The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.
Introduction

The first week of classes at Henderson begins, and a student turns on his computer with high speed internet access in his residence hall. He checks his course schedule on “My Henderson” to find that his first class is in the new Nursing Building. He rushes to class where his instructor uses one of the ninety-five multimedia stations in classrooms on campus to introduce the class to the course objectives which are tied to the assessment criteria of her department. In his next class, he discusses with another first-year student the common book that each of them began reading after receiving a copy when they attended the two-day orientation retreat called Heart Start over the summer.

Meanwhile, a returning commuter student finds a parking place in the new parking lot on 12th street and heads to the advising center to discuss a concern she has with her schedule. There, she is assured that the spring course and summer trip to China sponsored by the Ellis College will count for her nonwestern culture requirement. After adjusting her schedule, she stops by the newly renovated administration building, Womack Hall, where she checks to see if the change will affect her Henderson scholarship that she received as a result of reallocation of scholarship funds to increase the number of students receiving money.

While these activities seem mundane and usual on the Henderson campus, each one is important to the individual student. And all of these activities were brought about as a result of strategic planning processes that envision growth, change, and ways to manage that progress.

Henderson has been involved in planning, evaluating, and allocating resources to fulfill its mission since it was established as a church-related institution in 1890. Since becoming a state institution, Henderson has received a significant portion of its resources from the state of Arkansas. However, over the past decade, the percentage of university operating funds needed contributed by the state has decreased considerably. This challenge, as well as keeping up with a rapidly changing environment, has led Henderson to adapt its budgeting and planning processes accordingly to fulfill its mission, to improve the quality of its education, and to respond to future challenges and opportunities.
CORE COMPONENT 2A: The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Shaped by multiple societal and economic trends, Henderson is ready and poised to respond to the global educational needs of a growing and diverse student population. As the university plans for its future, strategic planning efforts are shaped by commitment to the mission by faculty, staff, and students. Henderson responds to the changing needs of the university population and the communities it serves, develops comprehensive and varied funding approaches, fosters innovative teaching strategies, programs, and methodologies, promotes evolving professional development, and follows a master plan for facility improvement and expansion.

Determining and Implementing Organizational Goals

Henderson’s seven-member Board of Trustees is ultimately responsible for setting the broad goals of the university and empowers the president of the university to set more specific goals and long-term strategies to reach those goals. Henderson’s presidents have utilized the culture of collective governance at the university to involve its multiple constituencies in the strategic and other planning processes.

Three strategic plans have guided Henderson within the last ten years: 1998 Bold Strokes, 2005 Designing Our Destiny, and the current 2010 Strategic Plan. All of these strategic plans drew significant input from the university community.

The 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan was the culmination of the third phase of strategic planning that had actually begun in 1988. In 1997 the President’s Council (a committee designed to assist with the planning efforts) examined four areas: “significant higher education trends, external environmental analysis, enrollment analysis, and the current circumstances faced by Henderson.” From that examination seven initiatives were identified, and university teams were assembled consisting of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The final recommendations of each strategic team were compiled in the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan which guided the university through the 2001 Higher Learning Commission Self-Study. The university implemented a significant portion of the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan before consultants recommended that Henderson update its strategic plan and documents.

The Board of Trustees met at a planning retreat in September 2004 and identified six broad issues facing the university. In November a group of more than forty administrators, faculty, staff, students, and board members met for two days at Queen Wilhelmina State Park near Mena, Arkansas, to discuss the six issues and to develop more specific
plans for Henderson’s future. After the retreat six strategic planning taskforces were established. They met regularly throughout the spring 2005 semester to discuss specific issues and to provide recommendations for the university. The Designing Our Destiny strategic plan that resulted from this process listed a series of action items, in many cases designating the administrator or committee responsible for implementing the goals.

In 2008 the resignation of President Charles Dunn, who had served as president of the university for twenty-two years, led to campus-wide discussions about the future of the university with open forums for faculty, staff, students, and the community to express what they wanted from the new university leader. From that process came not only an advertisement for a new university president but a recommitment to the mission and a vision for the future. Dr. Charles “Chuck” Welch was selected as the president and led the university toward a new concept of strategic planning whereby it would be a continually ongoing process. To start this process, in spring 2009 President Welch named faculty, staff, and student representatives to the Strategic Planning Council charged with developing an ongoing, strategic plan for the university based upon the five criteria for accreditation set by the Higher Learning Commission. After a July retreat subcommittees met during the fall semester to develop specific goals supported by objectives, strategies, and activities. “In their deliberations, each group also offered suggestions as to what resources would be needed, which university personnel or department would undertake the accomplishment of each objective, the projected dates at which objectives should be achieved, and the type of evaluation that should be used to measure success.”

Although President Welch left in April 2011, Interim President Bobby Jones is committed to the 2010 Strategic Plan and asked the Strategic Planning Council to meet again June 2011 to update and assess the plan. According to the summary evaluation of the retreat, “Most of the objectives, strategies, and activities within each goal are ongoing. A few of the objectives have been met. The Strategic Planning Council believes they are still relevant and should remain a part of the strategic plan. Some of the objectives either have not been addressed by the university or if so, the committee was not aware of it.” While it is not surprising that only a few objectives had been met within the first year, the report does indicate that there has been action of some kind on many of the objectives and strategies.

**Current Capacity**

Each planning process at Henderson has begun with a discussion of the current circumstances of the university. The 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan charged the participants to “envision the future and describe the current reality of Henderson” which led to the seven
key initiatives that made up that plan. The taskforce reports for the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan show that each taskforce began with an exploration of the current state of the issue it was challenged to address. For instance, the Enrollment Taskforce “focused on studying the general recruitment and retention processes.” When a taskforce needed more information, follow-up surveys and reports (the appendices) were generated. For instance, the Campus Community conducted a “Faculty Morale” survey.

The 2010 Strategic Plan began with a basic understanding of current capacity, but throughout it also recognizes the need to research the current capacity before undertaking actions. Goals 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14 all list objectives, strategies, and/or activities that require research of the current conditions at Henderson.

Apart from the strategic plans, other planning documents and processes begin with an understanding of the university’s current position and capacity. For instance, the 2000 and 2010 Technology Plans devote significant portions of the plan to the “Current Environment.” The Campus Master Plan begins with maps of current campus districts and current buildings and functions.

**Emerging Factors**

**Technology**

Prior to 1997 technology at Henderson was primarily business-focused. However, with the advancement of technology, the university evolved to assure technology supported the mission of the university. Since 2000 the Information Technology Plan has emphasized the goals and objectives that emerging and improving technology should support:

**Information Accessibility**

Technological resources should be provided routinely to all users in a broad and consistent fashion. Access to technology resources should be independent of location: classroom, office, lab, or home.
CORE COMPONENT 2A

Technological Literacy
The university should develop innovative methods to instruct all members of the university community in the effective use of technology resources.

Technology Enhanced Education
The university should support curricular activities by providing technology resources that can be used to enrich the teaching and research components of the instructional programs.

Business Process Effectiveness
Cycle times for basic business processes should be improved for all members of the university community.

Henderson’s most recently updated 2010 Information Technology Plan confirms these goals and objectives while demonstrating the changes in technology and infrastructure by listing plans for specific additions to technological capabilities.

Henderson’s strategic plans have also recognized the necessity of awareness of emerging factors in technology. The second initiative of the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan called for Henderson to achieve its mission “by supporting the implementation of technology necessary for a premier liberal arts university and encouraging all stakeholders to explore and implement innovative strategies and techniques.” The 2005 Designing Our Destiny recognized that “Henderson has made great strides in the area of technology” but even more progress is needed. Both strategic plans called for specific technology initiatives that indicated the changing needs of a university in a rapidly changing world of technology.

By 2010 technology had become such an integral element in achieving the university’s mission that the strategic plan did not need to make a specific call for resources for technology. The strategic plan implicitly recognizes the ongoing commitment in discussion of budget allocation processes that will be transparent. But it also explicitly recognizes the impact of emerging technology; one of the activities in support of Goal 2, “Internal/external conditions and trends which may impact the mission will be identified, analyzed and reported regularly,” is a SWOT analysis of the local, state, regional, and international technology environment. Goal 14 envisions “Distance learning course offerings through Compressed Instructional Video (CIV) and/or other technologies” as a way to achieve the goal of building “a more active relationship between HSU and the surrounding public school districts, the Dawson Co-op and the Community Colleges.” Goal 12 cites technological training on software, hardware, and other equipment as necessary for developing “a program for training new employees at all faculty and staff levels.”
Demographic Shifts

Demographic shifts have had a significant effect on Henderson. According to Henderson’s 2001 Self-Study Report, the university served eighteen counties in southwest Arkansas, with expansion in eastern Texas, eastern Oklahoma, and northern Louisiana. Over the past decade, Henderson’s target areas have grown as a result of its commitment to the mission to serve all of Arkansas as the state’s public liberal arts institution. The University Relations and Admissions Office employs five admission counselors who manage different territories including southern Arkansas, eastern Arkansas, northwest Arkansas, central Arkansas, and Texas. In addition, the northwest Arkansas counselor along with the director of admissions recruits in Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas, Memphis, Tennessee, and Shreveport, Louisiana. The admissions office continues to aggressively recruit students in the state; over 85 percent of first-time freshmen enrolling at Henderson are from Arkansas.

The five fall semesters 2006 through 2010 have shown an increase as a percentage of total enrollment for counties in the metropolitan areas of central Arkansas. These counties include Pulaski, Lonoke, Saline, Garland, Grant, and Jefferson. There have also been significant increases for the southern Arkansas counties of Nevada, Ouachita, and Union. (See Figure 2A-1.) A decrease of 1.5 percent of enrollment (33 students) occurred from Henderson’s home of Clark county in one year from fall 2009 to fall 2010. Other counties with significant decreased enrollment were mostly in southwestern Arkansas. Those counties include Polk, Howard, Pike, Dallas, Miller, and Sevier. Miller county is on the Arkansas/Texas border where Texarkana is located. Adjacent to Miller county is the Texas county of Bowie, which also saw a decrease in enrollment at Henderson. Although enrollment was down for students from Bowie county, the number of students from other Texas counties have increased, most notably those counties in the Dallas, Fort Worth, Plano, and Houston areas.

Emerging trends and economic characteristics for the Clark county area indicate that this area is experiencing severe economic hardships as evidenced by the unemployment rate for the region. According to 2010 data from the Arkansas Department of Workforce Services, while Arkansas’s unemployment rate held steady at 7.6 percent, remaining well below the U. S. average of 9.6 percent, the percentage of residents in Clark county who are
unemployed is 8.1 percent. Moreover, since July 1, 2008, the Clark county area has lost 888 jobs in manufacturing, trade, and agriculture which have affected a substantial number of Clark county residents.

The importance of understanding and responding to these demographic shifts is prominent in the 2010 Strategic Plan. Two goals, three objectives, and four activities are dedicated to understanding and acting on the shifts. (See Table 2A-1.)

Despite the economic and demographic changes, Clark county is still recognized throughout Arkansas and surrounding states as a dynamic center of higher education, technology manufacturing, and retirement living. According to the Clark County Strategic Plan 2007-2017 Vision Statement, Clark county has become a viable “national center for research, development and commercialization of ethanol from cellulose and other renewable energy technologies.” Henderson recognizes its important roles in the community to produce graduates with degrees that reflect the twenty-first century workforce and to assist in attracting more economic and employment opportunities. Henderson and its members participated in the development of the Clark County Strategic Plan and continue to partner with local and extended communities by encouraging students, faculty, and staff to become involved in community service and civic engagement (See also Criterion 5.)

Henderson has already identified and responded to another demographic shift in the area. Many veterans who are returning to Arkansas from active duty face employment and occupational barriers. There was a grave need for Henderson to help these veterans with retraining and education. Thus, Henderson applied for and received a TRIO grant to establish a Veterans Upward Bound Program in order to provide opportunities for postsecondary education and retraining for area veterans. According to David Fletcher, Director of the Arkansas Department of Veterans Affairs, there are 257,625 veterans residing in Arkansas. Of this total, 60,352 veterans reside in Henderson’s targeted counties. The registrar’s office serves as the university’s liaison to Veterans Affairs to help veterans utilize their educational benefits. Since 2008 the Office of the Registrar has served 555 veterans by processing applications for VA benefits and certifying enrollment in order for veterans to receive VA housing allowances and/or educational stipends.

**Globalization**

Henderson’s planning documents have long recognized the importance of globalization and advanced goals to prepare graduates for
the world they inhabit. In 1998 the Bold Strokes strategic plan called for the “commitment to international collaboration [to] be strengthened by increasing the number of international students to 150, enhancing the experience of the international student on campus, developing a minor in international studies and establishing a true ‘study abroad’ program.” The 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan recommended expanding “programs and opportunities for students to study abroad with full funding and administrative support.” The current 2010 Strategic Plan also addresses emerging factors in globalization through Goal 13, Objective 2, which states, “Expand student knowledge that the world contains diverse cultures and preferences that may be different from our own.” (See also Criterion 1 and Criterion 3.)

