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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Faculty of Dentistry is a leader in dental education, clinical care and research. With over 600 Clinical Associates and over 250 faculty and staff, the Faculty of Dentistry has earned an international reputation as a premier dental research and training facility in Canada.

Dean, Faculty of Dentistry, Daniel Haas initiated an external review of the Student Services Office (SSO) of the Faculty of Dentistry. The purpose of the review was to consider the functioning and services of the SSO with a view to improving services and support to further enhance the success and wellbeing of the Faculty of Dentistry’s students. The Review Committee was encouraged to provide both comments and recommendations addressing business processes, communications and roles. Feedback and assessment of internal and external communications and relationships with key stakeholders were also examined.

This review comes at a critical time as the University of Toronto’s Faculty of Dentistry is facing challenges as well as opportunities. Managing growth while continuing to attract and retain the highest calibre of students, faculty and staff necessitates vision, strategy and coordinated execution. A Strategic Plan has been developed which provides a strong framework for addressing these challenges and acting on opportunities. In recent years, important organizational changes have included the addition of a Communications Officer and a Director of Student Life. Further, the leadership in the Faculty of Dentistry recognizes the critical roles played by the Advancement unit. Organizational change often presents challenges, especially as they relate to roles and responsibilities.

Review Committee members spent two days meeting with faculty, staff and students. This report represents the committee’s findings and observations along with specific recommendations. It is clear the Registrar and Student Services Office (SSO) serve important roles in the Faculty of Dentistry. The support provided by the Registrar and SSO touches applicants, current students, staff, faculty and alumni. In general, the services provided are managed competently and are responsive to users’ needs. Staff are viewed as knowledgeable and helpful. However, most respondents pointed to concerns in four areas: roles and responsibilities, office culture, communications, and stakeholder relationships. In addition, some respondents asked if the unit name “Student Services Office” was still appropriate given changes that have occurred both internally and externally.

Recommendations and key findings are presented addressing the areas of Services and Functions, Communications, Roles and Responsibilities, Stakeholder Relationships, and General Observations. While there has been good progress in each of these areas, three themes emerged clearly that warrant particular attention:

1) The need to more precisely define the role and responsibilities of the Registrar and SSO

Section 6 of this report recommends an updated review of all SSO position descriptions and the inclusion of “core competencies” for each.

2) The importance and need to establish a collegial and open culture built on trust and mutual respect

Section 7 touches on stakeholder feedback regarding business interactions with the SSO

3) The reporting line for the Registrar and SSO

Section 8 of this report recommends the Registrar and SSO report to the Vice Dean, Education

In addition to examining a comprehensive Faculty of Dentistry Self-Study (2016) and the many supporting documents identified in section 2, the Review Committee has undertaken to search for common themes reported during interviews with faculty and academic administration, departmental staff, and students. The committee hopes to provide senior administration with insights that identify departmental strengths and achievements, to recognize opportunities for ongoing improvement, and to suggest possible courses of action that could be taken to address arising issues.
2. REVIEW PURPOSE AND PROCESS

As provided by the Dean, Faculty of Dentistry, the stated purpose for the Review Committee is articulated as follows:

“The review will consider the functioning and services of the Student Services office, with a view to promoting effective delivery of services and provision of support to promote student success.”

Reviewers were asked to focus particularly on the following dimensions:

1. Evaluation of the following services and functions:
   a. Core registrarial services (e.g. registration support, systems, records)
   b. Student support and advising (range and quality)
   c. Academic support (e.g. scheduling, exams)
   d. Recruitment and admissions
   e. Reporting and faculty relations
   f. Administration of student awards

2. Communications; internal and external

3. Clarity and appropriateness of roles and responsibilities divided between the Student Services Office and Director of Student Life

4. Relationships with other key stakeholders (e.g. faculty)

5. Any recommended changes to enhance the functioning of the office

Additionally, the review committee was asked to consider factors that would contribute to the Faculty of Dentistry’s ability to continue to attract the highest caliber of students, faculty and staff. The University of Toronto’s Faculty of Dentistry is committed to maintaining its leadership in education, clinical care and research.

The specific Terms of Reference of the Review Committee are attached as Appendix 1.

