President Jack Zibluk called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.

Zibluk requested the rules be suspended so Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard could take the floor for his presentation on faculty salaries. There were no objections.

Presentation

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard:

Salaries
Interim Chancellor Howard presented on faculty salaries. Howard stated currently faculty salaries at ASUJ are below SREB averages for instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and full professor. Howard has presented this information to the former president of the ASU system, the current president of the ASU system, the former chancellor of ASUJ and the Board of Trustees on multiple occasions. Howard explained that the President and Board of Trustees are sensitive to the situation and he feels there will be solutions to follow.

Howard presented the current discrepancy between SREB III average salaries and current ASUJ average salaries. In addition, he also presented the necessary money it would take to bring ASUJ salaries up to the SREB III averages. See Appendix A.

Next, Interim Chancellor Howard described possible solutions for the salary discrepancies. See Appendix B. Interim Chancellor Howard stated he presented the same solutions to the President, Board of Trustees and the other Chancellor’s at the Board of Trustees Planning Retreat. Before going over the possible solutions, Howard stated that among the senior institutions in the state, we are the farthest away from being funded at the 75% level according to the statewide funding formula. All other senior institutions, aside from the University of Arkansas, are a little below 75%. We are currently at funded at 66%. The University has asked ADHE Interim Executive Director Shane Broadway for a five and ten year plan to bring ASUJ up to the 75% funding level. After explaining this, Interim Chancellor Howard preceded to expound upon the eight different possible solutions for faculty salary funding.

Interim Chancellor Howard went on to say there will be performance based funding. Everything we have done by raising our standards has put us in the best possible place to compete in this funding environment.

Admission Standards
Interim Chancellor Howard next presented the proposed admission standards (see Appendix C).
Questions
Senator Alex Sydorenko: “Can you possibly give us the reason why we have fallen behind [the other senior institutions in the state] in the 75% [funding]?“

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “When the system was created, this campus [ASUJ] took its resources to support the system with the understanding that the state would come back and bring us up to the 75% level. The state has never fulfilled that promise. We are getting further behind because we are growing. Additionally, it is simple math. If I am making $1.00 and you’re making $0.50 and there is a 10% increase I get a $1.10 and you get $0.55. So the gap spreads, and that is what has been happening.”

Dr. Jim Bednarz: “You have been politicking around for our salaries, which we appreciate. Can you use your crystal ball and tell us what the chances are of any increase in the ADHE funding formula, let alone maybe moving up to the 75% level?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “It’s all contingent on the economy. ... Our state has done remarkable well in comparison with many other states like California and Florida. People still have to eat and we have been good at producing materials for people to keep processing that. It depends on what happens with the global, national and state economy because it is all contingent upon that. Everybody is aware of our needs. I know performance based funding is going to come in and I am confident we will do well with performance based funding, but that only gets us back to baseline. So, I don’t know where we will go with that, but I think what we have to do ... you have to create the opportunity for luck to strike. I think we have to be out there constantly with the theme ASU is less than 75%. ASU is less than 75. We are the farthest away and we need equity. We need that taken care of.”

“By the way, it’s not just equity. I had to correct some people. Oh you know, you got the equity component of the formula and you have performance. ... What is the major factor in that state funding formula? It is three year, weighted credit hour production. That’s performance. ... The more credits you produce, that’s good for us because many of those credits count towards a degree so we are performing well. So I keep telling them it’s not just an equity formula. Equity is part of it, but it is a performance formula for which we are not receiving our equitable share.”

Past-president Beverly Gilbert: “What is the Boards reaction when they see this? Is there any sort of concern that they have? Are they embarrassed when they look at where we are compared to UCA, UALR or U of A?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “Absolutely. Let me take it more to faculty salaries. Most institutions in the state don’t do really well against the SREB because, unfortunately, faculty was not treated well here in the state in terms of salaries. We know that. But the Board is chagrinned, concerned about faculty salaries. Let’s just talk about that. Absolutely, there is no question about it. They were very pleased with my options that are out there. It wasn’t just one thing or another. It was a whole bunch of things and maybe a combination, so they were for that. They understand. What they did, they took my work and put it to the other chancellors and said ‘Well, where is your plan?’ That’s a good thing because they realize it’s not just us, it is also our other sister institutions that also need new
and appropriate salaries. So the Board is aware. The Board is focused on it and it is a topic of conversation every time. When I first came here, no one was talking about salaries. Now it is actually occurring and that's a good thing. So I am pleased with that. I’m convinced that will cause results.”

Senator John Hall: “Is the Board as committed to this faculty salary crisis, deficit issue as they are to the System, Division 1 sports and buildings? Where do we fit in here, really? When you look at all the data that has been generated this problem has gone on for quite a while...”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “This is like the 900 pound person. You didn’t become 900 pounds overnight. ... Let me just say a few things. Number one ... we’re Division 1, whether we like it or not. If I went and fought Division 1 I’d be gone tomorrow. So Division 1 is here and we need to understand that. We are out of Bowl Championship Series, 120 top institutions; we are funding 119 out of 120. It is $11,400,000. I know that sounds like a lot, but in terms of athletic budget that’s nothing and much of that comes out of other resources. ”

“In terms of buildings, all the student housing is bonded money that is under auxiliary enterprises. Its bonded money for which the rents pay for, the fees paid for by the students covers the bonds. That has nothing to do with salaries. An endowed building, one-time money, you get $30,000,000 for a building. What we need is recurring dollars, not one-time money. So, we have to look at where we are going to get recurring dollars. That would be like this one percent set-aside for faculty. I see that would be recurring dollars. I would see monies coming in ... what we have done with differential [tuition], like most recently with Science and Mathematics, to have differential dollars that can go into faculty salaries. To bring in more evidence scholar chairs that generates constant revenue. The Board is there, the Board understands, the Board will act. I am convinced that will happen. Exactly when it will happen... There is not one member if you said here is all this new revenue, we’re funding at 75%, I guaranty you faculty salaries would go up fast. There is no question in my mind, no question whatsoever. The Board is on it and when I first came [here] I wouldn’t have said the Board is on it. The Board is really on it now. I mean really, really, really on it because you keep raising the theme, I keep raising the theme, and they keep going ‘Yeah, yeah, yeah we’re going to.’ It’s real, it’s palpable, and it’s real. I have every belief they will. It’s just where we’re going to get the money.”

Senator John Hall: “Should more colleges consider differential tuition?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “I don’t think the Board will support that. If you look at the funding; if you do that you might as well just raise tuition for everyone. There is some resistance to do that in the state. We fought like the dickens to get tuition raised. It’s a difficult thing. The state legislative appropriations have declined from about 70.5% to about 46%. So, what we have done is we have counterbalanced that with tuition and fee raises, but there is only so much before you are going to get a big push back from the students. I don’t think differential tuition for all colleges is appropriate.”

Senator John Hall: “Are there some student fees that can be eliminated and the money that would go toward those fees be redirected toward faculty salaries? I know students pay a lot of fees ...”
Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “They pay a heck of a lot of fees. I think the computer/technology fee - no. I mean you need it for your computer/technology. I think the library fee to get serials and subscriptions and all the other things that you’re doing – no. Athletic fee - they are not going to do anything with. I mean, there are some realities you have to deal with. I don’t think that’s going to do it. I think the way to do it is we need to convince the Board that they need to use all their political muscle to help the state start to funding us better to get to that 75% of funding incrementally. I think that’s number one. Number two, I would like to see the Board, but I can’t tell them what to do, but I would like to see the Board put one percent on the table of tuition to help with salaries.”

Senator Bill Rowe: “Dan, Jack probably has heard it too, we had a meeting with AAUP in Little Rock and I met Johnnie Roebuck. We are not the only place, but our salaries are talked about down there [Little Rock]. One example she used is a place that has been three years without a raise. It sounded really familiar. So, apparently the word has got out. So, I think everyone knows about it. So, it is no longer hidden.”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “I’ve put a laser on it and I keep that laser on so everyone stays aware. It is interesting you had a conversation with Johnnie Roebuck. I got called down to the legislative hearing yesterday [Thursday, October 20, 2011]. They wanted to know about distance learning.”

Dr. Lynn Howerton (proxy for Senator Joanna Grymes): “I have had some anecdotal reports across campus where new faculty are coming in, who are brought in usually at competitive rates, they’re watching what’s happening to people who have been here. They see this as a sign of what’s going to happen if they stay here for ten years or whatever.”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “You are absolutely correct in your observations. There are no questions about it. That’s why we need to fix the system. I think ultimately it will happen.”

