



CHAPTER 3: TALENT

Attract, Develop and Retain Quality, Diverse, Full- and Part-Time Faculty

“The life force of any college is its faculty and the learning that they inspire in their students. Learning is the result of the synergy of teacher and learner, a symbiosis grounded in intellectual inquiry and research, critique and assessment, assertion and reflection, working alone and working in a community of creative professionals. Learning to persist and learning to ask better questions.

Learning how to think independently and learning to master a discipline.

Faculty are the “talent” in this process. They are the ones who invite and encourage students to challenge themselves. MIAD was founded by faculty who, after the close of the Layton School of Art, re-grouped to continue offering an art and design education in Milwaukee. When the college was facing financial crisis in the early 1990’s, it was the faculty who stood firm and held the college together. MIAD faculty are committed to the MIAD mission, to MIAD’s students, and to learning: they are the “talent” that drives student success.”

Ethos

The college values and supports effective teaching in many ways. As explained in the Preface history, faculty devoted to the development of artists and designers founded the college. These founders valued teaching above all other faculty responsibilities. As MIAD has matured, that “ethos” has continued. Recently, one of the founding Fine Arts faculty members received the first Jane Shaw Knox Chair of Drawing, created by the Board of Trustees to recognize the service and philanthropic support of two long-time board members. The Chair honors artistic and teaching excellence. And, as another sign of the college’s maturity and continued respect for teaching, the college awarded its first two Faculty Emeritus awards in 2009.

Valuing and Encouraging Ongoing Faculty Dialogue (3a, 3b)

The most obvious characteristic of MIAD as a teaching institution is the collegial climate. New faculty observe teaching being discussed in the classroom and out – in halls, in stairwells and in faculty meetings. A passion for teaching defines the environment.

Because of the great value that faculty place on teaching, the process of discussing curriculum, as well as curricular integrity, are held in high regard. At the fall 2009 faculty orientation workshop/in-service, faculty identified the academic program review process as their most effective governance process. Curricular development begins with faculty; faculty plays a critical role in monitoring delivery, quality and the development of new curricular proposals.

The most recent example of how faculty influence the curriculum can be viewed through the current college-wide discussion on revising and reinventing the school’s curriculum as a whole. The process began in the fall of 2007 when faculty and key academic support staff met for a “Curriculum Jam” in which educators identified the strengths and needs that would lead to an ideal curriculum. The fall 2009 faculty orientation/in-service solicited specific goals and characteristics for a new curricular approach, focusing initially on the experience of first and second-year students. These ideas were passed on to the new faculty chairs, who would lead continuing discussions for significant curricular

improvement. The chairs have identified some exciting educational innovations that could be implemented as early as fall 2010. These changes will be introduced in several phases, and will aim for the creation of a seamless academic environment that prepares students to achieve 21st century learning outcomes. One example is the creation of a first-year freshman seminar. As discussion of student's learning needs has widened, faculty are becoming increasingly supportive of a first-semester course that integrates student learning and experiences and prepares them to be successful in the ensuing 3 ½ years.

One enlightening feature of the academic year has been the senior thesis “talkback” session, an important component of the writing capstone experience. After seniors completed their written “theses,” or final comprehensive writings, copies were distributed to faculty and staff who completed assessment and response forms. Afterwards, readers gathered for a highly informative roundtable discussion to share observations about their students as learners. As noted above, a faculty “curriculum jam” session in fall 2007 engaged faculty in thinking about the ideal state of their curriculum. In both examples, faculty demonstrate their willingness to think broadly and deeply about curriculum and student learning.

These discussions helped the faculty push beyond the more constricted, discipline-specific deliberations by departments to create more broad-based discussions about assessment and college-wide learning outcomes. Similarly, faculty participated in a review of how to connect students' first- and second-year as one contiguous experience. Faculty identified over 40 creative possibilities and 30 specific ideas to help engage students' energy and interest through the two-year period. The results of this discussion are part of planning as the college moves forward with the “Freshman-Sophomore” initiative. (*Notes from faculty workshops: **Resource Room – Cpt.3 #1.***)

The 2009 workshop gave faculty time to participate in thoughtful, creative dialogue about MIAD students' needs. It was also significant for continuing the discussion of the question identified two years earlier in the curriculum jam: “Who is the holistic student? How do we understand the needs

of each student holistically and address them as a united faculty?” “What becomes possible if we rethink the structure of our students’ learning experience?”

