

**Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture**

**FINAL ACTION PLAN**

*March 21, 2018*

with assistance from  
Lighthouse Consulting Group  
Warren, RI

**College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources  
Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture (PSLA)  
Action Plan**

**SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENTAL PRIORITIES**

These priorities were identified through the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis conducted as part of the phone interviews and confirmed during the workshop, ranked in order:

1. Agree to pursue thematic focus/disciplines that support collaboration within and across departments.
2. Take directed action to increase intra-departmental collaboration that makes progress on the mission, pursues priority thematic areas, and increases student enrollment.
3. Increase student recruitment strategies that benefit the entire department.
4. Develop and review faculty and staffing needs that consider the best, expected and worst-case retirement-hiring scenarios every five to seven years.
5. Continue to improve the functioning of PSLA so it can successfully achieve the above results.

**CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING THESE PRIORITIES**

This plan recognizes that these priorities, though important, are not necessarily new. There are considerable challenges to achieving these that include:

- The pressure on faculty and staff to balance their professional and scholarly responsibilities while also moving ahead on this action plan.
- Having access to centralized services (e.g., payroll, travel, grant support, purchasing and credit card processing) to allow our clerical staff to help us move these initiatives forward.
- Challenges of balancing the competing demands of three-way appointments while meeting University expectations, which are measured differently for research, teaching and extension.
- Support for collaborative efforts across all missions as an effective way to improve productivity.
- Lack of awareness about each other’s experience, expertise and capabilities.
- Ongoing cuts in the college constrain the ability to invest in people and necessary actions.

**WHY THIS DEPARTMENT IS IMPORTANT TO ME**

Participants of the workshop were asked what they value about being part of the department. Their statements indicate they value:

- Having the academic and scholarly freedom to pursue topics that are important to them
- Engaging with students to share, teach and mentor
- Bringing what we know to the communities to make them healthier places to live
- The small size of the department
- The thematic areas that align with my interests and talents
- Making a difference
- The people I work with

To overcome some of these challenges, this plan identifies those actions that are critical to making progress on the priorities named above as viewed through two lenses:

1. What can the department do to help itself?
2. What support does it need from the college and the university?

## **PRIORITY ONE: OUR RESULT AREAS**

We recognize that working together as a department is important to our individual and collective success. Therefore, we have identified cross-cutting themes that we believe best represent the departmental focus. We selected these because we will use them to drive growth and collaboration.

We aim to build and support sustainable and healthy communities. To achieve this, we focus on three areas:

1. Sustainable agriculture in rural and urban areas with a focus on safe and efficient food production systems. For example:
  - Water management
  - Crop enhancement
  - Biofuels, recycling and renewables
  - Integrated pest management
  - Ornamentals and turfgrass
  - Crop production
  
2. Sustainable planning and design of built environments, such as:
  - Performance landscapes
  - Green infrastructure
  - Resiliency planning for climate change and sea level rise
  - Community planning and engagement
  
3. Plant genetics and plant-soil microbiome that improve human health and sustainability, such as:
  - Biofuels, recycling and renewables
  - Specialty crops
  - Plant-soil-microbial interactions
  - Crop genetic improvement and selection
  - Ornamentals and turfgrass

Supporting this work is our *equal* commitment to:

- Educate today's and tomorrow's industry practitioners with a focus on career placement and service learning
- Extend our knowledge into the communities
- Conduct basic and applied research

These result areas are meant to help us stay focused and recognize that the department has three distinct and equal elements. We recognize and accept that there is tension between these broad focus areas and our individual interests. This is expected within diverse academic departments and provides the necessary grist for discovery and expansion. However, we agree to use these focus areas as filters as we make decisions about our future, including projects, programs, curriculum, future hires and where to invest and how to set priorities.

## **PRIORITY TWO: COLLABORATION**

Shifting to an approach that considers the department's advancement concurrently with individual success is a critical element in creating a PSLA culture that will endure. The desire to increase intra-departmental collaboration (working together on cross-cutting themes across research, teaching and extension) was identified as a significant opportunity. We recognize that despite our strong interest to collaborate, real technical and practical challenges may impede high levels of collaboration in well-established programs. However, we are committed to proactively increasing our social and professional interactions for the benefit of the department.

The goal of improved intra-departmental collaboration is to:

- Increase interdisciplinary grant success, leading to individual and departmental recognition based on university-recognized performance measures.
- Create greater overlap between what is being researched and what is being taught.
- Strengthen the connection between research and extension.
- Improve departmental morale.
- Create a better sense of community in the program.

