often within a larger institution). Instead, we now commonly see governance units based on disciplines. This development coincided with the recognition of new social and natural sciences with their distinctive foci for research and pedagogy. It reflects the idea that academic choices and evaluation ought to be made principally by those who share in common training, professional formation, expertise and interests. This change not only affected the nature and scope of university governance but also has necessitated an evolution of our conception of academic freedom.

Menand describes the general relationship between academic freedom and disciplinarity as follows:

Academia depends crucially on the autonomy and integrity of the disciplines. For it is the departments, and the disciplines to which they belong, that rival scholarly and pedagogical positions are negotiated.[†]

Thus, disciplinarity has become a fundamental building block of a “self-governing professional community.”[‡]

[†] Louis Menand, *supra*, note 1, at p. 17

[‡] *Ibid.* Of course, disciplinarity has bred inter-disciplinarity in which combinations of different expertise and methodological skills can be effected to address common issues of interest. This development has produced new challenges both for governance and academic freedom. These are not the subject of this investigation

Much of academic freedom literature and most of the well-known cases of violation involve intrusions from outside the discipline. This investigation is different. What we have observed and documented relates primarily, but not exclusively, to relations and interactions between colleagues within the same discipline working within the same department. Some might suggest that only actions by administrators or other external sources can violate academic freedom. We disagree. In our view, all members of the academic community bear the responsibility of respecting the academic freedom of others. Only through this mutual acceptance of the overarching value of academic freedom can good scholarship and fine teaching happen and thrive. That is, academic freedom requires its own form of ethical behaviour.

The Ethics of Academic Freedom

With the development of disciplinarity comes a new set of questions and concerns about the potential of a discipline to use its common features to become exclusive. By this we mean whether the specialization and self-governance of disciplinarity may lead to internal processes promoting a particular approach, methodology or school of thought to the exclusion of others. For the most part, these debates have arisen within the context of contemporary intellectual and political conflicts which have produced various examples ranging from incivility and insensitivity to blatant insults and other aggressive responses. While we might aspire to good manners and polite interactions with our colleagues, these goals are not the stuff of academic freedom. The scope and dimensions of academic freedom cannot guarantee politeness, but they ought to ensure that academics are not the object of debates or decisions that would exclude them from their essential roles as researchers and teachers.

The American scholar Joan Wallach Scott has thoughtfully described this academic freedom issue as the tension between the “regulatory authority of a disciplinary community and the autonomy of individual members.”[†] She argues:

Since disciplines are often referred to as “communities of the competent”, it is worthwhile trying to think about the two terms-discipline and community-together, specifically about whether the dogmatic form ... is the only one available. I don’t think so, but I also think that elaborating an alternative requires something more than pious nods to pluralism and tolerance.[‡]

Professor Scott describes the issue in the following way:

*... academic freedom must include substantive, not just procedural judgments. Academic freedom is committed to an ideal of the unfettered pursuit of an understanding that exists beyond structures of inequality or domination, yet it always addresses concrete situations (within disciplines and between scholars and “outsiders”) that involve difference and power. At its best, academic freedom doesn’t simply monitor such situations for the exercise of due process ... but intervenes to point out the ways in which certain (but not all) of the practises that enforce exclusions interfere with an individual’s ability to pursue his or her inquiry wherever it leads. The adjudicatory function of academic freedom is to decide, in the context of specific cases, which are and which aren’t violations of academic freedom.**

She goes on to say that the “ideal of scholarly activity” must be both impervious to, but inquisitive and sceptical about, power. This is because of power’s potential to exclude. That is, academic freedom “lives in the ethical

[†] Joan Wallach Scott, *Academic Freedom as an Ethical Practise*, in *The Future of Academic Freedom* [ed. Louis Menand], Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, 163, at 168.

[‡] *Ibid*, at 174

* *Ibid*, at 177

space between an ideal of autonomous pursuit of understanding and the specific historical, institutional political realities that limit such pursuits.”[§] It exists in the tension between the ideal and the concrete happenings of day-to-day experiences in contemporary universities.

We agree. The key is to demand “something more than pious nods to pluralism and tolerance.” While we are accustomed to looking to academic freedom to protect academics from various forms of external interference, there can be internal sources which go beyond dispute and difference into terrain where a colleague’s academic freedom is threatened or violated. The essence of this investigation is to determine whether that has happened within the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba.

In our view, members of an academic community which embraces and espouses its allegiance to the values of academic freedom owe a duty to be respectful of academic freedom in their interactions with colleagues. The nature of the academic life will necessarily generate debate and dissent; there may be consensus around some subjects but we all accept the value of differing views and how these can lead to better decisions and the production of knowledge. The ethics of academic freedom is not about compelling consensus, but neither is it about timidity or simple tolerance. When a governance body, like a department, must make various important decisions involving appointments, curricula and future directions, we understand that different views, passionately held, will be expressed. Perhaps we all aspire to conduct discussions and formulate decisions in ways that are courteous and civil, even if we sometimes fail. The question we must ask is whether the crucial events here involve more than simple failures of politeness.

[§] *Ibid*

The Test

In our view, the line between tolerance and a violation of academic freedom is crossed when an individual or group within a discipline seek to enforce views by undermining the scholarship of those who do not agree with them. We are not speaking of incivility or even insults, but rather we are referring to conduct that impairs how a member of the academic community does his/her academic work. Within most disciplines, there will be those who pursue different methodologies, adhere to different schools of thought, or accept different theoretical foundations. In an ideal academic community, all of these would be respected. However, decisions will come about which can lead to positions of allegiance: which candidate to hire, which program to expand, which program is worthy of more support, how the curriculum should be shaped. Dissent will be inevitable. Sides may form and some may even evolve into a position of dominance. Winning the debate does not violate academic freedom. What is clear is that when a colleague advances a position by resorting to undermining the scholarship of a colleague, this is a breach of the ethics of academic freedom. It is not simply disagreement but becomes an unacceptable act of exclusion. The common feature of undermining is acting in a manner that interferes with or prevents colleagues from pursuing their teaching and research as their professional judgement dictates. At first blush, one might question how to draw the line before reaching the threshold of undermining. The answer lies in looking to the values that academic freedom aspires to protect. Individual choices by academics about methodologies, theoretical perspectives, schools of thought, sources of data or interpretive tools ought to be respected by other members of the academic community. History has proven that orthodoxy can change, and novel

approaches can become mainstream (see the following section). An academic owes a duty to consider differing views and, if warranted, to challenge them in the academic arena through writing and debate. It is not the nature of the debate but rather the implications of aggressive positions which can violate the academic's ethical duty to other members of the academic community. A violation of academic freedom occurs when the effect of those positions impairs the ability of those who follow a different path from pursuing that path in their research and teaching. This test is an objective one.

In theory, this kind of violation of academic freedom can be a single event. However, for the purposes of this investigation, we need not be concerned about defining the threshold for a single event violation. Certainly, academic debates become acrimonious on occasion. The "effect" test which we are proposing requires more than incivility or insult. Here, we are looking at allegations based on a course of conduct that occurs and builds over almost a decade. The crucial question is therefore whether, looking at the entire series of events within their proper context, is there evidence that members of the academic community achieved the effect of impairing the ability of colleagues to pursue their scholarship. When looking at a course of conduct, we are required to look for indicia of impairment such as unjustifiable burdens, interference or obstacles.

4 | Economics and the Challenge of Heterodoxy

The members of the CAUT ad hoc committee do not pretend to be economists. But one does not have to be fully trained and credentialed in the discipline to appreciate that economics is rife with serious internal discord, and has been for some time. Within many disciplines, there is an orthodox, or mainstream approach, and several competing challenges to the mainstream. With economics, however, there may well be higher stakes than with many other disciplines because economists, as professionals, are often called upon to formulate many of the policies that run our economies and to explain why those policies did or did not work or should have worked, if only their advice had been heeded.

In 2000, Jeff Schmidt, a physicist and editor of *Physics Today*, published the book *Disciplined Minds*.[†] In it, he argues that the word “discipline,” in reference to knowledge workers has two meanings: first, a particular way of viewing the world and of practicing the profession that distinguishes it from other professions; and second, a distinct way of compelling adherence to an orthodoxy within the profession by way of inducements and sanctions.

