

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
COMPACT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM
FOR 2005 AND 2006

I. Introduction: Institution Mission and Goals

The mission of The University of Texas at Austin is to achieve excellence in the interrelated areas of undergraduate education, graduate education, research, and public service. The university provides superior and comprehensive educational opportunities at the baccalaureate through doctoral and special professional educational levels. It contributes to the advancement of society through research, creative activity, scholarly inquiry, and the development of new knowledge. The university preserves and promotes the arts, benefits the state's economy, serves the citizens through public programs, and provides other public service. [Source: "Mission," *General Information* catalog, 2003-2004, p. 1]

The University of Texas at Austin is one of three institutions in Texas with a membership in the Association of American Universities. Having the largest single-campus enrollment in the United States, it is composed of 14 colleges and schools, the Graduate School, and the Division of Continuing and Extended Education. For fall 2003, the university had an enrollment of 51,426 (viz., 38,383 undergraduates, 11,297 graduates students, 1,492 law students, and 254 students in the pharmacy doctorate program).

About 11,000 students graduate from the university each year and more than 450,000 have graduated since the establishment of the university. Students attending the university come from all 254 counties in Texas, all 50 states, and more than 100 foreign countries. The 2,500 faculty include a Nobel laureate, a Pulitzer Prize winner, MacArthur fellows, and hundreds of members of prestigious academic and scientific organizations. The students and faculty are supported by a staff of 14,000.

The university is a major research institution with more than 90 research units, including units at the main campus, the J. J. Pickle Research Campus, the Marine Science Institute at Port Aransas, the McDonald Observatory near Fort Davis, and the Bee Cave Research Center. The university research expenditures in fiscal year 2002-03 exceeded \$375 million.

Containing more than 8 million volumes, the library of the university is the fifth largest academic library in the nation and is consistently ranked among the country's top 10 research libraries. The university's holdings in Latin American materials are recognized as among the most significant in the world. Also world-renowned is the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center that houses 30 million literary manuscripts, 1 million rare books, 5 million photographs, and more than 100,000 works of art. The Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art contains 17,000 artworks from Europe, the United States, and Latin America. The L. B. J. Library and Museum (operated by the National Archives) contains more than 40 million documents relating to President Lyndon Baines Johnson. And the Texas Memorial Museum houses the Texas Natural History Collections, including the non-vertebrate paleontology collections, and the Vertebrate Paleontology Laboratory.

In the area of international education, the university has more than 100 active exchange agreements world-wide and hosts more than 1,000 international teaching faculty and researchers each year. It annually ranks among the top five universities in the nation for the number of enrolled international students and is consistently among the top three for the number of students sent to study abroad.

In service beyond its campus, the university administers many programs designed to assist both educators and students. Community outreach programs include the Texas Center for Reading

and Language Arts and the National Center for Educational Accountability. The university also plays an important role in the economic development of the state and nation by bringing significant federal and private-sector research funding to Texas, by training highly educated professionals for entry into a skilled work force, by providing preparation for successful entrepreneurship, by creating an attractive environment for businesses to relocate to Texas, and by providing intellectual property for the development of new businesses.

The core purpose of the university "is to transform lives for the benefit of society." The core values are learning ("a caring community, all of students, helping one another grow"), discovery ("expanding knowledge and human understanding"), freedom ("to seek the truth and express it"), leadership ("the will to excel with integrity and the spirit that nothing is impossible"), individual opportunity ("many options, diverse people and ideas; one university"), and responsibility ("to serve as a catalyst for positive change in Texas and beyond").

II. Major Ongoing Priorities and Initiatives

The items listed in this section of the compact are of the greatest strategic importance to the university and they appear below generally in the order of priority. Their importance and their implementation, however, are both immediate and long term. Thus elements of progress can and will be measured annually, but full realization of the goals can only take place over an extended period of time.

A. Faculty expansion

Priority

Reduce the student/faculty ratio by increasing the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty while maintaining stability in, or lowering, the overall university enrollment

Objective

A very poor student/faculty ratio is the university's greatest strategic disadvantage and greatest limitation in offering every student the quality of teaching environment found in its competitors nationwide. At The University of Texas at Austin, this student/faculty ratio is derived by dividing full-time-equivalent students by full-time-equivalent faculty. (For further information, consult the *Statistical Handbook, 2003-2004*.) As derived by that method, the current student/faculty ratio for the university is 21/1. However, in the College of Liberal Arts (the largest college) the student/faculty ratio is 23/1 and in the McCombs School of Business it is 32/1. These high ratios not only limit the university's ability to ensure in all programs the instructional quality to which it aspires, but also work strongly against it when it is ranked with its national peers.

The magazine *US News & World Report* publishes annually a "Report of the Best Colleges." Although its method of calculation differs somewhat from that explained above, the "Report" consistently lists The University of Texas at Austin with student/faculty ratios higher than similar institutions. Thus for 2004, *US News & World Report* calculations showed The University of Texas at Austin as having a student/teacher ratio higher than the following institutions without medical schools: Rutgers University (14/1), the University of Colorado at Boulder (16/1), the University of California – Berkeley (16/1) Pennsylvania State University (17/1), and the University of Alabama (18/1).

Strategies

To reduce the current ratios and place The University of Texas at Austin on a more competitive footing, it is critical to add new faculty members in the tenured and tenure-track ranks. Keeping enrollment stable (or decreasing it) and adding faculty could result in a decrease in the overall student/faculty ratio to 19/1 (i.e., calculated as explained above). This is, in fact, the ratio recommended recently by the university's Task Force on Enrollment Strategy. (This task force was appointed by the President in fall 2002, and submitted to him its final report and recommendations in January 2004. The report can be found at

http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200401/report_enrollment.pdf.)

This ratio would still be higher than the university's peer institutions, but would bring the university to a more competitive position while allowing it to serve a large student population. Already aware of this problem, the university began in 2000-2001 a 10-year program of adding strategically 30 new tenured or tenure-track faculty each year. Because of budget constraints, the program was suspended in 2001-2002, but resumed in the following year and will continue to the 10th year (2010-2011). Through the 2003-2004 academic year, 85 new faculty positions have been authorized under this initiative; 67 have been filled and the schools and colleges are recruiting for the remaining 18 positions.

Resources

With the exception of the one year during which the program was suspended, the university has allocated annually \$1.8 million in new, recurring monies to this program. Beyond the salary allocations (which are in "2001 dollars" and which do not take into account inflation and salary increases), faculty additions also require the university to cover start-up costs and space renovations to accommodate the new faculty. To date, \$5.4 million in recurring monies have been committed to this faculty expansion program. Full realization of the program will require an additional \$12.6 million of recurring salary monies, plus additional funding to cover inflation and raises, plus funding to cover necessary start-up and renovation costs.

The allocation to cover this initiative for 2004-2005 will come from the Academic Sustainability Tuition. Thereafter, sources of funding for this line-item initiative will be discussed and identified by the University Budget Council in its ongoing budget discussions. (The University Budget Council consists of the President, Executive Vice President and Provost, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Executive Vice Provost, Associate Vice President and Budget Director, and Deputy to the President.)