In advance of their on-site visit from October 17-18, 2016, the Review Committee received the following material for its consideration:

- Review of the Student Services Office – Terms of Reference
- Review Schedule
- Faculty of Dentistry Self-Study – DRAFT – September 28, 2016
- Organizational Charts
- Job Descriptions
- Procedures Manual

During the visit, the Review Committee received additional materials, including:

- Faculty of Dentistry “Open Door” Day – A Proposal
- Student Admissions Communications: Interviews Audit
- U of T DENTISTRY magazine – 2016 Summer/Fall
- 2016 Student Services External Review – DDS 3 Feedback

These and other readily available materials requested were provided to the Review Committee in a timely manner. The Review Committee acknowledges the openness and responsiveness of the Dean, Faculty of Dentistry, as well as all faculty, staff and students interviewed during this review. The information provided and ensuing discussions
were invaluable to the Review Committee. Everyone involved in this review are to be commended for their professionalism, competence, cooperation and access. A listing of individuals and groups interviewed during this review over the two days are included in the ‘Visit Schedule’ found in the Appendix A.

3. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL COMMENTS

Overall, there is consensus that the Student Services Office (SSO) reliably disseminates and upholds the policies of the University and Faculty of Dentistry. This is true for both academic and administrative policies. SSO staff are committed to their work and take pride in assisting students, faculty and staff. Staff reporting to the Registrar demonstrated command of their responsibilities and enthusiasm for their work. The Faculty Registrar is an experienced professional who oversees a wide portfolio of services. The Faculty Registrar is knowledgeable of business practices and policies that are common and necessary for this role.

Because the Registrar and SSO staff are engaged with applicants, students, staff, faculty and alumni, it is essential they represent the Faculty of Dentistry in a positive, progressive and welcoming manner. The perception and reputation of U of T’s Faculty of Dentistry impacts admissions through advancement. The needs and expectations of students are changing and the Faculty of Dentistry must plan for this new environment.

Today, there is greater competition for top students and faculty. The University of Toronto’s Faculty of Dentistry must meet these challenges and position themselves for continued excellence. Students expect the delivery of administrative services to be readily available on-line in an easy to understand and accessible platform. Faculty members are expected to be more accessible than before, and to deliver teaching and training that is more individualized than before. Engaging and leveraging the expertise of alumni is also imperative.

In recent years, the Faculty of Dentistry has created new positions outside of the SSO designed to meet the demands of the changing educational environment. It is recognized that change is needed to meet the needs of today’s students and faculty. These new positions, including the Communications Officer and the Director of Student Life, serve important roles in supporting the Faculty of Dentistry’s mission. As is common when organizations go through change, there is a transition period where roles are being clarified. The Faculty of Dentistry has managed this transition relatively well, though there are areas where further clarification as regards to roles and responsibilities is needed.

The Review Committee sets forth its recommendations with a full understanding that these contextual shifts have magnified the vital role played by the Registrar and SSO. While change is constant, it is not necessarily easy. That said, the University of Toronto’s Faculty of Dentistry is well positioned to continue its leadership role in education, clinical care and research.

4. SERVICES AND FUNCTIONS PROVIDED BY THE STUDENT SERVICES OFFICE (SSO)

The Registrar and Student Services Office (SSO) play a key role in facilitating services for students, faculty, staff and alumni. The SSO is at the nexus of a wide range of Faculty business processes and policies. The Registrar must also develop strong relationships with students, faculty and administrators. Though titles and reporting lines vary from institution to institution, the core responsibilities and span of responsibilities are similar.

The Registrar and SSO staff must support key processes, including:

- Recruitment
- Admissions
- Orientation
- Administration of bursaries and scholarship awards
- Registration
The Registrar and SSO staff members must have strong customer service skills and provide a welcoming environment for their constituents. Oftentimes a student’s first point of contact with anyone in administration will be with staff members of the SSO. It is important such interactions are handled in a positive and professional manner. Though there are many online and print resources providing information on academic and administrative policies, students may prefer or need in-person guidance. In addition to being knowledgeable, staff should be proactive and willing to go the extra step to provide service. Likewise, faculty members rely on the SSO staff for an array of support services and information. Faculty rely on the administrative support of the SSO and count on them to uphold Faculty and University policies. There are, however, legitimate instances where faculty request a review of practices or policies for a specific case. In these instances, it is important the SSO staff understand there may be cause for exception and as such it is not intended to undermine their authority.

Stakeholder Feedback and Comments

The Review Committee heard positive comments regarding the range of core services provided by the Registrar and SSO. For a small team they support a wide range of processes and handle a high volume of work.

