



Strategic Plan

Accepted June 2009
for the 2009 – 2010 academic year



This document printed on recycled paper



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Vision Statement	2
Mission Statement.....	2
Values Statement.....	2
Strategic Objectives	3
Appendix I (S.W.O.T. Analyses).....	4
Appendix II (Key Influencer / Stakeholder Interviews).....	8
Appendix III (Faculty / Staff Interviews)	10
Appendix IV (Student Interviews).....	14
Acknowledgements	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Between September 2007 and March 2009, the College conducted a strategic planning process that included an extensive listening phase. Findings from the listening phase were used to create or update key identifiers for the College (vision, mission and values) and were also used to revise and streamline the strategic plan.

The listening phase included an analysis, by various groups, of perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (S.W.O.T.); a series of individual interviews with key stakeholders and influential decision makers; and a series of individual interviews with faculty, staff and students.

Groups participating in the S.W.O.T. analysis included faculty and staff; the College Associates Board; and alumni located in Seattle and Bellingham. The first S.W.O.T. analysis was conducted at the faculty / staff retreat in the fall of 2007. It was facilitated by the Director of Development for Huxley College and the Senior Director of Gift Planning from the office of University Advancement. Subsequent S.W.O.T. analyses were conducted by the Director of the Development with the College Associates Board and with alumni located in Seattle and Bellingham. A summary of the findings from all of the S.W.O.T. analyses is included in this document as Appendix I.

The Dean and the Director of Development also conducted individual interviews with key stakeholders and influential decision makers throughout the region and nation. Approximately 20 people were interviewed between January and August 2008. Among them were state and local elected officials; including former Governor, Gary Locke; business leaders, environmental scientists and policy makers; academics from other institutions; former and current WWU Trustees; parents and donors. During the interview participants were asked to share their opinion regarding the mission of the College; the region it serves or should serve; and their perception of the role the College currently plays and should play in the future, related to environmental education, research and leadership. They were also asked how they would, if possible, influence the future of the College. A summary of the themes that emerged from these interviews is included in this document as Appendix II. (Items in italics reflect comments made by one or more individuals.)

In the fall of 2008 an ad hoc committee comprised of faculty and staff assessed the listening phase findings and developed recommendations for a vision statement and a significantly revised mission statement. Their recommendations were discussed at faculty / staff meetings during fall quarter and their final recommendation was approved via ballot in December. In the spring of 2009 a new ad hoc committee of faculty and staff continued the assessment of data to develop a values statement and begin work on strategic objectives. This committee also conducted personal interviews with faculty, staff and students to further inform the development of strategic objectives. Their recommendations were presented at the spring retreat. Their recommended values statement was adopted. The recommended strategic objectives were accepted as a working document with implementation to begin as soon as possible. A summary of the findings from the faculty / staff interviews is included in this document as Appendix III. A summary of the findings from the student interviews is included in this document as Appendix IV.

VISION & MISSION STATEMENTS
Approved via Ballot December 2008

VISION STATEMENT

Huxley College of the Environment is a premier institution for the education of future environmental experts and leaders.

MISSION STATEMENT

Huxley College of the Environment addresses today's environmental issues and prepares tomorrow's interdisciplinary problem solvers. We accomplish this mission by integrating outstanding educational programs, faculty-student collaboration, applied research, and professional and community service.

VALUES STATEMENT
Approved at Spring Retreat 2009

VALUES STATEMENT

Huxley College fully subscribes to the values contained within the existing WWU Strategic Plan. We are committed to excellence, engagement, diversity, community service, integrity and innovation.

