

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Minutes, January 20, 2011

Senate

Members: R. Berls, R. Bowen, G. Ettari, V. Frank, E. Gant, G. Kormanik, B. Larson, T. Meigs, S. Mills, K. Moorhead, L. Nelms, K. Reynolds, L. Russell, B. Schaffer, M. Sidelnick, S. Subramaniam; J. Fernandes.

Excused: G. Boudreaux, G Nallan.

Visitors: G. Ashburn, S. Capone, P. Catterfeld, L. Friedenberg, C. Galatioto, E. Katz, J. Konz, K. Krumpe, L. Langrall, M.L. Manns, P. McClellan, R. Nelson, R. Pente, C. Riley, A. Shope.

**I. Call to Order and Announcements**

Dr. Frank called the meeting to order 3:17 pm and welcomed senators and guests.

**II. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of December 2, 2010 were approved with editorial corrections.

**III. Executive Committee (EC) Report**

Dr. Volker Frank reported for the Executive Committee.

**Campus Master Planning Process**

Dr. Frank welcomed Rob Nelson, a recently retired UNC-GA VP for Finance, who will be the initial consultant on our campus master planning process. He is also a proud father of a former UNC Asheville student. Two colleagues, Gregg Kormanik and Dee Eggers, have agreed to serve as our faculty representatives on the campus master plan working group.

Mr. Nelson gave an overview on the campus master planning process. The purpose of the plan is to make sure our facilities match our vision for the future and help us reach our strategic planning goals. The planning process will take 18-24 months of work by campus constituents, landscape architects and planners. At this point, we have identified a campus working group and steering committee. The working group will identify all possible alternatives and the steering committee will serve as a governing body. The two groups will have a joint meeting next Tuesday.

Mr. Nelson noted that there will be a focus on the use of space and that our utilization is quite good compared to the UNC system average. The planning process will include a review of national space standards and the development of UNC Asheville standards. The master planning process will address the following elements: academics, housing, recreation, parking, aesthetics and architectural character of campus, safety, information technology to include wireless networking and on-line learning, and the financial feasibility of the facilities plan.

**Steering Committee:**

- Jim Buckner, Chair of UNC Asheville Board of Trustees
- Sue McClinton, Trustee
- Anne Ponder, Chancellor
- John Pierce, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations
- Keith Krumpe, Dean of natural Sciences
- Christine Riley, Chief of Staff
- Rob Nelson, consultant and facilitator

**Working Group:**

- Rob Nelson, consultant, chair of Working Group

- Don Gordon, Director of Design and Construction
- Melissa Acker, Landscape Architect
- Eric Boyce, Director of Public safety and Chief of Police
- Kimberly Newsome, AVC for Student Affairs
- Dee Eggers, Gregg Kormanik – Appointed by Faculty Senate
- Students – TBA
- Community member – Max Queen, Dir of Admin & Risk Management, AB Tech

### **Discussion**

- Dr. Reynolds asked what land surrounding the campus has been identified as not being used for academic purposes.
  - Mr. Nelson mentioned the Rhoades property on the corner of Merrimon Ave and W. T. Weaver Blvd and noted that we have to be strategic and listen to our neighbors who live close to us.
- Dr. Reynolds supported the sustainability of the Rhoades property that is used by the Departments of Biology and Environmental Studies for classes. Dr. Eggers is on the committee and Dean Krumpe is also well aware of some of the use that Biology and Environmental Science make of the land surrounding the campus for academic purposes.
- Dr. Larson asked what documents will be drawn upon in developing this plan.
  - Mr. Nelson said we will try to use existing documents where we can. There is no need to spend money on information we do not need. He is open to suggestions, has promised to keep communication open, and will set up a website so questions may be submitted.

N.B. Some of the wording of this report is taken from the minutes of the UPC meeting.

### **Search for Director of Institutional Effectiveness**

The Executive Committee (EC) was part of a search process for the Institutional Effectiveness director. One of our interests in meeting with the candidates was to point out that faculty are an integral part of any effectiveness vision. In this way faculty can look forward to and can count on a fruitful relationship with the person in this position. A decision has been made, but it has not been announced campus-wide.