SSO stakeholders were interviewed to get a sense of the effectiveness of advising services provided to students and faculty. There was consensus that SSO staff are knowledgeable of University and Faculty rules and strive to apply them in an efficient manner. This applies to advice given to both students and faculty. By and large, the SSO staff are recognized as being dedicated and knowledgeable. However, over the course of numerous discussions with faculty, staff and students, the Review Committee heard a consistent message:

1. The SSO can be an unwelcoming and inflexible organization
2. The Registrar does not always respond to email inquiries (or does so in an untimely manner)
3. The Registrar and SSO too often treated students and faculty in a “dismissive manner”

These concerns spanned a range of services and interactions provided by the Registrar and SSO

Further Comments from the Review Committee

The Review Committee wishes to make additional comments regarding:

(a) Balancing Policy Enforcement with Flexibility

Student, faculty and alumni interactions with any service office should be welcoming, helpful and timely. While it is understood that providing advice and counsel to students and faculty often involves enforcement of practices and policies, the committee believes there are opportunities for improvement. There is a sense that existing practices and policies are not reviewed periodically for potential change and that often interactions with the SSO are unwelcoming.

(b) Staffing the SSO

Though not noted by stakeholders, the Review Committee wishes to comment on the need to validate the number and skill sets of SSO staff. An observation worth noting is the potential for disruption of core services should any single staff member in SSO depart. Losing valuable staff is a concern for most organizations. However, given
the volume as well as the specialized nature of the work performed by the SSO staff, any such departures would have an immediate impact on delivery of core services. While the Registrar is capable of assisting with the work performed by each SSO staff member, this too increases “risk.”

(c) Leveraging Technology

Increasingly, Registrars need to be more involved in the adoption and integration of technologies designed to facilitate the delivery of services. The core records and registration system (ROSI) must interact with other systems, some developed internally and others provided by outside vendors. Registrars and their staff must be leaders in the adoption and use of technology. Today, Registrars and service professionals must be strong in such areas as project management and change management. Registrars must know why, when and how to integrate technological solutions that improve service, reduce costs, or both.

Recommendation 4.1

If not already in use, the SSO should adopt the use of an automated service management system that assists with the management of e-mails, phone calls and other types of inquiries. Doing such would improve the customer service experience. The Registrar should work with the Faculty Director of IT as well as other U of Toronto staff who are experts in IT in order to explore options for acquiring and deploying this type of technology. This sort of functionality is common in CRM systems as well as basic “ticket or help desk” applications.

Recommendation 4.2

Working with the Faculty of Dentistry’s IT leadership, an assessment should be completed (or updated) to identify existing hardware and software solutions being used by the SSO. There are likely cost effective opportunities to deploy application software solutions that improve efficiencies and service. Examples of solutions commonly found in higher education Registrar Offices include: (a.) automated room and event scheduling software, (b.) secure, electronic transcripts, (c.) integrated “ticket or help desk” applications, etc.

Recommendation 4.3

A review of Faculty practices and policies that are correlated with high volumes of questions, complaints or delays should be undertaken. Oftentimes there are opportunities to change outdated practices or policies that have been in place for years. This type of review should be done on a regular basis, e.g., every two years.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Over the course of discussions with student, faculty and administrative stakeholders, the Review Committee received comments and feedback on SSO communications (both internal and external). A consistent message heard was that while many communications initiatives and products generated by the SSO are excellent in their own right, an integrated strategy addressing the disparate needs of academic and non-academic groups is lacking. The need for an integrated communication strategy that includes e-mail, web pages and other means of delivering messaging is critical. As the organizational structure of the Faculty of Dentistry has evolved to include separate, more focused roles related to Communications and Student Life, a comprehensive communications roadmap and strategy is needed more than ever.

The Review Committee reviewed a summary of the findings from the March 2015 audit of Student Admissions Communications. The findings and observations noted in the audit report focus on the many Admissions related events and communications. While the focus was on Admissions related events and communications, some of the findings and themes can be tied to other services provided by the Registrar and SSO. For example, this Student Admissions Communications audit noted how students’ experiences with the SSO affect their impression of

---

1 University of Toronto, Faculty of Dentistry, ‘Student Admissions Communications: Interviews Audit’, initiated March 2015, revised September 2015, Erin Vollick, Communications Officer.
Faculty of Dentistry. In addition to correspondence and communications sent to applicants and students, attention needs to be directed at promoting a culture that reflects a welcoming and friendly atmosphere.