Huxley College was founded forty years ago as a pioneering effort to focus attention on the environment. It was based on the premises that the study of the environment is holistic and transcends disciplinary boundaries and that our reach is global, even when the problems we address are local. The nature of our college demands a more specific elaboration of the unique values that create the environment of engaged excellence in Huxley College. We value:

- **Collaboration:** We collaborate within the college, with other units in the university and with the larger community in solving environmental problems.
- **Application:** We apply our teaching and learning to the real world.
- **Problem orientation:** We engage students, faculty and staff meaningfully in the analysis and solution of pressing environmental problems.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES
Accepted at Spring Retreat 2009

I. Increase external visibility of Huxley College

Recommendations:

- 1) Develop a targeted national recruitment strategy for undergraduate students (*College Staff and Admissions*)
- 2) Develop improved communication with alumni and other influential entities (*Dean and Director of Development*)
- 3) Enhance marketing and fund-raising (*Dean and Director of Development*)
- 4) Develop new strategic partnerships (*Dean, Faculty, and Development Director*)

II. Improve college programs and encourage curricular innovation

Recommendations:

- 1) Review degree programs with the goal of consolidation into fewer offerings (*Departments and Programs*)
- 2) Review sequencing, scheduling and duplication of courses in all programs (*Departments and Programs*)
- 3) Develop a plan for a four year Huxley program, with conditional admission on WWU enrollment (*Policy Committee*)
- 4) Review requirements and develop a clear road map for preparatory courses (*Curriculum Committee*)
- 5) Develop a plan for moving graduate admission to the departments (*College faculty*)
- 6) Implement new curricular option in energy (*Faculty, staff, students*)
- 7) Develop a proposal for a new General Undergraduate Requirement category in Environment and sustainability (*Curriculum Committee*)
- 8) Assess the costs and benefits of maintaining IGCR and DREP
- 9) Clarify responsibilities and roles for faculty and staff advisers e.g. internships, career planning (*Academic Advisors, Chairs*)

III. Continue to improve college communication and transparency of decision-making

Recommendations:

- 1) Revamp the College's web presence (*College Staff, Interns*)
- 2) Enhance technology to serve student and faculty needs better (*College Staff*)
- 3) Reallocate office assignments to mix faculty of the two departments (*Dean, Chairs*)
- 4) Foster the intellectual community of the College (e.g. weekly brown bag research discussions)
- 5) Make meetings more focused and productive (*Dean, Chairs, Staff*)

APPENDIX I
Strategic Planning 2007 ~ 2009 Listening Phase
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Between September 2007 and March 2009, the College conducted SWOT analyses with faculty and staff; board members; Seattle area alumni and Whatcom County area alumni. In the following summary of the SWOT analyses, comments are separated by participating groups.

Faculty / Staff
Strengths

- Curricular Approach
- Academic Programs
- Graduate Program
- College Structure

Particular emphasis is placed on the value of the history of the College as the oldest environmental College in the country and its reputation as a leader and innovator. This reputation is highly valued by faculty and staff who are committed to maintaining the College as a leader and innovator. Strengths are also associated with the interdisciplinary curricular approach, College-based advising for students, and the emphasis on applied learning. Other strengths include the caliber of the academic program; the number of opportunities for undergraduate and graduate research; and the involvement of faculty with students. The graduate program is viewed a huge strength, both in its own right and for the enhancements it provides to undergraduate education. The caliber of people (faculty, staff and students) and the structure and size of the College itself, including the institutes, are also viewed as strengths.

Weaknesses

- Resources
- Curriculum
- Facilities
- Administration

Weaknesses focus primarily on the lack of resources; the challenges of coordinating an interdisciplinary curriculum and the associated advising of undergraduates; and some administrative issues. Weakness related to resources include a shortage of money to support students, especially graduate students, the inadequacy of existing facilities, and the insufficient allocation of TA's by the University. A particular weakness associated with facilities is the current physical fragmentation of what is intended to be an interdisciplinary program. Also of concern is the commonly perceived erosion of an interdisciplinary approach in the face of increasing specialization. There is a perceived lack of opportunity to explore the current meaning and purpose of an interdisciplinary curriculum. There is a widely held belief that the curriculum, especially its core requirements, should be revised and prioritized to meet the changing needs of students and to preserve a meaningful and relevant interdisciplinary academic experience. The physical distance between departments is perceived to have contributed to the erosion of interdisciplinary collaboration and the lack of common space for faculty to mingle and share ideas is perceived by many to have contributed to an increased sense of compartmentalization and isolation. Another area of weakness is related to College administration. Of particular concern is the inadequacy of systems for the management of internships, student advising, College planning and marketing.

