



December 2005

## A Transparent Approach to Higher Education Accountability Developed and Implemented by The University of Texas System

### Our Commitment to Accountability

One of the highest priorities of the Chancellor and the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System is to be accountable – to take responsibility for measuring and reporting the effectiveness of our work and to use that information to continuously improve our performance. **The UT System is committed to ensuring the highest degree of quality in teaching, research, and patient care. And the UT System is committed to communicating its performance to policymakers and citizens** so they can get clear answers to the question, “What is the return on our investment in higher education?” Given the fact of scarce public resources coupled with the public’s increased demands for higher education services, accountability is more important than ever.

### Leading a New Approach

The UT System acknowledges that the American higher education system is among the best in the world – that it is already highly accountable and takes that responsibility very seriously. And while, like Texas, nearly all states have accountability programs in place, these systems serve a multitude of purposes and aren’t always designed to provide accessible information to external stakeholders. There was no single, comprehensive, coordinated, and internally aligned accountability system that could be used as a basis for strategic planning or for focusing on long-term educational priorities of the state.

To make its accountability more transparent, consistent, and useful, with the publication of its first comprehensive *Accountability and Performance Report* in 2004, the UT System made an unprecedented commitment to measure performance, productivity, and outcomes of 15 highly diverse universities in the largest and fastest growing higher education system in the country’s second most populous state. The second *UT System Accountability and Performance Report* was published in February 2005, and the third edition will be released in February 2006.

Also in 2004, the State of Texas inaugurated a state-wide higher education accountability system that matches in many dimensions the framework developed by the UT System.

### What is the UT System’s New Approach?

The UT System’s accountability system is designed to facilitate planning, to make strategic resource allocations, to offer incentives for exemplary performance, to promote greater efficiencies and higher productivity, to establish expectations where improvements are needed, and to be outcome-oriented. It serves as a vehicle for communication with policymakers and the public. **It makes higher education operations and outcomes transparent.**

The UT System’s approach to accountability also addresses management and reporting needs of the state and the System. The System continues to work with policymakers to define state priorities and ways to measure progress. Examples of priorities that are monitored include:

- Affordability (tuition and financial aid);
- Student success and outcomes (graduation rates, licensure exam pass rates, learning outcomes);
- Impact of research and teaching on economic development (technology transfer, collaborations with industry);
- Efficiency and service (assignable classroom space per student, student/faculty ratios, energy savings).

This framework aligns the mission, goals, and priorities of the UT System and member institutions with key uniform data measurements to focus on outcomes and look at change over time.

## Defining the Accountability Framework

Four broad System-wide goals are the basis for planning the new approach to accountability:

- Ensuring access and success for students;
- Enhancing the quality of academic programs, health care programs, and patient care;
- Improving service to and collaborations with communities and the state;
- Strengthening efficiency and productivity.

This annual report provides an accountability framework for the UT System Board of Regents, UT System offices and institutions, the legislature, and the public. This framework is derived from the UT System's planning context, based on state, regional, and local needs, including those identified in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's *Closing the Gaps* higher education master plan. The report focuses on data related to System goals and priorities articulated in its long-range plan, "Service to Texas in the New Century," and individual institution missions, long-range plans, goals, and priorities.

## What is the Purpose of the UT System's Report and How will it Be Used?

The purpose of the report reflects the UT System's ongoing commitment to foster and monitor its overall accountability, including individual institution and System functions that contribute to its academic, health care, and service missions. The report provides information and analysis that demonstrate how UT System institutions add value, contribute to state goals, and how they compare with peers. It emphasizes results and implications for future planning to support continued improvement by the System and by each institution.

Five-year trend line data sets are displayed to provide a baseline of institutional performance and a basis for reviewing institutions and establishing benchmarks for continuous improvement and future performance. These data are being used by the System in conjunction with other documents such as each institution's Compact and each president's Presidential Work Plan, to evaluate performance and establish expectations of each institution. (For more information about the institutional compacts, see [www.utsystem.edu/ipa/compacts](http://www.utsystem.edu/ipa/compacts).)

This report is used as an almanac and ready reference on broad trends in institutional performance and to support management decisions and planning. It highlights key priorities, successes, and issues that require attention and contribute to future goal setting, but it does not substitute for the more detailed planning information, fact books, and web-based resources available from each institution. The report is also a widely-circulated public document, distributed to elected and appointed officials, and available on the Web for reference by students, alumni, parents, patients, donors, grantors, and other members of the public interested in the UT System's plans and performance.

## Sources of Data

Data in this report come from UT System and legislatively mandated reports, including data provided to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Texas Legislative Budget Board, and from information gathered from UT System institutions. The goal is to integrate and focus the information previously disseminated through several different performance reports. The report emphasizes results and the service the UT System provides to Texas.