The group recognizes that collaboration with other departments within the college and other schools or universities and more firmly integrating the department into the larger university is also important. This intra-disciplinary collaboration serves to make the department less dispensable and raise the public profile of our programs.

Intra-departmental collaboration and unit cohesion begins with weaving work through the agreed upon focus areas and is supported by specific, concrete actions:

What is working that should be continued:

- Researchers sharing their knowledge and expertise in the classroom
- Department retreats that focus on broader, strategic issues
- Newly initiated seminar series that introduces the work that is happening in the department to faculty, staff and students
- Short faculty presentations at departmental meetings
- Recent curriculum changes, e.g., Sustainable Plant and Soil Systems (SPSS)
- Continued use of merit rewards for grant success or leadership – whether internal or external
- Joint grants that work across disciplines
- The committee structure, which creates a venue for different faculty and staff to work together. However, the purpose of each committee should be reviewed and revised as needed to ensure each is supporting this action plan. Committee chairs should meet on a regular basis with the department head to report on progress.

New actions that should be taken:

- Encourage individual accountability to the whole. Although it is easy to focus only on those things against which faculty are being directly measured, it is important to recognize that the department's future success requires everyone's help and attention. This includes:
  - Committee work
  - Implementing this action plan
  - Attendance at important meetings (e.g., there were people missing at the retreat)

- Identify thematic integrators/grant facilitators (by theme, rotating). Provide incentives to do this, such as time release or merit bonuses. These individuals will liaise across the department to build and coalesce collaborations that connect research, teaching and extension. A point person would increase our ability to collaborate. Explore options for providing incentives to collaborate within the department to include release time, additional pay, access to paid graduate students, etc.
- Create opportunities for professional and social engagement between faculty, staff and students. These may include:
  - Brown bag lunches (with defined purpose, outcomes and actions)
  - No-agenda social gatherings/happy hour
  - Thematic meetings that include all units
  - Identified physical “public” space where faculty, staff and students can meet
- Increase efficiency by dropping low enrollment courses in the face of a shrinking number of faculty.
- Recognize that the measure and rewards for scholarly collaboration within and outside the department are identical. Measures presently used include (1) grant success, (2) publications, (3) grants submitted, (4) role of the principal investigator (PI) as either the lead (more points) or co-PI (fewer points).
- Develop measurement metrics beyond grants, scholarly research and publications to recognize individual efforts as important and equal, recognizing that many departmental faculty and professional staff focus on teaching and extension (the other two co-equal departmental missions).
- To address these final two bullets, as part of Article 30 changes to the recently adopted AAUP contract, every department must maintain governance documents that include bylaws, merit criteria, promotion and tenure and workload policies, or default to the college documents in these areas. Each department will need to vote on these policies by July 1 of every fourth fiscal year. Five items must be addressed:
  - Develop departmental bylaws that serve as governing documents for the unit.
  - Workload: Define what constitutes the minimum expected workload for various assignments (e.g., 25% teaching, 50% teaching, 75% teaching; likewise, for research; likewise, for extension) and the measurable work products that would indicate faculty are meeting workload expectations.
  - PTR: Identify criteria to use for Promotion, Tenure, Re-appointment considerations.
  - Merit criteria: Define measures of success within primary missions and service that indicate meritorious performance.
  - Who votes: Decide which faculty and professional staff are eligible to vote on these issues.

Where we need help from the college and university:

- Without additional support staff, progress on these actions will be possible but slow. The addition of administrative support, at any level, would expedite this plan’s implementation. The department recognizes the need for additional administrative support across the college is high.
- Include in our professional measures metrics that extend beyond the traditional scholarly work (grants and publications) to recognize faculty and staff that are focused on teaching and outreach that will be developed as part of Article 30 changes of the recently adopted AAUP contract.

- Revise the current measurements metrics as planned to balance the drive for personal gain and recognition against the need to work as a department.
- Explore options for providing incentives to collaborate within the department to include release time, additional pay, access to paid graduate students, etc.

### **PRIORITY THREE: STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

Stabilizing and increasing student enrollment is critical to the long-term success of the department. Student enrollment, especially in freshman admissions, has decreased even though the department has an excellent track record of producing students who are in demand and readily employed. This is a national trend. The lack of internal expertise and resources (time, money and, especially, staff support) has inhibited the execution of a consistent recruitment strategy. Increasing student enrollment is a critical factor in refilling faculty position vacancies.

