AZALEA
CONSULTING SERVICES

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS (SWOT) ANALYSIS REPORT

PREPARED FOR THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES (COEHS) AT VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

MAY 2018

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY™

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

       This report summarizes the results from the recent Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) survey distributed to the Dewar College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) at Valdosta State University (VSU). The SWOT analysis seeks to uncover faculty and staff opinions of the current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the COEHS. The analysis of the SWOT data was conducted by a student-based consulting group, Azalea Consulting Services. Upon request of Dean Oliver the SWOT analysis was created and distributed to faculty in the COEHS. The goals, objectives, and timeline of the distribution and analysis were coordinated by Dean Oliver, Dr. Waugh, Dr. Pate, Dr. Warner, and Dr. Bauer. Information was disseminated via Dr. Bauer to project leaders within Azalea. The survey creation process, the survey implementation, and the survey analysis were all reviewed by Dr. Bauer, Dr. Waugh, Dr. Pate, and Dr. Warner.

       The survey was created and disseminated to faculty within the COEHS using the Qualtrics Research Suite. The survey was available from April 23, 2018 until May 15, 2018. After data collection the statements were thematically coded by members of Azalea Consulting Services. The thematic coding sought to identify themes within each component of the SWOT. Once thematic categories were identified statements that were coded into each theme allowing for frequency information to be computed. The qualitative and quantitative information provided in this report may be useful for future efforts related to strategic planning within the COEHS.

       The survey was disseminated via email to COEHS faculty. The total number of completed or partially completed surveys was 86. The respondents identified that they were from multiple departments within the COEHS. The departments represented were; Adult and Career Education (n = 7), Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology (n = 11), Elementary Education (n = 6), Communication Sciences and Disorders and Special Education (n = 5), Middle Grades, Secondary, Reading, and Deaf Education (n = 8), Social Work (n = 3), Psychology, Counseling, and Family Therapy (n = 21), Kinesiology and Physical Education (n = 1), Library and Information Sciences (n = 1), Dean's Office (n = 1). Some respondents declined to identify the department in which they were currently working (n = 21). On average the respondents have been working at VSU for 10.38 (SD = .72) years. Respondents identified working at VSU a minimum of one year and a maximum of 25 years.

       Participants provided responses for each component of the SWOT analysis. The responses were reviewed by subject matter experts to identify themes within each category of the SWOT analysis. Our coders sorted statements into the identified thematic categories. Inter-rater agreement was utilized during team coding sessions to ensure correct categorization. Multiple reviews were conducted to ensure adequate sorting of the response statements and to assess the interpretability of the themes. As themes developed they were labeled based on the statements contained within. The labels are similar across SWOT components yet are uniquely defined across SWOT components. Interpretation of the themes should not be attempted without adequate understanding of the themes unique definition.

       The frequencies of each SWOT category can be found in *Tables 1, 2, 3* and *4*. The frequency data allows for comparisons to be made between themes within each SWOT component. Some broad comparisons that can be made involve the overall responses between

each SWOT component. Survey respondents generated more statements when discussing the weaknesses (n = 437) than when discussing strengths (n = 337) of the COEHS. Furthermore, respondents generated a relatively comparable number of statements when discussing the opportunities (n = 311), and threats (n = 305) facing the college.

In regard to the strengths of the COEHS, the quality of our talent (n = 91) was the most frequently reported. Both the faculty/staff (n = 81) and leadership (n = 10) were identified as a strength. Resources (n = 68) were also considered a strength particularly when discussing travel support (n = 18) and the copy center (n = 14). When discussing weaknesses, resources were the most frequently reported (n = 129) including perceptions of a general lack of support (n =28), a lack of support for faculty and staff lines (n = 22), and a lack of support for the human service programs (n = 32). The policies, procedures, and bureaucracy (n = 101) were also identified as a weaknesses of the college especially when discussing promotion and tenure policies (n = 30), perceived fairness (n = 17) and syllabi requirements (n = 16).

In regard to the opportunities available to COEHS, engaging in more strategic planning initiatives (n = 58) was frequently discussed with many respondents indicating that we should ensure that we are aligning with VSU's strategic plan and providing support to the recruitment of high quality students in addition to adequately marketing our programs, centers, and outreach clinics (n = 28). Curriculum and Course offering related opportunities were also popular (n = 57) with general recommendations (n = 28) and the addition of 4+1 programs (n = 16) being the most popular sub-domains. When discussing threats, lack of resources in the COEHS (n = 72) was the most frequently reported issue with lack of support for faculty/staff lines (n = 26) and general budget constraints (n = 15) consistently emerging as themes. Finally, threats related to our policies, procedures, and bureaucracy (n = 40) were frequently reported with perceived unfairness (n = 18) related to monetary resources and general workload. A more fine-grained analysis of the SWOT is provided in the discussion section (See page 26).

Introduction

The purpose of a SWOT analysis is to uncover and identify the specific strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of an organization. The responses are typically provided by current incumbents of the organization. The four components of a SWOT analysis can be categorized by potentially helpful factors (e.g., strengths and opportunities) and potentially harmful factors (e.g., weaknesses and threats). Furthermore, the strengths and weaknesses portions of the SWOT are meant to be an assessment of internal factors. The opportunities and threats portions of the SWOT are meant to be an assessment of external factors. An example matrix depicting these categorizations can be found in *Figure 1*. If done correctly, a SWOT analysis should provide a realistic portrait of the environmental landscape that the organization is currently facing. Additionally, the information yielded from the SWOT analysis should be presented in a highly organized fashion in order to maximally aid future strategic planning efforts.

Conducting a SWOT analysis is frequently recommended to organizations interested in strategic planning. The popularity of the SWOT is not surprising as a SWOT analysis can often provide a great deal of utility to the organization. More specifically, a SWOT analysis can act as a barometer of the current state of the organization. However, there are several caveats that should be mentioned before interpreting the results of a SWOT analysis. First, the data is often collected from current internal employees over a specified amount of time (e.g., half day or three day workshops). Thus, the information yielded from a SWOT analysis can become quickly obsolete with changing environments and can be deficient in regard to external information. For instance, external customers are often able to identify weaknesses and opportunities for an organization that incumbent employees are unable to identify. Additionally, a SWOT analysis often produces qualitative data from incumbent employees. This data can be difficult to interpret at a macro level as quantifying the data requires investigators to make assumptions and generalizations regarding the observed statements. The qualitative data provided is also susceptible to contamination from biasing sources such as shared group climates, organizational politics, and careless responding. Finally, a SWOT analysis often fails to prioritize the components or generate a great deal of potential solutions to the identified problems. Thus, a SWOT analysis is often considered descriptive in nature.

Since a SWOT analysis has several potential limitations, conducting a SWOT analysis is often only the first step of using data to inform the strategic plan. Data analyses related to strategic planning should be a sustained effort across several initiatives. For instance, industry or governmental data may provide useful metrics for decision making at the organizational level. Additional analyses (e.g., needs analysis) and subject matter experts may also provide useful information. Thus, we recommend the current investigation to be followed by a host of strategic planning initiatives to enhance the decision making capabilities of the COEHS. Regardless, the information contained in the current report provides useful information for those interested in developing a strategic plan for the COEHS.

Method

Participants

The survey elicited a total of 86 partial or completed responses from faculty and staff within COEHS. Responses originated from a wide host of departments including Adult and Career Education (n = 7), Curriculum, Leadership, and Technology (n = 11), Elementary

Education (n = 6), Communication Sciences and Disorders and Special Education (n = 5), Middle Grades, Secondary, Reading, and Deaf Education (n = 8), Social Work (n = 3), Psychology, Counseling, and Family Therapy (n = 21), Kinesiology and Physical Education (n = 1), Library and Information Sciences (n = 1), Dean's Office (n = 1). Some respondents declined to identify the department in which they were currently working (n = 21). On average the respondents have been working at VSU for 10.38 (*SD* = .72) years. Respondents identified working at VSU a minimum of one year and a maximum of 25 years.

Procedure

The survey was created using the Qualtrics research suite and was disseminated via email to COEHS faculty. Data collection took place from April 23, 2018 until May 15, 2018. Anonymity of participants was assured to increase participation and honest responses. The only identifiable information collected was two demographic questions included at the start of the survey. Participants were asked to indicate how many years they have worked at VSU and what COEHS department of office they currently work in. Participants were not required to respond to either question. While demographic information was retained during thematic coding, the demographic information was analyzed separately for frequency and was not connected with any responses. The SWOT survey was adapted from an existing scale provided by Dr. Pate. Respondents were given a general prompt to answer each portion of the SWOT analysis. The components of the SWOT were defined to aid participant understanding. Participants were asked to provide a minimum of three responses per SWOT question. However, participants were allowed to respond a total of 10 times per SWOT question. Thus, a fully completed survey response could yield up to 40 independent statements regarding the perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the SWOT. The finalized Qualtrics survey can be viewed in *Appendix A*.

Before analyzing the data, participants were removed if they did not complete any of the SWOT items or if they only completed the demographic variables. A total of 13 responses were removed from the dataset. After the data was cleaned a team of subject matter experts met to analyze the data for emerging themes. Our method involved having three or more independent coders sort each statement into domains (i.e., themes) that they perceived to emerge throughout the sorting process. The constructs that emerged from the sorting were organized by levels to aid in interpretation. The highest level was labeled domain, the next level was labeled sub-domain, and the lowest level was labeled sub-category. Inter-rater agreement was utilized to ensure accuracy of the sorting process. A statement was not sorted into a domain without consensus from all raters present during the sorting session. Occasionally, the coders would encounter statements that could be classified into two categories. These statements were double coded and are marked with an asterisk (*) in *Appendix B*. Since the initial round of sorting had themes emerging simultaneously and because the sorting team varied over time, a second round of sorting was conducted to verify and improve the accuracy of the first round. The second round of sorting resulted in the reclassifications of several statements. Additionally, new themes emerged and a few were removed or merged together. For instance, the domain of COEHS climate emerged as an important domain in the second round of coding. Several statements that were marked as general or misclassified in the first round of sorting were sorted into the domain of climate in the second round. This resulted in a more organized and parsimonious content domain.

Although similar themes emerged across portions of the SWOT analysis, the manifestation of these themes often varied across the four sections of the SWOT analysis. For instance, diversity emerged as a domain across both strengths and weaknesses. However, the frequency of responses and the sub-domains that emerged within both categories varied considerably between the two constructs. The thematic labels presented in the current report were created to allow for more meaningful interpretation of the data but care should be taken when interpreting these results as sorting qualitative statements is a subjective process. The full list of thematic categories and the coded statements can be found in *Appendix B*.

Considerations for interpreting the data

Before interpreting the results of the current SWOT analysis, there are several caveats that should be discussed. More specifically, there was no limit placed on the amount of times a respondent could submit a survey response. Thus, it is possible that some of the survey responses were generated by the same respondent. Thus, the emergent themes identified here may be inflated. Another consideration involves the double coding of several statements. Detailed responses may inflate frequencies across domains as the same statement is counted twice across domains. Finally, although a SWOT analysis is designed to separate statements across four constructs (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats). However, the categories of the SWOT are not orthogonal. Thus, respondents can have trouble correctly identifying their statement in relation to these constructs. For instance, slight changes in the wording of a statement can cause individuals to reclassify a weakness as an opportunity or even threat. In regard to the current investigation, we asked respondents to give us statements that they believed to be strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Thus, there are likely misclassifications within each category. To maintain the quality of the data, we did not reclassify statements across categories that were identified as not representing the category. Instead, we kept the statement within the category but labeled it as a potential misclassification.

Results

Once the construct domain was identified within each category of the SWOT analysis, frequencies of associated statements were calculated for each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category. Statements that were double- or triple-coded statements were counted multiple times throughout the report (See tables 1-4). A general domain was created to categorize statements that were related to the domain but did not fit clearly into any of the sub-domains or sub-categories.

Strengths

Strengths are defined as internal characteristics that are unique, special, highly valued, and positive relative to the COEHS. The Strengths component of the SWOT analysis contains 337 statements categorized into 11 domains. Strengths had the second highest quantity of associated statements. The content domain and frequency data can be found in *Table 1*.

Quality of Talent. The most frequently reported strength of the COEHS is the quality of our talent (n = 91). Talent refers to the quality of COEHS administration, faculty, and staff. Comments ranged from simply stating "faculty" as a strength to listing specific characteristics that are considered strengths of the faculty and staff (e.g., "Most faculty work very hard in

advising students"). Two sub-domains emerged from the quality of talent domain (e.g. faculty and staff and leadership quality).

Faculty and Staff. The faculty and staff sub-domain refers to the expertise and quality of COEHS faculty and staff. General Faculty and Staff statements (n = 54) had the greatest frequency within the quality of talent domain. These statements ranged from "faculty expertise" to "the support staff is excellent." Two additional sub-categories emerged within this subdomain. The commitment/dedication sub-category (n = 19) refers to the effort, care, and loyalty of faculty and staff in relation to their jobs and their students. Statements ranged from "caring faculty" to "hard working faculty." The student-centered sub-category (n = 8) refers to the COEHS' focus on students and providing good customer service. Statements ranged from "student centered" to "customer focus."

Leadership Quality. The leadership quality sub-domain (n = 10) refers to leadership at the department, college, and university levels. Items typically included positive statements about new leadership and leadership accessibility.

Resources. The second most frequently reported strength is resources (n = 68) and refers to the tangible items, funding, and support provided by the COEHS. The statements referred to general resources (n = 13) provided by the COEHS such as "polos for faculty are a really great touch." The resources domain consists of five sub-domains (e.g., technology, travel, funding, copy center, and certification support).

Technology. The sub-domain technology (n = 9) included statements related to the utilizations of technology. The majority of statements specifically referred to the "information monitor system."

Travel. The sub-domain travel (n = 18) involved funds, support, or accessibility specifically related to the ability to travel. It was the most frequently reported sub-domain of resources. Statements regarding travel included "Travel Proxy" or "Travel Support."

Funding. The sub-domain funding (n = 7) includes statements involving funding types such as grants, scholarships, and awards. Most statements referred to the student awards and scholarships provided by the COEHS.

Copy Center. The sub-domain copy center (n = 14) focused on statements that dealt with the COEHS' copy center. The copy center appears to be considered a strength by multiple respondents.

Certification Support. The sub-domain certification support (n = 7) includes statements referring to certification support. The majority of statements mentioned general certification support or GACE support.

Diversity. The third most frequently reported strength is the diversity of the COEHS (n = 48). The diversity domain is listed third as it has the third highest frequency count in Strengths (n

= 38). Three sub-domains emerged within the domain of diversity (e.g., diversity of curriculum, diversity of leadership, and diversity of faculty and students).

Diversity of Curriculum. The sub-domain diversity of curriculum (n = 38) was the most frequently reported sub-domain of diversity. The sub-domain included general statements (n = 18) referring to the variety of programs that are offered by the COEHS (e.g. social work, MLIS, communication sciences, family therapy, industrial/organizational). Two additional sub-categories emerged within the diversity of curriculum sub-domain. The opportunities/experience/training sub-category (n = 13) includes statements that mention a variety of campus based services available to our faculty and students (e.g., study abroad programs, applied research opportunities, active clinics, and social work micro-practice exercises). The online sub-category (n = 7) includes statements that mention the variety of program offerings the COEHS makes available online.

Diversity of Leadership. The sub-domain diversity of leadership (n = 3) includes statements that refer to the growing demographic diversity of administration within the COEHS.

Diversity of Faculty and Students. The sub-domain diversity of faculty and students (n = 7) includes statements that mainly refer to the demographic diversity of faculty and students in the COEHS.

Culture. The domain culture (n = 37) refers to the shared feelings and ideals between people within the COEHS. There were several general positive statements about the culture of COEHS (n = 6). Two additional sub-domains emerged within the domain of culture (e.g., annual meetings and climate).

Annual Meetings. The sub-domain annual meetings (n = 16) includes statements that refer directly to the annual COEHS meetings (e.g., faculty and staff lunches).

Climate. The sub-domain climate (n = 16) includes statements about the positive collaborative relationships found within the COEHS.

Quality of Programs. The quality of program domain (n = 19) refers to the quality of programs offered by the College. There were multiple general positive statements about the general quality of programs offered by the COEHS.

Regional Service. The regional service domain (n = 18) refers to the labs, clinics, or services that the College offers to aid in the functioning or improvement of the region surrounding VSU. All statements were sorted as general regional service. Examples of regional service statements include "Azalea Consulting Services" or the "Speech and Hearing Clinic."

