This document has three parts:
  Part I: Process
  Part II: Overall Impressions
  Part II: Syntheses of Survey Responses

**PART I: PROCESS**
Units (departments and schools) were asked to engage in a collaborative strategic planning exercise based on a simple SWOT survey (of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). The survey also asked people to respond to the following three questions.

1. Do you have input about the College structure (particularly as that input relates to the prior merger of the College) that the Taskforce and the Dean should take into consideration as we move forward?
2. Do you have ideas for innovations or changes the College could implement to help position Humanities and the Arts well as we move forward?
3. Do you have anything else to add?

The Transition Taskforce then held a series of lengthy meetings to discuss and analyze all responses to the survey (from units and from individuals) to create an overarching synthesis of data gleaned from the strategic planning exercise. Note that even though a link to an open-input anonymous text-based response system to comment on the College's strategic planning process was provided during the survey period, no responses were received. The survey, however, had a 100% response rate from the units in the College and a 25% response rate from individuals (faculty and staff).

The synthesis is based on discussions about the unit- and individually-submitted surveys distributed to all faculty and staff in the College. Once complete, the synthesis served as the basis for the Taskforce’s extensive discussions about College values, mission, and goals, all of which constitute important elements of the College strategic plan.

**PART II: OVERALL IMPRESSIONS**
1) **FACULTY AND STAFF COMMITMENT TO SJSU AND THE COLLEGE**
   a) Faculty and staff in the College energetically are committed to and believe in the mission and the students of SJSU yet a streak of demoralization runs through the responses.
   b) Faculty and staff expressed a backlog of feeling frustrated and beleaguered, but overall there is optimism.
2) **WORKLOAD CONCERNS**
   a) Faculty and staff feel they are doing more than ever before and still hanging in there and hoping for conditions to improve while continuing to serve our students.
   b) Lack of tenure-track and tenured faculty density has increased service workload for permanent faculty.
   c) Advising workload has grown due to bureaucratic pressures and push to get students to graduate sooner.
   d) Staff has shrunk and not been replenished since the budget crisis hit in 2009.
   e) Lack of support for research and creative activities hampers faculty members’ ability to be successful in the RTP process and to be active and informed members of the profession.
f) Lack of staff support for continuing training and education similarly diminishes staff members’ ability to be effective and up to date in their skills and knowledge.

3) **FRUSTRATION ABOUT RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY**
   a) Many responses reflect that we are asked to do more with less and that we lack the resources to keep current, have adequate facilities, and perform our jobs well.
   b) Lack of permanent (tenured and tenure-track) faculty is a significant source of frustration and a reality that concretely threatens leadership pipeline and health of programs.
   c) Some people and programs expressed concern about resource distribution, including, but not limited to: space, money, and tenure-track lines.

4) **DESIRE TO IMPROVE PUBLIC RELATIONS, OUTREACH, AND PUBLICITY**
   a) Many responses emphasize the need for a marketing strategy for SJSU and our College, particularly in the face of an administration focused on STEM.
   b) In the College, we need to step up to highlight our programs and articulate the importance of humanities and the arts (i.e., need to emphasize to students how our majors connect to jobs and concrete outcomes).
   c) Faculty and staff understand that we need to raise funds but are not sure how to successfully engage with development. Specifically, responses acknowledge that all of us should engage in all aspects of fundraising and learn to “friend raise” and not just ask for money when we need something.
   d) Overall, many people in the Humanities and the Arts are concerned about our lack of ability to resonate with the current focus (in society and at SJSU) on STEM and are worried that SJSU is becoming too much of a “vocational” or “technical” school.

5) **ADMINISTRATIVE INSTABILITY**
   a) The revolving door and resultant changing priorities and policies at the upper administrative level have been detrimental to the campus (e.g., decision to take Santa Clara County students only; decision to limit graduate admissions).
   b) Similarly, CSU changing mandates (e.g., unit-caps) have created pressures and require new responses seemingly on a continual basis.
   c) In sum, changing mandates have created extra work and burdened faculty and staff.

6) **TECHNOLOGY:** To a large extent, online teaching and the emerging emphasis on technology are seen as a threat.
   a) This concern extends to intellectual property, educational quality, and a perceived disjuncture between what we think we should and can be doing and what we are being asked to do.
   b) Faculty find it questionable whether we have adequate infrastructure to deliver on what the administration wants us to do.
   c) Concern about the budget worries driving the decisions to take teaching online and extent to which we are sacrificing quality.
   d) Some people view online teaching and emerging technologies as an opportunity. This sentiment also is expressed across the College.