Opportunities

- Public Interest in Environmental Issues
- Location
- International Relationships
- Reputation

Growing environmental awareness and shifting norms could provide new venues for internships, senior projects, faculty research, and funding. This is viewed as an opportune time to capitalize on public interest. It is also viewed as a critical time for the College to assert and promote its position as a leader in the education of environmental experts. The location of the College is also viewed as an asset. Its close proximity to a diverse array of ecosystems, another country, and the potential development on the waterfront, all provide numerous opportunities for cross-border research, teaching, partnership and innovation. The increasing ability to collaborate with global partners is also viewed as an opportunity to enhance international connections, research, partnerships and learning opportunities. The national recognition of Huxley College a leader in its field presents opportunities for students, faculty and WWU as a whole. This reputation could be leveraged, especially in this changing political climate, to bring new resources and partnerships to WWU and Huxley College.

Threats

- Public Interest in Environmental Issues
- Global Warming
- Sustainability Movement
- Location
- Students

The potential expansion of environmental programs at other universities and institutions could lead to a weakening of the College's position in the academic marketplace; confusion on the part of funders and the public; duplication of services; and a potential further reduction of resources, especially at the state level. Threats also include concerns related to possible isolation of programs located on the waterfront; the lack of preparation on the part of incoming students; and inadequate state funding.

Associates Board

Strengths

- Curricular Approach
- Caliber of People
- College Structure
- College Reputation

Strengths are associated with the interdisciplinary curricular approach and the emphasis on applied learning, especially when it prepares students for real-world job challenges. Identified strengths also include the expertise and reputation of faculty and the caliber and quality of both undergraduate and graduate students. The structure and size of the College is also viewed as a strength along with history of the College as the oldest environmental college in the country. The reputation of the College as a leader and innovator is viewed as a strength to be preserved.

Weaknesses

- Publicity and Perceptions
- Resources
- Curriculum
- Administration

Weaknesses focus primarily on the lack of visibility of the College and the lack support for marketing. Inadequate resources (public and private) for facilities and programs are also considered a weakness. There are perceived gaps in curriculum (management training, strategic planning and “negotiation” skills) which, to the degree they are accurate, are seen as a weakness. Challenges related to working with the university bureaucracy and “the academy” are viewed as a weakness. Specifically these challenges relate to perceived and real experiences of cumbersome decision making structures within the University; the inability of the institution to respond quickly to opportunities and requests; and the resistance to change.

Opportunities

- Public Interest in Environmental Issues
- Need for Environmental Leadership
- Waterfront
- Partnerships
- Changes in Leadership

Growing environmental awareness and shifting norms could provide new venues for internships, senior projects, faculty research, and funding. This is viewed as an opportune time to capitalize on public interest. It is also viewed as a critical time for the College to assert and promote its position as a leader in the education of environmental experts. This group identifies the need for environmental leadership in every sector of the economy and society as a huge opportunity for the College. The potential development on the waterfront provides numerous opportunities for research, partnership and innovation. Changing leadership within the University is seen as an opportunity for the College to experience increased visibility, improved flexibility in responding to opportunities, and stronger support for leveraging outside relationships.

Threats

- UW
- Change
- Public Perceptions

The potential expansion of environmental programs at other universities and institutions could lead to a weakening of the College’s position in the academic marketplace. The rate of social change, especially re the environment, could threaten the College’s ability to effectively evolve and maintain leadership in the educational market place. Past (and present) public perceptions of WWU as a “teaching College” threaten the ability of WWU and Huxley College to attract key philanthropists and influential decision makers. It is time for WWU to update its brand to incorporate and emphasize current strengths / expertise.

Alumni (Seattle & Bellingham)

Strengths

- Curricular Approach
- Caliber of People
- College Structure
- College Reputation

Strengths are associated with the interdisciplinary curricular approach, multidisciplinary programs, the emphasis on applied learning, community involvement and opportunity to work on real-world problems; the caliber of people (faculty, staff and students) and the history, structure, size and reputation of the College itself.