Valuing The Critical Studio Dialogue: Critiques and Feedback (3b)

Critique is the definitive aspect – the heart and soul – of any studio-based education. Critique brings together the experienced artist and designer with those who are seeking to learn through applied practice and application of skill and method, problem solving and conceptualization. Critique is the collective discussion wherein students can learn from each other and the developmental process through which they can internalize, over several years, the critical acumen necessary to become successful independent creators.

Critiques are largely dialogic events at a particular moment in time. In the past, the college made the assumption that because professional artists, designers and educators conducted the critiques, they were conducted well. When the college reviewed results from the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), faculty were surprised that students noted concerns about critiques. Two of the academic areas in which faculty rated the lowest in the students’ perceptions were concerns related to “fair and unbiased ... treatment of individual students” and “timely feedback about student progress in a course.” Given that a studio-based education steeped in critique should ostensibly offer students *frequent* feedback that is fair and unbiased, the college was taken aback by these perceptions. To gain more insight and to better understand the students’ perceptions and academic concerns, the Provost and others met with focus groups comprising 60 students who participated in the SSI. The concerns expressed at these meetings were collected and shared with students and faculty.

In fall 2008, one senior faculty member volunteered to conduct a yearlong inquiry into critique at the college. He met with students representing all four years of study and listened to their concerns, questions and recommendations. He shared his observations with the President and Provost, who held several planning sessions to explore how the college might foster a wider dialogue. A working group of five full-time faculty members was formed to foster a deeper understanding of critique, and to learn how it might be done better. Some of the questions that the working group considers include:

- *What do we want critique to be?*
- *How do we interact with students during the critique process?*
- Ask students: *“Why do we critique? Why is critique so important in your learning?”*
- *What is the work trying to say?*

It is crucial for students and faculty to master the critique process. Using questions to engage students in a process of inquiry, both during a particular critique and throughout four years, helps students internalize the process of thinking and asking questions, not just providing answers. This type of inquiry is the heart of critique. (*Notes from MIAD’s Study of Critique: **Resource Room – Cpt.3 #2.***)

Several steps have been taken regarding increasing faculty feedback. First, beginning in spring 2009, midterm grades at all levels are now mandatory (formerly, only freshmen received midterm grades). Second, faculty have been encouraged to explicitly frame discussions about feedback with students as “feedback” to counteract the discovery that millennial students do not recognize critique sessions or conferences as “feedback.” Third, Communication Design, Illustration, Writing and Art History faculty, in particular, have taken steps toward using rubrics so that students see additional evidence of feedback beyond written or oral commentary. By calling attention to these activities, and keeping students well-informed, faculty can improve student understanding of the opportunities for feedback and MIAD’s desire to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Support for Innovative Teaching: Embracing Technology

A studio-based education requires substantial physical space. However, the implementation of courses that blend face-to-face exchange with digital and Web 2.0 technologies is growing. Faculty members are exploring creative approaches in teaching, including team teaching, teaching outside their discipline, developing new courses and teaching “hybrid” or blended courses. Faculty increasingly invite colleagues from other disciplines to participate in lectures, discussions, presentations, and critiques.

IMPACT OF TITLE III STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS GRANT (2B, 3B, 3C)

In 2002, the college received a five-year Title III Strengthening Institutions Grant from the U.S. Department of Education to fund Instructional Technology for Student Success. (*Title III documents: Resource Room – Cpt.3 #3*) The grant was awarded to position the college with the infrastructure, personnel, hardware and training to offer undergraduate- and graduate-level digital media degrees. The grant was adapted two years later to expedite a shift to digital photography and, among other goals, position faculty throughout the college to use digital technology to deliver curricula.

Major benefits of this grant were MIAD's ability to equip all full-time faculty with 15-inch MacBook Pro laptop computers and to provide extensive training; in fall 2008, faculty received a replacement laptop. The original laptops were then refurbished and disseminated to part-time faculty. In the upcoming years, plans for rotating and refreshing faculty laptops will be included in the college's operating budget. As laptop learning emerges, faculty will need to adjust to how students think differently because of their exposure to digital tools and media. The college has recognized the need to adapt to the digital learning that is revolutionizing higher education.