7) **SHARED GOVERNANCE AND CONSULTATION**
   a) Many responses expressed concern and frustration about the past restructure of the college and lack of consultation.
   b) Some people in the affected areas felt that the autonomy they gained was positive. Yet many still perceive inequities that resulted from the restructure, including resources, support staff, and space.
   c) Staff in the performing arts units specifically expressed support for the collaborative possibilities that came out of the merger/restructure.

**PART III: Syntheses of Survey Responses**
A. ART & ART HISTORY

1) STRENGTHS
   a) Strong faculty and staff who operate collegially and are proud of that;
   b) Strong BA and MA programs. At BA level, curricular alignment and updating have been done and faculty are excited about this new curriculum;
   c) Pride in the facilities, including galleries and fabrication spaces;
   d) Pride in the history of the programs.

2) WEAKNESSES
   a) Facilities need an upgrade;
   b) Lack of marketing strategy.

3) OPPORTUNITIES
   a) Curricular innovation is an opportunity;
   b) Recruitment and marketing offer great possibility;
   c) Facilities can offer possibility to engage with community partners (e.g., certificate);
   d) Naming opportunities;
   e) More opportunities to do public art projects.

4) THREATS
   a) Perception of redundant curricula (A/I);
   b) Lack of consultation regarding the former merger;
   c) Retirements;
   d) Facilities need an upgrade;
   e) Funding cuts;
   f) Emphasis on online teaching.

B. DESIGN

1) STRENGTHS
   a) Strong programs;
   b) Strong community connections;
   c) Fundraising tradition is strong;
   d) International and local points of connectivity and strength;
   e) High demand programs (industrial and graphic in particular).

2) WEAKNESSES
   a) No self-identified weaknesses.
   b) Externally identified weakness: graduation rates need improvement.

3) OPPORTUNITIES
   a) Significant international opportunities (e.g., South Korea project)
   b) Possibility of expanding opportunities in Silicon Valley

4) THREATS
   a) Concern about the SSETF and resource distribution;
   b) Lack of space in the ART building is a threat that hampers the programs in Design;
   c) Lack of equitable distribution of resources as a result of the merger.

C. ENGLISH
1) **STRENGTHS**
   a) Strong composition, creative writing, and BA/MA/MFA, and teacher preparation programs, including steady numbers of majors;
   b) Steinbeck Center + San Jose Area Writing Project;
   c) Engaged, good faculty open to digital pedagogies and digital humanities.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) Advising needs to be strengthened;
   b) Lack tenure-track and tenured faculty to participate in shared governance and act in leadership positions and advise;
   c) Lack of smart classrooms;
   d) Disjointedness of the Basic Writing and Composition Coordinators (e.g., LLD and English both teach these classes; need for a “long-range plan” to cope with this perceived disjointedness).

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
   a) Digital pedagogies (e.g., essential to stay engaged in digital initiatives where appropriate);
   b) Technical Writing;
   c) Certificate programs;
   d) Collaboration with other programs;
   e) Creation of college-based advising center(s);
   f) Fundraising opportunities;
   g) Global education initiatives.

4) **THREATS**
   a) Digital pedagogies (a threat if we do not stay engaged);
   b) Lack of tenure-line faculty threatens health of programs and leadership pipeline;
   c) Inadequate facilities (e.g., office space and not enough classrooms and smart classrooms).

**D. HUMANITIES**

1) **STRENGTHS**
   a) Strong faculty and staff, including long term adjunct faculty;
   b) Humanities Honors well-respected program;
   c) Interdisciplinarity at the core of the department;
   d) Strong teacher preparation program in Liberal Studies
   e) Strong and diverse curricula in GE and majors;
   f) Some online, high-quality courses;
   g) Strong community outreach and presence in the community;
   h) Impressive level of cohesion and collegiality in a group of interdisciplinary scholars and teachers.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) Lack of tenure density;
   b) Fundraising;
   c) Difficulty in articulating the value of majors in the department to potential students (and possibly to articulate the career paths to potential students);
   d) Faculty stretched too thin due to so many service commitments.

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
a) Capitalize on American Studies and Western Cultures interest to do online classes for international people abroad;
b) Develop STEM partnerships that capitalize on interdisciplinarity of department;
c) Collaborative opportunities with other units and programs;
d) General interest public events as a possibility.