The book insists that, “Professional work is inherently political[‡] and . . . professionals are hired to subordinate their own vision and maintain strict ‘ideological discipline.’”^{*} According to Schmidt, it is the academies of learning where the process of disciplining begins and persists, among both students and among teachers. In reaction to the book, and as if precisely to prove his

point, *Physics Today* dismissed Schmidt from his editorship of 19 years. Only after a massive campaign by 750 physicists and other scholars, including Noam Chomsky, writing public letters of protest, was he reinstated and awarded compensation.[§]

In Schmidt’s view, the only way that dissenters or critics can keep from being overcome by the orthodoxy is by organizing with the like-minded and, together, resisting. We may note that sometimes disciplines eventually incorporate contrary approaches either as part of the mainstream, or at least as an acceptable sub-discipline. Sometimes, however, disciplines are more stubbornly resistant to approaches and views that they consider outside the mainstream.

Economic historian Frederick Lee uses the analogy of religious heresy and blasphemy to describe the uneasy relationship between mainstream and heterodox economics:

In the twentieth century, mainstream economists have generally treated their heretical brethren with tolerance, partly because they ascribed to many of the same theoretical tools and models and accompanying discourse and partly because many theoretical advances in mainstream theory started out as heretical ideas. Thus often one-time heretical economists become, without selling-out, well-respected mainstream economists. Also, as with church and state, mainstream economists have attempted to suppress the economic ideas and arguments of blasphemous economists, whom they do not generally consider their brethren at all.^{††}

† Schmidt, Jeff. 2000. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes their Lives*. (Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield)

‡ Schmidt uses a small ‘p’ although orthodoxy can often be influenced by governments and their granting systems.

* From summary of *Disciplined Minds* retrieved May 18, 2014 at <http://disciplinedminds.tripod.com/>

§ A similar take on the dual meanings of the concept of “discipline” is employed by Joan Wallach Scott, referred to elsewhere in this report.

†† Lee, Frederick. 2009. *A history of heterodox Economics: challenging the mainstream in the twentieth century*. (New York, Routledge): 6

The analogy to heresy and blasphemy is particularly apposite. And, just like the Church, while heretical economists may eventually work their way into a position of uneasy acceptance, or at least tolerance, within the discipline, others, the blasphemers, are considered outside the pale.

How have the blasphemers been excluded? Lee says the methods have ranged from social penalties to more serious forms of discipline:

The social penalties included shunning, ostracizing, and discrimination, especially when the blasphemous economist was a member of the same professional association. In the latter case, neoclassical economists used organizational power to prevent the hiring of blasphemous economists, to deny them tenure, or to directly get them fired for teaching blasphemous material. They also directly and/or indirectly used the power and the authority of the state to impose penalties, which included denying blasphemous economists government research funds, firing and blacklisting thus preventing blasphemous economists from practicing their trade, and legally sanctioning definitions/descriptions of Economics and economic theory that again excluded blasphemous material, with the outcome that blasphemous economists were not allowed to teach their theory and ideas in university classrooms.

Lee insists that, using its “incestuous relationship with state institutions,” the economics profession has some powerful disciplinary tools, including the power to restrict the blasphemers from access to platforms where they could influence economic policy. Given the strength of these tools and the “intolerant and hostile attitudes of mainstream economists,” Lee wonders how the blasphemers even managed to maintain their challenge.

While allowing that both mainstream and heterodox approaches are trying to explain the process whereby societies decide who gets what share of scarce resources, Lee summarizes the distinction between mainstream and heterodox economics in this way: “The mainstream explanation focuses on how asocial, ahistorical individuals choose among scarce resources to meet competing ends given unlimited wants and explains it using fictitious concepts and a deductivist, closed-system methodology.”[†] Heterodox economics, on the other hand according to Lee, concerns itself with “human agency in a cultural context and social processes in historical time affecting resources, consumption patterns, production and reproduction, and the meaning (or ideology) of economic activities engaged in social provisioning.”[‡] In short, according to Lee, a significant proportion of those in the mainstream of the profession regard the challengers as not really practicing the same profession and hence belong, not in the profession, but, at best, in some other profession entirely.

One of the exclusionary devices employed within many academic disciplines, but in economics in particular, is the notion of “excellence” or “quality.” While academics justifiably pursue the highest quality of scholarship, this notion has proven remarkably plastic and remarkably useful. After all, is there an argument against “excellence?” But if one believes in a narrow range of scholarly output in one’s discipline, then contributions outside that range may never qualify as excellent. Or they may possibly count as excellent in another discipline, but not one’s own. One method of gauging quality is peer review. The highest standard of peer review is often considered publication in scholarly journals thought to be top-rank

[†] Ibid. 7

[‡] Ibid. 3 The term “social provisioning” means the way society decides in which certain institutions and individuals

in the discipline. In many disciplines and in economics especially, failure to publish in the top journals can adversely affect scholars, especially those at the beginning of their careers.

Unfortunately, the choice of “top” journals can constrain, rather than expand the discipline, and can contribute to rigidity of orthodoxy rather than expansion of knowledge. As Faria et al suggest:

Paradigms have a social dimension, since they transform groups of researchers into a profession. The social structure of science has its own hierarchy, developed, among other things, to organize and preserve the paradigm, creating orthodoxy. Academic journals editors can be regarded as guardians of orthodoxy.

They are generally selected among the leading researchers of a given field of expertise. In this hierarchical world researchers are followers of editors, since editors shape and direct research.†

Macdonald and Kam, writing about management studies, a not-too-distant cousin of economics, note the circular logic and “gamesmanship” evident in the choice of quality journals: “quality journals are defined in terms that are themselves defined in terms of quality journals — a circularity that explains both the paper’s title and the frustration of those who do not mix in these circles.”‡

Such gamesmanship has long frustrated economics students. A portion of those in mainstream-dominated departments of economics have long complained that their discipline is effectively closed to alternate views.

† Faria, Joao Ricardo, Damien Besancenot and Andreas Novak. 2011. “Paradigm depletion, knowledge production and research effort.” *Metroeconomica*. 62(4):587-604

‡ Macdonald, Stuart and Jacqueline Kam. 2007. “Ring a Ring o’ Roses: Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies.” *Journal of Management Studies*. 44(4):640-655.

Comparing the problems of their discipline to a psychological malady, a group of French graduate students in 2000 founded the so-called “Post Autistic Economics” movement (a term they later abandoned as not entirely appropriate). The students (and the professors who later joined them) were not easily dismissed as they came from the *hautes écoles* (the French elite post-secondary institutions). As summarized by Fullbrook, they were protesting against:

- *The lack of realism in economics teaching;*
- *Economics’ “uncontrolled use” and treatment of mathematics as “an end in itself,” with the result that economics has become an “autistic science,” lost in “imaginary worlds”;*
- *The repressive domination of neoclassical theory and approaches derivative from it in the university economics curriculum; and*
- *The dogmatic teaching style in economics, which leaves no place for critical and reflective thought.**

The movement grew with media coverage, the inclusion of a group of professors, and the publication of the Post-Autistic Economics Newsletter/Review and soon gained world-wide attention. In their manifesto, the students claimed:

From the 1960s onward, neoclassical economists have increasingly managed to block the employment of non-neoclassical economists in university Economics departments and to deny them opportunities to publish in professional journals. They also have narrowed the Economics curriculum that universities offer students. At the same time they have

* Fullbrook, Edward. 2002. “A Brief History of the Post-Autistic Economics Movement.” *Journal of Australian Political Economy*. 50. December.

increasingly formalized their theory, making it progressively irrelevant to understanding economic reality. And now they are even banishing economic history and the history of economic thought from the curriculum, these being places where the student might be exposed to non-neoclassical ideas.†

It was with the financial crisis of 2008, however, that the movement really built a head of steam, as mainstream economics was manifestly unable to explain the predicament, and as some suggested, bore at least some of the responsibility for the crisis.

A *Guardian* article of May 4, 2014 reported that economics students from nineteen countries, including from Britain, the US, Brazil and Russia, had formed the first global protest against mainstream economics, the so-called International Student Initiative for Pluralist Economics. As journalist Phillip Inman reports, they insisted that:

... research and teaching in Economics departments is too narrowly focused and more effort should be made to broaden the curriculum. They want courses to include analysis of the financial crash that so many economists failed to see coming, and say the discipline has become divorced from the real world.