Dr. Fernandes said the university has hired Dr. Jessica Dunsmore as our Institutional Effectiveness Director. She will start on February 15, coming from Tennessee Wesleyan College in Athens, TN. Dr. Dunsmore has experience as an off-site reviewer for SACS and has been asked to give expert assistance to colleges and universities about their SACS reporting – that will be a tremendous immediate help to us. Dr. Frank said Dr. Dunsmore has a proven track record and he believes she will be a good fit.

### **Search for Executive Director of Development**

As Senate chair, Dr. Frank was invited to search for a new Executive Director of Development. The search committee has narrowed the search to five candidates.

Dean Krumpe said the Chancellor has determined that this position is a critical for the university. The search process will occur quickly: phone interviews will be held next week and candidates will be brought to campus the following week with the goal of having someone identified by mid-February.

### **Meeting with Chancellor**

The EC met with the Chancellor and Provost earlier this week to discuss the budget. A lot of the information was repeated today at the all-campus meeting. Nothing concrete was mentioned in terms of anything being in jeopardy, rather it was a sharing of the sense of urgency and uncertainty that big decisions may loom in the future and we will prepare as best as we can. The Chancellor also made an appeal for cooperation. Obviously, the more information we have, the better we can cooperate. It is important, and he believes the Chancellor understands, that we be informed. Ms. Nelms said the Chancellor also urged that all the faculty work on building a strong sense of community and to be especially sensitive to those among us who are the least secure.

### **Meeting the Deans and Provost re: summer school**

Earlier Dr. Fernandes had informed the EC about plans for summer school which the EC expressed a concern about. The plan was put on hold and the EC met with the Deans, Provost and Pat McClellan and had

a fruitful meeting. Faculty has since received the plans for summer school. Dr. Frank said he has not received a single comment in the Senate mailbox on this issue so he assumes that faculty finds the plan to be acceptable. The mailbox is available at: [Senate@unca.edu](mailto:Senate@unca.edu)

Dr. Frank thanked Dr. Fernandes and Ms. McClellan for taking the EC's concerns seriously and for revisiting the plan. Major changes were not made, but the EC concerns that summer school not be detached from the bigger process of curriculum revision was specifically agreed upon.

#### **Diversity Action Council (DAC)**

Some Senators were able to attend the Diversity Action Council meeting in December. It was a good meeting and we need to continue to meet and collaborate on the important issue of diversity.

#### **Board of Trustees meeting**

The Board of Trustees approved the request to increase tuition. Obviously this is shifting the burden from one group to the other: parents who have students in college will have to pay more but the tuition increase will help the universities. Dr. Frank thanked the Chancellor who put in a good word for us on the difficulty that we are facing, as did Vice Chancellor John Pierce. Most importantly he thanked Courtney Galatioto for her brilliant comments. She spoke on behalf of the students but also on behalf of the faculty and the entire institution. It was received quite well. Hopefully we will be able to keep the tuition funds and it will buffer part of the impact that will come to us with the budget decision.

#### **President Ross: campus visit in March**

UNC President Ross is visiting our campus in March and this will be a good opportunity to show him who we are. This should be more than just a handshake. Senators were encouraged to think of ways to impress upon President Ross who and what UNC Asheville is – its faculty and its students.

#### **Upcoming Elections**

Senators were asked to talk to their colleagues about the importance of faculty participation and faculty governance and to consider running for office and serving on any committee including the Faculty Senate.

#### **Task Force on Curriculum**

Dr. Frank met with the Provost before the start of the semester to discuss the Task Force on Curriculum and changes in the curriculum. This is a daunting enterprise and Senators are asked to consider serving on the task force that may be comprised of two or three subcommittees. Dr. Kormanik has taken the initiative to also make this point to the Chairs and Program Directors. All are invited to participate in one way or another, even if we need to limit the number of people that work on committees. We need to be as representative and inclusive as possible in this endeavor.

### **IV. Faculty Welfare and Development Committee**

Dr. Gary Ettari reported for the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

#### **Update on Committee Work**

- Faculty elections will begin soon. Thanks go to Greg Boudreaux for all the hard work he does to make elections happen.
- FWDC continues to work on Section 3 of the Faculty Handbook.
- FWDC will meet with the Review of Tenure and Rewards Committee to receive an update on its findings to give faculty input. .
- At FWDC's last meeting they received a report from Pat McClellan on the electronic Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) from last semester. He has asked Ms. McClellan to report the results to the Senate. Ms. McClellan distributed a handout on the response rates of the electronic SRI fall 2010.

