Faculty Senate
Minutes of April 2, 2004

FACULTY ASSOCIATION OFFICERS   Proxy
Bill Rowe – President (Fine Arts)   P
John Hall – Secretary / Treasurer (Education)   P   E Gilbert
Bob Bennett – Immediate Past-President (Science & Mathematics) P
Debra Walden- Vice-Chair of the Senate   P
Bill Humphrey – Secretary of Senate   P
Dennis White- Parliamentarian   absent

AGRICULTURE (1)
Bill Humphrey   P

BUSINESS (3)
Dan Marburger   P
Jim Washam   absent
Gauri Guha   P

COMMUNICATIONS (2)
Jack Zibluk   P
Marlin Shipman   absent

EDUCATION (5)
Cindy Albright   absent
Kris Biondolillo   P
Dan Cline   P
Charlotte Skinner   P
Amany Saleh   P

ENGINEERING (1)
Tom Parsons   absent

FINE ARTS (3)
Allyson Gill   absent
Ken Hatch   absent
Bert Juhrend   absent

University College (1)
Margaret McClain   P

HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES (6)
Ernesto Lombeida   P
William Maynard   P
Mary Donaghy   P   J Coombs
Joe Sartorelli   P
Richard Wang   P
Win Bridges   absent
LIBRARY (1)
Myron Flugstad   P

MILITARY SCIENCE (1)

NURSING AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS (3)

Judith Pfriemer	P	C Hall
Troy Thomas	P	
Debra Walden	P	

SCIENCE & MATHEMATICS (4)

William Burns	absent
David Gilmore	absent
Jie Miao	absent
Jeff Jenness	absent

Minutes: The minutes of the March 5, 2004 meeting were approved as distributed without corrections.

New Business:

M Hoeting reported on the following:

- Course Management System (Blackboard): RFI has been made and information is being evaluated by the committee, request for proposals will go out next week. Other systems are being evaluated due to the escalating cost of the Blackboard system (5 to 9,000 dollars /year currently, new contract will be in the $55,000/year range). The committee is looking at options, however, Blackboard may still be the best option and we may continue to use it.

- IP Telephone System: There are currently 86 phone systems on campus, these will be replaced. The network built three years ago is voice ready, will begin layering phones on it this summer. By September 75-80% of the phones on campus will be on the new system, the remainder will be converted by the end of December. New phone sets will be placed in all offices at no cost to the departments.

- Enterprise Management System: To systems are being evaluated, SCT and People Soft. The RFP is on the IT web site for people to look at. A decision on which system will be selected will be made on May 7.

- Virus problem on campus: This is a continuing problem, faculty need to keep their antivirus software up dated on a regular basis and change passwords frequently.

J Coombs presented a report on parking on campus. (see attachment) M McLain said that freshmen should not be allowed to have a car on campus. Maynard asked how much money the administration spent on a parking consultant, it appears that they could have used faculty (Coombs) at no cost. Rowe suggested that the senate ask for more representation on committees like parking and building and grounds. Coombs said that as more parking is built mass transit becomes less effective; it becomes too easy to drive. Rowe will appoint an ad hoc committee to make recommendations on parking; committee will include J Coombs. Humphrey suggested that one solution would be to only let dorm residents park in the dorm parking lots. It takes less than five minutes to

walk across campus which is a lot less time than it takes to walk to the car, drive to the other side of campus, find a parking spot and get to class on time.

Captain Donovan gave a brief report on the history of ROTC at ASU. He ask the senate help in getting permission to paint the ROTC insignia on the rappelling tower. He presented this request to the building and grounds committee and was denied. Bennett moved to suspend the rules, Maynard seconded, motion passed. Motion made that the faculty senate at ASU supports the ROTC department's request to paint the ROTC insignia on the rappelling tower. Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business:

Wang gave a report from the nominating committee (T Thomas, R Jorgensen, R Wang). The two candidates for president-elect are B Humphrey and J Zibluk. Bennett made a motion to accept report, D Walden seconded. Motion passed. The election will be April 13 at the faculty association meeting.

Maynard read a summary of the faculty responses to the Kline survey based on the University goals established in 1995. The results are attached. Kline made the observation that the current strategic planning taskforce has identified nine new goals, seven are the same as before that according to the survey had no progress made in implementing them. Motion to accept report on survey made and passed.

Rowe reported that R Lee will report on the outcome of the disciplinary action taken in the student athlete case when he gets back from China.