Accreditation. The accreditation domain (n = 16) refers to the accreditation of programs in the College. The majority of statements focused on the COEHS having accredited programs and having accreditation support.
.

Job Procedural Clarity. The job procedural clarity domain (n = 15) refers to the amount of transparency provided by administration. Job procedural clarity means that employees understand their roles and the policies and procedures that govern their work environment. Job procedural clarity statements often referred positively to the structure and consistency of expectations within the COEHS.

Misclassified. The misclassified domain contains statements that did not appear to fit into any of the thematic categories identified for Strengths (n = 15). Statements were sorted into misclassified if they did not pertain specifically to the college, were nonspecific, or did not add any value (e.g. I wish I had more, potential, and I just can't think of any).

Perception/Reputation. The perception/reputation domain (n = 6) includes statements about the positive regional and state opinions of COEHS programs.

Organizational Structure. The organizational structure domain refers to the internal arrangement of the departments and the college itself. The organizational structure domain had the least amount of statement within Strengths (n = 3). General organizational structure statements referred to the sizes and structure of the departments in the COEHS.

Table 1

Frequency data for the domains, sub-domains, and sub-categories of Strengths

Domains/Sub-Domains/Sub-Categories	Frequency
1. **Quality of Talent (Grand Total)**	**91**
a. **Faculty and Staff (Subtotal)**	**81**
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*54*
ii. **Commitment/Dedication (Subtotal)**	*19*
iii. **Student-Centered (Subtotal)**	*8*
b. **Leadership Quality (Subtotal)**	**10**
2. **Resources (Grand Total)**	**68**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**13**
b. **Technology (Subtotal)**	**9**
c. **Travel (Subtotal)**	**18**
d. **Funding (Subtotal)**	**7**
e. **Copy Center (Subtotal)**	**14**
f. **Certification Support (Subtotal)**	**7**
3. **Diversity (Grand Total)**	**48**
a. **Diversity of Curriculum (Subtotal)**	**38**
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*18*
ii. **Opportunities/Experience/Training (Subtotal)**	*13*
iii. **Online (Subtotal)**	*7*
b. **Diversity of Leadership (Subtotal)**	**3**
c. **Diversity of Faculty and Students (Subtotal)**	**7**
4. **Culture (Grand Total)**	**37**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**6**
b. **Annual Meetings (Subtotal)**	**15**
c. **Climate (Subtotal)**	**16**
5. **Quality of Programs (Grand Total)**	**19**
6. **Regional Service (Grand Total)**	**18**
7. **Accreditation (Grand Total)**	**16**
8. **Job Procedural Clarity (Grand Total)**	**15**
9. **Misclassified (Grand Total)**	**15**
10. **Perception/Reputation (Grand Total)**	**6**
11. **Organizational Structure (Grand Total)**	**3**

Note. Numbers indicate domains. Lower-case letters indicate sub-domains. Lower-case roman numerals indicate sub-categories. Frequency data is included for each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category. Grand Total indicates the overall frequency for the domain. Subtotal indicates the frequency for the subdomain or subcategory.

Weaknesses

Weaknesses were defined as internal challenges that the COEHS faces or limitations to achieving missions and goals. The weaknesses component of the SWOT analysis contains 437 statements categorized into eight domains. Multiple sub-domains and sub-categories were identified to increase the interpretability of domains. The weaknesses component contains the greatest quantity of statements. The frequency data can be found in *Table 2*. The unique definitions of each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category are explored as well as the comparisons within and between SWOT components.

Resources. The resources domain of Weaknesses has the greatest frequency of statements within Weaknesses (n = 129). Resources are the tangible and intangible assets provided by the COEHS to departments, faculty, and staff. General resource statements (n = 28) varied in content (e.g. weak alumni relationships and lack of infrastructure). Seven sub-domains were identified (e.g. faculty/staff, travel, child care, funding, programs/department, technology, support non-education majors.)

Faculty/Staff. The faculty and staff sub-domain (n = 22) contains statements that primarily refer to the lack of funding for full-time faculty, increased turnover, and misuse of personnel.

Travel. The travel sub-domain (n = 13) includes statements that primarily address a lack of travel and conference funding for students.

Child Care. The child care sub-domain (n = 7) contains statements the primarily address the lack of child care services made available within the COEHS.

Funding. The funding sub-domain (n = 9) contains statements that primarily address the lack of funding for department, programs, and faculty.

Programs/Department. The programs/department sub-domain (n = 7) includes statements that primarily deal with the non-monetary support of programs and departments. Response statements range in content from "supporting the special education program" to statements about class sizes being a problem.

Technology. The technology sub-domain (n = 11) contains statements that primarily deal with the lack of faculty technology skills and the need for updated and equitable availability of updated technology.

Support for Non-Education Majors. The support lacking for non-education majors sub-domain (n = 32) contains statements that primarily deal with the lack of resources and support for the human services departments within the COEHS. The general (n = 22) sub-domain contains statements related to the lack of accreditation support for non-education programs. A sub-category related to a lack of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff in the human services (n = 10) also emerged.

Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy. The policies, procedures, and bureaucracy domain (n = 101) consists of statements dealing with the stifling and inflexible nature of many policies and procedure present in the COEHS. The general statements (n = 14) often refer to the loss of time due to outdated bureaucratic practices. Five sub-domains were identified (e.g. assessment, procedural clarity, promotion and tenure, classroom requirement, and procedural justice).

Assessment. The assessment sub-domain (n = 13) consists of statements about the uselessness of many required assessments, the inability to access the data from assessments, and the lack of program specific assessment standards.

Procedural Clarity. The procedural clarity sub-domain (n = 11) consists of statements regarding the inconsistencies in hiring, policy implementation, and the overall lack of transparency in the COEHS.

Promotion and Tenure. The promotion and tenure sub-domain (n = 30) consist of statements regarding the inflexibility of requirements for tenure and promotion, the inconsistencies and ambiguity found in the promotion and tenure documents, and the unwillingness of the COEHS to make changes or create opportunities to aid faculty in gaining tenure or promotion. It is the most frequently reported weakness in the domain of policies, procedures, and bureaucracy.

Classroom Requirements. The classroom requirements sub-domain (n = 16) primarily contains statements regarding the irrelevancy of syllabi requirements for non-education programs.

Procedural Justice. The procedural justice sub-domain (n = 17) contains statements addressing a variety of inequities across departments within the COEHS. Many statements simply stated "no equity across departments" while others specified the areas of inequity (e.g., workload, course releases, salary).

Culture. The culture domain (n = 81) includes statements regarding the perception of a negative work environment in the COEHS. The general culture statements (n = 3) addressed the lack of a family friendly work environment, the lack of accountability for faculty and staff to come to work, and the lack of collaboration across departments. Three sub-domains were identified within the culture domain (e.g. climate, diversity, and awareness and consideration).

Climate. The climate sub-domain (n = 47) had the greatest frequency within the culture domain. The general statements in the climate sub-domain (n = 19) addressed issues within and between offices and department both within the COEHS and in the greater university as a whole. Two sub-categories were identified within the climate sub-domain (e.g. cooperation and communication). The cooperation (n = 9) sub-category consist of statements regarding the lack of collaboration and cooperation between faculty within departments and between departments within the COEHS. The communication (n = 19) sub-category contained statements dealing with the lack of communication among departments and between departments and administration.

Diversity. The diversity sub-domain (n =17) contains statements addressing the current lack of demographic diversity within faculty and administration. The statements also address the lack of policies to promote diversity and to punish discrimination.

Awareness and Consideration. The awareness and consideration sub-domain (n = 14) consists of statements regarding the lack of understanding of all departments within COEHS and the lack of consideration for human services departments when making decisions the COEHS.

Organizational Structure. The organizational structure domain (n = 42) is defined as the geographic locations and departmental organizations of the COEHS. The general organizational structure statements (n = 16) consists of complaints regarding the size of departments and the geographic separation of many human services departments from the COEHS building. Two sub-domains were identified for the organizational structure domain (e.g. administration and department merge).

Administration. The administration sub-domain (n = 9) contains statements regarding the top-heavy COEHS administration.

Department Merge. The department merge sub-domain (n =17) contains statements addressing the addition of human services to COEHS and the merging of programs and departments within the COEHS.

Strategic Plan. The strategic plan domain (n = 29) is defined as the lack or need of a unifying goal or mission for the COEHS. The general strategic plan (n = 12) statements address the lack of a clear goal or executable plan for future improvement of the COEHS. Two sub-domains were identified within the strategic plan domain (e.g. mission and vision).

Mission. The mission sub-domain (n = 10) consists of statements addressing the vagueness, incoherency, and lack of meaning of the current COEHS mission statement.

Vision. The vision sub-domain (n = 7) contains statements regarding the lack of transparency in the future direction of the COEHS and the lack of vision for the future.

Quality of Leadership. The quality of leadership domain (n = 20) is defined as the ability of COEHS leadership to adequately lead the college. The general quality of leadership statements (n = 9) consist of statements addressing the inadequacies of COEHS leadership. One sub-domain was identified (e.g. turnover of leadership).

Turnover of Leadership. The sub-domain turnover of leadership (n = 11) contains statements regarding the historic instability of leadership within the COEHS and VSU.

Program Quality. The program quality domain (n = 19) contains statements addressing the degradation of program quality due to weak departments, lack of class offerings, regional reputation, and the push for online programs.

Job Demands. The job demand domain (n = 16) includes a variety of factors that can contribute to job strain. The general job demand statements (n = 7) address a lack of program control, support for scholarship, unrealistic expectation, and a lack of budget funding. One sub-domain was identified (e.g. work load).

Work Load. The work load sub-domain (n = 9) contains statements addressing the heavy teaching/workloads and inability to conduct research due to the heavy loads.

Table 2

Frequency data for the domains, sub-domains, and sub-categories of Weaknesses

Domains/Sub-Domains/Sub-Categories	Frequency
1. **Resources (Grand Total)**	**129**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	28
b. **Faculty/Staff (Subtotal)**	22
c. **Travel (Subtotal)**	13
d. **Child Care (Subtotal)**	7
e. **Funding (Subtotal)**	9
f. **Programs/Department (Subtotal)**	7
g. **Technology (Subtotal)**	11
h. **Support for Non-Education Majors (Subtotal)**	32
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*22*
ii. **Professional Development (Subtotal)**	*10*
2. **Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy (Grand Total)**	**101**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	14
b. **Assessment (Subtotal)**	13
c. **Procedural Clarity (Subtotal)**	11
d. **Promotion and Tenure (Subtotal)**	30
e. **Classroom Requirement (Subtotal)**	16
f. **Procedural Justice (Subtotal)**	17
3. **Culture (Grand Total)**	**81**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	3
b. **Climate (Subtotal)**	47
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*19*
ii. **Cooperation (Subtotal)**	*9*
iii. **Communication (Subtotal)**	*19*
c. **Diversity (Subtotal)**	17
d. **Awareness and Consideration (Subtotal)**	14
4. **Organizational Structure (Grand Total)**	**42**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	16
b. **Administration (Subtotal)**	9
c. **Department Merges (Subtotal)**	17
5. **Strategic Plan (Grand Total)**	**29**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	12
b. **Mission (Subtotal)**	10
c. **Vision (Subtotal)**	7
6. **Quality of Leadership (Grand Total)**	**20**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	9
b. **Turnover of Leadership (Subtotal)**	11
7. **Program Quality (Grand Total)**	**19**
8. **Job Demands (Grand Total)**	**16**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	7
b. **Work Load (Subtotal)**	9

Note. Numbers indicate domains. Lower-case letters indicate sub-domains. Lower-case roman numerals indicate sub-categories. Frequency data is included for each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category. Grand Total indicates the overall frequency for the domain. Subtotal indicates the frequency for the subdomain or subcategory.

Opportunities

Opportunities were defined as occurring when the external environment is closely aligned with an organizational strength. Aspects of the external environment that will create or accelerate a need or a capability that is or can be a strength of the organization. The opportunities component of the SWOT analysis contains 310 statements categorized into 11 domains. Multiple sub-domains were identified to increase the interpretability of domains. The Opportunities component contains the third highest quantity of statements. The frequency data can be found in *Table 3*. The unique definitions of each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category are explored as well as the comparisons within and between SWOT components.

Strategic Plan. The strategic plan domain (n = 58) contains statements that suggest changes that can be made to our existing strategic plan to better align ourselves with VSU's strategic plan. Additionally, specific recommendations (n = 30) are included such as becoming a regional hub of education and forecasting the employment needs of relevant industries. The general strategic plan domain includes statements that mainly identify potential One sub-domain was identified within the strategic plan domain (e.g. recruitment and marketing).

Recruitment and Marketing. The recruitment and marketing sub-domain (n = 28) consists of statements that address the need to recruit quality students and faculty. The statements in this sub-domain also identified the need for marketing support for programs, outreach clinics.

Curriculum and Course Offerings. The domain curriculum and course offerings (n= 57) contains statements that pertain to the ability of the COEHS to offer more programs and courses and to become a catalyst of change. The general curriculum and course offerings (n = 28) statements address opportunities for the COEHS to increase curriculum variety and increase the opportunities for students. Three sub-domains were identified within the curriculum and course offerings domain (e.g. class size, online, and 4+1 programs).

Class Sizes. The class sizes sub-domain (n = 3) contains statements addressing the need for smaller class sizes.

Online. The online sub-domain (n = 10) consists of statements regarding the need for online programs. The statements also address the need for increased support and quality of the existing online programs.

4+1 Programs. The 4+1 programs sub-domain (n = 16) addresses the need for more 4+1 programs to increase undergraduate recruitment and feed graduate programs.

Recruitment and Marketing. The recruitment and marketing sub-domain (n = 28) consists of statements that address the marketing needs of the COEHS and what populations are of interest for recruitment.

Outreach. The outreach domain (n = 49) contains statements that address the regional outreach of the COEHS. The general outreach sub-domain (n = 28) includes statements addressing the multitude of opportunities available to create partnerships with the local

communities to increase opportunities and to provide vital services. Two sub-domains were identified within the outreach domain (e.g. school and service/experiential learning).

School. The school sub-domain (n = 13) includes statements that address the ability for programs to provide greater collaboration between the COEHS and local and regional schools. The connections would provide students and faculty with networks through which opportunities may arise.

Service/Experiential Learning. The service/experiential learning sub-domain (n = 12) includes statements that indicate a need for greater opportunities for experiential and service learning.

Resources. The resources domain (n = 42) addresses the tangible and intangible services, opportunities, and other resources the COEHS has the opportunity to provide. The general resources statements (n = 4) indicate the need for a center for service that includes services for non-education programs, an increase in technology usage, and university branded gifts for students. Six sub-domains were identified for the resources domain (e.g. program resources, faculty and staff, funding, travel, development and training, and data).

Program Resources. The program resources sub-domain (n = 3) contains statements that indicate support is needed for a variety of programs such as LEA's, distance students, and study abroad.

Faculty and Staff. The faculty and staff sub-domain (n = 8) contains statements that indicate the need to increase faculty and staff and to advocate on behalf of current faculty and staff.

Funding. The funding sub-domain (n = 7) contains statements that address the need for more funding for positions, research, and recruitment.

Travel. The travel sub-domain (n = 6) consists of statements that address the need for travel funding for students and faculty attending conferences.

Development and Training. The development and training sub-domain (n = 4) statements indicate profession development opportunities, diversity training, and specialized skills training (e.g. grant writing) should be offered by the COEHS.

Data. The data sub-domain (n = 10) contains statements that indicate data needs to be more widely shared and easily accessible so that it may be utilized by programs and departments when engaging in strategic planning.

Culture. The culture domain (n = 40) is concerned with the relationships and interactions of departments within the COEHS. Two sub-domains were identified (e.g. collaboration and diversity).

Collaboration. The collaboration sub-domain (n = 35) contains statements that directly address the need for collaboration within COEHS, across campus, and abroad.

Diversity. The diversity sub-domain (n = 5) indicates a need for the COEHS to better educate employees on their diversity and inclusion policies and to create greater diversity within the COEHS.

Faculty and Staff. The faculty and staff domain (n = 21) contains statements highlighting changes that would benefit faculty and staff within the COEHS. The general faculty and staff statements (n = 15) indicate ways in which the COEHS can better serve the faculty and staff but also ways in which the faculty and staff can enrich the local region. One sub-domain was identified within the faculty staff domain (e.g. promotion and tenure).