Function in a Multicultural Society

Henderson has had a long-term commitment to deliberately recruiting a diverse student body both as a moral obligation to equally serve the diverse community of which it is a part and as the most effective way of enhancing the ability of all students on campus to learn to appreciate a multicultural environment. From the adoption of the liberal arts mission in 1988, one of the goals was to recruit a diverse, superior student body. Henderson adopted “admission standards which permitted and encouraged admission of a better prepared freshman class,” while mounting “an aggressive effort to maintain African-American enrollment at approximately fifteen percent of the enrollment and by increasing the presence of international students at Henderson.”

Recognizing the importance of diversity, Henderson has engaged in planning processes specifically dedicated to “recruiting and maintaining a diverse faculty and staff who value and respect all members in our learning community” and thus are able to prepare “students to effectively compete and function in a multicultural and global society in the twenty-first century.”

The Office of External Affairs-Diversity has initiated a proactive effort to facilitate the university’s ongoing commitment to awareness of the importance of diversity for students, staff, faculty, and administrators. As a result, the university has made a conscious effort to build healthy and diverse learning environments in accordance with Henderson’s mission statement. The third bullet item of Henderson’s mission statement reads: “To appreciate the complexity and diversity of world cultures.” Henderson believes that diver-
sity in the student body, faculty, staff, and administration is important to fulfill its primary mission of providing a quality education.

Although Henderson has separate planning processes for diversity specifically, the overall university 2010 Strategic Plan still shows careful attention to issues of multiculturalism and diversity. **Goal 13** of the current strategic plan is that “an educational environment to enhance and support the classroom experience will be provided by the university.” One of the objectives of this goal is to “Expand student knowledge that the world contains diverse cultures and preferences that may be different from our own.” Strategies listed to support this objective include

- Support and encourage study of other cultures both locally and abroad;
- Encourage student leadership to reflect the diversity of the Henderson student population;
- Encourage learning about disabilities and accessible technology;
- Collaborate with OBU to publicize cultural and educational events on both campuses.

**Innovation and Change**

Henderson’s planning, its organizational structures, and its environment indicate that the university treasures its heritage and traditions but is open to and facilitates innovation and change. Each strategic plan has issued calls for change and innovative thinking. For a few examples among many, the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan called for designating one hour during the day for non-instructional activities. This innovative initiative forced faculty, staff, and students to re-think the long-standing traditional schedule; however, the hour from 12:30-1:30 pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays has been set aside and used to great advantage. The 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan called for the initiation of a Common Book Program as part of the First-Year Experience and for the benefit of the entire campus. The 2010 Strategic Plan listed a new academic advising center as one of the strategies for enhancing advising. Discussed below are some of the many examples of innovation and change at Henderson. Some of these came about as a result of strategic planning, but others demonstrate Henderson’s ability to react to opportunities and changes in the environment.

The bachelor of general studies (B.G.S.) degree is one of the newest degree offerings at Henderson. In the truest tradition of the liberal arts, this degree allows a student an opportunity to determine his or her own course of study by choosing specific courses in selected areas of emphasis. Students design their own programs with the help of advisors. For students who
wish to combine areas of interest into a rewarding and innovative career or for those who are preparing for a pre-professional program that requires only certain courses but no specific degree, the B.G.S. degree is one of the most flexible degrees.

The Southwest Arkansas College Preparatory Academy is a university/public school collaboration that is data driven and focused on the achievement of high school students. The academy’s intervention is a way to eliminate the need for remediation once students enroll in college. The goal of the academy is to strengthen college preparedness through the utilization of the study materials, practice tests, and test data from ACT’s Explore and Plan tests. In fall 2009 the pilot academy served forty students from Arkadelphia High School. The program has been expanded to serve students from three school districts in southwest Arkansas. (See Criterion 5D for more information.)

Henderson’s aviation program is a program designed to allow a student to qualify for Federal Aviation Administration certificates and to complete requirements for a bachelor of science degree. Henderson is currently the only four-year university in the state of Arkansas that offers a degree program in aviation. Through a collaborative partnership with Dawson Education Cooperative and its Center for Distance Learning, Henderson’s aviation program expanded its current provisionary program of study in an effort to prepare high school students for careers as professional pilots. A combination of distance learning courses and hands-on engagement provides opportunities for high school students grades 10 through 12 to gain knowledge on piloting and related skills using a flight training device to fly an aircraft.

The university’s website was redesigned in 2010 by Stamats Higher Education Marketing (Stamats). Stamats was chosen in part because of Henderson’s commitment to keeping up with changing technology and innovation. The new site has a consistent appearance throughout while allowing for a degree of distinction between the various department pages. The architecture is sufficiently flexible and scalable to accommodate future changes and additions. Moreover, the templates are more user friendly than Henderson’s previous design so that updates will be easier to make. However, with change comes growing pains. Because the website is still new and the updating of pages is decentralized, new procedures and more training are needed. The Faculty Senate and other groups and individuals on campus are in the process of offering feedback on a number of issues related to the web redesign.
Henderson’s scholarships were restructured and reallocated for the 2010-11 fiscal year to provide a broader range of scholarships for more students. The scholarships now award a specific amount that can be used for any institutional expenses instead of paying specifically for tuition and/or room and board. The restructuring has enabled Henderson to award more scholarships with the same amount of money. With over nine types of scholarships, the university potentially awards over two million dollars in scholarships to eligible students each academic year. (See Table 2A-2.)

The Visiting Professor–Visiting Classroom program was introduced to Henderson faculty during April 2008. The program allows a university faculty member to adopt a public school classroom and mentor its students and teachers throughout the school year. The teacher of a high school classroom adopted by a visiting faculty member may audit that member’s classes on the university campus. Elementary classes adopted by visiting professors participate in tours of the Henderson campus, thus heightening college awareness and interest. The program stimulates discussion between higher education, public schools, and students while promoting productive collaboration among universities and public schools. This initiative has stimulated ongoing collaboration between university faculty and public school teachers and has heightened pre-service teacher and public school student interaction. It also provides opportunities for teaching between groups. University professors and public school teachers are beginning to examine curriculum and assessment implications as they continue their partnerships. Professional development opportunities for public school and university faculty, along with the ongoing evaluation of curriculum and assessment, are the goals of the program. The program has increased from eleven professors in 2008 to twenty-six professors, representing all colleges and departments, in 2009-2010. Two professors are assisting school districts in aligning math and science curriculum documents K-13. The South Arkansas Mathematics and Science Center has assisted with aligning K-13 science curriculum and assessment documents.

History and Heritage
As “the smoke still curled up from the ruins of the main building” the morning after a fire destroyed all but one building at Henderson-Brown College on February 3, 1914, the Board of Trustees and the president began strategically planning to save from the ashes the university that would eventually become Henderson.

The next day students, faculty, and administrators gathered under the stalwart pine trees for chapel, singing songs, and vowing to stay together to rebuild their university. Legend claims that at this moment, the Reddie Spirit was born and it became clear that Hender-
son was a “School with a Heart.” Today the holly still bleeds red, the oaks still shade the south lawn with their sweeping branches, and the pines remain erect, stalwart and reaching for the sky. This is the history of how the Reddie Spirit rose as the phoenix from the ashes and continues to be live in the hearts of its students, old and new.

”The School with a Heart” is a fitting nickname for a university with a definite interest and love for its students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends. Each year freshmen students gather on the lawn in the shape of a heart for the traditional photograph. The entire student body posed in The Star (yearbook) photo in 1919. The 2010 heart photo included only the freshman class.

The annual Pine Tree Assembly is held and sponsored by the Heart & Key Student Organization every year during the first week of the fall semester. Of all the events held on campus each year, the Pine Tree Assembly is the most important in terms of traditions at Henderson. It is the summation of the spirit, history, and traditions of Henderson.

From the freshman heart and pine tree speech to the band playing the Reddie Spirit fanfare from the hill overlooking the football stadium, the “School with a Heart” is a special place for both alumni and current students.

Henderson strives to maintain its treasured connection to the past as it plans for the future. In addition to planning to keep the rituals and mottos mentioned above, Henderson prides itself on preserving many of its historic buildings even as new buildings and renovations of old buildings change the face of the campus. Below are some of the ways in which historic buildings have been preserved, expanded, and/or renovated.

Captain Henderson House Bed and Breakfast – Built in 1876 and renovated in 2001, the bed and breakfast features seven guest rooms with private baths, a sitting room, parlor, sunroom, dining room, and conference room. Captain Henderson House is on the National Register of Historic Places and is a Victorian-era home with detailed fretwork, pocket doors, and elaborate paneling.

Foster Hall – Built in 1936 the former dormitory underwent extensive renovations in 1989. Using federal stimulus funds, the building has just been renovated to house the Disability Resource Center and a new technology center. (See also Criterion 3D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Freshman</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Excellence</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Centurium</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red and Gray Success</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Ten Percent</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddie Spirit Leadership</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the Boundaries</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Transfer</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Community College</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2A-2
Henderson Scholarship Categories

Mary Jo Mann delivers The Pine Tree Speech each year. (Digital report includes video of the speech.)
The Newberry House – A 4,736 square foot home has been the official residence for Henderson’s university presidents since 1969 when Farrar Newberry gave the home to the university. This historic home is a one-and-one-half story residence built in 1896 and renovated during 1952-1954 into a two-story residence. A 2008 renovation project included the addition of a deck to provide handicapped access to the home, a porte-cochere with three parking spaces, and balustrades on all outside stairways, decks, and the upstairs veranda balcony. These renovations included improvements to the interior of the home, including the establishment of private living quarters for the presidential family, through conversion of the upstairs sunroom to a private kitchen and eating area, and the renovation of the bedrooms and bathrooms.

Barkman House – Following extensive renovations that were completed in 1993, the Barkman House, a Greek Revival building, now houses the Institutional Advancement offices. This historic home is included in the National Register of Historic Places. According to the Arkadelphia Area Chamber of Commerce, the Barkman House was originally owned by J.E.M. Barkman, son of early Clark county settler Jacob Barkman. This house was constructed by Madison Griffin, who also built Magnolia Manor, another historic home in the county. Its ornamentation is known as ‘Steamboat’ or ‘Carpenter’s Gothic.’ The house was not completely finished when the Civil War began, and local legend reports that piles of lumber were taken from the front yard to build Confederate fortifications.

The 2010 Campus Master Plan also recognizes some of Henderson’s historic buildings. (See Figure 2A-2.)

In addition to treasuring buildings which preserves Henderson’s heritage and history, Henderson takes measures to preserve other historical artifacts as well. The archivists in Henderson’s Archives have taken proactive steps during the last ten years to stabilize the physical environment and reorganize the historic documents of Henderson. This is evidenced by the creation of the Henderson Archives website, the relocation of the university archives to a larger room with improved humidity and lighting, and the implementation of electronic monitoring of the archives for daily temperature and relative humidity levels. In 2008 an ongoing digitization project was implemented to increase the usability of the archives while helping to preserve fragile documents. This project makes documents from the university archives available on the web for the first time through Content DM, a digital collection management software program. Digitization is only one process used in the archives to preserve historic documents. Each document is read, noted, and assigned to a record group and a subject group. The archivist then stores the document in archival buffered boxes and interleaves fragile documents with acid free paper.
CORE COMPONENT 2B: The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

The development of the current strategic plan, prompted by the hiring of a new university president and in conjunction with the many conversations stimulated by the HLC self-study, has afforded the campus community a timely occasion to consider where the university has been, where the university wants to go, and what choices need to be made. Henderson’s current strategic plan seeks to keep the university grounded in its historical identity as it responds imaginatively and innovatively to the challenges and opportunities created by population trends in Arkansas and the nation’s continually-evolving educational needs and expectations. Careful analysis of the financial, human, and facility resources is key to planning for the future.

Adequate resources

Operating Budget

Henderson maintains adequate financial resources to support educational quality through comprehensive planning and allocation of resources. The majority of the following information is based on the fiscal year 2010-2011 (FY2010-2011) budget that is in effect at the date of this research. Updated data will be available in the resource room.

The operating budget of Henderson is constructed annually and is a working document that is modified as needed. The initial FY2010-2011 operating budget of $43,598,228 is an increase of 4.2 percent in the educational and general budget and a 5.3 percent increase in the auxiliary entities budgeted revenue over the previous year. Henderson has seen a substantial decline in state funding over the past several years. The initial state appropriation forecast for FY2009-2010 was $20,892,971. Due to state reductions, the actual revenue was $20,109,853, which is a $783,118 or 3.9 percent decrease.