Without an integrated communications strategy, the opportunities for duplicative and confusing messaging are too great. Today’s students are inundated with communications from a variety of sources, including e-mail, web pages and social media. Students and others receive messages from different units in the Faculty of Dentistry which can lead to inefficient and less effective communications.

**Recommendation 5.1**
The SSO should continue to work closely with the Faculty of Dentistry’s Communications Officer to review and coordinate communications, messaging and branding sent to or available to students, faculty, alumni and other constituents.

**Recommendation 5.2**
The Communication Office should continue to refine and integrate communications and branding for the Faculty of Dentistry, identifying appropriate modes (e.g., email, web, print, social media) and style/brand formats.

### 6. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN SSO AND STUDENT LIFE

The Registrar and SSO staff are critical to the mission of the Faculty of Dentistry. The expertise and services are both valued and unquestioned. As with many organizations, internal and external changes often demand a review of roles and responsibilities. Increased competition from other universities requires the University of Toronto’s Faculty of Dentistry to make organizational adjustments and improvements or risk losing ground in attracting the best students and faculty. The rapid pace of a technological change presents both challenges and opportunities. The skill sets and expectations of staff need to change to address the technological developments. Today’s staff must have a broad and deep set of core competencies. Among the key core competencies are customer service, communications, analytical thinking, emotional intelligence, project management, facility with technology, change management, leadership and teamwork, and professionalism.

One of the many positive outcomes of the Faculty of Dentistry’s Strategic Plan were organizational changes that resulted in the creation of new roles and shifts in responsibilities. In particular, the establishment of new positions for Communications and Student Life were created to address constituent needs. Prior to the organizational changes, the Registrar and SSO were responsible for some of the services now provided by Communications and Student Life. Separating Communications and Student Life from the Registrar and SSO allows each unit to focus on its strengths.

The Review Committee applauds these organizational changes and firmly believes they have positioned the Faculty of Dentistry to meet the needs of students, faculty, alumni and other constituents more effectively. As is often the case, organizational change can be initially disruptive before roles and responsibilities “mature.”

In discussions with stakeholders, including the Registrar and Director of Student Life, there surfaced a need to provide more clarity on roles, responsibilities and boundaries between SSO and Student Life. The Review Committee observed a significant level of friction between the Registrar and the Director of Student Life. While both the Registrar and Director of Student Life demonstrate commitment to the Faculty of Dentistry, the working relationship between the two is in need of repair. Students, faculty and staff can be put “in the middle” and given conflicting information. To the extent this relationship is not improved there will be continued stress on the organization.

Registrars and SSO staff are required to enforce Faculty and University policies. They are also asked to design and administer business processes that are efficient and equitable. Student Life professionals tend to play more of an advocacy role for students (and sometimes faculty). Students may have sensitive or confidential issues that
affect academic or personal lives. The role of Director of Student Life is well suited for being an appropriate and effective advocate for students. Sometimes what is being asked for or recommended by Student Life is in conflict with Faculty or University policy. Other times such requests go against established business practices. In both these scenarios, it is important to have an open, transparent and collegial relationship between the Registrar and Director of Student Life in order to arrive at fair and timely resolution of issues.

Recommendation 6.1

With guidance and assistance from U of Toronto Human Resources experts, a review of position descriptions and responsibilities for the Registrar and SSO staff should be initiated. In the event such a review has already taken place, it should be reviewed again to validate its findings. Job descriptions should be updated to reflect responsibilities given the current organizational structure.

Recommendation 6.2

With guidance and assistance from U of Toronto Human Resources experts, a set of ‘Core Competencies’ should be adopted for the Registrar and SSO staff. There are numerous models and approaches for implementing Core Competencies. Unless there is an agreed to model in place at the U of Toronto, the Faculty of Dentistry should review several models and select one that makes most sense for the organization.

7. RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS

The Review Committee had the opportunity to meet with other key stakeholders who interact with the Registrar, SSO staff, and Director of Student Life. The nature of these discussions were somewhat open ended, though the Review Committee did ask a set of standard questions to each individual. The focus of the questions revolved around the effectiveness of services provided by the SSO. There was also discussion on departmental roles given the current organizational structure.