Progress measures

Progress will be measured in several ways. 1) An annual assessment will be made of the number of new tenured and tenure-track positions added to the total faculty. As indicated above, the goal for the period of this compact is thirty new positions per annum. 2) An annual assessment of the student/faculty ratio will be made at the university-wide level and college or school level. Particular attention will be paid to those programs with high student/faculty ratios and the progress made toward lowering those ratios. 3) Complementing these annual assessments will be the biennial compact reviews of the colleges and schools by the Executive Vice President and Provost. These reviews, which are conducted currently, include an assessment of the quality of the faculty and of instructional effectiveness, as well as issues such as student/faculty ratio and national rankings of programs. 4) In addition to these ongoing assessments, the university's Task

Force on Enrollment Strategy called for a review of its recommendations in 2008. Progress of the faculty expansion initiative and its effect on the student/faculty ratio will be evaluated again as part of that review.

Major obstacles

1. The cost of the program is substantial. The cost of the 10-year program is \$18 million in recurring monies. But beyond this are the costs of inflation, raises, start-up needs, and space renovations.
2. The need to add space for 30 additional faculty per year is a considerable challenge. Faculty in some academic fields require laboratory and research space and equipment in addition to normal office needs.
3. If the current plan is to meet the goal of reducing the student/faculty ratio to 19/1, then the overall enrollment of the university must be held constant or allowed to decrease. In recent years, however, pressures to increase enrollment size have continued unabated.
4. The university must annually find sufficient numbers of high quality faculty not only to add these 30 positions but also to keep abreast of a turnover rate of about 75 per year in the tenured and tenure-track ranks.

Given these constraints, it is not practical to expand faster than about 30 faculty members per year.

B. Facilities preservation

Priority

Develop and fund a systematic plan for the preservation of facilities operated by The University of Texas at Austin

Objective

The size and scope of the facilities required to support the university's large and complex enterprises of teaching, research, and service described in the Introduction, above, are enormous. The university's facility assets contain 19 million gross square feet (GSF), with an estimated value exceeding \$3.1 billion (including both facilities supported by Education and General funding and by auxiliary enterprises). The majority of the facility assets are on the main campus which has 16 million GSF and more than 200 buildings with a replacement value of \$2.8 billion. Another major component of the university's facility asset is the J. J. Pickle Research Campus with 1.6 million GSF and a value of \$187 million. Additional facilities in Austin include the Brackenridge tract used for research in life sciences and the Montopolis Research Center. Beyond Austin, the university owns and operates a variety of facilities, including the Marine Science Institute at Port Aransas, the McDonald Observatory near Fort Davis, the Bee Cave Research Center, the Winedale Historical Center near Round Top, and the J. Frank Dobie Paisano Ranch.

All of these properties and their facilities require maintenance, repair, and renovation. The enormity of the challenge is exemplified by that part of the main campus facilities (over 12 million GSF) supported by Education and General funding. A recent comprehensive analysis of the condition of these physical assets indicates that the

university is presently consuming these facilities at a rate exceeding 1.5% per year, i.e., approximately \$35 million annually. However, for the past five years, the university has been able to address this consumption by allocating only about \$10-\$12 million per year toward preservation. It is irresponsible to future generations to permit any net consumption. The university must, therefore, develop a plan to fund the required preservation adequately. If that is not done, then a decade from now it will not be possible to use our buildings for teaching and research and the public will face a staggering bill for facilities renewal. The problem is compounded by the fact that many of the buildings are now 30 to 40 years old and at a point where attention is imperative.

Strategies

The University of Texas at Austin hired VFA, Inc. to undertake a comprehensive condition assessment program of the institution's facilities. The assessment has been completed and the final report made. This assessment, a fire and life safety survey, and the university's participation in the Facilities Renewal Resource Model (FRRM) initiative of The University of Texas System have served to provide specific information on the condition of major systems in all buildings over 20,000 GSF on the main campus and at the J. J. Pickle Research Center. In addition, the conditions of substantial portions of the facilities at the Marine Science Institute and the McDonald Observatory have been assessed. Information from these assessments is being used in a variety of ways to improve the effective use of funds for the preservation of facilities.

1. The Campus Planning and Facility Management (CPFM) organization has proposed a goal of improving the overall campus condition by 50% by the year 2020.
2. Buildings at the main campus and J. J. Pickle Research Center have been grouped into reinvestment categories based on their condition. These categories are used to guide the use of preservation funds.
3. Campus Planning and Facility Management has established a measure to determine effectiveness in the use of preservation funds. The goal is to improve this measure from 70% to 80% by the year 2010.

The effectiveness of these efforts, however, depends upon the availability of adequate funding.

Resources

The university's short-term plan is to allocate \$20 to \$22 million per annum for repair and renovation, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, fire and life safety needs, classroom renovation, renewal of academic space, a catastrophe reserve, and needed studies and consultation. These monies will come from a variety of sources (e.g., interest on unexpended plant fund balances, Academic Sustainability Tuition). But the institution needs to find additional resources over the next five years to develop and sustain a necessarily aggressive plan for facilities preservation.

Progress measures

As is the current policy, Campus Planning and Facility Management will continue to use three measures to evaluate progress in improving campus condition.

1. One measure is the building condition index (BCI). This is an assessment of individual buildings and indicates the cost to remedy the deficiencies of a specific building as compared with the replacement value of that building. The goal for the university is to keep all BCI values in the range of 0.15 to 0.45 (i.e., 15% to 45% of replacement value). A building condition index (BCI) was established for each building included in a condition assessment during fiscal year 2003. (Building condition indices ranged from 0.01 to 0.98.) To measure progress toward the university goal, the condition of each building will be measured periodically against the benchmark BCI for that building.
2. Another measure is the change in the overall facility condition index (FCI). An FCI is an assessment of a specific group of buildings and indicates the aggregate cost to remedy the deficiencies in that group as compared with the replacement value. As of fiscal year 2003, the FCI for the main campus was .045 (i.e., the cost of remedying the deficiencies amounted to 45% of the replacement value of this group of buildings). The goal for the university is to bring the FCI for the main campus down to 0.20 by fiscal year 2020. The FCI will be reviewed periodically to determine what progress is being made toward that goal.
3. A third measure is the effectiveness of expenditures of facilities preservation dollars in reducing the condition indices at the building and campus levels. The university will also continue to use VFA, Inc. to provide regular condition assessments of its facilities as well as evaluate progress on improving campus condition.

Major obstacles

1. Availability of funding
2. Coordination of repair and renovation efforts with academic and research upgrades and other essential projects (e.g., fire and life safety and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act)
3. Space to house personnel and functions displaced by repair and renovation projects
4. The ability of the campus to endure large amounts of repair and renovation

C. Compensation program

Priority

Fund a total compensation program for faculty and staff that will keep The University of Texas at Austin competitive in the recruitment and retention of top quality talent

Objective

Nationally competitive institutions are very important to Texas and Texans. The University of Texas at Austin has become such an institution, but it can be preserved only by holding onto the best of its talent and by recruiting more of the best talent available. Its total compensation program must not only keep pace with regional and national markets but must become competitive with the nation's leading universities.

