
**Analysis and Comments
Policy Report Goldwater Institute
Administrative Bloat at American Universities**

December 2010



**Prepared by
The University of Texas System Administration
Office of the Controller**

Policy Report Goldwater Institute

Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Cost in Higher Education

-Analysis and Comments

-Table 1 Full-Time Employees per 100 Students in 1993-2007

-Comments on UT Austin Data

The Goldwater Institute Report
Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education

Analysis and Comments

The Goldwater Institute¹ has produced a report based on Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data, which data system is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. The Institute examined data on employees and expenditures for 198 public and private universities in the U.S. identified in IPEDS as four-year colleges that also grant doctorates and engage in a high or very high level of research.

The report focuses on growth in full-time employees per 100 students in four categories (and also includes a Total for the schools) and on inflation-adjusted expenditures per student. The report cites increases in these areas over the 1993-2007 era, particularly in the Institute's compilation of Administrative employees and costs, to conclude that the universities are guilty of "administrative bloat".

The attached tables have been compiled from the same data used by the Institute. Included are tables that examine the employee counts per 100 students and the inflation-adjusted expenditures per student for the four UT institutions in the report (UT Arlington, UT Austin, UT Dallas, and UT El Paso). These data are contrasted with the averages for all the *public universities* in the U.S. that are represented in the report, as well as the other four Texas' institutions in the report (Texas A&M University, Texas Tech University, the University of Houston, and the University of North Texas). These tables not only illustrate the growth that has occurred in the relative number of employees, but also the growth in spending over the 1993-2007 period.

Employees per 100 Students

Table 1 shows that employees per 100 students have increased at the four UT institutions. However, and importantly, it also illustrates the relatively low employee count per 100 students exhibited by the UT schools, both at the beginning of the comparison period (1993) and at the end of the period. In 1993, the UT schools' average Total employee count, per 100 students, was only 62% that of the average for all public institutions in the nation. By 2007, the UT average still amounted to only 67% of the national average. The average for Administrative/Executive and Other Professional employees at the UT schools amounted to 65% of the national average in 2007, while the average for Instruction, Research, and Service employees amounted to 61% of the national average that year.

¹ <http://www.goldwaterinstitute.org/article/4941>

In 2007, the four UT institutions had a slightly higher average for the Total employee per student ratio than the other four Texas schools included in the report: 13.7 employees per 100 students compared to 13.2. If UT Austin is omitted from the UT totals, however, the average number of total employees per 100 students for the remaining UT institutions is only 81% that of the other Texas institutions.

Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

The differences between the four UT institutions included in the Goldwater report and the other public institutions in the nation, as well as the other Texas institutions included in the report, is even more evident when it comes to spending per student.

Table 2 illustrates the Goldwater data for inflation-adjusted spending per student, in Total and for Administration, Instruction, Research & Service, and Other functions.

Table 2A illustrates a comparison of the spending by the four UT schools with that of the average of all public institutions in the report. As is the case with employee counts, while the dollar amounts have grown over the 1993-2007 period, the 2007 spending average for UT schools falls well below the spending levels for all public institutions. The average for Total spending in 2007 of the UT schools is barely one-half (54%) that of the national average. Average UT spending for Administration is 65% of the national average, while spending for Instruction is 68% of the national average.

Table 2C compares the four UT schools to the four non-UT Texas institutions included in the report. The 2007 average spending (in Total) for the four UT schools is 95% that of the average of the other four Texas institutions. The UT schools' spending level, relative to the other four Texas schools has increased from 87% in 1993 to the 95% level, primarily driven by relative gains in spending for Instruction and Research & Service. Instructional spending by the UT schools, in 1993, amounted to only 84% of the average of the other Texas institutions; however, by 2007 the UT schools' average spending level for Instruction was 103% that of the other four schools. Similarly, UT schools' average spending for Research & Service increased from 82% of the average of the other Texas schools in 1993 to 91% of the other schools in 2007. UT Austin's Research & Service spending level in 2007 was more than twice (205%) that of the average of the other Texas institutions.

(Reported Research & Service spending on the part of Texas A&M University greatly influences the average of the Four Non-UT Texas public institutions included in the report. According to the Goldwater data, Texas A&M University's spending per student for Research & Service led all eight Texas schools included in the report, as well as the average for all public institutions, nationally. In 2007, Texas A&M's reported Research and Service spending per student amounted to \$11,435, compared to UT Austin's \$8,618 and the national average of \$7,807.)