Their manifesto also contended that:

The lack of intellectual diversity does not only restrain education and research. It limits our ability to contend with the multidimensional challenges of the 21st century — from financial stability to food security and climate change ...

† “A Brief History of the Post-Autistic Economics Movement.” Retrieved on June 7, 2014 from <http://www.paecon.net/HistoryPAE.htm>

... the real world should be brought back into the classroom, as well as debate and a pluralism of theories and methods. This will help renew the discipline and ultimately create a space in which solutions to society's problems can be generated.‡

This contemporary student dissatisfaction is relevant to the situation in the University of Manitoba Department of Economics.

Among the panoply of academic economists, and in the Department that we are investigating, we discern three groups.

1. Those who practice and embrace heterodox economics;
2. Those who practice mainstream economics but feel that heterodox economists have an important place in the profession; and
3. Those who practice and embrace mainstream economics and who feel that practitioners of heterodox economics have no place and should have no standing in the profession. At best, according to this group, heterodox economists belong somewhere else.

To be sure, there is no clear dividing line between mainstream and heterodox economics, nor is there a clear division between those who practice these sub-disciplines. So, for example, most scholars who espouse heterodox economics are trained in neo-classical economics and employ and espouse approaches popular in the mainstream, like econometrics and game theory, though they may often prefer other approaches.

‡ Inman, Phillip. 2014. “Economics Students Call for Shakeup of the Way their Subject is Taught.” *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 7, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/may/04/economics-students-overhaul-subject-teaching>

Indeed, many mainstream economists insist that their discipline is broad enough to encompass a wide array of challenges and that the heterodox are criticizing a straw man. In fact, some mainstreamers insist that they are the true heterodox. Kenneth Arrow, a 1972 Nobel Economics laureate and Robert M. Solow, who won in 1987, have both insisted that economics has grown enormously in both scope and methods.[†] They and others point to game theory, behavioural economics, transaction cost analysis and other approaches that are part of the conversation, if not embraced, in the mainstream. The Nobel Prize in Economics[‡] itself has been awarded in recent years to several who might be labelled heterodox, such as Paul Krugman, Eleanor Ostrom and Daniel Kahneman. And even Oliver Williamson, a 2009 winner, at first rumbled the profession with his ideas until it realized that those ideas could make traditional assumptions of economic theory easier to reconcile to the real world.

Nonetheless, the high degree of animosity in many quarters to economic heterodoxy belies the notion of a welcoming discipline, with arms open to new approaches. Indeed, the insistence by the mainstreamers that the heterodox are attacking a straw man could be labelled “gaslighting” or causing “(a person) to doubt his

or her sanity through the use of psychological manipulation.”* Even as some heterodox are subject to unfriendly discrimination, ridicule, hostility, and censure, some mainstreamers simply deny it and insist the others are making it all up.

In answer to the accusation that heterodox economists attack a “straw man,” Australian economist Steve Keen, insists that economics curricula are overloaded with the neoclassical: “If what I demolish is a straw man, why do you teach him.”[§] In other words, despite protestations of inclusiveness by the mainstream, discrimination against and even distaste for heterodoxy *on the ground* in some economics departments around the world is well-established and commonplace.

Among academic departments of economics, the majority contain only a small number of heterodox economists, and their colleagues do not usually feel threatened by these few. However, a small minority of departments contain a critical mass of heterodox economists. And that is where the acrimony can be especially bitter. Just such a situation existed at Notre Dame University in South Bend, Indiana. From the 1970s to 2003, nearly half of the practitioners in its Economics Department were heterodox economists. An article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* described the situation.

† Monaghan, Peter. 2003. “Taking On Rational Man.” The Chronicle of Higher Education. January 24. (This article, by the way, presents an excellent overview of the dispute between mainstream and heterodox Economics.)

‡ Strictly speaking, there is no Nobel Prize in Economics. In 1968, a Swedish bank donated money to the Nobel foundation for a prize in Economics, called the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences. Eleanor Ostrom, the 2009 laureate, with characteristic modesty, insisted that she had not won the Nobel Prize.

* Retrieved on 13 June 2014 from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/gaslight>. In the classic 1944 movie *Gaslight*, the character played by Charles Boyer convinces his wife, played by Ingrid Bergman, that she is going crazy. He arranges for things of hers to go missing and for strange things to happen, like footsteps on an upper floor or flickering gaslight in the house, and then he insists that these are figments of her imagination.

§ Ibid

How do you start a fire under a huge wet blanket? A faction of disgruntled economists says that is their predicament. Their efforts to open the field to diverse views are smothered, they say, by an orthodoxy - neoclassical Economics and its derivatives — that is indulgently theoretical and mathematical in its aspiration to be more ‘scientific’ than any other social science ...

Many say that the rebels are challenging a straw man — that neoclassical Economics, which is based on such concepts as rational choice, the market, and economies’ tendency to move toward equilibrium, is much roomier than portrayed. But others have a more belligerent response: Like us or leave us for other departments and disciplines, such as political science, history, or sociology.†

After a long series of disputes in the Department, university administrators employed (in the words of the *Chronicle*) a “Solomonic” solution, and split the 21-member department in two: a Department of Economics and Policy Studies for the eleven heterodox and a Department of Economics and Econometrics, for the remaining mainstreamers. The eleven heterodox protested the move, predicting that without a graduate program their new department would die a slow death, while the Economics and Econometrics Department, with a graduate program and new hires, would thrive.

Those favouring the split argued that the beefed-up Economics and Econometrics Department could then turn its attention to publishing in the top mainstream journals and make a name for itself. And that is what happened, with “a sharp growth in the overall number of Economics majors and stronger visibility for Notre Dame in the world of mainstream economic research.”‡

† Ibid

‡ Glenn, David. 2009. “Notre Dame Plans to Dissolve the ‘Heterodox’ Side of Its Split Economics Department.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. September 16.

This result, however, was achieved at the expense of diversity and a diminishment of the scope of what is considered acceptable economics. “Everyone is trying to be a little MIT or a little Harvard and look exactly the same because that’s the way you get scientific prestige,” Bruce J. Caldwell, a historian of economic thought at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro told *The Chronicle*. That approach, he added, “ignores basic economic theory about the benefits of diversification, specialization, and niche marketing.” Charles K. Wilber, an emeritus economics professor at Notre Dame noted the irony of removing critical voices from the mix: “In light of the crash of the economy, you would think there would be some humility among economists, some openness to new approaches. There’s not a lot.”*

In 2010 The University of Notre Dame shut down the heterodox department. A few of the academics in it would go back to the mainstream department but others would either leave Notre Dame or find jobs elsewhere on campus.

We mention all of the above to underline that while the situation at the University of Manitoba bears its own distinctive stamp, it is far from unique in the recent annals of academic economics.

* Glenn, David. 2009. “Notre Dame Plans to Dissolve the ‘Heterodox’ Side of Its Split Economics Department.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. September 16

5| Narrative of Events

This section of the report is a chronology of events that have marked the controversy within the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba. For the reader's clarification, it begins with the series of Department Heads since 1984, followed by a condensed timeline, and ending with a fuller narrative.