Target: Total of 200 students across all programing areas within seven years.

#### Recruitment steps:

Ideally, we would have a dedicated person/company to help with recruitment and marketing. This could be someone from the department, with time freed up through a release, or it could be a subcontractor. At a minimum, the department head should create a task force to focus on executing the on-campus activities. Overall recruitment activities would focus on three areas:

1. On campus recruitment/targeting:
  - ACES (clearing house for those undeclared students already at UCONN) presents a database that can be used to speak directly to those looking for a major that matches their interests.
  - Encourage student-led departmental social activities that introduce potential students to PSLA.
  - Pursue on-campus marketing opportunities, such as banners and advertisements.
2. Off campus recruitment/targeting (increasing the number of freshman admissions — i.e., long term investment):
  - Continue to provide information to high school guidance counselors, visiting schools as appropriate.
  - Develop online curriculum that introduces prospective students to the overall course of study.
  - Identify nontraditional sources of students, such as community colleges, veterans' organizations, farmer/grower/food organizations (organic farming, beekeeping, barley growing), and others that attract prospective students with the characteristics targeted by the department.
  - Reach out to magnet schools that attract students with the characteristics targeted by the department.
  - Tap industry to get involved in both finding new recruits and placing graduates.
  - Attract students from urban areas, especially Hartford, by offering an introductory class at UCONN branch campuses along with community colleges.
3. General marketing:
  - Maintain the website to ensure it is up-to-date and accurately reflects PSLA accomplishments. Publicize faculty and student achievements through the existing

MailChimp list. (Distribution of material via MailChimp is relatively easy but collecting content and coordinating a distribution schedule has proven difficult).

4. Develop new, desirable degree programs:
  - Create and deliver a new certificate/non-thesis Masters Degree or accelerated Masters Degree (dual BS/MS), such as in sustainable development.
  - Pursue the establishment of an accredited Master of Landscape Architecture Program.

#### Where we need help from the college and university:

We have invested significant time in a recruitment strategy but have not yet realized expected results. To support our continuing efforts, the following would provide a strategic boost:

- Identifying funding that can be used for a specific person to move the above actions forward. We estimate this cost at between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Our priorities would be to review, revise and finalize the actions above, develop the necessary marketing materials, build an annual marketing calendar, and receive help in implementing specific tasks.
- Providing access to on-campus, centralized talent that can help us implement this plan.
- Providing access to on-campus experience that has successfully developed and implemented a recruitment program with measurable positive results. We would use in-house capacity to implement lessons learned from others on campus.

#### Characteristics:

To assist in recruitment efforts, it is agreed that the attributes of an ideal student for this department include:

- Career-oriented and with knowledge of the potential of the profession; has previous work experience
- Environmentally aware
- “Creative types,” e.g., those with a diverse range of design and drawing skills and looking for a place to use them (specific to landscape architecture)
- Nontraditional, diverse audiences (e.g., woman with children, etc.) who reflect Connecticut demographics, including a focus on urban areas
- Motivated, enthusiastic, passionate, curious, interested and inquisitive
- Willing to work hard and are open to careers that include work outside for SPSS and horticulture students

#### **PRIORITY FOUR: STAFFING TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS**

One challenge faced by the department is the anticipated faculty retirements over the next five to seven years. Although these retirements and their timing are not certain, it is clear there will be significant opportunity to recruit new faculty in the coming years. The number of hires will depend significantly on the overall financial state of the university, the vitality of the department, and the positions importance to the priority mission of the program. To understand the possible scenarios and implications, the department prepared best, expected and worst-case retirement-hiring scenarios.

#### Best case scenario

Department reaches 200 students; UCONN financial stress decreases, allowing for hires and expansion.

#### *Implication and actions*

- Increase the level of support staff to four full-time equivalents (FTEs) (one secretary, one

financial, one dedicated program support, and one dedicated to Landscape Architecture and recruiting)

- Hire a finance manager, recruiter and website manager (at least 2 FTEs)
- Grow landscape architecture personnel to 8 FTEs and includes individuals in research, teaching, extension and technical support
- Add turf professionals, including those with expertise in physiology, soil microbiology, and pathogens plus an internship coordinator (5 FTEs)
- Increase farm personnel to 5 FTEs plus a farm manager
- Maintain personnel in horticulture, including sustainable agriculture, home and garden, and soils lab at 5 FTEs
- Revise FTE estimates around the priority focus areas instead of units
- Prioritize the proposed hiring noted above based on agreed upon focus areas and anticipated demands
- Locate additional space (presently a limiting factor)
- Continue active recruitment of potential faculty to create a stable pipeline of candidates
- Revisit and update this plan periodically, based on changing needs
- UCONN blooms; the floriculture program once again has difficulty funding this full time
- Facilities will need to be increased: labs, farm, office, studies, greenhouse space

#### Expected scenario

Student enrollment holds steady or moderately increases from 125 to 160-170. The current level of 18 faculty would decrease to 15 through some combination of retirement (up to 10) and hiring. The timing of these changes is difficult to estimate.