The current FY2010-2011 budget for tuition and fees was based on the actual student semester credit hours (SSCH) produced from the previous end of year numbers. Henderson’s tuition and fee percentage increase from FY2009-10 to FY2010-11 was the...
second lowest increase in Arkansas’s public four-year institutions at 3.9 percent. (See Table 2B-1.)

Utility budgets were based on a predicted increase of 6.0 percent. Another unknown at that time was the cost of Henderson’s health insurance premiums. Since then the premiums were adjusted in January 2011 with an increase of 7.4 percent; however, the university has chosen to pay for those increases with no additional cost passed on to the employees. (See Table 2B-9.)

At the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year, Henderson had an enrollment increase of 3.5 percent, resulting in unbudgeted tuition and fee revenue. This additional revenue will be disseminated based on a review of university needs and existing priorities.

**Fund Balances**

Colleges and universities organize their accounting systems on a fund basis. Separate funds are used for accountability purposes to show that financial resources are being used only for the purposes permitted.

A fund balance is established or increased when fund revenues exceed fund expenditures. When fund expenditures exceed fund revenues a fund balance is decreased and becomes a deficit fund balance. A fund balance represents a financial resource that may be available to finance expenditures in the next fiscal year. A deficit fund balance can be recovered in the next fiscal year only if fund revenues exceed fund expenditures.

It is common to assume that a fund balance corresponds to the university’s cash in the bank. However, a fund balance is total assets minus its liabilities. Cash is part of a fund balance, but so are accounts receivable, inventories, investments, and capital assets. Fund balances also are made up of liabilities that may require an outflow of cash if they are paid.

One question commonly asked is “how large should the university’s fund balance be?” The Arkansas Higher Education 2010 Comprehensive Annual Report (AHECAR) recommends that colleges and universities maintain a minimum fund balance of 5 percent of the educational and general operating budget with an ideal level of 14 percent. Henderson’s fund balance is near 8 percent as of June 30, 2010. However, in the recent past, Henderson’s percentage has fallen below the recommended 5 percent. One significant reason the balances fell was the way the university accounted for student fees. Carryover funds available at the end of each year were transferred to the restricted fund to carry forward into the next year.
Beginning July 1, 2009, the university ceased making the transfers to the restricted fund; therefore any funds remaining are now reflected in the educational and general and auxiliary fund balances. From June 2008 to June 2010, Henderson’s fund balance was increased by over $3.4 million. (See Figure 2B-1.)

Bobby Jones, then vice president for finance and administration, stated in the February 2, 2011, budget meeting, “there is an increased focus being placed on fund balances” in the state of Arkansas. “Over the past few years we have some increases in our fund balances and we hope to continue to build these to get to a level that doesn’t warrant concern from the state.” Although too low a fund balance can be a sign of a problem, according to an article from “The State, South Carolina’s Homepage,” South Carolina’s legislators are looking at cutting state funding to the public four-year colleges and universities that have large fund balances. According to former President Welch fund balances are like a “juggling act.” Fund balances do not need to be too high or too low. In light of these economic times, it is preferred to have sufficient fund balances so that cash flow remains fluid but large enough to meet Henderson’s long range planning goals.

Tuition/Fees and State Appropriations
Henderson’s most significant financial resources are its state appropriations and its tuition and fee income. Some revenue is generated through auxiliary entities, endowment support, an annual fund drive, and grants. Unanticipated shortfalls in any one of these revenue sources can negatively affect the university. Through careful planning, Henderson has been able to respond quickly and effectively to flat or decreased enrollment and reduced state funding over the past few years.

The graphs in Figure 2B-2 show that in 2002 state appropriations made up 50 percent of Henderson’s total revenue or $17,421,107. In 2009 state appropriations dropped to 41 percent of total revenue.
or $20,790,347. This represents a 9 percent decrease in state appropriations towards total revenue over eight years. Decreased state funding has forced the university to increase tuition and fees and expend some of its fund balances to make up the differences.

The structure of support for funding has changed significantly over the last ten years. This is particularly true from a state funding standpoint. Table 2B-2 of the states of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) shows that Arkansas has followed the national trend in decreasing state appropriations as a percentage of state taxes for higher education.

The Henderson FY2010-2011 state appropriation budget was $20,628,126, a decrease of $264,845 from the previous year. The FY2011-2012 budget is forecasted to increase by only $202,063. This will still not put Henderson back to the funding level of what was actually received in FY2009-2010. (See Figure 2B-3.)

As mentioned in the Arkansas Higher Education 2010 Comprehensive Annual Report (AHECAR), “state-supported colleges and universities experience three things during economic downturns”:

1. Enrollment increases
2. Decreased state funding
3. Increases in tuition and fees.

The following statistics are evidence that Henderson is following the same trend:

1. A 3.6 percent increase in enrollment from the 2005 level to the 2010 level; 2010 recorded the largest fall freshman class in the history of Henderson
2. State funding has decreased by 9 percent as a percentage of total revenue over eight years
3. Tuition and fee revenue has increased 8 percent as a percentage of total revenue over eight years.

Henderson also receives revenue from federal grants and endowment support, but these sources of revenue are restrictive in nature and are usually not available for the general operations of the university.

In November 2008 the voters of the state of Arkansas approved the creation of a state lottery and in fall 2010 awarded 30,575 scholarships to Arkansas students. These scholarship awards for FY2010-2011 were $5,000 per year to attend a four-year school and $2,500 per year to attend a two-year school. In the 2010-2011 academic year, Henderson had 1,113 students receiving funds from
this source (also called the Arkansas Challenge Scholarship). In fall 2009 Henderson had only 264 students who qualified for the Arkansas Challenge Scholarship before the lottery was established. While these 849 additional scholarship recipients had some impact on enrollment, they were not the sole cause for Henderson’s increased enrollment. Instead, the qualifications for the scholarship changed and made these funds available to more students, almost half of whom were already attending Henderson. Of the 1,113 Arkansas Challenge Scholarship students in fall 2010, 538 students were already enrolled at Henderson and paying tuition and fees from other sources, 526 of the students were first-year and 49 were
transfer students. The creation of the lottery has provided funds for parents and students to pay for college but has not yet created many extra students for Henderson and other universities. If the lottery scholarship funds provide the financial means to keep the 526 freshmen and 49 transfer students in school, then Henderson may see an increase in retention and, thus, overall enrollment rates. Even then, according to the AHECAR, additional students will cause a decrease in state funding. The chart and paragraph from the AHECAR explain the problem (in Figure 2B-4).

Another source of funding for students, other than state and federal grants and scholarships, is institutionally-funded academic and performance scholarships. Until 1997 the state had a cap on the amount an institution could expend on academic and performance scholarships. From 1997 through 2009 there was no cap, and institutions increased scholarship funding to attract students. In the 1997-1998 academic year Henderson expended $1,681,830 on institutional scholarships or 23 percent of tuition and fees. In 2007-2008 institutional scholarship expenditures totaled $6,080,027 or 32 percent of tuition and fees. In 2009 legislation was passed to once again place a cap on institutional scholarship expenditures, limiting these to 20 percent of unrestricted tuition and mandatory fees by 2013-2014. As a result of this legislation, Henderson restructured its academic scholarships so they are not tuition driven and are now a flat dollar amount (See Table 2A-2.) and cut its educational and general and auxiliary budgets by 11 percent in 2009-2010. With these initial measures taken, Henderson’s scholarship to tuition and fee revenue percentage went from 22.0 percent to 18.1 percent in just two years. (The formula for calculating this percentage is different than the calculation for the percentages used above for years 1997-1998 and 2007-2008, so comparison of these percentages cannot be made.) (See Table 2B-3.)

**Foundation Support**

The focus of the Henderson Foundation continues to be support for the mission and goals of Henderson. The foundation is a legally separate, tax-exempt component of Henderson. The foundation was formed as a nonprofit 501(c)3 corporation and acts primarily as a fund-raising organization to supplement the resources that are available to Henderson in support of its programs. Although the university does not control the timing or amount of receipts from the foundation, the resources – or income that the foundation holds and invests – are restricted to the activities of the university by the donors. Table 2B-4 outlines the major funds held by the foundation and the value of these funds over the past five years.
As of June 30, 2010, the total value of the foundation was $12,313,852 which includes $9,190,209 in permanently restricted endowment accounts.

The foundation has provided funding for the construction or renovation of many campus buildings. Over the past ten years, three of the new buildings that have been constructed with help from private gifts to the foundation are the Sturgis Hall: The Honors College (2001), the Formby Athletic Center (2003), and the Simonson Biological Field Station (2011). The Reynolds Science Center benefited from foundation support not only for help with the original construction/renovation but also for mold removal and equipment repairs.

The foundation also has worked to develop a strong supportive role in the area of scholarships and instructional/program support. As stated earlier, students at Henderson bear a large percentage of the financial burden for their education. Henderson is cognizant of the fact that the cost of higher education might prohibit otherwise potentially successful students from...
attending. Every effort is made to reach those students academically prepared for college. Through the foundation, it has been possible to provide additional scholarships for needy students and to purchase equipment specific to individual programs.

In 2009-2010 the foundation provided the institution with over one million dollars which included over $400,000 in scholarships; the remainder was used for equipment, construction, lighting, and renovations. For example, in the attempt to develop a strings program, the foundation has funded the purchase of cellos and violins and, until recently, funded an adjunct strings teacher. The foundation also provides support for the dance troupe as it travels to national dance competitions and provides stipends for adjudicators for the annual President’s Concert auditions.

**The Office of Institutional Advancement**

The Office of Institutional Advancement serves as a liaison between Henderson and its alumni, the business community, foundations, and various constituencies. The office works to assist donors in achieving their charitable goals while fulfilling the educational mission of the university. The Office of Institutional Advancement works to develop understanding and support through a variety of functions.

**Alumni**

The Alumni Office works to foster a committed spirit and affiliation among students, graduates, and former students. The office achieves this through constituent relations, communications, programs, and special events.

**Annual Fund**

The purpose of the Annual Fund is to raise consistent financial support from alumni and friends. Proceeds from the Annual Fund are used for scholarships and general university operations. Additionally, the Phone-A-Thon coincides with the Annual Fund as an effort to reach out and talk to alumni and encourage financial support. While the past five years show strong support of the annual fund drive, it is notable that in 2004-2005 this fund only generated $63,945. The institution has enjoyed a varied but significant increase in fund giving each year since 2005. (See Table 2B-4) Approximately 15 percent of the Henderson alumni continue to support the institution with the average annual alumni gift being approximately $324.00.

**Alumni Database and Records**

The Office of Institutional Advancement maintains a database containing the records of Henderson alumni. This information is used by the development team to solicit funds for scholarships and special projects. The alumni office uses the information to keep a working relationship with the alumni and keep them informed and involved in campus events.
Collecting and keeping current information is an ongoing process. In November 2004 the database contained 27,336 records of which 24.8 percent were known to contain bad addresses. As of 2011 the database has grown to 31,024 records, and the lost percentage has been reduced to 7.2 percent. Henderson has contracted with Blackbaud and will be converting the database from the POISE (Jenzabar PX, still known as POISE on campus) system to Raiser’s Edge. Raiser’s Edge should be a more user-friendly system. It will enable the staff to obtain wealth index information that will help target alumni with the ability to support the university. It will also provide an online system for alumni to update their personal information and to make contributions online. Communication with alumni should improve with the use of Net Solutions. Email will be used to communicate with alumni routinely and in a cost-effective manner.

**Development**

The Office of Institutional Advancement is responsible for all activities which relate to the identification, cultivation, and solicitation of gifts from internal and external constituencies. The fund-raising objectives of the university are generally focused on the priorities contained in the strategic plan of the university. The Office of Institutional Advancement assists departments with programs and projects in need of external funding.

### Resource Development and Allocation

The Composite Financial Index (CFI) is a measurement tool introduced in 1999 by KPMG Peat Marwick LLP and Prager, McCarthy & Scaly, LLC, that is used to help determine the financial health of a public institution based on four core ratios. (See Table 2B-5.)

According to the *Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education*, “The CFI has been adapted by many leading institutions...and is a very valuable tool for senior managers and boards of trustees to help understand not only the state of an institution’s financial situation at a point in time but also serve as a valuable tool, unavailable from other sources, that can provide insight into the trends of an institution’s key financial indicators.” The following three reasons are given for its value: “By blending the four key measures of financial health into a single number, a more balanced view of the state of the institution’s finances is possible because a weakness in one measure may be offset by the strength of another measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Reserve Ratio</th>
<th>Expendable Net Assets + Component Unit * (C.U.) Expendable Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenses + C.U. Total Expenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viability Ratio</th>
<th>Expendable Net Assets + C.U. Expendable Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-Term Debt (Total Project-Related Debt) + C.U. Long-Term Debt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return on Net Assets Ratio</th>
<th>Change in Net Assets + C.U. Change in Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Net Assets + C.U. Total Net Assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</th>
<th>Operating Income (loss) + Net Non-operating revenues + C.U. Change in Unrestricted Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues + C.U. Total Unrestricted Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Component Units (C.U.) are the affiliates of the institution, such as the Henderson Foundation, of which the financial information is contained in a separate financial statement.