Headships

1984–1997	Headship of Dr. John Loxley
1997–2008	Headship of Dr. Wayne Simpson
2008–2010	Acting Headship of Dr. David Stangeland
2010–present	Headship of Dr. Pinaki Bose

Timeline of Events Discussed

2006	Search for a position in Canadian economic policy
2007	Second search for a position in Canadian economic policy
2008	Search for a Department Head
2008–2009	Investigation of respectful work and learning environment complaints
2009	Second search for a Department Head
2009	Grievance over the process of the headship search by Faculty Association and Dr. Chernomas
2010	Labour Studies moved from the Department of Economics
2012	Undergraduate program review received
2013	Controversy over reassignment of undergraduate macroeconomics course
2013	Proposed review of Dr. Chernomas's undergraduate health economics course
2013	Dean Jeffrey Taylor's Working Group chaired by Prof. Richard Lobdell
2013	Graduate program review received
2014	Continuing discussion of graduate program review

The Department of Economics Prior to 2006

Prior to 2006 the Department of Economics was a mix of heterodox and mainstream economists, with the mainstream being in the majority. In matters of hiring, there was a consensus that both mainstream and heterodox candidates should be hired at a rate of roughly two mainstream economists to one heterodox economist to ensure the viability of both broad traditions: "we were committed to methodological pluralism" was the way one senior faculty member put it. Another faculty member said the Department had a "rich intellectual environment" and was "a terrific place to be." S/he went on to stress that the atmosphere within the Department was sustained by support for a pluralist presence from a middle group of mainstream economists who were committed to the inclusion of the approaches and research of their heterodox colleagues. The mainstream and heterodox scholars appeared to work well together: invitations to external speakers included a mix of mainstream and heterodox visitors, with members of each group attending. Discussion following a presentation might be heated and intense, but remained respectful. The significance of these exchanges is summed up by one faculty member, who described his/her own research as "mainstream orthodox," but said, "I like to have a dialogue." The Department regularly held retreats at Delta Marsh, which were well attended, popular with all faculty members, and seen to be an important part of Departmental collegiality, allowing interaction and discussion to take place in a less formal setting. Perhaps most significant is the priority that the two assessors, Lars Osberg of Dalhousie University and David Johnson of Wilfrid Laurier University, in the 2006 graduate program review gave to continuing the balance in the Department. In the opinion of these assessors, one of the decided strengths of the University

of Manitoba Economics programs was the ability to train graduate students in heterodox economics. From their perspective, this characteristic made the University of Manitoba program unique among the many other competing programs on the continent.

They made the following recommendation:

A final consideration is what economists might call “product differentiation”. We asked repeatedly “What’s special about Manitoba? What strengths does the department have that might attract students?” Although there were a variety of answers given by different members of the Department, the committee is impressed that this is the only program in Canada with the potential to teach heterodox economics at the graduate level. The committee suggests that the Department consider whether this should be more thoroughly exploited as a positive differentiation of the Department’s programs.†

This recommendation seems to have been ignored. However, former Dean Sigurdson denies this and stated that any decision about how to proceed on graduate program recommendations was made not by him but through the department’s own collegial governance processes. He further stated that the heterodox flavor of the program was never eliminated and that the important heterodox tradition of the Department was clearly valued both by him and by Economics faculty members who identified as more mainstream.

We do not raise these issues to create nostalgia for the past. Instead, the situation before 2006 emphasizes that a program with a diversity of approaches to the study of economics was able to function productively and that

such a program brought unique distinctiveness to the University. A former graduate student told us that the PhD program was recommended by his/her professors because of its strength in heterodox economics. Such a recommendation from an international source would be considered a positive by any university.

Deterioration of relations among faculty members in the Department may have started under the headship of Dr. Simpson, but was rapidly accelerated when several interventions by Dean Sigurdson altered the direction of the Department. What follows is a narrative of a series of events in the Department over an extended period of eight years.

The Search for a Position in Canadian Economic Policy (2006)

In 2006, a search commenced for an economist in Canadian economic/social policy, a position that had been agreed upon by the entire Department. The search committee was made up of both heterodox and mainstream economists. One faculty member told us that under the Department’s traditional policy of hiring both heterodox and mainstream economists this position should have been for a heterodox scholar. Former Dean Sigurdson stated that it was not the “policy” of the Department to alternate between the hiring of heterodox and mainstream economists although it is true that that the Department generally desired to recruit from both areas of the discipline but that this has never been interpreted to require the Dean to accept candidates which are of unsatisfactory quality.

In any event, the shortlist put forward consisted of four candidates who then attended campus for interviews. A faculty member told us that any one of the four would have been acceptable to him/her, and pointed out that subsequently all were offered positions at other

† Johnson, David, Lars Osberg and Raymond Wiest. 2005. “Report of the Review Committee of the Graduate Program in Economics.” Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the Department of Economics of the University of Manitoba. May 17.

universities, a convincing measure of their quality. Another said that three of the four were acceptable. The hiring committee forwarded the names acceptable to it for decanal approval. At this point Dean Sigurdson declared a failed search, and so informed the Department by letter, giving no specific reason. Former Dean Sigurdson stated that the members of the Department agreed that the search had failed. The abruptness of this decision raised procedural questions. First, if none of the candidates were appropriate, then why was the shortlist approved for interviews? From the University of Manitoba's point of view, it would be more fiscally responsible not to interview inappropriate candidates. From a professional point of view, it is questionable to bring candidates to campus if they are inappropriate for a position.

The Second Search for a Position in Canadian Economic Policy (2007)

The search for a position in Canadian economic policy was taken up in 2007 with a different committee, this time dominated by mainstream economists. One faculty member told us s/he believes that the Dean was instrumental in creating this imbalance. A second faculty member, using stronger terms, told us that the Dean "loaded committees with his people" and that "there was never another [hiring] committee that reflected the diversity of the Department." In his correspondence, former Dean Sigurdson denied these allegations and pointed out that he only "selected a portion of the search committee members" and the remainder were nominated by the department. The outcome of this search was the hiring of a mainstream economist.

The Headship Search (2008)

Concerns about the searches for the position in Canadian economic policy pale beside the search for a Department Head in 2008, which one faculty member described as "unbelievably chaotic." Dr. Chernomas has told us he applied for the position but was not interviewed by the search committee. The Arbitrator of a subsequent grievance (discussed below) wrote, "two strange things happened" during this process. The first was the delivery by two department members to the search committee of prepared statements about Dr. Chernomas that were described as "emotional," "highly personal and visceral." The writers were the two complainants in the Respectful Work and Environment complaint discussed below. [It should be noted that "strong negative views" were also expressed about the other internal candidate at this time.] The second was bringing in Dr. Bose from outside the department before a shortlist was published. The Arbitrator of the eventual grievance commented that everyone agreed that this step was "unusual and unheard of." Department members had not been informed that the committee had reached the stage of interviews. When Dr. Bose visited the Department, the purpose of his visit and presentation were not made clear to the Department. However, several faculty members said that the general sense was that he was in Winnipeg as a candidate for the headship. At this point, in a process that had been obscure and confused, to say the least, the Dean aborted the process.

On June 2, 2008, the Dean sent a memorandum to the Department, which included the following:

This is to inform you that due to procedural irregularities the search for the position of Head, Department of Economics, has been cancelled and the search advisory committee disbanded. In the meantime, I have asked an individual outside the Department to become Acting Head for the period July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

I am sure that you will agree that filling the position of Head with an outstanding academic leader is absolutely crucial for the Department of Economics.

The Second Headship Search (2009)

A second headship search was mounted. The nominees for the advisory committee were elected at a November 19, 2008 meeting of the Department at which 18 faculty attended. At the time, the Respectful Work and Environment complaint [discussed below] had been initiated and the University of Manitoba Faculty Association had advised the Dean that the second search should not proceed until that complaint was investigated. A number of faculty members expressed the same view at the meeting and, as a result, seven members abstained from the voting. At least one objector declined a nomination. Eventually, the committee, as constituted by the Dean from the nominated list, was made up of members who favoured mainstream economics. This committee produced a shortlist comprised of a candidate from an Ontario university, Dr. Bose, from University of Memphis and a candidate from Texas. Dr. Chernomas applied for the position, but was not shortlisted. The candidate from the Ontario university would have brought the experience of having served two terms as a department head. The candidate from Texas was relatively junior and had no administrative experience at all; he had not served as chair of an important university committee, let alone as an associate or assistant head. Several faculty members told us that when asked about his administrative experience, he replied that he had been captain of a sports team — evidence of leadership perhaps, but hardly qualification to head an academic department. It is difficult to understand why an apparently under-qualified candidate was brought to Winnipeg for an interview. The committee recommended the appointment of Dr. Bose. During the

interview process, in response to queries about the growing animosities in the Department, Dr. Bose said publicly that he would try to foster reconciliation, a statement that was important for a unit experiencing polarization. Skepticism of Dr. Bose's ability to work with both traditions is borne out by subsequent events, discussed below. The first example, as reported to us, was his appointment of an Associate Head who was identified with faculty members hostile to heterodox economics.