E Gilbert read the resolution (attached) crafted by M Shipman on the creation of the Honors College and moved that the senate approve it, Marbuger seconded. Motion passed unanimously. I either deleted the copy or did not get one, I will send it out on the list serve and also add it to these minutes as soon as I get it.

Marbuger withdrew his resolution on sports activity at U of A.

Flugsted reported on the parking committee's activities. The proposed new parking fees are attached. Marbuger suggested that if people could park in the parking garage without a fee (parking decal only) then the senate should support the increased fees. Maynard said that ASU just keeps increasing the fees charged to students and faculty and the senate should not support this increase. T Thomas asked where is this money going, does the athletic department need more money? Guha opposes, not environmentally sound it just encourages more cars on campus. The senate will vote on this issue at the next meeting.

T Thomas reported on the ad hoc committee on computer/technology use. See attached report.

Rowe started discussion on student library fees. T Thomas opposes, it is like the technology fee which is good but when the University gets in trouble they divert some of the money for other uses such as the athletic area. Maynard suggested that all students should be polled. Wang suggested that the senate should find out what Grant', position on fees is.

Rowe introduced the following diversity statement, the senate will vote on it at the next meeting.

Arkansas State University is committed to preventing illegal or unconstitutional discrimination, and discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the job function involved, including, but not limited to, age, sex, disability, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual orientation.

Maynard suggested that the Senate should ask for an increase in their appropriation. SGA gets $50,000/year compared to $1800/year for the senate.

Hall announced the AAUP meeting will be April 17, 04 at 10:00am at the Edge. Thirty legislators have been invited. All faculty are encouraged to attend.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by President Rowe at 4:50 p.m.

```
Library fee resolution

Whereas the free and unfettered access to knowledge is a value intrinsic to
any public library;

Whereas providing access to knowledge to those who might not otherwise be
afforded that access is a fundamental principle of public higher education;

Whereas the creation and imposition of an across-the-board, per-credit-hour
library fee undermines those basic principles;

Whereas nationally, state university libraries have more often resorted to
more specific fees including charging off-campus and out-of-state users for
specific archives, journals and databases;

Whereas Arkansas State University has traditionally been able to transfer
funds from reserves or lower-priority budgetary items to meet the needs of
high priority items;
```

Whereas the creation of an across-the-board student library fee would also
necessitate an unnecessary student board to oversee the use of the fee;

Whereas the creation of student user fees in general creates a financial
hardship that discourages lower-income students from attending Arkansas State
University;

Whereas the creation of an across-the-board student library fee would
discourage students from attending Arkansas State University at a time when
the institution wishes to reach out to them;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Arkansas State University opposes
the creation and imposition of an across-the-board, per-credit-hour student
library fee.

Arkansas State University
Division of Student Affairs
Parking Initiatives

ASU Parking Services is growing to serve you. Our mission is to create and maintain a parking
infrastructure that helps get students, faculty, staff, and visitors where they need to be as
courteously, safely, and efficiently as possible. Achieving this is a complex task. We would like
to implement an initiative to improve customer service, implement new technologies and
improve parking infrastructure. To accomplish these beneficial programs, we are proposing a
$10.00 increase in the parking fee for faculty, staff and students. The following is what you will
receive for your fee:

- New maps and brochures
- New, easy-to-use, friendly visitor parking plan to inform visitors and direct them to
  parking locations
- New hardware and software for parking services
- 72 new reserved spaces
- 285 new open spaces
- Pay stations/meters for Visitor parking
- Systematic/regular maintenance of parking infrastructure

Parking Fee Structures at Regional Universities

Name	Faculty	Staff	Students
Southwest Missouri State	$62.00	S62.00	$62.00
UAF (Salary over $30,000/yr)	$93.00	$93.00	
UAF (Salary $30,000 and under)	$72.00	$72.00	$52.00
University of Memphis	$41/semester	$41/semester	Maintenance fee**
University of Central Arkansas	$51.00	$51.00	$40.00
Arkansas State University (proposed)	$70.00*	$50.00	$50.00

*Faculty Staff Green Parking
*Maintenance fee includes a fee for parking

Parking Fee Increase History

Year of Increase	Student	Employee	Faculty/Staff (Green)
1982	$5.00 to $ 10.00	$5.00 to $10.00	$5.00 to $10.00
1995	$10.00 to $20.00	$10.00 to $20.00	$10.00 to $40.00
2000*	$20.00 to $40.00	$20.00 to $40.00	$40.00 to $60.00

*Increase to fund parking garage debt service and operation only.

