

Internal Academic Review 2004-2005
School of Business
Internal Academic Review Committee Report to Senate

School of Business

The School of Business has an exceptional reputation both nationally and internationally for its high quality, innovative undergraduate and graduate programs. External Consultants identified several elements and practices within the School to be worthy of commendation such as the School's various Master's programs in Business Administration (MBA), its technologically advanced educational facilities and the international emphasis of its programs, notably the Bachelor of Commerce exchange program. The School continues to attract the highest quality students despite increasing competition among business schools for the best students. Undergraduate and graduate students alike describe their overall educational experience as outstanding and voiced enthusiastic praise for their teachers and School staff.

The School of Business has recently engaged in a strategic planning exercise which not only identified key issues but also provided the Unit with clear direction and mechanisms to ensure its future success. The Internal Academic Review Committee (IARC) commends the School for its ongoing efforts to address the three main concerns raised by reviewers; namely, to raise expectations and achievements in research output, and to judiciously plan and balance resources across multiple programs and to increase gender diversity of the student body and faculty complement.

Major Recommendations

1. RESEARCH: The IARC took note of the conclusion reached by both the Review Team and External Consultants that more work is needed to build the School's research profile across a breadth of disciplines. While it is acknowledged that the School is on a positive trajectory in this regard, it is suggested that the School clarify measures of research accomplishment, not only to ensure consistency within the University but also to

convey to both faculty and students the importance of active research in ensuring a vibrant learning environment.

The IARC recommends that the School of Business continue to build on its momentum to enhance the overall research culture of the School through initiatives which support, monitor and reward research productivity.

2. PROGRAM BALANCE: The IARC supports the caution voiced by Review Team members for the School to maintain good communications and to provide strong leadership, management and planning to ensure the delicate balance among the needs of its various private and public programs.

The IARC recognizes that significant financial incentives exist to expand privately funded programs, and encourages the School of Business to continue to monitor annual teaching assignments to ensure that they represent a fair and equitable distribution of work among the faculty, and teaching.

Outcomes of the Internal Academic Review of the School of Business

Joint response submitted by the Dean of the School of Business

Recommendation 1: Research

The School of Business is pleased to continue to build on its momentum to enhance the overall research culture of the School. For instance, in the most recent round of SSHRC Major Grant Results, eight of nine applicants from the School of Business were either awarded a major research grant or were categorized 4A. This demonstrates our success in this area.

Recommendation 2: Program Balance

The School of Business is pleased to continue to monitor annual teaching assignments to ensure that they represent a fair and equitable distribution of work among the faculty. This was recently made an explicit part of the responsibilities of the Associate Dean (Faculty), and we will continue to monitor this area.

Follow-up on these recommendations and issues will take place in the annual budget and staffing strategy meetings between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Vice-Principal (Academic)

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Mackintosh-Cony Hall, Room **0431**
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada *K7L 3N6*
Tel 613 533-2162
Fax 613533-2871
<http://qsilver.queensu.ca/sociology/>

September 8, 2005

Dr. Patrick Deane,
Vice-Principal (Academic),
Queen's University,
Kingston, ON

Dear Vice-Principal Deane,

On behalf of the members of the internal Review Team involved with the Internal Academic Review of the Queen's School of Business, I am submitting our final report.

If you have any questions about the report or wish to discuss it, or any of our recommendations further, the members of the Review Team and I would be happy to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Rob Beamish, Ph.D.

Final Report of the Internal Review Team for the
Internal Academic Review: Queen's School of Business

September 8, 2005

Queen's University Internal Review Team

The internal Review Team for the Internal Academic Review of the School of Business at Queen's was comprised of Kathy Arney (Staff, Chief Financial Officer, Advancement), Muhammad Arshad (Graduate Student, Applied Science), Keith Banting (Faculty, Policy Studies), Rob Beamish (Faculty, Sociology) (Chair), Susan Lederman (Faculty, Psychology), Sergio Sismondo (Faculty, Philosophy), and Charles Sumbler (Undergraduate Student, Political Science). The internal Review Team received the same documentation that the School of Business supplied to the two external consultants and took part in the two day site visit along with the external consultants.¹ The internal Review Team also received the external consultants' report along with the Dean's response to the report. Finally, the internal Review Team met at strategically important times during the entire review process. This report is the result of the Review Team's deliberations and consideration of all the material to which it had access.