4) THREATS
   a) University’s trend toward online teaching and data-driven decisions lead “away from social-personal aspects of education such as face-to-face learning, classroom contact, and teacher-mentor relationships”;
   b) Lack of university support for humanities and misapprehension of what humanities is all about in our culture in general;
   c) Lack of tenure density leads to tremendous workloads (e.g., assessment, service, etc.);
   d) Difficulty in staffing Humanities Honors courses in particular due to lack of tenure-track and tenured faculty and lack of funding to reimburse units when they let faculty teach in Honors.

E. Linguistics and Language Development
1) STRENGTHS
   a) Strong and big graduate programs with large alumni base
   b) Large number of international students
   c) Diverse students and faculty
   d) Department is small so everyone can talk
   e) Certificate program (computational linguistics)
   f) Large number of graduates who go on to MA and PhD
   g) Language Development Center
   h) High school students participate in the International Linguistics Olympiad (outreach)
   i) Graduation rate is less than five years for native starters in the major (note

2) WEAKNESSES
   a) Department has not had new hires for a long time (tenure-track); this has all the consequences we understand to be common in college (such as high service loads; top-heavy faculty; difficulty in populating committees);
   b) Alumni are not rich so fundraising base is not robust;
   c) Lack of administrative support (one full-time person);
   d) Advising load is high;
   e) Need to have sufficient number of students in each class restricts the horizon of interdisciplinarity (e.g., students cannot take more than one class outside the department).

3) OPPORTUNITIES
   a) Organized research unit (Center for Human Language Technology) has potential to connect with industry;
   b) Large GE classes;
   c) Global / international collaborations;
   d) STRETCH program;
   e) Possible online MA in TESOL could be offered;
   f) Database in developmental writing could be created;
   g) Examine possibility of creating A/I separate department.

4) THREATS
   a) CERF funding sweep threatens stability of budget;
b) University’s “market” and “popularity” based approach is a threat;  
c) Large sections of classes are threats to graduation rates, especially for underprepared and under-resourced students according to faculty members’ opinions of these classes;  
d) F&A / indirect rates perceived as high;  
e) Enrollment management;  
f) Recent GE attempted reform to change English 1B into Area C.1 was done in LLDs view without appropriate consultation;  
g) Data-driven decision making.

F. MUSIC and DANCE  
1) STRENGTHS  
   a) Strong community relations with global profile;  
   b) High quality education is good value for the money;  
   c) Beethoven Center;  
   d) Experienced and well-respected faculty as well as strong alumni and emeriti base;  
   e) Nationally accredited, diverse programs;  
   f) Robust recruitment programs.

2) WEAKNESSES  
   a) Lack of tenure-track faculty lines (i.e., have not replaced retired faculty);  
   b) Lack of instructional spaces;  
   c) Insufficient scholarships.

3) OPPORTUNITIES  
   a) Creation of a performing arts center and programming to bolster profile (annual concert series, community music institute, visiting artists);  
   b) Fundraising (endowed professorships; endowed series; etc.);  
   c) Creation of Master of Music degree as possibility (similar to MA but has more performance);  
   d) Enhance relations with local community groups and schools;  
   e) Music and Dance values collaboration;  
   f) Possibly we could establish a College of the Arts but it didn’t work this time.

4) THREATS  
   a) Lack of upper-level administrative understanding of how performing arts are taught;  
   b) Changing administrative policies on campus and in CSU (e.g., student unit caps and restriction of admissions to Santa Clara County only a few years ago);  
   c) FD&O chargebacks are a significant threat;  
   d) Lack of donations;  
   e) Image of SJSU as not a highly selective or desirable school;  
   f) Enrollment policies vis-a-vis bursar’s drops, add/drop dates, and other policies that discourage students from enrolling in and staying in classes.  
   g) Concern about past lack of consultation in the College continues to affect the School and creates anxiety about how decisions will be made in the future.

G. PHILOSOPHY  
1) STRENGTHS  
   a) Strong, up to date curriculum;  
   b) Well-published, strong faculty;  
   c) Collegial faculty;
d) Fiscally solid department with strong GE offerings;
e) Outreach program to elementary school students;
f) Center for Comparative Philosophy and Center for Ethics.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) Fewer majors and graduate students than we would like;
b) Fewer tenure-track and tenured faculty than we would like.

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
   a) Enhance outreach (Philosophy in the Schools; Center for Ethics; prison and retirement home teaching; cyber security);
b) Possibility for cluster and collaborative teaching with many across college;
c) We have highly talented artists and scholars who could be highlighted for fundraising efforts.

4) **THREATS**
   a) Lots of faculty nearing retirement age and concern about lack of replacement of those lines when people retire;
b) Lack of external understanding about what we do and who we are as philosophers, particularly as the focus on STEM continues to grow.
c) Concern about SJSU becoming a “vocational or technical” school.