**Table 2B-5**

*Composite Financial Index*
By using the same criteria to determine the CFI over a period of time, the board and management are given the opportunity to measure the overall financial progress that the institution is making. The measure is easily understood and remembered, so it can become part of institutional communications on where the institution is as well as how far the institution has come.”

In 2006 Henderson’s CFI was the lowest in a period of years from 2005 through 2010. This was anticipated as two 176-bed residence halls were built. The expense of the construction and related costs were paid through the issuance of bonds prior to the revenue being received from increased housing. In a letter dated February 13, 2008, to the HLC, then President Charles Dunn states, “By making the capital expenditures, we knew that the Viability Ratio would likely decrease. The increased interest expense on debt service and other costs resulted in a net operating loss and a decrease in net assets which affected the Net Operating Revenue Ratio and the Return on Net Assets Ratio.”

The construction of the new halls was a partial implementation of the 2005 Designing Our Destiny Strategic Plan with the purpose of attracting more students to campus. As a result, the number of students living on campus increased over 40 percent in the two years following the completion of the two halls. Increasing enrollment was critical as state appropriations for the operating budget had continued to decrease. In the same letter to the HLC referenced above, President Dunn explains how the construction of the two residence halls, a planned student recreation center, and a department of nursing building will help boost enrollment and lead to financial recovery: “Henderson State University has a clearly articulated mission. That mission has guided the strategic plan for increased enrollment. We feel that implementation of this plan will permit Henderson to become healthier financially through systematic growth of its enrollment.”

In 2007 and 2008 the Composite Financial Indices increased. In 2009 the CFI decreased due to an Arkansas Legislative Audit requirement that dictated that the full $700,000 early retirement pay plan be expensed at year-end rather than over a three-year period as had been planned. Another cause of the reduction was a substantial decrease in the market value of the foundation’s invested assets due to the economic recession.

However, Henderson has reversed this downward trend. In March 2010 the Higher Learning Commission Financial Panel Review concluded “that the institution has substantially met its commitment in its Report on Finances (i.e., Financial Recovery Plan).”
The ratios and other issues are addressed at a satisfactory level and do not require interim monitoring.” In April 2011 the 2010 CFI reported an increase of 150 percent over the previous year. This is the highest CFI Henderson has reported to the HLC since 2005 and perhaps since this measure began.

There are many variables that can affect the ratios used to determine the CFI. It is most important to consider the trend line over a period of time. In the final sentence of his letter dated January 28, 2010, to the HLC, then President Welch states “The Composite Financial Index will continue to be used as a component of our financial goals and will support our institution’s strategic plan and overall mission.”

One of the key underlying concepts of Henderson’s most recent strategic planning process is the linkage of strategic plan priorities with resources. Principles guiding the strategic planning process also set the foundation for resource development and allocation dedicated to strengthening the quality of education. The process focuses attention on short- and long-term issues and balances the two. It also considers how priorities for new initiatives match mission commitments.

Henderson has done a great job of stretching limited resources to support all programs. However, for the past two or three years there has been only enough fiscal support to maintain programs currently in place and little additional funding for any significant future planning.

Through the strategic planning process and the Higher Learning Commission Self-Study, the institution is identifying areas where growth may be possible in terms of curriculum/programs, where additional resources must be invested, where cuts might need to be made, and how the university can better position itself for the future.

**Use and Development of Human Resources**

**Planning and Allocation**

Planning and implementation of programs and processes which affect human resources are accomplished through the collaboration of administration with offices, such as human resources, business, academic affairs, and the general counsel. The vice president for finance and administration and his staff develop resource allocation recommendations for the president and Board of Trustees with information from federal and state laws and regulations, professional peers, and campus groups. These include, but are not
limited to, the President’s Cabinet, the Budget Committee, Staff Senate, Faculty Senate, and the Fringe Benefits Committee.

As a state institution Henderson’s ability to meet existing staffing needs and plan for future needs is directly affected by the state legislature. The number and specific types of job positions available for utilization, pay scales for classified positions, and pay maximums for non-classified and faculty positions are regulated by the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration’s Office of Personnel Management and the Arkansas Department of Higher Education with oversight from the legislature’s Personnel Committee.

However, the institution has flexibility in making decisions regarding the use of appropriated job positions and other work-life factors, such as employee access to insurance and retirement benefits and training and professional development. To use human resources effectively Henderson strives to employ, motivate, and retain faculty and staff qualified to provide a quality education while balancing the needs of the students with the mandates of the legislature.

Local, national, and international job-seeking candidates may apply for faculty and non-classified staff positions through the General Counsel’s Office and classified positions through the Office of Human Resources. These offices provide administrative guidance to the heads of the departments which have open positions. The actual search for the most qualified candidates is decentralized and is organized by a search committee chair for faculty and non-classified positions and by the hiring supervisor for classified positions. The recruitment guidelines encourage the search for diverse, qualified candidates, and the percentage of minorities employed has increased steadily. (See Criterion 1B.)

Classified positions are usually sought by candidates within a fifty-mile commuting radius from campus due to the entry-level hourly rates which range between $7.84 and $17.95. The Office of Human Resources sends all classified job postings to the Arkansas Department of Workforce Services for free publication statewide. Postings for all university positions are published on the Henderson website, and specialized positions are advertised in publications, such as The Chronicle of Higher Education, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, and higheredjobs.com.

Due to limited state funds and the desire to keep tuition and fees at a minimum, Henderson has effectively used private donations, grants, and special fees to temporarily fund salaries for select positions. These agreements include specified time commitments to roll expenses into the university operating budget. For instance,
the Academic Programs Subcommittee of the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan recommended a specific position based upon emerging technology needs:

“Sixty-six percent of the responders [to an email soliciting input on technology] indicated the need for either more rooms with permanent MultiMedia stations, portable MultiMedia stations and/or better maintenance of the current MultiMedia stations. Several indicated a need for more than one. We currently have 42 MultiMedia stations on campus. Some of these are portable. A new permanent station would range from $16,000 to $35,000 depending on the configuration. The portable stations on a lockable cart are about $5000. The Academic Programs committee agreed in the March 8th meeting to recommend that the computer technician position be unfrozen and someone hired with the primary responsibility of supporting the MultiMedia stations. They also recommend an increase in the Multimedia station maintenance budget.”

In July 2005 a portion of the technology fee was used to hire a multimedia computer technician to build and maintain multimedia stations, saving the university money and time compared to outsourcing. In 2007 the Student Government Association proposed a library fee increase from $2.00 to $2.50 per credit hour to the Budget Committee. A portion of the fee income funded two part-time Library Academic Technicians, enabling Huie Library to extend night-time hours from 10 p.m. to midnight, Sunday through Thursday. A donor contributed $30,000 toward an assistant director of bands position from August 2008 through May 2011. The operating budget funded the remaining salary and benefits and will fund the entire expense starting with FY2011-2012.

Salaries

Salaries and fringe benefits are a substantial cost to the institution. In FY2010–2011 the proposed educational and general and auxiliary salaries plus fringe benefits represented 48 percent of the proposed total budget. Although the state provides funds for the operating budget, the proposed state funds were only 37.4 percent of the proposed total FY2010–2011 budget. The entire $20,628,126 state appropriation for FY2010–2011 would have funded 77.6 percent of the $26,559,953 budget for just salaries and fringe benefits, requiring tuition, fees, and private funds to cover the remaining $28,568,772 budgeted to provide a quality learning environment. The graph in Figure 2B-5 shows the decline of budgeted state appropriations

![Figure 2B-5](image-url)
relative to the increasing budgeted salaries and fringes within budgeted total expenses since 2001-2002.

Although the percentage of state revenues relative to total compensation expenses has declined, appropriated positions filled with full-time and part-time employees have increased as Henderson has grown. (See Table 2B-6.)

In addition to legislating budget and position appropriations, the state’s Office of Personnel Management mandates the pay scale and cost of living adjustments (COLA) for classified employees. Salary increases for non-classified staff and faculty are determined by the institution based on available funds. The salary offered upon date of hire for non-classified personnel and faculty is also determined by the institution. Each non-classified and faculty position has a maximum salary, regulated by the state, listed on the position appropriation act for each state institution. These “line item maximums” are assigned to institutions based in part on their size, so similar institutions have competitive salary maximums.

Competitive and compressed salaries are a concern when recruiting and retaining employees. A salary study was conducted in 2005 by a committee of faculty and staff who analyzed data from twenty-two peer institutions and recommended a plan to raise average salaries to be more competitive. The committee identified 44 of 63 professors, 19 of 33 associate professors, 27 of 37 assistant professors, 10 of 17 instructors, and 39 of 90 non-classified staff positions which were not competitive with peer institutions. They recommended the adjustments be made over four years contingent upon available funds. Furthermore, they recommended a shorter implementation period should sufficient funds become available. Starting July 2005 salary plan adjustments were implemented for the specified positions, in addition to COLA increases, for three of the planned four years. State budget cuts in 2008 reduced the availability of funds necessary to complete the recommendations from the 2005 salary study. The Budget Committee and Faculty Senate recommended a new study be conducted for implementation after the state economy improves.

In spring 2010 the president established a Compensation Committee to thoroughly review all aspects of faculty and staff benefits to include salary, health benefits, retirement, job expectations, teaching/work load, and other related issues. Twenty-five institutions identified as similar to Henderson are being used for comparison in this study. The committee will work throughout the 2011-2012 academic year and make recommendations to the president once its work is complete.
The 2006-2007 salaries listed in Table 2B-7 include the first and second installments of the 2005 salary study adjustments for specific positions. Changes evidenced in the 2010-2011 average salaries were affected by the third salary study adjustment, across-the-board cost of living increases when available, and increases due to the state pay plan study for classified positions. Average salary changes and increases in instructors and assistant professors’ salaries were affected by attrition from the 2007 early retirement offer and regular turnover.

July 2008 and 2009 included no cost of living (COLA) salary increases for non-classified staff and faculty. Classified positions, which typically have lower average salaries, received a 2 percent COLA in 2008. As a result of a legislatively-mandated review of the state classification and compensation structure, in 2009 classified positions also received 50 percent of salary adjustments that were required by the new state pay plan. Although the times were lean and employees were not pleased with little to no pay raises, the university was able to avoid layoffs, benefit reductions, hiring freezes, and program cuts. For this, in March 2010 the Staff Senate passed a resolution extending its “appreciation to President Charles Welch, Mr. Bobby Jones, and the administration for their diligence and foresight looking out for the campus community and its best interests through these dire economic times.”

In 2010 Henderson was able to provide a 2 percent across-the-board increase in December. Active classified staff employed since at least July 1, 2010, received the remaining fifty percent of the state pay plan increase that December. These staff and faculty increases were retroactive to July 1, 2010, because

---

### Table 2B-6
**Breakdown of Henderson Employees by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Category</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Administrative/Manager</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Non-Faculty</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial-Clerical</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Maintenance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Craftsmen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Paraprofessional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Administrative/Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Non-Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial-Clerical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Maintenance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Craftsmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Paraprofessional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FULL AND PART TIME</strong></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Data from 4/12/10 report from Office of Assessment and Research)

Note: Human resource statistics may vary slightly throughout this self-study document depending on the office producing the report, the census date of the data, and the categories of employees included (full-time, part-time, classified, faculty, etc.) in the data.

---

### Table 2B-7
**Salaries of Full-Time Benefit Eligible Employees, 2006-2007 Compared to 2010-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2006-2007 Average</th>
<th>2010-2011 Average</th>
<th>Comparison of 9 month Faculty by Rank</th>
<th>Distinguished Prof</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Prof</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Classified</td>
<td>52,162.44</td>
<td>54,683.34</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$81,499.00</td>
<td>$83,499.00</td>
<td>$81,499.00</td>
<td>$91,800.00</td>
<td>$91,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (12 mo.)</td>
<td>52,364.56</td>
<td>52,364.56</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$53,453.00</td>
<td>$54,836.34</td>
<td>$104,926.00</td>
<td>$131,000.00</td>
<td>$80,552.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (6 mo.)</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$45,233.00</td>
<td>$56,855.90</td>
<td>$91,445.00</td>
<td>$42,230.00</td>
<td>$54,773.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>21,742.47</td>
<td>43,056.00</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>$44,311.29</td>
<td>$64,549.00</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
<td>$98,040.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2006-2007 Average</th>
<th>2010-2011 Average</th>
<th>Comparison of 9 month Faculty by Rank</th>
<th>Distinguished Prof</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Prof</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Classified</td>
<td>52,162.44</td>
<td>54,683.34</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (12 mo.)</td>
<td>52,364.56</td>
<td>52,364.56</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they had been approved by the Board of Trustees in the proposed FY2010-2011 budget. The budgeted increases were postponed before the proposed budget could be implemented, and the funds were put into reserve until the state budget improved. Following a mandate from the Office of Personnel Management, no classified across-the-board cost of living increase had originally been budgeted for FY2010-2011, but a 2 percent increase was later recommended for all state classified employees. A proposal to give classified employees a 2 percent across-the-board increase was approved by the Board of Trustees effective January 23, 2011. (See Table 2B-8.)