Promotion and Tenure. The promotion and tenure sub-domain (n = 6) contains statements addressing the need for revisions of the promotion and tenure document.

Policies, Procedures, and **Bureaucracy.** The bureaucracy domain (n = 12) contains statements addressing the need for simplified policies and procedures that remove the current organizational constraints that many departments are experiencing.

Mentor. The mentor domain (n = 11) contains statements indicating an opportunity is available for the COEHS to provide student, faculty, and community based mentoring initiatives.

Misclassified. The misclassified domain (n = 9) contains statements that did not provide useful data or were not able to be categorized. Statements ranged from "make a difference" to "the only university in Valdosta."

Organizational Structure. The organizational structure domain (n = 6) consisted of statements regarding potential restricting of specific programs and departments.

Leadership. The leadership domain (n = 5) contains the least amount of statement within Opportunities. The statements contained within the leadership domain address the positive attributes associated with new administration within the COEHS.

Table 3

Frequency data for the domains and sub-domains of Opportunities

Domains/Sub-Domains	Frequency
1. Strategic Plan (Grand Total)	<u>58</u>
a. General (Subtotal)	30
b. Recruitment and Marketing (Subtotal)	28
2. Curriculum and Course Offerings (Grand Total)	<u>57</u>
a. General (Subtotal)	28
b. Class Size (Subtotal)	3
c. Online (Subtotal)	10
d. 4+1 Programs(Subtotal)	16
3. Outreach (Grand Total)	<u>49</u>
a. General (Subtotal)	24
b. School (Subtotal)	13
c. Service/Experiential Learning (Subtotal)	12
4. Resources (Grand Total)	<u>42</u>
a. General (Subtotal)	4
b. Program Resources (Subtotal)	3
c. Faculty and Staff (Subtotal)	8
d. Funding (Subtotal)	7
e. Travel (Subtotal)	6
f. Development and Training (Subtotal)	4
g. Data (Subtotal)	10
5. Culture (Grand Total)	<u>40</u>
a. Collaboration (Subtotal)	35
b. Diversity (Subtotal)	5
6. Faculty and Staff (Grand Total)	<u>21</u>
a. General (Subtotal)	15
b. Promotion and Tenure (Subtotal)	6
7. Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy (Grand Total)	<u>12</u>
8. Mentor (Grand Total)	<u>11</u>
9. Misclassified (Grand Total)	<u>9</u>
10. Organizational Structure (Grand Total)	<u>6</u>
11. Leadership (Grand Total)	<u>5</u>

Note. Numbers indicate domains. Lower-case letters indicate sub-domains. Frequency data is included for each domain, and sub-domain. Grand Total indicates the overall frequency for the domain. Subtotal indicates the frequency for the subdomain or subcategory.

Threats

Threats were defined as situations in which the external environment actually or potentially could reduce or eliminate a capability or the need for a capability of COEHS. The threats component of the SWOT analysis contains 306 statements categorized into 14 domains. Multiple sub-domains and sub-categories were identified to increase the interpretability of domains. The Threats component contains the smallest quantity of statements. The frequency data can be found in *Table 4*. The unique definitions of each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category are explored as well as the comparisons within and between SWOT components.

Resources. The resources domain has the greatest frequency of statements (n = 72) across all domains within Threats. Resources are the tangible and intangible assets provided by the COEHS. The general resources statements (n = 6) address lack of resources provided to students and faculty within COEHS. Two sub-domains were identified (e.g. funding and reports and data).

Funding. The funding sub-domain (n = 62) contains statements that refer to issues with budgets and a lack of funds. The general funding (n = 15) statements address budget reductions and constraints. Three sub-categories were identified within the funding sub-domain. The first sub-category is the lack of funding for graduate assistants (n = 9). The graduate assistant's sub-category contains statements that indicate the lack of funding for graduate assistantships to be problematic for recruitment. The second sub-category is positions and hiring (n = 26). Statements from this sub-category discuss the lack of faculty lines and an inability to hire new faculty. The third sub-category is faculty and staff salary (n = 12). These address the low and inequitable salaries of the COEHS faculty and staff.

Reports and Data. The reports and data sub-domain (n = 4) contains statements that refer to the lack of access and under-utilization of the reports and data collected by the COEHS.

Policies, Procedures, and **Bureaucracy.** The bureaucracy domain (n = 40) deals with the antiquated systems in place that create a stifling work environment. The general bureaucracy statements (n = 11) deal primarily with outdated procedures that are not applicable to all department within the COEHS. Two sub-domains of the bureaucracy domain were identified (e.g. graduate school and procedural justice).

Graduate School. The graduate school sub-domain (n = 11) contains statements that refer to issues within the graduate school. Specifically, statements refer to the outdated application process.

Procedural Justice. The procedural justice sub-domain (n = 18) contains statements that bring up issues of fairness within the COEHS. The general procedural justice (n = 3) statements address the inequity of faculty responsibility, monetary inequities, and inability to control money flow. Two sub-categories were identified (e.g. monetary inequities and workload). The monetary inequities sub-category (n = 6) contains statements that address inequitable compensation when comparing new and old hires, within the COEHS, and between colleges. The workload sub-category (n = 9) contains statements regarding the inequitable workloads of faculty within the COEHS.

Culture. The culture domain (n = 40) refers to shared feelings and ideals between people in an organization. The general culture (n = 4) statements address discrimination and diversity issues. five sub-domains were identified (e.g. climate, communication, collaboration, complacency, and awareness/consideration).

Climate. The climate sub-domain (n = 9) contains statements that refer to the relationships between the departments within the college (e.g. faculty morale, lack of respect, and divisiveness).

Communication. The communication sub-domain (n = 4) contains statements that adress the lack of communication between faculty, staff, program, and stakeholders.

Collaboration. The collaboration sub-domain (n = 12) contains statements that refer to the lack of connections with other colleges.

Complacency. The complacency sub-domain (n = 5) contains statements that refer to the lack of innovation within the College.

Awareness and Consideration. The awareness and consideration sub-domain (n = 6) contains statements that refer to the lack of administrative awareness of programs and departments.

Strategic Plan. The strategic plan domain (n = 32) contains statements addressing the need for a strong vision, mission, and goal for the COEHS. The general strategic plan (n = 15) statements address the lack of a strategic plan for the COEHS. Two sub-domains were identified (e.g. recruitment and retention).

Recruitment. The recruitment sub-domain (n = 11) contains statements that refer to issues regarding recruiting a high quality diverse students and faculty.

Retention. The retention sub-domain (n=6) contains statements that refer to issues regarding student retention.

Competition. The competition domain (n = 23) contains statements addressing the competition between the COEHS and other institutions. Statements list other universities and online programs as competition for the COEHS.

Job Demands. The job demands domain (n=23) contains statements that address faculty workload and burnout issues.

External Threats. The external threats (n = 20) domain contains statements that refer to hazards the college and university faces due to outside circumstances. External threats include changes in public perception, external policy makers, and educational trends.

Leadership. The leadership domain (n = 12) contains statements that refer to the lack of leadership support within the COEHS and VSU.

Curriculum. The curriculum domain (n = 12) contains statements that address issues related to programs and course offerings. Issues include a "lack of online offerings" and "no clinical mental health track."

Accreditation. The accreditation domain (n = 12) contains statements that refer to issues and lack of support for non-teacher education programs regarding the accreditation process.

High Turnover. The high turnover domain (n = 9) addressed statements referring to issues with the loss of faculty and staff at VSU.

Reputation/Perception. The reputation/perception domain (n = 5) contains statements that refer to the negative reputation of the COEHS.

Structure. The structure domain (n = 4) contains statements that refer to issues regarding departmental organization.

Misclassified. The misclassified domain (n = 3) contains statements that did not appear to fit in the thematic categories identified.

Table 4

Frequency data for the domains, sub-domains, and sub-categories of Threats

Domains/Sub-Domains/Sub-Categories	Frequency
1. **Resources (Grand Total)**	**72**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**6**
b. **Funding (Subtotal)**	**62**
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*15*
ii. **Graduate Assistants (Subtotal)**	*9*
iii. **Positions and Hiring (Subtotal)**	*26*
iv. **Faculty and Staff Salary (Subtotal)**	*12*
c. **Reports and Data (Subtotal)**	**4**
2. **Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy (Grand Total)**	**40**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**11**
b. **Graduate School (Subtotal)**	**11**
c. **Procedural Justice (Subtotal)**	**18**
i. **General (Subtotal)**	*3*
ii. **Monetary Inequities (Subtotal)**	*6*
iii. **Workload (Subtotal)**	*9*
3. **Culture (Grand Total)**	**40**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**4**
b. **Climate (Subtotal)**	**9**
c. **Communication (Subtotal)**	**4**
d. **Collaboration (Subtotal)**	**12**
e. **Complacency (Subtotal)**	**5**
f. **Awareness and Consideration (Subtotal)**	**6**
4. **Strategic Plan (Grand Total)**	**32**
a. **General (Subtotal)**	**15**
b. **Recruitment (Subtotal)**	**11**
c. **Retention (Subtotal)**	**6**
5. **Competition (Grand Total)**	**23**
6. **Job Demands (Grand Total)**	**23**
7. **External Threats (Grand Total)**	**20**
8. **Leadership (Grand Total)**	**12**
9. **Curriculum (Grand Total)**	**12**
10. **Accreditation (Grand Total)**	**12**
11. **High Turnover (Grand Total)**	**9**
12. **Reputation/Perception (Grand Total)**	**5**
13. **Structure (Grand Total)**	**4**
14. **Misclassified (Grand Total)**	**2**

Note. Numbers indicate domains. Lower-case letters indicate sub-domains. Lower-case roman numerals indicate sub-categories. Frequency data is included for each domain, sub-domain, and sub-category. Grand Total indicates the overall frequency for the domain. Subtotal indicates the frequency for the subdomain or subcategory.

Discussion

The results of our SWOT analysis reveals several interesting trends that may help to guide future strategic plans. In regard to the reported strengths of the COEHS, respondents indicated that the staff and faculty (n = 91) contributed greatly to the technical fabric of VSU. The most common statements indicated that staff and faculty were both committed and student-centered in their work. Moreover, incumbents of the COEHS were described as having a wide range of useful skillsets that may provide us a strategic advantage. Resources (n = 68) provided by COEHS were also identified as a strength of the college. More specifically, resources provided for travel support, the copy center, and certifications were frequently mentioned by respondents. The COEHS also offers a wide breadth of quality courses and programs. The diversity of our curriculum (n = 38) spanned the themes of applied opportunities (See also regional service n = 18), study abroad opportunities, online programs, and a range of graduate programs. Additionally, our programs were frequently described as being of a high quality (n =19). Respondents described our culture (n = 37) as being as being friendly and collegial. Respondents especially appreciated the annual lunches that are provided by the college. Finally, both the support given to our accredited programs and the overall strength of our accredited programs (n = 16) were frequently discussed by respondents.

The current investigation also found evidence that the COEHS may have several weaknesses. The most frequently reported weakness was the lack of resources provided by COEHS (n = 129). Although no statistical tests of significance were conducted for this investigation. There were more reports of resources as a weakness than as a strength (n = 68). The lack of support for critical programs (n = 7), the human services (n = 32), faculty lines (n = 22), student travel (n = 8), and childcare (n = 7) were all frequently discussed. Additionally, issues related to our policies and procedures (n = 101) emerged as another potential weakness. More specifically, the procedures for tenure and promotion (n = 32) were perceived as lacking transparency, consistency, specificity, and fairness. Several respondents indicated that these policies create a deficiency in our performance appraisal system such that high quality work is often not taken into account when evaluating faculty and staff. The requirements regarding syllabi (n = 16) were also identified as being overly cumbersome and restrictive. Our policies and procedures were also frequently perceived as being unjust (n = 17) across a wide range of domains including the allocation of resources across programs, overall workload, and unfair compensation (e.g., salary compression).

More respondents identified the culture within the COEHS (n =81) as a weakness than as a strength (n = 38). Our climate (n = 47) was a particular focus for respondents as they indicated consistently that there is a lack of collaboration (n = 9), communication (n = 19) across departments and administrators. Respondents also indicated a general lack of awareness and attention within the COEHS (n = 14) for their departments and programs. Demographic diversity was also identified as a major weakness of the college in regard to the composition of the faculty, staff, and students. The strategic plan, policies, and procedures related to the topic of diversity was also often described as subpar. The organizational structure of COEHS (n = 42) was frequently described as having departments that are too large as a result of the merging of departments and programs. Finally, strategic planning within the COEHS (n = 29) is perceived

as lacking and we are currently suffering as a result of a high degree of turnover of the top leadership at VSU.

We have identified several potential opportunities available to the COEHS. Respondents indicated that creating strategic planning initiatives (n =58) that are congruent with VSU's strategic plan would be a great opportunity to establish ourselves in the region. Additionally, providing support for marketing and recruitment initiatives (n = 27) would yield high quality enrollment and provide additional opportunities for our centers and outreach clinics. Respondents also indicated that there are also several curriculum based opportunities. More specifically, respondents suggested co-teaching courses, embedding service learning in the classroom, and developing stronger international exchange programs. Additionally, developing 4+1 programs (n = 16) to feed graduate programs was particularly popular. Respondents frequently reported the opportunity for outreach based initiatives (n = 49) particularly among graduate programs. Several respondents indicated that our access to high quality data (n =10) is currently being underutilized. Providing regular reports or access would allow better strategic planning within departments and programs. Finally, faculty and staff identified a multitude of opportunities for collaboration (n = 35) within and across campus. For instance, student and faculty based mentoring initiatives (n = 11) were frequently identified as a good opportunity for the COEHS.

Although there is a wealth of opportunities available to the COEHS, trends in the data also indicate that there are some serious threats to the college. Resource related threats (n = 72) were most frequently reported. Lack of support for graduate assistants (n = 9), faculty and staff lines (n = 28), competitive salaries for staff/faculty (n = 12) and general budget constraints (n = 15) were all identified as negatively impacting the quality of services offered by the COEHS. Additionally, respondents indicated that perceived inequities related to monetary support and workload may be detrimental to morale. The culture within the COEHS (n = 40) was identified as a threat. More specifically, general negative climate (n = 9), attitudes of complacency (n = 5), and lack of collaboration (n = 12) within the college were reported. Strategic related issues (n = 32) such as recruitment (n = 11) and retention (n = 6) were also perceived as a threat to the COEHS. Finally, external competition from other institutions, the growth of online programs, and shifts among policy makers and educational establishments were perceived as potential threats to the wellbeing of the college.

Typical to SWOT analyses, the majority of the statements identified elements internal to the organization. Thus, a large percentage of the weaknesses and threats identified here can be partially addressed through internal mechanisms. For instance, a thorough review of the COEHS policies and procedures could reveal ways in which we can remove organizational constraints from our staff and faculty. There are likely obsolete policies and procedures that need to be removed and new policies and procedures that can better support our employees. It is recommended that any new forms should be supported by electronic processing. Additionally, a thorough review of how we enforce these policies and procedures should also be conducted. If we want our faculty and staff to be contributing to quality programs while serving the region, engaging in multi-disciplinary endeavors, and contributing to the budget of the COEHS; we need to incentivize accordingly. The current promotion and tenure policies provide a great opportunity for reform. It should be noted that one size may not fit all when it comes to policy and

procedures. Working closely with departments to develop narrowly tailored policies and procedures may lead to better organizational functioning (e.g. potential restructuring, better allocation of resources, increased faculty performance and curriculum based improvements). Such changes are likely to enhance, job satisfaction, productivity, and climate within the COEHS.

It is also recommended that we support our current outreach based initiatives and create new initiatives designed to serve the region and enhance multi-disciplinary interaction. Such projects could allow us to leverage our diversity of talent to develop strong community relations. Not only will this improve our climate but it would enhance our visibility and enable us to better advocate for more resources both on and off campus. The administration should take a vested interested in supporting these endeavors. Additionally, developing mentorship based initiatives may also help faculty and staff to get a dialogue started. Initiatives should also be created that can enhance our influence with policy makers at the campus, regional, and state level. We need to do a better job lobbying for the COEHS.

We appreciate the opportunity to conduct this SWOT analysis but it should only be the first step in a much bigger process. Additional analyses, data, and subject matter experts should be consulted to capture an external view of our current status and direction. For instance, how are we performing in comparison to comparable institutions? What about environmental forecasts? Additionally, departments and programs should be supported in their strategic planning. With the proper resources, the strategic plan of VSU can be distilled from the university level through the college down to the department and program level. The utility of our strategic planning can be greatly enhanced by allowing us to utilize institutional data to guide our visions.