H. TRFT/AI [NOTE: A response was submitted from TRFT; a separate response was submitted by RTVF; and one faculty member submitted independently.]

**TRFT RESPONSE:**

1) **TRFT STRENGTHS**
   a) Diversity of disciplines;
b) Strong trade and professional relationships in the area;
c) Strong community and alumni connections;
d) Faculty and staff highly skilled;
e) Some areas of shared value in diverse programs, specifically narrative and storytelling;
f) Strong technology infrastructure to support production.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) History of disagreement and conflict;
b) Lack of consensus (e.g., resource battles; some people concerned about resources going to production over “studies/scholarship”; some concerned about “silos’ed” curriculum);
c) Lack of consistent leadership and long-term planning;
d) Low enrollments.

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
   a) Collaboration with other performance oriented programs;
b) Opportunity to move to a project-based curriculum;
c) Online teaching;
d) Fundraising and institutional partnerships;
e) Enhance recruitment of majors;
f) Revitalize graduate program (in Theatre Arts).

4) **THREATS**
a) Lack of tenure-track faculty hires and attrition of faculty, particularly in Theatre Arts (number of people approaching retirement age is of concern);
b) Aging infrastructure;
c) Lack of film showing venue is a major challenge for film;
d) Enrollment management concerns (minimum of 15 and the inability to balance larger classes against very small classes);
e) “Micro-management” and concern that faculty always have to justify what we do.

**RTVF RESPONSE**

1) **STRENGTHS**
   a) Curricular overhaul has been effective;
   b) High FTES;
   c) Solid graduation rate;
   d) Stable program leadership;
   e) KSJS;
   f) Television production studio;
   g) Spartan Films Studio;
   h) Strength of staff; and strength of faculty and staff collaboration;
   i) Faculty teach throughout the curriculum;
   j) Students can move back and forth between programs in department;
   k) Accomplished, active faculty.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) Lack of audio faculty member;
   b) Lack of resource distribution to non-production faculty perceived as weakness;
   c) Curriculum watered-down in some ways because program emphasizes breadth over depth;
   d) Lack of consensus about important issues such as curriculum and internal governance and extent to which curriculum should be combined with Theatre Arts is a destabilizing factor for RTVF in some areas (e.g., some in department want to combine RTVF classes with TA; RTVF feels that personal issues and agendas should not dictate curricular decisions and should not impede collaboration);
   e) Production is expensive;
   f) Relatively weak fundraising history that could be a lot stronger;
   g) Expectation that program needs to serve students and not be a conservatory is a source of disagreement in the department.

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
   a) Special sessions classes;
   b) Opportunity to build on the synergies that exist between Theatre Arts and RTVF (the synergy exists within production but not necessarily within scholarship, particularly in terms of curriculum);
   c) Seek a hire for the audio portion of the curriculum and production;
   d) Enhance fundraising efforts;
   e) Produce film and radio for money;
   f) Certificates;
   g) Continued and enhanced collaboration;
   h) Online teaching.

4) **THREATS**
a) We have to explain ourselves (e.g., lack of understanding sometimes that production classes require different kinds of scheduling);
b) Unstable budget environment;
c) Concern about merged situation (e.g., we don’t want to be merged with Animation/Illustration);
d) Theatre Arts issues need to be addressed to resolved to address financial and curricular concerns so RTVF is not adversely affected going forward.

**ANIMATION AND ILLUSTRATION RESPONSE**

1) **STRENGTHS**
   a) High rankings of the program at national level;
   b) Well-placed graduates in industry;
   c) Much student interest;
   d) Strong, highly professional, collegial faculty.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
   a) None stated. [Note: Taskforce moved the stated weaknesses to threats because they were external to the program. No internal weaknesses stated.]

3) **OPPORTUNITIES**
   a) Numerous opportunities to build on existing relationships in the industry and on opportunities in education, including CSU Entertainment Industry Initiative as an example;
   b) Fundraising / potential to attract outside support;
   c) Could find opportunities to increase enrollments in the program.

4) **THREATS**
   a) Limits placed on Animation/Illustration admissions;
   b) Lack of consultation (e.g., space, admissions, resource allocation);
   c) Lack of support and representation from and within the College;
   d) Concern about university mishandling outside partnerships since a prior partnership was mishandled;
   e) Concern about outcome of restructure decision in 2013 given program’s discontent with prior merger situation (specifically, concern about lack of staffing and numerous other areas of support for program);
   f) The program views the Dean’s Office staff as inadequate and hostile and requests a review of them.