11)
To: Faculty Senate

From: Troy Thomas, Faculty Senate Representative to the Computers / Technology Committee

Re: Recommendations concerning the Appropriate Use Policy

Dear Senators:

The only agenda item for the Computers / Technology Committee for the 2003/2004 academic year has been the Appropriate Use Policy which gained much notoriety during last year's grievance by Dr. Truncellito. As a Faculty Senate representative to this committee, my main objective was to review the ASU Appropriate Use Policy in light of policies from other universities and in light of feedback from the AAUP. Based on this review, I have made several recommendations that are listed below. These recommendations were discussed at the last meeting of the Computers / Technology Committee where it was determined that, with the exception of recommendations #1 and #2, that these recommendations are beyond the scope of this committee which is not a policy making group. It is the opinion of Mark Hoeting, Director

of IT Services, that these recommendations should be pursued by the Faculty Senate through other channels if the Faculty Senate so desires.

In my opinion, ASU's Appropriate Use Policy is similar to the policy in use at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and does not appear to be overly restrictive when compared to policies of similar public institutions. I have included specific comments on our Appropriate Use Policy below.

Comments on Appropriate Use Policy:

1. The AUP is difficult to locate online as a link to it is not clearly evident on the ITS home page. In fact, the AUP is buried about 4 clicks deep on the ITS page.
2. The AUP contains no stated method for dissemination of the policy to the users. Each user is expected to be aware of the existence of the policy and to find said policy's location.
3. The AUP is not a system-wide policy. This potentially requires those who use resources at more than one campus to be familiar with more than one policy. This seems unnecessary.
4. The AUP policy supersedes any IT policies found in other handbooks. This has implications for the development of the new Faculty Handbook.
5. According to feedback from the AAUP, the description of "appropriate use" seems too restrictive (Section IV. Policy Statement) and / or vague. Recommended is the use of a statement similar to the University of Vermont:
   a. "Users may use their computers and network accounts for non-university matters except as otherwise prohibited by this or other university policy or where such use unreasonably interferes with academic uses, job performance, or system performance / operations."
6. The AUP has a history of inconsistent / unequal / unfair enforcement. Unfortunately, solutions to this problem may cause worse problems.
7. The AUP lacks sufficient detail / explanation in certain areas to allow the average user to determine what would or would not constitute a violation of the policy.
8. To the best of my knowledge, there is currently not an identifiable person to whom questions about appropriate use can be directed.

Recommendations concerning Appropriate Use Policy

1. The Information and Technology Services home page (http://computing.astate.edu/) should be updated to include a clearly labeled link to the Appropriate Use Policy. **Note: At the last meeting of the Computers / Technology Committee, Mark Hoeting indicated that this was a simple change that could be made the next day. To date, this change to the ITS page has not been made.**
2. Dissemination of AUP should be done in a consistent and well-described manner such that all users have adequate notification of said policy. Recommendation is to include this policy as part of all new student or employee orientation packets if this is not already being done. Note: Some universities require users to sign and date a copy of the policy signifying that they have received it. Mark Hoeting indicated that this policy could be

distributed annually to all employees in one of their paycheck envelopes. According to Mark Hoeting, students had to view a copy of the AUP online last semester when converting to their new digital IDs.

3. Recommend that AUP be a system-wide policy, so that individual campuses do not require users of more than one campus to be familiar with multiple policies. This is a Board of Trustees issue.
4. Recommend that appropriate student, staff and faculty representatives evaluate AUP against any IT policies (current or planned) in any handbooks to ensure that policies are not in conflict and any penalties for violations of IT policies are clear and reasonable.
5. Recommend that the definition of "appropriate use" be made less restrictive and less vague in a manner similar to the Vermont statement mentioned above.
6. **Information concerning violations and results of disciplinary procedures is available via the FOIA after a case has been closed. Mark Hoeting cautioned that strict application of the AUP policy may not be in all faculty members best interests.**
7. Recommend that faculty representatives or Academic Affairs develop a set of "Best Practice Guidelines" that would exist as a supplement to the AUP and would provide additional detail and resources (see U of A as an example) that would allow the user to comply as fully as possible with the letter and spirit of the AUP (including links to applicable state and federal laws). A set of "Web Content Guidelines" might be a part of such guidelines. Training sessions may need to be developed for certain compliance areas such as Disability Access Guidelines.
8. Recommend that faculty or Academic Affairs identify a person or persons to serve as AUP resource persons so that users will have identifiable, responsible persons to approach with questions concerning the AUP.