The university's average faculty salaries for the tenured and tenure-track ranks lag 7.7% behind the average of the 20 institutions of its normal comparison group and 14.6%

behind the average of the 12 schools considered its most serious competitors. The immediate goal is not to lose still more ground over the next two years. For the long run, the university needs to find ways to increase total compensation to levels competitive for faculty with the leading institutions of higher education and competitive for staff with appropriate regional, state, and national competitors.

In the area of staff compensation, the university has strived to provide a total compensation package competitive with regional, state, and national markets (according to employment position). During the past three years, the university has made much progress with staff salaries. However, the increasing pressure from the private sector and the significant cost increases and cost shifting related to health care benefits make the goal of competitive total compensation an ongoing challenge.

Strategies

For the immediate goal (viz., to avoid falling farther behind competitors during the next two years), the University Budget Council is reviewing relevant salary data annually and, within the constraints of available funds, is implementing a general compensation program intended to address the goal.

Finding sources of funding for the long-run goal (viz., compensation packages that are competitive with the nation's leading universities) will be especially difficult. The gap between current resources and what is needed to bring the university to a truly competitive position for salaries cannot be closed by relying solely on student tuition. Other sources of substantial funding must be found and those will not necessarily be related directly to faculty and staff salaries. Instead, they will often be a consequence of operational improvements that allow an ability to reallocate funds internally for compensation and other important priorities. Thus continued improvements in the management of all resources (including salaries, operating expenses, balances, and endowment income), as well as cost control measures and efficiency initiatives, have the potential to make more funding available for the compensation program.

Resources

But even these strategies will not, by themselves, provide the university with the resources needed to meet the long-run goal. Other sources that have the potential to help solve this problem include increases from the Available University Fund, targeted fund raising, increases in external research funding, and improved support from the Texas Legislature.

Progress measures

The university annually reviews its faculty and staff compensation packages by using a variety of measures, including turnover rates and statistics provided by numerous local, regional, and national compensation surveys. For faculty, an annual comparison is made with a group composed of the 12 schools viewed as the most serious competitors: Columbia University; Duke University; Northwestern University; the University of Pennsylvania; Rice University; Stanford University; the University of California, Berkeley; the University of California, Los Angeles; the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; the University of Michigan; the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; and the University of Wisconsin. For this analysis, faculty salary comparisons are made on an institutional-wide basis, as well as according to faculty rank (e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor). Additional analyses are made by academic discipline and

faculty rank for 11 standard national comparison institutions: the University of California, Berkeley; the University of California, Los Angeles; the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Indiana University; the University of Michigan; Michigan State University; the University of Minnesota; Ohio State University; the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; the University of Washington; and the University of Wisconsin.

Major obstacles

Availability of funding

D. Diversity

Priority

Establish effective means for increasing diversity in all parts of the university and for creating a climate of cultural understanding and respect

Objective

In light of dramatic demographic changes and the increasing globalization of almost all enterprises, a fundamental question for a major public university in Texas is this: "How can we better prepare leadership for the next generation in our state and beyond?" Toward that end, The University of Texas at Austin needs to find systematic, effective ways to build the knowledge and skill among students, faculty, and staff necessary to learn and to work across cultural boundaries. The idea is not about fixing obvious defects in our current society, but rather about getting to a future that we can already see.

Even in this heterogeneous America, almost all people grow up and spend most of their lives in a homogenous culture, often, but not always, racially or ethnically delineated. They do not have from experience a proper basis for understanding even the other principal cultures of America, much less those of the larger world. It should be no surprise that people are fearful, tentative, and clumsy in their efforts to make contact and to understand across cultural lines. As a nation, we have made do. But making do in the same way will not be good enough if America is to be prosperous, healthy, and stable in the decades ahead. As a center of higher learning, and as a place where the leadership of the next generation is educated, The University of Texas at Austin has an obligation to help our students--and in the process to help the entire university community--become much more capable citizens.

Strategies

The issue of diversity for the campus has at least three components. One challenge is to increase and maintain the representation of diverse populations among the university's students, faculty, and staff. The second challenge is to create on campus a climate of cultural understanding and respect. And the third challenge is to create academic and student life programs by which students can develop the skills they will need to be successful leaders in an increasingly diverse state and nation.

Following the Supreme Court decisions last summer, the university submitted to The University of Texas System a formal proposal to begin using race and ethnicity in a holistic review of admission applications. But this can be only one part of the overall strategies. To address the challenges, a Task Force on Racial Respect and Fairness was

formed in spring 2003. Its final report and recommendations were submitted to the President of the university in January 2004. The report can be found at http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200401/report_respect.pdf.

To find additional innovative ways to achieve greater diversity, in January 2004 the university held a symposium to generate ideas (*Educating for a Diverse America: A Symposium and Summit*). National leaders in higher education, business, and the military met at this symposium to discuss the issues, share ideas, and develop new strategies.

The President of the university has reviewed the recommendations from both initiatives. On May 10, 2004, he issued his formal response to the Task Force on Racial Respect and Fairness. The text of his response is at http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200405/enrollment_response.doc. He is now working with the campus leadership to develop strategies for implementing recommendations of the Task Force beginning with the coming (2004-2005) academic year.

Resources

The need for resources will be known when steps are taken to implement specific action items. That will be during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Progress measures

Implementation of strategies will include the establishment of mechanisms for systematic and ongoing evaluation of progress.

Major obstacles

Obstacles will become more apparent as strategies for specific action items are developed.

E. Student progress and success

Priority

Increase undergraduate retention and graduation rates and improve average time to graduation.

Objective

The University of Texas at Austin lags behind its most serious competitor institutions in graduation rates and time to graduation. There are consequences both for the institution (it could serve more incoming students if current students were graduating and leaving at a faster pace) and the individual student (the financial costs to students who remain in undergraduate programs beyond four years are substantial in terms of the cost of education and lost salary income).

Strategies

Included among the recommendations of the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy are several that would significantly affect undergraduate retention and graduation rates.

(See

http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200401/report_enrollment.pdf.)

On May 11, 2004, the President issued his formal reply to the Task Force, accepting the report and promising to move toward its implementation. (The text of his reply is at

http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200405/enrollment_response.doc.)

Implementation of various recommendations, however, will require deliberation, decisions, and action by several components of the university (e.g., the Faculty Council, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost). The approval process will be undertaken during the 2004-2005 academic year, but the time needed to implement specific recommendations will depend upon the various levels of deliberation and approval involved and the need to provide appropriate notice in official publications.

Resources

The need for resources will be known when steps are taken to implement specific action items. That will be during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Progress measures

To achieve parity with other leading institutions, the university needs to raise its freshman retention rate from the current 91% to 94%. To achieve parity in timely degree completion, the goal is to raise the four-year graduation rate from 39.2% to 42% in the near run and then to 50% in the future. At the same time, the university will be seeking to raise its six-year graduation rate from the current 71.5% to 75%. Retention and graduation rates are reviewed by the institution annually to determine progress toward these goals.