Commendations

On the basis of all the material it reviewed and discussions within the Review Team itself, the members of the internal Review Team, like the external consultants, were favourably impressed by the strengths the School of Business demonstrated in its self-study, the supporting material, and the information provided during the site visit. Overall, the Review Team concurs with the external consultants' very positive account of the School and concurs with their overall conclusions that the School "enjoys an excellent reputation, both nationally and internationally" and that "this reputation is well deserved."² The Review Team agrees with the consultants' conclusions that the School's mission and goals are "clear to all, the leadership and management of the School are strong, and the plan for the future is realistic and attainable."³

It would not be appropriate in a short report for the internal Review Team to restate the numerous strengths demonstrated in the School of Business's Internal Academic Review, particularly because they are captured so well by the external consultants.⁴ Nevertheless, although the members of the internal Review Team shared the overall sentiments expressed in the external consultants' report, there were three specific aspects of the School, its programs, and its operations that the internal Review Team wanted to highlight from the perspective of internal assessors.

¹ See Appendix A.

² Gregory Bruce and Suzanne Rivard, *External Reviewer Report: Queen's University School of Business*, April 29, 2005, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴ The consultants note, for example, that "[i]n conducting assessment reviews there is, at times, a tendency to focus attention on those areas needing improvement. Within the context of the assessment, both reviewers feel it necessary to highlight those elements and practices that were found at Queen's University School of Business as worth of special mention and commendation." They identify 13 items for particular commendation (*ibid.*, p. 3).

Review Team members were impressed by the degree to which the mission, goals, objectives, and the means to attaining them were – often enthusiastically – shared by students, staff, faculty and administrators within the School. This is not to say that healthy tensions were completely absent and unnoticed during the Review Team’s interactions with people within the School during the site visit but the sense of a broadly shared mission, a clear focus, and the belief that the School’s objectives would be attained was impressive. Strong, purposeful leadership seems to be a centrally important strength of the School of Business and in view of all that Dean Saunders and his management team have accomplished in a relatively brief period of time, the strength of leadership bodes extremely well for the School.

Like the external consultants, the Review Team members found the statements of the School’s strategic framework to be clear, carefully considered, well developed, and well presented.⁵ It was not surprising that the external consultants used the School’s *Strategic Framework* documents to organize their final report.

Second, during Bill Leggett’s tenure as Principal, Queen’s committed itself to increased internationalization; the School of Business appears to have moved further ahead in this area than other faculties in the University.⁶ The Centre for International Management, created in 2004, seems to be playing a vital and successful role in “coordinating all the international activity within the School.”⁷ At the undergraduate level, 65% of the BCom students participate in an “international study program.” In addition to using Queen’s International Study Centre at Herstmonceux, the School has formal exchange programs with 52 different partners; equally important, the School’s undergraduate students have initiated individual study programs at various centres of business excellence around the world.⁸ The School can serve as an example for other Faculties to follow in the area of internationalized programs.

Third, as internal to the University but external to the “business school community,” members of the review team were impressed with the ability of the School of Business to develop and run their very successful, highly reputed, private programs in balance with their regular academic programs. The mixture of “private” and “public” programs within the same faculty is unique to the School of Business and it was instructive to members of the Review Team to see how those very different types of programs are balanced. Although some of the potential tension is mitigated by deregulated tuition in the BCom program, on the basis of all the documentation received and our discussions with students, staff and faculty, the Review Team felt that the School was able to balance the needs and demands of their private programs with those that were not privatized. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators seem to successfully manage the fiscal tensions that must exist in such a mixed environment while ensuring that students, staff

⁵ See Queen’s School of Business, *Strategic Framework: 2004-2008*, endorsed by the Queen’s School of Business, January 20, 2004, 21 pp.; Queen’s School of Business, *Strategic Framework: 2004-2008*, 4 pp.

⁶ The external consultants also identify the “pervasiveness of international emphasis in the BCom program” as a strength but from an internal perspective, we felt the strength merited a higher profile (see Bruce and Rivard, *External Reviewer Report*, p. 3).