## Scope of Performance Measures

Performance measures provide a 360-degree, longitudinal view of activities that support the educational, research, and health care missions of UT institutions. These measures are organized in five main sections:

- Student Access, Success, and Outcomes;
- Teaching, Research, and Health Care Excellence;
- Service to and Collaborations with Communities;
- Organizational Efficiency and Productivity;
- Institutional Profiles (including rankings and other comparisons with peer institutions).

Within this framework, measures are tailored to the specific missions of academic and health-related institutions, with considerable overlap in types of measures: academic institutions – 70 measures; health institutions – 50 measures; and System – 15 measures. Approximately 50 percent of all measures are outcome- or input-related. Others provide context or track progress that ultimately translates into outcomes.

Data are presented for a five-year period, as available. Each section of the report includes trend analysis, a discussion of implications for future planning, and measures proposed for future development. Comparisons to peer institutions are based on a selection of measures used in this report. Analysis of trend data and comparisons are used to set future performance targets and identify areas of strength and areas where improvement is needed.

#### Timeline

The report is presented to the U. T. System Board of Regents in February of each year.

#### For More Information

Contact:

The University of Texas System Office of Institutional Planning and Accountability, 512-499-4798, [www.utsystem.edu/ipa](http://www.utsystem.edu/ipa).

The full report is available on the Web, at [www.utsystem.edu/ipa/acctrpt/](http://www.utsystem.edu/ipa/acctrpt/).

The University of Texas System  
**Accountability and Performance Report  
2005**

**Index of Performance Measures**

**U. T. System Academic Institutions**

**Student Access, Success, and Outcomes**

**Undergraduate Participation and Success**

Number and percent increase of first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates, disaggregated by ethnicity and gender  
Ethnic composition of first-time, full-time undergraduates compared with composition of high school graduates in state  
Average ACT/SAT scores of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates  
Number and percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates from top 10% of their high school class, by ethnicity  
Number of undergraduate students enrolled on 12<sup>th</sup> class day, by ethnicity, gender, and age  
Number of first-time, part-time undergrads; % first-time, part-time degree-seeking undergrads; % part-time undergrads  
Total financial aid disaggregated by source  
Total financial aid and net tuition and fees  
Percent TEXAS grant funds allocated  
Number of financial aid awards to undergraduate students, and amount awarded  
Tuition, required fees, and scholarship aid  
First-year persistence rate for first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled at this University, by ethnicity, gender  
Four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates from this University of first-time, full-time undergraduates  
Six-year persistence rates of undergraduates enrolled at this University, by ethnicity and gender  
Four-year graduation rate from this University of transfer/community college students  
Six-year composite graduation and persistence rates from this or another Texas public university, by ethnicity and gender  
Number of baccalaureate degrees awarded, by ethnicity and gender  
Certification exam pass rates of teacher education baccalaureate graduates, by ethnicity and gender  
Licensure exam pass rates of nursing graduates  
Licensure exam pass rates of engineering graduates  
Student outcomes: satisfaction with advising  
Student outcomes: evaluation of overall educational experience  
Student outcomes: likelihood of attending same institution again  
Student learning outcomes: Collegiate Learning Assessment  
Postgraduate experience: Percent of baccalaureate graduates employed or enrolled in a graduate/professional program in Texas

**Graduate and Professional Students**

Average entrance examination scores: GRE, LSAT, GMAT  
Number of graduate and professional students enrolled on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day, by ethnicity and gender  
Number of degrees awarded by level (masters, professional, doctoral), disaggregated by gender and ethnicity  
Graduate/professional student certification/licensure exam pass rates for law  
Graduate/professional student certification/licensure exam pass rates for pharmacy  
Graduate and professional degrees in high priority fields  
Graduate education degrees conferred  
Number of graduate and professional programs, by level

## U. T. System Academic Institutions, continued

### Teaching, Research, and Health Care Excellence

Dollar amount of research expenditures, by funding source (federal, state, private, local)  
Sponsored revenue, by funding source  
State appropriations for research as a percent of research expenditures  
Number and percent of FTE tenure/tenure-track faculty holding extramural grants  
Ratio of research expenditures to FTE tenure/tenure-track faculty  
Total number of endowed professorships and chairs, number filled, and percent of total tenure/tenure-track faculty  
Faculty awards  
Number of new invention disclosures  
Number of patents issued  
Number of licenses and options executed  
Gross revenue from intellectual property  
Number of new public start-up companies  
Number of faculty and staff, by ethnicity and gender  
FTE student/FTE faculty ratio  
Percent lower division semester credit hours taught by tenure/tenure-track faculty  
Percent lower division semester credit hours taught by professional faculty  
Number of postdoctoral fellows  
Examples of high-priority externally funded research collaborations  
Examples of high-priority educational collaborations  
Faculty salaries and trends

### Service to and Collaborations with Communities

Contributions to K-12 education, and high-priority collaborations with schools and community colleges  
Examples of economic impact (periodic studies), and aggregate impact on regional economies  
Examples of high-priority collaborations with business, industry, health, public, and community organizations  
Historically Underutilized Business trends  
Sources of donor support (alumni, individuals, foundations, corporations, other)  
Distance education trends