Additional Suggestions:

9. Recommend the use of disclaimers on user email and / or web pages stating that individual user personal opinions do not reflect the position of the university.
10. Spam and virus problems are rampant on the ASU campus and are seriously interfering with normal operations. Recommend methods be enacted to better address this problem. **Mark Hoeting has several suggestions in this area, but indicates that faculty compliance / initiative would have to play a big role in addressing these issues.**

Table 3–Parking at Southwestern Division I Schools

University	# of Students, Staff, Faculty	# of Parking Stalls	Ratio
Arkansas State University	*12,612*	*8,350**	*1:.66* ⇐
Louisiana State University	34,000	21,000	1:.62
Texas A & M University	46,798	25,012	1:.53
University of Arkansas	19,295	9,340	1:.48
University of Oklahoma	32,621	12,352**	1:.38
U. of Louisiana Lafayette	19,906	7,300	1:.37
Southwest Texas State	26,274	9,290	1:.35
Oklahoma State University	30,865	10,500	1:.34
University of New Mexico	32,862	10,000	1:.30
University of New Orleans	18,854	5,000	1:.27
U. of Texas at Austin	71,865	14,451	1:.20
Average***	33,334	12,424	1:.37

* Does not include fraternity parking or spaces located at the Equine Center and Farm Complex east of Stadium Boulevard.

** 3,500 of these are free parking stalls at the Lloyd Noble Center.

***Average does not include Arkansas State University.

Source: Appendix A.

Report of the results of a survey of the faculty on ASU's status in achieving the goals established by a 1995-95 strategic planning initiative. 4/02/2004

During academic year 1995 - 1996, a coordinated effort was initiated to articulate a desired future for Arkansas State University. This was accomplished through a systematic planning process with the direct, collaborative participation of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The full spectrum of ASU's academic, service and executive functions participated in the strategic planning process, including members of the board of trustees. A comprehensive set of twelve institutional goals and fifty-five operational objectives were produced to guide ASU toward a new vision for the future.

During the fall of 2003, the faculty senate used the twelve goals and 55 objectives to develop a faculty survey. The purpose of the survey was to seek the faculty's appraisal of ASU''s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives. This is a report of the results of that survey.

Summary

1. The goals and objectives from which this survey is derived were intended to establish strategic initiatives as part of a strategic planning process, not a survey. Some of the items contain multiple response points or are otherwise "double barreled." This is ordinarily a violation of item writing rules in the field of survey research. However, the instrument has a full scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) of .9536 and none of the 55 items stand out as detracting from internal consistency. A reliability coefficient of .9536 is quite high and indicates a lack of bad items or items that could create respondent ambiguity. This means that the items with multiple response points are actually measuring closely tied concepts.

2. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the characteristics of the 65 respondents in the sample. While it is not known what the average length of service is for the entire ASU faculty, the breakdown by rank and tenure status in the survey sample is not dramatically skewed when compared to the entire ASU faculty. However, the survey respondents were comprised of a greater proportion of tenured full and associate professors.

Table 1. Characteristics of Responding Faculty: NR = no response

Tenure Status	Length of Service (yrs)	Rank
Yes = 38	Avg = 11.17	Instructor = 8
No = 20	Min = 1	Asst Prof = 12
NR = 7	Max = 37	Assoc Prof = 20
	NR = 7	Full Prof = 18
		NR = 7

3.   Table 2 reports aggregate responses for all items in the sub-scales in the instrument representing the 12 broad goals established in 1995-96. Respondents were asked to rate ASU'S progress toward meeting each of the 55 objectives under the goals using the scale below.

1 X :	:	:	:	:	**No**	No observable progress
2	: X :	:	:	:	**Min**	Minimal
3	:	: X :	:	:	**Mod**	Moderate
4	:	:	: X :	:	**Sub**	Substantial progress has been achieved
5	:	:	:	: X :	**Sig**	Significant, objective mostly accomplished
6	:	:	:	:	: X	**Met**	Progress meets your expectations, objective met

As Table 2 reports, none of the goals was rated by faculty as having been met. In fact, none received a rating higher than "minimal progress" and two received aggregate ratings of "no observable progress." These were goals to enhance communication and cooperation within the ASU community and to establish a system for evaluating administration, academic programs and academic support services. The highest rating, but still in the minimal progress range, was for the goal of enhancing the academic and intellectual environment on campus: An examination of individual items for that goal indicates the slightly higher rating may have been because of some acknowledged progress in the area of technology.