#### **Response Rates by Student Class/Type**

Freshmen	96%
Sophomore	92%
Junior	71%
Senior	32%
MLA	49%
PostBac	64%

#### **Response Rates by Division**

Humanities	73%
Social Sciences	76%
Natural Sciences	74%
University Programs	75%

- The overall response rate was 75%
- The surprising factor was that 32% of seniors responded as opposed to 96% of freshmen. This is disappointing because they have the perspective of four years and their response is important.
- Dr. Tracy Brown will receive the raw data (stripped of all identifiers) to continue his study of SRIs. Ms. McClellan will ask him to also analyze the skill questions at the top of the form.

#### **Discussion**

- Dr. Meigs said November and December are the prime time for graduate school applications. Perhaps this contributed to the low senior response rate.
- Dr. Moorhead asked if it is a difficult task to block the questions that are not applicable.
  - Ms. McClellan said that decision rests with the Faculty Senate. The online course evaluation gives us greater nimbleness, greater flexibility, and FWDC has discussed this possibility.
  - Dr. Sidelnick said information on all of the Intensives should be mandatory so the effectiveness of those courses can be tracked at the very least. Perhaps this function can be turned off for any course that does not have an Intensive designation. Dr. Moorhead supported this idea.

### **V. Institutional Development Committee/University Planning Council Reports**

Ms. Linda Nelms reported for Institutional Development Committee and University Planning Council.

#### **University Planning Committee (UPC)**

The UPC December meeting was postponed until January.

#### **Institutional Development Committee (IDC)**

The December meeting of the IDC consisted of information provided by two sets of people:

- Skip Capone, UNC Asheville's General Counsel, and Gregg Kormanik, one of our fellow Senators, presenting information on the Policy Review Committee.
- Peg Downes and Sandra Byrd, representing two of the programs on campus that generate flexible funds.

The request that Mr. Capone and Dr. Kormanik join IDC was the result of two separate issues: 1) a concern among members of the faculty that existing policies were not being followed, either because they were not widely known and easily located or because they were perceived as cumbersome and outdated; and, 2) a discussion of the Senate that made it apparent that there were areas of uncertainty about whether changes in the Faculty Handbook would need to be put before the Senate for vote or whether it would be put before the Senate for information only. A question was asked, "Who owns the Faculty Handbook and the Senate documents." Learning that Mr. Capone has been charged to head a committee dealing with university operating policies and that some of the questions that have arisen about Faculty Handbook policies might have a parallel in their work, IDC invited him, as chair of the committee and Dr. Kormanik, as a representative of the faculty on that committee, to speak to IDC.

In their report, Mr. Capone and Dr. Kormanik noted that their first task was to define "University Policy" in a way that would distinguish it from Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), with University Policies identified as the highest level and SOP as the bottom level. SOP will change with changing technologies or structures, and policies should be changed only after review and discussion. The second area they addressed is how a review of items identified as policies would take place. To accomplish a review, the "owner" of the policy needs to be named and that owner needs to be consulted. A challenge has been to identify ownership. The problem of access to policies is one that needs to be addressed by technology. One of the challenges of using technology to access policies is to maintain an archive to know what policy was in effect when a given action was taken and to know when a policy sunsets or should sunset. Ultimately, the committee will try to identify policies that should be in place and ensure that those policies are created.

A discussion followed that dealt with how the work and discoveries of that committee could be used to assist the Faculty Senate in their questions about access, use, and ownership of policies. An interesting concept that was brought forward was the idea of dual ownership. For example, the Provost may own a manual, but the faculty may own pieces within it (such as the Faculty Senate Constitution). That discussion will be continued and Senators are welcome to attend. The next meeting is January 27 at 3:15 in New Hall lounge.

- As a result of questions asked in an earlier Senate meeting and at a recent UPC meeting, IDC requested that Peg Downes and Sandra Byrd provide information on areas of the University that bring in flexible dollars. These areas include, but are not necessarily limited to, the Masters of Liberal Arts program, the Asheville Graduate Center, and summer school. These are, by definition and state requirement, self-funding. Handouts were distributed to provide information about the impact of some of these programs.