Full-Time Employees per 100 Student in 1993 and 2007

Table 1

	1993					2007					Percent Change 93 to 07					
	TOTAL	Instruction, Research & Service			Other Employees ⁴	TOTAL	Instruction, Research & Service			Other Employees ⁴	TOTAL	Instruction, Research & Service			Other Employees ⁴	
		Admin. ²	Service ³	Clerical ³			Admin. ²	Service ³	Clerical ³			Admin. ²	Service ³	Clerical ³		
Average of All Public Insitutions in the Goldwater Institute Report ¹	19.4	5.7	5.4	3.8	4.5	20.5	7.9	6.0	2.7	3.9	5.7%	38.6%	11.1%	-28.9%	-13.3%	
Average of All Eight Texas Public Institutions in Goldwater Report	12.0	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.0	13.4	5.0	3.7	1.9	2.8	11.9%	56.9%	13.1%	-24.3%	-7.0%	
Texas A&M University	16.6	4.0	4.3	3.3	4.9	16.8	6.6	4.7	1.9	3.6	1.2%	65.0%	9.3%	-42.4%	-26.5%	
Texas Tech University	12.5	3.1	3.3	2.6	3.4	14.4	4.2	3.9	2.2	4.0	15.2%	35.5%	18.2%	-15.4%	17.6%	
University of Houston	10.0	2.9	3.2	2.2	1.7	12.4	5.7	3.4	1.5	1.7	24.0%	96.6%	6.3%	-31.8%	0.0%	
University of North Texas	8.9	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.9	9.0	2.9	2.6	1.2	2.3	1.1%	45.0%	-13.3%	-40.0%	21.1%	
Avg., These Four Non-UT Universities	12.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	13.2	4.9	3.7	1.7	2.9	9.6%	61.7%	5.8%	-32.7%	-2.5%	
UT Arlington	7.2	1.4	2.3	1.8	1.7	10.3	3.1	3.3	1.7	2.2	43.1%	121.4%	43.5%	-5.6%	29.4%	
UT Austin	22.1	7.0	4.3	4.3	6.6	22.5	9.3	4.9	3.5	4.8	1.8%	32.9%	14.0%	-18.6%	-27.3%	
UT Dallas	9.6	2.7	3.0	2.2	1.7	11.9	5.0	3.3	2.0	1.6	24.0%	85.2%	10.0%	-9.1%	-5.9%	
UT El Paso	9.0	2.4	2.5	1.8	2.3	10.0	3.2	3.2	1.3	2.3	11.1%	33.3%	28.0%	-27.8%	0.0%	
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	12.0	3.4	3.0	2.5	3.1	13.7	5.2	3.7	2.1	2.7	14.2%	52.6%	21.5%	-15.8%	-11.4%	
											Average Increase Per Yr.	1.0%	3.8%	1.5%	-0.8%	
UT Schools As % of All Public institutions in Report																
UT Arlington	37.1%	24.6%	42.6%	47.4%	37.8%	50.2%	39.2%	55.0%	63.0%	56.4%						
UT Austin	113.9%	122.8%	79.6%	113.2%	146.7%	109.8%	117.7%	81.7%	129.6%	123.1%						
UT Dallas	49.5%	47.4%	55.6%	57.9%	37.8%	58.0%	63.3%	55.0%	74.1%	41.0%						
UT El Paso	46.4%	42.1%	46.3%	47.4%	51.1%	48.8%	40.5%	53.3%	48.1%	59.0%						
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	61.7%	59.2%	56.0%	66.4%	68.3%	66.7%	65.2%	61.3%	78.7%	69.9%						

Source: Policy Report Goldwater Institute: Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education Report, Appendix B: Tables

¹ Table A1: Employees per 100 Students in 1993 and 2007

Institution specific data - Table A8 Per Student Spending in 1993 and 2007

² Administration consist of IPEDS categories Administrative/Executive and Other Professionals

³ Instruction, Research, Service and Clerical as reported in IPEDS

⁴ Other Employees consists of the Technical/Paraprofessional, Skilled Crafts and Maintenance categories as reported in IPEDS.