4.   Respondents had the option of leaving items blank and to indicate if they truly had no basis for making a rating. Table 3 takes a look at the "no basis" responses at the individual item level. Items where 10 or more faculty indicated they had no basis for making a judgement could be considered areas about which the faculty is least well informed. Conversely, items having very few faculty indicating they had no basis for a judgement would indicate areas where the faculty is well informed. Table 3 reports the number of "no basis" responses by item. These are arranged by goal area so patterns can readily be seen in broad areas where they are more knowledgeable than other.

5.   Respondents were asked to write in comments wherever they felt it appropriate. Table 4 reports the written comments from respondents for each item in the survey

6.   Finally, the survey instrument is included here as a reporting device. Mean rating values are reported for each of the 55 items in the survey. On only four items out of 55 was the

institution rated as having made moderate progress. None were rated higher. All other responses indicate ASU has made no progress or only minimal progress on the objectives it set for itself in academic year 1995-96.

Table 2. Average Respondent Ratings for all Items Combined within the 12 Subscales (goals)

1. Mean = 2.88   *Enhanced Academic and Intellectual Environment*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:		X:	:	:	:	

2. Mean = 2.45   *Assessment of student learning*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	X	:	:	:	:	

3. Mean = 2.13   *Retention and diversification of high quality faculty*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:X		:	:	:	:	

4. Mean = 2.83   *Improved quality of undergraduate education*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:		X:	:	:	:	

5. Mean = 2.79   *Retention and diversification of a high quality student body*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:		X:	:	:	:	

6. Mean = 2.30   *Enhanced range and depth of graduate education*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	X	:	:	:	:	

7. Mean = 2.08   *Increased emphasis on pure and applied research at undergraduate and graduate levels*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:X		:	:	:	:	

8. Mean = 1.81   *System to evaluate all administrative services, academic programs, academic support services, and student services*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	X:		:	:	:	:	

9. Mean = 2.13   *Enhanced economic development of the state by enhanced public service*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	X	:	:	:	:	

10. Mean = 1.89   *Enhanced communication and cooperation within the ASU community*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	X:		:	:	:	:	

11. Mean = 2.43   *State leadership role in defining, studying, and resolving educational issues*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	X	:	:	:	:	

12. Mean = 2.41   *The university image as a qualified institution of higher education*

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	X	:	:	:	:	

Table 3. Number of Respondents having No Basis for Ratings by Survey Item Number. N = 65

Item #	No Basis	Goal Area		Item #	No Basis	Goal Area
1	0			29	9	
2	4			30	2	
3	1			31	4	
4	1					graduate education
5	5			32	3	
6	10			33	2	
7	1			34	3	
		academic environment		35	5	
8	3			36	6	
9	4			37	3	
10	12					research support
11	12			38	11	
		student assessment		39	12	
12	1			40	8	
13	0					evaluation
14	1			41	8	
15	1			42	7	
16	4					service
17	2			43	2	
		faculty		44	0	
18	9			45	4	
19	6					communication
20	6			46	16	
		undergraduate educ		47	9	
21	13			48	10	
22	14			49	7	
23	6			50	6	
24	7			51	4	
25	7					ASU leadership role
26	7			52	5	
27	8			53	3	
28	13			54	3	
		student body		55	1	
						ASU's image

Table 4. Faculty Survey of the Status of ASU on accomplishing its stated objectives:

Summary of Comments

Question.	Case no.	Comment
2	39	**To enhance the quality and use of academic services (study skills, writing labs, academic advising)** Many of our grad students have very poor writing skills, there is no place for them to get help
3	39	**To develop integrated campus computer network that serves students, faulty, and administration.** Moderate progress has been made even though substantial effort has been made B the ancient system has reached its upper limits
	33	However it often does not work in a reliable fashion.
4	39	**To develop an operational plan that sets priorities for university equipment needs, including classroom and laboratory equipment, computer needs, audiovisual equipment and materials, and library needs.** No plan is evident. It is by hook or by crook. The library has continued to lose ground for the last three decades as evidenced by the last two NCA reports.
	9	Classroom space is inadequate in the nursing AT (arts tutorial lab) for 90 BSN students and for storage of equipment.
	8	For off-campus sites, only computers have been received. We should be able to order library needs for our specific campuses.
5	39	**To develop an operational plan for achieving computer literacy throughout the campus** Good effort has been put into the courses, workshop, CLT etc.
7.	39	**To strengthen library resources in support of academic research programs**. The library does not even stay level B it loses ground
	36	Pathetic!
10	39	**To periodically survey university graduates to determine their satisfaction with their academic preparation.** This happens in some programs because of accreditation expectations, but I don=t know about programs outside my area.

12		**To increase faculty salaries to at least the average of SREB**
	39	Compared with ten years ago we are in better shape but still lag behind.
	33	We have failed here!
	16	It is very bad for the morale of full time faculty who are not given any raise when all the other faculty staff and administrators receive raises. There is not anything equitable in this system of awarding raises.
13		**To develop an equitable system of faculty merit evaluation that emphasizes an appropriate mix of quality teaching, research and service.**
	39	Some faculty provide extraordinary service but are not rewarded. This has gotten worse.
	33	Merit pay is so low it is a joke!
14		**To develop equitable promotion, retention, and tenure policies.**
	45	The present VCRAA is not helping on these goals
	39	There is too much room for arbitrariness in review at the administrative level. There is nothing to prevent administrators from substituting a baseless judgment over the judgment of the faculty.
	33	These have been abused by VCRAA
	9	A travesty exists here. It is frightening when people meet the criteria and Susan Allen has her own set.
15		**To continually assess and improve faculty / staff benefit plans.**
	9	We do we get cards for health insurance two months after covering 11/03?
17		**To develop accountable programs for the recruitment and retention of women and minorities for faculty, staff, and administrative positions.**
	39	The proportion of women on faculty ahs dramatically shifted in their favor. The recent emphasis on minority has been dramatic but now seems to cross over into reverse discrimination.
	9	The current method of diversity checklist is too muddled for faculty chairing searches!

18		**To secure national accreditation for all eligible programs.**
	33	HLC said we failed here.
	9	What about computer science?
23		**To attract and retain higher proportion of academically gifted and talented students.**
	27	Decline in this area.
	9	Students are less prepared every year.
25		**To develop programs and services for freshman students to increase retention**
	39	Efforts made here are neutralized by removal of standards
	33	The 4 yr guarantee is simply a PR stunt. Half of the students have folded on it!
26		**To expand educational opportunities, recourses and services for non-traditional students.**
	27	We need daycare!
29		**To implement a systematic graduate-education needs assessment plan for the university.**
	33	Totally unknown if it was ever done.
	27	Only for ABI
30		**To develop appropriate facilities, faculty, and other resources to support selected doctoral degree programs.**
	39	Efforts to establish new doc programs without qualified faculty and resources recently looks more like Carnegie ladder climbing than investment in graduate education.
32		**To develop clear, consistent, and progressive policies and procedures regarding research support and funding.**
	39	With the new VCRAA this has become a wrong-headed mess. The delusions of research university grandeur begin to demoralize most faculty and minimize their contributions.
34		**To define roles and enhance stipends for graduate assistants and other specialized research positions**.
	39	Progress was made here but financial support has fallen behind again. The VCRAA=s plan for reallocation and severely limited use of grad assistants is inappropriate without adequate manpower to replace them.

35	39	**To secure increased amounts of funding for research.** It is unclear what this means. If it refers to state and local support, nothing has been accomplished.
	36	Only for a select few i.e. Bioscience.
	27	Only for ABI.
38	39	**To establish a database suitable for review of programs and services.** Institutional research makes a valiant effort but is understaffed and has only some of the data.
42	33	**To respond to requests and needs in the service areas of agriculture, business, education, engineering, government, health and industry.** Service is not rewarded especially by the VCRAA Why? Service isn=t valued anymore. Publish in valid journals. Fact. Educating or helping the public!
43		**To improve operational policies and procedures.** This has gotten worse. The policy arena is a mess of surprises and contradictions.
44	39	**To promote student input and active participation of faculty in governance.** This has gotten worse. Shared governance has been obliterated by an autocratic administration.
	36	Structure/ Chart. No roles.
	33	This notion is a total failure at ASU
	31	This is a joke
45	39	**To disseminate a clearly defined organizational structure that includes role definitions.** The chart seems to change almost daily.
	9	Biggest issue is shared governance and faculty are ignored by Wyatt.