Major obstacles

Obstacles will become more apparent as strategies for specific action items are developed.

F. Enrollment management

Priority

Implement more effective strategies for enrollment management, including both student matriculation and course offerings and enrollments

Objective

Because of the rapidly rising demand for admission and the improved retention of students who matriculate, enrollment continues to grow. At 51,426, the headcount for 2003-2004 was well beyond the target of 48,000 recommended by the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy. The university must take steps to stabilize enrollment and bring into balance enrollment and the resources needed to sustain a high quality educational experience for all students.

Strategies

Included among the recommendations of the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy are several that would significantly affect enrollment management.

(See

http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200401/report_enrollment.pdf.)

On May 11, 2004, the President issued his formal reply to the Task Force, accepting the report and promising to move toward its implementation. (The text of his reply is at http://www.utexas.edu/opa/news/04newsreleases/nr_200405/enrollment_response.doc.)

Implementation of various recommendations, however, will require deliberation, decisions, and action by several components of the university (e.g., the Faculty Council, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost). The approval process will be undertaken during the 2004-2005 academic year, but the time needed to implement specific recommendations will depend upon the various levels of deliberation and approval involved and the need to provide appropriate notice in official publications.

Resources

The need for resources will be known when steps are taken to implement specific action items. That will be during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Progress measures

The general recommendations of the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy call for a decrease in the university's enrollment from its current level to 48,000, a reduction in the student/faculty ratio to 19/1, and an increase in the average undergraduate credit hours undertaken from 13.1 to 14.0.

Enrollment trends at the departmental and college and school levels are reviewed systematically in the university's ongoing Performance Based Instructional System (PBIS) and internal compact processes. And progress toward the university goals will be monitored on an annual basis by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Major obstacles

Obstacles will become more apparent as strategies for specific action items are developed.

G. Academic initiatives

1. Review of the undergraduate curriculum

Priority and objectives

The last major revision of the undergraduate curriculum at the university was completed more than 20 years ago. To maintain academic excellence, the university must periodically review and revise its curriculum. This goal was advanced for the compact by the President's Student Advisory Council. It complements the recommendation of the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy that the university "undertake a formal review of its undergraduate core curriculum."

Strategies

A committee would be appointed to undertake this effort.

Resources

Appropriate resources would be allocated by the university to support this effort.

Progress measures

The committee would be required to issue a formal report to the President and Executive Vice President and Provost.

Major obstacles

No major obstacles are anticipated at this time. However, the President of the university plans to consider this initiative within the context of the report of the Commission of 125 which will be issued in September 2004. Therefore, no action on this initiative will be taken until that report is issued. (The Commission of 125, comprised of distinguished citizens from across Texas and beyond, has been engaged in a two-year process of examining the current state of the University and recommending goals and priorities for the next two decades. More information about the Commission may be found at <http://www.utexas.edu/com125/>.)

2. Continued development of the Latin American initiative

Priority and objectives

Texas has a cross-cultural Anglo-Mexican history, a growing Hispanic population, and a strategic location at the frontier between the U.S. and Latin America. The next half century will see a rapid development of Latin America and complex interrelationships evolving among the countries of this hemisphere. The University of Texas at Austin has risen to preeminence in Latin American studies. For the current and future development of the state, it is important for the university to continue its unique leadership role in this area of scholarship.

Strategies

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will continue to identify, coordinate, and facilitate campus-wide programmatic and faculty recruitment efforts to support and enhance the Latin America initiatives. (See the website for the Latin American Initiative at <http://www.utexas.edu/lai/>.)

Resources

The Executive Vice President and Provost provides both one-time programmatic start-up funding and recurring faculty salary funds to support this effort. Combined funding of approximately \$250,000 is provided annually.

Progress measures

Success of the Latin American initiative can be measured by a variety of criteria, e.g., the number of regularly matriculated University of Texas at Austin students pursuing degrees in studies pertaining to Latin America, the number of University of Texas at Austin students participating in study abroad or exchange programs in Latin America, the number of reciprocal exchange students from Latin America, the number of University of Texas at Austin faculty engaged in teaching and research in subjects and topics pertaining to Latin America, the flow of visiting faculty and scholars from Latin American to The University of Texas at Austin, the number of

exchange agreements and *convenios* with Latin American institutions, the number of visits to campus by Latin American political and higher education leaders, the number of official visits by University of Texas at Austin administrative leaders and faculty to Latin America, acquisitions of The Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, etc. But the significance of the Latin American initiative cannot be captured solely in readily quantifiable data. What is of special importance is the influence of the initiative and its programs on U.S. and Latin American scholarship, and on policy, scientific, business, and cultural development. As a major academic thrust of the university, the Latin American initiative is under annual review and assessment by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Major obstacles

No major obstacles are anticipated at this time, although advancement of the initiative is dependent upon the continued availability of new funding.

3. Development of the biomedical engineering program

Priority and objectives

The university's biomedical engineering program is an important participant in the evolving world where technology meets medicine and health science. The mission of the program is to educate undergraduate and graduate students in the fundamentals of engineering and science as they relate to medicine, and to perform multi-disciplinary, disease-oriented research at the molecular and cellular levels. The vision is to integrate molecular and cellular biology and engineering research and education. The program is also positioned to foster collaborations between biomedical engineers and fellow researchers in other engineering departments, pharmacy, and the natural sciences. Such collaborations are essential to realize the full potential of this area of scholarship on the campus.

Strategies

The College of Engineering and the chair and faculty in the newly established Department of Biomedical Engineering have responsibility for the continued development of this program. There remains the need to build adequate facilities for the program and to continue with needed faculty hires.

Resources

The Whitaker Foundation and the university jointly provided funding to initiate this program. The Whitaker Foundation provided a grant of about \$2.9 million for operating expenses during the first three years of the program (2001-02 through 2003-04) and an additional award of \$3 million for construction of a permanent facility for the program. The university provided recurring salary funds of \$720,000 for 12 new full-time equivalent faculty, recurring departmental operating budget funds of \$1,122,000, one-time faculty recruitment start-up funding of \$4,800,000, and one-time programmatic funding of \$684,500. The university also will provide \$27 million of funding to construct a new biomedical engineering facility.

Progress measures

Although Biomedical Engineering has had a presence on campus for many years as a graduate program, the new department has provided a home for the existing faculty and the new faculty hired over the past several years. It has also provided focus for the graduate students as well as developed a new undergraduate program which enrolled its sophomore class in the 2003-2004 academic year. Measures of success will include the retention and productivity of the faculty; the numbers, quality, retention, and graduation rates of undergraduate and graduate students; the ability of those students to meet the program outcomes of their field upon graduation and the program educational objectives of their field once they enter the profession; and the success of the program in resolving its financial situation brought on by the Whitaker Foundation's decision to cut the grant funding.

Major obstacles

Because of an economic downturn and reduction in available funds, the Whitaker Foundation made the decision not to fund the last two years of its grant. The result was some reduced activity within the department and an unanticipated increase in reliance on institutional funds. Nevertheless, the undergraduate program is growing, faculty recruitment is taking place, and the reputation of the department is becoming stronger.