Dr. Lynn Howerton: “Also, I think that many within the public don’t know that when an assistant professor comes in that the promotion money only amounts to about five percent up to the highest career rank.”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “What we do is, we promote a lot of people but we don’t give them a lot of money. So you hold the rank but you don’t get the pay for the rank. I have noticed that here. A lot of other institutions hold back on promotion. They don’t give nearly as many promotions as we do, but when you get promoted your get more salary. I don’t know. It’s one of those [things]. The whole thing is resolved by putting more money in.

Dr. Lynn Howerton: “We share those concerns. Now a possible solution, I want to use the word, but I want to make sure it’s understood as being non-harmful to employees – reallocation. That’s something maybe that could also be considered part of the mix? People usually think they are going to lose their job when they hear reallocation. I’m talking about reallocation as people retire or leave. There has been a plan in place that that money now can flow to other areas, like for example academics. That’s another solution.”
Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “Sure. We have looked at reallocations. One of the things, I’ll be honest with you; my focus has been on the resource generation side of the equation. International students, we are at about 15 million more than we had without them. Distance learning, 1.128 million. The capital campaign, we are at 40 million or so through the capital campaign. Continuing education. So, I’m looking at how do I generate more dollars? When you are emaciated, it’s hard to share some of your resources to handle this over here. I haven’t even looked at that, but we did the Chancellor’s Taskforce, as you know, on cost containment and there may be some reallocations there. I don’t know of any areas that are overly fat, if you will, with a lot of resources we are going to be able to reallocate, although, there may be some.”

Dr. Lynn Howerton: “I don’t know if there’s fat, but there might be some areas that are not as efficient.”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “I think that is right. One of the things, look at credit hour production among all the different colleges and departments and say do we need to do some reallocating there. You’re right. But that is always fraught with ‘Oh, we need that. We finally got to the point where our teacher/pupil ratio is right and now you are taking it away.’ I prefer to put my fourteen hours a day into generating dollars where I can.

Dr. John Pratte: “These figures that we have, you mentioned that we are still in the SREB Category III. Ideally, we want to move into Category II. So, in our college we started looking at how we compare to those people. The nice thing is there are not that many in Category II. There are only about fourteen institutions. It’s easy enough to go out there and calculate the average, but one thing you can also do when you only have 14 relatively easy is to adjust those salaries for cost-of-living. Are the figures that we do for SREB III cost-of-living adjusted?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “There are basically 16 southern states, so they are not adjusted for cost-of-living. If you go to national data … you don’t even want to go there. Go to the AAUP salaries for research institutions in the Chronicle of Higher Education if you really want to get scared. So, when you compare against SREB, I think that is a fair comparison. I think what that does is it takes out the big expensive east-west coast and north schools.”

Dr. John Pratte: “We’ve done our analysis, and there all from the Category II, and there about the same amount as the Category III. I wonder if maybe that SREB average comparison is not quite as good of a comparison as we think. That maybe a lot of those institutions are actually in economic situations that are different from us.”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “Some will be. But on average, I think you’ll come out about the same because it all averages out. Atlanta, GA is certainly going to cost a lot more Jonesboro, AR.”

Dr. John Pratte: “And it’s [Atlanta, GA] got 12 institutions of higher ed.”

**Points of Pride and First Friday**

Before leaving the Senate, Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard disbursed copies of the current Points of Pride for the ASUJ campus (see Appendix D). He stated the points are constantly being updated and the
most recent version is available at the Chancellor’s website (http://www.astate.edu/dotAsset/2bd42f83-5a4f-45cb-b64e-93cd377a7446.pdf). Howard indicated the faculty are the ones who make the Points of Pride happen and the faculty should feel good about themselves. In the past 3-1/2 years the campus has made extraordinary improvements.

The final piece of information distributed by Interim Chancellor Howard was the October 14, 2011 issue of First Friday (see Appendix E). The October 14 issue contains a white paper of Interim Chancellor Howard’s projections on enrollment and the implication of those projections on enrollment. Howard has shared these projections and implications with the Office of Admissions.

All issues of First Friday from Dr. Wyatt to Dr. Howard are available online at the Chancellor’s website (http://www.astate.edu/a/chancellor/first-friday/landing.dot). All issues of First Friday beginning with the September 10, 2010 issue and forward have been indexed into a topical index.

Senator John Hall: “Dr. Howard, will you help to keep this fire burning?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “Absolutely. There is no question about it. Every time I visit with the Board, every time I see Chuck [President Welch] they say ‘Oh yeah, we need to do something’. That’s what I want to hear and we need too. If you run into Shane Broadway, say ‘Shane, we need your help now. You’re an alumnus of our institution. We’re not asking for anything unfair. We just want; we want to be up to parity at 75% of that funding formula.’ That’s recurring dollars. That’s real money. It’s not one-time money, its real money that you can go on and on and on with.”

President Jack Zibluk: “Quick question on that. Dr. Wyatt was always, that was a major issue for him and he wasn’t able to move the needle. What’s different now than 10 years ago?”

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard: “First of all, Chuck Welch’s resident is in the Little Rock area. He is there every day working with the legislators. That’s a very important dimension of what we’re doing. I don’t know that, no dispersing’s against Dr. Wyatt; I’m not so sure he understood as much as I’ve convinced Dr. Welch that he understands what we’re doing with faculty salaries. So, it’s well understood.”

“I think we have different Board members. We have Board members that are sensitive to the need for fair and appropriate compensations. It’s not exorbitant compensations, it’s just fair and appropriate compensations. That’s all you’re looking for. It’s not unreasonable at all and I think they appreciate it and recognize that.”

“I think the fact that Shane Broadway is there and happens to be an alumnus of ours and the fact we have Governor Beebe there who is an alumnus of ours I think the stars are in alignment. Now all we need is the state to do better economically then I think we will be able to go forward.”

Approval of Minutes
Before the minutes were approved, Dr. Lynn Howerton asked if it would be possible for the minutes to reflect some of the comments made by the senators. Senator Tracy Farmer, the Faculty Senate
Secretary, informed the Senate that he records each meeting for accuracy and he would include the requested items.

Due to numerous errors in the September 21, 2011 minutes, they were not approved at the October 7, 2011 meeting. Therefore, there were two sets of minutes to approve: the September 21, 2011 and the October 7, 2011 minutes. Senators Humphrey and Mooneyhan (M/S) to approve both sets of minutes. Without objection the minutes were approved.

Presentations

President's Report

Chancellor Search
There is currently one applicant and candidate for the chancellor position: Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard. He submitted both the First Friday and the Points of Pride as part of his application materials.

Applications will be taken until January 9, 2012.

Cost-containment Taskforce
The Cost-containment Taskforce charge was presented (see Appendix F). There are a few areas out-side the role of the Cost-containment Taskforce: infringement of academic freedom, elimination of tenure, dropping specialized academic accreditation, non-academic accreditation, police and other areas, admission standards and athletics. So, the question is what is the scope of the Cost-containment Taskforce?

The taskforce has met. The following subgroups were established: academics, facilities, operations and procedures. The subgroups have not met.

Marketing Ad Hoc Committee
The Marketing Committee was established during the week of October 14, 2011. The charge for this committee was presented (see Appendix G). This committee has not met.

Master Plan Taskforce
Henry Torres, President Jack Zibluk and Senator Bill Humphrey were at the meeting for this taskforce earlier in the day of October 21, 2011. The taskforce will be looking at parking, the Humanities and Social Sciences building, traffic, signage, safety and many other things.

Interim Chancellor G. Dan Howard informed President Zibluk the ironwork currently in place for the Humanities and Social Sciences building will not be taken down. Instead, the campus is waiting for someone to fund the rest of the construction.

Senator John Hall inquired if anyone knew about the construction of the road behind HPESS to Aggie for when Caraway is closed. President Zibluk indicated the issue came up during the taskforce’s meeting. Someone stated that it was mentioned in the taskforce meeting that they are in the official phrase of
designing that road but it will not be completed until sometime in 2013/2014. Senator Bill Humphrey suggested the funding for the road does not currently exist. Zibluk confirmed they do not have the funding for the road. Humphrey and Hall agree that closing Caraway before the road is complete is going to be a problem. Hall stated that closing Caraway is a safety concern. Zibluk said people are aware of the situation.

Senator Bill Humphrey made a motion to send a message that Caraway Road not be closed until the access road behind HPFESS is complete. The motion was tabled.