Finally, the emerging theme of diversity as a weakness is concerning. Although the issue of diversity can be complex, we recommend starting by taking a look at the utility of our ongoing strategic initiatives related to diversity. We must be proactive in our approach to making the COEHS a welcoming environment for diverse talent. Future investigations should be able to identify specific actions that can be taken to encourage a diverse workforce. One potential avenue would be to look at how we onboard new faculty to the area and the organization. There are likely several barriers that are discouraging entrance to the organization and potentially encouraging premature organizational exit.

Figure 1. SWOT Matrix

	Helpful **(for your objective)**	**Harmful** **(for your objective)**
Internal **(within organization)**	Strengths	Weaknesses
External **(outside organization)**	Opportunities	Threats

Appendix A. SWOT analysis Qualtrics survey.

The Dewar College of Education and Human Services is currently in the process of updating the current goals for the College. As part of developing a strategic plan, organizations generally undertake an activity to identify important aspects of both their internal and external environment.

We need your assistance in this important piece of the planning process. We are asking you to please list the current Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (S.W.O.T.) as they relate to the College as a whole.

Q1. Please indicate how many years you have worked at Valdosta State University.

Q2. Please indicate what department within COEHS you are currently housed. If you do not feel comfortable answering this question please leave it blank and move on to the next question.

Please fill out the following items as they relate to our S.W.O.T. analysis. Your answers should be based on the current status of the COEHS.

Please pay specific attention to the definitions provided on each question. Your answers can be as descriptive as necessary.

Q3. List a minimum of three Strengths for the Dewar College of Education and Human Services.

Strengths are internal characteristics that are unique, special, highly valued, and positive relative to the College.

- Strength 1 (1) _____
- Strength 2 (2) _____
- Strength 3 (3) _____
- Strength 4 (4) _____
- Strength 5 (5) _____
- Strength 6 (6) _____
- Strength 7 (7) _____
- Strength 8 (8) _____
- Strength 9 (9) _____
- Strength 10 (10) _____

Q4. List a minimum of three <u>Weaknesses</u> for the Dewar College of Education and Human Services.

Weaknesses are internal challenges that the College faces or limitations to achieve our mission and goals.

- ○ Weakness 1 (1) _____
- ○ Weakness 2 (2) _____
- ○ Weakness 3 (3) _____
- ○ Weakness 4 (4) _____
- ○ Weakness 5 (5) _____
- ○ Weakness 6 (6) _____
- ○ Weakness 7 (7) _____
- ○ Weakness 8 (8) _____
- ○ Weakness 9 (9) _____
- ○ Weakness 10 (10) _____

Q5. List a minimum of three <u>Opportunities</u> for the Dewar College of Education and Human Services.

Opportunities occur when the external environment is closely aligned with an organizational strength. Aspects of the external environment that will create or accelerate a need or a capability that is or can be a strength of the organization.

- ○ Opportunity 1 (1) _____
- ○ Opportunity 2 (2) _____
- ○ Opportunity 3 (3) _____
- ○ Opportunity 4 (4) _____
- ○ Opportunity 5 (5) _____
- ○ Opportunity 6 (6) _____
- ○ Opportunity 7 (7) _____
- ○ Opportunity 8 (8) _____
- ○ Opportunity 9 (9) _____
- ○ Opportunity 10 (10) _____

Q6. List a minimum of three <u>Threats</u> for the Dewar College of Education and Human Services.

Threats occur when the external environment actually or potentially reduces or eliminates a capability or need for a capability of the College or organization.

- ○ Threat 1 (1) _____
- ○ Threat 2 (2) _____
- ○ Threat 3 (3) _____
- ○ Threat 4 (4) _____
- ○ Threat 5 (5) _____
- ○ Threat 6 (6) _____
- ○ Threat 7 (7) _____
- ○ Threat 8 (8) _____
- ○ Threat 9 (9) _____
- ○ Threat 10 (10) _____

Appendix B. All submitted statements
Statements were included with originally grammatical errors to maintain the integrity of the
*data. Additionally, an * next to a statement indicates that it has been double coded.*

Strengths

Quality of Talent
I.   Faculty and Staff
1. faculty
2. Most faculty work very hard in teaching
3. Practitioners who are scholars
4. We have a core of strong, smart, and forward-looking faculty.
5. Quality faculty
6. highly qualified professors
7. Faculty expertise
8. Quality and professionalism of the seasoned faculty
9. Strong Faculty
10. Faculty expertise
11. Faculty that values diversity and inclusion
12. diversity of students and faculty*
13. strong instruction
14. High quality faculty and programs*
15. Faculty expertis
16. Faculty expertise
17. Faculty
18. broad faculty expertise
19. Faculty Expertise
20. Faculty expertise?
21. The range of faculty expertise
22. Lots of faculty expertise across departments
23. MSRD tenured faculty
24. Knowledgeable professors
25. We provide quality education, and well-trained faculty members to educate our students.*
26. Expertise in teaching non-traditional students
27. Faculty expertise
28. faculty expertise
29. the qulaity of work done by faculty as recognized by the success of our students
30. Quality faulty and staff
31. Qualified faculty and staff
32. Quality faculty and staff
33. highly qualified faculty and support staff
34. COEHS staff (directors, administrative staff) provide excellent support
35. staff
36. The support staff is excellent (names redacted)
37. support staff
38. Support staff are excellent and very outstanding to work with

39. Name redacted and all of tthe admin support staff are great
40. admin support personnel
41. Admin support staff
42. Administrative support staff are responsive
43. Accessible support staff for faculty
44. COEHS support staff is great (e.g., names redacted).
45. Admidistrative and support staff are available
46. admin support staff is great
47. Admin support are responsive
48. Administrative support staff
49. Strong administrative support staff (admin assistants, etc.)
50. Wide age and experience range
51. depth of content knowledge
52. Size & Diversity of Talent: We have a lot of talent across important domains (e.g., professional services & education). This should allow us to coordinate better to serve a wide range of clients.
53. Human capital expertise
54. experience of personnel

A. Commitment/Dedication

1. Caring dedicated faculty
2. caring faculty
3. Caring Faculty
4. Faculty truly care about the progress and well-being of their students
5. Facutly care about students
6. Experienced and dedicated faculty
7. Experienced, Dedicated Faculty and Staff
8. Experienced and dedicated staff
9. Strong, dedicated faculty
10. faculty dedicated to the cause
11. faculty loyal to the college
12. Hard working faculty
13. Most faculty work very hard in advising students
14. Most faculty work very hard to participate the assessment for accreditation
15. Most faculty work very hard to keep the department stronger
16. Most faculty work very hard and do not complain anything in the overloading of teaching and service
17. Most faculty work very hard in conducting research
18. Most faculty work very hard in attending the off campus OPEN HOUSE to recruit students from high schools in GA
19. Faculty who go above and beyond normal requirements and expectations

B. Student-Centered

1. Student Centered

2. student-focused
3. We strive to meet each students needs as they progress throughout the program.
4. The COEHS strives to know the students on a personal level.
5. Positive relationship with our students
6. keeps up with today's students
7. Customer focus
8. overall focus on the student

II. Leadership Quality

1. approachable administration*
2. Leadership of the College in the online arena
3. Growing Leadership
4. Growing Dept leadership
5. Name redacted-position of leadership
6. Name redacted-position of leadership is accessible
7. Name redacted-position of leadership is great.
8. Leaders for the university as a whole
9. MSRD Department Leadership
10. Name redacted-position of leadership responds to emails/calls

Resources

1. There is a diverse base of resources within the college from which innovative, top tier endeavors could be developed
2. We have a great assessment office that aggregates or dissaggregates unit and program data, and provides faculty with accurate data for reporting purposes
3. support of graduate programs
4. name redacted is great when seeking data
5. RESOURCE ALLOCATION
6. faculty resources (copy center, travel proxy, advising center)*
7. Advising center, especially name redacted
8. Graduate Assistantships
9. Resources for faculty to feel connected and decrease administrative duties such as lunches travel, training,etc.
10. polos for faculty are a really great touch
11. Professional Development
12. Training/PD
13. COEHS Advising Center

I. Technology

1. Use of state of art technologies in learning
2. We have state of the art technology in some of our classrooms.
3. monitors conveying info
4. Information Monitors
5. Information monitor system.

6. Information monitor system

7.Supports technology and online learning*

8. Access to information through the information monitor system

9.Website faculty resources

II.   Travel

1. Travel proxy
2. Travel proxies
3. travel proxies
4. Travel proxy
5. travel proxy for faculty
6. The COEHS travel proxy makes processing travel funds much easier than otherwise.
7. travel proxy is FANTASTIC
8. Streamlined travel proxy
9. Staff to help with travel paperwork
10. GAs to submit travel (proxy)
11. travel support
12. Travel support
13. Travel Support
14. Good travel proxy support
15. Process for submitting travel is much easier because of the new procedural changes.
16. travel help
17. resources-travel
18. faculty resources (copy center, travel proxy, advising center)*

III.   Funding

1. good for helping out with small levels of funding
2. recognizing students
3. having access to funds for recruitment
4. Scholarships
5. College Level Awards
6. Affordability and opportunity for scholarship
7. Availability of student scholarships and awards

IV.   Copy Center
1. The compy center is really great
2. copy center is a vital service
3. Copy Center
4. Copy center
5. copy center
6. COEHS copy center support
7. Good copy center support
8. Copy center support
9. Copy Center

10. Copy/print services
11. COEHS Copy Center
12. Integrity of programs
13. copy center is easy to use
14. faculty resources (copy center, travel proxy, advising center)*

V.   Certification Support

1. Help with accreditation and GACE support*
2. GACE and certification support
3. Seem to have a lot of support for teacher certification.
4. Certification Support
5. Certification support
6. Certification support provided to students
7. Flexible and adaptable to rapid changes in teacher certification and policy

Diversity

I.   Program

1. Many strong programs (SW, family therapy, Communication sciences and some in education) with accreditation*
2. Consists of both graduate and undergraduate programs
3. High quality faculty and programs*
4. Graduate programs in COEHS (MSW, Communication Sciences, Family Therapy, MLIS)
5. Offers a wide variety of programs
6. Diverse in programs
7. Number of graduate programs
8. Variety of majors offered to students
9. Variety of unique programs/opportunities for students to choose from*
10. Variety of unique programs/opportunities for students to choose from*
11. Variety of course options such as face to face, hybrid, and online
12. Offer a variety of real-world classroom experiences for teachers
13. Flexibility in classes for various student demographics
14. The education programs meet a critical need
15. We are one of only a few colleges in the nation that train teachers of the deaf and offer a four year ASL/English Interpreting Program.
16. Program Preparedness
17. Student Social Work Association has essential framework within Social Work dept.
18. Co-Teaching model used by undergraduate programs

A. Opportunities/Experience/Training

1. Social Work Micro-practice Skills exercises
2. We provide hands-on, experiential, and transformative learning experiences.

3. human services consult (e.g., I/O)
4. Vital human services, I/O consult*
5. Provides vital human services*
6. We are working hard at moving toward PDS
7. Excellent active clinics that provide wonderful training for students and outstanding services to the community (Comm D. and Family Therapy). The I/O programâ€™s Azealia Consulting is likewise a gem. All contribute significantly to the community. *
8. Emphasis on Applied Research*
9. Research and practice in teacher preparation*
10. Study Abroad Programs
11. Excellent foreign study opportunities and programs-- Czech and Italy
12. Hands-on job preparation for students across discipline, experiential learning for undergraduate and graduate programs
13. Experiential and hands on training providing at multiple levels (graduate/undergraduate) to enhance job preparation

B. Online

1. seems to have a good online program for teachers, but I really don't know since we don't seem to actually be part of the College
2. Expertise in teaching online
3. Supports technology and online learning
4. We offer an opportunity for ASL/English Interpreting students to earn their degree through distance learning/video conferencing classes.
5. Online formats (degrees and certificaitons)
6. Online and hybrid course delivery offerings
7. Comprehensiveness, quality, and growth of online education

II.   Diversity of Leadership

1.Growing Diverse Leadership
2.Name redacted-position of power: diverse
3.Position of power, name redacted

III.   Diversity of Faculty and Students

1.Student body that is diverse
2.Diversity of students
3.diversity of students and faculty*
4.Growing diverse faculty
5.students
6.Country well represented
7.Good mix of Instr, Asst, Assoc, Full profs

Culture

1. positive culture
2. Positive Community Support
3. mission-centered
4. The college upholds educational values.
5. Faculty values diversity and inclusion
6. Person-in-Environment Philosophic Framework "everything affects everything"

I. Annual Meetings

1. the way the opening meeting college convocation is held
2. COEHS opening meeting
3. College opening meeting
4. The first week COEHS meeting and lunch
5. Cultural support: Annual meetings
6. college wide meetings
7. COEHS lunches
8. The COEHS encourages team spirit by way of the start of the (academic)year lunch and meeting. This is a good chance to place names with faces for those outside of one's department.*
9. COEHS lunch encourages community
10. COEHS lunch encourages community
11. COEHS lunch encourages community
12. COEHS lunch encourages community
13. beginning of year lunch creates community
14. COEHS Fall meetings have lunch that helps build community.
15. Annual College Training and Lunch

II. Climate

1. Most faculty have only one goal for the department
2. The department has only ONE MIND to make it better and stronger
3. approachable administration*
4. Friendly
5. friendly work environment with colleagues that are enjoyable to work with
6. collaborative
7. collegiality
8. Collaborative colleagues
9. Collaboration
10. Helpful
11. supportive colleagues as a whole
12. availability
13. Professional
14. Most faculty enjoy working in this department

15. FACULTY EMPOWERMENT
16. willingness to try new things

Quality of Programs

1. Social Work Core Values throughout Curriculum
2. engaging and quality programs that meet and surpass assessment requirements
3. Nationally recognized program
4. Successful programs that prepare students to in the working world
5. strong programs
6. Quality Programs
7. highly sought after degree programs
8. We provide quality education, and well-trained faculty members to educate our students.*
9. Programs that meet the needs of our students
10. Quality Education received by the undergraduate and graduate students in our college which could not be possible without the low student/teacher ratio
11. Future teacher education
12. rigor
13. Focus on developing effective teacher graduates
14. positive student outcomes
15. Students in COEHS appear to be the highest performing across the university Research and practice in teacher preparation
16. High expectations of students
17. Our candidates in Elementary education spend more time in the field than candidates at other universities.
18. The professional semesters are set up so students can get experience in all areas (pre-k-5th)
19. CLT and PCFT employ biz models that have extremely high credit hour production

Regional Service

1. Service to region
2. Regional Service
3. Service to the community & region
4. Service to the community and the region
5. Essential services provided to the community through I/O consulting, advising, school counseling, family therapy, CAMP, VECA*
6. The essential services which are provided to the community such as VECA, FamilyWorks,CAMP
7. Home to the CAMP program
8. Community service: Speech and Hearing clinic, Literacy Center, Helen Ruffin Reading Bowl, tutoring...
9. Also, our students provide services to the larger community.
10. provides vital human services*
11. Vital and diverse human services
12. Vital human services, I/O consult*
13. College provides vital human services
14. good relationship with local schools

15. commitment to having a positive impact on our communities
16. Commitment of COEHS programs to their professional communities
17. connected to our community through service and applications for our students
18. community integration/support

Accreditation
1. CAEP and Other National Accreditations and National Recognitions
2. Help with accreditation and GACE support*
3. COEHS Office of Clinical Experience and Certification
4. Our programs are accredited and well known*
5. Many strong programs (SW, family therapy, Communication sciences and some in education) with accreditation*
6. has accredited programs
7. Accreditation and resources for accreditation
8. accreditation of programs
9. Accredited programs
10. Accredited Programs.
11. Accredited programs
12. Accredited Programs
13. Accredited programs
14. Accreditation programs
15. Accreditation
16. accreditation seems successful across programs

Job Procedural Clarity
1. Structure and consistency of expectations
2. Structure and consistency of expectations
3. There is structure and consistency of expectations (e.g., syllabus template, faculty resources)
4. Structure and consistency of expectations for faculty
5. Structure and consistency of
6. Clear expectations for committees, office hours, etc
7. Clear expectations
8. expectations
9. Clear structure and expectations provided
10. Clear structure and expectations
11. Clear expectations of syllabi.
12. Provides structures and documents to help us with teaching, tenure etc.
13. P&T document is A LOT better than it used to be...though large sections are "Not Applicable" for what psychology does.*
14. Including policy pertinent to student conduct, success, and resources in the syllabi
15. P&T document is A LOT better than it used to be...though large sections are "Not Applicable" for what psychology does.*

Misclassified

1. desire to improve in terms of technology

2. The SW program has a proposal for a BSW program.
3. Looks towards future
4. Potential
5. quality learning environment
6. Consistent
7. I just can't think of any -- we have learned to take care of ourselves and not see the "unit"
8. I don't know many "impactful" strengths because what the focus of COEHS is teacher prep & that has nothing to do with psychology's needs.
9. technology committy was good when it was functioning
10. We have a good basic foundation in online offerings, but it has become stagnant.
11. There are pockets where real innovation is going on (but there needs to be a lot more)
12. Physical plant and the infrastructure are a definite strength of the past and current strategic planning (the college and university campus remains beautiful and functional which may be contributing factors for the student and faculty recruitment)
13. Affordability
14. I wish I had more
15. cost of tuition for in and out of state students

Reputation and Perception

1. Students enjoy the programs
2. Reputation in state for delivering quality programs
3. Solid reputation in the community, state, and due to our online presence, in the nation
4. Our programs are accredited and well known*
5. Positive community perception
6. We are "it" in South Central Georgia - - we are the respected training institution for educators and service providers.