#### *Implications and actions*

- Maintain 5 landscape architecture (LA) faculty positions to retain accreditation
- Maintain 10 PLSC in areas in line with our focus areas, specialties may include:
  - Sustainable agriculturist/nutrient management
  - Plant and soil microbiologist
  - Plant genomicist that augments existing faculty
  - Landscape ecologist that works across disciplines
- Hire administrative support with a focus on recruitment and marketing, recognizing there is also a continued need for general clerical support
- Recognize the need to adjust the teaching load to offset the loss of teaching faculty
  - Remaining faculty increase their teaching load to compensate, but focus on teaching courses in which they have experience and expertise
  - new hires fill teaching gaps between thematic focus areas and existing capacity
- Explore opportunity hires that allow the department to attract nationally or internationally recognized scholars that can carry with them funded projects and programs.

#### Worst case scenario

The department loses faculty through retirements — down to as few as 10-11 faculty —and is not able to replace them due to decreased student enrollment numbers.

#### *Implications and actions*

- Faculty positions go unfilled
- Grant revenues decrease as there are fewer faculty to seek grants
- There is less support from staff (research and extension)

- Accreditation of the landscape architecture program, which requires 5 licensed LA professionals, is jeopardized
- Sustainable agriculture and its concentrations are greatly impacted in terms of the ability to deliver the desired range of courses and opportunities to students
- The department is vulnerable to being merged or disbanded
- There is significantly increased reliance on adjunct and teaching assistants to cover course loads
- The department explores opportunities for shared curricular with other New England land grant institutions
- Courses and programs are consolidated; there are fewer offerings
- There is a shift to graduate programs, focusing on small classes
- Duties are reassigned

Where we need help from the college and university:

The administration should review these scenarios with the departmental leadership to discuss how they fit within the college's broader academic plan.

**PRIORITY FIVE: FUNCTIONS AND PRIORITY SHORT TERM CHANGES**

- Use this plan as an annual work plan, using departmental meetings and regular retreats to check in on progress against the plan, adjust as necessary, and use it as a decision-making foil.
- Look for other opportunities to use this plan in departmental conversations and decisions, such as in hiring and developing new curricula.
- Review progress on this plan at every departmental meeting; these priorities and related action should be part of the standing agenda of those meetings.
- Revise the standard retreat agenda to include this action plan, discussing what has been accomplished, re-setting priorities and making necessary adjustments.
- Add to the retreat agenda a review of the marketing that will be done for the next four months and what and who will be providing material.
- Ensure measures of individual professional success that include metrics that reward not just scholarly work and teaching success, but also credit for collaborating within the department. Refine measures as necessary to provide clarity and additional incentives to implement this plan.
- Review and revise, as needed, the purpose of each committee to ensure they are supporting this action plan. Each committee should have a written (one page or less) terms of reference. Committee chairs should meet on a regular basis with the department head to report on progress.
- Create a time-bound task force to implement the on-campus student recruitment activities for one semester, measure impacts, ease and efficiency of activities, and revise the approach as necessary.
- Develop a departmental meeting agenda that focuses on items that require the entire department's input and ensure these are published before the meeting. Encourage units to meet separately to review unit-specific issues and questions.

## **ANNEX A – SWOT Analysis**

### **Rolling Draft and Proposed Workshop Agenda As of January 3, 2018**

This document summarizes conversations held with 13 faculty and staff from the Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture. These interviews were conducted by phone following a standard set of probing questions that were adapted during each interview to explore recurring themes and observations. These recurring observations and themes are captured herein and sorted by strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Strength and weaknesses are internal to PSLA while opportunities and threats are external.

This is not a draft of the Strategic Plan. This summary is meant to provide a platform to base the upcoming one-day retreat so that it is focused on the specific questions and issues that need attention. The retreat will review the current draft of the rolling plan, identify areas of agreement and disagreement, and make choices about the future direction of PSLA. The outputs from the one-day retreat will be incorporated into the next version of the rolling draft and shared with the department.