4. Development of the Institute for Computational Engineering and Science (ICES)

Priority and objectives

Computational engineering and science are areas that will affect almost every aspect of our lives in the coming century. The technological and economic advancement of Texas and the nation hinges on these critical fields of endeavor, and the Institute for Computational Engineering and Science (ICES) places The University of Texas at Austin at the forefront of these fields.

In conjunction with ICES, the university is acquiring two of the world's most powerful high performance computing systems dedicated to academic research. One will be a cluster provided by Cray, Inc. and Dell, Inc., with more than 600 processors and a peak performance of more than 3 trillion operations per second. This is the equivalent of a 3 teraflop computer. The second computing system is an IBM Power4 with more than 200 processors and more than one teraflop.

This new infrastructure will be integrated into a new campus computing grid, which will in turn be connected to emerging regional and national grids. These grids will allow researchers at the university to harness the collective computational power of their own workstations together with the computational power of other computers and other devices (e.g., microscopes and telescopes) on the grid.

This kind of shared computing, in which computing power is shifted to where it is needed and strengthened through a grid-like network, is the next big development in technology. Grid computing is expected to enter the mainstream in the very near future and it will revolutionize the information technology industry. Its impact is likely to be equivalent to, or even more dramatic than, that of the Internet 10 years ago.

ICES will be home to several new research units in distributed and grid computing, computational biology, biomedical science and engineering, computational materials research, and many others. Because of these expanded research efforts and the accompanying boost in computing power, the university will have the technological muscle to do highly complex calculations and simulations. These are vital for the advancement of basic science.

The people of Texas have a big stake in the future of advanced computing, advanced applications, and network development. And it is critical that The University of Texas at Austin support them by strengthening its position of leadership. Texas needs a serious place at the national agenda-setting table, and this is what it will take to secure it.

Strategies

With significant funding from various sources, ICES is able to advance its goals and objectives through the able leadership of its director, J. Tinsley Oden, its various research groups that integrate faculty, students, post-doctoral and visiting national and international scholars from several academic and research entities, and the graduate degrees offered through the Computational and Applied Mathematics program.

Resources

To complement the major gift from an anonymous donor to support ICES, the university provided \$3.4 million to renovate the fourth floor of the Advanced Computer and Engineering Sciences (ACES) Building, \$372,000 in one-time programmatic funding, and a recurring operating budget of \$2 million phased in over the period 2002-03 through 2007-08 (with a 2003-04 budget of \$1.1 million). In addition, the university has a commitment to raise \$4 million in matching funds (\$1 million each) for the four chairs established by the gift.

Progress measures

Measures of progress will include the research funding acquired by the faculty and the reputation of the sources of that funding; the numbers, quality, and retention of the faculty and graduate students involved in ICES research and academic programs; the variety of academic and research units represented by faculty and students; the ability of the students to meet the program outcomes of their field upon graduation and the program educational objectives of their field once they enter the profession; the interactions of ICES with programs in several colleges; and the reputation of ICES both within and beyond The University of Texas at Austin.

Major obstacles

No major obstacles are anticipated at this time. The Institute for Computational Engineering and Science (ICES) has strong support both internally and externally, its leadership has been strong, and the academic and research results coming out of ICES have been exceptional.

5. Funding to complete both new buildings for the Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art and funding for the ongoing operational costs of the museum

Priority and objectives

The Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art is recognized as one of the leading university art museums in the country. The Blanton Museum is an object-based teaching and research institution that has a permanent collection spanning the history of Western civilization with about 17,000 artworks from Europe, the United States, and Latin America. The museum also presents a wide range of special exhibitions and educational programs. The museum serves as a teaching resource, a laboratory for innovative curatorial and educational research, a center for scholarship and professional training, a catalyst for interdisciplinary exchange and collaboration among many departments across campus, and a model for community outreach programs. As the only encyclopedic art museum in central Texas, the Blanton Museum responds to the needs of citizens in the region through collaboration with the community, audience involvement, and outreach programs which help elementary and secondary school teachers integrate art into all aspects of the K-12 curriculum.

Strategies

The first phase of the building project for the Blanton Museum is in progress and this new building is scheduled for occupancy in 2005. Fundraising has begun for the second phase (i.e., the second building) which is needed to bring the museum to its full potential of exhibition, research support, and outreach.

Resources

The operating budget for the Blanton Museum is about \$2.5 million and includes an annual institutional supplement of \$485,000. With the move to the new facility, recurring funding for the current institutional supplement as well as funds for the anticipated increase in operating costs must be identified.

Progress measures

Because the Blanton Museum serves a variety of functions (teaching, research, acquisition, exhibition, and outreach), measures of progress must reflect those functions. Measures include use of the museum by organized classes and individual students and scholars; number and quality of presentations of special programs, conferences, and symposia; recognized success of acquisitions in building the collection to support the goals of teaching and research; critical recognition of exhibitions; number and quality of outreach programs; number of visitors annually; etc. An additional measure of progress and success will come through the accreditation process to be conducted by the American Association of Museums in 2006.

Major obstacles

Availability of funding remains a significant obstacle to realization of the full potential of the museum. Until funds can be found, the second phase (second building) will not be constructed. Moreover, the university must still identify a recurring source of funding to support adequately the operational expenses of the museum.

III. Future Initiatives of High Strategic Importance

A. Continuation of major ongoing priorities and initiatives

Priorities and objectives

Looking to the future, the items listed above (II, A through G) will continue to be of high strategic importance. All of the first six items (faculty expansion, facilities preservation, compensation, diversity, student progress and success, and enrollment management) are of immediate importance, but none can be "completed" within the next several years.

The faculty expansion program is scheduled to last until 2011. There remains a considerable gap between recurring funding that can be dedicated to facilities preservation and the university's ability to maintain the systematic long-range plan required. That gap cannot be closed solely by student tuition. At the present level of funding, the university is hard pressed to keep pace with the national averages of compensation, and it is already significantly behind its competitor institutions. The gap will take years to close, even if adequate resources are found. The university is about to implement several initiatives to address issues of diversity on its campus, but there are no "quick fixes" in this area and progress will also be realized only during the course of years. That is equally true of initiatives affecting student progress and success and enrollment management. For each of these items, progress will be measured annually, but significant changes will only come with sufficient time.

As the academic initiatives cited above are established and reach a point of stability, new initiatives will take their place.

Strategies, Resources, Progress Measures: See above

B. Budget

Priorities and objectives

Although deregulated tuition will help the funding base, a six-year forecast suggests that the university's critical financial needs will exceed substantially any monies available even after approved tuition increases. In fiscal year 2005, the anticipated shortfall will be about \$33.8 million and the shortfall will grow to nearly \$211.8 million by fiscal year 2009. (Cf. *The University of Texas at Austin 6-Year Budget Forecast, FY 2003-2008.*)

Strategies

1. Reduce the annual growth in the university's expense structure
2. Improve university processes to enhance services and reduce costs
3. Increase public awareness of the university's spending and the resulting public benefit of state investments in the university
4. Explore alternative methods of pricing educational services that encourage more rapid completion of degree requirements

Critical needs are to protect access and affordability of The University of Texas at Austin, to retain existing talent, to hire new talent, and to preserve facilities for future

generations. Therefore, funds generated by the successful implementation of these strategies will be invested in the following order of priority.