47	36	**To develop an outreach program to increase the percentage of high school graduates attending college.** We have satellite campuses in every town possible.
48	33	**To maintain ties with retired faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni and utilize their expertise.** This does not happen.
50	36	**To develop interdisciplinary programs to meet identified educational needs in Arkansas?** Cost saving measure?
53	39	**To promote the university more broadly thorough a variety of media.** Some good PR happens occasionally. Unfortunately some of it is spin doctoring.
	33	We engage in poor PR
55	45	**To operate an athletics program that is competitive, financially affordable, and complementary to the primary academic mission of the university.** So long as the administration continues to push for a 1-A football, the athletics program overall will be a drain on the university (as well as an embarrassment).
	33	No way! We remain in the hole / no way out. The board wants to play ball even thought it is taking the university down from a $$$ point of view.
	31	Not financially affordable!
	25	WORSE!
	16	To much emphasis is put on athletics and too much money allocated to football. Not enough money allocated to faculty raises.

Arkansas State University Faculty Senate
Faculty Survey of the Status of ASU on Accomplishing Its Stated Objectives

This **anonymous** survey asks you to evaluate our university's progress toward meeting its stated objectives as listed in the Faculty Handbook currently in force. Those objectives appear here in the form of survey items. Please mark an X in the location on the scale that best represents **your observations** on ASU's current status on each objective. The following example illustrate how the scale works:

A mark in this location indicates that ASU has made significant progress on this objective

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: : : : X :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Key

1 **X : : : : :**   **No**   No observable progress

2 **:X : : : :**   **Min**   Minimal

3 **: :X : : :**   **Mod** Moderate

4 **: : :X : :**   **Sub**   Substantial progress has been achieved

5 **: : : :X :**   **Sig**   Significant, objective mostly accomplished

6 **: : : : :X** **Met** Progress meets your expectations, objective met

If you **truly have no basis** for making a judgment on a particular objective, please put a check next to NB by the item number. Feel free to **write any comments** in available space near the item or on the back to elaborate on your response to individual items. The scale does not take into consideration special circumstances or the possibility of the institution losing ground in a particular area.

Enhanced Academic and Intellectual Environment

1.__NB To increase the use and quality of technological aids for teaching.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: : 3.23: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

2.__NB To enhance the quality and use of academic services (study skills, writing labs, academic advising).

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **:2.83 : : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

3.__NB To develop an integrated campus computer network that serves students, faculty, and administration.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: : 3.62: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

4.__NB To develop an operational plan that sets priorities for university equipment needs, including classroom and laboratory equipment, computer needs, audiovisual equipment and materials, and library needs.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.50: : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

5.__NB To develop an operational plan for achieving computer literacy throughout the campus.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	:	3.06 :	:	:		

6.__NB To enhance the quality of student life through student services.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.96:	:	:	:		

7.__NB To strengthen library resources in support of academic and research programs

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	1.88:	:	:	:	:		

Assessment of student learning

8.__NB To specify the educational outcome objectives of each degree program and the general education core.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.81:	:	:	:		

9.__NB To develop procedures and instruments for the evaluation of educational outcome objectives.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.40:	:	:	:		

10.__NB To periodically survey university graduates to determine their satisfaction with their academic preparation.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.62:	:	:	:		

11.__NB To determine employer satisfaction with the educational preparation of Arkansas State University graduates.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.06 :	:	:	:		

Retention and diversification of high quality faculty

12.__NB To increase faculty salaries to at least the averages of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	1.60:	:	:	:	:		

13.__NB To develop an equitable system of faculty merit evaluation that emphasizes an appropriate mix of quality teaching, research, and service.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	1.76:	:	:	:	:		

14.__NB To develop equitable promotion, retention, and tenure policies.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
	:	2.22:	:	:	:		

15.__NB To continually assess and improve faculty/staff benefit plans.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.25**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

16.__NB To promote and support a professional development program to renew and upgrade staff, faculty, and administrative competencies.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.01**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

17.__NB To develop accountable programs for the recruitment and retention of women and minorities for faculty, staff, and administrative positions.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.98**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Improved quality of undergraduate education