### Organizational Efficiency and Productivity

Key operating revenue sources, disaggregated by source (i.e., state appropriations, tuition, etc.)  
Key operating expenses, disaggregated by purpose  
Adjusted total revenue (tuition, fees, state appropriations) per FTE student and per FTE faculty  
Appropriated funds per FTE student and per FTE faculty  
Total dollar amount of endowment, and ratio per FTE student and per FTE faculty  
Amount expended for administrative costs as a percent of expenditures  
Assignable space per FTE student  
Space utilization rate of classrooms  
Ratio of research expenditures to research E&G sq. ft.  
Energy Use  
Construction projects—total projected cost, number of projects, number of square feet to be added  
Facility condition index  
Small class trends

## U. T. System Health-Related Institutions

### Student Access, Success, and Outcomes

Number of undergrad, grad, and professional students enrolled by school on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day, by ethnicity, gender, and level  
Licensure/certification rate of allied health students  
National board exam first-time pass rate for dental students  
National board exam first-time pass rate for medical students  
National licensure exam pass rates of graduate level nursing students (R.N., and advance practice nursing)  
Number of degrees awarded, by school, level, ethnicity, and gender  
Graduation rates of medical, dental, nursing, allied health, public health, and informatics students  
Medical student satisfaction  
Postgraduate experience: Percent of baccalaureate graduates employed or enrolled in a graduate/professional program in Texas

### Teaching, Research, and Health Care Excellence

Dollar amount of research expenditures, disaggregated by funding source  
Sponsored revenue, by funding source  
Amount of research expenditures as a percent of formula-derived general appropriations revenue  
Number and percent of FTE tenure/tenure-track & FTE non-tenure-track research faculty holding extramural grants  
Ratio of research expenditures to FTE faculty  
Total number of endowed professorships and chairs, number filled, and percent of total tenure/tenure-track faculty  
Faculty awards  
Number of new invention disclosures  
Number of patents issued  
Number of licenses and options executed  
Gross revenue from intellectual property  
Number of new public start-up companies  
Number of faculty and staff, by ethnicity, and gender  
FTE student/FTE faculty ratio  
Number of Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education-accredited resident programs  
Number of residents in ACGME-accredited programs  
State-owned and affiliated hospital admissions by U. T. institution faculty  
State-owned and affiliated hospital days by U. T. institution faculty  
Clinic visits in state-owned and affiliated facilities treated by U. T. institution faculty  
Total charges for un-sponsored charity care by faculty in state-owned and affiliated facilities  
Patient satisfaction ratings  
Examples of high-priority externally funded research collaborations  
Examples of high-priority educational collaborations

### Service to and Collaborations with Communities

Examples of high-priority collaborations with schools  
Examples of economic impact (periodic studies), and aggregate impact on regional economies  
Examples of high-priority collaborations with business, health, industry, public, and community organizations  
Historically Underutilized Business trends  
Sources of donor support (alumni, individuals, foundations, corporations, other)  
Distance education trends

### Organizational Efficiency and Productivity

Key operating revenue sources, disaggregated by source (i.e. state appropriations, tuition, etc.)  
Key operating expenses disaggregated by purpose  
Ratio of admissions, charity care, hospital days, and clinic visits to General Revenue for state-owned hospital/clinic operations  
Total dollar amount of endowment, and ratio per FTE student and per FTE faculty  
Amount expended for administrative costs as a percent of expenditures  
Clinical billings and collections per FTE clinical faculty  
Ratio of research expenditures to research E&G sq. ft.  
Energy Use  
Facility condition index  
Construction projects—total projected cost, number of projects, # sq. ft. to be added

## U. T. System

### System Performance

- Total enrollments, percent increase over previous year
- Comparison of total U. T. System enrollment increases with increases for all senior institutions in Texas
- Number of total graduates as a percent of total graduates in state
- Percent of U. T. Hispanic graduates as % of all Hispanic graduates in state
- Percent of U. T. Black graduates as % of all Black graduates in state
- Hispanic Serving Institutions in System
- Total sponsored expenses
- Total technology development (inventions, patents, license agreements, public start-ups, intellectual property income)
- Total operating revenue by fund sources
- Total operating expenditures by purpose
- Total expenses for U. T. System Administration
- Number and demographics of System employees (compare with State demographics)
- U. T. System bond rating
- Total patient care revenue
- Energy use

### Institutional Profiles

**National rankings (institutions, programs)**

**Faculty awards (subfields, regional)**

**Peer Comparisons**

**Centers of Excellence**

- UT Arlington
- UT Austin
- UT Brownsville/Texas Southmost College
- UT Dallas
- UT El Paso
- UT Pan American
- UT Permian Basin
- UT Tyler
- UT Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas
- UT Medical Branch at Galveston
- UT Health Science Center-Houston
- UT Health Science Center-San Antonio
- UT M. D. Anderson Cancer Center
- UT Health Center-Tyler