Turnover
The voluntary early retirement plan offered to 107 eligible employees in 2007 presented challenges for those departments whose employees retired. Because the plan was announced August 23, 2007, and was effective December 31, 2007, there was a limited amount of time to find qualified replacements for faculty members retiring just before the spring semester. Therefore, willing retirees continued to teach as adjuncts for the remainder of the academic year or until their replacements could be hired. The intent of the plan was to raise funds for the incoming administration by hiring at lower salaries than had previously been budgeted. There were no cost savings, but there were plenty of challenges. Eight of the thirty-four employees retired from Teachers College, making it difficult to advise students, leaving two of their departments without department chairs, and resulting in a loss of valuable institutional memory. Teachers College met the challenges through reorganization, converting nine-month department chair positions to twelve-month positions, and hiring adjuncts. To maintain their accreditation, Teachers College must hire faculty with P-12 or other career experience. Because the salaries of candidates in the labor market were higher than the salaries of the retirees, finding qualified replacements was facilitated by hiring faculty without terminal degrees with agreements to complete their terminal degrees within specified time limits. As Dr. Judy Harrison, Dean of Teachers College and Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, stated about the loss of institutional memory, “In some cases, faculty who had not had an opportunity to demonstrate their leadership skills before were appointed as department chairs. Fortunately, they had some institutional memory and were willing to learn the intricate details of SPA and NCATE assessment and lead the new faculty in building new assessments aligned with SPA, NCATE, state and institutional standards.”

Apart from the early retirement programs, however, Henderson employees exhibit low turnover. According to an article in Employee Benefit News, February 23, 2011, the Employee Benefit
Research Institute (EBRI) recently released a study with the following findings:

- Over the past thirty-five years, the percentage of Americans who remained in the workforce after age fifty-five was 34.6 percent in 1975, dropped to 29.4 percent in 1993 and rose to the high level of 40.2 percent in 2010.

- For employees age sixty-five and older, the participation rates for both women and men increased. Contributing factors were the expectation of longer life spans, age-based delays to the availability of full social security benefits, increased costs and changes to Medicare, and supplemental medical insurance in an uncertain economy.

Employees at Henderson have a history of staying at the institution past the age of fifty-five, and a few have stayed past age seventy-five. As of February 25, 2011, the oldest employee is an eighty-one-year-old maintenance assistant, who has twenty-eight years of service at Henderson. Service award ceremonies are held annually to recognize staff and faculty who have five or more years of consecutive service. In 2007, 47 percent of full-time employees had between five and twenty years of service.

A review of length of service among faculty in 2011, revealed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Average Years of Consecutive HSU Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>9.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>11.3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20.5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Turnover rates** by year for full-time employees from 2002 through 2010

- 2002-2003: 11%
- 2003-2004: 13%
- 2004-2005: 15%
- 2005-2006: 9%
- 2006-2007: 9%
- 2007-2008: 18% (includes special early retirement population)
- 2008-2009: 9%
- 2009-2010: 11%

(Data from Turnover Rate by Year report from Office of Assessment and Research)

Henderson employees’ retirement decisions are affected by the rising cost of health care and changes in social security and Medicare, but
some have also shared stories explaining that they came to the institution intending to gain a few years of experience but stayed longer than expected because of the friendly atmosphere.

**Fringe Benefits**

The cost of health insurance is a concern not just for retirees, but also for potential employees and active employees. Henderson pays a larger percentage of the employees’ premiums for employee-only coverage (100 percent) than competing institutions, such as Arkansas State University (88 percent) and the University of Central Arkansas (85 percent).

Beginning in January 2011, in an effort to help employees during a period when they had not received salary increases, Henderson continued covering employees’ premiums at 100 percent (See Table 2B-9.) and increased its share of the family premium from 49.5 percent to 53 percent, an additional increase of $24.91 per month for 120 families. The institution was able to absorb the additional cost with revenues from increased student enrollment. Also, the potential 9.56 percent health insurance premium increase, due in part to costs associated with federal health care reform, was decreased to 7.64 percent by changing the dental insurance provider to the same parent company, Arkansas BlueCross/BlueShield. Employee approval of purchasing health, dental, and/or vision insurance through the same vendor if it would result in an overall savings was confirmed by a “yes” response from 92.4 percent of the 157 employees who answered that question on the 2010 Employee Benefits Survey.

Health insurance premiums are affected by the age and health of the participating members (employees or retirees plus dependents) and their utilization of the insurance. Henderson reviews age demographics, types of illnesses, and claims costs of active employees and retirees in efforts to provide the best coverage at an affordable cost for health insurance participants. Eligibility for insurance for early retirees in the future may change in response to the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

Between December 2009 and November 2010, 50.2 percent of the total dollars in claims were for members fifty-five years of age and older.

**Percent of total claims**  
December 2009 - November 2010 by age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newborns</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14 years</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-34 years</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the older member base influences premium rates, employees of all ages have used their insurance wisely and lowered Henderson’s utilization costs by using in-network medical providers, attending wellness visits, using generic-brand drugs, and improving their overall health. The Student Health and Counseling Center and the Office of Human Resources work together to provide various health-conscious programs to Henderson students, employees, and local community members. Since 2006 the Student Health and Counseling Center has sponsored the Health Improvement Program now renamed “Reddie for Wellness.” Students already pay a health fee, so they may participate at no additional cost. Employees may participate for the cost of materials, which has been less than the $25 co-pay for a doctor’s visit. The program has the added convenience of being provided on campus, reducing employees’ time away from work. Through the Reddie for Wellness program, the Student Health and Counseling Center nurses measure health indicators, such as a participant’s blood pressure, cholesterol level, blood sugar level, and body mass index during the fall semester and follow up with comparison measures in the spring semester. During the four-month program, participants may receive nutritional counseling from a dietician in the family and consumer sciences department and participate in diet programs, exercise groups, and support groups on campus. The Office of Human Resources has hosted the Blue Cross Blue Shield Blue and You Fitness Challenge, health fairs, flu shots, and heart screenings on campus and provided informative “Lunch N Learn” sessions on how to prevent health problems, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, and stress. Various aquatic classes are available through the athletics department, and exercise classes are offered to students and employees with memberships at the Student Recreation Center. Henderson provides a workout room in the Garrison Center with exercise machines that employees may use at no cost. By encouraging collaboration between departments, encouraging use of its facilities, and allowing time for employees to attend wellness events, Henderson is improving the well-being of employees while lowering insurance utilization costs and the percentage of any premium increases.

### Table 2B-9
**History of Henderson Insurance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th># or Participating Employees</th>
<th>HSU Cost per Employee</th>
<th>HSU Share of Employee Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2006</td>
<td>+2.10%</td>
<td>437 employees</td>
<td>$336.47/month</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2007</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>430 employees</td>
<td>$336.47/month</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2008</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>425 employees</td>
<td>$336.47/month</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2009</td>
<td>(9.19%)</td>
<td>441 employees</td>
<td>$311.98/month</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2010</td>
<td>+2.39%</td>
<td>464 employees</td>
<td>$319.44/month</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.7% decrease over these five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2011</td>
<td>+7.64%</td>
<td>465 employees</td>
<td>$343.85/month</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial resource development and investment

Even through difficult financial times, Henderson has constantly invested in its future through faculty development, by growing and enhancing learning support services, through investing in technology, and by an aggressive updating of buildings and facilities.

Faculty Development

Henderson is fortunate to experience rather low turnover rates in its faculty and staff. Therefore, the university’s investment in faculty development is a clear investment in the future. Henderson regularly assists in faculty development and research opportunities by funding travel to state, regional, national, and international conferences. In addition, money is budgeted annually for the purchase of needed equipment and supplies relative to specific research projects. Over the past three years approximately $378,000 has been allocated directly for this purpose. As a result of a recommendation in the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan, the majority of these funds are allocated to individual colleges/schools to be disseminated, usually through an application/committee process. For examples of funded projects, see Table 2B-10.

While research funds may be used for travel, they may also be expended on supplies, such as in the sciences where money is used to purchase liquid nitrogen, geometric batteries and sensor cables, cylinders of helium and oxygen gas for purging combustion tubes, blacklight tubes for night collections of biology specimens, paper, the binding of materials, and other research-based supplies.

Learning Support Services

Many disciplines collect course fees from students that are dedicated funds for supporting learning in those academic areas. In the 2008-2009 academic year, $447,884 in fees were collected for academic programs. The dean of the college and/or chairs of departments control the spending of those funds. Some of these funds are for immediate needs including student-intern supervisor travel expenses, nursing-student supervisor travel to clinical sites, thermal cylinders, film and print development supplies for photography, clay and kiln supplies, and maintenance/tuning of pianos; others serve as immediate and long-term investments for student learning, such as digital shows for the planetarium, refurbishing of telescopes and glassware, and specimens for biology dissection and study.

Henderson also made an ongoing commitment to learning support services with the investment in the Henderson Seminar. Implemented in 1998 this nine-week course taken during the
student’s first semester is designed to increase the likelihood that the student’s “first and future years at Henderson will be successful, both academically and socially.” (See also Criterion 3D.) In recognition of the importance of the efforts made by seminar instructors to help students make the transition from high school to college, the stipend for teaching a Henderson Seminar class was raised from $600 to $1000 in 2004 and to $1250 in 2011. The number of Henderson Seminar instructors has steadily increased with a current average of thirty-three instructors per fall semester.

As a result of a 2005 strategic plan initiative, Henderson inaugurated a Common Book Program in fall 2006. The goal of the program is to offer everyone on campus—faculty, students, and staff—the opportunity to read and discuss the same book over the course of the semester. Freshmen discuss the book in Henderson Seminar, and events related to themes in the selected book are also scheduled. Funded with an allocation from the student orientation fee, the program budget is used to purchase books for incoming freshmen and other interested members of the university community and to bring the author or related speaker to campus.

In fall 2010 the university developed the Academic Advising Center, another initiative from both the 2005 and 2010 strategic plans. This center helps students in designing successful class schedules and determining career choices. The staff will provide assistance to students who have not declared a major, to students under thirty hours of earned credit who have not completed their remedial classes, and to students on academic probation. It is anticipated that this program will need additional resources in the future.

---

### Table 2B-10
Examples of Funding for Faculty Development and Research in 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of faculty development support for 2009-2010 include</th>
<th>Amt funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Conference or Workshop Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 46th International Congress on Medieval Studies</td>
<td>675.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC International Conference on Romanticism</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2010 Arkansas Philiological Association Conference</td>
<td>314.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 239th ACS National Meeting and Exposition</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC National Association of Schools of Theatre</td>
<td>640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC National Association of College Wind and Percussion Instructors</td>
<td>796.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Texas State Historical Association Annual Meeting</td>
<td>567.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC National Student Nurse Association Annual Convention</td>
<td>843.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC National Pop Culture Association Convention</td>
<td>928.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC International Conference: Strikes and Social Conflicts in the 20th Century</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC AACN Baccalaureate Education/Leadership Development Conference</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC National Art Education Association Conference</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB International AASCNB</td>
<td>2,508.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB AAPU Conference</td>
<td>193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH American Dietetic Association Workshop</td>
<td>695.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH National Assoc. for Education of Young Children Conference</td>
<td>1,124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH National Council for Social Studies Conference</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH American Alliance for Health, Phys Ed, Recreation conference</td>
<td>971.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH Council on Exceptional Children—SPA training</td>
<td>1,430.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examples of research support for fall 2010 include

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Research Title</th>
<th>Amt funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC &quot;Invasive Marine Species&quot;</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC &quot;Ionics for Exploring Biomass Lignin Conversion&quot;</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Molecular Phylogenetic Analysis of Microbial Life in Blanchard Springs Caverns</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC &quot;Energy Legislation Under President Carter: an Analysis of Congressional Behavior&quot;</td>
<td>1,305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC &quot;RN to BSN Success from Non-accredited Programs&quot;</td>
<td>1,039.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC &quot;A Longitudinal Study: Investigating the Treatment of Drug and Alcohol Addiction&quot;</td>
<td>2,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Unionization of Ford Motor Company&quot;</td>
<td>1,304.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB ASBBS Conference</td>
<td>830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB Allied Academies</td>
<td>1,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB SMA</td>
<td>1,056.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoB APEE International Conference</td>
<td>1,154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH Assoc. for the Study of Higher Education</td>
<td>1,962.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH Hawaii International Conference on Education</td>
<td>743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH Hawaii International Conference on Education</td>
<td>1,910.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH American Alliance For Health, Phys. Ed, and Rec.</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to enrollment increases in fall 2010, additional tutors were hired to help meet the demands of the Writing Center. From 2003 to 2007 additional full-time instructors were hired in English, Mathematics, and Oral Communications in order to offer enough sections to meet demand. In 2007-2008, the institution put these three positions into the budget as regular instructor salaries. It is anticipated that these will be necessary for many years into the future.