Organizational Structure
1. Small to moderate sized departments
2. Small size
3. Emphasis on self-assessment with corrective actions evident

Weaknesses

Resources
1. Not enough time to do real program evaluation
2. Hard to conduct research with undergraduate students, especially thesis and independent projects. Release time limited or absent.
3. Undergraduate thesis work lacks support / resource dedication
4. poor support for faculty research
5. Thesis work is not supported
6. Thesis work not always supported
7. Lack of support for faculty Scholarship
8. Minimal support for faculty and student research
9. Career-specific advising
10. data usage
11. Lack of infrastructure
12. Lack of classroom space
13. Outdated building and furnishings
14. Lack of support for potential opportunities. For instance, course releases for course development.
15. More resources for faculty to provide experiential learning such as research, training,course releases,
16. No central source for resources and community resources
17. Need central list of community and service projects
18. No centralized information sources about service opportunities
19. Not enough service available for faculty
20. Inadequate resources
21. more policies and resources to assist with supporting diversity and inclusion*
22. administrative support - need more
23. alumni news, achievements, students that go to PhD programs,etc
24. Alumni relationships
25. We don't connect to our Alumni enough. We need a system in place and have access to the data about what happens about to our students. And what happened to the educator?
26. Weak alumni relationships.
27. Service to community
28. Faculty service to College and communities

I. **Faculty /Staff**

1. In great need of additional faculty to lighten the course load
2. Not enough faculty to teach courses
3. understaffed
4. Not enough faculty to do the work of the department

5. Not enough financial support for faculty lines
6. some faculty are detached from schools
7. Would benefit by having a Practicum Supervisor that would be in charge of all Practicums.
8. miss use of personnel
9. The inability to hire because of budget has left very few of us to do a lot of work, and some employees are not as committed as others.
10. staffing of departments
11. Increase reliability on Part-time faculty
12. High turnover of faculty/not filling vacated faculty lines
13. PD should include human services areas. Not enough PD on tech in our buildings (smart board)
14. resources-falculty and staff
15. allotment of faculty - we could admit many more students if we had adequate faculty
16. lack of full time faculty to carry course loads
17. Lack of pool of qualified mentors who are trained
18. provide resources to keep diverse faculty
19. Faculty turnover
20. Loss of full-time faculty positions*
21. Increased number of adjunct and temp faculty positions at the cost of the reduction of the number of tenure-track positions
22. Increase reliability on Part-time faculty*

II.   Travel

1. Procedures for funding needs to be simplified for faculty travel
2. Dept travel funding
3. LACK OF MONEY FOR CONFERENCES
4. In great need of increase in faculty funding for conferences and presentations
5. poor support for student research and travel (faculty shouldn't have to support students out of pocket)
6. Little funding for undergraduate and graduate research and travel
7. In great need of student financial support to attend conferences when they are presenting projects
8. Scholarship and travel funding for undergraduate and graduate students. Also, weak support for international programs.
9. A lack of resources to support undergraduate and graduate research / travel
10. Limited funding to support graduate student research, travel, and scholarships for them to present at conferences funding for undergrad research and travel
11. Funding for graduate and undergraduate research and travel
12. Funding for graduate and undergraduate research and travel

13. Graduate programs are invisible and funding for graduate students to present is lacking or to go to conferences

III.   Child Care

1. No child care services on campus (no early childhood practicum/human development site on campus)
2. no campus-based child care
3. No campus-based child care.
4. Lack of childcare on campus
5. No on campus based child care and education
6. Why don't we have child care?
7. Need campus/college child care/ day care sevice. It would be great for student training and research as well

IV.   Funding

1. Loss of online funds to other colleges
2. Underfunding in programs
3. State budgets have been cut since 2007 and there is not much left to cut now. Most of f us who are left, are working at full capacity*
4. Shrinking budgets
5. Continues budget restrictions that may be compromising quality and/or sustainability of the programs and create concerns for our future employment
6. The salary does not allow department to attract quality employees.
7. Lack of funding for faculty
8. It seems the college has a surplus of money each year, which is ludicrous when there are needs that need to be met.
9. Lack of grant funding

V.   Programs/Departments

1. We lack specific and focused recruitment for our programs in the schools in our service area.
2. Supporting the Special Education program
3. Too many students enrolled in online graduate programs. We need smaller sections!
4. Our class sizes for the interpreting skills classes are too large/ this will hamper our ability to become an accredited program.
5. Online programs
6. Lack of resources to support programs going through the accreditation process and recruitment of students.*

7. Weak support for study abroad and international programs

VI. Technology

1. IT
2. Limitations with technology
3. Lack of Apple Lab to support Apple classroom
4. The educator blog?
5. technology - the one size fits all generic desktop computers - positively useless for those of us who work at home during nights and weekends because that is when our students need support
6. technology - need for far more frequent updates to our technology - including software
7. No technology class for elementary education students
8. focus on face to face course support and technology - more focus on online education needs is essential
9. Our faculty, myself included, is weak in school-based use of technology.*
10. Most faculty's "teaching with technology" skills are limited to using MS Office.
11. more technological guidance needed on North Campus; (a person can not even turn on a hallway light on a Saturday morning--this convenes a sense of non-importance by those present-techno-determinism);

VII. Support for Non-Education majors

1. Lack of availability of resources for human services students
2. Student support heavily biased for teacher support.
3. Way too much focus on teacher training little for human services
4. Focus too heavy on education majors, ignores everyone else
5. Field experience office is restricted to teacher ed programs or seems like it is. Our students want international experiences too. We need more support to accommodate this!
6. Scholarship are mainly for education programs
7. No support for non-education related fields
8. Lack of support for non-educ related field
9. No support for non ed-related fields/accreditation.*
10. Student support/resources heavily biased to teacher ed.
11. Minimal support for non-education related fields
12. No support for non-education related fields
13. Support lacking for non education majors
14. no support for non-education programs (school counseling, social work, Family Therapy, etc.

15. no support for non education related fields in terms of accreditation
16. No accreditation support for non-education related fields
17. No support for non-education departments with accreditation process
18. No support for accreditation outside education
19. No support for non-education accreditation
20. Accreditation only for education programs
21. No support for non ed-related fields/accreditation.*
22. No support for the huge task of program accreditation--only educator prep programs get accreditation support. This seems unfair.

A. *Professional Development*

1. Professional development only for education programs
2. Professional development activities for human services are lacking
3. Lack of professional development & Support for Human Services
4. Professional development too focused on education.
5. Professional development is focused only on education
6. Professional development for human services are lacking lack of support/professional development for human services
7. Professional development focused on mostly education
8. Professional development focus lacking for human services
9. professional development often too teacher focused
10. professional development focuses only on education

Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy

1. Too many meetings
2. At times we create too much rigidity in our procedures and practices.
3. Bureaucratic systems that detract from time devoted to mission
4. Difficult to work within bureaucracy of institution is stifling
5. Too much bean counting
6. Slow to adapt to market demands
7. purchases not made in timely manner
8. communication protocols*
9. lots of reporting and processes rather than product
10. Graduate application itself and the entire process
11. Too many rigid internal structures, systems and processes that prevent from getting the job done most effectively
12. Procedures for hiring faculty need to be streamlined
13. redundant work

14. Personnel issues (involving dishonesty) in COEHS that have been very difficult to address through T&P & following the chain of command.*

I.   Assessment

1. The assessment system is too time consuming and not user friendly
2. Meaningless Assessments
3. Too many meaningless assessments
4. too much irrelevant assessment that is never used for program enhancement
5. too much irrelevant assessment that is never used for program enhancement
6. The unit has an overbearing focus on assessment, and that assessment is unorganized and disjointed.
7. SOI's does not reflect graduate and human services
8. SOIs don't address graduate programs
9. simplify assessment process / requirements for program/unit asssessments
10. There is no mechanism to ensure program/course curricula are up to date and that faculty are using the most effective instructional strategies and materials in their instruction
11. Absence of any kind of instructional quality control
12. surveys like this -- this is really not how to get real information –
13. another "factlty assignment" that no one is going to use the results

II.   Procedural Clarity

1. Lack of consistent policy implementation, which includes clear violatoins of policies
2. inconsistency regarding hiring process
3. Inconsistencies in ECSE
4. Lack of transparency
5. Lack of transparency
6. Lack of transparency. Too many back room deals that are made to promote personal agendas, not in the best interest of students P&T and SOI not clear, not set up for human services*
7. some structure (uniform syllabi, for example) alienating to non-education programs
8. On-Boarding of faculty in new positions (e.g., new faculty, program coordinators etc.)
9. Too complex of processes
10. Unclear/falsely communicate expectations of teaching loads, administrative duties, funding for travel
11. confusing differences between units

III.   **Promotions and Tenure**

1. not fighting for tenure and promotion requirements
2. Personnel issues (involving dishonesty) in COEHS that have been very difficult to address through T&P & following the chain of command.*
3. conflicting promotion & tenure process
4. SOI and P&T documents do not reflect the current level of faculty effort.
5. P & T document does not reflect changes to advising.
6. Inconsistencies with T&P document and some parts unclear
7. P&T processes are not equal and have been used to punish faculty who voice any little bit of dissent. 2. Different departments have very different interpretations of the criteria. In addition, some are very supportive and some are simply awful. Woe to anyone trying to navigate the mean-spirited psychology department process.*
8. Confusion regarding P & T requirements
9. P & T document does not reflect graduate adn human services programs, where it does it lacks clarity and is inconsistent.
10. P&T document doesn't reflect clinical work/programs
11. P & T doc does not reflect clinical programs
12. P & T does not address clinical programs
13. t and p guidelines don't reflect clinical programs
14. P & T document does not acknowledge clinical work
15. P & T does not give credit to clinical programs
16. P&T and SOI not clear, not set up for human services*
17. Pand T documents are inconsistent
18. Promotion and tenure requirements seem inconsistent at times
19. P and T document is unclear, inconsistent, and inflexible for the different programs.
20. P&T document does not have a place for clinical work or the additional roles and responsibilities of clinical faculty or see clinical work as a significantly different endeavor in addition to teaching and research. Social service programs are nearly invisible, receive few resources, and desperately need an Associate Dean position to advocate for them and to promote the unique needs and possibilities of these programs.
21. The P & T process and the Annual Report does not acknowledge or credit the time/value of school-based work, clinical supervision, the Professional Development Model, etc.
22. P&T document & process lack of clarity

23. The P & T process and the Annual Report does not acknowledge or credit the time/value of school-based work, clinical supervision, the Professional Development Model, etc.
24. P&T processes are not equal and have been used to punish faculty who voice any little bit of dissent. 2. Different departments have very different interpretations of the criteria. In addition, some are very supportive and some are simply awful. Woe to anyone trying to navigate the mean-spirited psychology department process.*
25. not enough committee choices within the college
26. For those in need of service (for P & T) there is often not enough service to go around
27. Minimal opportunity for service.
28. limited service/committee opportunities
29. Insufficient service opportunities
30. imbalance of dissertation service

IV. Classroom Requirements

1. The syllabus template is not relevant to some of us. We don't need the DEPOSITs stuff and other items related to ed only.
2. Syllabi requirements too extensive
3. The syllabus template has mandatory material that lacks relevance
4. syllabi not friendly to non-education majors
5. Syllabi formats are not relevant for non-educator classes/departments
6. too many adjustments for the various accrediting bodies, when the syllabus becomes 10 pages long, nothing gets read
7. Syllabi too rigid and focused on education...DEPOSITS have nothing to do with psychology majors.
8. communication broadly; syllabus issues; what is our mission? why don't we celebrate what we are doing well?*
9. syllabi are not relevant for non-education areas
10. Syllabus too restrictive
11. Syllabus requirements are excessive and not relevant for non-education majors
12. Required syllabi alienating to non-education classes and students
13. Some syllabi requirements are not relevant for non-education areas
14. syllabus format
15. Being forced to have too many students in online classes and thereby lessening the quality of the experience
16. confusing college requirements

V. Procedural Justice

1. I think our efforts should be fairly recognized
2. Equity across departments
3. Equity across departments
4. No equity across departments
5. No equity in pay across departments and classification (assistant, associate, full).
6. No equity across departments in course releases or course load.
7. No equity across departments, course release for program coordinators is unequally applied
8. no equity across departments
9. inequity in requirements across departments (teaching, service, research)
10. Lack of equity in release time for program coordinators
11. no equity in teaching load for program directors
12. lack of consideration for faculty schedules and plans - the all college meeting at the end of finals week is only one example of this - with only a few days between the end of Spring and the beginning of MayMester this took away any opportunity to get a few days away
13. Majority of COEHS resources not available to psychology students and faculty
14. No equity in resource distribution across departments (course releases for program coordinators, thesis supports, etc.)
15. Inequitable compensation for additional duties, overload teaching, administrative work
16. Teaching Loads are too high given all the research and field experiences; no equity across departments in course releases*
17. Some not contributing their weight

Culture
1. not family friendly work environment
2. Faculty and Secretaries rarely come in to work on time, if at all.
3. Not interdisciplinary or departments working together

I. Climate
1. communication protocols*
2. The college doesn't seem like a cohesive unit since human services was added.*
3. No unity of faculty
4. A degree of isolation between departments*
5. Divisiveness with departments and faculty
6. lack of community/family feeling in the college...each dept doing their own thing
7. There are a few people who suck the life out of others
8. Internal departmental politics

9. Too many people operate in a "we've always done it this way" approach to teaching and service to the students
10. People need to stop dwelling on the past and how awful everything has been and get moving. We are losing precious time. We need to be rowing in the same direction. If you do not like something, be part of changing it. If you just want to be mad then please get out of the way. I know faculty morale is down, but Tinkerbell and Superman are not coming with pixie dust or building-moving abilities. We have to help ourselves.
11. Secretive and dishonest
12. No accountabililty
13. there are a few "nay" sayers that need to retire
14. lack of respect for faculty and student opinions and input in ECSE
15. We need to celebrate our students' achievements more. For example, not enough emphasis on undergraduate research. We need funding for their travels (both undergrad and grad)
16. Whatever happened between our advising center and the rest of campus has badly damaged our reputation across campus. Justly or not, we are notorious. This will continue to harm our ability to work collaboratively with other colleges and units, as Centralized advising staff are now distributed in every college; whatever happened between them and COEHS advising is absolutely toxic. This needs to be fixed. Not litigated, fixed.
17. There are not enough risk takers (in both admin and faculty ranks) to truly unleash the potential of the college's overall resources
18. too much Not Invented Here attitude; resistant to new ideas and people from outside UGS
19. Not creative enough when creating solutions

A. *Cooperation*

1. Faculty not working together
2. internal divisiveness
3. unity and collegiality: need to build upon this to support faculty advancement
4. fragmented efforts with many depts serving similar constituents but not collaborating for maximum impact*
5. Innovation occurs in silos
6. There is no collaboration within certain departments.
7. Lack of collaboration across disciplines
8. Little to no cross-departmental collaboration
9. The senior faculty are inadequate and look down on students and other faculty/staff

B. *Communication*

1. Communication outside one's specific department
2. Communication can be assumed
3. engagement and sharing in the evaluation process for programs

4. dissemination of info
5. communication protocols*
6. Poor communication among departments
7. Communicative effectiveness in the past has been poor but has seemed to improve since the new dean started.
8. There is a lack of communications
9. no "real" faculty input - no real voice
10. Inclusion of faculty in decision making as of just window dressing
11. Communication and support
12. communicate how data gathered about programs and how desseminated
13. more VSU administration transparency needed at ALL LEVELS;
14. communication broadly; syllabus issues; what is our mission? why don't we celebrate what we are doing well?*
15. Departments are thrown together without input.
16. Departments hardly know each other--about what they do, what they teach, we are strangers to each other. Communication and a sense of community is a real weakness.
17. Lack of communciations
18. Communication about college offerings
19. Lack of clear communication and the dissemination of information.