## Initial observations and directional questions

### Strengths

- Broad range of expertise across the department: bio-tech, plants, soil and landscape architecture. Diverse group. Leaders in their fields. Many have been here for many years, well recognized. Dedicated teachers, researchers and Extension agents.
- We do collaborate but could be improved and have more of an integrated focus.
- Good interaction between Department and extension communities.
- Private sector growth with the emergence of green agriculture.
- Excellent senior and mid-career professionals in the Department. Those that have been here a long time have extensive resumes and experience. Those that are relatively new have much to offer in teaching, research and extension.
- There is strength in being small – it is easy to get access to people and resources; not competing for space.
- College supports what we are doing, they don't want us to drift away. As long as we are trying/making progress, Dean will defend us to Provost. Need to communicate with clear rationale that we need additional faculty in order to sustain and grow.
- Leading edge research, which creates new knowledge, builds recognition and attracts graduate students.
- Unique curriculum that focuses on the practices and professional skill development. Small class size, with labs and hands-on opportunities.
- Industry demand for horticulturists. There are jobs for our students.
- Creation of a seminar series for department that ranges from microbiology to landscape architecture and modernism. Big stretch of programming and topics.
- There is a demand and need for the type of research we are producing.

### Weaknesses

- There is a tense and contentious mood in the department that creates bad feelings and an individual unit focus instead of a departmental focus. We don't act like a department, instead there are small groups of individuals.
  - This is a very disparate group ranging from turf to bio-genetics. We have different responsibilities, but they are all not accepted equally.
  - Currently living in silos, each competing for resources, time and attention instead of considering what's best for the whole.
- Lack of clarity about our focus: is it research, extension or teaching? It is not possible for each individual to balance all three successfully.
  - Number of three-way appointments limits progress faculty can make in certain areas because it is hard to focus on any one thing. Are we doing the best we can in terms academic parameters (publishing, research) while meeting the needs of the State and teaching our students?
  - People do good work, but if not, it is difficult to transfer this into a measure of personal performance of the researcher within the University system. This is especially true for extension. Teaching has measures, but they are less important than research within this University. Is there set of measures that would work across the entire Department instead of by different responsibilities.
  - Disparate views on how much effort is required for research and teaching; there isn't a common understanding or cultural agreement on the importance of both.

- Faculty to student ratio seems out of balance; could time be freed up to do more grant writing.
- Lack of time is a big issue/not enough time. Administration needs to give us time for collaborative efforts.
- Student enrollment is decreasing even though we produce students who are employable; very low enrollment classes. We do not have a solid recruitment strategy and efforts to create one have been piecemeal and not fully executed. Without student enrollment increases, it will be hard to argue for more faculty.
  - Student numbers in Turf program have dwindled. Work is being replaced with immigrant, Spanish speaking who can't afford college. Students don't see themselves getting up at 5 a.m., working six days a week.
  - Inability or unwillingness to add faculty could cost landscape architecture its accreditation.
- Anticipated retirements in the next five years could have significant impact on program delivery, department needs to prioritize faculty positions that need to be filled. It is unclear who is going to teach the necessary courses.
- Many have been here for many years, know the system and what they needed to do (or not do) to successfully exist within the University system.
- Lack of support staff.
- Name change made parts of the department hard to find, obscure. Understand sustainable is a hot word in the industry and is an attraction for potential students.
- Need better department-wide communication; don't feel like we are getting to the real issues.
- Need to improve follow-through on decisions made at the departmental level and better, more complete participation in departmental business.

#### Opportunities

- Although there is tension between the different units within the department, for the foreseeable future the department, as currently constituted, will continue. Given this, recognize the value of working together for the good of the whole and to defend against the dismantling or elimination of department or certain programs.
- Large number of undeclared students at UCONN (Academic Center for Exploratory Students).
- Partner more with industries that have historic relationships with department research.
- Broaden our horizons, other entities within the sustainability and environmental realms.
- Consider a shift in focus to urban centers, urban agriculture and vertical agriculture.
- Plant genetics, bio-tech is appealing to administration.

#### Threats

- Lots of competing interests for potential students; we've gotten lost in the University.
- Change in economy since 2008, foreign labor taking golf jobs, and a general shift in student interest (e.g., fewer desire to work outside).
- Industry doesn't pay new employees well, so it is hard work (outside work).
- Sustainable agriculture concentration has dismantled the traditional horticulture concentration See students that want to do something in sustainable agriculture (i.e., small scale organic veg farm, medical marijuana), but there aren't the jobs.