TECHNOLOGY PLANNING AND THE LAPTOP LEARNING INITIATIVE (3C, 3D)

For the last decade, the college has provided student desktop labs to support the design curriculum, but the limitations of a lab model have become increasingly apparent. Computers are expensive to lease and labs cannot serve all students. To address students' growing digital learning needs and the increasing limitations of fixed labs, a Laptop Learning Initiative was formed in spring 2008 as part of the college's strategic planning process. The initiative brought together IT staff with faculty in the college's first wide-ranging discussion about digital needs that centered on learning, rather than technology. An aggressive technology plan was crafted such that by fall 2008, Communication Design juniors participated in a pilot study using school-furnished laptops for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Rather than being confined to the labs, these students “nested” in mobile teams and worked together in spaces throughout the college. Because the students could work together more readily, one design faculty member created integrated, interdisciplinary and team-oriented assignments to foster the students’ use of their laptops. Student-owned laptops will continue to be introduced institution-wide over three years, resulting in all students owning laptops by fall 2011 and having digital learning with all its pedagogic possibilities available 24/7.

USING TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE TEACHING (3B, 3C, 3D)

Because Institutional Technology is housed in Academic Affairs, its vision is focused primarily on improving teaching and learning. The departmental mission statement is, “Dedicated to providing a variety of technology solutions to the MIAD community.” Their motto, prominently displayed over the IT help desk is, “*Train * Engage * Support.*” The IT team was instrumental in leading the process for the Laptop Learning Initiative. The staff supports meeting the needs of faculty to strengthen their pedagogical base. MIAD’s IT trainer works closely with faculty, as well as staff, to provide both one-on-one support and workshops to develop technology skills and the use of digital technology in the classroom.

Recent examples of improving teaching effectiveness through technology include:

a.) *Employing a course management system in all classes.* The open-source digital course management system, MOODLE, has been adopted across the curriculum. This technology provides students with digital access to standardized course documents, such as course syllabi and calendar, institutional policies and major assignments. Instructors are encouraged to add additional resource documents (such as library guides, web links, and information sheets) and use Web 2.0 teaching tools such as asynchronous discussion forums, links, images, videos, blogs and e-portfolios to further supplement the course.

b.) *Creating “hybrid” courses.* Digital technology is changing student learning and course delivery and increasingly defines how our students come to the college as learners. Like most colleges, courses that blend traditional classroom/studio (face-to-face) meeting with digital and Web

2.0 technologies are expanding. To ensure that hybrid or “blended” courses meet academic standards, the college has developed a hybrid course policy to guide faculty offering this type of blended instruction. Since 2008, several advanced-level writing courses have been run as hybrids, and a variety of studio courses have been including blended learning practices in their course experiences. Faculty report that student contributions in threaded discussions, posting content, and sustaining additional questions and discussion are increasing. It is clear that faculty will create additional blended learning opportunities for their students in the future. (*Hybrid Course Policy:*

Resource Room – Cpt.3 #4.)

c.) *Embracing new digital image technology in the classroom.* In summer 2008, IT and Library staff worked with faculty to create a repository of digital images for the AH213 History of Modern Design class using MDID (Madison Digital Image Database). This pilot project explored how a faculty member could use MDID software to access the images, create a “slide show,” and present it in class. Using MDID rather than PowerPoint gave faculty a more dynamic teaching tool – one that allows creation of side-by-side image comparisons at any point during the presentation and “zooming” into an image to highlight relevant details. Staff also created two groups of images for students to access via MOODLE as a study tool and for mid-term and final exams. The faculty reported positive student response to use of MDID technology. (*Report on the MDID Pilot Project: Resource Room – Cpt.2 #8.)*

d.) *Bringing Web 2.0 technologies into the classroom.* The “e-portfolio” is an online technology expected to soon become a critical part of major- and discipline-learning outcome assessment plans. At the college’s most recent faculty orientation workshop, faculty identified implementing e-portfolios for all students as a way of ensuring that all students are engaged, and to integrate the students’ learning experiences across the years.

e.) *Adobe Connect.* The college’s investment in Adobe Acrobat Connect Pro provided the first step towards the delivery of online courses and webinars. The software allows the learning community to communicate and collaborate through easy-to-use, easy-to-access online personal meeting rooms,

screen sharing, whiteboard, chat, polling, breakout groups, video and audio conferencing. Faculty and students can teach, learn, and collaborate from any distance, at any time, with integrated technology that's easy to use and access. Classes and webinars can be taught live or recorded and rebroadcast.