The Asheville Graduate Center (AGC) has offered 30 graduate degree programs from four universities. The Distance Education includes the Great Smokey's Writing Program, the Correctional Education Program, and the Lateral Teaching Initiative (mandated by the state). It provides test preparation courses for the GRE, the SAT, the LSAT and they are considering introducing a preparation course for the GMAT. It provides a variety of teaching courses. AGC courses are offered in on-line, face to face, and hybrid models. Everyone is urged to read the handouts provided, especially the section on "How We Support the Academic Core."

Because of the tuition differential, MLA courses are able to pay outside instructors (or on-campus instructors when they are available) a reasonable stipend and still contribute financially to the general needs of the campus. The program has had a strong presence in the community and the contribution to faculty and students goes beyond the financial with opportunities for undergraduates to participate in cross-listed courses.

The summer school program is undergoing review and renovation with an eye to increasing attendance and the corresponding contribution to the University. Inclusion of MLA and AGC in discussion of summer school may be advantageous in terms of student access to courses and in generating revenue for the university.

There is an ongoing record of these programs providing financial support for the university in ways that increase flexibility in a time when pressures seem to be decreasing flexibility. There is some concern among those associated with these programs that the campus in general does not understand the purpose and the challenges of these programs. Recent interest in the summer school program is promising.

When asked directly what they would most like the Faculty Senate to know or do, Dr. Downes and Dr. Byrd said they would like for the Senate and the faculty in general to have a clear idea of the benefits the programs represent for the campus community and they would like for any changes in those programs to be made only after faculty consultation.

## **VI. Academic Policies Committee**

Mr. Rob Berls reported for the Academic Policies Committee.

### **Second Reading: [Unanimously approved by APC]**

The following documents were considered for Second Reading:

APC 2: Remove Computer Competency from ACCT 340 and MGMT 491  
APC 2 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 0911S.

APC 3: Change HIST 250 from 2 to 3 Credit Hours  
APC 3 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1011S.

APC 4: Change course description for MLA 500  
APC 4 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1111S.

APC 5: Add new course, ATMS 355, Physical Oceanography  
APC 5 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1211S.

APC 6: Add new course, ATMS 325, Geographic Information Systems in Meteorology  
APC 6 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1311S.

APC 7: Add new course, ATMS 328, Broadcast Meteorology  
APC 7 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1411S.

APC 8: Change in Academic Policy for Permission to Take a Course as a Visitor at Another Institution  
APC 8 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1511S.

APC 9: Delete HIST 346; Add new course, HIST 347, History of Ireland  
APC 9 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1611S.

APC 10: Change title and course description for HIST 348  
APC 10 passed without dissent and became Senate Document 1711S.

## VII. Administrative Reports

### Provost Fernandes:

#### Budget Update

- There will be a 2010-11 reversion of at least 1.5% beyond what we had anticipated (i.e., beyond the original 1% we held back.)
- It is now necessary to plan for an additional 15% cut scenario for 2011-12.
- There will be an impact starting this academic year, carrying into next year, as the Chancellor made clear in the all-campus meeting.
- We will try to protect the academic core, wherever possible; however, as the Chancellor also noted, we will not be able to protect the academic experience to the extent that we have been able to in the past.
- We are reviewing every unit and program for ways of contributing to the cuts that Academic Affairs will need to make as part of our overall University efforts.
- We may be forced to eliminate vacant positions, combine positions, and take other actions necessary due to the cuts.
- That is, we will be forced to make the kinds of decision we have not typically had to make here.
- We are looking at every possible way to deliver the curriculum with our reduced levels of adjunct and one-year lecturer support.
- On a positive note, we made several strong new faculty hires last semester and two outstanding faculty searches that we have been allowed to continue.