At the same time that these problematic searches were undertaken several other issues deepened Departmental divisions.

The Respectful Work and Learning Environment Investigation (2008–2009)

On June 16, 2008, apparently after consulting with Dean Sigurdson, two department members made a formal complaint under the University's *Respectful Work and Learning Environment* policy. They alleged that Drs. Chernomas and Loxley, two senior heterodox faculty members, had behaved uncollegially towards them. Essentially, the complaint consisted of allegations of harassment. The Vice-President appointed an external investigator who heard the evidence, including the testimony of thirteen departmental members. She found that not one of twenty complaints could be upheld. The investigation findings and reasons have been kept confidential on orders of the University, and we have not had access to them. However, we have been told that shortly after its completion the Department members were advised that the investigation had exonerated Dr. Loxley and Dr. Chernomas on all counts.

Despite being absolved of any wrongdoing by the investigator's ruling, Drs. Chernomas and Loxley felt considerable stress in facing the allegations — charges that have the potential to deeply damage a scholar's reputation. The process proved to be extremely hurtful to both. The latter described the effect of the accusations and the inquiry on him as traumatic. Even if it was gratifying to know that an external investigator dismissed all the allegations, that knowledge does not erase the distress of the process. According to one faculty member, someone not involved in the process, the complaints and their investigation had the effect of “a steady deterioration in a number of relationships in the department, and rapid deterioration in others.”

The Grievance over the Second Headship Search

On March 27, 2009, the University of Manitoba Faculty Association on behalf of Dr. Chernomas filed a grievance arguing that the second headship search was, contrary to the Collective Agreement, unfair, unreasonable and biased in relation to Dr. Chernomas. The grievor's main complaint, as interpreted by the Arbitrator, was that “the search process was not adjourned pending the investigation of the complaint” against him.†

The matter went to arbitration before Michael Werier who heard evidence and submissions for five days from April 26 to May 10, 2010. In essence, the grievor was arguing that continuing the search process while the Respectful Workplace Complaint was still ongoing produced the alleged unfairness. By reasons dated November 10, 2010, the Arbitrator dismissed the grievance concluding that he was not satisfied that the

collective agreement had been violated or that the “Association has proven that there was unfairness or bias in the process leading to the selection” of Dr. Bose as Department Head. He also held that the irregularities which caused the first search to be cancelled did not taint the second search.

Given that the Arbitrator heard evidence from three faculty members, Dean Sigurdson and Acting Head David Stangeland, and reviewed 64 exhibits, some of his findings and observations are extremely relevant to our investigation, even though the grievance was dismissed. In his summary of events, he found that:

All witnesses confirmed that the Department was experiencing significant difficulties. The Faculty was split into two camps; the heterodox and the orthodox or mainstream. The two camps had opposing views of the future direction of the Department ... There was a lack of collegiality and collaboration and all witnesses agreed that the Department needed a new Head who could provide leadership to the group.‡

He commented that “tensions” had been increasing, and pointed out that during the aborted first headship search two “unusual things happened” (discussed above). With respect to Dr. Chernomas, the Arbitrator observed that:

*... it was unfortunate that he was subject to a Complaint which was determined to be unfounded. It obviously caused him personal anguish. This however cannot be the basis for overturning the selection of the new Department Head.**

In concluding his Reasons, the Arbitrator expressed his hope that the new Head, Dr. Bose, would be “able to bring some stability, direction and healing to the Faculty.”§ This exhortation aptly captures the ruptured and dysfunctional state of the Department in 2010.

† See Award, Michael Werier, November 10, 2010, at p. 54.

‡ Ibid, at p. 8.

* Ibid, at p. 64.

§ Ibid, at p.65.

A Hostile Environment for Heterodox Faculty and their Students

From 2008 several incidents point to an atmosphere in the Department of Economics that made it difficult for heterodox economists to do their work. One mainstream economist is reported to have said within the hearing of a heterodox economist that “what the department needs is a good health economist.” The heterodox economist had published widely in health economics and had taught the subject over many years. S/he took the statement to mean that his/her research and teaching were of little worth, and that they did not fulfill the needs of the Department. In another incident, a faculty member reported that honours and graduate students were told heterodox economists were “dinosaurs,” a pejorative metaphor. A parallel example occurred when students reported that they received advice not to undertake research in developmental economics, a field where researchers are normally heterodox. In a more general sense, a faculty member commented that, although there had been no direct intervention into his/her [mainstream] research, s/he felt his/her possibilities were constrained by the atmosphere in the Department: “I would be reluctant to propose research collaboration; I can publish on my own, but I enjoy collaboration.” S/he felt future possibilities were constrained. Perhaps the most dramatically dismissive and demeaning behaviour towards the heterodox tradition, however, involved two faculty members in Labour Studies, which we discuss in the next section. This series of incidents is significant not only for the level of aggression involved, but also because they took place in Department Council meetings.

The Labour Studies Program

By vote of the university Senate, the program in Labour Studies had been part of the Department of Economics from 1979. Labour Studies faculty had a special interest

in labour economics and the study of trade unions and labour relations. Two more faculty were hired, in 1999 and 2003. A 2003 ruling from the then Dean [not Sigurdson] indicated that these two Labour Studies professors were members of the Department of Economics and would be allowed to attend and vote at department meetings, except on matters pertaining specifically to the discipline of economics.

However, following the retirement of several key Labour Studies initiators in 2003, the process to disengage Labour Studies from Economics began. The two continuing Labour Studies faculty attended Department of Economics meetings. Some mainstream economists, however, expressed concern that they would vote with heterodox economists on certain issues. At Departmental Council meetings in 2009 and 2010, the two Labour Studies faculty members reported that they were intimidated and subjected to harassment. One faculty member told us “there was serious bullying going on.” For instance, a mainstream economist told a Labour Studies faculty member that if s/he continued to attend Department meetings and vote, “I will be on your tenure committee and decide whether you are an economist or not,” that is, a threat was issued to become involved in a tenure process with the purpose of voting negatively. This behaviour was clearly unprofessional and unacceptable (one Labour Studies faculty member described the experience as being “the target of verbal aggression” in a University meeting). Such actions were neither stopped, nor the perpetrators warned by the Acting Department Head who was chairing the meeting. Ironically, one of the Labour Studies professors told us that, notwithstanding poor treatment by some faculty members, his/her scholarship was enhanced by being in a department of Economics.

Ultimately, the Labour Studies program was removed from the Department of Economics in 2010. As one faculty member put it, “An argument was made that they did not belong in the Department of Economics, so they were removed. Dean Sigurdson agreed and made it happen.” We are not commenting here on the removal of Labour Studies from the Department; our concern is the treatment of the Labour Studies faculty members prior to the move because of the perception that they were sympathetic to the heterodox group.

The Treatment of Graduate Students

Also troubling is the treatment of graduate students working with heterodox faculty members. Some incidents seem to be a lack of performance of social conventions: a faculty member related how the Department Head did not congratulate a student working on a heterodox topic, even though he knew the student had just successfully completed a final defense. Other incidents and patterns are more serious. One former student told us that s/he was several times reminded by different Department members that his/her research was not valuable and not “real” economics. These remarks were always made in informal spaces, away from the Department. S/he described the faculty member’s attitude as if “[s/he] had the right to poke [his/her] finger in my eye.” The metaphor used here is succinct in its depiction of a combination of aggression on the one side and pain on the other. Two graduate students were told they were voting the “wrong way” in Department Council meetings with the implication that they should vote the “correct” way. Another student related a conversation in which s/he questioned a failure to achieve Departmental funding even though s/he had maintained a 4.0 plus grade point average in the program. The reply was that s/he had been placed below the rest of the graduate students because that was where s/he

belonged, with the implication that anyone conducting heterodox research belongs at the bottom regardless of accepted performance indicators such as grade point average.

A faculty member identified with the heterodox group reported an incident related to a supervisee’s PhD oral candidacy examination. One of the examiners had been asked by a mainstream colleague to put a particular question to the student adding the comment that an inability to answer should result in a failure. The student was not able to answer the question — constructed by someone who was not a member of the examining committee, asked by a willing committee member — and the student was failed. [Subsequently, the student passed the next candidacy examination and proceeded.] The question was not put to other students on their examinations.