Professional Development for Faculty (3d, 4a)

Professional development of faculty has remained a high funding priority since the last accreditation visit by the Higher Learning Commission and NASAD. (*SEE Faculty Professional Development Policy: Resource Room – Cpt.3 #5.*) The college has funded and maintained consistent sabbatical leaves, even during challenging financial times, allocating at least two per year. Faculty can apply for a full-year sabbatical at 80% of their salary, or a one-semester sabbatical at 100% of their salary.

Below is a summary of recent faculty sabbatical leaves:

FACULTY	DIVISION	DATE of SABBATICAL
Jan Feldhausen	Foundations	Spring 2010
Paul Caster	Fine Arts	Spring 2010
Barbara McLaughlin	Liberal Studies	2009-2010 Academic Year
Michael Howard	Fine Arts	2008-2009 Academic Year
Al Balinsky	Fine Arts	2008-2009 Academic Year
Polly Ewens-Caster	Fine Arts	Fall 2008
Christiane Grauert	Design	2007-2008 Academic Year
Rina Yoon	Fine Arts	2007-2008 Academic Year
Chris Beetow	Design	Spring 2007
Jill Sebastian	Fine Arts	2006-2007 Academic Year
Leslie Fedorchuk	Liberal Studies	2005-2006 Academic Year

Faculty members are also eligible to apply for annual professional development grants. At the program's inception, grants were competitive and awarded by a committee comprising faculty and deans. Subsequently, a two-part system was created in which all faculty could access a stipend up to \$500 for purchase of materials, supplies and equipment, in addition to funding more traditional professional development. Remaining monies were made available for competitive grant requests to be selected by a faculty committee. This system proved flawed in that faculty who wanted to fund significant projects, such as participating in international design conferences, international exhibitions

and artist's panels, and for attending writing conferences, etc., found that available funds had been usurped by small purchases.

The college's existing professional development policy was homegrown. After research was conducted on "best practices" at other colleges in summer 2009, the VPAA created a revised policy that was more closely aligned with the college's need to support faculty's professional development. The changes that were implemented in professional development for the calendar year 2009-10 marked a dramatic shift in the way that funding was going to be issued.

At the beginning of the fall 2009 semester the faculty thinking regarding these changes was divided and unclear. Concerns included: defining the differences between "Professional Development" and "Faculty Development" (both terms had been utilized in the past), "losing" the automatic \$500 stipend, outlining the Professional Development funding cycle, and defining the method of appointing members of the Professional Development Committee. As the semester got underway, the Faculty Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, Professional Development Committee, and the VPAA addressed these concerns to alleviate the uncertainty of the faculty. One of the most important aspects was that the majority of the faculty were interested in reinstating a competitive process for Professional Development that could ultimately benefit the faculty, allowing for more generous funding.

In December 2009 the new Faculty Professional Development Grant process was followed. Four faculty served on the Professional Development Committee, as they had in the past. This year, following the revised policy and procedures, 10 of 17 proposals were funded. The decision-making process went extremely well. The purposes for which grants will be used range from attendance at conferences, training and workshops, support for travel to Beijing to deliver a paper at an international conference, purchase of specialized computer hardware, and funding for creating an exhibition. Total cost for these awards was approximately \$14,000.

The college must continue to find new ways to reward effective teaching and to nurture professional growth. Without question, the funds available to professional development, which have

stayed essentially the same for the last ten years (roughly \$17,000 for 33-36 full-time faculty), need to increase. Supporting effective teaching by providing more resources and supporting research on learning will continue to be a priority.

To promote faculty and staff achievements, faculty and staff acknowledgements are widely and effectively communicated through the college's publications, web and Web 2.0 platforms and the electronic communication system under the direction of the Director of Communications. Widespread media coverage of the college's activities and personalities has occurred. Faculty, students and programs have received coverage in local and regional newspapers, on radio and television, and professional accomplishments have been distributed electronically and posted on the website.