**Technology**

Technology plays a very important role in the success of Henderson students and faculty. Through the implementation of wireless access in all residence halls and academic buildings, multimedia in ninety-five classrooms, expansion of eLearning, computer access for all, broadband telephone (Voice over Internet Protocol-VOIP), upgrades in network infrastructure, and more, technology at Henderson continues to be one of the most advanced areas. (See also Criterion 3B.)

**Facilities**

Renovation and Construction

Many of the buildings on the Henderson campus have either been renovated or constructed over the past ten to fifteen years. Most recently, Henderson saw the construction of a new nursing education building, two new residence halls, the student recreation center (funded by students), and the aviation maintenance and flight training hangar. With property acquisitions through 2010, Henderson’s main campus includes 152.41 acres, 61 buildings, and 1,137,972.24 square feet. With over $46 million spent in new construction and renovation since 2001, Henderson continues to invest in facilities. (See Table 2B-11.)

Of the nineteen building projects completed since 2001, 63 percent were new buildings. Of the twelve new buildings, one third of those were replacements of older facilities. According to the Arkansas Higher Education Comprehensive Annual Report- Financial Condition Report 2010 (AHECAR) by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE), the average Facilities Condition Index (FCI) for 2010 for all of Arkansas’s educational and general facilities is 54 percent, meaning that 54 percent of the life expectancy of the average facility has passed. Any FCI exceeding 15 percent according to national literature signals that the maintenance of facilities needs improvement and a dedicated source of funding. The FCI for Henderson in 2010 was 54.7 percent. This is very high, yet comparable to other Arkansas public universities. (See Table 2B-12.) Although public universities in Arkansas reduced their critical maintenance need by $57.7 million from 2008 to 2010, the facilities square footage increased only by 179,000 in that same year.
Table 2B-11
Investment in Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2003 | Captain Henderson House Bed and Breakfast | Renovation | 8,604 sq. ft.; $1,960,454
59% matching grant from the Arkansas Natural / Cultural Resources Council |
| 2002 | Roy and Christine Sturgis Hall: The Honors College | New Construction | 33,993 sq. ft.; $4,056,000
College Savings Bonds and tuition and fees |
| 2003 | Mooney Hall – First Floor | Renovation | 4,650 sq. ft.; $461,737
Bond proceeds and Sturgis Foundation donation. |
| 2004 | Wells Renovation – First Floor | Renovation | 15,540 sq. ft.; $1,465,499
State Appropriated Funds, tuition and fees, and private donation. |
| 2006 | East Hall and West Hall | New Construction | 84,600 sq. ft.; $12,623,466
Bond proceeds |
| 2008 | Bette Wallace Tennis Center | New Construction | 520 sq. ft.; $148,639
Private donation |
| 2009 | Charles D. Dunn Student Recreation Center | New Construction | 42,340 sq. ft.; $6,932,180
The student recreation center was requested by students and funded by student fees. |
| 2011 | Clyde Berry Baseball Field Renovation | Renovation | $142,260
Private donation |
| 2011 | Simonson Biological Field Station | New Construction | 7,555 sq. ft.; $695,000 est.
Private donation |
| 2011 | Foster Hall Technology Center | Renovation | Foster Hall - 18,462 sq. ft.
Womack Hall - 38,598 sq. ft.
33,069,995 est.
Foster Hall – 60%
Womack Hall – 40%
Funded by ARRA of 2009, Higher Education General Obligation Bonds, and tuition and fees |

Table 2B-12
ADHECAR 2010
Facilities Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>E&amp;G Sq Ft</th>
<th>E&amp;G Replacement Value</th>
<th>E&amp;G Maintenance Needs</th>
<th>E&amp;G Critical Maintenance</th>
<th>E&amp;G FCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>2,122,663</td>
<td>$306,009,755</td>
<td>$184,287,754</td>
<td>$27,771,593</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATU</td>
<td>940,703</td>
<td>$179,133,490</td>
<td>$80,596,234</td>
<td>$4,143,319</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSU</td>
<td>872,256</td>
<td>$121,343,177</td>
<td>$62,323,025</td>
<td>$13,500,925</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUM</td>
<td>769,285</td>
<td>$139,220,931</td>
<td>$70,357,463</td>
<td>$3,209,590</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAFF</td>
<td>5,810,932</td>
<td>$677,751,966</td>
<td>$420,487,526</td>
<td>$10,369,272</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAFL</td>
<td>707,443</td>
<td>$107,641,542</td>
<td>$57,317,406</td>
<td>$12,037,273</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>584,368</td>
<td>$104,356,357</td>
<td>$56,621,175</td>
<td>$2,652,635</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UABP</td>
<td>917,305</td>
<td>$159,649,925</td>
<td>$53,849,623</td>
<td>$7,328,435</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCA</td>
<td>1,437,256</td>
<td>$254,216,052</td>
<td>$145,915,343</td>
<td>$753,744</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV TOTAL</td>
<td>14,023,640</td>
<td>$2,476,081,826</td>
<td>$1,339,730,705</td>
<td>$83,073,187</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
time period, indicating the replacement of facilities that cost too much to renovate because renovation costs can often exceed the cost of a new facility.

Maintenance

Deferred maintenance is a lack of normal upkeep. It is an appraisal term used to note items like broken windows, missing shingles, peeling paint, broken guttering, and other property defects that have not been addressed by the owner.” Henderson conducted a campus-wide deferred maintenance audit for 2011-2013. Its purpose was to identify the value of deferred maintenance of the buildings and mechanical equipment. The current estimate for deferred maintenance for 2011-2013 is $25,850,834. State appropriations to meet this need have been minimal over the last ten years. In its “Recommendations for 2010-2011,” the AHECAR notes that “it was recommended at the October 29, 2010 Board meeting that the Board members work with the Legislators for funding to support the maintenance of state facilities,” but no money has yet been allocated for this purpose.

On October 29, 2010, the Arkansas Department of Higher Education Coordinating Board enacted a Policy for Maintenance of New Facilities. This policy requires that any “newly constructed or purchased facilities will have a source of funding for maintenance of the new facility. Institutions seeking approval of a loan or a bond issue for the construction or purchase of a new facility must provide for the maintenance of that facility by transferring annually to plant funds an amount as recommended by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Colleges (APPA). This is currently $2.50 per gross square foot for an educational and general facility or $1.25 per gross square foot for an auxiliary facility. A lower rate per gross square foot for a specific building/facility can be approved with appropriate justification.” The deferred maintenance amount will be a budgeted item for the life of the building. Funds set aside can be used for critical maintenance on any building.

Henderson is currently investigating energy-saving solutions through an energy service company, (ESCO). The ESCO will perform an in-depth analysis of the properties and design an energy-efficient recommendation. The savings in energy costs may be used to pay back the capital investment of the project over time. Through a rebate program from Entergy of Arkansas, an audit has been performed on every building on campus for replacement of T12 light bulbs with T8 bulbs. There are 5,904 fixtures that need replacement. This will take place building by building as funds become available; funds will be reimbursed through Entergy of Arkansas. All new buildings include an automatic light system that will turn on upon entering and off upon exiting.
In fall 2008 an internal committee which included President Charles Welch, Vice President for Finance and Administration Bobby Jones, faculty, and staff was formed to make recommendations for a new Campus Master Plan. The proposed goal was “to produce a Master Plan document concisely documenting the goals, objectives, improvements and design information generated as a result of study of the campus, and comments and decisions reached during meetings of the HSU Master Plan Committee.” The keynotes for the proposed improvements are below.

Proposed Improvements - KEYNOTES
1.0 Construct new Dining Hall and Coffee Cafe
2.0 Architecturally enhance/ renovate Amy Jean Greene Bridge - extend bridge to new Dining Hall, add lighting
2.1 Architecturally camouflage Boiler Building
3.0 New Residence Hall
3.1 Acquire property; expand parking for residence halls - refer to “Proposed Parking Improvements” plan
3.2 Enhance west sidewalk at Garrison Center - widen, add lighting, add traffic devices
4.0 Expand existing parking lot for faculty and commuter students - refer to “Proposed Parking Improvements” plan
5.0 New entry / landscape to Womack Hall with parking and fountain and Womack / Caddo Plaza
6.0 Adaptive re-use / renovation of Caddo
6.1 Add parking at Caddo
7.0 New monumental campus entry sign
7.1 Camouflage blind wall for Physical Plant along 10th Street
7.2 Sidewalk / trail / greenway to recreation fields along 10th Street
7.3 Campus collegiate architectural fence (Decorative metal fence with brick masonry posts at +/- 40’ integrals)
8.0 Building addition / renovations to Womack Hall
9.0 Enhancements/ improvements to Henderson Street (landscape, enhanced crosswalks, lighting, streetscape, etc.) (Near Term improvements Pg. 19)
9.1 Enhancements/ improvements to 12th Street (landscape, enhanced crosswalks, lighting, streetscape, etc.)

Plans for proposed improvements 1.0, 2.0, and 2.1 are being developed during the writing of this report, while improvement 8.0 is in progress. The building addition and renovations to Womack Hall will not only bring the building into compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, but will also allow the admissions personnel to relocate there. This will bring most services for admissions and registration for students into one building.

Parking has long been a complaint of students and employees alike. At the time of the development of the 2010 Campus Master Plan there were 1,427 parking spaces available for approximately 4,000 students and employees. The proposed parking improvements
shown on page 14 of the Campus Master Plan below add over 1,650 new spaces to campus. (See Figure 2B-6.) A new parking lot that was not part of the Campus Master Plan was built in summer 2010 at the corner of Wilson and 12th Streets. That new lot created an additional sixty-one spaces.

Prioritization of projects in the Campus Master Plan, both near-term and long-term, are listed in Figure 2B-7.

The three bulleted items below were listed as “Major Recommendations” in the Facilities and Grounds section of the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan. Each of these is being addressed with the 2010 Campus Master Plan.

• Define and develop a physical area that will be dedicated to student residential life. Construct new residence halls as well as a new dining facility in this area.
• Improve the aesthetics of the entire campus by accelerating general maintenance and repairs, improving outdoor lighting, better landscaping, paved parking.
• Develop a “Master Plan” for future physical plant improvements and changes. Form permanent committees to review and monitor future physical plant needs (or extend the life of the Master Plan Committee).

Flexibility
Henderson’s budget planning and processes have adequately maintained programs over the years but are currently being reviewed and revised to better allow for growth and innovation. For the past eight to ten years it has been nearly impossible to significantly increase support for rapidly growing departments as state funding has decreased or remained static, as has institutional size. Some of the vice presidents and deans have made small reallocations within their units and limited budgets, but the resources are not significant enough to generate substantial change. Over the past three years the president, vice presidents, and deans have begun to look at areas in critical need with the intent of developing plans for addressing these concerns. Only recently (fall 2010) has the institution seen a significant enrollment increase, generating unanticipated funds that might be allocated for this purpose. Without increased state support, the institution relies mainly on student tuition for additional revenue.

A desire for maximum flexibility to respond to changing demands inspired President Welch to establish the new strategic planning process in 2009. He charged the Strategic Planning Council to look at all aspects of the university and to develop plans for the future, but he also insisted that this be seen as an ongoing plan and provided for assessment and updates to be made annually. A primary
objective in this plan is to undertake a cost analysis of all units on campus. This will be critical in determining future funding and resource allocation.

History of Achievement
Planning processes have been an important way in which Henderson has focused its attention on important initiatives that would move the university into the future. With each strategic plan, Henderson has achieved significant portions of its planning goals while remaining flexible enough to revisit and revise some goals and realizing that some, such as technology, are moving targets.

The 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan identified seven initiatives to implement the liberal arts mission of the university. A total of twenty-two recommendations were made to accomplish those initiatives. As of the writing of this report, 23 percent of the recommendations have been met, 73 percent have been partially met, and 4 percent have not been met.

The 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan began with six broad issues identified by the Board of Trustees. Twenty-three major recommendations were made. As of the writing of this report, 26 percent of the recommendations have been met, 61 percent have been partially met, and 13 percent have not been met.

The 2010 Strategic Plan is the current strategic plan in effect as of the writing of this report. It was developed by five subcommittees, with each subcommittee addressing one of the five Higher Learning Commission criteria. It is comprised of seventeen goals. These goals are formatted into a table that includes an evaluation. (See Figure 2B-8.)