Traditionally there have been a significant number of students enrolled in heterodox courses and choosing to undertake research in heterodox areas with heterodox faculty members. In other words, the heterodox approach was popular among a significant minority of undergraduate and graduate students in the Department. This proportion has shrunk because such students have been effectively discouraged and intimidated. And as prospective students, they have been made to feel unwelcome. In addition to the treatment of students in the Department, it appears that applications from students wishing to study with heterodox economists may not have been forwarded to potential supervisors. In the Department of Economics, graduate applications are received in the Department, vetted to make sure the applicant fulfills basic criteria, and then forwarded to area specialists for review. This process means that a student who has an acceptable undergraduate degree with sufficient grades might still be diverted because of

the nature of the topic proposed. Several heterodox faculty members mentioned that over the past few years there has been a decline in the numbers of potential graduate student files they have received. One faculty member queried the falling number of graduate applications: “Are they being diverted? Possibly.” S/he could not point to direct evidence (what s/he called “a smoking gun”); neither could s/he explain the fact that several members of the Department had in recent years received fewer graduate applications. Another faculty member told us a student reported being asked to change from development economics [heterodox] to microeconomics [mainstream]. Still another summed up the general climate of persistent demeaning and degrading comments about heterodox economics by saying, “The biggest effect has been on the graduate students ... they are afraid to talk to us [heterodox economists].” Tellingly, when we asked a former graduate student what advice s/he would give to a student intending to enter to Department of Economics graduate program at the University of Manitoba, the reply was “keep your head down, do your research and don’t get involved in anything.”

The Proposed Review of Dr. Chernomas’s Course in Health Economics (Spring 2013)

In spring 2013 Dr. Chernomas, who has published extensively in the area of health and economics, proposed an undergraduate course in “economic determinants of health” that would investigate questions about the socio-economic determinants of health and their implications. This content is different from “health economics,” a course he now teaches that is a more traditional type of course taught in economics departments. At the April 11, 2013 Department Council meeting, motions were brought to approve three new

courses. Two were approved with no controversy, only friendly amendments for clarification. The meeting then turned to Dr. Chernomas’s proposal for the “economic determinants of health” course. Some members of Council expressed concern about overlap with the current health economics course taught by Dr. Chernomas. It was explained that the two courses were distinct. The new course was approved by a substantial majority vote. However, what happened next is of great concern to us. Without any “notice of motion” and in the absence of Dr. Chernomas, a motion was brought from the floor to have his long-existing course in health economics reviewed by the general studies committee. This is highly unusual. No other course or teacher was the subject of the motion and the mover did not even have a copy of the course syllabus. No explanation was offered as to the motivation behind the motion, nor was the initiative ruled out of order by the meeting chair. It was not part of a general review of all undergraduate health economics courses. Still, the general studies committee was directed to review Dr. Chernomas’s course, an action that calls into question Dr. Chernomas’s ability to teach the current course, even though he has published extensively in the area. The general studies committee, with a number of members who believe heterodox courses should be part of the Department curriculum, has declined to review the course and the motion may have been withdrawn. What is important, however, is that Dr. Chernomas’s ability to teach a course in an area in which he has research and publications was singled out among all others for questioning.

The External Review of the Undergraduate Program (2012)

Traditionally, in the Economics Department at the University of Manitoba, external assessors for program

reviews have been chosen in a wide collegial consultation within Departments. The University's Academic Review Procedure specifies that Review Committee members are chosen by the Dean from nominations submitted by the Unit head. In earlier Department reviews, both mainstream and heterodox economics were represented on assessment committees. This time, faculty members had no input into the choice of the assessors. They were chosen by the Dean and represented mainstream economists only. A heterodox faculty member visited Dr. Bose to question why the process was neither collegial nor representative. S/he reminded the head about his promise to heal the rifts of a divided department, and pointed out that the choice of external assessors was bound to intensify divisions. The Head's response was that "quality" was the only concern. Another faculty member pointed out to Dr. Bose that the assessors chosen were "not qualified to understand a heterogeneous department." S/he received the same response: "quality" was the only concern.

Predictably, the mainstream externals reported that the Economics Department undergraduate program was deficient in economic theory and in quantitative methods, and thus, in effect, was putting its graduates at a disadvantage both in seeking employment and in entry to graduate studies. Recommendations included dropping the three-year undergraduate degree. The honours program required more theory, which in turn needed calculus as a prerequisite. More econometrics and more applied micro-economics courses should be included. The report also recommended splitting the economic history course into two half courses, thereby reducing its impact and possibly suggesting students take only one half.

When meetings were set up to discuss the report, the Head set the tone by submitting that all the

recommendations should be accepted, except for dividing economic history. He communicated that, in his view, there should be no general discussion in which the report as a whole could be critiqued. The Departmental Council decided that report should not be discussed generally but only the recommendations would be debated point by point. This substantially narrowed the debate. A faculty member depicted the process in this way: "The forest was set up; we will vote on the trees." The same faculty member described the meeting to discuss the Head's response as "unbelievably fractious." Another said it was "a debacle." A third, someone with decades of university experience, reported that the meeting was "the worst conceived, executed and managed" s/he had ever attended. Heterodox faculty members described how their opinions were not listened to and were responded to with such verbal aggression that there was a psychological cost to attending meetings.[†] In these divisive and disrespectful meetings the Head never reprimanded faculty members for behaviour that may have constituted harassment, although these occurred many times.

The refusal to allow discussion of broad general issues raised by the report was perceived by some faculty members as premature closure of questions around the undergraduate program. One description of the proposed changes characterized them as "training students in a technical way to do something technical." The faculty member who used this phrasing felt that "critically thinking students will avoid economics," that is, they will turn to other departments for honours/majors programs and for elective courses.

[†] In his correspondence to CAUT, Dr. Bose rejects our characterization, based on a number of informants, that heterodox views were ignored. He has said that "[t]o my memory, the only member of the Department who was aggressive ... was Dr. Chernomas."

Another faculty member told us s/he supports training in economics that provides students with a good quantitative background, but added that “being quantitatively competent does not necessarily mean doing more calculus.” These comments underline the issues that were foreclosed by the narrow focus given to the discussion about the undergraduate report. Furthermore, faculty members pointed out that Dean Michael Benarroch of the Asper School of Business has suggested that his students in take a course in macro-economics, normally taught by heterodox economists. Dean Benarroch’s concern that business students have a broad, rather than a narrow, understanding of issues in economics points out that the Department of Economics undergraduate program is part of an overall context within the University of Manitoba community. Because of the narrowed positioning of the agenda and the discussion, none of these wider questions were addressed.

The Controversy over Macro-Economics (2013)

“Alternative Approaches to Macro-Economics (Econ 3810)” is not a required course in macro-economics, but rather a course that covers various alternative views of macro-economics and presents material that is critical of mainstream economics. In the past Dr. Chernomas and other heterodox economists have taught it. The Head assigned the course to an economist described by colleagues as mainstream who claimed s/he was willing and able to teach it. One faculty member saw the reassignment as a strategy to divest the course of its heterodox content without actually having an open debate on the subject. Another described the process as “the ‘dissing’ of a course by people with no expertise.”

The colloquial term, “diss,” is very apt here: the meaning implies both *dismissing* the importance of the course and *disrespecting* the professor who teaches it. The Head now seems to have backed away from the reassignment, but the act in itself adds to a lingering climate of distrust.

The Internal Committee on Reconciling the Department of Economics (2013)

Prior to the arrival of Dr. Jeffrey Taylor, who succeeded Dr. Sigurdson as Dean of the Faculty of Arts in 2011, the troubles in the Department of Economics had been recognized and an internal committee established. Dean Taylor met with Department members and solicited their views. In November 2012, he circulated a document entitled *Consultation with the Department of Economics, 2011–2012: What Was Heard and Next Steps*. The document included a detailed account of all that he was told. Its conclusion can be found in the following paragraph:

I believe, based on my consultation, that there is a general commitment in the department to offering high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs, to the creation and dissemination of excellent and high-impact research, and to respecting and nurturing a diversity of approaches to the study and teaching of economics among departmental members. Nonetheless, I have concluded that the situation in the Department of Economics is such that it warrants further action on my part. An unfortunate departmental culture appears to exist of division, suspicion, animosity, and polarization in which it is difficult for the work of the department to be conducted in a collegial fashion.