Professional Advancement of Faculty (3b, 3d)

At the beginning of each semester, Academic Affairs organizes faculty in-service/workshops to foster teaching effectiveness. Recent workshops have focused on critiques, digital learning and teaching, integrated learning, assignments that engage first-year students, and making the freshman/sophomore years a single contiguous experience. These workshops have been highly interactive and have activated wide-range thinking and discussions. They have also been planned to bring together faculty from different academic areas.

At the fall 2009 faculty orientation workshop/in-service, one of the strongest themes was a request by part-time faculty for increased support and communication. This is something that the new faculty chairs addressed immediately. Potential areas of impact include creating a network of communication, offering teaching and pedagogical support and opportunities to share their experiences, creating a peer evaluation system, and creating a series of critique workshops and cross-critiques.

The spring 2010 faculty orientation/in-service focused on college-wide assessment, teaching innovations, and continuing the discussion of the first and second year student experience. In the past three years, and since the adoption of a new institutional mission, these faculty orientations have

shifted from simply “downloading” new college procedures to engaging faculty in thoughtful discussions towards improvement in student learning.

Valuing Faculty: Evaluation, Qualifications, and Rank (2b, 3b)

Teaching is the primary criterion for faculty annual performance reviews. In the faculty self-reports, faculty assess their teaching performance from the previous year. Faculty members reflect both on their students’ performance as well as on their own, focusing especially on new assignments, strategies and revised techniques. These reflections are important for faculty growth and development, especially when they are combined with the student evaluations of faculty preparation and teaching effectiveness. The Vice President of Academic Affairs reviews these self-assessments and student evaluations. Until the recent implementation of the new leadership model, faculty evaluation was conducted largely by the division dean or Faculty Coordinator. Currently, until a Director of Assessment and Faculty Evaluation is hired, faculty evaluation is conducted by the VPAA. Such evaluation is rooted in dialogue and a summary of faculty annual self-reports and periodic student evaluations. Dialogue generally focuses on teaching improvement and development. The faculty evaluation process is outlined in the Faculty Handbook. (**Appendix #6.**)

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS (2B, 3B)

Full-time faculty is selected through a rigorous search process that requires candidates to possess a terminal degree in their discipline or a record of commensurate professional experience. *(A list of full-time faculty, including year hired, department, highest degree earned, and current course schedule can be found in **Appendix #7**; NASAD Faculty Record Reports are available in the **Resource Room – Cpt.3 #6.**)* After advertising, posting positions in appropriate national and professional journals and publications, and seeking nominations, faculty search committees review the dossiers of highly ranked candidates. Campus visits are conducted for the most promising candidates. The college requires all finalists to teach a class session with the search committee members present. Students are queried about the candidate’s performance and their responses are

included in the evaluation process. The college has high teaching expectations of its faculty candidates, and has had great success hiring faculty who demonstrate a commitment to good teaching.

It is expected that MIAD faculty participate in a wide range of professional organizations relevant to their academic disciplines, including:

- *Industrial Designers Society of America (IDSA), International Housewares Association*
- *American Institute of Architects, American Association of Interior Designers*
- *American Institute of Graphic Arts, Southern Graphic Print Council, Mid-America Print Council*
- *Professional Photographers of America, Photo Council (Milwaukee Art Museum)*
- *Public Art Network (Americans for the Arts), Public Art Dialogue (C.A.A.)*
- *C.A.S.T. Coalition of Active Sculptors Teaching*
- *Milwaukee Artist Resource Network (MARN)*
- *College Art Association, Modern Language Association*
- *Society of Architectural Historians, Victorian Society of America*
- *Foundations in Art: Theory & Education (FATE), Adult Higher Education Alliance*

FACULTY HIRES

Over the last ten years, the college has hired ten full-time faculty members. Seven of these have been replacements for faculty who have retired or left the college. One of the ten is African-American and one is Hispanic. With each search for full-time positions, the college seeks qualified minority candidates and strives to achieve a diverse pool of candidates.

Recently, in response to increasing enrollments, the college has hired several qualified full-time interim faculty to meet increased teaching requirements in Science, Writing, Communication Design and Interior Architecture + Design. Interim faculty are selected from part-time faculty members who have excelled in the studio or classroom or, in the case of Animation or Communication Design, bring difficult to find expertise and commensurate experience. The college recognizes that it needs to hire full-time faculty in several areas: The most immediate needs are in Industrial Design, Communication Design, Interior Architecture + Design, Foundations, Animation and Liberal Studies.