**Old Business**

**Internal Committees**
The following internal committees are in need of members: Elections, Finance, Status of the Profession and the Committee on Committees.

President Jack Zibluk indicated he would like to have a formal list of names for each committee by the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Lynn Howerton, who is currently serving on the Finance Committee, made a point that Dr. Louella Moore has done an excellent job in the past on the funding part of the presentation. Dr. Howerton indicated funding was not one of their strengths and they would appreciate someone to assist with the funding analysis. They could split up the work, but the funding process is a critical part of the report. Past-president Beverly Gilbert agreed that Dr. Moore would be an added benefit. Senator Bill Humphrey stated that Dr. Dan Marburger might also be considered. President Jack Zibluk indicated that both Dr. Louella Moore and Dr. Dan Marburger have deferred from being on the committee. Senator John Hall asked if there is another Accounting professor who might step forward. Past-president Beverly Gilbert asked about Dr. Jeff Pittman. Dr. David Kern, Assistant Professor of Finance, was suggested as was Dr. Philip Tew, Assistant Professor of Finance.

Dr. Lynn Howerton asked for the record to show that Dr. Louella Moore is much appreciated for all the work she has put forth on the Finance Committee. Senator John Hall suggested that in the Spring the Faculty Senate should consider formally recognizing Dr. Louella Moore for all her contributions. Senator John Hall and Past-president Beverly Gilbert will work on this.

President Jack Zibluk will personally ask Dr. David Kern, Dr. Philip Tew, Dr. Chris Brown and Dr. Jeff Pittman if they would be willing to work with the Finance Committee with the funding report.

**iPad Study**
President Jack Zibluk spoke with Mr. Henry Torres and Mr. Mark Hoeting regarding the iPad study. Hoeting indicated he would like to get an initiative going as soon as possible. $100,000 has been set
aside by the Technology Advisory Committee for this initiative. Currently there is no clear direction for the study.

Senator Bill Humphrey asked where the money originated and what the original idea behind the study was. President Zibluk specified Hoeting wanted to originally implement some sort of use of iPads in the educational settings. The Technology Advisory Committee thought Hoeting’s idea was too broad and suggested a study be conducted to focus on what to do with iPads in education before just putting the iPads out there. Senator Humphrey followed up by asking if it were true that iPads had already been purchased and were setting unused. Mr. Henry Torres stated that iPads had been purchased and there were two classes that volunteered to use them. The iPads are being used for eBooks. This reduces the cost of the courses for the students due to the eBook costing less than a physical, hard-copy book. Zibluk thinks the cost reduction of textbooks is what is driving the issue; however, iPads are not the only platform eBooks are available.

Senator John Hall asked if any of the original $100,000 set aside for this project has been spent. Mr. Henry Torres indicated that none of the money has been spent. Hall followed up by asking why a portion of that money couldn’t be used to purchase iPads and apps. The iPads would be placed in ITTC and faculty could check them out for use in their classes. Zibluk stated that could be a viable option.

Zibluk will put out a call to see who is interested in the iPad issue.

New Business

SGOC 11FA19 Raise in Admission Standards - First Reading
See Appendix C. This will be addressed more thoroughly at the next meeting.

Bill Rowe – Adjunct Hiring Standards
Senator Bill Rowe reported that in 2010 the Taskforce on Constituent Services Final Report included a short recommendation for adjunct faculty hiring procedures. Rowe feels that report should be part of shared governance. Rowe believes the report was approved by the Faculty Senate or was at least presented to the Senate. Some of the recommendations from the taskforce have been enacted.

Senator Rowe plans to send to the members of the Senate a proposal for shared governance for feedback. He requested feedback on the proposal with intent that the proposal would eventually be presented to the Handbook Committee.

Senator Andy Mooneyhan brought up that there has been some discussion of reducing overload pay to a set dollar amount. He believes that there is precedence where overload pay is calculated as something like 13.888% of your salary for a six hour load. He stated that overload pay could be reduced to a flat $1,800.00 for a course.

Past-president Beverly Gilbert clarified that Summer School overload pay is 13.88% of your salary.
President Zibluk asked if a taskforce or committee needed to be established to research this issue or if Senator Rowe’s proposal would cover it? After discussion, it was decided that Senator Rowe’s and Senator Mooneyhan’s issues are two separate issues and should be treated as such.

Senator Rowe’s proposal will be circulated for feedback and readdressed at the next Senate meeting.

With regards to the faculty compensation issue, Dr. John Pratte indicated that the Handbook does not contain the extra compensation policy, but only references it. The actually policy is found on the website (http://finance.astate.edu/policies/AA_Exa__Comp.htm) under the Operating Policies and Procedures Manual. The policy, however, only lists things you can do for extra compensation but does not stipulate any salaries.

Senator Andy Mooneyhan and Past-president Beverly Gilbert (M/S) to create a taskforce to address the faculty compensation issue. Discussion followed with the initial charge of the taskforce being to gather data concerning the status and policies regarding compensation and report back to the Senate. Without objection the motion passed. President Zibluk will accept volunteers for the taskforce via email.

Farhad Moeeni – Library
Faculty Association Secretary/Treasurer Farhad Moeeni presented a brief survey he conducted of his students regarding the usability of the library’s website (see Appendix H). The survey results indicate students go to the Google to do research before they go to the library’s website because it is easier to use. Moeeni feels that the library’s website needs to move toward a more Google-like experience where the user is presented with one search box to search all resources. Currently, this is not possible due to vendor constraints. Moeeni suggested that since the University is looking at the redesign of the University website, maybe now would be a good time to look at redesigning the library’s website as well.

Senator Tracy Farmer, the Systems Librarian for the library, explained the library tried to implement a Federated Search system several years ago where you could enter a keyword and have all electric resources searched at the same, but it did not function as expected. This is due to the different vendors each having propriety searching mechanisms. These mechanisms are not generally shared between database vendors.

Mr. Jeff Bailey, Interim Dean of the Library, agreed the library would like for the website to be simpler. There was discussion with ITS when the last website design templates were rolled out about modifying the templates to allow the library more flexibility in the website design, but the library was not allowed to make those modifications. Bailey agreed with Senator Farmer’s statements. Bailey said that within the next calendar year the library would be looking at some enhancements to get the website closer to the one box search, however, it may be a while before the library gets there.

Moeeni stated that since we are moving toward a research institution the library needs more resources.

President Zibluk asked Mr. Bailey what sort of connections the library has with the consultants working toward the redesign of the campus website. Bailey reported that the library does not have a presence
on the redesign committee. Mr. Henry Torres, who is on the redesign committee, stated he would formally ask Todd Clark to allow the library to have a seat on the committee.

Senator Andy Mooneyhan stated the library is not on that committee and asked whether they should be. If so, is there something that can be done about this? Does the Senate need to ask for that? Bailey stated having an individual from the library setting on the committee would be beneficial to the library.

Senator Bill Humphrey and Past-president Beverley Gilbert (M/S) to ask for a representative from the library be included on the web design taskforce. Without objection the motion passed.

**Possible Meeting with Legislators, Johnnie Roebuck, Chair with AAUP**
Johnnie Roebuck and legislators are willing to come to Jonesboro to discuss higher education issues.

Senator John Hall and Senator Bill Rowe will work with President Jack Zibluk on the arrangements.

**Other Business**
Senator Bill Humphrey stated it was his understanding that President Welch would be attending a Senate meeting in November. President Jack Zibluk indicated he was not aware of a visit by Welch. Humphrey suggested that if Welch is planning a visit, then the Senate might want to reserve the Heritage Studies Conference Room (next door to the Board Room) and have refreshments. In addition, the Senate may want to start the meeting 30 minutes earlier to allow faculty some meet and greet time with President Welch. President Zibluk stated he would check to see if Welch is planning a visit.

**November 18, 2011 Meeting**
President Jack Zibluk asked if we should cancel the November 18, 2011 meeting since it falls on the Friday before Fall break. It was decided to leave the meeting at the schedule time and if there is no business to address it could be cancelled.

**Annual Reception**
A reception will be held at the end of the semester for faculty at the Cooper Center. Past-president Beverley Gilbert has agreed to coordinate the arrangements for the reception. Gilbert asked that suggestion for dates for the reception be emailed to her. She also requested a recommendation for a budget.