Representing faculty insight on behalf of the Faculty of Dentistry were the following roles:

- Vice Dean, Education
- Associate Dean, Graduate Education
- Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education
- Assistant Dean, Director of Clinics

Representing other insight were the following senior roles from the Faculty of Dentistry:

- Assistant Dean, Administration & CAO
- Director of Advancement
- Communications Officer

Several consistent themes emerged from these discussions, including:

- affirmation that the Registrar and SSO staff were knowledgeable, hard-working and committed to the success of the Faculty of Dentistry
- affirmation the new organizational structure was needed, especially as it relates to the roles of Communications Officer and Director of Student Life
- affirmation there is still work to be done to clarify roles and responsibilities, primarily between the Registrar/SSO and Director of Student Life.

Some commented on the need and importance for the Registrar and SSO to establish a more welcoming and collaborative environment. Others expressed a desire to see the Registrar and SSO staff improve services by deploying better technology and possibly changing some business processes.
The Review Committee does feel obliged to note concerns were expressed regarding the appropriateness of the Registrar being involved in decisions or processes that disregarded faculty expertise and recommendations. Examples cited included the awarding of some financial scholarships, requests to accommodate students with special circumstances, and a general sense that the input of faculty are not valued. It should be noted these concerns were expressed in a constructive and professional manner. Most of these concerns tie back to the need to clarify roles and responsibilities, as well as finding ways to improve relations between the Registrar and SSO with internal (students, faculty, staff) and external (alumni) constituents.

8. OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There also emerged during the interviews a number of topics that are broad in nature. The Review Committee respectfully offers commentary and recommendations on some in anticipation they will add context and value to this review. These include:

- Organizational Reporting Line for the Registrar and SSO
- Appropriateness of the unit name ‘Student Services Office’ (SSO)
- Skill Sets and Expertise Needed for Registrar and SSO staff
- Managing Change

The Registrar and SSO currently have a direct reporting line to the Dean, Faculty of Dentistry. While the voice and needs of the Registrar and SSO are valued by the Dean, having this direct reporting line should be re-examined. A large part of the Registrar’s and SSO’s portfolio support academic and faculty needs. At the same time, the Vice Dean, Education, is a direct report to the Dean. Having the Registrar and SSO report to the Vice Dean, Education, would be beneficial to all parties and constituents involved. The Vice Dean, Education, is well positioned to support and represent the Registrar and SSO. Further, making this reporting change will allow the Dean to focus on the strategic needs of the faculty, students, alumni and other constituents.

During the course of interviews conducted by the Review Committee, several comments were made regarding whether or not the name Student Services Office (SSO) is still appropriate given the creation of the position Director of Student Life. Indeed, the Registrar and SSO currently focus more on administering and enforcing academic practices and rules - though they still advise and counsel students. The role of the Director of Student Life tends to focus more on student life matters related to “advocacy,” “academic and clinical experiences,” “health,” “extracurricular activities” and liaising with faculty and staff on behalf of students. The Review Committee did not hear a compelling case for changing the name of the SSO to something that does not include the word “student.” Indeed, as long as the portfolio includes providing on-line and in-person services to students the inclusion of “students” in the office name seems appropriate. That said, there will be an opportunity to affirm or change the unit’s name should their reporting line change to say the Vice Dean, Education.

In previous sections of this review, comments and recommendations were made regarding the necessary skill sets for the Registrar and SSO staff. Much of this addressed the need to clarify roles and responsibilities by updating position descriptions and expanding expectations around agreed to core competencies. Today, organizations that provide service require individuals with a hybrid of skills - everything from communication and interpersonal skills to strong analytic and problem solving skills. The workplace is constantly reacting to changes in the external and internal environment that require staff to be flexible and adept at adapting to meet emerging expectations and needs. Registrar and SSO staff must position themselves to be seen as effective change agents. From time to time they must challenge their own business practices to determine if change would be of benefit. They must play a leadership role in the adoption and use of technologies to support student and faculty services. Sometimes this results in a change to the portfolio of services provided or how services are provided. Increasingly there is a need for more integrated communications and awareness for value of consistent and professional branding.

Managing change in an organization requires the support of senior leadership. It should be recognized that
change often creates stress and uncertainties. Therefore, clearly communicating the vision and expectations for the organization is important. The Faculty of Dentistry’s Strategic Plan outlines a vision for the future. Thanks to strong leadership as well as support from students, faculty, staff and alumni, much progress has been made.

Listed below are some specific recommendations related to these matters.

**Recommendation 8.1**
The Registrar and SSO should report directly to the Vice Dean Education (see above for rationale).