- What's happening here is reflective of what is happening at other institutions across the country.
- Not clear what is more important to the UCONN leadership, research or student enrollment?
- Ten years of budget cuts in College, Department has had to be reactive to these changes and hasn't been given the opportunity to be strategic.
- Really need to promote extension on campus. Well regarded in communities, but not known on campus.

**Initial Directional Questions:**

1. Describe the future mission and thematic focus/disciplines.
  - As a department, what is the balance between teaching, research and extension? What are measures of success for each?
  - What are the thematic areas that need to be pursued over the next five to seven years to encourage research grants, student enrollment and service to the community?
2. Increasing student enrollment
  - Develop a sustainable recruitment strategy that benefits the entire department.
3. Coordination and collaboration
  - How can intra-department collaboration be increased to better achieve mission, pursue priority thematic focus areas and increase student enrollment?
4. Succession planning
  - Based on the mission, priority themes and the need to increase student enrollment, what are the five- to seven-year faculty and staffing needs given the best and worst-case retirement scenario?
5. Departmental Function and operations
  - Where do function and operations need to be changed to support new strategies?

## ANNEX B – Workshop Agenda

**University of Connecticut**  
College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources  
Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture  
SWOT and Visioning Workshop Public Agenda  
January 15, 2018

### By the end of the event, we hope to achieve the following outcomes:

- Describe the future mission and thematic focus/disciplines that supports growth and inter-department collaboration.
- Develop a sustainable student recruitment strategy the benefits the entire department.
- Define the five to seven-year faculty and staffing needs that considers the best and worst-case retirement-hiring scenario.
- Discuss specific activities to increase inter-department collaboration that make progress on the mission, pursue priority thematic areas and increase student enrollment.
- Identify and describe changes to the structure and function of PSLA so that it can successfully achieve these results.

**Output:** By the end of the event, we will develop an outline of a “SWOT Analysis and Vision Document” that captures the outcomes of these conversations and organizes them into a short (5-7 page) document that can be shared with the Dean and used by PSLA to guide actions and decision making.

### Schedule

- 9:00 Introductions and Opening Remarks
- 9:15 Objectives, Agenda and Flow
- 9:30 Acknowledge the Present Context
- 10:00 Review of SWOT Analysis Findings
- 11:00 Based on the SWOT Analysis, work in large and small groups to address the following:
1. Describe the mission and thematic focus/disciplines that supports growth and inter-department collaboration
    - As a department, what is the balance between teaching, research and extension? What are success measures for each? What are thematic areas that need to be pursued over the next five to seven years to encourage research grants, student enrollment and service to the community?
  2. Describe increasing student enrollment
    - Develop a sustainable student recruitment strategy the benefits the entire department.
    - Define student characteristics, target numbers, where they are and how they can be reached.
  3. Succession planning
    - Based on the mission, priority themes and the need to increase student enrollment, what are the five to seven-year faculty and staffing needs that consider the best and worst-case retirement-hiring scenarios?
  4. Coordination and collaboration
    - How can inter-department collaboration be increased to achieve mission, pursue priority thematic focus areas and increase student enrollment?
  5. Departmental function and operations
    - Identify and describe changes to the structure and function of PSLA so that it can successfully achieve these results.
- 4:00 Adjourn

**ANNEX C – List of those interviewed and workshop attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interview</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
<b>1.</b> Ana Legrand		x
<b>2.</b> Donna Ellis	x	x
<b>3.</b> Gerald Berkowitz		x
<b>4.</b> Huanzhong Wang		x
<b>5.</b> Jason Henderson	x	x
<b>6.</b> Jessica Lubell-Brand	x	x
<b>7.</b> Joan Allen		x
<b>8.</b> John Inguagiato	x	x
<b>9.</b> Julia Kuzovkina	x	x
<b>10.</b> Karl Guillard	x	x
<b>11.</b> Kristin Schwab	x	x
<b>12.</b> Mark Brand	x	x
<b>13.</b> Mark Westa	x	x
<b>14.</b> Mary Concklin		x
<b>15.</b> Natalie Miniutti		x
<b>16.</b> Peter Miniutti	x	x
<b>17.</b> Richard McAvoy		x
<b>18.</b> Rosa Raudales	x	x
<b>19.</b> Steven Rackliffe	x	x
<b>20.</b> Yi Li	x	
<b>21.</b> Mark Amaral – Lighthouse Consulting		x