



# DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

September 25, 2025

**Dr. Prose Ivy G. Yepes**President
Visayas State University
Visca, Baybay City, Leyte

Thru: **Dr. Rotacio S. Gravoso** VP for Academic Affairs

Dear Dr. Yepes,

Good day!

On behalf of the Department of Economics constituents, I respectfully submit our position regarding the proposed transfer of the Department of Economics (DOE) to the New Academic Building. While we support initiatives that seek to unify the faculty and research functions under the FME, we find the current building design and facilities unsuitable for the Department's academic and operational requirements. Below are our arguments and concerns:

## 1. Faculty Workspace and Congestion

The proposed design provides office space sufficient for only **24 faculty members**, whereas the combined faculty of the DOE and DBM already exceeds this number. This design creates a highly congested arrangement, compromising both comfort and productivity. Moreover, such conditions are not conducive for faculty members who need quiet, dedicated spaces for conducting online classes.

## 2. Inadequate Functional Design for Academic Needs

The building design does not adequately provide for:

- Appropriate laboratory rooms tailored to Economics classes, which are essential for the Department's instruction and research activities.
- An office for the Head of Department and an office for the Dean, which are standard and necessary for academic governance.

### 3. Lack of Gender-Responsive Facilities

At present, the DOE has 3 female faculty and 11 male faculty and staff. The proposed design offers only a single common comfort room for everyone in the faculty office, which is not aligned with the current setup where separate facilities are provided. This lack of gender-sensitive amenities may affect the welfare and comfort of faculty members.





#### 4. Implications for Research and Institutional Cohesion

If the rationale of the transfer is to unify the Faculty of Management and Economics (FME), the design must also accommodate the **VISERDAC**, as it is the FME's research unit. Its exclusion undermines the very objective of unification.

#### 5. Absence of Support Facilities

The proposed building plan lacks **designated parking spaces** for its users, a necessity for both faculty and visiting stakeholders. This omission would add further inconvenience and inefficiency.

#### 6. Institutional Identity and Stakeholder Investment

It is important to recognize that the current building has long been known as the **ECON Building** by its constituents. Stakeholders—including faculty, staff, students, and partners—have invested significant effort and resources to make the DOE as functional and effective as it is today. Relocating the Department without due regard for this history and identity risks undermining that collective achievement.

#### 7. Economic Perspective

Lastly, from a welfare economics standpoint, the current arrangement is technically at a **Pareto-efficient level**. A forced transfer to the new building, under its current design, would disadvantage the DOE while offering no clear compensating gains to others. This creates a situation of inefficiency rather than improvement.

In light of these considerations, I respectfully recommend that the proposed transfer of the DOE to the new building be **reconsidered**. Instead, the building may be more appropriately awarded to another unit whose needs better align with its current design and facilities. This way, institutional resources can be optimized without compromising the functionality, identity, and welfare of the Department of Economics.

Thank you very much for your attention to these matters.

Very Respectfully Yours,

LEMUEL S. PRECIADOS

Head Department of Economics

Noted by:

MARK C. RATILLA

Dean

Faculty of Management and Economics