Weaknesses

- Curriculum
- Internships
- Career Preparation
- Resources

Weaknesses focus primarily on the challenges associated with the delivery of a truly interdisciplinary curriculum, the management of required internships and the lack of preparation for students to enter the harsh realities of the real world. Other weaknesses include lack of resources for facilities, networking, marketing and web presence. Although existing partnerships are identified as a strength, the lack of partnerships with new and emerging entities is viewed as a weakness and a failure to stay on the cutting-edge within the emerging green economy.

Opportunities

- Public Interest in Environmental Issues
- Waterfront
- Alumni Connections
- Academic Programs

Growing environmental awareness and shifting norms provides new venues for internships, senior projects, faculty research, and funding. It is an opportune time to capitalize on public interest while promoting the position of the College as a leader. Alumni connections and expertise are under utilized, presenting opportunities for increased support, networking, and internships. Growing career opportunities indicate the need to strengthen preparation of students entering a changing environmental workforce. The development on the waterfront provides numerous opportunities for research, partnership and demonstration of leadership in sustainable development.

Threats

- Public Perceptions
- Resources
- Academic Programs
- Location

Public perceptions regarding “environmentalism”, the idealism of students / faculty, and perceptions about the need to offer a Ph.D. could all contribute to a weakening of the College’s position in the academic marketplace. Also included are concerns about the economy as it relates to private and public funding. The failure to maintain a competitive edge in academic programs increases threats from the expansion of other institutions (UW). The move to the waterfront is perceived as a potential threat if it leads to isolation, impacts the ability of the College to deliver an interdisciplinary curriculum or reduces the connection or access to other departments on campus. Transportation to and from the waterfront was also identified as a concern.

APPENDIX II
Strategic Planning 2007 ~ 2009 Listening Phase
Key Influencer / Stakeholder Interviews

Between January and August 2008, the College conducted interviews with twenty stakeholders and influential decision makers throughout the region and nation. The following is a summary of the themes that emerged from these interviews. Items in italics are near quotes from one or more individuals.

Mission

- *“Educate the future environmental leaders”*
- Provide a comprehensive education in wide range of environmental disciplines
- Provide education for environmental fields in a global, interdisciplinary way
- Teach people to solve real-world problems
- Play a primary and leading role in the area environmental science and policy education

Region

- WA, OR, ID, MT, AK / EPA Region 10 / International, especially BC
- Local, regional, national and global depending on the specific area or project
- Be global rather than regional

Education

- *“Give people the tools to change the world, knowing the world is hard to change”*
- Engaged in community, solving real-world problems
- Comprehensive, interdisciplinary, innovator, cutting-edge
- Foster wide-spread environmental literacy both w/in the academy and in society
- Assume a leadership position for education at the undergraduate and masters level

Research

- Research role is important ~ student experience and social benefit
- Research efforts are under publicized
- Faculty, staff and students should be recognized as a resource for legislators, decision makers and businesses
- Help create, promote environmental checklist
- Environmental expertise of faculty, staff and students should be better known to the public especially as it relates to Puget Sound and the work of the Puget Sound Partnership
- Waterfront an outstanding opportunity

Leadership

- *“Huxley College should be the ‘go to’ place for environmental expertise”*
- An important role, one of the most well-known places for environmental degrees
- Has produced leaders who are often not recognized as alumni
- Should have a role in Puget Sound Partnership
- Huxley can’t be the advocate but its alumni can and should lead the change process
- Should be an active partner in training policy makers
- Should be viewed as the institution that sets the standard
- Help bring about public awareness, outreach, to foster highest standard of stewardship
- Craft a purposeful interaction between the college, the media and legislative process
- Help fill the gaps in scientific information for policy makers

Influence

- Help you identify your niche
- Lobby for resources
- Connect to key decision makers
- Help tell the “Huxley Story”
- Advocate for growth, relocation of college
- Facilitate partnerships
- Help elevate the visibility of Huxley College as resource for environmental expertise
- Help implement your vision

APPENDIX III
Strategic Planning 2007 ~ 2009 Listening Phase
Faculty and Staff Interviews

During the spring of 2009, an ad hoc committee of faculty and staff conducted a series of interviews with faculty and staff. Nearly every faculty and staff member was interviewed. The following is a summary of their collective responses.