Evaluation of the progress and updating of the document are built into the process. The preface of the plan states that the “document should be viewed as a working document and the process of strategic planning as an ongoing process.” In an email dated September 14, 2010, Drew Smith and Catherine Leach, co-chairs of the Strategic Planning Council, wrote the following to the chairs of the subcommittees, “The next step for the Strategic Planning Council will be for each subcommittee to go through this current version of the plan and determine which of the goals, objectives, etc. are currently being addressed, and assessing what current activities are being done and to
what extent these activities are effective in accomplishing particular goals.” In June 2011 the committee met again in retreat to identify the goals and objectives that had been met, those that were in progress, and those that had not been addressed.

**Summary:**

Ultimately, the use of internal resources to maintain a balanced budget is not without its faults. The transition to greater self-funding had the impact of decreasing the institution’s total net assets. Recognition of this fact by the administration has circumvented any financial crises and has led to recent increases in internal financial resources.

Henderson has been able to sustain educational quality through sound fiscal and budgetary management. The university has endeavored to offset the decreases in state funding as well as rising expenses through conservative budgeting and restrained spending. The university recently moved to budgeting for a flat or decreased enrollment rather than for an anticipated increase in enrollment, as had been the practice for many years. In addition, spending has been cut off early in the spring semester during poor economic years, with purchases approved only when a critical need existed. Not replacing, or delaying the hiring for, vacated positions, has also generated enough funds to help ensure that the institution ended each year in the black. As always, Henderson continues to look at reprogramming efforts that will address critical funding issues required to support academic initiatives.

Through conservative planning and management of resources, the university will be able to restore reserves for unanticipated needs and short-term strategic investments and invest in top priorities— even without additional state appropriations for these purposes. Prudent budget planning and possible reallocation of existing resources will enable the institution to realize its goals.

**CORE COMPONENT 2C: The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.**

Henderson has been significantly better at collecting data than at analyzing or using the data for continuous improvement. However, after the 2001 Self-Study, the Higher Learning Commission team recommended a focused visit for the university on the issue of assessment. In preparation for that focused visit, the university engaged in an intense and concerted effort to create a culture of assessment where data is collected, analyzed, and utilized to make improvements in programs and practices. The momentum in evaluation and assessment processes has continued, and the academic and administrative
units alike have begun to systematically collect and use evidence to make changes. (Academic assessment will be covered much more in-depth in Criterion 3A.)

**Assessment Process and Support**

Henderson is committed to the evaluation and assessment program. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the president charged the deans and vice presidents with developing assessment programs in their respective areas. However, it was determined later that year that this strategy was unlikely to produce a quality evaluation and assessment process. The administration brought in an assessment speaker, Dr. Denise Watts, to present an assessment workshop in fall 2002. As a significant show of support for creating a university-wide assessment program, Henderson hired a director of assessment in March 2003. The Office of Assessment and Research was created at that time with supply/service and travel budgets. The university also provided the resources to purchase the TracDat system and training for both the TracDat and iWebfolio products. A survey software package was purchased to assist programs/units in the development of surveys for evaluation and assessment. The university funded the cost of eight members of the Assessment Team to attend the AAHE/HLC Assessment Workshop in June 2005, and a national assessment expert was brought in prior to the start of the fall 2006 semester.

The director of assessment provides training sessions to assist programs/units in the use of TracDat, development of assessment plans, and analysis of data, as well as in other support activities. Additionally the Assessment Team was created in 2003 to assist the director of assessment. The Assessment Team consists of both academic and non-academic representatives, along with undergraduate and graduate student members.

With the help of the director of assessment and the Assessment Team, each academic program and administrative unit is required to develop an assessment plan and use TracDat to record the plan, collect the data, and track the results. Each assessment plan includes:

- At least three student learning outcome statements/objectives;
- Two measurements for each student learning outcome statement/objective, which include the criteria for assessing, a schedule, and how the data will be used to make changes;
- Measurement tools (survey, rubric, etc.) attached;
- Linkage to higher-level goals.

The Assessment Team reviews each plan and reports the findings to the program/unit. The team has developed rubrics for evaluating the assessment plans and end-of-the-year, “Closing the Loop,” reports.
Data is to be collected during the year, with specific deadlines for entry into TracDat, and reported annually. Subsequent to data collection, storage, and analysis, any changes in the program/unit are recorded in TracDat. Each “Closing the Loop” report includes

- Data collected for each measurement;
- At least one observation for each measurement used in the assessment plan;
- Action(s) to be taken if changes need to be made;
- Follow-up on changes made in the assessment plan.

The director of assessment also assists departments in the development and administration of surveys and in analyzing the data collected. The director has created both paper and web-based surveys for many academic and administrative units. The surveys gather indirect data from students, faculty, staff, administrators, and external constituencies. The administrative units administer satisfaction surveys. The academic programs survey students on experiences, quality of programs, and preparedness. They also gather data from employers to see how prepared students are and what changes they recommend to programs.

Reviews

In addition to the formal assessment process, the university and units across the campus regularly engage in other reviews of effectiveness. For example, the current strategic plan will be assessed at different points throughout the process and reported upon annually. The groundwork for the strategic plan was laid during spring 2009, and each of the subcommittees met during fall 2009 to finalize their part of the strategic plan. The Strategic Planning Council met again during summer 2010 for a two-day retreat to review the plan and make any necessary revisions, based upon the current conditions and the results of the Campus Climate Survey. Members of the council determined if any of the goals had been met or were currently being addressed. Again in summer 2011, the Strategic Planning Council met to evaluate each goal, objective, strategy, and activity.

Academic programs also conduct periodic reviews as required by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE). In June 1997 Arkansas Code 6-61-214 charged the ADHE with the responsibility for reviewing existing academic programs of public colleges and universities. All institutions are required to develop an academic review plan for all programs every seven to ten years. The Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) requested in October 2008 that the ADHE revise the existing program review process to ensure academic quality and to remove nonviable programs. Now each institution has to schedule an ex-
ternal review for all existing programs every seven to ten years by employing out-of-state reviewers/consultants and writing a comprehensive self-study. The reviewer/consultant must conduct a site visit to meet with program faculty, students, and administrators. A comprehensive self-study will include curriculum, faculty, resources, course delivery methods, student outcomes, recent/planned program improvements, and any other additional information needed.

**Data Collection**

To assist in the process of assessment and review, the university collects and maintains a wide variety of data including faculty, staff, student, and community member surveys; nationally-normed tests and assessments; peer reviews; and internal research.

Data is stored in various databases depending on the type of data. The main data warehouse is Jenzabar PX POISE which stores enrollment, student, financial aid, fiscal, and personnel data. The research associate in the Office of Assessment and Research is responsible for most of the state and federal reporting. The office is tasked to ensure the integrity and reliability of data for effective university planning and decision-making. The Office of Assessment and Research coordinates the data analysis and the reporting of university data to administrators, faculty, staff, students, and other internal and external constituencies. Examples of the types of data that could be requested are student enrollment, retention, courses, grades, and remediation. Student data reports for state and federal reporting are collected from this database.

Teachers College has utilized this system to develop their Undergraduate Teachers College Assessment System (TCAS) and the Graduate Teachers College Assessment System (GTCAS). Teachers College uses the data collected in both of these systems for National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation, Specialized Professional Association reports, program reviews, and in the university assessment process. Beginning fall 2011 Teachers College will begin using the TK20 assessment system, purchased by the college to even better facilitate the collection and use of data.

As discussed above, the university’s assessment data tool is Nuventive’s TracDat software. TracDat is an assessment management tool designed to meet the assessment and planning needs of both the academic programs and administrative units. TracDat allows for institution-wide viewing of assessment plans and uniform reporting across departments. It provides a user-friendly tool for managing assessment processes, such as planning, data storage, data analysis, change implementation, and follow-up. Data can be organized into reports for
faculty, staff, and administrators to support formative and summative evaluations of program or unit progress each year.

Henderson uses TracDat to store all academic program and administrative unit assessment plans. Each program/unit is responsible for summarizing the results collected and attaching the data as well as creating action plans to improve the program/unit. Once the action plans are implemented, follow-ups are recorded to monitor the success of the action plans. The program/unit is asked to share all results and action plans with its entire area. This is to ensure continuous improvement is happening across the entire area.

Results
Since the institution of the Assessment Office in 2003, many administrative units have made changes to their units based upon collected data. Some examples follow.

Heart Start
One of the changes has been to Heart Start, Henderson’s orientation program for new students. In fall 2006, the orientation shifted from a morning-only session to a two-day orientation. Surveys were developed and data has been collected since that time. Based on the 2007 survey results the following changes were made:

1. The Heart Start printed materials were changed. Instead of a one page letter, a twenty-page booklet was developed to include a campus map, department telephone numbers, and information about programs and the forms students might need to prepare before attending the session.
2. The data showed that in 2007 the breakout sessions were confusing and many students did not attend those sessions. In 2008 sessions were reduced and all students attended the same sessions at the same time.
3. Six Heart Start faculty members had done all the academic advising in 2007. Students were not actually being advised, just put into classes. Beginning in 2008 students were advised by someone from each academic department, and the time spent advising students was increased to provide more time for academic issues.
4. There were only three sessions of Heart Start during 2007. It was decided based on the data that another session needed to be added in 2008.

The overall data showed there was a significant increase in satisfaction from 2007 to 2008.

Residence Life
During the 2006-2007 assessment cycle, Residence Life collected data on attendance of hall programs. The data showed only 35 percent of the students responded that they regu-
larly attended the programs. It was decided that changes needed to be made to the days and times the programming was offered; however, the data did not show any improvement in attendance after these changes were made.

Residence life employees held discussion groups on living cooperatively with roommates. Ninety-six percent of the students attending these groups reported they got along with their current roommate. Several students questioned how they had been assigned to their original roommate as they reported to have nothing in common and had to change roommates because the living situation was uncomfortable. Based on the data collected, a roommate interest survey has been created to collect information on personalities, likes, dislikes, and other desirable attributes for a roommate. Residence Life will complete a follow-up in early fall 2011 to determine the effectiveness of this tool before students are allowed to change roommates.

Scholarships
The University Relations and Admissions Office was concerned with the low percentage of first-time admitted students that enrolled at Henderson. The university evaluated the 2009 scholarship program and decided to make the necessary changes to remain within the parameters of Act 323, yet yield more students. By making these changes to scholarships, the number of students enrolling has increased. (See Criteria 2B.)

Academic Advising Center
The Academic Advising Center has been in the planning stages for many years. In 2008 the final report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Retention made a recommendation to develop an advising center. This committee researched several topics before making any recommendations. One piece of the research included the results from the Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising conducted by ACT. The 2010 Strategic Plan also listed the advising center as one of its objectives. National data shows that students need holistic advising. The advising center was created in fall 2010. The center develops an individual plan for each student. Advisors in the center currently advise undeclared and high risk students. This spring the University Academic Council (UAC) adopted two new standards. If a student requires at least two remedial courses and has lower than a 21 ACT score, that student cannot declare a major and must be advised by the advising center. Also, if a student is on academic probation (under 2.00 GPA) the student is restricted to taking 15 or fewer credit hours and must be advised by the advising center. If the student receives any type of financial assistance, the center works with the Office of Financial Aid to ensure the student is enrolled in the required number of hours. The
advising center collected data during the fall 2010 and the spring 2011 semester on the retention of the students who were advised, and is developing an assessment plan and measurement tools to collect evidence to gauge the success of this endeavor.

**Greek Life**

Henderson partnered with the North-American Interfraternity Conference in fall 2010 to provide a third-party assessment of the Greek Life system at Henderson. This assessment process is the most significant step taken in the past ten years to improve Greek Life at Henderson. The assessment process included data collection from Henderson and a site visit from the Coalition Assessment Team in November 2010. Based on the findings from the visit, major changes are being made to the Greek Life system. The dean of students developed a plan to incorporate the recommendations of the Coalition team. The first change was to socially suspend all fraternities indefinitely and suspend all spring rush activities. The university is requiring each fraternity to develop a plan for the process of self-governance. This plan will make each fraternity responsible for its own standards and the standards of other fraternities on campus. Each fraternity is required to work with its national organization. The dean of students hosted a summer retreat for members of the Greek councils to discuss the action plan for the 2011-2012 academic year.

**Other**

Additional examples of how data collection helps contribute to the improvement of the university:

- The **Non-Returner Survey** was developed in fall 2006 to gather evidence as to why students did not return to Henderson. The results were discussed during a President’s Cabinet meeting. Each vice president was charged with taking the data pertaining to his or her area and implementing changes based on the data. There are current discussions on the need to gather this evidence again because it has been five years.