#### Discussion

- Dr. Frank said we are now contemplating a 15% budget cut. If we were allowed to keep the tuition increase, would it reduce the budget cut from 15% back to 10%?
  - Dr. Fernandes said the tuition increase would mitigate but does not offset the additional 5% cut. Dean Konz said that each 5% cut is about \$2M, and the tuition increase would only generate about \$900,000, leaving a net additional cut of \$1.1 million, or 2.75%. Dr. Fernandes said that originally Academic Affairs' share of the budget cut was \$930K. Even assuming we can keep the tuition money, a 15% budget cut makes our portion of cuts \$1.5M. This is less proportionally than the other divisions.
- Dr. Moorhead asked if there was going to be any attempt to save money by changing the curriculum.
  - Dr. Fernandes said we should design a curriculum with a reasonable teaching load that is sustainable for faculty. The goal is to have a curriculum that we can deliver with our full time faculty and a few adjuncts and a few other people, not with \$1M of supplemental faculty.
  - Dr. Frank said he wants us to be sensitive to economic considerations as we craft the curriculum, but it should not be too strong a factor. We need to review and change the curriculum to the degree possible and accepted by everyone in the economic moment.
  - Dr. Sidelnick said our campus has not had a history of balancing the budget on the backs of our students. Our sister institutions have done that quite heavily and regularly. We have balanced it on the backs of our faculty and staff. The students stepped up and said "We will pay more to keep the quality of our education." When curricular decisions are made, he would ask that the faculty listen to the voice of the students and the SGA representatives on that task force because they are the ones buying what we are selling. It was noble of the students to step forward. He applauded Ms. Galatioto and her leadership.

### Craft Campus Update

- As you know, we were unable to develop a viable plan for moving forward on the Craft Campus idea when it was conceived to be situated at the landfill.
- We began a process of review that led to a campus committee, including faculty, administration, trustees, and students, to examine the possibility of relocating a facility on our campus, in order to make craft and craft studies a true part of our campus community.
- We conducted a feasibility study of a site by Owen Hall, funded by an external donor.
- The budget crisis worsened and we realized that, irrespective of private funds we might secure, the public resources necessary for this initiative will not be forthcoming for the foreseeable future. We are not going forward with the craft facility, except in the unlikely event that all funds could be secured from private sources and we are able to do something on a much smaller scale.
- The Craft facility is now off of our capital priority list, in its prior form.
- We will be working with the Art Department on the possibility of a Craft Studies concentration similar in shape to the Art History concentration that the department develops and operates within its existing instructional and operational resources.

### Question

- Dr. Kormanik said when we switched the Center for Craft Creativity and Design (CCCD) from an inter-institutional center of UNC to an institutional center at UNC Asheville we accepted a lot of financial responsibility. Part of accepting it had to do with its association with our Craft Campus. Now that we are not going to have the Craft Campus, is there any profit from the CCCD? Is the CCCD costing us anything? We now support it in numerous ways; are we looking to profit from the Center for Craft Creativity and Design or developing relationships that will support our students and faculty in related disciplines?
  - Dr. Fernandes said everything in Academic Affairs is on the table to be reviewed, including the Craft Creativity and Design Center.

### Reaffirmation Update

Dr. Mary Lynn Manns reported on the Results Report from QEP Survey #3 that was sent to the campus and posted on the QEP website. The Topic Category that emerged from this survey: *Engaged learning project that allows students to be makers of knowledge; prioritize projects that have a Global and Cultural Understanding focus.* The QEP Leadership Team (QEPLT) has begun working with this to narrow the topic and the plan for our QEP.

In December the QEPLT took proposals in Engaged Learning and Students as Makers of Knowledge and brainstormed three rough proposals:

- Freshman and Transfers in LSIC – community directed projects
- Sophomores through seniors in DI courses
- Students of every year do a service learning project and create a portfolio of their activities throughout their years at UNC Asheville

In January the QEPLT combined those three ideas into a new draft, as follows:

- The goal is to increase access to and quality of engaged learning experiences among UNC Asheville students. Engaged learning experiences may include one or more of the following: *service learning, internships, undergraduate research, and/or study abroad.*
- Proposed a QEP that centers on providing engaged learning experiences that allow students to be makers of knowledge, prioritizing projects that have a global and/or cultural understanding focus.
- The goal is to increase the quality of and access to engaged learning experiences among UNC Asheville students. In particular, we would like to develop a model to enhance student learning with experiences that have four components:

Inquiry – The student does research (of some type) to learn more about a topic, issue or problem.

Action – The student takes action by designing and implementing a study, project or other experience.

