



given advanced standing, to U1, who would find it easier to find their way if they were admitted to the longer-120 credit program; we understand that a University committee is considering this, and our own decisions will have to take into account the actions of this committee. Some of the problem would apparently be alleviated by a reduction in admissions to the short 90-credit program.

We also agree that there are unwritten advising rules that arise in response to University procedures that are not well known. Nonetheless, we do try to provide extensive information, including written documentation (the Honours program description contains substantial detail both about the program itself and about switching in and out of it) and additional beginning-of-term advising hours.

We will undertake two specific actions in response: (i) we will convene a small committee to consider possible changes in the content or structure of the Majors program;<sup>1</sup> (ii) experienced advisors will be asked to prepare a written codification of some of their knowledge.

Recommendation 3 (pages 5,6):

The department should consider strategies to limit the number of students entering undergraduate programs, perhaps particularly the Majors program. Some students have expressed concern about the difference in mathematical levels between the Honours and Majors programs, and believe that the Majors program should have more mathematical content. The department should consider this.

Response.

These points will be considered, and the committee reviewing the Majors program can address them. Before actively moving to limit student numbers, however, we think it would be prudent to see whether the current high enrollments persist: we note that, not only at McGill but in general, Economics enrollment tends to be countercyclical: that is in times of economic distress, enrollments tend to increase, presumably reflecting greater interest in the subject. We may therefore see some decline over the next few years as the effect of the recent recession gradually fades. This is, of course, far from clear: g6c(haps)-n1v69(ha)28(v)27(e)

The idea of written guidelines for advisors, based on the experience of those who have served for many years in this capacity, is a good one, as we have already noted. We note also however that the Department has a number of programs: Minor, Major, Honours, Qualifying Year, Master's, and PhD. Different members of the faculty are specialized in providing advising for different programs; it is too much to expect that all faculty members would learn the rules for multiple programs. Therefore the idea of a period during the semester in which all professors advise undergraduates appears impracticable to us. Because of the complexity of rules at the University level as well as the department level, it is important to have specialized advisors who are expert in particular programs. The development of written guidelines for the undergraduate programs should however enhance the effectiveness of the existing program-specific advising teams.

Recommendation 5 (page 6):

Recruitment to the Ph.D. program should emphasize quality of students rather than quantity. Attention should be paid to the timing as well as amount of University-level awards to entering students.

Response.

The department is fully in agreement with this recommendation and welcomes any aid from the University to make more attractive offers to high-calibre potential doctoral students.

Recommendation 6 (page 7):

The department should consider suggesting that students register for courses at other universities in Quebec to reduce the pressure on our own courses. Hiring of one or two

Response.