II. Diversity

1. Diversity
2. Diversity and inclusion is not encouraged in our mission, PD, or messages across TVs in our college). We need to be real and address inequities. Social justice and advocacy is an essential part of teaching, counseling, and research! It would help to cross-list courses with women and gender's studies!*
3. There is a general lack of action regarding issues of diversity. *
4. diversity does not lead in the mission statement
5. No deep appreciation of diversity and inclusion. Lots of well-intended good will and ill directed white guilt
6. Lacking policy-in-place to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion.
7. no real committeemen to diversity or social justice in the classroom
8. Teacher prep for diverse population
9. There is a MAJOR lack of diversity.
10. There is blatant discrimination towards minority faculty, staff, and especially students.
11. Our admissions criteria are not user friendly for students who are not L1 English users.
12. Diverse Student recruitment
13. Lack of graduate representation on the larger campus community.
14. Diverse student recruitment

15. Diversity Faculty Diversity
16. Overall faculty diversity
17. Diversity and inclusion is not encouraged in our mission, PD, or messages across TVs in our college). We need to be real and address inequities. Social justice and advocacy is an essential part of teaching, counseling, and research! It would help to cross-list courses with women and gender's studies!*

VI. Awareness and Consideration

1. communication broadly; syllabus issues; what is our mission? why don't we celebrate what we are doing well?*
2. lack of Employee focus
3. Thus far--my last three years, I do not feel "the warmth" from College of Ed---I understand the SW dept. does not feel supported by College of Ed.
4. The social service program are undervalued
5. SW students need to attend MORE faculty meetings and be provided VOICE (& reasonable VOTING);
6. SOWK is a stepchild
7. Grad. SW students with full-time work; school; field work; and family feel very overwhelmed--(we need to help them find ways to support one-another)
8. understanding of all the programs within the college
9. under appreciated
10. Psychology is not understood as STEM
11. psychology is STEM and not recognized as such
12. Psychology is not valued and belongs in the social sciences *
13. lack of consideration that programs are NOT all teacher ed or education!
14. I assume other "non-education" programs are also stepchcildren

Organizational Structure

1. Organization of COE as a whole
2. departments are too big
3. Some departments are too large and unfocused
4. Social Work dept. is geographically separated from College of Ed--this makes for poor communication in many areas including research
5. Departments are bloated (too large)
6. Department are getting so big they become ineffective
7. the college is too big
8. Departments are too large (moved around, re-organized)
9. departments too large/span too many areas-disciplines

10. Departments are getting so big that they are becoming ineffective in streamlining process and resources necessary for student engagement and faculty development *
11. Departments are too large. we could meet as programs and also foster cross-program collaborations. For example, psychology is STEM and should work with math and science.
12. A degree of isolation between departments*
13. We are too scattered and are not connected academically and professionally
14. Some departments don't fit in the COEHS framework (not teacher prep, not direct human services).
15. Assessment center that is unconnected to the departments it is supposed to serve
16. lack of use of data for our shared discussions and decision making...we have had top down, non-transparent, punitive leadership for the last 3 years

I.   Administration

1. Delayer administration structure
2. too many directors of departments
3. top heavy administration
4. Top-heavy administration
5. Top-heavy administration - is there a need for the number of deans / assistant deans
6. Administrator bloat: way too many adminstrators (Deans, "Directors," etc).
7. Administrator bloat. Too many administrators.
8. Administration seems too heavy
9. Only really need one Dean not 3 or more

II.   Department Merges

1. Human Services don't belong--an unwanted appendage
2. Few students in education take (or are interested in) human services courses (e.g. Psychology) and few students in human services take (are interested in) education courses. Students (and some faculty) consider these fields as different career tracks and domains of interest.
3. Several human services programs have joined COEHS since 2013 and we have never come together as a college since then (lack of stable leadership until this year)
4. Programs need to be combined differently. College needs to be reorganized
5. Programs need to be combined differently. College needs to be reorganized
6. Departments have been combined in thoughtless ways. The organization of the college makes no sense. Programs are combined in the dark of the night. Merging Family Therapy and Psychology was a mistake. Merging Special Ed with Communication Disorders was a mistake. These decisions are made and executed under the cover of darkness. These kinds of changes need to take place in the sunlight. Some departments are too big.

7. Psychology is not valued and belongs in the social sciences *
8. The college doesn't seem like a cohesive unit since human services was added.*
9. Dept merging too large groups
10. department merging could yield to departments that are too large
11. merging departments
12. Department merging
13. Department mergers
14. Switching combining departments.
15. No integration between COEHS and SOWK adminssions
16. lumping non-teacher prep into teacher prep
17. We need more fields for weaknesses. Psychology doesn't belong in this college.

Strategic Planning

1. Lack of a clear strategic plan that is congruent with the University level strategic planning.
2. Lack of sustainable of leaderships for many years on both the college and university levels with no unifying goal oriented vision for its future (interim department heads, interim deans, interim past president)
3. Has no plan for improvement
4. lack of consideration when planning that some programs are graduate only
5. Unclear about vision for research expectations and mismatch between research expectations and teaching/administrative work load
6. we have not evaluated the need for all of the programs we have and thus, are doing too much with too little...need to have a direction, prioritize, eliminate some programs and put resources into our priorities/direction vision areas
7. Decisions for developing new courses based on a "first come, first served:" approach rather than on any kind of plan with regard to the need for program expansion, and prioritizing those needs
8. lack of focus
9. The mission statement is non-existent for non-ed departments nor is it meaningful.
10. Mission statement is too broad lacks substance and is not representative of departmental and discipline values (too many buzzwords).
11. Few initiatives to support work-family balance
12. more policies and resources to assist with supporting diversity and inclusion*

I.   Mission

1. mission statement not meaningful
2. Mission statement is impossible to assess-couldn't design assessment processes around this statement

3. Mission needs to change to better meet the new needs of the college as departments have been added.
4. Mission statement not meaningful
5. lack of coherent mission
6. communication broadly; syllabus issues; what is our mission? why don't we celebrate what we are doing well?*
7. Mission statement too broad
8. Vague mission statement
9. Our mission statement is an empty suit. We need to place social justice, diversity, and inclusion at the heart of a real mission that makes faculty want to get up and go to work every day. No empty platitudes. If you feel you need something like our current soulless mission statement to make the accreditors happy, then have one public fake statement for them and one real mission that we can love and nurture.
10. Lack of a mission that encompasses the entire college

II.   Vision

1. Lack of transparency in vision and policy especially when it comes to graduate programs.
2. No forward vision
3. lack of a direction/vision that could assist in prioritizing our efforts
4. Lack of vision regarding the population of adult learners to be tapped
5. No vision of the quality student we produce
6. tunnel vision
7. We have no vision or plan in terms of where we are going as a college

Quality of Leadership
1. Lack of transparency from top leadership
2. The leadership's level of communication is horrible (position redacted).
3. Top Dn Leadership
4. Name redacted
5. leadership challenges
6. Unprofessional leadership in ECSE
7. Has weak leadership
8. Name redacted
9. We need to feel supported at the university level through our leadership (position redacted)

I.   Turnover of Leadership

1. Leadership turnover
2. Administrative Turnover
3. Rotating leadership over the last decade

4. Inconsistent leadership
5. Interim Dean for years and years and years.
6. instability of leadership while I've been here. Interim, changing leadership
7. Lack of sustainable of leaderships for many years on both the college and university levels with no unifying goal oriented vision for its future (interim department heads, interim deans, interim past president)*
8. Constant disruption of leadership
9. Leadership in COEHS and VSU is just getting some stability, We have not had stable leadership since 2012, and this has been painful.
10. From a PIE perspective---organizational holism--VSU has had 3 univ. Presidents in 3 yrs---this leads to a sense of less direction within Dept. of Ed. and SW dept;
11. Number of pending retirements

Program quality
1. Sudden removal of special education program for undergraduates
2. Online programs are significantly under-supported.
3. More online programs required
4. Online programs
5. No BSED in special education
6. More programs need to be online to reach a larger audience
7. Candidates leaving still needing stronger classroom management skills
8. We have a weak Department of Elementary Education and we don't have Secondary Education degrees in our department.
9. poor relationships with local school districts
10. very poor community impressions of our elementary (early childhood) programs and our Social Work Programs
11. Early Childhood
12. Early Childhood Dept
13. weak elementary education dept
14. Social Studies class for pre-service teachers
15. inconsistent quality of teacher education programs
16. Consequently our graduates' skills are poor compared to other institutions
17. not enough field experience in programs
18. Teacher Preparation and an inability to teach in multicultural classrooms
19. We need more internship sites for our interpreting students.

Job Demands

1. lack of program control
2. Difficult to teach classes and give the adequate time needed for Practicum.

3. State budgets have been cut since 2007 and there is not much left to cut now. Most of f us who are left, are working at full capacity*
4. Lack of support for thesis and research (faculty load not reduced)
5. Expanding Job Roles without expanding support and accommodation for additional responsibilities.
6. requirement for office hours for faculty who have no on campus students - we are on call 24/7 for office hours - but many (most) of these are off campus
7. Unrealistic expectations of faculty, particularly early-career/junior.

I.   Workload

1. Teaching load may be high if we want to do more research and work with undergraduate thesis
2. Far too heavy work loads which greatly inhibits those who are interested and capable in regards to scholarship
3. Teaching Loads are too high given all the research and field experiences; no equity across departments in course releases*
4. Most faculty are overloaded in teaching and service
5. Work Load
6. High teaching load with few opportunities for course releases
7. Too many service activities for the faculty within our departments & college. If we don't do them, they don't get done and this looks bad for our departments. Takes away from time in scholarly productivity.
8. As the university professor, i like to have more time in conducting research, but everyone is overloaded in teaching and service!
9. Overload of administrative duties on faculty

Opportunities

Strategic Planning

1. Adjust operational services, academic support, academic programs and policies to best meet the needs of the growing adult student population.
2. Be open to the emergent needs of the students and the society for online sections
3. We could, should be the regional hub for educational and human service partnerships. but would need to assure that all of our programs are innovative, truly collaborative relative to our partners, and connected with each other.*
4. We should capitalize on the improved state economic environment and the restoration of full funding for school systems to market education as a desirable career.*
5. Growing need to re-train/educate workforce to close skills-gap
6. Georgia is entering an era of teacher shortages. The number of graduates from teacher education programs at USG institutions is down 20% (2011-2015) and the number of retirements has increased by almost the same amount. Other institutions are eating up most

of the market but VSU could make large gains by massively overhauling its Elementary Ed programs and growing its middle/high school programs.

7. Find ways to make connections with services in community for students to intern in
8. Better collaboration with GA schools for improving graduate outcomes*
9. Need to hire more faculty in departments that show growth in their programs OR who have consistently maintained a strong program
10. The COEHS generates a lot of income for the university with the GOML programs; it is time that we leveraged that income in our favor
11. Become known for caliber of research
12. We could collaborate with our schools and human service agencies to provide the most cutting-edge, impactful programs in the state of Georgia as well as in the nation.
13. With new COEHS leadership, there is an opportunity to identify policies that work, those that don't, and revise as needed
14. The university Strategic Plan is a good opportunity to provide the college with direction
15. VSU strategic plan
16. see the opportunites for COEHS within the VSU strategic plan
17. see the opportunites for COEHS within the VSU strategic plan
18. The Universities new strategic plan could help guide the college level plan. More specifically, it focuses on student success, revising P&T, transformational and experiential opportunities, and regional impact.
19. Incorporating VSU strategic plan to college plan
20. VSU strategic plan
21. VSU Strategic Plan is good
22. Connect COEHS mission and strategy with university's strategic plan
23. A proactive link to the iniversity's strategic plan
24. VSU Strategic Plan and connecting with our mission/plan with this mission statement not integrated
25. Revisit the mission and vision for the college
26. move towards a 21th century vision of a brick and mortar undergraduate institution
27. With a name redacted- position of leadership, articulate a plan fo rimprovement of our core mission
28. Awareness of regional and community needs
29. More graduate representation on the larger campus community.*
30. Time to elevate our programs

I. **Recruitment and Marketing**

2. Untapped market of non-traditional students
3. more money and resources for recruiting*
4. Marketing*
5. Enrollment is at a critical point, so there is a need for recruitment of new students, which provides us with an opportunity to identify and prioritize programs for expansion *
6. Travel for recruitment*
7. Focus more time and resources to opening the door to higher education to our adult learners
8. Promote programs throughout the state and beyond, build awareness of the great programs we have to offer

9. Increasing number of first-generation students who chose to pursue their college education
10. Connect program faculty with the Admission Office to actively recruit students for majors.
11. Market programs to ensure stability and promote growth
12. higher quality of student
13. In-state tuition rates for Florida residents opens the Jacksonville market to VSU. non-teacher prep programs should be marketing their programs like crazy in JAX to grow their programs.
14. The Sullivan Scholars program could be our flagship/signature program--we should lead with this as is it an incredible transformative vehicle of change. In our region every mayor, every town council person, every community leader, every school counselor, every bank president, everyone should know about the program and connect it to VSU.
15. Attracting minority and international students to our programs that value their presence
16. Utilize SOWS mailing lists and contacts to recruit students for other COEHS programs
17. marketing online programs all together and widely; service learning classes (outside of teacher ed) and support - a center would be great
18. increase advertising to highlight all programs marketing online programs all together and widely; service learning classes (outside of teacher ed) and support - a center would be great
19. increase advertising to highlight all programs
20. Advertise ALL (not just some) of the programs available here.
21. Marketing to students
22. Advertise all programs available
23. Promoting more non-education online programs
24. Become known for caliber of teacher
25. Bringing more international students through an enhanced exchange program
26. simplify the advertising/hiring process*
27. Increase visibility of institution to communities that we impact

Curriculum

1. Increased course offerings
2. Increasing levels of student degree offerings and the number of alternative ways of earning college credit, degrees, and certificates (for example, online master degree programs)*
3. Co-teaching; cross listing courses*
4. Co-Teaching Model during clinical practice
5. Clinical Based Model (PDS)
6. cross list courses especially between educational leadership and other school personnel
7. Many opportunities to build connection between undergraduate and graduate education to enhance both such as research teams, *
8. Embed service learning in many classes
9. revenue generating certficates/badges
10. Build consistency in courses (ECSE) to stabilize faculty teaching courses
11. Diversity needs to be addressed...it's absent. No meaningful attempt to have an applied focus.
12. potential to be great UG research experience (in contrast to R1 universities)
13. Increased international programs and student and faculty exchange
14. Partner with organizations/corporations for curriculum improvement and better placement opportunities*

15. develop unique and rigorous programs
16. Faculty willingness to design programs to meet the needs of our students and community
17. This College has opportunities to foster a national presence with its online OAT program which is the only one of its kind at the bachelor degree level.
18. experiential learning (High Impact Practices for student success)
19. International and off-campus study programs (e.g., Study abroad)
20. increase online enrollment by increasing number of online courses
21. Accreditation of programs (programs that are successful-SW, Family therapy, Communication disorders
22. International exchange programs
23. Extensive retirements, especially in high schools, highlight the need to provide certified secondary educators.
24. The social work department-could start a BSW program. We are ready!
25. Venues for faculty to showcase student and faculty work -- have them provide each other PD
26. Need to develop dual enrollment classes
27. rethinking all programs to include open education resoiurces, technology, and meaningful demonstrations of skills
28. We should capitalize on the intellectual capacity of faculty to learn best practices related

I.   Class Size

1. reduce class size
2. Class sizes should be reconsidered.
3. cutting back the number of students in single sections of online graduate courses to 15-20 instead of reduced grad section size so that we are able to provide the individual support and stimulation that our students should be receiving 30+