Impact – The experience has an application outside of the academia silo. The student must be able to show connections.

Reflection – The student analyzes his or her learning and draws meaning from the experience.

Among the actions necessary to make our plan a reality are the following:

- 1) Formalize our definition of engaged learning. (It may include elements from any of the following: service learning, undergraduate research, internships, and study abroad.)
- 2) Put in place a process for goal setting around engaged learning for a student's time at UNC Asheville and make it easy for students to learn about all the different types of opportunities that are available and how to access them.
- 3) Put in place a system (assignment/scoring rubric) for reflection on engaged learning experiences that addresses UNC Asheville's Student Learning Outcomes. For each experience, the student or facilitator will identify whether the project enhances any or all of the following: critical thinking, creative expression, open inquiry, effective communication and global and/or cultural understanding.
- 4) Put in place an improved process for documenting engaged learning experiences, projects, and reflections using e-portfolios or another appropriate method.

This QEP formalizes, enhances, and offers an opportunity to make engaged learning experiences that will meet SLOs and enhance student learning at UNC Asheville. When the details of the project are worked out, it is likely to link to and greatly improve on work we are already doing; the QEP project would make these opportunities more visible, supported, beneficial, and tracked.

The QEPLT is sending a one-page description of our rough topic idea to Cheryl Cardell, our VP representative at SACS, to get initial feedback. We are on track in the QEP Timeline.

#### **VIII. Old Business**

There was no Old Business.

#### **IX. New Business**

There was no New Business.

#### **X. Adjourn**

Dr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:      Sandra Gravelly  
Executive Committee

Addendum:  
Asheville Graduate Center  
MLA



## The Asheville Graduate Center

**What we do:** The Mission of the Asheville Graduate Center (AGC) is to offer high quality graduate and continuing education in western North Carolina that addresses the needs of our region through a continuum of learning. The Center identifies and develops collaborative learning opportunities with the university community, the UNC system, the region, and the state to expand access for traditional students, non-traditional students, and life-long learners. Programs and degrees offered through the AGC complement our undergraduate education mission, support the culture of interdisciplinarity, align with the university strategic plan, and are financially self-sustaining. Last year we served over 1,200 graduate students and over 1,000 continuing education students and generated net revenue of \$526,000 for UNC Asheville.

The Asheville Graduate Center serves the post-graduate, professional, distance and continuing education needs of Western North Carolinians including:

- Over 30 Graduate degree programs from four universities, from the master's level to Ph.D. degree.
- Distance Education includes off-campus instruction for credit, whether face-to-face, electronically mediated, or a combination of methodologies; programming includes online, videoconference, and hybrid courses, certificate programs, or an ongoing series of courses, such as the Great Smokies Writing Program, Correctional Education, and Lateral Entry Teacher Initiative.
- Test preparation courses for standardized tests such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), Graduate Record Examination (GRE), and Law School Admission Test (LSAT).
- Professional education and teacher training programs such as the Lateral Entry program, Effective Teacher Training/ Substitute Teacher Training, Teacher Cadet, and the Advanced Placement Summer Institute.

### **We collaborate with an average of 14 UNC Asheville departments each year. Activities include**

- administration and support of distance education classes for which there is high demand/ shortage of sections offered (such as undergraduate classes in Statistics, foreign languages, physics courses for teachers) ;
- assisting the university to meet state and general administration mandates (such as lateral entry teacher program and participation in UNC Online and other distance education initiatives);
- promoting cultural diversity by providing distance education classes in locations that will increase access for underserved population(such as undergraduate and MLA classes at YMI and Asheville Middle School);
- grant writing in partnership with departments across the social sciences, natural science, and humanities;
- generating revenue that provides financial support for instruction, academic support, student support, physical plant, cultural and special events, health and counseling, professional education, campus recreation;