What does Huxley College do well?

- Prepares students for entry-level careers (we do this through curriculum and faculty)
 - *Relevant and applied teaching*
- Students get a solid academic training; come out with a strong background
- Support students
- Covers lots of material/disciplines → talented people
- Provides good/practical/applied opportunities for students
- Diverse faculty backgrounds
- Students get involved in different things
- Institute for Watershed Studies is a stellar example of service, learning, and research.
 - Water issues well addressed
- Good courses taught well!
- Research productivity, especially with the Student Tech Fees has been successful
- In Sciences, “there isn’t anyone I would steer a student away from.”
- Well-respected regionally and nationally.
- Has a sense of mission and identity.
- Students have a sense of community
- Allows a multi-disciplinary approach to learning.
- Links guest speakers and courses to contemporary issues.
- Outstanding faculty
- Strong partnerships within the University

What can Huxley College improve upon?

- We can improve the quality of students by choosing better students. How? By attracting more students from a larger pool, and getting the most qualified (rather than just those that apply).
- Need better recruitment and advising
- Make Huxley a four-year program!
- Need one building or location to increase communication and efficiency
- Higher standards for courses
 - *Need higher expectations of undergrads/more rigor*
 - *Need to improve preparatory classes and common core.*
- Lots of redundancy – there is much overlap, especially in ecology (marine, stream, wetland, forest).
 - *Some of the concentrations (freshwater, riparian ecology) are essentially the same*
 - *Faculty too thin, need a deeper “bench”*
- Common environmental knowledge base
 - *We need mentorship for faculty, e.g. “best practices” in teaching*
- Coursework is not as well integrated as it could be.
- Student interaction is a challenge because of the broad array of students with different levels of ability. (How to have a productive class then?)
- The “liberal arts” i.e. general ed component and “intellectual” component.
- For example, CBE grads have a skill set, knowledge of the culture of business, and better expectations of the working environment – are we doing the same for Huxley grads?
- We could do a better job of capturing the student population – servicing/preparing them for Huxley, knowing the pre-reqs before applying.
- The departmental split is “weird.”
- Avoid further balkanization of the college
 - Not everything should have a major; need breadth as well.
- Resources for grad programs/research support
- The Geography graduate program is nebulous – what are they trying to do?
- Following through with initiatives such as this (Strategic Planning) – getting feedback!
- Capstone a good idea, but needs to work on better integration
- Increase environmental GURs
- Answer the question of “how does the curriculum address our College mission?”
- More opportunities for faculty to engage, though the Friday lecture series helps.
- Need more one-on-one faculty advising (for undergraduates)
- More collaborative research between faculty
- Rewarding risk.
- Should have a greater focus on coastal issues and shorelines, given our location and likely move to the waterfront.
- Need to work on minority recruitment.
- More field-based education.
 - Needs better support for staff
 - Internship program needs to be improved; it provides a large number of credits but is poorly supervised.
 - Needs a full-time person in charge, not just a student intern. It is a good thing to have, but it needs more supervision.

What things should Huxley College discontinue or avoid doing?

- Discontinue two departments in two buildings → end segregation
- Decrease the tracking of students into majors – too many majors/tracks in Env. Sciences
- Don't accept all students
- Have meetings with a purpose
 - We need to create opportunities – such as a real retreat – to develop a stronger sense of staff mission and identity.
- Everybody teaches a new course, and the result is a bloated catalog (with courses that we don't teach)
- We got caught up in Emergency Management; we need to stop jumping on bandwagons.
- On the other hand, we need to find a way to shape the curriculum to meet future needs and be more responsive to opportunities
- When faculty have to do administrative tasks (overrides, enrollment, rooms), it takes away from their teaching.
- It's a mistake to "force" interdisciplinary classes, as the program is already interdisciplinary
- Huxley should reconsider the value of having so many tracks. Maybe have fewer curricular requirements with broader focus; less emphasis on sequential classes. Currently, it is difficult to blend science and policy interest
- We're a bit diluted – individuals are good in specific program areas
- Avoid waterfront; too far from campus
- Avoid building programs around 1-2 people; we're spread too thin.
 - We need a critical mass, as we're still in silos.