For our purposes, it is also relevant to quote in its entirety Dean Taylor’s summary of comments he received about the degree of mutual respect within the Department:

2. Are department members treated respectfully? If not, what do you think is the problem? If you have identified one or more problems, do you have suggestions to address it or them?

— some people refuse to speak with other people — hostilities have been expressed at meetings — historically there were differences of opinion, but there was a group in the middle that provided balance do not feel respected by the heterodox group — I do not feel respected by the mainstream group — some feel that they have been called narrow data miners — cartoons on doors seemingly referring to departmental practices — lack of respect for graduate students and the graduate program — the research of some faculty members is disparaged — departmental members are labeled according to one's purported ideology — some faculty members appear to be shunned; some feel that they are being intimidated — some women appear to feel that they are antagonized, frustrated and afraid — most people would say they are not treated respectfully — some departmental members who are not in the political economy group don't consider the work of the political economy group to be legitimate; comments such as the following have been made: "dated," "old school," "there is no one in health economics," "there is no one in macroeconomics," "there is no strength in development" — many in the political economy group do not consider or respect the non-political economy group's work — there is a lack of respect both ways; it is a two-way street — some don't respect the other's approach to economics, while in other cases it is the quality of the individuals or their work that is not respected — comments are made by some departmental members that the department is "poor," "substandard" — the composition of the department does not sit well with some — some departmental members feel that international students are discouraged from having contact with or working with certain professors — the department has been a respectful workplace throughout my long career.

Subsequently, by memorandum dated April 13, 2013, he constituted the committee to come up with ideas for healing a fractured department known as the Ad Hoc

Working Group on the Workplace Climate in the Department of Economics. In his memorandum, the Dean commented that "... an unfortunate workplace climate of division, suspicion, animosity, and polarization appears to exist in the Department of Economics in which it is difficult for the work of the department to be conducted in a collegial fashion". The Terms of Reference for the Committee were:

- Conduct a discussion of the workplace climate in the Department of Economics.
- Determine specific aspects of the departmental workplace climate that need to be improved.
- Identify steps that may be taken to improve the departmental workplace climate Report jointly to the Dean and to the Department Head regarding the nature of the departmental workplace climate and recommending specific steps that may be taken to improve the climate.

The committee consisted of a Chair and four departmental members. Dr. Richard Lobdell, a member of the Economics Department, who had served as Associate Dean in the Faculty of Arts and Vice-Provost in the Office of the President, was appointed to chair the committee. Dean Taylor told us that he was concerned the CAUT investigation might interfere with his committee's attempt to find a solution to the Department's divisiveness.

The Committee met on several occasions and produced a report on September 4, 2013. It is a seven-page document and we will only summarize it here. With respect to the environment in general, the Working Group noted that some considered it a "crisis" and others simply an obstacle to the Department's ability to thrive. Still, it concluded that the climate was "unpleasant and unproductive," but could not reach consensus on the origins or causes of this negative climate. Perhaps the

Working Group did not want to point any fingers. However, its conclusion to this section of the Report bears repeating:

... the Department's workplace climate will not cure itself, nor can it be remedied by outside authority. Any significant improvement depends on the willingness and ability of the Department's academic staff to make the personal, intellectual and organizational changes necessary to repair that climate. If nothing is done by Departmental academic staff to improve the workplace climate or the differences that divide us are truly irreconcilable, then ultimately the Department will fall short of its potential as an effective centre for economics teaching, learning and research.

The Report makes a series of small internal recommendations dealing with matters like a collective affirmation of “its commitment to a multiplicity of approaches,” the need for improved departmental and personal websites, the sharing of annual research reports, a re-invigorated seminar series, the revival of the Delta Marsh retreats and greater participation in multi-lateral conferences. However, the Working Group could not come to grips with internal governance problems, and the extent to which these problems have exacerbated the environment. The report contains a discussion of these issues, including the adverse effects on the climate of appointment decisions in the past years due which seem to have excluded heterodox economists. As potential responses, the Working Group considered some forms of special protection for the complement of heterodox economists, or the prospect of dividing the Department. On both matters, there was no agreement. With respect to curriculum and teaching assignments, the Working Group suggested greater consultation before decisions as a way to “reduce potential conflict.” Ultimately, the

Working Group expressed regret “that it was unable to agree on how to resolve departmental governance issues that have largely conditioned the current workplace climate.”

Further Actions in Recent Months, Especially the Review of the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (2013–2014)

The discussion around the external review of the graduate program has further polarized the department. Before 2006 assessors were traditionally chosen in a wide process of consultation. As with the 2012 undergraduate review, no consultation was undertaken in this case and, again, in contrast with tradition, two mainstream economists were selected. Working from his own reading of the report, Dr. Bose has proposed specific motions based on the recommendations of the report. Several faculty members objected to these procedures. One said that there was no discussion of principles, just a focus on implementation. Their suspicions are justified in the response to the graduate program review submitted to the Provost by the Department Head. Without addressing the details of the response, we note that a major change is a recommendation for the PhD program, supported by Dr. Bose, that history of economics (heterodox) be made an elective course. Coupled with a similar recommendation for the MA program that graduate econometrics [mainstream] should become a requirement, these changes would significantly reduce participation of heterodox economists in the graduate program. In this context, it is useful to keep in mind that graduate students are still developing in their understanding of a discipline. Exposure to varied positions is more challenging than simply learning technique, more likely to foster intellectual and critical thinking, a claim that is made by

the Department of Economics website (“The Department is committed to the interaction of ideas and intellectual discussion of Economics from a variety of perspectives”). Because of the intimidating environment created within the Department, it has not been possible to discuss these issues in the Department’s response to the graduate program review. We are reminded of a faculty member who said, “I want to interact with people with people who hold different viewpoints to understand [research] questions better,” that is, research and thinking benefit from exposure to different ideas. Because of the hostile environment in the Department issues such as these have not been discussed in regard to the proposed changes in the graduate program requirements.

The 2012 external undergraduate review also led to various curriculum changes passed at the September 20, 2013 meeting which produced a set of new course outlines for new and revised courses. These were all passed by majorities at Departmental Council meetings. However, the concerns about the composition of the external review and the thrust of these curriculum changes produced a formal response, a Minority Report, signed by eight members of the academic staff. We would describe those members as the heterodox group plus a few colleagues who have been sympathetic to their situation.

The Minority Report characterized the process of approving the changes as “flawed” and began its critique that the “recommendations have often been contradictory, pedagogically ill-advised, and alien to the interests of students in our programs and the University generally.” Although it approved of one recommended change, the new econometrics program, it expressed concerns and disapproved of the other changes. For the most part, its concerns focused on a failure to justify

changes combined with concomitant disadvantages that would flow from the change.

In late September 2014, the Department Council passed motions that effectively removed heterodox economics and economic history/history of economic thought requirements from the PhD program. Thus, for the first time in many years, PhD students will no longer be exposed to heterodox economic theory. Moreover, the elimination of the term “designated fields of study” for PhD students will effectively remove the name “heterodox economics” from the PhD curriculum. As well, changes to the MA program effectively reduce the number of electives that MA students may take while maintaining their normal course loads, further narrowing heterodox alternatives. These measures appear to further the process of marginalization and, indeed, the concealment, of the historic heterodox component within the department.

Because we are not economists, we do not intend to enter into this curriculum debate. The state of internal argument and dissatisfaction, however, supports the concerns of the Working Group that governance issues need to be addressed. Moreover, the expanded consultations recommended by the Working Group do not seem to have taken place. In fact, at the April 14, 2014, Departmental Council meeting, a majority approved reducing the number of internal committees from four to two, each chaired by an Associate Head to be appointed by the Chair.

6 | Findings

After reviewing all written material and interviews, the following findings are, in our view, directly supported by the evidence or are reasonable inferences which we have drawn from all the available evidence. These findings are derived from the narrative above and the events mentioned are more fully described in the narrative.