FACULTY RANK AND COMPENSATION PLAN (2B, 3B)

At the request of the faculty, in 2007 the President met with the Faculty Senate committee to discuss the development of a faculty rank and compensation plan. Over the course of the next two years, a task force studied the issue in depth and major changes were approved.

The faculty and administration first identified those institutions with which, because of their quality and similarity of mission and purpose, MIAD wished to be compared. They then examined their funding sources (public or private), the size of their endowments and their fundraising methods. From this review, nine colleges were chosen for further study in the areas of overall planning and recruitment, as well as for comparison of faculty salaries. Analyzing faculty salary ranges by rank at those institutions led to the creation for the first time of a competitive full-time faculty compensation schedule for MIAD. Implementation of the plan will be tied to achieving enrollment benchmarks, with full implementation occurring with achievement of a 1,000-student enrollment.

The next step (fall 2009) was to adjust the faculty salaries to create equity. A cursory review of salaries revealed some inconsistencies in levels of faculty compensation. A comprehensive review of faculty qualifications and accomplishments was deemed the best approach to creating equity. The Faculty Senate has asked all faculty to provide background information that is being reviewed by the Rank Evaluation Committee to assure that faculty are placed in their appropriate rank. In spring 2010, equity adjustments will be made as the first priority for faculty compensation.

FACULTY RANK PROCESS (2B, 3B)

At the time of hire, faculty are ranked according to their academic and professional preparation, their record of exhibition, scholarship and professional work, and professional service. Subsequently, faculty create professional development plans to guide them through the rank promotion plan (see **Faculty Handbook, Appendix #6**). Once faculty attains the rank of Full Professor, they draft continuous performance plans spanning three to five years, which currently result in stipends rather than promotions or salary increases. Developed in the mid-1990's, the

ranking structure provided faculty with titles appropriate to academic professionals, but the salary structure has, over time, constricted and created inequities. The college is addressing these issues with faculty salary inequities being addressed first, followed by increasing the overall salary schedule.

PART-TIME FACULTY (2B, 3B)

Acknowledging the important contribution that part-time faculty make to the college, salary adjustments and a part-time faculty ranking system with criteria similar to that used for full-time faculty are being studied. Because there were obvious inequities in part-time faculty compensation, in spring 2008 the lowest level of per-class, part-time compensation was increased by 20%, from \$2,500 to \$3,000. New compensation levels have been established. A recent WAICU (Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities) survey reveals that MIAD is now among the leaders of Wisconsin's independent colleges in its pay scale for part-time/adjunct faculty. A process similar to the full-time faculty review began in fall 2009 to create short- and long-range goals. When completed, part-time faculty will be placed in their appropriate rank and compensated accordingly, also beginning with equity adjustments. *(For a list of part-time faculty, year of hire, department, and current course schedule see **Appendix #7.**)*

ACADEMIC PLAN

To address how budgeting for and meeting academic needs and priorities will unfold in the future, the college is currently creating an academic plan. A draft outline for this purposeful planning process suggests consideration of the following elements:

- The college's assessment plan;
- The strengths and weaknesses of the overall full and part-time faculty in relation to the curricular needs of the college. The examination leads to the establishment of criteria for all faculty hires;

- In particular, the guidelines and processes for the assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness and professional accomplishments. The overall goal is faculty excellence, to be supported with appropriate recognition and compensation;
- The ability of faculty to meet or exceed their students' expectations;
- The number of full and part-time faculty necessary to meet the academic goals of the college as well as the related duties in their departments, student advising, planning, etc.;
- Recruitment and retention of nationally recognized preeminent faculty;
- New programs and changes in existing programs to address the ever changing nature of art and design education and societal needs;
- Sufficient financial support for the academic programs of the college to fulfill their goals;
- Short term and long term facility and equipment needs;
- Determine the overall long-range enrollment and the distribution of enrollment in each of the academic units;
- Manage the efficiency of class enrollment levels in relation to the academic goals and the college's budget;
- Create annual and long range budgets to meet the academic goals in relation to the college's budget;
- Define staff needs necessary to achieve the program and enrollment goals;
- Incorporate co-curricular activities, residence living with the academic programs (such as visiting artists, lectures, galleries and exhibitions);
- Update and refine the Faculty Handbook to reflect current practices;
- Promote the campus as a community.