Senator Bill Humphrey moved to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm.
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## Average Faculty Salaries
### SREB III vs. ASUJ
#### 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>SREB III Average (adjusted by 2.3% HEPI)</th>
<th>ASUJ Average</th>
<th>SREB III - ASUJ Difference</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Fringe @ 28%</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$44,297 $36,068 $8,229 $1,028,625 $288,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,316,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$59,055 $56,165 $2,890 $419,050 $117,334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$536,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$69,328 $60,115 $9,213 $1,041,069 $291,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,332,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$85,552 $75,853 $9,699 $1,183,278 $331,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,514,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>505</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,672,022</strong> $1,028,166** $4,700,188**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Arkansas State University

**Average Salaries Including Equity Adjustments Effective 08/16/11**

**Fiscal Year 2011-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Level</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SREB III (2010-11 adjusted 2.3% HEPI)</strong></td>
<td>$85,552</td>
<td>$69,328</td>
<td>$59,055</td>
<td>$44,297</td>
<td>$64,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASUJ (2011-12)</strong></td>
<td>$75,853</td>
<td>$60,115</td>
<td>$56,165</td>
<td>$36,068</td>
<td>$56,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Endowment Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SREB @ 2.3%</th>
<th>ASU @ 3.539%</th>
<th>ASU @ 4.795%</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
<th>Salary + Fringe @ 28%</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>Needed to Offset Cost @ 4% Payout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$64,102</td>
<td>$56,831</td>
<td>$56,831</td>
<td>$1,382,040</td>
<td>$1,872,529</td>
<td>$34,550,992</td>
<td>$46,813,226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$65,576</td>
<td>$58,842</td>
<td>$59,556</td>
<td>$1,444,645</td>
<td>$1,987,457</td>
<td>$36,116,124</td>
<td>$49,686,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$67,085</td>
<td>$60,925</td>
<td>$62,412</td>
<td>$1,510,086</td>
<td>$2,109,440</td>
<td>$37,752,156</td>
<td>$52,735,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$68,628</td>
<td>$63,081</td>
<td>$65,404</td>
<td>$1,578,492</td>
<td>$2,238,909</td>
<td>$39,462,298</td>
<td>$55,972,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$70,206</td>
<td>$65,313</td>
<td>$68,541</td>
<td>$1,649,996</td>
<td>$2,376,324</td>
<td>$41,249,909</td>
<td>$59,408,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$71,821</td>
<td>$67,625</td>
<td>$71,827</td>
<td>$1,724,740</td>
<td>$34,550,992</td>
<td>$43,118,497</td>
<td>$56,831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$73,473</td>
<td>$70,018</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,802,869</td>
<td>$36,068</td>
<td>$45,071,730</td>
<td>$52,735,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$75,162</td>
<td>$72,496</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,884,538</td>
<td>$39,462,298</td>
<td>$47,113,443</td>
<td>$55,972,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$75,891</td>
<td>$75,061</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,969,906</td>
<td>$425,161,318</td>
<td>$49,247,645</td>
<td>$55,972,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$78,660</td>
<td>$77,718</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,059,141</td>
<td>$45,071,730</td>
<td>$51,478,524</td>
<td>$55,972,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$80,469</td>
<td>$80,468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,006,453</td>
<td>$10,584,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  
$17,006,453 $10,584,658 $425,161,318 $254,616,457

Prepared by the Offices of the Controller and Budget Planning and Development  
October 17, 2011
Arkansas State University
Average Instructor Salaries Including Equity Adjustments Effective 08/16/11
2011-12

**Instructor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SREB @ 2.3%</th>
<th>ASU @ 4.425%</th>
<th>ASU @ 6.59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$44,297</td>
<td>$36,068</td>
<td>$36,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$45,316</td>
<td>$37,664</td>
<td>$38,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$46,358</td>
<td>$39,331</td>
<td>$40,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$47,424</td>
<td>$41,071</td>
<td>$43,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$48,515</td>
<td>$42,888</td>
<td>$46,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$49,631</td>
<td>$44,786</td>
<td>$49,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$50,773</td>
<td>$46,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$51,941</td>
<td>$48,837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$53,136</td>
<td>$50,998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$54,358</td>
<td>$53,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$55,608</td>
<td>$55,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arkansas State University
Average Assistant Professor Salaries Including Equity Adjustments Effective 08/16/11
2011-12

Assistant Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SREB @ 2.3%</th>
<th>10 years</th>
<th>ASU @ 2.815%</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>ASU @ 3.331%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$59,055</td>
<td>$56,165</td>
<td>$56,165</td>
<td>$56,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$60,413</td>
<td>$57,746</td>
<td>$58,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$61,802</td>
<td>$59,372</td>
<td>$59,969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$63,223</td>
<td>$61,043</td>
<td>$61,967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$64,677</td>
<td>$62,761</td>
<td>$64,031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$66,165</td>
<td>$64,528</td>
<td>$66,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$67,687</td>
<td>$66,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$69,244</td>
<td>$68,212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$70,837</td>
<td>$70,132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$72,466</td>
<td>$72,106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$74,133</td>
<td>$74,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arkansas State University
Average Associate Professor Salaries Including Equity Adjustments Effective 08/16/11
2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SREB @ 2.3%</th>
<th>ASU @ 3.77%</th>
<th>ASU @ 5.258%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$69,328</td>
<td>$60,115</td>
<td>$60,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$70,923</td>
<td>$62,381</td>
<td>$63,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$72,554</td>
<td>$64,733</td>
<td>$66,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$74,223</td>
<td>$67,173</td>
<td>$70,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$75,930</td>
<td>$69,705</td>
<td>$73,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$77,676</td>
<td>$72,333</td>
<td>$77,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$79,463</td>
<td>$75,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$81,291</td>
<td>$77,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$83,161</td>
<td>$80,826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$85,074</td>
<td>$83,873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$87,031</td>
<td>$87,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arkansas State University
Average Professor Salaries Including Equity Adjustments Effective 08/16/11
2011-12

Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SREB @ 2.3%</th>
<th>10 years ASU @ 3.538%</th>
<th>5 years ASU @ 4.791%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$ 85,552</td>
<td>$ 75,853</td>
<td>$ 75,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$ 87,520</td>
<td>$ 78,537</td>
<td>$ 79,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$ 89,533</td>
<td>$ 81,315</td>
<td>$ 83,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$ 91,592</td>
<td>$ 84,192</td>
<td>$ 87,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$ 93,699</td>
<td>$ 87,171</td>
<td>$ 91,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$ 95,854</td>
<td>$ 90,255</td>
<td>$ 95,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$ 98,059</td>
<td>$ 93,448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$ 100,314</td>
<td>$ 96,754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$ 102,621</td>
<td>$ 100,178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$ 104,981</td>
<td>$ 103,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$ 107,396</td>
<td>$ 107,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Arkansas State University–Jonesboro
Faculty Senate Presentation
Inadequate Faculty Salaries
Possible Solutions
October 21, 2011

I. Seek, through all legitimate means, to cause ASUJ to be funded at 75% of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) funding formula for institutions of higher education.
   A. ASUJ currently is funded at only 66% of ADHE funding formula
   B. If ASUJ was funded at 75% of ADHE funding formula it would receive $8,130,135 in additional funding (i.e., more than enough to address increasing faculty salaries to the SREB average).
   C. ASUJ’s leadership needs to engage actively and effectively all of its constituencies (e.g., trustees, other alumni, major donors of record, and others with influence) to encourage persuasively the Governor, the legislature, and ADHE to cause this funding to occur (probably phased-in over a 3- to 5-year period).

II. Offer (through Continuing Studies and Community Outreach) considerably more continuing education courses, especially those offering CEU’s needed to meet professional licensing/credentialing requirements, which generate a positive revenue stream.
    A. Meet expenses and current general budgetary obligations (currently ≈ $4.3 million).
    B. Set aside a reserve account for revenue above expenses and current budget obligations.
    C. Commit an amount equal to the reserve account for faculty salaries in the following year.

III. Raise additional levels of philanthropic and corporate support for scholarship endowments that will enable ASUJ to cover a greater share of scholarships to release operating funds that could be used to support faculty salaries.
    A. ASUJ currently awards approximately $10.5 million in scholarships funded by tuition.

1 N.B.: It will probably require employing a number of these possible solutions (and others that may arise) simultaneously and over a period of years to cause faculty salaries to reach SREB averages.
B. To offset this total amount of scholarships funded by tuition it would take $263.3 million in scholarship endowment paying out at 4%.
C. The current amount needed to raise faculty salaries to the SREB average is approximately $3.7 million.
D. To offset this total amount it would take $91.8 million in scholarship endowments paying out at 4%.
E. See the attached schedule of scholarship endowments needed meet the 5-year and 10-year faculty salary catch-up.