⁷ Queen’s School of Business, *Internal Academic Review: Self-study*, n.d., pp. 26-7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

and faculty in all programs enjoy a relatively fair share of the economic benefit that the privatized programs bring to the School. While healthy at the moment, this balance and the vagaries of market forces may cause problems in the future – something we will focus on below.

Points of Focus

Like the external consultants, Review Team members were positively impressed with the School's self-study, much of the documentation it submitted, and the information gathered during the site visit. Nevertheless, aside from the overall strengths identified by the School and reinforced by the external consultants in their report, there were areas that members of the internal Review Team felt merited some discussion and consideration on the part of the Senate Internal Academic Review Committee. These "points of focus" are the research culture within the School, the maintenance of an on-going, successful balance between privatized and regular academic programs, fiscal stability, and gender equity.

Research Culture

While the external consultants commented on the research activity of the School, the internal Review Team had, prior to the receipt of the consultants' report, discussed this dimension of the School.⁹ While there is significant overlap between our discussions and those of the consultants, the Review Team felt that, as a fundamental activity of the University, the research profile of the School merited attention from the internal Review Team.

Tension is always present in applied programs within a university setting. Universities have historically been centres of research and expanding knowledge as well as centres for higher learning. These two objectives – expanding knowledge and instruction in higher learning – should complement each other and the dynamic tension that exists between them should enhance the two, although it can also impede one or the other. Within professional programs, there is a further possible tension between "pure" research – the pursuit of new knowledge – and narrowly "applied" research – the application of existing knowledge to particular settings.

When asked directly about the research profile of the faculty members in the School of Business at Queen's, Dean Bruce was very clear that he saw a growth in the research profile of faculty members when comparing the current level of activity with the levels he noted in an earlier assessment of the School for accreditation. Professor Rivard, speaking from her perspective as an active researcher in the fields of information systems and information technology in business, indicated that the Queen's School of Business had produced a number of publications in her area which were extremely influential. Her overall impression with the research activity in her area of expertise was extremely positive. Both of these assessments bode well for the School as it raises its research activity and profile. Indeed, the School offers a number of institutional supports for

⁹ See Bruce and Rivard, *External Reviewer Report*, pp. 8-9.

faculty engaged in research – there is a Research Office, “a vibrant internal funding program,” support for conferences, workshops and symposia, internal awards, and a scholar-in-residence program to mentor junior faculty members.¹⁰ Nevertheless, members of the internal Review team felt that the School’s research profile was neither well nor thoroughly established. Therefore, the School must remain vigilant if it is to continue to build on the momentum it has developed.

To demonstrate the issues of research culture that members of the Review Team discussed, one only need turn to the School’s scholarly productivity. In “Appendix E: Research,” the School notes that “[d]uring the last five years, over 70 percent of the full-time faculty have published journal articles, for an average of 4.8 journal articles per faculty member.” It notes that “[o]ver 60 percent of the other 25-plus percent of the faculty have been active with respect to other intellectual contributions” having produced “over two such intellectual contributions during this five-year period.” An average of one journal article per faculty member, per year demonstrates an active research culture but it is not one that mirrors the School’s other strengths as demonstrated in *Business Week*, the *Financial Times*, or *Canadian Business* rankings of business schools and business programs.

Members of the internal Review Team noted that the research culture may be more fragile than the data presented by the School indicate. If, for example, the contributions of two of the most productive researchers are removed, the average falls from 4.8 to 3.6 journal publications per professor in the top 70 percent of active researchers over a five year period. In addition, members of the Review Team, like the external consultants, noted that the data presented by the School seems to include refereed and non-refereed journals together and, in some instances, publications that did not appear to be in journals at all.¹¹ Without appearing overly critical and delving into minutiae, members of the internal Review Team were concerned about the extent to which a research culture was spread across the faculty and conveyed to students, and about the vibrancy of that culture within the School. Like the external consultants, the internal Review Team felt that the School needs to maintain research as a point of focus. It should be clearer about what counts as research and how the School can present its research accomplishments in a manner that is more consistent with, and thus more informative to, the University as a whole. Members felt that in addition to all the supports it has put in place to develop its research profile, it should set clearer and higher standards for expectations of research productivity and then monitor those targets. This sort of change would be consistent with the clarity the School demonstrates in its *Strategic Framework* documents.¹²

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹² It is important to note that these conclusions, which parallel those of the external consultants, were arrived at independently of the consultants’ report thereby reinforcing the validity of those findings and conclusions.