Comments on UT Austin Data

Background

- This analysis compares the number of annual full time equivalent employees (FTEs) in 1993 and 2007 categorized as Administration/Executives and Other Professionals.
- Set of data is a subset of the seven categories of data the universities report to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and reflects the information used by the authors of the Goldwater report.
- The categories of Administration/Executives and Other Professionals are comprised of a wide variety of types of work. While it is reasonable to assume all employees in the Administration/Executives category perform at least some administrative duties, and it is reasonable to describe many of the duties performed by some Other Professionals as administrative, at the University of Texas at Austin, many employees in the Other Professionals category perform other types of professional work such as research and provide services directly to students.

Data Notes

- UT Austin assigns an IPEDS category to each job title. It is assumed that all incumbents using a job title perform similar work with similar levels of responsibility although the content of the work may differ (e.g., a director of a research unit versus a director of a business operations unit).
- Several titles classified as Administration/Executives or Other Professionals in 1993 had been changed to other categories by 2007. A few titles classified as Administration/Executives or Other Professionals in 2007 were incorrectly classified. This discrepancy in classifying work makes a comparison between the two years difficult to interpret. Accordingly, IPEDS coding was adjusted to reflect a common interpretation of the Administration/Executives or Other Professionals categories.
- Following the corrections to the data, in 1993 there were 314 titles coded as Administration/Executives or Other Professionals, representing 2,100.56 full-time equivalent employees. In 2007 there were 342 titles coded as Administration/Executives or Other Professionals, representing 3,686.58 full-time equivalent employees. There were 201 common titles across years.

Findings

- For the Administration/Executives category the most growth by far was in the Research/Research Administration category, 642%, followed by Athletics (102%), Academic Administration/Student Services (97%), and General Administration (76%).
- For the Other Professionals category, the most growth was in Information Technology (148%), followed by Safety Compliance (120%), General Administration (69%), Academic Administration/Student Services (61%), Health Care (55%), Research/Research Administration (53%), and Athletics (46%).
- In each year the category with the most FTEs was General Administration.
 - ◆ Generic titles such as Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, and Program Coordinator are by definition categorized as Administration/Executives and placed in the General Administration group. Some may in fact be better categorized as Other Professionals. Regardless of category, individuals in these titles may be involved with research, direct student service, or another category. Those distinctions can only be made at the incumbent/position level for generic titles like these, and that level of analysis has not been conducted.
- Summary data are provided in the tables on the next page.

Employment data for all incumbents in the IPEDS categories of interest for 1993 and 2007 were collected to determine the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees in each job family.

Comments on UT Austin Data (continued)
FTE Percent Change for Administration/Executive

	1993 FTE	2007 FTE	% Change
General Administration	227.18	399.37	75.80
Academic Administration/Student Services	49.23	97.25	97.25
Research/Research Administration	13.05	96.91	642.79
Safety Compliance			
Information Technology			
Health Care			
Athletics	5.11	10.33	102.31
Total	294.57	603.87	105.00

FTE Percent Change for Other Professionals

	1993 FTE	2007 FTE	% Change
General Administration	667.31	1125.64	68.68
Academic Administration/Student Services	273.12	441.46	61.06
Research/Research Administration	554.65	846.42	52.60
Safety Compliance	10.51	23.12	120.00
Information Technology	199.61	494.54	147.75
Health Care	49.46	76.72	55.12
Athletics	51.33	74.81	45.76
Total	1805.99	3082.70	70.69

Comments on UT Austin Data (continued)**FTE Percent Change for Fund Groups for Administration/Executive**

	1993 FTE	2007 FTE	% Change
14 – E&G Funds	95.58	154.44	61.58
18 – Service Departments	17.92	27.88	55.57
19 – Designated Funds	28.83	154.28	35.11
20 – AUF	56.14	95.92	70.86
26 – Contract & Grants	29.09	82.58	183.84
29 – Auxiliary Enterprise Funds	48.62	70.93	45.88
30 – Restricted Funds Gifts	15.38	17.83	15.87
Total	291.58	603.87	105.00

FTE Percent Change for Fund Groups for Other Professionals

	1993 FTE	2007 FTE	% Change
14 – E&G Funds	462.52	455.98	-1.41
18 – Service Departments	127.92	165.52	29.44
19 – Designated Funds	152.64	810.05	30.68
20 – AUF	285.60	385.24	34.89
26 – Contract & Grants 26	550.47	851.64	54.71
29 – Auxiliary Enterprise Funds	166.01	267.11	60.90
30 – Restricted Funds Gifts	53.20	147.17	176.61
Total	1,798.36	3082.70	70.69