IV. Raise additional levels of philanthropic and corporate support for endowed chairs and professorships (for which that portion used as salary supplement will count to improving average faculty salaries).

V. Increase international student enrollment.
A. Conservatively, each international student (after netting out any scholarships, fellowships, or exchange students) contributes $10,000 in tuition annually.
B. Therefore, each 100 international students equates to $1 million
C. Tuition and fee revenue from all international students now enrolled is budgeted currently
D. First call against tuition from new international students (above current enrollment) has been projected to be used to meet revenue lost by increasing undergraduate admission standards and in meeting other operating expenses for the next two fiscal years.
E. A portion of international student tuition growth after the next three fiscal years are over may be considered to help raise faculty salaries.

VI. Consider charging a dedicated tuition increase annually for faculty salaries (currently a 1% tuition increase generates ≈ $380,000).

VII. Increase the number of academic programs offered by distance learning in which Academic Partnerships (AP) provides non-academic support services and otherwise, and dedicate some of the net revenue for faculty salaries.

VIII. Direct all differential tuition charged for majors courses in Business, Engineering, Sciences and Mathematics, and Nursing and Health Profession to faculty salaries in these colleges.
Undergraduate Admission Standards

I. Introduction: The following provides background information regarding the impact of admission standards on undergraduate student recruiting, extent of student remediation, retention rates, graduation rates, and institutional reputation and ranking. Additionally, it offers a brief history of recent changes to undergraduate admission standards (both unconditional and conditional). Finally, it proposes an increase in undergraduate admission standards for fall 2013 and 2014 along with the expected impact of such increases on enrollment.

II. General Considerations of Undergraduate Admission Standards
   A. The single most important factor in improving undergraduate student retention rates and graduation rates is the quality of the academic preparation of students at the time that they enter the university.
   B. Primary factors in raising ASU's profile in America's Best Colleges published by the editors of US News & World Report are related directly to the ACT/SAT scores as well as associated impacts on student retention and graduation rates (If ASU wants to move from a tier 3 rated institution to a top 100 institution in the south, it must raise the minimum ACT score for entry into undergraduate programs).
   C. ACT/SAT scores are predictors of academic success, which are more reliable than high school GPA because of significant variability of grading by different high schools.
   D. Undergraduate admission standards at ASUJ have been fairly minimal (nearly “open” admission) and for many years at ASUJ and there has been a reluctance to raise them over concerns that by doing so tuition and fee revenue (needed to meet operational expenses and debt service) would decline and ASUJ would not be serving adequately students in the Delta region.
   E. Least well prepared students at ASUJ (despite efforts to help them succeed) tend to drop-out, cost more to educate, fail to graduate (or graduate as a small percentage of those who enroll), and tend get in more trouble than better prepared students.
   F. Changing landscape
      1. Community Colleges (e.g., ASUMH, ASUB, and ASUN) provide access to educational opportunity for students who may not qualify to enter ASUJ if/when undergraduate admission standards are raised
      2. Growth of the international student population at ASUJ has created revenue necessary to offset the revenue that would be lost from students who would no longer qualify to attend ASUJ if undergraduate admission standards are increased.
      3. ASUJ is now designated as a Research university by the State of Arkansas and undergraduate admission standards are Research universities are higher than at Master’s Comprehensive universities (e.g., students diagnosed with remedial/developmental needs are often not admissible or admissible only on a conditional basis).

III. Undergraduate Admission Standards at ASUJ (Recent History)
   A. Fall 2009 Undergraduate Admission Standards (tantamount to “open” enrollment)
      1. A minimum ACT composite score of 15 or a minimum final high school GPA of 2.25.
      2. Comparable scores on the SAT, ASSET or COMPASS may be submitted for consideration.
   B. Fall 2010 Undergraduate Admission Standards (Approved)
      1. Students may be admitted on an unconditional basis with minimum high school cumulative grade point average of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale and a minimum composite ACT score of 17.
      2. Students may be admitted on a conditional basis with a minimum high school cumulative grade point average of 2.2 on a 4.0 scale and a minimum composite ACT score of 14. Students admitted on a conditional basis must enter the Academic Success Institute and receive passing grades before they may progress into regular academic programs at ASUJ.
   C. Fall 2011 Undergraduate Admission Standards (Approved)
      1. Students may be admitted unconditionally with a high school GPA ≥ 2.5 on a 4.0 scale and a combined ACT score ≥19 to qualify for admission to ASU.

1 N.B.: Prepared by Dr. G. Daniel Howard, CGFM, CFRE, Interim Chancellor
2. Students may be admitted on a conditional basis with a high school GPA $\geq 2.3$ and a combined ACT score $\geq 16$. Students admitted on a conditional basis must enter the Academic Success Institute and receive passing grades before they may progress into regular academic programs at ASU.

D. Fall 2012 Undergraduate Admission Standards (Approved)
1. Students may be admitted unconditionally with a high school GPA $\geq 2.5$ on a 4.0 scale and a combined ACT score $\geq 21$ to qualify for admission to ASU.
2. Students may be admitted on a conditional basis with a high school GPA $> 2.3$ and a combined ACT score $> 18$. Students admitted on a conditional basis must enter the Academic Success Institute and receive passing grades before they may progress into regular academic programs at ASU.

IV. Proposed Undergraduate Admission Standards at ASUJ

A. Fall 2013 Undergraduate Admission Standards (Proposed)
1. Students may be admitted unconditionally with a high school GPA $\geq 2.75$ (up from 2.5) on a 4.0 scale and a combined ACT score $\geq 21$ to qualify for admission to ASU.
2. Students may be admitted on a conditional basis with a high school GPA $\geq 2.3$ and a combined ACT score $\geq 18$. Students admitted on a conditional basis must enter the Academic Success Institute and receive passing grades before they may progress into regular academic programs at ASU.
3. Anticipated Impact: 102 students will move from unconditional to conditional admission status.

B. Fall 2014 Undergraduate Admission Standards (Proposed)
1. Students may be admitted unconditionally with a high school GPA $\geq 2.75$ on a 4.0 scale and a combined ACT score $\geq 21$ to qualify for admission to ASU.
2. Students may be admitted on a conditional basis with a high school GPA $\geq 2.3$ and a combined ACT score $\geq 19$ (up from 18). Students admitted on a conditional basis must enter the Academic Success Institute and receive passing grades before they may progress into regular academic programs at ASU.
3. Anticipated Impact: 94 students will not be admissible at ASU.
Arkansas State University

Points of Pride¹
November 1, 2011

- ASU moved from a tier III institution to tier I institution as selected by the editors of *U.S. News & World Report* in *America's Best Colleges* for 2011 and again achieved tier I ranking in *America's Best Colleges* for 2012.

- Enrollment at ASU in the fall of 2011 is at an all-time high of 14,200 (including 300 students in the English as a Second Language program).

- ASU has moved from the fourth largest institution of higher education in the state to the second largest (only behind the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville).

- The student body includes 10,698 Arkansans in fall 2011, which is 77 percent of all students enrolled.

- ASU is enrolling more international students than ever before (increasing from 127 students from approximately 45 countries in the spring of 2008), with 1,088 students in fall 2011 from 59 countries.

- Enrollment in the English as a Second Language (ESL) program has grown from 3 students, in spring 2008, to 321 students today.

- In 2008, ASU did not have any students enrolled in academic programs delivered online — today, there are more than 2,100 students (primarily teachers) enrolled in master’s degree and educational specialist degree programs delivered by distance learning. The graduates from these programs number 1,340, and 421 are registered to graduate in December, for a combined total of more than 1,760. These teachers in turn will influence positively more than 1 million students over their careers and help these students prepare for challenges they will face in the ever increasing globally competitive marketplace.

- ASU had the largest December graduating class, with 960 graduating.

¹ N.B.: Prepared by: Dr. G. Daniel Howard, CGFM, CFRE, Interim Chancellor
• It is expected that approximately 1,500 will graduate in December 2011, which will require ASU to hold two commencement ceremonies as we do in May.

• Almost 2,000 students graduated in May 2011, which is the largest graduating class in the history of ASU, representing more than 570 students above the previous highest level at any ASU commencement.

• Overall, in the 2010-11 fiscal year, 3,554 students (combined summer 2010, fall 2010, and spring 2011) graduated from ASU. This is 33 percent higher than the previous record set in fiscal 2010.