II.   Online

1. On-line opportunities
2. Online education opportunities
3. Online program development
4. Enhancement of online delivery
5. On-line courses and programs
6. Online opportunities worldwide
7. increase online enrollment by increasing number of online courses
8. could be leader in developing meaningful on-line programs
9. increase quality of online instruction
10. Increased support for online programs

III.   4+1 Programs

1. 4+1 programs for accelerated programs to feed grad programs
2. 4 + 1 at the college level for graduate programs
3. 4+1 programs to feed graduate programs.
4. encourage four plus one program

5. Need for more 4+1 programs
6. 4+1 programs to feed graduate programs.
7. 4 +1 programs that can feed graduate programs and increase recruitment into graduate programs.
8. Need for more 4+1 programs
9. 4+1 programs that create a ladder between out undergraduate programs and our graduate programs
10. 4+1 programs to feed grad programs
11. 4 + 1 programs and other similar programs could help us to keep students around. Other initiatives to entice student retention should be investigated
12. 4 + 1 programs to feed graduate programs
13. 4+1 programs to feed graduate programs
14. 4+1 programs that allow students to easily earn a graduate degree
15. 4+1 programs to feed graduate programs
16. 4+1 programs to feed graduate programs

Outreach

1. Offer ability to work with outside organizations
2. Increased work with the community
3. Support of local agencies
4. Collaboration with schools and community partners
5. Community and public school involvement
6. partner with city agencies more
7. Work with community to share ideas and expertise
8. Possible connections between community and university
9. Better collaboration with local community organizations on meaningful projects
10. Professional Outreach: There are lots of opportunities to impact the region. We have a ton of resources to help the region/community but there is a gap in communication & coordination.
11. involvement in community
12. Service to outside agencies
13. Partner with organizations/corporations for curriculum improvement and better placement opportunities*
14. Partner with DFCS to improve the educational experiences of children in foster care
15. This College has unlimited opportunities to serve adult learners in the state and nation.*
16. Diverse student body that is representative of the community we are embedded in increases the reach of the college in our region. *
17. Improve services for DEAF students in Valdosta combining the resources of Deaf Education, SOWK, MFT, and perhaps other depeartments
18. We could, should be the regional hub for educational and human service partnerships. but would need to assure that all of our programs are innovative, truly collaborative relative to our partners, and connected with each other.*
19. Graduate Program Outreach

20. Mentoring across the board -- faculty mentoring students, college student mentoring in the community…*
21. The opportunity to build a closer, more meaningful relationship with surrounding school districts and agencies of human service is available but not utilized effectively.
22. College of Ed/SW faculty need to work more together on local community/education projects---(i.e., how to help high school students dxed with Conduct Disorders); *
23. Collaboration between graduate program which provide services to the community to partner with the university such as friendly visitors
24. This College has unlimited opportunities to serve adult learners in the state and nation.*

I. Schools

1. More correspondence with local schools.
2. Schools in the area want us to become partners
3. Support school improvement
4. Establish a regional laborabory K-12 school for students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing
5. STEAM center is ready to work with schools
6. Partner with the local schools and communities
7. There is huge capsity to have our education students more involved in teh schools and community. Why are we keeping our best feature--our students--in a box at VSU? Let them out into the community where they can do good and LEARN
8. GEORGIA PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS WITH GEORGIA SCHOOLS, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, OR AGENCIES
9. Cooperation with school districts
10. Local schools need special education teachers. Do not close opportunities for the university until concrete plans are actively in place
11. Local schools need special education teachers. Do not close opportunities for the university until concrete plans are actively in place
12. We live in a poor underserved region, we could be transforming lives all around us with our students and their passion. We need to harness this Teach COEHS classes in schools. Take our student to their campuses.
13. Strong partnerships with schools

II. Service and Experiential Learning

1. Service and experiential learning opportunities.
2. Service and experiential learning
3. Opportunities for service and experiential learning
4. Service or experiential learning
5. Service and experiential learning
6. service learning
7. Many programs can provide experiential or service learning opporunties across the college such as helping about to be teachers what therapy might look like with a family and children
8. experiential learning
9. experiential learning

10. Many programs can provide experiential or service learning opporunties across the college such as helping about to be teachers what therapy might look like with a family and children
11. Increased opportunities for service learning
12. More focus on experiential learning

Resources

1. VSU swag to students
2. A center for service learning that includes non teacher-ed opportunities.
3. Center for Service that includes non-educ programs
4. Technology will always be in demand but our programs use too little of it and often what is used it not leading edge nor even industry standard. The single greatest thing we could do is infuse true innovation into our use of technology-augmented teaching (e.g., using artificial intelligent, analytics, virtual/augment reality, etc)

I. Program Resources

1. Support of LEA's
2. improved resources and services to our distance students
3. support for international programs and study abroad

II. Faculty/Staff

1. Hire more staff
2. more full time faculty to address overwhelming schedules
3. Increased number of advisors
4. Increase Grad Student Employment
5. Improve teaching and learning opportunities
6. be an advocate for non-tenure track faculty in terms of promotion administrative support for advising and other student related needs - faculty spend a great deal of time on this and much could be more efficiently done in a less expensive manner if we had either one faculty member with course release to facilitate this
7. Transformative Educational Opportunities: There are lots of research and teaching professional development opportunities but faculty work load often prevents us from attending. Reducing our job demands would allow us to develop our skill sets.
8. Make President aware how much we do so we get more resources.

III. Funding

1. improve funding
2. Funding for positions
3. grant writing
4. Grant opportunities pay our adjunct faculty more - we currently pay only 30% of what other nearby LIS programs pay for adjuncts - this means we get the least qualified & experienced instead of competing for the best possible adjuncts; many of ours do it for their love of the profession, but some are actually trying to survive on their adjunct salaries and as a result they have to go to other schools that pay more

5.Funding or course releases for program coordinating and program/course development*

6.We should capitalize on the improved state economic environment and the restoration of full funding for school systems to market education as a desirable career.*

7.more money and resources for recruiting*

IV. Travel

1. Travel for recruitment*
2. Funding supports for students who are presenting at conferences
3. Funding supports for students who are presenting at conferences
4. Funding supports for faculty who are presenting at conferences
5. Travel funding from the Graduate School
6. Travel funding via Grad school

V. Development and Training

1. Racial, Gender, Religious diversity training*
2. Professional development
3. Professional Learning
4. Schools need special help - - grant writing? curriculum work? leadership development? How can the COEHS develop a cadre of faculty who can offer these services, and get P&T credit for this work.

VI. Data

1. Data: the university has access to a great wealth of data but little of it is directly accessible to faculty that could use it for strategic planning. Although some data can be requested, it often takes too long or is restricted. I think this is a great weakness as most administrators could use this data to measure growth and to guide future initiatives. Department Heads and Program Coordinators should have automatic reports generated and sent to them at least annually.
2. Make student data (like SOAs and other) more available at program and teacher level; we need to track our students and alumni
3. While the college has lots of good data, there is often a lack of access for the data
4. keep sending out data!
5. More transparency in data sharing (e.g., getting results of student evaluation of advisor).
6. massive data not made available for faculty research
7. Use COEHS data to improve educational programs and the student experience
8. Data we already have being used by faculty for scholarship/accreditation
9. Access to data sharing
10. Online Graduate Admissions. This would greatly help graduate programs to better compete for talent in the graduate applicant talent pool.

Culture

I.   Collaboration

1. Diversity and faculty parnerships
2. Diverse disciplines in COEHS. I'd love to see us collaborate more.
3. increase/build sense of unity across all departments in the COEHS
4. Encourage interactions & collaborations with other departments outside of the COEHS
5. unrealized interdisciplinary collaborations (across depts outside COEHS)
6. More opportunity in teaching and research to collaborate with other faculty across disciplines
7. The inclusion of related fields of study presents an opportunity for collaborative research, teaching, and learning.
8. Building a connection between undergraduate and graduate students, as well as across disciplines / fields of study.
9. Many opportunities to build connection between undergraduate and graduate education to enhance both such as research teams, *
10. Get more involved with other departments
11. collaboration with other departments
12. Collaboration with other VSU colleges and departments
13. If you are not related to education, there is virtually no opportunity for any type of collaboration. The Ed Psych faculty have a lot of opportunity, but not many others.
14. Link more with programs outside of the COEHS (teaching)
15. Encourage interaction with departments outside of COEHS
16. Encourage teaching collaboration across departments outside COEHS
17. Encourage interactions/collaborations with departments outside COEHS
18. Foster more collaborations in both university level teaching and research across disciplines--take advantage of expertise.*
19. College of Ed/SW. faculty need to work more together on research projects and ideas in supportive manner;
20. Build and reinforce community service through different departments
21. We could, should be the regional hub for educational and human service partnerships. but would need to assure that all of our programs are innovative, truly collaborative relative to our partners, and connected with each other.*
22. The clinics -especially the Communications Disorders clinic and Family works, I am in SW and would love to see SW more active in the clinics. I have some ideas! But, no one has asked me lately!
23. Learn what the counseling professions provide and bring to the College of Ed/Human Services.
24. Collaborating across disciplines on research: we don't know what everyone is up to!
25. Encourage interactions with other colleges
26. Encourage interaction/collaborations with other departments outside of COEHS.
27. encourage collaboration with other departments outside our college
28. College of Ed/SW faculty need to share more concerning their knowledge about online tech. and online courses (esp. micro-practice exercises);
29. Better collaboration with GA schools for improving graduate outcomes*

30. Share technical knowledge
31. Advocate across the university for the college and its mission
32. Encourage more interaction with departments outside COEHS.
33. encourage teaching collaboration inside and outside of COEHS
34. Encourage interactions/collaborations across department and across colleges.
35. College of Ed/SW faculty need to work more together on local community/education projects---(i.e., how to help high school students dxed with Conduct Disorders); *

II.   Diversity

1. Racial, Gender, Religious diversity training*
2. Diverse student body: for example this can provide better meeting needs of the community as we will better representive
3. You hear crickets at this university when diversity and inclusion are mentioned. We should maximize this opportunity
4. Create more diversity-oriented opportunities.
5. Diverse student body that is representative of the community we are embedded in increases the reach of the college in our region. *

Faculty and Staff

1. Very capable, intelligent and creative faculty
2. Capitalize on the strengths of current faculty.
3. Motivated faculty that are approaching burnout
4. This College has opportunities to retool with qualified, professional full-time faculty.
5. staffing/personnel changes or strengthening/supporting
6. Faculty mentorsor course releases for program coordinating and program/course development*
7. Funding or course releases for program coordinating and program/course development*
8. decrease teaching load for those active in research
9. Better pathways for teaching versus research
10. Help faculty connect to the community about our research interests
11. Connect faculty interests and expertise with the local community
12. connect faculty and research interests with region
13. connect faculty and research with community
14. Stronger effort to connect COEHS faculty with needs facing surrounding region
15. We have many services, programs etc that would be better advertised to the community to build connection

I.   Promotion and Tenure

1. Revision of P&T document
2. revision of t and p document for those interested in more teaching or more research
3. revision of P & T for research vs. teaching "tracks"
4. Revising P and T document could allow flexibility for faculty that want to emphasize teaching or research

5. Revision of P&T document could allow pathways for faculty to pursue teaching or research-allow "teaching faculty" and "research faculty"
6. Revsion of P& T to allow faculty resources to be effective such as those who want to teach/teach/ service/service/scholarship/scholarship

Policies, Procedure, and Bureaucracy

1. simplify funding request process for large items
2. Less meetings to maximize productivity
3. Re-visit P&T so we have a teaching track and research track--our students will benefit.
4. Revision of P & T document could provide better opportunities for those that want to focus on teach and those who want to focus on research.
5. We have qualified people to hire if the name redacted-position of power would let us!!!
6. simplify the advertising/hiring process*
7. Antiquated policies and procedures could be removed. It is MADNESS that my students cannot return to the school where they went for pre-college education.This rigidity is smothering us.
8. Better/Easier access to advising SOI. Make forms electronic and not antiquated paper/pencil forms.
9. simplify syllabus
10. More accounitbility for faculty/staff, department heads.
11. Ensure equitable workload/class sizes across faculty.
12. more sharing/transparency

Mentor

1. Integrate the university and community with mentoring
2. Integrate the university and community with mentoring
3. develop some mentor programs
4. Create mentoring opportunities
5. Mentoring
6. student Mentoring
7. Mentoring: across faculty & students. Right now there is a not a formal mentorship process. Providing one may enhance faculty and student engagement.
8. Faculty mentorsor course releases for program coordinating and program/course development*
9. training on mentoring for on and off campus ; Connecting us to our 41 county service area - matching our skills with their needs
10. Mentoring across the board -- faculty mentoring students, college student mentoring in the community…*
11. Integrate the University and community with mentoring opportunities.

Misclassified

1. THE ONLY UNIVERSITY IN VALDOSTA
2. need for teachers
3. We have many excellent and hard working students

4. Make a difference
5. Incentives for overextended faculty
6. Incentives for creative and innovative ideas
7. hire someone with an "wide" background that can teach across several discipline to share across departments if we cannot get funding for faculty in certain departments
8. improve technology
9. VSU lobbyists for BOR are ineffective.

Organizational Structure

1. New College of Humanities and Social Services is a great opportunity to move social sciences currently in COEHS to a more properly aligned College.
2. Drop CSDSE from COE
3. Restructuring oportunities to make us more effeicient
4. Problems have existed in ECSE for a very long time. Constant change has hindered moving forward. Opportunity to rebuild department is now.
5. Re-organize the departments in a way that make sense, saves money, and creates synergy
6. Advocate to put psychology in the Social Behavioral Sciences College so our majors can get the support/resources they desperately need to grow.

Leadership
1. Upper administration is more aware of problems that exist
2. stability of leadership with new permanent name redacted-position of leadership
3. name redacted-position of leadership
4. New leadership in COEHS and my department
5. awesome that name redacted-position of leadership is starting to email out data to faculty about increases and decreases in enrollment by program and department. This was all private before

Threats

Resources

1. Lack of resources and faculty to fulfill the programmatic missions of the college
2. No mentor process for faculty
3. We are encouraged to meet shortages of faculty by hiring adjuncts who are poorly paid and not invested in our mission or program
4. There needs to be more institutional support and opportunities for faculty professional development (both monetary and programmatic support)
5. College is behind on technology when it comes to online application and admissions process. This potentially hinders recruitment efforts.
6. Taking baby steps in technology integration and online instruction instead of taking massive leaps or, worse yet, not changing at all

I. Funding

1. Budget constraints
2. Budget constraints
3. Budget Constraints
4. Budget Issues
5. Budget / staffing / summer funding
6. budget
7. Budget
8. Budget
9. Reduced funding
10. funding reductions
11. Escalating costs
12. Funding is static or declining
13. ignoring/starving growing programs*
14. Limited resources
15. Removing resources for the possibilities of graduate assistantships threatens the college's ability to function and opportunities for recruitment.