### **Policies that Guide Distance and Graduate Education offered at the AGC**

UNC Asheville offers distance education courses; it **does not** offer any distance education programs. We also offer selected electronically mediate courses that are part of the UNC General Administration effort in online learning. In 1998, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs appointed a Distance Learning Task Force to debate the role that distance education was to play at UNCA. The task force drew up a *Distance Education Philosophy Statement* approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2000. The Distance Learning Task Force and Senate Document 6800S share the view that UNCA will not offer degree programs through distance learning. The document states, "One of the characteristics of a liberal education generally, and of UNC Asheville's approach specifically, is extensive face-to-face interaction among students and between students and teachers." This policy remains the defining one governing distance education at UNC Asheville. As distance education courses are developed, the academic department chair and the relevant dean approve proposed courses. Special topics courses may be developed in concert with the department chair and the faculty member. Instructors are responsible for developing syllabi and submitting these to the Director of Distance Education. **Guest university graduate programs offered through the AGC are dynamic**; changes occur annually based on regional needs, student enrollment, accreditation/assessment issues, and financial viability. All revisions/additions/deletions in graduate education programs are discussed with and approved by the Associate Provost.

### How do we support the academic core?

- Provide access to high quality/ reasonably priced GRE test preparation for students who plan to attend graduate school;
- Provide test proctoring services for students enrolled in online courses and participate in statewide test proctoring network through UNC General Administration
- Administer and support a distance education lateral entry program for teachers, which fulfills a state mandate and supports the education department;
- Administer and support distance education classes in mathematics, foreign language, education, and science to increase student access to courses needed for a variety of degree programs;
- Administer and support graduate, distance, and continuing education classes during the summer; under current funding model, distance education classes in the summer produce more revenue than traditional summer school classes; and
- Support university “commitment... to a diverse and increasingly connected world.”

### Where can we add revenue?

- **Distance Education: add classes that are off-campus or electronically mediated in academic areas of high demand/shortage of sections that compliment what is offered on campus;**
- **Add guest graduate programs and certificates in areas of high demand;**
- **Increase participant numbers in Advanced Placement Institute for Teachers;**
- **Add GMAC Test Preparation Course; and**
- **Continue grant writing**

#### **Linkage to Strategic Plan and University Mission**

- *“The university houses the Asheville Graduate Center ... and other programs which provide opportunities to citizens for continued learning and public service.”*
- *“Furnish North Carolina’s economy with highly accomplished thinkers, negotiators, planners, collaborators, and problem-solvers.”*
- *“Share responsibility with the greater Asheville community for collaborations on issues of mutual concern, benefit, and accomplishment.”*

#### **Linkage to UNC Tomorrow**

- 4.1.1, Prepare students for successful professional and personal lives in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and adaptation to the ever-changing world;
- 4.2.1, Increase access to higher education for traditional students, non-traditional students, and lifelong learners;
- 4.4.1, Enhance capacity and commitment to respond to and lead economic transformation and community development;
- 4.6.2, Leverage existing research expertise to address critical environmental issues;
- 4.6.3, Increase community awareness of environmental and sustainability issues;
- 4.7.3, Create a mechanism for applying research and scholarship to addressing significant regional and statewide issues; and
- 5.7., Encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations among its institutions.

Annual Reports are available online at <http://agc.unca.edu/>

***Asheville Graduate Center, & Master of Liberal Arts Program: Meeting with IDC, 12/8/10***

UNCA seeks ways to increase funding, and to support its undergraduate programs, in these times of dearth.

AGC and MLA exist so that: (1) UNCA can help the community; and (2) UNCA can increase revenue.

MLA: Some points to consider:

• All UNCA's programs and departments bring in money. And all of these cost money.

(For example: MLA grossed \$270,000 in 09-10; net profit was \$43,233, after expenses.)

FYI--MLA's annual budget is \$14,000.

But, because MLA has no assigned faculty, and generates 2-4 times as much State funding per SCH

(because of State-assigned Categories—see tables, attached), it *likely* brings in more State-money per student per course. (I haven't seen a "Catterfeld Report" on undergrad. depts., so I'm making an educated guess.)

**MLA students pay more than twice the tuition and fees** as do undergrads:

(a) \$1306 (grad), vs. \$609 (undergrad), for a 3-credit course;

(b) most MLA students are taking just 3 SCH at a time—while most undergrads. are taking 12 or more SCH at a time—for **\$2363**. Most MLA students will pay 4 x \$1306, or **\$5224**, for those 12 SCH.

• UNCA's in a low-growth mode. Every head counts. And MLA students "count higher per head."