*Program Breadth; Program Balance*¹³

The School of Business offers an impressive array of academic programs ranging from three day (e.g. Fundamentals of Governance), week long (e.g. Corporate Social Responsibility Program, Leadership Program, or Finance for the Non-Financial Manager) and custom programs, to the well established BCom, MBA, EMBA, MBA for Science and Technology, and the Accelerated MBA programs, as well as graduate programs in management (MSc and PhD in Management). On the basis of all the materials the internal Review Team had to review, its discussions with various representatives of the School during the site visits and its own internal deliberations, three points of focus emerged regarding the breadth and array of programs offered by the School of Business.

First, the programs offered are indeed impressive and the reputation of the different programs even more striking. The School of Business, as its own self-study indicates and the external consultants echoed, enjoys an outstanding reputation nationally and internationally. A key strength, it seems to the internal Review Team, has been the School's ability to find the niche markets for which it can deliver solid programs. The School's success has its consequences – many are very positive but two could be troublesome.

Second, the School has become increasingly dependent upon its privatized programs for the resources that support the entire School (even if they simply exist as an important supplement to the Faculty's share of the operating grant and other monies the University receives from the Ontario Government). Dean Saunders indicates that more than 80 percent of the School's operating budget comes from private programs.¹⁴ To maintain its position in privatized business education, the School will have to continue to successfully respond to changes in the market, which the School appears to be doing. Total enrolment in the EMBA program has dropped from a high of 474 in 2001-02 to a low of 322 in 2004-05. To find a new niche market program, the School appears to have introduced the AMBA which has regained some of the declining enrolments in the EMBA program. The MBAs program numbers seem to fluctuate but may begin to decline as that niche market has been satisfied. The enrolment shortfall seems to have been recovered in the PhD program. While it is impossible for the internal Review Team to fully examine enrolment and program decisions made by the School, Table 1 below, based on Table 1 in the School's self-study, shows that although the total student enrolment in the School has been increasing – suggesting increasing revenues – those increases have come primarily from the undergraduate program and the MSc/PhD programs; the various privatized programs have shown an overall decline in enrolment.

¹³ Once again, the internal Review Team and the external consultants both, independently of each other, focused on program balance as a potential problem for the School (see Bruce and Rivard, *External Reviewer Report*, pp. 9-10). The framing of the problem was different within the internal Review Team and merits presentation despite any overlap with the external consultants.

¹⁴ David Saunders, "Internal Academic Review – External Consultants' Report," memo to Suzanne Fortier, V-P (Academic), May 12, 2005.

Table 1

Year	BCom	MSc/PhD	EMBA, AMBA, MBAst	Total
2000-01	798	40	499	1347
2001-02	828	57	532	1417
2002-03	843	64	512	1419
2003-04	913	77	456	1467
2004-05	965	75	373	1465

Source: Adapted from Table 1. Total Enrolment in Degree Programs, 2000-present

Continuing to expand the number of programs offered to meet market needs may, however, become problematic unless the School is able to drop less economically viable, privatized programs as it introduces new ones. The future development of the School's privatized programs, the internal Review Team members felt, requires tremendous care and judicious planning – a point of focus that the external consultants did not address.

Third, for reasons the internal Review Team could appreciate, the sources and distribution of financial resources among the different programs are not crystal clear in the documentation we reviewed; however, even in the short site visit we undertook, it was apparent that without strong leadership and an ongoing commitment to the full list of programs, tensions and potential conflicts could quickly emerge. While the tensions arose in a few different contexts, it was around instruction that Review Team members were made most aware of how delicate the current balance actually is. When one looks at the BCom USAT evaluations for Questions 1 through 4, it is striking to note that as a group, BCom instructors have been consistently evaluated less favourably than instructors in the University as a whole.¹⁵ While these data might simply reflect higher expectations among BCom students, they might also reflect some of the concerns Review Team members heard when students responded directly to questions about instructor availability, instructor commitment to teaching and instructor experience – comments that were not confined solely to undergraduate students.¹⁶ Maintaining one's focus on the tensions that exist in the delicate balance of resources among programs with high expectations is, Review Team members felt, important even when the School is enjoying considerable success. More explicitly, one concern expressed by the IAR was that the best teachers in the School were being assigned into the privatized programs in recognition of the very high financial and other commitments of such students. It is very important that BCom students experience the full teaching strength of the Faculty.