I. **STAFF FROM MUSIC, DANCE, TRFT/AI [14 staff members participated in this response]**

1) **STRENGTHS**
   a) Staff present year-round;
   b) Staff well qualified to respond to needs in the college (including equipment, technology, students, faculty issues);
   c) Staff in College often take on lead roles in addressing issues and solving problems;
   d) First to be called when there is a need to be addressed;
   e) Incredibly resourceful, well-educated, hard-working, and creative staff;
   f) Camaraderie among staff.

2) **WEAKNESSES**
3) OPPORTUNITIES
   a) Collaboration: Support for the continued merger from staff perspective because of ability to more robustly and effectively serve students and collaborate on behalf of student and faculty needs; also provides opportunities for collaboration and cross training among staff;
   b) Current structure that resulted from the merger created possibility for synergy and expertise and sharing of resources; building on this model is an opportunity;
   c) Enhance opportunities for student interns and assistants to build skills (e.g., build on the marketing team and web development model created by Music and Dance);
   d) Continue to create environment in which staff are supported and valued.

4) THREATS
   a) Lack of sufficient staff leads to high workloads for everyone;
   b) FD&O charges threaten ability of units to serve students and the community;
   c) Lack of support for continuing education of staff;
   d) Staff pay structure inadequate in College;
   e) Lack of centralized performing arts space perceived as a challenge because it impedes collaboration;
   f) Staff feel worried that further separation of units and programs would undermine the possibilities for collaboration and also the ability of the College to highlight and support the arts;
   g) Lack of respect towards staff on the part of some faculty;
   h) Lack of consistent policies impedes ability to be effective at times, particularly when deadlines are tight and turnaround is fast;
   i) Lack downtime to regroup and revitalize;
   j) Concern about undoing the collaborative work that has been built in the merger environment if we “unmerge.”

J. WORLD LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
1) STRENGTHS
   a) Diversity of faculty and students, including collaborative relations with other programs;
   b) Global focus, including study abroad;
   c) Strong donor and foundation ties, including availability of student scholarships;
   d) Engaged faculty (on national and state levels as well as at SJSU);
   e) Curricular strengths include strong MA program in Spanish and Latin American Studies;
   f) History of online courses and ability to offer tailored classes (e.g., variable unit online and in person classes);
   g) Language lab;
   h) Strong sense of community among faculty and students.

2) WEAKNESSES
   a) Not enough students study abroad;
   b) Limited number of courses;
   c) Low enrollments in some majors;
   d) Faculty stretched thin.

3) OPPORTUNITIES
   a) Enhance recruitment and fundraising efforts;
b) Rising demand for translation and interpretation;
c) Build relationships and partnerships with other units and institutions;
d) Build relationships with Consulates and explore Cervantes Institute Spanish testing;
e) Change language classes to four units as a possible opportunity to attract more students;
f) Make lower division languages GE;
g) Examine AP exam assessment at department level.

4) **THREATS**
   a) Faculty approaching retirement and concern about lack of replacement of tenure-track lines;
b) GE patterns do not necessarily encourage students to take language;
c) Attack of the humanities and arts as a core function of the university;
d) Student demographics (including financial challenges) make it difficult some times for students to learn effectively;
e) Lack of incentives for faculty to enhance and improve teaching and curriculum;
f) Rapid change of technology destabilizes teaching environment and makes it hard for people to adapt quickly enough;
g) Statistical invisibility of double majors.
h) Enrollment management (specifically 15 unit minima) makes it difficult for some programs to hit minimum numbers.

K) **INDIVIDUAL SURVEYS**
The Transition Taskforce read and discussed all individual surveys in addition to discussing the unit-based surveys (above). The overall impression was that the individual surveys did not add anything in terms of the larger categories captured in unit-based responses related to strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. However, the individual surveys provided a level of detail and depth that the unit-based surveys did not. As such, the individual surveys provided an opportunity for taskforce members to more fully understand concerns of individuals in the College and to have examples to point to when discussing those concerns. More than the unit-based surveys, the individual responses articulated frustrating with the perception of a prior lack of consultation and, similarly, gratitude and support for a process that is more transparent and consultative. It should be noted that eight of the surveys contained exactly the same cut and paste responses related to support (or, more specifically, lack thereof) of the Animation/Illustration program. Overall, the individual surveys provided the Taskforce with the ability to find numerous examples for each of the larger ideas, frustrations, and points of pride mentioned in the unit-based responses.