• MLA supports undergrad. programs by:

(a) offering courses to dept. faculty—"special topics" interdisciplinary topics that are fun to teach, and that can help faculty's research;

(b) offering co-listed courses to serve not only as MLA, but also as electives in majors (next semester: for LIT, HIST, PSYC, ENVR).

**FROM Peg Downes, MLA Director—  
Spring 2010: Presentation to APC & then to Senate**

**•Data from Pat Catterfeld’s 2/10 “MLA Enrollment Revenue Expenditure Review”  
(figures rounded up / down):**

	<u>Anticip. Total Revenue</u>	<u>Net Profit</u>	<u>Fees Generated</u>
09-10	\$ 270,000	\$ 43,233	\$ 48,000
10-11	\$ 350,000	\$ 102,000	\$ 64,000

**•Data provided by Archer Gravely:**

**Table 1: UNCA Disciplines by G.A. Cost Category:**

Category 1		Category 2		Category 3		Category 4	
CIP	Discipline	CIP	Discipline	CIP	Discipline	CIP	Discipline
09	Communication	05	Area/Ethnic/Cultural Studies	26	Biology	14	Engineering
23	English	52	Business Admin & Mgt	11	Computer Science/Multimedia		
54	History	13	Education*	03	Environmental Studies		
27	Math	16	Foreign Languages/Classics	51	Health Professions		
38	Philosophy/Religion	24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	40	Physical Sciences		
42	Psychology	30	Multi/Interdisc Studies	50	Visual & Performing Arts		
45	Social Sciences	31	Parks, Rec, Leisure & Fitness				

**Table 2: SCH Generated By Different Cost-Categories:**

The number of projected/budgeted SCH required to generate a new faculty position varies by instructional cost category and level of instruction. These SCH figures are shown in the following table.

Funding Category	Undergraduate	Masters	Doctoral
Category 1	708.64	169.52	115.56
Category 2	535.74	303.93	110.16
Category 3	406.24	186.23	109.86
Category 4	232.25	90.17	80.91

**Table 3: Financial Advantage of Using Prefixes other than “MLA”:**

Archer prepared this to show the financial advantage of offering our campus’s MLA courses with different prefixes—specifically, LIT and CS. (As mentioned above, these prefixes are flexible: it is the Discipline Cost Categories that count: see TABLE 1. Archer ran them, for this table, as LIT and CS: there is no problem adjusting those prefixes to ENG and CCS.) For purposes of contrast, this table compares the budget impact of teaching 8 “MLA”-prefixed master’s courses, each with an enrollment of 12 students, with the budget impact of teaching 4 “LIT”- and 4 “CS”-prefixed master’s courses (enroll. 12 each):

	A	B	C	D	E
1	UNC Asheville				
2	Office of Institutional Research				
3	25-Jan-10				
4					
5					
6					
7	Budget Impact of Teaching 8-3 Credit Hour Graduate Courses With Enrollment of 12 (288 SCH)				
8	MLA Prefix vs Climate & LIT Prefix				
9					
10			Prefix		
11			MLA	CS/LIT	Difference
12		Faculty Positions	0.95	1.62	0.67
13		Instructional Salary	73,200	125,420	52,220
14		Other Academic Costs	32,877	56,301	23,424
15		Total Academic Costs	106,117	181,721	75,604
16		Library Rate	12,182	20,862	8,680
17		General Institutional Support	57,356	98,220	40,864
18		Total Budget	\$175,655	\$300,802	\$125,147

**Financial Benefit to the University:**

Right now, credit hours generated in the MLA program—in courses that use the MLA prefix—do add substantially to the university’s budget. However, data provided by Archer Gravely indicate that the university’s budget will benefit even more substantially when new prefixes are used instead of “MLA.”

Archer points out that the State budget cuts would be in part offset by altering the prefixes for some MLA courses.

**Increasing MLA enrollments--without adding new graduate programs:**

UNCA Catalog: “The [MLA] program offers three areas of study whereby students may focus their scholarly and creative energies. The areas are Humanities and Creative Writing, Globalization Past and Present, and Science and Human Values” (pg. 208). This refocusing, and subsequent addition of courses, have increased MLA enrollment—particularly of students interested in creative writing, and in climate and society—in ENG and MLA-CCS courses.

Other emphases (and prefixes) could be added in future.