**Recommendation 8.2**
At this time, it is not recommended to change the name of the office from its current Registrar and Student Services Office. If it turns out the Registrar and SSO report to the Vice Dean, Education, there will be an opportunity to consider renaming the unit. This will depend upon what other services and functions report to the Vice Dean, Education.

**Recommendation 8.3**
After any changes are made to position descriptions (roles and responsibilities) along with the addition of designated “core competencies,” all future hires for positions in the SSO should seek individuals who meet the minimum skill and competency requirements.

**Recommendation 8.4**
Support for the Open Door initiative. The Review Committee had an opportunity to see a draft proposal that outlined the benefits of having the Faculty of Dentistry hold “Open House” or “Open Door” events to showcase its many strengths. These types of events, combined with other strategies that integrate communications and branding, make great sense to fund and support.
9. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

The Faculty of Dentistry is well positioned to continue its leadership role in education, clinical care and research. Though the Review Committee focused its attention on the Student Services Office (SSO) there was time to gain a good understanding of the entire organization. This is important to note as the Registrar and SSO staff work closely with faculty and administrators throughout Dentistry. The introduction of a Strategic Plan and creation of new roles for Communications and Student Life have already provided benefit to the Faculty of Dentistry.

Organizational change often takes time to be supported and effectively adopted by staff. It is not uncommon for organizational change to introduce some uncertainty regarding roles and responsibilities. Staff have a sense of pride and ownership over the types of services they support and their responsibilities. External reviews such as this one are important to validate the “good” as well as identify opportunities for improvement.

The Registrar and SSO staff are dedicated and hard-working professionals who take their responsibilities seriously. Keeping up with existing demands for service and support is no small task. It is, however, imperative the Registrar and SSO find ways to provide service and support to students, faculty and alumni that is more efficient and welcoming. This can only be achieved through strong leadership focused on “continuous process improvement” as well as enhancing collaborative partnerships with the University community.

The Review Committee appreciates the opportunity to work the Faculty of Dentistry and offer our observations and recommendations. Some recommendations may be easier to adopt and achieve than others. But each, we believe, should be given serious consideration. It is also important to be cognizant of the academic calendar and business cycle when adopting specific recommendations.
# APPENDIX - VISIT SCHEDULE

**University of Toronto, Faculty of Dentistry**  
**Student Services’ External Review**  
**Visit Schedule**  
**October 17 & 18, 2016**

**Review Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paul Robinson</strong></th>
<th><strong>Andrea McGee</strong></th>
<th><strong>Howard Tenenbaum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University Registrar  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI | Registrar and Assistant Dean, Students, Office of Student Services  
John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design  
University of Toronto | Professor  
Faculty of Dentistry  
University of Toronto |

**Addresses and Contacts:**  
Faculty of Dentistry: 124 Edward Street, Toronto  
Dean’s Office: Suite 301, 3rd Floor  
Susan Mazza, Executive Assistant: Dean’s Office  
Tel (416) 979-4910, ext. 4382 Mobile (647) 688-4261

### Day 1: Monday, October 17, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting with</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30am</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Daniel Haas, Dean</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:15am</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Mary Choi, Assistant Dean Administration &amp; CAO</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 11:30am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:30pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Margaret Edghill, Registrar and Manager</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 1:30pm</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong> with DDS representatives (undergraduate students)</td>
<td>Catered Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 1:45pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 - 2:45pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Rick Rayman, Director of Student Life</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 - 3:15pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Lisa Hutchinson, Graduate/Postgraduate Programs Officer</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 4:00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Lina Dinatale, Admissions Assistant</strong></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 4:30pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Nick Mitchell, Undergraduate Program Office</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 - 5:00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Frankie Thompson, Secretarial Assistant</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>DINNER with Reviewers only</td>
<td>Oro Restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 2: Tuesday, October 18, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 9:00am</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Selina Esteves, Director of Advancement</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:30am</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Jim Posluns, Assistant Dean, Director of Clinics</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:15am</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Grace Bradley, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 - 10:30am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:15am</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Jim Lai, Vice Dean, Education</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 12:00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Ernest Lam, Associate Dean, Graduate Education</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00pm</td>
<td>LUNCH with GPDSS representatives (graduate students)</td>
<td>Catered Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 1:15pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 - 2:15pm</td>
<td>Meeting with <em>Erin Bollick, Communications Offices</em></td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 - 3:45pm</td>
<td>WRAP-UP discussion - reviewers only (Registrar is available to answer any questions as needed)</td>
<td>Dean’s Conference Room (300A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>