• ASU is producing more academic degrees at the Associate, Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Educational Specialist levels than ever before.

• ASU is producing more semester credit hours than ever before — Academic Year 2010-2011 produced 354,724 semester credit hours which is 32.5 percent more credit hours than academic year 2006-07 and 10.9 percent more than academic year 2009-10.

• Raising ASU’s undergraduate admission standards (in three phases) is leading to increased student retention and graduation rates, helping ASU recruit better students, and placing ASU in a perfect trajectory for performance-based funding that has been mandated by state law.

• The freshman retention rate this year rose to 71.3 percent, an increase of 5 percent in just two years.

• The latest six-year graduation rate is 40.2 percent, which is 15.5 percent better than the number reported in 2010.

• Undergraduate ACT scores at ASU are increasing. The average ACT score of entering freshmen has increased by 7.5 percent over the past three years, to 22.8 in 2011. This is substantially more than the Arkansas (19.9) and national (21.1) averages.

• The percentage of students at ASU requiring remedial math (25.5 percent), English (15.9 percent), and reading (14.8 percent) is declining and is now the lowest since data have been collected at ASU on remedial education.
Arkansas State University

- ASU has more students enrolled in the Honors College than any time previously, with 769 enrolled as of fall 2011.

- ASU has the largest freshman Honors Class in its history, with 239 enrolled in fall 2011 (despite the fact that requirements for admission to Honors were raised in fall 2009, from a 24 ACT or 3.5 high school GPA, to a 27 ACT and a 3.5 high school GPA). In actuality, the average ACT score in fall 2011 for freshmen entering Honors is 28.4 and the average high school GPA is 3.84.

- ASU has more alumni contributing funds than ever before; currently, the percentage of alumni donors is 9.6 percent, which is one of the top percentages among its peer institutions.

- More than 19,000 alumni live in Craighead and the five adjacent Arkansas counties, where they hold jobs and contribute to the economy and the quality of life.

- ASU faculty developed and submitted more proposals and for greater amounts to external sponsors and expended more funds for research and other sponsored activities than any previous time in its history.

- ASU has been named among the top 10 most veteran-friendly campuses in the nation by Military Times EDGE magazine.

- ASU has been named as one of the most military-friendly campuses by the editors of Military Advanced Education in the 4th Annual Guide to Military Friendly Colleges and Universities.

- For the third consecutive year, ASU has been named as one of the most military-friendly schools by the editors of G.I. Jobs in the 2012 Guide to Military Friendly Schools.

- Arkansas State University, a member of the Sun Belt Conference, competes in 16 different sports (seven for men and nine for women) at the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I level. ASU is one of only 120 universities nationwide that fields an NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) football program.

- ASU has 94 percent occupancy in its residence halls and apartments, with 2,849 students living in on-campus student housing.
While 77 percent of ASU students are from Arkansas, students come from 48 other states and 59 other countries.

Campus crime statistics showed an overall decrease of 15 percent in 2010, compared to 2009.

During fiscal 2012, ASU’s budgeted payroll for the 1,550 full-time faculty and staff members totals $85.6 million, the majority of which is spent or invested in Northeast Arkansas. The total budget exceeds $162 million.

Despite the worst recession since the Great Depression, ASU has been able to provide faculty promotions and make faculty and staff equity adjustments — this has occurred primarily as a consequence of tuition and fees paid by an expanding pool of international students and a growing number of students in distance learning in association with Academic Partnerships.

Simply put, ASU is transforming positively and is doing exceedingly well on virtually all performance measures due to the excellent support of the Board of Trustees, the strong support of the alumni and other donors, and the hard work and dedication of the faculty and support staff of the University.

For more information:

www.astate.edu/chancellor

chancellor@astate.edu
Introduction

Unlike many other states, we are so very fortunate that the economy of Arkansas appears to be improving and this may have positive implications for Arkansas State University. The university continues to provide access to a high quality education at an affordable price in a caring and supportive environment, due in substantial part to the hard work and selfless dedication of the faculty, staff, administrators and the outstanding support of ASU alumni, the president of the ASU System (Dr. Charles “Chuck” Welch), the Board of Trustees for Arkansas State University, Chancellor’s Cabinet, and other donors and friends. In this second issue of First Friday for fall 2011, the focus will be on ASU’s ranking by the editors of U.S. News & World Report in “America’s Best Colleges”; efforts recently taken to enhance well-considered actions to control institutional costs; enrollment projections for the next five years and associated implications; the Chancellor’s Annual Report; and other actions to prepare ASU for the future.

First Friday is written as a means of providing major campus stakeholders (e.g., faculty, staff, students, alumni, government officials, donors and other friends) with valid, reliable and timely information about Arkansas State University. It is also directly correlated with and supportive of my commitment to transparency, inclusiveness and shared governance. Tom Moore does an excellent job in editing First Friday and Sherry Johnson and Marilyn Brewer do a superb job in double proofing each issue. Although every effort is made to provide correct information in First Friday, I take full responsibility for any and all unintentional errors and ask your forgiveness in advance for any of my shortcomings. Anyone interested in visiting previous issues of First Friday may do so by clicking on Archives.
ASU Achieves Tier I Ranking in America’s Best Colleges 2012

Arkansas State University has been ranked by the editors of U.S. News & World Report in “America’s Best Colleges 2012” as a Tier I southern regional institution of higher education. This is the second year in a row that ASU has achieved Tier I status and it provides additional objective evidence of institutional quality and value beyond that associated with the regional accreditation and 20 specialized accreditations earned and held by ASU. The entire campus community should feel justifiably proud of this signal accomplishment. Higher undergraduate admission standards, improved retention rates, increased graduation rates, and larger numbers of alumni donors all contributed to this success. Clearly, ASU faculty members are central in helping to achieve this ranking by their commitment to student success. The special bonds forged between faculty and students help them survive and thrive at ASU and to become successful alumni who remain connected and supportive of their alma mater. Additionally, the warmth, friendliness and competency of the staff complement the efforts of the faculty, which helps to attract well-qualified students to ASU and to encourage students to persist through graduation.

It is expected that the Tier I ranking for the second year in a row will contribute positively to ASU becoming an institution of first choice among many of the best and brightest students. The benefit from last year’s Tier I ranking has already been seen and felt this fall by the higher ACT scores and high school success of the entering freshman class as well as extraordinary growth of the Honors College under the leadership of Rebecca Oliver. Enrolling better-prepared students influences positively the overall educational environment of the university; reduces the number of students requiring remedial education in math, English, and reading (as well as the extent of remediation needed by these students); enables faculty to conduct more rigorous and challenging courses; contributes to higher retention and graduation rates; and should help reduce student loan default rates as college graduates tend to earn more than non-graduates and are therefore better able to pay their debts. It is expected that many of these parameters will be included in performance-based funding mandated by the Arkansas General Assembly; thereby, placing ASU in the trajectory to benefit by performance-based funding. Additionally, as ASU moves from being a regional institution of higher education to a research university (consistent with its recent change in role and scope) the Tier I ranking
will enable ASU to attract more outstanding faculty and well-prepared students from a larger geographical area, better supporting more advanced levels in the teaching, research and service aspects of the university.

**Chancellor's Task Force on Cost Containment**

Arkansas State University has an important duty and obligation to ensure that the precious financial resources under its control, which are provided by legislative appropriations, tuition and fees, returns on investments, philanthropic contributions, and other funding sources, are used optimally in achieving the mission, goals and objectives of the university. The university employs a number of practices and procedures for cost control, such as competitive bidding on contracts; preventive maintenance of facilities, fixed and non-fixed equipment; cash management; and a variety of energy efficiency measures. However, there is no doubt that the university should consider other actions to contain costs. With the aforementioned in mind and with inspiration from members of the State Legislature, the president of the ASU System, Dr. Charles "Chuck" Welch, and with support from the Board Trustees for Arkansas State University, the Chancellor's Task Force on Cost Containment has been constituted and approved by the Executive Council of the university. It is comprised of individuals from campus with the explicit charge of identifying how ASU may be able to contain costs more effectively and to prepare, in written form with an executive summary, a set of objectively based and well-considered recommendations to be presented to the Chancellor's Office by the end of the 2011-12 academic year.

