



November 2007

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 four editions of a comprehensive *Accountability and Performance Report* since 2004, the UT System has 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 fifth edition will be released in May 2008.

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 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 strategic plan and the campuses with key uniform data measurements to focus on outcomes and look at change over time.

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 Strategic Plan 2006-2015.

What is the Purpose of the UT System's Report and How is It 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 annual work plan, to evaluate performance and establish expectations of each institution. (For more information about the institutional compacts, see www.utsystem.edu/osm/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 over five-year trend lines of activities that support the educational, research, and health care missions of UT System institutions. A new framework for 2008 is organized around themes of:

- Student Access, Success, and Outcomes;
- Faculty and Research;
- Health Care;
- Resources, Efficiency, and Productivity;
- Separate sections will provide analysis of the impact of System-wide strategic initiatives and customized accountability profiles for each campus, including rankings and other comparisons with peer institutions.

Within this framework, 75 measures are tailored to the specific missions of academic and health-related institutions and the System as a whole. Over 60 percent of all measures are outcome- or impact-related. Others provide context or track progress that ultimately translates into outcomes.

Timeline

The report is presented to the UT System Board of Regents in May of each year.

For More Information

Contact: The University of Texas System Office of Strategic Management, 512-499-4798, www.utsystem.edu/osm.

The full report is available on the Web, at www.utsystem.edu/osm/accountability/.

Index of Performance Measures

A. Student Access, Success, and Outcomes

Preparation & Academic Cost

Ethnic composition of first-time undergraduates compared with composition of high school graduates in state
Number and percent of first-time undergraduates from top 10% of their high school class, and by ethnicity
Average ACT/SAT scores of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates
Average entrance examination scores: GRE, LSAT, GMAT
Total financial aid disaggregated by source and type
Number of financial aid awards to undergraduate students, and amount awarded
Average net academic cost and average percent discount for full-time undergraduate students
Number of FTE professional academic advisors and ratio to FTE students

Enrollment

Total enrollments and percent increase over previous year
Comparison of total UT System enrollment increases with increases for all senior institutions in Texas
Number of undergrad, graduate, and professional students enrolled by school on the 12th class day, and by ethnicity and level
Number and percent increase of first-time undergraduates, and by ethnicity
Number and percent increase of entering undergraduate students, by full-time, part-time, freshmen and transfer
Number of graduate and professional programs, by level
Number of Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education-accredited resident programs

Outcomes

First-year persistence rate for first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled at this University, and by ethnicity
Four- and six-year graduation rates from this University of first-time, full-time undergraduates
Six-year graduation rates of undergraduates enrolled at this University, and by ethnicity
Four-year graduation rate from this university of community college transfer students
Six-year composite graduation and persistence rates from this or another Texas public university, and by ethnicity
Time to degree: average number of semesters enrolled before earning baccalaureate degree
Enrollment and degree trend lines
Graduation rates of graduate students at health-related institutions
Number of degrees awarded, and by ethnicity and level
Graduate education degrees conferred
Certification, licensure, and national board exam pass rates
National Survey of Student Engagement: advising, educational experience, likelihood of attending same institution again
Collegiate Learning Assessment results
Medical student satisfaction
Post-graduation experience: % of baccalaureate graduates employed or enrolled in a graduate/professional program in Texas

B. Faculty and Research

Faculty

Number of tenure/tenure-track faculty
Faculty salaries and trends

Instruction

FTE student/FTE faculty ratio
Small class trends
Distance education trends

Research

Dollar amount of research expenditures, by funding source (federal, state, private, local)
National and state total research and development expenditures ranking
State appropriations for research as a percent of research expenditures for academic institutions
Amount of research expenditures as a percent of formula-derived general appropriations revenue for health-related institutions
Number and percent of FTE tenure/tenure-track faculty holding extramural grants
Ratio of research expenditures to FTE tenure/tenure-track faculty
Sponsored revenue, by funding source
Number of new invention disclosures
Number of U.S. patents issued
Number of licenses and options executed
Number of new start-up companies
Gross revenue from intellectual property
Faculty awards
International and national institutional rankings
Number of postdoctoral fellows

C. Health Care

State-owned and affiliated hospital admissions by UT institution faculty
State-owned and affiliated hospital days by UT institution faculty
Outpatient visits in state-owned and affiliated facilities treated by UT institution faculty
Total charges for unsponsored charity care by faculty in state-owned and affiliated facilities
Total charges for unsponsored charity care by hospitals owned by UT institutions
Patient satisfaction ratings
Total patient care revenue
Ratio of admissions, charity care, hospital days, and clinic visits to General Revenue for state-owned hospital/clinic operations
Clinical charges and revenue per FTE clinical faculty

D. Resources, Efficiency, and Productivity

Revenues and Expenditures

Key revenue by fund sources
Key expenses by purpose
UT System administrative expenses
Ratio of campus administrative costs to expenses
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
Total number of endowed professorships and chairs, number filled, and percent of total tenure/tenure-track faculty
Sources of donor support (alumni, individuals, foundations, corporations, other)
UT System bond rating

Efficiency and Productivity

Historically Underutilized Business trends
Assignable space per FTE student
Space utilization rate of classrooms
Ratio of research expenditures to research E&G sq. ft.
Ratio of E&G space to FTE faculty
Energy use