We offer one cautionary note. Other than Deans Sigurdson and Taylor and Drs. Bose, Chernomas, Loxley, Lobdell and Stangeland, we have not named specific individuals. While it may be possible to identify Department members as being part of different factions, only the actions of some individuals have contributed to the findings we have made. Many of the Department members who may be identified as orthodox or mainstream economists did not consent to meet with us. Our findings are based on documents and reports made personally to us. We make no speculation about motives, and we recognize that there likely have been passive observers who bear no responsibility for the events within the Department.

1. Prior to 2006, the Department of Economics approached hiring, curriculum and pedagogical issues with an approach that made room for heterodox, as well as mainstream views, although the heterodox group remained a minority of the department. This was achieved through a solid degree of good will that permeated the Department.
2. Sometime in 2006–2007, it is alleged that former Dean Sigurdson decided to change the direction of the Economics Department by moving to a more mainstream/orthodox emphasis. The first concrete sign of this decision pointed to by people we interviewed was the Dean's declaration that the 2006 search to fill a position in Economic Policy was a "failed search," although the Committee was told the search committee had approved a number of candidates. The search was repeated with a re-structured search committee dominated by orthodox members of the Department and this resulted in the appointment of a new colleague who represented the mainstream ethos.
3. The major step pointed in support of the assertion that Dean Sigurdson had changed the direction of the Department was the appointment of Dr. Pinaki Bose in 2009 as the new head. While Dr. Bose represented the orthodox view of economics, during the search process he advised members of the department that he was committed to maintaining diversity within the Department. In our view, his subsequent actions were not consistent with this assertion.
4. Viewed longitudinally starting in 2006, decisions about the establishment of search committees, new faculty appointments, curriculum, the selection of external reviewers, faculty retreats, and invited speakers ceased to reflect a diverse approach to the study of economics and became dominated by the new orthodox emphasis.
5. We find that the combined effects of the first irregular headship search, the bringing of the Respectful Workplace Complaints, the second headship search conducted while that Complaint was extant and the concomitant concerns by the heterodox group that it not proceed at that time, all contributed to creating an atmosphere of turmoil and distrust. Rather than dealing with these internal problems, subsequent actions and decisions by Dr. Bose, and a small number of Department members, exacerbated them. By this point, the good will, or social capital, which might have characterized the earlier Department climate, began to evaporate.

6. We find that some members of the Department viewed the dismissal of the UMFA/Chernomas grievance about the second headship as condoning the entire process leading to Dr. Bose's appointment. In our view, the Award shows only that the Arbitrator was not satisfied that the decision to proceed produced unfairness to Dr. Chernomas or showed bias, especially since the exoneration of Drs. Loxley and Chernomas occurred before any decision was made.
7. We find that, notwithstanding the Arbitrator's optimism, after 2010 collegial relations and interactions continued to deteriorate. The prior state of good will no longer existed.
8. We find the continued recourse to the rhetoric of "quality" as a justification for the string of mainstream appointments, the use of mainstream economists as external reviewers, and the dismissing and demeaning of heterodox scholarship were a mask for what were decisions by the Head and the former Dean promoting their own agendas.
9. We find that the atmosphere at Department meetings also deteriorated and became intimidating. This must have affected the decisions of pre-tenure junior Departmental members.
10. After 2010, with the apparent support of Dean Sigurdson and Dr. Bose, both governance and collegial decisions became dominated by the orthodox majority of the Department. Moreover, the current Head has diminished the level of consultation and use of, and respect for, pre-existing internal committees. This has been apparent especially with respect to curriculum changes approved in 2013 and 2014. As a result, while passed by majorities, these changes have exacerbated rifts within the Department to the point of dysfunction.
11. The failure of the Lobdell Working Group to address the problems of governance led to a continuation of the *status quo ante*. It is our view that, notwithstanding adherence to existing governance protocols, the climate within the Department has become corrosive and dysfunctional to the extent that it can properly be described as "in crisis."
12. A change of direction or emphasis within an academic unit does not intrinsically implicate academic freedom, nor do instances of incivility, although they may create an uncomfortable climate. However, it is our conclusion that decisions and actions within the Department cumulatively constituted violations of academic freedom by producing an environment within which the scholarship of heterodox colleagues was undermined. This was evidenced by:
 - The negative treatment of heterodox colleagues at Departmental meetings which was apparently countenanced by Dr. Bose who chaired these meetings;
 - The selection of external reviewers for the undergraduate program who would not be sympathetic to the heterodox approach;
 - The aborted attempt to re-assign macro-economics to a proponent of the orthodox view;
 - The intimidation of the "labour studies" members of the Department;
 - The treatment of graduate students by some "mainstream" members of the Department;
 - The dramatic deterioration of collegiality with respect to retreats and invited speakers, especially by ignoring the "heterodox" interests; and
 - Undermining of the achievements and work of "heterodox" members of the Department.

13. It is only when one stands back and examines the cumulative effects of both governance and collegial decisions over time that one can appreciate the extent to which the change in direction became a toxic tyranny of the majority. This environment encouraged and produced interactions which had the effect of undermining the scholarship and pedagogy of those members who pursued a heterodox approach. The cumulative effects of this environment did not meet the standards of ethical conduct which members of an academic unit that respects academic freedom owe to each other and thus constituted a violation of academic freedom.
14. It was a violation of academic freedom for the Department Council to direct a review of Professor Chernomas's course in Health Economics in response to his proposal for a new course in the "economics determinants of health."
15. It was a violation of academic freedom when orthodox members of the department behaved in ways that discriminated against doctoral students being supervised by heterodox economists. This included treatment at oral examinations, advice about potential areas of study, funding decisions, and advice that their choice of heterodox supervisors was unwise in terms of their future careers. Academic freedom requires that colleagues within the academy, notwithstanding different views or disagreements, not undermine the scholarship of their colleagues.

7 | Recommendations

Notwithstanding his good intentions, Dean Taylor's Working Group did not achieve the resolution and reconciliation that he had hoped. The atmosphere and relations within the Department of Economics remain divided and embittered. This can be destructive and not conducive to a successful academic enterprise and lead to further undermining, demeaning and denigrating of colleagues. The *status quo* cannot be maintained. In the past, harms have been caused both to individuals and to the collective ethos which probably cannot now be redressed. However, in our view, the answer lies in resurrecting some degree of balance in the Department between the orthodox and heterodox groups. We believe the following recommendations will produce changes which will re-generate an environment which will benefit department members, students, and the general productivity of the department.

1. The senior administration at the University of Manitoba should recognize the state of crisis within the Department of Economics and take steps to ensure that it can continue to function as a teaching and research centre pending the changes which we recommend below.
2. An Acting Head from outside the Department should immediately be appointed.
3. The search for the new head should recognize as an explicit criterion that all candidates must be committed to maintaining the two broad traditions in the Department, appreciate the respective values of both the orthodox and heterodox approaches, and have backgrounds which demonstrate these qualities.
4. The Dean should ensure now and in the future that head search committees consist of members who represent both the orthodox and heterodox approaches.
5. A new external review of both the undergraduate and graduate programs should commence immediately and the Dean should ensure proper consultation before appointing the new reviewers and especially that those appointed appreciate the respective values of both the orthodox and heterodox approaches, and have backgrounds which demonstrate these qualities. Pending the new external review, all curricular and internal structural changes approved in 2013 and 2014 should be held in abeyance, not implemented, and subject to re-approval in light of the new external review and after proper consultation.
6. With respect to future appointments, the search committees should represent the orthodox and heterodox approaches.
7. During the next four years, three new Department positions should be filled with heterodox economists. Thereafter, appointments should respect the need to allow both heterodox and mainstream traditions to remain viable in the Department. With the assistance of an experienced outside facilitator/mediator, preferably an economist, a program should be developed to assist the Department in addressing the issues raised in this report. In particular, this program should deal with appropriate modes of interaction with graduate students, plans for future collegial programs like Delta Marsh, and ways to enhance the diversity of invited speakers.
8. In the future, at least for the next three years, Department Council should be chaired by a senior academic from another department who will not vote, even in the case of a tie. After the three years, the Head should no longer chair Departmental Council meetings. The chair of the Council should be elected annually by the Department Council.