1. Financial aid to maintain access to all deserving students
2. Compensation and benefit programs to retain existing talent and attract new talent
3. Critical maintenance, repair, capital improvement necessary to improve the teaching and research missions of the university

Progress measures

Progress toward these goals is reviewed continuously and systematically by the University Budget Council and the Tuition Policy Advisory Committee. (The latter is composed of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, a college dean, the Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets, a representative of Student Government, a representative of the [student] Senate of College Councils, a representative of the Graduate Student Assembly, and a student representative at large. Serving as non-voting members are the Executive Vice Provost and the Associate Vice President and Budget Director.)

C. Facilities enhancement

The major priority of facilities preservation is discussed in item II, B, above. Student leaders have advanced an additional goal of facilities enhancement that has two principal components.

1. Increase the number of classrooms and offer more classes

Priority and objectives

This goal complements recommendations of the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy that call for more classroom space and increased class availability. (Cf. item II, F, "Enrollment management," above.)

Strategy

In February 2002, the Faculty Council passed a resolution developed by the Faculty Building Advisory Committee.

Therefore the Faculty Building Advisory Committee resolves that all future buildings and renovation of academic facilities on the main campus of The University of Texas must include a minimum of 15% on the assignable space in the form of general-purpose classrooms. Any exceptions to this must be approved by the president, following advice from the Faculty Building Advisory Committee and the Facilities and Space Council. [*Documents of the General Faculty* 1691, February 2002. See http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2001-2002/legislation/bldg_advisory.html.]

This Faculty Council resolution was approved by the President of the university.

Resources

Resources can be devoted to construction of classrooms in proportion to the resources devoted to new buildings and renovations of academic facilities. The addition of classes will depend upon classroom availability, academic areas to be served, and the financial resources available to hire necessary faculty.

Progress measures

Progress toward construction of classroom space will be monitored by the Faculty Building Advisory Committee and Facilities and Space Council. (The Facilities and Space Council is composed of the President, Executive Vice President and Provost, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Vice President for Employee and Campus Services, Executive Vice Provost, Associate Vice President for Campus Planning and Facilities, Chair of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee, and Deputy to the President.) Class availability is monitored by the Executive Vice President and Provost as part of the compact process with colleges and schools.

Major obstacles

Availability of funding

2. Increase student-life facilities on campus, especially to accommodate undergraduate and graduate commuter students

Priority and objectives

There is a need for additional space on campus for student-life activities. The shortage of space is felt especially by commuting students who must remain on campus for study and other activities.

Strategy

The President of the university and the Facilities and Space Council have initiated efforts to determine the best location for the next student-life facility. Once a location has been finally approved, the project can proceed to the design phase.

Resources

Resources for such a project would need to come from students (i.e., as the result of a referendum through which students would agree to add a fee to support the project).

Major obstacles

The project cannot proceed to completion unless students agree to fund construction.

D. Enhancement of first-year experience

Priority and objectives

The first-year experiences of freshman and transfer undergraduates and graduate students are critical to their success at the university. Although the university offers various programs to support first-year students, student leaders see a need to review current offerings and to seek ways to enhance the first-year experience for new students of all levels.

Strategy

To address this goal, a review of academic and student-life programs would need to be undertaken by the Executive Vice President and Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Resources

Resources needed for this initiative would be determined when the reviews began.

Progress measures

Results of the reviews would be reported formally to the President of the university.

Major obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated to the reviews.

IV. Other Critical Issues Related to Institutional Priorities

A. Impact of initiatives

1. Enrollment management

Discussed above

2. Diversity of faculty and staff

Discussed above

3. Community and institutional relations

As a recognized "flagship institution" in the state capitol, The University of Texas at Austin has unique responsibilities in community and institutional relations. These responsibilities remain an important consideration as initiatives are developed and implemented. Moreover, the university maintains an ongoing strategy of systematic communication to appropriate public officials and to the public at large.

4. Finances

Discussed above

5. Facilities

Discussed above

6. Other infrastructure issues

Computing, data storage, and communications technologies are essential infrastructure for many of the initiatives discussed above. The University of Texas at Austin is reviewing funding mechanisms for both its data centers and communications--data, voice, and video networks on campus, with corresponding connections to the Internet and the Public Switched Telephone Network. To ensure reliability, the information technology infrastructure requires not only an adequate and consistent funding model, but also re-engineering to eliminate or minimize risks to business continuity. The university requires access to advanced national research networks, which include Abilene, TeraGrid, and National LambdaRail, and to a state-of-the-art research and education network within Texas. The University of Texas at Austin has taken a leadership role in building a state network and in connecting this university and other Texas universities to the national networks.

B. Unexpected opportunities or crises

None anticipated at this time.

V. System and State Priorities

A. Increasing student access and success

Discussed above

B. Collaborations among UT System institutions, particularly academic-health institution collaborations

1. A significant collaborative effort is The University of Texas Center for Biomedical Engineering. This effort involves The University of Texas at Austin, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, and The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center. The Center for Biomedical Engineering is composed of a dynamic group of highly respected researchers who already develop significant, state-of-the-art biomedical engineering technologies. Its purpose is to direct those efforts toward improving health. Interactions between this center and The University of Texas at Austin have flourished, and the reasons that the 180 mile Houston-Austin "bridge" has been successful is because those involved have nurtured an environment consisting of mutual respect, open communication, group ownership of data, collective support of individual careers, a focus on science and education rather than "politics," and a clear mission of helping patients.

2. The College of Pharmacy has partnerships with several components of The University of Texas System in support of professional and graduate education and training. The Cooperative Pharmacy Programs with two Hispanic Serving Institutions (The University of Texas at El Paso and The University of Texas-Pan American) incorporate an early admission program for high school graduates and are designed to allow students to complete four years of the six-year pharmacy

curriculum at their local campuses. These programs assist in diversifying the student body while addressing significant pharmacy workforce shortages along the Texas-Mexico border. The College of Pharmacy has conducted a Joint Pharm.D. Program with The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio since 1974. This affiliation also supports a significant level of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary basic and translational research. The strength of these partnerships served as a basis for the awarding of a three-year, \$2 million grant from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Bureau of Health Professions to establish the College of Pharmacy Hispanic Center of Excellence in September 2003. In addition, the college collaborates with the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center Science Park at Smithville in the conduct of a Joint National Institutes of Health (NIH) Center Grant.