¹⁵ See "Attachment #3," Appendix B, Teaching, *IAR 2005-05 Unit Self Study*. The internal Review Team's assessment of student satisfaction differs from that of the external consultants although both groups recognize the problematic nature of the data upon which the discussion is based.

¹⁶ Despite the overall satisfaction Bruce and Rivard saw among students on the basis of the material they reviewed and their interviews during the site visit, the internal Review Team's overall impression was one where the tensions felt among the different programs were greater than Bruce and Rivard indicate and important enough to note in this report (see Bruce and Rivard, *External Reviewer Report*, p. 6).

Gender Equity

The final point of focus the internal Review Team discussed at some length concerned gender equity.¹⁷ Review Team members fully appreciate that the School operates in an environment in which systemic discrimination has resulted in a sizeable gender imbalance in all positions of significant authority within the private and public spheres, which has significant implications for both student and faculty.¹⁸ At the same time, opportunities for women and their career aspirations are continuing to undergo change. The School of Business has made important strides in recruiting women as full-time researchers and instructors. The proportion of women has increased from 25 in 1997 to 32 percent in 2004. Close to half (47%) of the students in the BCom program are women although only 25% of the graduate students are female. Overall, however, the student population is 40 percent female and if the School is successful in recruiting more women to its graduate programs that percentage will grow.¹⁹ As a result, the gender profile of the teaching faculty is significant.

Overcoming gender inequity requires the University to be proactive and that requires strategic planning. Like the external consultants, the members of the internal Review Team were impressed by the School of Business's *Strategic Framework* documents. The values set out in the *Strategic Framework* include innovation, integrity, and collaboration but unfortunately in the expanded version of the School's *Strategic Framework*, there is nothing directly related to improving the gender equity within the faculty or the graduate student programs. Under "Mission Critical' Success Factors," none of the eight "mission critical' success factors" in the category "People," addresses gender inequity.²⁰ Similarly, under "Specific Initiatives & Measures – MBA Programs," the strategic framework is silent on the promotion of greater gender equity in the nine initiatives it presents. As a final "point of focus," the members of the internal Review Team feel that the School of Business should consider ways and means by which it can make a greater commitment to gender equity in its graduate programs and among full-time faculty as part of its future strategic planning.

Recommendations

On the basis of the above, the internal Review Team feels that the Senate Internal Academic Review Committee should consider the following recommendations to the School of Business.

1. It is recommended that the School of Business should maintain and further develop research as a point of focus. To enhance the research culture in the

¹⁷ See also *ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁸ See, for example, Pay Equity Task Force, *Pay Equity: A New Approach to a Fundamental Right*, Pay Equity Task Force Final Report, 2004, or Nicole Fortin and Michael Huberman, "Occupational Gender Segregation and Women's Wages in Canada: An Historical Perspective," paper 2002s-22 in the Scientific Series produced by Centre interuniversitaire de recherche en analyse des organisations, March, 2002.

¹⁹ Queen's University, "Academic Unit Profiles: Business," <http://www.queensu.ca/irp/pdfiles/academicunits/2004-05/other/business.pdf>

²⁰ Queen's School of Business, *Strategic Framework: 2004-2008*, p. 7.

- School of Business, it is recommended that the School set higher expectations of research productivity and monitor those targets. The research objectives in the School's *Strategic Framework* indicate strong support for the enhancement of the currently existing research culture. Moreover, increasing research productivity will help to establish the School's contribution to the University's research mission.
2. The School should be clearer about what counts as research and it needs to improve the ways in which it presents its research accomplishments to the University as a whole. This would require greater consistency between the way the School classifies and categorizes research with that of the rest of the University. For internal purposes, researchers would benefit from a set of clearer expectations.
 3. Maintaining the delicate balance of resource distribution among programs with high expectations is one of the most significant challenges faced by the School. It is recommended that the School continue to consciously focus upon the delicate, and numerous balance points upon which its current success rests. In striking this balance it is important that all programs benefit from the best teaching faculty in the School.
 4. In the area of gender equity, it is recommended that the School carefully consider ways and means by which it can increase the participation of women in their graduate programs and among full-time faculty. It is recommended that the recruitment of more women to the School become part of its future strategic planning. While issues of gender equity were most apparent to the Review Committee, other aspects of the University's equity policy should not be overlooked.

