

**SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY GROUP DATA EXCHANGE
INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY FORM
FALL 2004**

INSTITUTION: University of Arkansas

RESPONDENT: Kathy Van Laningham

Instructions: In Parts I and II, provide the numbers and percents as appropriate. In Part III, summarize highlights of significant events/situations at your institution during the past year and, when available, as anticipated in the following year. Use telegraphic words/phrases. Add additional lines as necessary.

Part I: Preliminary Enrollments (Headcount/FTE - gains/losses) for Fall 2004

Fall 2004	Number	Percent	Increase/Decrease from previous fall	
			Number	Percent
a) Undergraduate Headcount (Included in (a) above):	13,817	80.0%	692	5.3%
Entering Freshman Headcount (fall entrants)				
Entering Freshman Headcount (summer + fall entrants)	2,514	18.2%	157	6.7%
Total Out-of-State Headcount	2,059	14.9%	326	18.8%
b) Undergraduate FTE	12,000	83.8%	338	2.9%
c) Graduate/First Prof. Headcount (Included in (c) above):	3,452	20.0%	128	3.9%
Total Out-of-State Headcount	1,253	36.3%	62	5.2%
d) Graduate/First Prof. FTE	2,325	16.2%	132	6.0%
Total Headcount (a+c)	17,269		820	5.0%
Total FTE (b+d)	14,325		470	3.4%
Enrollment Headcount by Ethnicity				
White	13,905	80.5%	682	5.2%
Black	981	5.7%	-24	(2.4%)
Hispanic	298	1.7%	11	3.8%
Asian	458	2.7%	29	6.8%
Amer Indian/Alaskan Native	352	2.0%	52	17.3%
Non-resident alien	895	5.2%	9	1.0%
Unknown	380	2.2%	61	19.1%
Other:	0	0.0%	0	---
	17,269			

Part II: Faculty/Staff Salary Increases for 2004-05

	% Change	Effective Date	Comments
Faculty	2.7%	7/1/2004	Merit
Staff	2.7%	7/1/2004	Non Classified Staff (Merit) and Classified Staff (Across the Board)

Part III: Significant Events/Situations(i.e., funding changes, financial outlook, and other) - insert additional rows as needed

The state is attempting to implement a new funding formula which draws heavily on the University of North Carolina model as well as using some aspects from the Texas model and from the Delaware study. The model as it stands shows that the University of Arkansas is \$30 million behind where it should be in state funding. This is about the same amount of shortfall that had been identified by the benchmarking and sizing of the funding gaps that were done by the UA 2010 commission two years ago. The formula is supported by all but one president/chancellor in Arkansas, but there is some guarded optimism that it will be adopted for allocating new funds.

The big unknown at this moment for state funding is the amount that will be needed to address the results of a study of public school facilities as dictated by the state Supreme Court in its ruling last year on school funding equity and adequacy. Most believe this will be the Legislature's top priority for funding in the upcoming session in January 2005, and fear that this discussion will re-open the wounds of the discussion of forced consolidation of schools which dominated the last legislative session.

The state economy seems to be holding its own, meaning perhaps less concern about mid-year cuts, but not a growth that would signal new funds for higher education or other services, particularly in light of the uncertainty on the facilities issue in K-12.

Peer Group Universities:

Alabama	Georgia	Massachusetts	Oklahoma	Texas Tech
Arizona	Georgia Tech	Michigan	Oklahoma State	UC Berkeley
Arizona State	Illinois	Michigan State	Oregon	UCLA
Auburn	Indiana	Minnesota	Oregon State	Virginia
Clemson	Iowa	Mississippi	Penn State	Virginia Tech
Colorado	Iowa State	Mississippi State	Purdue	Washington
Colorado State	Kansas	Missouri	Rhode Island	Washington State
Connecticut	Kansas State	Nebraska	South Carolina	West Virginia
Delaware	Kentucky	North Carolina	Tennessee	Wisconsin
Florida	Louisiana State	North Carolina State	Texas	
Florida State	Maryland	Ohio State	Texas A&M	