- The **Non-Matriculated Survey** was developed during the fall 2006 semester. The data gathered assisted in understanding why students applied and were accepted but chose not to attend Henderson. The data showed students were applying and being admitted to numerous institutions. The vice president for student services and other student services staff reviewed the scholarship program and suggested changes. This survey has not been administered again since 2006; however, the Office of University Relations and Admissions...
still collects the reasons why students did not enroll at Henderson. This data is collected by phone calls to students that are not enrolled in courses.

• The Survey of Graduates was locally developed over ten years ago. The surveys were filed until 2010. The assessment office spent the fall 2010 and spring 2011 semesters manually entering the data into the survey software. The data will be aggregated and distributed to the necessary departments for action to be taken to improve student learning and experiences.

• The Graduate School Exit Survey was locally developed in 2004 and is administered online. The instrument was built by the director of assessment and the Graduate School Council. It is administered each semester. The counseling department added some questions during the fall 2006 semester specifically for those majors completing the survey. The data is distributed to the graduate council for action to be taken.

• The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) has been administered on Henderson’s campus every other year since 2002. The data collected has been used in various ways to improve the campus.

Summary:
The university has supported evaluation and assessment through hiring a director of assessment, supporting a funded office of assessment and research, purchasing campus-wide assessment management system and survey software, and revitalizing the Assessment Team. As a result, all units of the university have engaged in a culture of assessment by making plans to collect data, reviewing the data, and using the data to make decisions leading to continuous improvement.
CORE COMPONENT 2D: All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Planning and the Mission

The university mission was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1988. As a result, in 1988 the university made a commitment to fully implement the mission with three major goals: 1) recruit a diverse, superior student body; 2) fully integrate the liberal arts into every undergraduate academic program, and 3) identify several programs of distinction that would be known for their quality throughout the South. This was the university’s first effort to develop a strategic plan.

Planning efforts continued in 1998, with the university’s Bold Strokes strategic plan. It identified seven initiatives which supported the first initiative, which was “Henderson State University will implement its liberal arts mission by a) developing a common definition and understanding of the liberal arts at Henderson State University; b) achieving state and national recognition as a public liberal arts university by developing a comprehensive plan; and c) developing benchmarks to monitor university progress in implementing its mission.”

As a result of the 2001 Higher Learning Commission visit, it was recommended that the university develop a campus-wide assessment plan. With the development of the university’s assessment plan, each department’s assessment goals are linked to its departmental mission which in turn is linked to the university mission. This helps ensure that departmental planning and assessment is mission driven.

In September 2004 the Board of Trustees identified six broad issues facing Henderson and charged Dr. Dunn, faculty, and others with developing a strategic plan to deal with these six issues. Six strategic planning taskforces were established and met regularly throughout the spring 2005 semester, and out of these efforts, the 2005 Designing Our Destiny Strategic Plan was developed. While the six issues are issues that face many campuses, the taskforces and the narrative that resulted centered on solutions consistent with the mission. For instance, the Academics section of the report began “As Arkansas’s Public Liberal Arts University, Henderson has the obligation to present any and all opportunities for its students to better comprehend culture and ideas beyond what can be found in Arkansas.” The Campus Community taskforce envisioned a true liberal arts university culture where the campus is “populated with focused and engaged constituents, where participation in academic and social activities is the norm for everyone on the campus; where morale is high across all segments of the HSU community, encom-
passing students, staff, faculty, and the surrounding community; and where active listening and open dialogue ensure a climate where even a negative is communicated with respect.” The Telling Our Story taskforce identified the need for more discussion to reach an agreement about a common image, and even the Facilities taskforce recommended changes in residence halls and other buildings to create an on-campus residential section where students could commune and learn from each other.

After the university’s new president arrived in July 2008, efforts began to formulate a Strategic Planning Council. In spring 2009, the president charged this council with developing an ongoing strategic plan. This plan was formulated around the five criteria for accreditation set by the Higher Learning Commission. This strategic plan is designed to be a work in progress, to have set priorities, timelines, and performance indicators (dashboard indicators). This planning document contains five goals that involve the university’s mission: Goal 1: A culture of commitment to the mission will permeate the university; Goal 2: The mission will be examined to determine its vitality and responsiveness to the changing needs of the university and the constituents it serves; Goal 3: Henderson and its mission will be known throughout the region and state; Goal 4: The university will operate with integrity; and Goal 5: University committees will be strengthened and mission oriented.

Planning, Budget, and Implementation
Within the past decade, Henderson has faced decreased state funding and (until last year) static enrollment. As a result, there has been little new money to budget for planning initiatives. Nevertheless, Henderson’s budgeting process has taken seriously the need to tie the budget to the planning process, and as a result, accomplished many of the initiatives.

Within the past few years, the budget process has become much more transparent. As vice president for finance and administration, Bobby Jones, had an open-door policy and was very willing to explain the budget and all expenditures to anyone desiring this information. He initiated monthly meetings with the presidents of the Faculty and Staff Senates. The interim vice president Lecia Franklin has continued these policies. Budget Committee meetings are open to all faculty and staff, and minutes of the meetings are now kept.

An important aspect of the current 2010 Strategic Plan is an annual review of the plan to note the accomplishment of initiatives for the purpose of informing the budget process. One of the first accomplishments of the current plan was the implementation of the recommendation of two previous strategic plans: the establishment of an advising center. In fall 2010 an advising center was created, and staff and resources were dedicated to this objective.
Below are a few examples of how budgeting priorities have followed the strategic planning process and led to the implementation of planning recommendations. For a full record of Henderson’s success at implementing planning goals, see the 1998 Bold Strokes Table of Accomplishments, the 2005 Designing Our Destiny Table of Accomplishments, and the 2010 Strategic Plan Table of Accomplishments.

**Study Abroad Program**

1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan – Initiative #6C – Create a meaningful study abroad program involving students and staff.

2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan – Expand the programs and opportunities for students to study abroad with full funding and administrative support.

2010 Strategic Plan – Goal 13 activity – Develop an international exchange program.

The planning for a study abroad program has resulted in increasing the budget for this purpose from $2,500 in FY1999-2000 to $39,636 in FY2010-2011. The university started committing more funding towards this goal in FY2006-2007 with a budget of $41,722. The budget was reduced to its current amount due to a 5 percent across the board budget cut in FY2009-2010. This item still remains in the 2010 Strategic Plan as a priority and demonstrates the desire to create an international student exchange program.

**Technology**

1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan – Initiative #2 – Support the implementation of technology necessary for a premier liberal arts university and encourage all stakeholders to explore and implement innovative strategies and techniques.

2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan – Increase the support for technology in the classroom and for online learning: multimedia stations, access to laptops, increased budgets for departmental equipment, maintenance, and training for software and online learning environment.

2010 Strategic Plan – Goal 1 – Support TracDat; Goal 3 – Obtain and support new website; Goal 12 – Develop training programs for faculty and staff.

In 1999 Henderson started leasing computers on a three-year replacement cycle. This process was made possible by the Board of Trustees’ approval of a technology fee that is charged to the students and generates enough income to support lease renewal and provide for other technology and staff. In 2000 a webmaster was hired to fulfill the need for better communication internally and externally. A computer technician was hired in 2005 in response to the need for support of multimedia stations across campus. The university has continued to plan for better communication by hiring Stamats in 2010 to develop a new website.
Assessment
Although campus-wide assessment was not specifically addressed in the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan or the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic plan, as a result of the 2001 Self Study the university set as one of its priorities in planning the hiring of a director of assessment and including budget funds necessary to purchase assessment software. This was accomplished by the hiring of the director of assessment in 2003, the purchase of TracDat Software, and continued support of professional development in assessment. As a result the university has revitalized its Assessment Team and has improved its assessment record keeping and reporting activities. Although assessment was not a planning priority for the university, the university was able to modify its plans to adjust for emerging needs.

Planning and the Future
Planning for the future is happening at Henderson as evidenced in the 1998 Bold Strokes strategic plan, the 2005 Designing Our Destiny strategic planning, and the 2010 Strategic Planning Council Report. It is also evident—and a goal of the 2010 Strategic Planning Council—that frequent planning efforts occur and that the “plan become a working document and the process of strategic planning become an ongoing process.” It is also a goal/vision of the 2010 Strategic Planning Council that the strategic plan does not merely sit on a shelf. The council’s desire is to work with all campus constituents to accomplish what is set forth in this plan.

As part of President Welch’s reorganization, a new position, vice president for external affairs was established in April 2009. This position was created to “make the institution more community-centered and responsive to needs of our entire region and state.” This position will also be responsible for the operations of the Southwest Arkansas Training and Learning Center, now known as Henderson Community Education Center. This position will be responsible for strengthening Henderson’s relationships with area school districts, community colleges, community organizations, and business/industry partners. This new commitment to partnerships and community involvement (see Criterion 5) will assist Henderson in including even more external constituents in its planning processes.

As part of the 2010 Strategic Plan there are three specific goals that were established to help the university prepare for the future. These goals are 1) the university will establish a regular and thorough plan for preparing the university budget, 2) the university will undertake steps to increase grant funding, and 3) a master plan of major facilities and physical plant updates and improvements will be kept current and accessible. The 2010 Strategic Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees at its November 2010 board meeting and by spring 2011 several steps had already been taken towards meeting the above goals. For instance, minutes are being taken at each budget committee
meeting and distributed to members of the committee to keep those who cannot attend the meetings abreast of the information discussed.

CRITERION 2 SUMMARY:
Henderson has faced many years of financially straitened circumstances. As a result, funding for important projects, salaries, and professional development is not as high as the university would like. However, Henderson has constantly engaged in planning processes while remaining flexible to meet financial challenges. With the record freshmen enrollments in 2010 and 2011, Henderson should see greater financial revenue, but a different set of challenges will arise. Overall, Henderson has carefully allocated its resources to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and prepare for future challenges as well as opportunities.

Strengths
Henderson has been successful in developing and allocating its resources even during difficult financial times. Planning processes at multiple levels have helped the university fulfill its mission while responding to new challenges and opportunities. An improved culture of evaluation and assessment at all levels has improved the quality of education and services.

Henderson has been successful in maintaining a balanced budget in tough economic times. With the fall 2010 increase in enrollment and the changes in budget development (based on flat or decreased enrollment), Henderson is financially more stable now than it has been in several years. The 2010 Strategic Plan has provided a clear picture of where the institution is and where it needs to go. The budget process itself is more open and transparent, including innovative ideas from a broad spectrum of the campus. Proactive planning and conservative budgeting based on current student enrollment and cost predictions for large expenses, such as utilities and mandated state programs like the Classified Pay Plan gave administration the ability not only to survive recent state budget cuts but also to implement strategies to increase student enrollment. The institution has a number of grants which support students and programs. The Office of Institutional Advancement and Henderson Foundation provide program support in the areas of scholarships, travel, services, and equipment.

Planning efforts have evolved to the current, broad, and comprehensive strategic plan that addresses long-range priorities and includes an understanding of enrollment trends, technology needs, and quality academic programming. This 2010 Strategic Plan is a working document designed to have set timelines. This type of document will enable those using it to evaluate the goals, see what is being accomplished, and make adjustments where needed, one of many indicators of Henderson embracing a culture of assessment and evaluation.
Dramatic improvements have been made in the assessment and evaluation processes overall. The university has invested in human and technological resources that have allowed fundamental changes in how information is evaluated, tracked, and utilized. An active university Assessment Team reviews each plan and meets with each area to discuss successes or improvement needs. A culture of assessing, using data, and implementing changes based on the data collected has taken root and begun to grow.

Other strengths include technology planning and implementation that has provided many opportunities for classroom enhancements with the use of multimedia stations, internet connections, and SmartBoards. The institution enjoys having modern facilities, the majority being new or renovated within the past fifteen years.

Challenges
State appropriations continue to be of concern to the university. If the downward trend in state revenue continues, Henderson will find it increasingly difficult to support existing programs without considerable tuition increases or other outside sources of funding. Increasing foundation support through the institutional advancement office will be critical over the next several years. The institution must also increase retention and recruitment in order to generate additional funds through SSCH. These will be necessary to offset state funding shortages and rising costs in utilities and health coverage. These things will be even more difficult as Henderson is located in an economically depressed part of the state, with population and employment decreasing.

Delayed funding of long-term investment in real and human assets has put Henderson in a position where continued delay may have an adverse impact on the faculty, staff, or students. For instance, salary compression within and between the categories of classified, non-classified, and faculty positions is a significant concern. The ability to support new, innovative programs is hampered by the decrease in funding and insufficient collection and analysis of data to determine the best use of the limited resources.

While the investment in a software system to improve tracking alumni and asking for their help has already occurred, additional resources must be employed to insure the new system begins paying dividends soon. More time and energy needs to be focused on effective grant writing. Grant opportunities should be sought and application made whenever feasible.

Henderson will need to follow through with a cost analysis of existing programs. Because the institution has a recent strategic plan in place, funding will need to be tied directly to those initiatives determined most critical for maintaining academic integrity and for institutional growth and stability.