Appendix A

Internal Academic Review – Queen’s School of Business External Consultants’ Site Visit April 4 and 5, 2005

*External Consultants: Dean Greg Bruce, La Salle University
Dr. Suzanne Rivard, HEC Montreal*

<i>Time/Review Team Member(s) in Attendance</i>	<i>Details for Monday, April 4, 2005</i>	<i>Location</i>
8:00–8:30 am	<i>Student picks up Consultants at hotel (Lisa Hendry, contact at QEDC)</i>	<i>Hochelaga Inn</i>
8:30–9:00 am <i>Sergio Sismondo</i>	<i>Tour of Goodes Hall Catherine Purcell Senior Development Officer</i>	<i>Goodes Hall</i>
9:00- 10:00 am	<i>David Saunders Dean, School of Business</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
10:00-10:40 am <i>Keith Banting</i>	<i>Julian Barling Associate Dean, Research</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
10:40-11:00 am	BREAK	
11:00-11:30 am <i>Rob Beamish</i>	<i>Brent Gallupe Associate Dean, Faculty</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
11:30-12:00 pm <i>Charles Sumblar</i>	<i>David Edwards Director, Business Career Centre</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
12:00-1:00 pm <i>Kathy Arney Sergio Sismondo</i>	LUNCH with QSB Alumni	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
1:00-2:00 pm <i>Susan Lederman Muhammad Arshad</i>	<i>Staff group meeting</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
2:15-2:30 pm	BREAK	
2:30-3:00 pm <i>Susan Lederman Rob Beamish</i>	<i>Gloria Saccon Director, Office of the Dean Coordinator of IAR</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
3:00-4:00 pm <i>Kathy Arney Rob Beamish Charles Sumblar</i>	<i>Dean’s Executive Committee</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
4:00 - 5:00 pm <i>Keith Banting Muhammad Arshad</i>	<i>Faculty group meeting</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>

<i>Time/Review Team Member(s) in Attendance</i>	<i>Details for Tuesday, April 5, 2005</i>	<i>Location</i>
8:00-8:30 am	<i>Student picks up Consultants at Hotel</i>	<i>Hochelaga Inn</i>
8:30-9:30 am <i>Kathy Arney Sergio Sismondo</i>	<i>Bill Blake, Associate Dean, MBA Programs Roger Wright, Director, Executive MBA, Jeff McGill, Director, MBAst Shannon Goodspeed, Associate Director, MBAst Michael Darling, Director, AMBA</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
9:30-10:00 am <i>Charles Sumblar Rob Beamish</i>	<i>Peter Kissick, Director Commerce Program</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
10:00-11:00 am	<i>Dr. Rob Beamish, Chair and Review Team Members</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
11:00-11:15 am	<i>Move to Fleming Hall</i>	
11:15-11:45 am	<i>Uli Scheck, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research</i>	<i>Room 204 Fleming Hall</i>
11:45-1:15 pm <i>Charles Sumblar Rob Beamish Keith Banting</i>	LUNCH with students	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
1:15-1:45 pm <i>Susan Lederman</i>	<i>Jim McKeen Director, The Monieson Centre</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
1:45-2:15 pm <i>Kathy Arney</i>	<i>Steve Millan Director, Finance and Administration</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
2:15-2:45 pm <i>Rob Beamish</i>	<i>Eric LeBlanc Director, Centre for International Management</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
2:45-3:00 pm	BREAK	
3:00-3:45 pm	<i>David Saunders Dean, School of Business (wrap-up)</i>	<i>Room 402B Goodes Hall</i>
3:45-4:00 pm	<i>Move to Richardson Hall</i>	
4:00-5:00 pm	<i>Vice-Principal (Academic) Suzanne Fortier</i>	<i>Room 239 Richardson Hall</i>