3. The university collaborates with six components of The University of Texas System in the Coordinated Admission Program (CAP) for undergraduate admission. A Texas resident who graduates from an accredited high school with the units required by The University of Texas at Austin and who completes an admission application by the required deadline, but who is not admitted to the university, is eligible for admission through the CAP. To be admitted to The University of Texas at Austin through this program, the student must meet certain requirements in residence at a component school. The student chooses from a list of participating institutions when signing a CAP contract. If the student satisfies the requirements in the allotted time, he or she is guaranteed admission to The University of Texas at Austin. Participating components include The University of Texas at Arlington, The University of Texas at Brownsville, The University of Texas at El Paso, The University of Texas-Pan American, The University of Texas-Permian Basin, and The University of Texas at San Antonio.
4. The School of Law has several race-neutral recruiting initiatives underway involving other University of Texas System institutions, Texas A&M System component institutions, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). These initiatives include the South Texas Recruitment Program, the Institutes, and HBCU recruitment.

- a. South Texas Recruitment Program

Since 2001, the Law School has committed to 15 offers of admission to students who have attended one of the five designated south Texas schools: Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi, Texas A & M University-Kingsville, Texas A & M University-Laredo, The University of Texas at Brownsville, and The University of Texas-Pan American. The dean, several students, and the admissions staff visit each school each year to recruit students and discuss the program.

- b. The Institutes

The University of Texas at El Paso, The University of Texas-Pan American, and The University of Texas at San Antonio each conducts a pre-law program (Institute) to assist students with law school preparation. The institutes provide an intensive pre-law curriculum that includes the study of legal research and writing and LSAT preparation. In addition, students are given an introduction to first-year law courses such as "Contracts" and "Torts" to enhance the

analytical skills of the students and to improve their written and oral communication skills. The Law School of The University of Texas at Austin has partnered with these institutes by offering instruction from our law faculty and by providing financial support. The dean and other administrative staff visit each campus each year. The Law School's support of this program began in summer 1998, initially at The University of Texas at El Paso. In 2004, the Law School has entered a partnership with Prairie View A & M University to create another institute. The goal is for Prairie View to enroll its first class of students in summer 2004.

c. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Recruitment

The Law School has traditionally recruited at prominent Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), including Fisk University, Florida A & M University, Morehouse College, Southern University, Spellman College, and Texas Southern University. In addition, the Law School was invited to participate with Duke Law School in a North Carolina HBCU recruiting caravan in February 2003. Recruiting events were held at North Carolina A & T State University, North Carolina State University, Shaw University, Fayetteville State University, Winston-Salem State University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

5. The University of Texas at Austin is involved in several initiatives with University of Texas System component campuses and other institutions in Texas regarding nanoscience, nanotechnology, and nanomanufacturing. (Nanotechnology enables the fabrication of materials that have new physical or chemical properties as a result of their orderly construction from pieces that are about a billionth of a meter in size.) On our campus, the focus of this work is in the Center for Nano- and Molecular Science and Technology. The University of Texas at Austin, The University of Texas at Arlington, and The University of Texas at Dallas are leaders in nanotechnology education and research, and they joined forces several years ago with Rice University in the Strategic Partnership for Research in Nanotechnology.

In January 2003, The University of Texas at Austin joined with The University of Texas at Brownsville and The University of Texas-Pan American to establish a consortium on nanotechnology, a "Nano at the Border" initiative, which seeks to bring the fledgling field of nanotechnology to south Texas. The University of Texas at Arlington and The University of Texas at Dallas are also involved. The goal of the initiative is to create an integrated, interdisciplinary educational and research program in nanotechnology that allows participants on each campus to have the most advanced information about this field. Success will bring Texas to a place of leadership in this field which has the potential to be the next revolution in science. The initiative includes classes and other means of information exchange as part of formal education programs and degree plans, development of faculty and student expertise, and enhanced outreach and commercialization efforts. The information exchange involves Web-based instruction, laboratory courses, conferences, and meetings. It has potential application in disparate fields that include electronics, medicine, communications, and manufacturing. The University of Texas at Austin also recently signed an educational partnership on nanotechnology with the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, and has enhanced its capabilities in the field by establishing a nanomanufacturing technology program at the Center for Nano- and Molecular Science and Technology.

C. Increasing external research funding

Federally funded research and development expenditures at The University of Texas at Austin increased by 51% during the period 1999-2003. In 2001, the university ranked fourth nationally in federally funded research among universities without a medical school, after the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT); the University of California, Berkeley; and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The differential with the University of Illinois was only about 0.07%, or less than \$150,000. [Source: *National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Fiscal Year 2001*]

This significant growth was achieved in spite of federal funding trends that favor medical research. The growth in federally financed research and development expenditures in the life sciences at all universities surveyed by the National Science Foundation (NSF) between 1998 and 2001 has been 27%, more than double the growth in the physical sciences (13%) and at a significantly higher level of funding (\$11 billion for the life sciences vs. \$2 billion for the physical sciences in 2001). Due to the lack of a medical school, The University of Texas at Austin has benefited only marginally by National Institutes of Health (NIH) budget increases.

The strategy to ensure a healthy and sustained growth of research at the university is two pronged:

1. Increase the capacity of the faculty to engage in research by hiring 300 new faculty over a 10-year period (cf. section II, A, above).
2. Implement programs that foster interdisciplinary research, create strategic organizational structures that can respond to major federal research initiatives, and train and facilitate proposal submission by the faculty. Examples implemented at The University of Texas at Austin include the following.
 - a. Establishment of centers and institutes that are programmatically aligned with major federal initiatives in nanoscience (Center for Nano- and Molecular Science and Technology), information technology (Institute for Computational Engineering and Science), computational biology (Center for Computational Biology), and environmental research (Environmental Science Institute).
 - b. Establishment of a program (the "NIH Initiative") to provide intensive training to faculty in the preparation of research proposals to the National Institutes of Health. This initiative sponsors proposal writing workshops, interdisciplinary proposal writing mentoring groups of 5 to 8 faculty who meet biweekly for about 6 to 8 months, and regularly scheduled seminars featuring local and national experts in proposal writing. Through the initiative, faculty have access to expert editorial review of their proposals and receive technical assistance and administrative support with the preparation of their grant proposals. Over the past year, workshops on writing NIH proposals have been held with a total of 155 faculty attending.
 - c. Dedication of resources from recovered indirect costs to fund an intramural program ("Interdisciplinary Research Initiative") to support cross-disciplinary research that is judged to hold high promise of evolving into extramurally funded programs.

D. Increasing marks of academic and health care excellence

This year the university created the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Among other responsibilities, this position will work with all colleges and schools to develop a campus-wide program for enhancing program excellence. The goal is to improve continuously what the university does in the academic and health areas and to set benchmarks of excellence within each program. In response to the last reaffirmation review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Provost issued a policy requiring all programs on campus to develop an outcomes-based approach to program review. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is monitoring the status of the implementation of this policy and, as needed, helping the colleges and schools move forward. Several benefits result from the outcomes-based approach.

- a. A focus is placed on students, what they have learned, and how well they are prepared to work in society and in the professions for which they have been educated.
- b. The faculty are encouraged to enhance their teaching effectiveness by changing their focus from what they teach to what students learn. Support is provided to help faculty make this change.
- c. To help meet the desired outcomes, curricula are reviewed and improved.