Although it is expected that the Chancellor's Task Force on Cost Containment will have a considerable amount of latitude to review institutional practices, procedures and data, there are a few areas and associated potential recommendations that are outside of the role and scope of their charge as follows: infringement of academic freedom; elimination of tenure; dropping specialized academic accreditation and non-academic accreditation in such areas as the University Police Department (UPD); eliminating intercollegiate (NCAA) sports and/or dropping to a lower level of NCAA competition; altering the role and scope of the university; or undermining campus safety and security. When recommendations are offered by the Task Force, it is expected that the Task Force will consider and report upon the cost/benefit of such recommendations. For example, if reducing the amount of lighting on campus is recommended, the potential impact and campus safety and security should
be addressed.

In order to fulfill its charge, it is expected that the Task Force will consider the best cost containment practices in the field including those employed by other institutions of higher education (both within and outside of the state of Arkansas) and to assess if these practices may have merit for possible adoption (with or without adaptation) at ASU. The Task Force has been charged to meet at least monthly; prepare and follow an agenda; prepare, approve and disseminate minutes; and establish a Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment website on which it is to post valid, reliable, relevant and timely information (e.g., Task Force membership; charge to the Task Force; meeting dates, times, and locations; meeting agendas and minutes; and Task Force tasks and timelines). The website for the Task Force has already been established and can be accessed at http://www.astate.edu/a/chancellor/task-force/index.dot.

Graciously, Dr. JW Mason, associate vice chancellor for Administration, has agreed to serve as chair of the Task Force and Dr. Len Frey, dean of the College of Business, has accepted the position of co-chair. Both the chair and the co-chair are expected to meet at least monthly with the interim chancellor to discuss progress, issues and concerns, and challenges for which feedback or assistance may be necessary.

I am grateful that the following individuals have volunteered to serve as members of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment:

- Dr. JW Mason, Chair, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration
- Dr. Len Frey, Co-chair, Dean, College of Business
- Dr. Susan Hanrahan, Dean, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Dr. Lonnie Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
- Dr. Gina Hogue, Chair, Department of History
- Dr. Jack Zibluk, President, Faculty Senate Association
- Ms. Lori Wynn, Director, Human Resources
- Dr. John Pratte, Associate Dean, College of Sciences and Mathematics
- Dr. Kim Pittcock, Associate Professor, Horticulture
- Dr. Shane Hunt, Associate Professor, Marketing
- Ms. Christy Valentine, Executive Director of University Communications
- Mr. Dave McKinney, Chair, Staff Senate
Please join me in expressing heartfelt appreciation to all of the above listed individuals and for their special commitment that will lead to ASU reducing costs without diminishing educational quality; thereby, providing greater value and access to exceptional undergraduate and graduate education at ASU.

**Chancellor's Annual Report**

Each year the chancellor of Arkansas State University is expected to initiate the development of an annual report providing highlights of the fiscal year. This report is used to underscore annual performance of the university and as a marketing piece for ASU. It is distributed in hard copy to a number of constituencies (e.g., Chancellor’s Cabinet, ASU Foundation Board, Board of Trustees for Arkansas State University, ASU Alumni Association board members, state constitutional officers, legislators and government officials, major donors, and other friends). It is also made available online in PDF format through the Chancellor’s website, [http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/](http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/).
The preparation of the Chancellor's Annual Report involves the senior administrative line officers of the university, including the vice chancellors, athletic director, deans, as well as the creative services team and others. Tom Moore, executive assistant to the chancellor, simply did an extraordinary job in orchestrating the development of the Chancellor's Annual Report for 2010-11 (as he did in 2009-10), which reflects accurately and positively upon the university. He served tirelessly as the editor of the report and ensured that it was clear, concise, comprehensive, accurate, consistent with a single-style voice and logical format, and enjoyable to read. Tom engaged Sherry Johnson and Marilyn Brewer in double proofing the report and they did a wonderful job in this capacity. Accordingly, Tom Moore is owed a deep debt of gratitude by the entire campus community and certainly by me for his special efforts. I encourage you to join me in expressing your appreciation to Tom for his special efforts to create an absolutely first-rate Chancellor’s Annual Report for 2010-11. Sherry Johnson and Marilyn Brewer also merit recognition and our appreciation.

**Enrollment Projections and Implications**

Consistent with sound management of the university and in order to meet accreditation requirements, it is valuable to have well-considered enrollment projections going out at least five years and to articulate the implications of these enrollment projections with regard to faculty and support staff, academic facilities, student housing, dining space and parking. Among other things, these predictions, their underlying assumptions, and the associated implications will help with the development of a first-rate Campus Facilities Master Plan being developed under the leadership of Ed Kremers, vice chancellor for Finance and Administration, with the support and assistance of an institution-wide Campus Facilities Master Plan Committee and special expertise provided by Johnson, Johnson, and Roy (JJR), a firm that specializes in the development of campus facilities master plans. Enrollment predictions, along with their underlying assumptions and implications, also will help to inform the development of a new Enrollment Management Plan being
developed under the leadership of Dr. Rick Stripling, vice chancellor for Student Affairs, with substantial input from many individuals and departments on campus, particularly Academic Affairs, Offices of Admissions, Financial Aid and Scholarships, Registrar and the Graduate School.

Accordingly, I took the liberty of developing a White Paper, “Enrollment Projections 2012-2016 and Associated Implications,” with considerable feedback and assistance from many individuals, both on and off campus. A few snippets from this White Paper are included below and the entire White Paper is available on the Chancellor’s website http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/.

Arkansas State University anticipates continuing and substantial enrollment growth as measured during consecutive fall semesters 2012-2016, despite increases in undergraduate admission standards for all undergraduate students and selective increases in graduate admission standards. Although a best-faith effort was put forth in predicting enrollment over the next five years, it is important to keep in mind that there are numerous variables that influence student enrollment over which the university has no control (e.g., overt acts of terrorism, global economic challenges and natural disasters), which may render enrollment predictions inaccurate and unreliable. Moreover, the longer the time frame of the prediction, the more variance is likely to be seen between the predicted enrollment and the actual enrollment. Nevertheless, it is invaluable to predict enrollment and associated implications of this enrollment as a prudent practice, albeit recognizing the associated caveats and to revisit these predictions annually to consider possible adjustments to these predictions.

It is anticipated that student enrollment will increase approximately 23 percent to 26 percent over the next five years. Students qualifying to be counted by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) are predicted to increase by 3,130 (i.e., 13,900 to 17,030) or 23 percent; in combination with students enrolled in English as a Second Language (ESL) who are not countable by ADHE (but are actually enrolled full-time and pay tuition and fees), the increase is predicted to be 3,630 (i.e., 14,200 to 17,830) or 26 percent. The preponderance of predicted enrollment increases at ASU is derived from two primary sources:
a) international students enrolling in academic programs offered by ASU at the undergraduate and graduate levels and in English as a Second Language (who are not counted by ADHE); and

b) students enrolled in academic programs offered by ASU and delivered by distance learning via a large-scale model in which ASU has a contract with Academic Partnerships, LLC (AP) for AP to provide non-academic support services (i.e., marketing, EPIC learning management system, and technical support).

The following chart depicts the composition of the projected enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>2011-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not distance learning)</td>
<td>11,026 10,876 10,876 10,985 11,095 11,206</td>
<td>180 1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AP/HEH Related)</td>
<td>2,086 2,286 2,786 3,286 3,786 4,286</td>
<td>2,200 105.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not ESL)</td>
<td>788 938 1,088 1,238 1,388 1,538</td>
<td>750 95.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESL)</td>
<td>300 400 500 600 700 800</td>
<td>500 166.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total w/ESL</td>
<td>14,200 14,500 15,250 16,109 16,969 17,830</td>
<td>3,630 25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total w/o ESL</td>
<td>13,900 14,100 14,750 15,509 16,269 17,030</td>
<td>3,130 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because students enrolled in large-scale distance learning will not attend any courses on-campus, their potential impact upon campus infrastructure is minimal. Due to the nature in which the courses are offered, the number of new faculty members needed to support them is fairly modest. Conversely, all international students will be full-time and attend virtually all of their courses on campus, resulting in substantial additional demands upon campus infrastructure. A number of new instructors and faculty members will be needed to support them.

Completion of the new building for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will be critical to serving these students, and the construction of a new College of Business Building will be helpful and will add additional capacity for future enrollment growth. Since student housing and the student dining facilities are at capacity and demands for more and
better student housing and expanded dining facilities are increasing (irrespective of enrollment growth), it will be necessary to construct additional student housing (including additional housing for Honors students) and on-campus housing for sororities without delay and to consider adding student dining facilities at a physical location closer to the newest student housing.