If you were creating Huxley College from scratch, what would you envisage being different from the current college?

- Action item: reduce everyone's course load by 1 class per year & get people to think!
- Require a common set of pre-requisites for all Huxley students. All students should have a skill set that includes one full year of biological sciences (ecology, botany/zoology, and basic biology) and economics.
- Need grants to support grad students, but need time to apply, & there's no course release
- Have all faculty in the same location (not necessarily the waterfront, though)
- More collaboration
- Need to emphasize how we interact with the rest of the University
- Introduce/emphasize a social justice component into the curriculum
 - Have a "discourse on sustainability" that fosters intellectual conversations
 - Depth of knowledge is good, but need that social justice piece.
- Avoid perceptions of inequality (workload equity)
- Physical proximity to each other (offices could alternate natural and social scientists)
- Huxley is a prime candidate for online/e-learning. There is a market for people who want to go into Environmental Studies/Sciences, but don't fit into the traditional college niche; there's an opportunity to do this online.
- Some missing programs: remediation (but involves a stronger engineering program).
- Toxicology program is an example of a program that needs stronger standards. Someone can get a toxicology degree, but without taking biochemistry.
- Four-year program
- Devote more resources to graduate education
- Scrap the two departments, and make them less distinct
- Increase the breadth requirements
- Narrow the scope of what we do
- Common and strong admissions standards (this could be a College without departments)
- Broaden the concept of systems sciences
- Need people who will impact the world more; could be awesome researcher/teacher/env. educator
- One major per department? Or, just one department...but what would that do to us? Loss of faculty? This would bring more resources into the grad program.
- Combine units, and everything else will fall into place.
- We could use a new facility.
- "Flexibility"
- Consider a semester system to allow deeper investigation of class subjects.
- A more innovative, less-structured curriculum: a hybrid of Huxley and Fairhaven/Evergreen.
- A strong graduate program that enlists more graduate participation in undergrad learning.
- Rebuild more in line with the original college with more emphasis on interdisciplinary programs.
- Focus on knowledge that is important for future jobs
- Improve or maintain collaboration within the college and within the community
- Add more focus on green building and low impact development
- Consider how big Huxley should become. Smaller is nicer for education and flexibility.
- Look at careers to build programs around (such as air quality)
- Offer classes not just at peak times!
- Ensure highest quality GURs to attract students

APPENDIX IV
Strategic Planning 2007 ~ 2009 Listening Phase
Student Interviews

During the spring of 2009, an ad hoc committee of faculty and staff conducted a series of interviews with three graduate and 14 undergraduate students. The following is a summary of their collective responses.

Graduate Students

What does Huxley College do well?

- It is a small program capable of adapting to student interests. Huxley College offers many classes that get out into the field for field based learning.
- Huxley is great in the way it allows students to not be limited to specific classes by allowing a lot of options like student run classes (independent study) and individual independent study. Also very open thesis options. 502 and 503 are great!
- Keeps students on track and moving forward toward their goals. Also excellent advising and support for students.

What can Huxley College improve upon?

- Increased funding for graduate students, perhaps more higher level challenging courses specific to graduate students. There is a lot of overlap between courses and TA's combined with the quarter system leads to a lot of lost opportunity for learning. Perhaps eliminating quarters or developing specific focused learning tracks with courses that dovetail rather than overlap material. For example, develop an integrated path of 4 courses for a freshwater ecology focus where redundancies are eliminated from being repeated in several classes.
- More class options for graduate students, not many options. So they have to resort to independent study.
- Please improve on communication between different departments.

What things should Huxley College discontinue doing?

- Accepting students w/o full funding
- Less class credit required with the limited classes offered. Classes are often taken just for credit not because it is something they are interested in or will help them with his/her thesis. The only other option is independent study.

What new things should Huxley College consider doing?

- Establishing partnerships with Federal Agencies and Field Stations to enhance opportunities for employment following completion of the program.
- Adding more stats classes. Most students take 502 and 503 their first year. It would be beneficial to have at least a refresher course for after they collected data.
- MORE STATS, or at least additional options. A 500 level intro to GIS that is based on maps and basic information retaining to thesis projects.
- Offer a statistics class for students that allows them to work with their own data. Have the class based around analyzing data that the individual students have collected for their research (just a suggestion).