E. Development and alumni relations

1. Development

As the seven-year capital campaign closes, the Resource Development Office is looking to the university's next fund-raising focus. A primary goal is to increase the university's privately held endowment to a level roughly equivalent to the Permanent University Fund (PUF). Therefore, major gift activity that continues beyond the capital campaign will be focused primarily on endowment. During the next year, the university must develop a compelling theme around this activity that will be grounded in the work of the Commission of 125. (Cf. item II, G, 1, above.) The goal will be not only to put added emphasis on securing gifts towards endowments, but also to ensure that those endowments are designated to areas essential for the long-term success of the university.

During the capital campaign, the focus on major gift fund raising, particularly from individuals, was intensified and, as a result, larger gifts were secured and total giving increased over time. Now that the university is moving into another fund-raising initiative, it must continue to maintain a high level of activity across the university with an emphasis on major gift fundraising. This will require an effort that supports the strategic planning and activity management in each of the colleges, schools, and units. Early on, this activity will consist of two primary efforts. First, it will be necessary to undertake an intensive review of each major gift portfolio to ensure that the Resource Development Office is focused on the right prospects and that it is building new, refreshed strategies for top prospects in each college, school, and unit and at the presidential level. Second, the office will need to build a closer strategic relationship with the Provost and each dean and director to ensure that there is full agreement on the priorities of each development operation and on the expectations of respective development personnel.

2. Alumni relations

The Ex-Students' Association (The Texas Exes) of The University of Texas at Austin is a self-governed, independently funded membership organization. Its role is to support the university and its students, to communicate with all alumni and build alumni relations with the institution, to preserve history and traditions, and to be an advocate for education at all levels, particularly higher education and The University of Texas at Austin.

The Texas Exes is the only alumni entity that is for all alumni of the institution. In addition, most colleges and schools, and even some departments and units, have an alumni relations function, usually attached to development. Staffs of these entities meet together with Texas Exes staff monthly to coordinate calendars, activities, and resources.

There are more than 70,000 dues-paying Texas Exes members. Twice a year, the association also communicates with all undergraduate degree holders.

The Texas Exes carries out a number of initiatives that are supported in part by the Office of the President, including excellence awards for faculty members and academic advisers, scholarships, recognition for public school teachers, and student leadership development.

VI. Compact development process

In developing the compact document for The University of Texas at Austin, the President used various sources. Among these were his own lists of institutional goals and priorities. Also considered were the internal compacts developed by the Executive Vice President and Provost and the dean of each college and school. In addition, each vice president was asked to participate in the institutional compact process by submitting to the President a list of her or his short- and long-range goals.

As part of the compact process, the President asked the President's Student Advisory Council (PSAC) to develop and submit to him a list of the principal goals the members have identified for the institution. The council is composed of the President, Vice President, and two additional members of Student Government; the Chair, Co-Chair, and two additional members of the Senate of College Councils; and the Co-Chairs and one additional member of the Graduate Student Assembly. The goals of these student leaders were fully compatible with those of the university administrative leadership and have been incorporated into this compact.

The President of the university also asked the Faculty Council Executive Committee to review the compact and comment. The Faculty Council Executive Committee is composed of the following members of the Faculty Council: Chair, Past-Chair, Chair-Elect, Secretary, representative of the Educational Policy Committee, representative of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets, representative of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the Chair of the Graduate Assembly.

The final draft of the compact was shared with the Vice Presidents Council.

VII. System contributions

The University of Texas System is to furnish information addressing this item, however, System officials also asked The University of Texas at Austin to provide suggestions for needed support. The System can contribute to the continuing success of the university by providing the following assistance.

1. Funding The University of Texas Elementary School
2. Funding for start-up costs needed to attract outstanding faculty
3. Funding for major renovations, especially for academic facilities such as the Experimental Sciences Building, the Biology Building, and Welch Hall (chemistry).
4. Funding for short- and long-term financing programs (e.g., commercial paper funding, tuition revenue bonds, Permanent University Fund [PUF] bonds, Library Equipment Repair and Renovation [LERR] bonds, revenue financing bonds)
5. Funding for employee benefits and worker compensation programs
6. Funding for physical property, casualty, and other business insurance needs
7. Assistance in informing the Legislature about The University of Texas at Austin and its substantial positive effects on Texas in the areas of education, research, and public service
8. Assistance in helping The University of Texas at Austin obtain increased funding from the Legislature

VIII. Appendices

1. Budget summary [To be provided by UT System]
2. Statistical profile [To be provided by UT System]
3. Institution-specific information

Below is a sampling of Web sites that offer information about peer comparisons, results or surveys, and other special studies that reflect the institution's unique context and character.

Graduate level programs and specialties rankings

<http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/recruit/rankings.html>

Business

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/mba/brief/mbarank_brief.php

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/mba/brief/mbasp04_brief.php

<http://www.mcombs.utexas.edu/news/facts/rankings.asp>

<http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/news/newsbyid.asp?id=12277>

Education

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/edu/brief/edurank_brief.php

Engineering

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/eng/brief/enkrank_brief.php

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/eng/brief/engsp04_brief.php

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/eng/brief/engsp12_brief.php

<http://www.engr.utexas.edu/admin/dean/college01.cfm>

<http://www.engr.utexas.edu/news/publications/newsletter/Spring2000/utnewsrank.cfm>

Law

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/law/brief/lawrank_brief.php

<http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/news/newsbyid.asp?id=12276>

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/rankings03.html> (faculty quality)

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/scholarly_impact.html (faculty quality, citations)

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/03_best_teachers.html (teaching facilities)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/mostcited.html> (cited faculty 03)

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/03_most_national.html (most national)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings/appendD.html> (summary rankings)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/breakdown.html>

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/peer_groups.html (faculty quality)

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/faculty_quality.html (faculty quality)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/citations.html> (citations)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/books.html> (books and articles)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/journals.html> (journals)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/books2.html> (books)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/studentbody.html> (student body)

http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/most_cited.html (cited faculty)

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/clerkships.html> (supreme court clerkship placement)
<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/tenure.html> (tenure-track faculty went to law school)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#admin (excellent)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#bus (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#const (excellent)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#crim (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#crit (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#international (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#intellect (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#juris (excellent)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#labor (excellent)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#lawlit (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#sosci (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#ethics (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#history (strong)
http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/top_choices.html#moral (strong)
<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/speciality.html> (summary of strong/excellence from above)

Library Science

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/lib/brief/infsp1_brief.php

Science: Geology-Sedimentology/Stratigraphy

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/phdsci/brief/geosp5_brief.php

Social Sciences & Humanities: History-Latin American History

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/phdhum/brief/hissp7_brief.php

Research

<http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research2003.pdf> pages 88, 94, 204, 208, 212, 216, 220, 224, 228, 233, 239, and 240 (2003).

<http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research2002.pdf> pages 37, 43, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 117, 121, 125, 129, 133, 137, 141, 146, 152, and 153 (2002).

Bachelor degrees to Hispanics

<http://www.hispanicoutlook.com/top100.html>

4. Links to Web resources

Basic statistical information about The University of Texas at Austin can be found at the following websites.

a. Office of Institutional Research: <http://www.utexas.edu/academic/oir>

b. Office of Admissions research: <http://www.utexas.edu/student/admissions/research/index.html>