As with most important reports, the White Paper, "Enrollment Projections 2012-2016 and Associated Implications," is based on contributions from a substantial number of individuals and they are acknowledged at the beginning of the White Paper.

**Summary and Conclusion**

Arkansas State University continues to improve on virtually all important benchmarks (e.g., higher average entering student high school GPA and ACT scores; increased overall enrollment; improved freshman retention rate; highest number of semester credit hours produced; highest graduation rates; largest number of graduates at the associate's, baccalaureate, masters, and education specialists levels; highest number of students enrolled in honors, with the largest freshman honors cohort ever; greatest diversity of the student body; and the highest percentage of alumni of record who are donors to the university), that have contributed to the ranking of ASU by the editors of U.S. News & World Report in “America’s Best Colleges 2012” as a Tier I southern regional institution of higher education. This represents the contributions of the entire campus community and those who have been particularly involved know who they are and should feel justifiably proud. As the higher undergraduate admission rates are implemented in fall 2012, ASU’s national ranking by the editors of U.S. News & World Report in “America’s Best Colleges” should continue to improve.

A Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment has been established under the leadership of Dr. JW Mason, chair, and Dr. Len Frey, co-chair. It is expected that this Task Force will identify additional ways in which ASU may be able to control costs to make access to a high quality education at ASU more affordable. Relevant deliberations and work products of the Task Force will be included on its web page, [http://www.astate.edu/a/chancellor/task-force/index.dot](http://www.astate.edu/a/chancellor/task-force/index.dot). Recommendations, suggestions, and any other feedback through any member of the Task Force, its chair, or co-chair will be appreciated and given full consideration.
Under the leadership of Tom Moore, the “Chancellor's Annual Report for 2010-11” has been completed and distributed to many campus constituencies and institutional stakeholders, both in hard copy and electronically. This report provides a brief synopsis of information submitted by all major campus areas. It is available on the Chancellor’s website, [http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/](http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/).

Consistent with sound management practices, a White Paper, “Enrollment Projections 2012-2016 and Associated Implications,” has been developed and released. This White paper includes enrollment projections for the next five years and provides associated implications regarding the need for additional faculty and staff, academic facilities, student housing, dining facilities for students, and parking. It is available on the Chancellor’s website, [http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/](http://www.astate.edu/chancellor/).

Unquestionably, I am honored and humbled to serve as interim chancellor at this time and look forward to serving you, our students and other stakeholders well. You have my assurance that I will continue to invest myself fully in meeting the important duties and obligations of my job and hope that you will forgive any unintentional errors that I may commit. Please feel encouraged to share with me, [dhoward@astate.edu](mailto:dhoward@astate.edu), any issues, concerns or suggestions that you may have for improving ASU. Thank you so very much for your support, dedication and contributions to our university.

Warmest regards,

Dan
Appendix F
Arkansas State University
Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment

Charge to the Task Force

Arkansas State University has an important duty and obligation to ensure that its precious financial resources, which are provided by legislative appropriations, tuition and fees, returns on investments, philanthropic contributions, and other funding sources, are used optimally in achieving the mission, goals, and objectives of the university. The university currently employs a number of practices and procedures for cost control, such as competitive bidding on contracts; preventive maintenance of facilities, fixed equipment, and non-fixed equipment; cash management; and a variety of energy efficiency measures. However, there is no doubt that there are other actions that the university should consider to further contain costs.

With the aforementioned in mind, the Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment has been constituted and approved by the Executive Council of the university. It is comprised of individuals from campus with the explicit charge of identifying how ASU may be able to contain costs more effectively and to prepare, in written form with an executive summary, a set of objectively based and well-considered recommendations to be presented to the Chancellor’s Office by the end of the academic year 2011-12.

Although it is expected that the Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment will have considerable latitude to review institutional practices, procedures, and data, there are a few areas and associated potential recommendations that are outside of the role and scope of their charge: infringement of academic freedom; elimination of tenure; dropping specialized academic accreditation and non-academic accreditation in such areas as the University Police Department (UPD); lowering admission standards; eliminating intercollegiate (NCAA) sports and/or dropping to a lower level of NCAA competition; altering the role and scope of the university; or undermining campus safety and security.

In order to fulfill its charge, the Task Force will be expected to consider the best cost containment practices in the field, including those employed by other institutions of higher education, and to assess if these practices may have merit for possible adoption (with or without modification) at ASU.
When recommendations are offered by the Task Force, it is expected that the Task Force will consider and report upon the cost/benefit of such recommendations. For example, if replacing less energy efficient windows with more energy efficient windows is recommended, it will be important to provide a best faith estimate of the time it will take for energy savings to offset the cost of this action.

The Task Force is expected to carry out these responsibilities: meet at least monthly; prepare and follow an agenda; prepare, approve, and disseminate minutes; and establish a Chancellor’s Task Force on Cost Containment website on which it is to post valid, reliable, relevant, and timely information (e.g., Task Force membership, charge to the Task Force, meeting times and locations, meeting agendas and minutes, and Task Force tasks and timelines). Both the chair and the co-chair are expected to meet at least monthly with the interim chancellor to discuss progress, issues and concerns, and challenges for which feedback or assistance may be necessary.

###
University Marketing Committee

Role and Scope

The University Marketing Committee is an ad hoc committee that initially will serve as a planning and advisory body for the ASU brand identity research currently being conducted by Simpson Scarborough on behalf of ASU. This committee will provide strategic guidance on the conduct of the research project and the interpretation of the ensuing results. Specifically, the University Marketing Committee will be involved in the project in the following ways:

• Providing feedback on project scope and guiding questions during the research process and endorse final methodology for research;
• Reviewing and providing commentary on drafts of moderator guides for focus groups and instruments for survey research;
• Participating in on-campus presentations of the research findings to assist with interpretation; and
• Developing informal internal support for the identity initiative.

Moving forward, this committee will assist in providing and implementing an integrated marketing vision for the university and will advise the Executive Director of University Marketing and Communications on marketing issues related to the university including marketing strategies or needs that may influence student enrollment, donor giving, student and alumni support, and institutional reputation. In the spirit of transparency and inclusion, the committee is charged with holding meetings at least monthly, using a formal agenda, and producing minutes that will be placed on an appropriate website with notice to the campus community as to its address. It is expected that this committee will submit a formal written report to the Chancellor by the end of the spring semester 2012, which may include a recommendation as to the establishment of a permanent University Marketing Committee within the Shared Governance structure. The ad hoc University Marketing Committee will sunset December 31, 2012, or at an earlier date should a University Marketing Committee emerge through the shared governance process prior to December 31, 2012.

Members:

Osa Amienyi - Dean, College of Communications
Tammy Fowler - Director, Admissions
Len Frey - Dean, College of Business
Gleen Hart - Assistant Athletic Director, Athletic Administration
Shane Hunt - Associate Professor, Marketing, Committee Co-Chair
Julie Isaacson - Associate Professor, Nursing, HLC Committee
Dave McKinney - President, Staff Senate
Rebecca Oliver - Director, Honors College
Tim Oliver - Associate Professor, Music
Support for Library Website

One of our most valuable assets
Making it more user-friendly
During past year, **how many times** did you use the **ASU library** to search, access, or check out books, journal, etc. in order to write papers, do **projects, homework, etc.**?

If your answer to question 1 is more than zero then explain what **caused or motivated** you to do so.

During past year, **how many times** did you use a **search engine on the Internet** (Google, etc.) to search, access, save or print materials from the Internet in order to write papers, do **projects or homework, etc.**?

If your answer to question 3 is more than zero then explain what **caused or motivated** you to do so.
ASU Library visit frequency in the past year

0; 0; 0; 0; 1; 2-3; 3 or more; 4-5; 5; 5-10; 20; 7-8; 10-15; times, Once a week/a month,

Reasons for using library:
Required; Course-related reserved materials; Materials that are exclusively available through Library - LexisNexis; group meeting; prefer library for avoiding distraction; first place to look for research, I enjoy reading books;

Internet Search frequency in the past year

6; 20 or more; 25; 100, >100; >100, >100, 300, over 1000; 1000; 1000; 250 times, Once a day, daily, too many to count

Reasons for using the Internet:
Doing homework, easy access, easy access, easy access, easy, simple, easier, easy, quick, convenient, number 1 resource for research?? convenient; self-motivated; quick; find multiple sources
Presented to the Faculty Senate on Oct 21, 2011.
User’s Perspective of Simplicity

• Simplicity and ease of access to the website

• Simplicity and ease of the website and the use of the search engine