Undergraduate Students

What does Huxley College do well?

- Professors work very hard to help you with all aspects of being a student. For example: outside projects etc. professors are always available to help you.
- Intelligent professors that are accessible and community based
- Location
- Specificity with multiple degrees available
- Crossing over between ESTU and ESCI

What can Huxley College improve upon?

- Relationships with other departments. As an enviro-econ major I felt very uncomfortable in a few of my Huxley classes when economists were referred to as f*ing economists. I think Huxley would be very surprised if they tried to build a relationship with the CBE and the economics department in particular that the professors at the CBE agree that traditional cost based accounting has not worked. Cost based accounting is the topic that is discussed the most in my Huxley classes when discussing economics but I believe some of the arguments are a bit dated. Team teaching classes could be a great way to build relationships between the departments. After all, Huxley does push how important it will be us for work with multiple and diverse groups but cannot seem to work with those one building over.
- More economics program involvement ~ join with business college
- Sustainability aspect in a less of a traditional "Huxley" way
- Required or taught skill sets for classes that would make work easier
- Lots of overlap with classes (Ex. ESTU 304 & 464 or ESCI 325 with Biology series)
- Becoming more a cutting edge environmental college
- More of a real-world experience for students to partake in (classes, internships, job shadows, field trips). More opportunities for hands-on experience
- Direct connections with professors or alumni
- Huxley website by giving the project to an IT class
- Students did not know Huxley existed, most until a year after starting at Western
- Recommendations for prerequisites through advisors

What things should Huxley College discontinue doing?

- Capstones that are not interdisciplinary
- All day long classes (Field Methods, Wildlife Ecology)
- ESTU classes mostly on T and R
- Too many tracks and majors
- Make Policy and Planning one major
- More flexibility within major

What new things should Huxley College consider doing?

- Team teaching! In addition a lot of the policy classes at Huxley seem to overlap a lot because it seems that the professors do not seem to work together to diversify the classes. Instead of working together so that classes discuss multiple environmental policy issues the professors tend to teach the same aspects of environmental policy. Ex. the CAA is discussed in almost every single policy class but other policies are completely over looked.
- Working with the business college
- Work on appeal towards attracting students and staying ahead as an Environmental college
- Archive The Planet magazine

Other?

- Application process: prerequisites are good but have the application feel more like an actual application so it can be taken more seriously by students.
- Advising:
 - Doesn't always have contacts
 - Better advising at start of Huxley program
 - Misleading at times
 - Professors vs. Central office
- Andy Bunn- Renewable Energy major
- Business/Econ/Sustainable Design/GIS majors created
- Access to Resources/References/Library
- Seminar- Introduction to Huxley course should be offered

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks are due to the many faculty and staff who contributed their time, talent and energy to this project. Thanks are also due to the alumni and Associates Board members who participated in focus groups and to the many individuals who shared their thoughts and perspectives through personal interviews.

The strategic planning process was lead by the Dean, Brad Smith, in close collaboration with the Director of Development, Manca Valum. Special thanks are due to Ms. Valum for providing continuity and guidance during the project and for preparation of the final report.

Two ad hoc committees worked intensively on the project and their contributions of time and expertise were a key to the overall success of this important planning effort. Special thanks are due to Dr. Andrew Bodman who shared his planning expertise and served as chair for the spring ad hoc committee, which was charged with drafting the strategic objectives for the plan.

Fall 2008 Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee

Manca Valum, Chair
Brian Bingham, faculty representative
Andrew Bodman, faculty representative
Stefan Freelan, staff representative
Peter Homann, faculty representative
Jean Melious, faculty representative

Spring 2009 Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee

Andrew Bodman, Chair
Andy Bunn, faculty representative
Sarah Burnet, student representative
Lauren Erickson, student representative
Robin Matthews, faculty representative
Kathryn Patrick, staff representative
Manca Valum, staff representative
Grace Wang, faculty representative