A. Graduate Assistant

1. cutting Graduate Assistantships
2. Graduate assistantship funding.
3. Lack of GA funding
4. Loss of GA funding
5. Loss of funding for graduate assistants
6. cut in funding for graduate assistants
7. graduate assistantships losing money
8. Little funding for graduate assistantships, which limits graduate recruitment
9. loss of funding for graduate assistant ships which are essential for the COEHS, Departments, programs to function as we have lost other resources, and impact recruitment to out of state students and diverse students who could not have an education without these funding

B. Positions and Hiring

1. not providing enough faculty at the grad level
2. Funding for additional faculty
3. Budget - faculty lines
4. Budget - Staffing
5. Budget and staffing
6. faculty/staff lines/budget
7. We lose faculty lines due to the university not funding the needed programs who are growing even though they are needed*

8. Lack of funding to replace vacated faculty lines
9. The workload is too high for the low pay and we need more FT faculty*
10. salary compression so we lose quality mid career people
11. A lack of incentive for tenured and promoted faculty to go beyond everyday duties
12. Faculty and staff hiring
13. Not enough FULL TIME faculty to run the programs sufficiently
14. Limited number of full time faculty positions
15. We're beginning to see a trend where we have more part-time faculty than full-time
16. adjuncts - leaving for other places due to low pay
17. over-reliance on adjuncts
18. Lack of faculty incentives
19. Inability to hire highly qualified faculty
20. Other institutions more attractive to minority professors
21. Faculty lines/staffing.
22. faculty lines
23. Too few faculty lines
24. Need for more faculty lines
25. faculty/staff lines/budget
26. Limited faculty lines
27. no human services administrators at college level
28. We are asked to recruit students and are not given faculty to teach those students

C. *Faculty and Staff Salary*

1. Pay for part-time faculty
2. imporving faculty salaries to keep people around
3. Faculty salaries inequitable and non-competitive*
4. Faculty salaries inequitable and noncompetative*
5. Faculty salaries
6. Faculty salaries
7. Faculty salary are inequitable across colleges and non-competitive*
8. Faculty salaries inequitable and non-competitive*
9. Faculty salaries inequitable and noncompetative*
10. Inequitable faculty salaries (non-competitive)*
11. COEHS faculty salaries are inequitable and noncompetitive*
12. salary compression so we lose quality mid career people

II.   Reports and Data

1. Not be allowed access to resources or data that we need to be successful
2. Program reports don't appear to be utilized in a meaningful way by COEHS
3. Reports created not utilized in a meaningful way
4. Reports created are not utilized in a meaningful way

Policies, Procedures, and Bureaucracy

1. No electronic documentation which elimanates paper forms which create inefficiencies across the campus, to faculty, to administrators
2. A lack of electronic forms (e.g., graduation application)
3. Outdated application process for prospective students.
4. too much documenting for the sake of documenting
5. Lots of paperwork-- much of which seems meaningless
6. Employees do not properly deduct annual leave
7. Lack of administrative support from Academic Affairs and President's office
8. internal inconsistencies
9. no faculty P & T credit for accreditation work (writing self studies, etc. maintenance of accreditation standards)
10. he needs of Human Services departments are simply different from those of departments involved in teaching, yet teaching requirements are preferred in P & T, poor integration across COE and Human Services. After all these years, I'm not sure integration is possible, but I think little effort has been made by administration. Human services just not a part of the teaching education program goals. *
11. we are rule bound.

I. Graduate School

1. In the past 5 or 6 years the Graduate School disaster has already taken a serious toll on programs and our ability to grow and thrive. Countless hours are spent trying to repair the damage they do.
2. slowness of the Graduate School with processing applications
3. Outdated graduate school application
4. Graduate application process and application itself
5. need to modernize graduate school application process to keep with all the other schools
6. Graduate school procedures need to go online and eliminate paper
7. antiquated graduate school application process
8. Grad school app process is antiquated and paper-based
9. Grad school app process is antiquated and paper-based
10. Graduate application process
11. Old school grad application process and limited GA monies/positions

II. Procedural Justice

1. Inequity of faculty responsibilities. Budget, faculty lines, workload, unsupported accreditation process for non ed programs.
2. How GOML money is no longer accessible by GOML programs
3. How GOML money is used in the college

A. Monetary Inequities

1. COEHS faculty don't make as much as other colleges or at least that is the perception
2. inequitable compensation
3. Faculty salary are inequitable across colleges and non-competitive*
4. inequity of salaries within and outside departments
5. Faculty salaries are inequitable in that newly hired faculty are offered more than tenured faculty are receiving
6. COEHS doesn't get resources proportional to the contributions that COEHS makes to university

B. Workload

1. Workload and task distribution for faculty is not equitable.
2. Workload not equitable
3. Workloads seem uneven across departments.*
4. Faculty workload, not equitable workload*
5. Faculty salaries at COEHS are low compared to other colleges
6. Inequitable faculty salaries (non-competitive)*
7. Faculty salary inequity across colleges
8. Ensuring equitable workload across faculty
9. Inconsistent workload (some faculty required to teach more than others, with no pay differential)

Culture

1. A large number of faculty members discriminate against minorities staff and students, and nothing is done. *
2. Lack of diversity
3. Many faculty bring their children to work in Social Work and this is very distracting.
4. Name Redacted- accusation of diversity intolerance Non COEHS leadership

I. Climate

1. divisiveness
2. an organizational culture based on fear and extreme individualism ;
3. Lack of respect for graduate progams
4. lack of respect for human services program
5. students/society that does not value teaching as a profession
6. Psychology is not recognized as STEM and it is. Reference APA and APS arguments.

7. Dishonesty among a few personnel, and we are unable to get at this through T&P and the chain of command. Because positions are so valuable and scarce, when we have people not working in the interest of VSU, this really shows and slows us down.
8. Faculty morale in psychology is really low as we feel ostracized, not important. Outside of School Counseling and Ed Psych, we don't belong. Look at how other universities house psychology.
9. Millennial mentality causing pressure to lower standards

II. Communication

1. Lack of a communications with faculty and staff
2. Lack of communication
3. Communication is poor. The dissemination of information is not good.
4. More open communication between program and stakeholders

III. Collaboration

1. Lack of communicative effectiveness
2. There is lack of clear and open communication leaving the impression as if we are working against one another at times
3. Weak inter-college connections
4. Lack of connections with other colleges on campus
5. No enough connection within college to support students
6. Some departments have very weak connections to the COEHS.
7. Weak inter-college connections
8. College seems to be isolated from other colleges in the university
9. weak/poor relationships with other colleges
10. Weak intercollege connections
11. Other colleges around college have stronger networking relationships with other colleges and community organizations
12. Partnerships in "name" only, where faculty go in as "experts" and do not understand the collaborative, shared, unpretentious nature of true partnerships.

IV. Complacency

1. Keep doing what we're doing ... stale teaching methods and frequent out-of-date content permeate too much of what students receive in their courses. We have a false sense of quality in our programs and these blinders are stifling what needs to be done to ensure our long term success: bringing about real innovation in teaching and learning.
2. faculty who are not currently able to demonstrate (in collaborative ways) innovative applications that they talk about in their classes. They talk the talk, but cannot walk the walk.
3. Unknown willingness of the COEHS faculty to do something different, particularly if it

4. Many faculty have stopped dreaming of possibilities. We need hope. We need to see that creativity is rewarded

5. We must be careful that all faculty in the COEHS have consistent contact and work with those entities for which we are preparing professionals. It should not be possible for faculty to continue to work without participation in current real-world contexts.

V. Awareness and Consideration

1. Lack of administrative awareness
2. Lack of admin awareness for dept faculty contributions
3. Lack of administation awareness for department/faculty contributions
4. Lack of administrator awareness of college/dept contributions
5. make sure university administration is aware of contribution of the COE in terms of FTE and student enrollment
6. ignoring/starving growing programs*

Strategic Plan

1. potential retirements -- succession plan
2. Lack of emphasis serving non-traditional student populations
3. enrollment
4. We lose low enrolled programs
5. On line classes, only foucs
6. We don't need to continue business as usual in the online world. Many of our courses are nowapproaching being 10 years old. Though revisions have been made, we need to take a long hard look at what is there in light of what is current best practice. Faculty will need time and support in this process. We need to be "futuring."*
7. Global Shifts in educational attitudes and trends. As the cost of education raises and more competition enters the market. Keeping & Attracting students to VSU will become increasingly difficult without a lot more support. We must adapt! A strong strategic plan and acquiring a bigger budget would help us greatly.*
8. VSU Strategic plan...better start being proactive.
9. no vision
10. Without a clear direction it is impossible to do the hard work of "trimming" unnecessary or unsuccessful, or low-quality programs.
11. COEHS not aligned with the larger university/BOR/Strategic Plan
12. consistent leadership and mission*
13. We may inquire students every
14. Our rigidity has alienated many school administrators and teachers. It is clear to them that our accreditation standards are more important to us than educating future teachers. We make it hard for them to help us and our students. Eliminating the Special Ed program communicated our concern about this marginalized and underserved population. Our values are suspect to many regional educators.

15. Not considering college as part of the community

I. Recruitment

1. Location: Attracting and retaining folks often requires a receptive environment. Although VSU is a nice place to work. I know several faculty, staff, and students that leave solely due to having to live in Valdosta. Maybe there are some ways that we can endorse making Valdosta a bit more conducive to long term relocation.
2. Too much emphasis on attracting a limited population of freshmen from the high school ranks
3. More needs to be done to recruit and retain the student population*
4. Opportunities to recruit bachelors students early into Master's programs
5. Lack of diverse student recruitment
6. Lack of diverse student and faculty recruitment
7. Lack of diverse faculty recruitment
8. Resistance to bringing in people outside of VSU. History of "in-breeding" regarding administration and hiring.
9. academic inbreeding; too many faculty/admin with VSU degrees
10. Removing resources for the possibilities of graduate assistantchips threatens the college's ability to function and opportunities for recruitment.
11. lack of clear goals -- real goals -- not to lofty one written for reports

II. Retention

1. Decreasing interest in Higher Ed
2. More needs to be done to recruit and retain the student population
3. Student enrollment
4. Oher colleges have gotten the message that we need to focus on retention
5. Student retention
6. Location: Attracting and retaining folks often requires a receptive environment. Although VSU is a nice place to work. I know several faculty, staff, and students that leave solely due to having to live in Valdosta. Maybe there are some ways that we can endorse making Valdosta a bit more conducive to long term relocation.*

Competition

1. Outside competitive programs
2. Competition from other universities
3. Other schools attracting students
4. Other institutions
5. other competitors for our potential applicants/ students
6. Increased competition for students
7. COMPETITION FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
8. Other institutions' programs more attractive to prospective students than ours

9. other institutions offering the same programs
10. other universities offering better early college and online college opportunities
11. Online Programs
12. Online programs
13. other rival university programs across the state
14. Proprietary schools (especially online) that provide an easier graduate degree
15. Technical college competition
16. Growing interest in technical education being diverted to technical colleges when we have opportunities in our own College
17. Competition from 2-year colleges
18. more attractive to minority students
19. I always have advisees come to me for "Transient Permission Form" requesting my permission for them to take online courses in GA Military College or the other institutions who offer many online courses in Areas A,B, G, C, D,E and F. In my department, EVERY SEMESTER, FOUR faculty travel a long way to participate the OPEN HOUSE to recruit students, but we lose students for not offering online sections for the students.
20. Global Shifts in educational attitudes and trends. As the cost of education raises and more competition enters the market. Keeping & Attracting students to VSU will become increasingly difficult without a lot more support. We must adapt! A strong strategic plan and acquiring a bigger budget would help us greatly.*
21. P-12 school administrators will continue to look to other USG institutions for their new teachers; eventually our programs and college will wither to the point where the BOR is forced to merge VSU with another institution
22. In my area (social work) there are now more SW programs than ever offering the BSW and MSW, and online SW programs.
23. Finite University Resources: We are in direct competition with other colleges for a relatively small amount of resources. Budget related issues are manifested in several different ways within the college and university (e.g., faculty lines, faculty salary, GA funding, and support staff lines)*

Job Demands

1. Faculty workload
2. Faculty workload
3. Faculty workload, not equitable workload*
4. Workload
5. Workload
6. Workload
7. High workload
8. Workload not always balanced
9. Administrative workload
10. Increased workload for faculty
11. workload that makes impossible greater participation in the wider universityamount of required service
12. Workload balance within departments: incentivise faculty for additional work.

13. poor incentives to balance/ensure equitable workload across faculty and depts
14. Workload leads to burnout and lack of incentive to do further do activities Workload
15. faculty burnout
16. faculty burnout
17. workload fatigue -- doing more with less is getting old
18. Unsupported accreditation: extra work with no pay, no course releases, no acknowledgement of extra work.*
19. reports for accreditation not recognized for the monumental effort and time they take
20. Report writing is expected but workload isn't balanced
21. Faculty are required to dedicate too much time to non-instructional endeavors associated with programs (e.g., program reporting -- IEPs, ERPs; aggregating and writing up accreditation reports; processing students' Applications for Graduation; reviewing transcripts and raising advising flags for registration; etc). The end result is that course curricula are stagnating and instructional quality is declining.
22. Faculty stress
23. faculty - low pay and high administrative and teaching expectations. Research is something to be done on spare time since we all teach 12 months.*

External Threats

1. Escalating costs
2. VSU is in an economically weak area. Lots of poverty and businesses are closing.
3. tuition - if it goes up, our student enrollment will drop
4. not being able to teach classes face to face on the Valdosta campus due to additional fees for students
5. Decline in higher ed preparation
6. Clinical mental health grad program GONE due to CACREP.
7. Trump-like actions
8. Trump actions
9. Trupmish actions
10. Regional & Statewide Influence: Some other universities have more clout and persuasive capabilities (e.g., lobbying) than VSU when it comes to attracting investments and influencing education policies and procedures. We need to do a better job getting folks to invest in VSU including policy makers
11. State government and UGS directives that do not take our concerns into account
12. GA online prgram development*
13. GA DOE/PSC rules that negatively impact education and the teaching profession
14. GaPSC regulations
15. governance
16. Politicians' perception of Colleges of Education
17. VSU lobbying
18. VSU lobbying could be more effective.
19. more effective lobbying for VSU

20. Lobbying ineffective

Leadership

1. Lack of support from leadership-specific position redacted- Non COEHS leadership
2. Questionable autonomy of the position redacted to make real changes as desired, due to perceived levels of micromanagement by the university administration
3. Not allowing the position redacted to make decisions that impact hiring of qualified faculty, funding, etc
4. The university administration does not seem to value ALL of the programs in the COEHS (e.g., online graduate programs)
5. support of administration
6. Attrition of college leaders and experts
7. consistent leadership and mission*
8. constant change in leadership
9. Unstable leadership continues to wreak havoc.
10. In the last three years---the three different VSU presidents seems related to a lack of grassroots VSU empowerment;
11. COEHS & VSU did not have stable leadership from 2012-2017.
12. As above--in my three years at VSU--(& on other U.S. campuses), I perceived a continued increase in neoliberal top-down managerial style--that has an anti-intellectual aspect to it);

Curriculum

1. putting doctoral programs completely online, lowers the quality of the doctoral experience
2. Lack of clinical/mental health track at the masters level
3. Lack of a clinical mental health counseling program
4. lack of a Clinical Mental Health Counseling track
5. Lack of clinical mental health track limits student recruitment efforts
6. No clinical mental health track
7. Lack of online offerings
8. We need to be careful not to minimize our offerings; i.e. if we need to be more efficient, we could be more flexible within broad offerings.
9. We don't need to continue business as usual in the online world. Many of our courses are now approaching being 10 years old. Though revisions have been made, we need to take a long hard look at what is there in light of what is current best practice. Faculty will need time and support in this process. We need to be "futuring."
10. having to increase our class size which can decrease quality and our strengths of this university
11. Poor international program support/notice.
12. Weak mentor teachers in K-12 setting

Accreditation

1. Unsupported accreditation processes
2. unsupported accreditation processes
3. Unsupported accreditation processes could hinder program's success
4. Unsupported accreditation Unsupported accreditation: extra work with no pay, no course releases, no acknowledgement of extra work.*
5. Unsupported accreditation - no faculty return*
6. unsupported accreditation
7. Unsupported accreditation processes
8. rising accreditation expectations, costs, bullshit
9. accreditation makes programs inflexible, immutable
10. Accreditation policies & procedures: To maintain accreditation from external accrediting bodies, VSU has to invest a lot of faculty and staff resources. Not only does this strain the resources of VSU but, in some cases, we have lost programs due to accreditation requirements.
11. Accreditation seems to dominate common sense. Not all of these regukla
12. Unclear expectations of accrediting agencies

High Turnover
1. Risk of losing faculty and staff
2. Keeping qualified faculty
3. Keeping quality faculty at the university
4. Loss of key admin and faculty
5. Losing faculty over lack of clarity regarding promotion process
6. established faculty leaving because new faculty are hired at the same or higher beginning salaries
7. Unsupported accreditation - no faculty return*
8. losing faculty due to overload and burnout
9. We lose good faculty becasue they cannot keep being abused by the university

Reputation/Perception

1. COEHS has a very bad reputation with the rest of the campus
2. Negative perceptions
3. Media Portrayal: VSU and Valdosta has received some bad press in the past. Even worse, we are sometimes not considered at all in the conversation of education in South Georgia. We need to make a better and bigger impression.
4. student view of organization
5. Putting students in student teaching roles in the local schools who are of poor quality makes the college look bad

Structure
1. unthoughtful departmental organization
2. wide range of services under one college - assimilation

3. Alienation of psychology and non-ed programs. Granted, several departments/programs don't fit...square peg being forced into a round hole for no apparent reason.
4. the needs of Human Services departments are simply different from those of departments involved in teaching, yet teaching requirements are preferred in P & T, poor integration across COE and Human Services. After all these years, I'm not sure integration is possible, but I think little effort has been made by administration. Human services just not a part of the teaching education program goals.

Misclassification
1. Student need for employment
2. quantity vs quality