18.__NB To secure national accreditation for all eligible programs

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.94**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

19.__NB   To periodically evaluate degree programs and the general education core.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.82**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

20.__NB To develop programs that respond to regional and state educational needs.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.83**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Retention and diversification of a high quality student body

21.__NB To develop a student enrollment management plan that monitors and responds to trends in student enrollment and the educational objectives of the university.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.59**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

22.__NB To develop clear transfer agreements with two-year and other four-year colleges in Arkansas.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : : **3.18**: : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

23.__NB To attract and retain a higher proportion of academically gifted and talented students.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.50**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

24.__NB To implement accountable programs for the recruitment and retention of minorities within the student body.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : **2.71**: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

25.__NB To develop programs and services for freshman students to increase retention.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.99:	:	:	:		

26.__NB To expand educational opportunities, resources, and services for non-traditional students.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.40:	:	:	:		

27.__NB To enhance and promote career planning and placement efforts throughout the university.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.74:	:	:	:		

28.__NB To review the availability and accessibility process and level of health counseling services.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.80:	:	:	:		

Enhanced range and depth of graduate education

29.__NB To implement a systematic graduate-education needs assessment plan for the university.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		1.94:	:	:	:		

30.__NB To develop appropriate facilities, faculty, and other resources to support selected doctoral-degree programs.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.65:	:	:	:		

31.__NB To develop programs which respond to graduate education needs within the region and the state.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		: 2.50:	:	:	:		

Increased emphasis on pure and applied research at undergraduate and graduate levels

32.__NB To develop clear, consistent, and progressive policies and procedures regarding research support and funding.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		1.90:	:	:	:		

33.__NB To assign more faculty time for research, both contracted and non-contracted.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		1.99:	:	:	:		

34.__NB To define roles of and enhance stipends for graduate assistants and other specialized research positions.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No	Min	Mod	Sub	Sig	Met	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations
		1.69:	:	:	:		

35.__NB To secure increased amounts of funding for research

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : 2.09: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

36.__NB To actively encourage and support ongoing involvement of undergraduates in research

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : 2.13: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

37.__NB To support research at levels appropriate to degree programs, especially at the doctoral level.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : 2.27: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

System to evaluate all administrative services, academic programs, academic support services, and student services

38.__NB To establish a database suitable for review of programs and services.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.91: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

39.__NB To complete, implement, and periodically update an evaluation matrix for all university programs, departments, and service areas.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.73: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

40.__NB To develop clear role definitions for faculty, staff, and administrative services.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.69: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Enhanced economic development of the state through enhanced public service

41.__NB To establish a database of available university resources

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.93: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

42.__NB To respond to requests and needs in the service areas of agriculture, business, education, engineering, government, health, and industry

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : 2.30: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Enhanced communication and cooperation within the university community

43.__NB To improve operational policies and procedures

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.89: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

44.__NB To promote student input and active participation of faculty in governance.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met : 2.12: : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

45.__NB To disseminate a clearly defined organizational structure that includes role definitions.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **1.71: : : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Statewide leadership role in defining, studying, and resolving educational issues

46.__NB   To employ environmental scanning to monitor regional and state trends and develop response strategies.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.01: : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

47.__NB   To develop an outreach program to increase the percentage of high school graduates attending college.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.45: : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

48.__NB   To maintain ties with retired faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni and utilize their expertise.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **1.88: : : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

49.__NB   To develop teacher education programs and policies responsive to changing needs in Arkansas.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.70: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

50.__NB   To develop interdisciplinary programs to meet identified educational needs in Arkansas.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.65: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

51.__NB   To develop programs which facilitate students' ability to function in an international arena.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.35: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

The university image as a qualified institution of higher education

52.__NB   To capitalize on public events held on campus to promote university programs

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.85: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

53.__NB To promote the university more broadly through a variety of media

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.50: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

54.__NB To publicize and support faculty and student achievements in the community, state, and region.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met **: 2.46: : :**	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

55.__NB To operate an athletics program that is competitive, financially affordable, and complementary to the primary academic mission of the university.

I have seen no observable progress on this objective	No Min Mod Sub Sig Met 1.62: : : : :	Progress on this objective meets or exceeds my expectations

Demographics:
 	
Tenured? Yes____ No____
 	
Rank: ____Instructor
      ____Assistant Professor
      ____Associate Professor
      ____Professor
	Length of service to ASU (in years)_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!!