Inflation-Adjusted Spending Per Student

-Table 2 - Base Data

-Table 2A - Average of All Public Institutions

-Table 2B - Average of Eight Texas Public Institutions

-Table 2C - Average Four Non UT Texas Public Institutions

-Definitions

Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Table 2

	1993					2007				
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Admin. /2</u>	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Research & Service /3</u>	<u>Other/4</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Admin.</u>	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Research & Service</u>	<u>Other</u>
Average of All Public Institutions in the Goldwater Institute Report /1	\$ 24,414	\$ 3,998	\$ 7,073	\$ 5,727	\$ 7,617	\$ 31,663	\$ 5,471	\$ 8,939	\$ 7,807	\$ 9,445
Average of All Eight Texas Public Institutions in Goldwater Report	\$ 13,509	\$ 2,287	\$ 5,105	\$ 2,994	\$ 3,123	\$ 17,411	\$ 3,756	\$ 6,020	\$ 4,018	\$ 3,617
Texas A&M University	\$ 24,588	\$ 2,822	\$ 8,231	\$ 9,041	\$ 4,493	\$ 31,097	\$ 4,259	\$ 9,107	\$ 11,435	\$ 6,296
Texas Tech University	\$ 12,001	\$ 2,276	\$ 4,651	\$ 1,503	\$ 3,572	\$ 16,025	\$ 4,016	\$ 5,853	\$ 1,871	\$ 4,286
University of Houston	\$ 11,764	\$ 2,358	\$ 4,914	\$ 1,972	\$ 2,521	\$ 15,038	\$ 4,481	\$ 4,883	\$ 2,985	\$ 2,689
University of North Texas	\$ 9,361	\$ 1,939	\$ 4,461	\$ 658	\$ 2,303	\$ 9,120	\$ 3,143	\$ 3,896	\$ 547	\$ 1,534
Avg., These Four Non-UT Universities	\$ 14,429	\$ 2,349	\$ 5,564	\$ 3,294	\$ 3,222	\$ 17,820	\$ 3,975	\$ 5,935	\$ 4,210	\$ 3,701
UT Arlington	\$ 8,158	\$ 1,569	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,227	\$ 11,781	\$ 3,002	\$ 4,596	\$ 1,647	\$ 2,537
UT Austin	\$ 22,218	\$ 3,337	\$ 7,027	\$ 6,714	\$ 5,140	\$ 30,168	\$ 5,200	\$ 10,026	\$ 8,618	\$ 6,323
UT Dallas	\$ 11,461	\$ 2,662	\$ 4,939	\$ 1,903	\$ 1,956	\$ 14,601	\$ 3,552	\$ 5,834	\$ 2,966	\$ 2,248
UT El Paso	\$ 8,519	\$ 1,334	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,107	\$ 2,770	\$ 11,455	\$ 2,396	\$ 3,964	\$ 2,076	\$ 3,019
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	\$ 12,589	\$ 2,226	\$ 4,646	\$ 2,695	\$ 3,023	\$ 17,001	\$ 3,538	\$ 6,105	\$ 3,827	\$ 3,532

Source: Policy Report Goldwater Institute: Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education Report, Appendix B: Tables

/1 Table A2: Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Institution specific data - Table A8 Per Student Spending in 1993 and 2007

/2 Administration consist of Academic Support, Institutional Support and Student Services

/3 Research and Services consist of Research and Public Service

/4 Other consist of Auxiliary and Operation and Maintenance of Plant

Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Table 2A

	1993					2007					Percent Change '93 to '07				
	TOTAL	Admin. /2	Instruction	Research		TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research		TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research	
				& Service /3	Other/4				& Service	Other				& Service	Other
Average of All Public Institutions in the Goldwater Institute Report	\$ 24,414	\$ 3,998	\$ 7,073	\$ 5,727	\$ 7,617	\$ 31,663	\$ 5,471	\$ 8,939	\$ 7,807	\$ 9,445	29.7%	36.8%	26.4%	36.3%	24.0%
UT Arlington	\$ 8,158	\$ 1,569	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,227	\$ 11,781	\$ 3,002	\$ 4,596	\$ 1,647	\$ 2,537	44.4%	91.3%	38.9%	56.3%	13.9%
UT Austin	\$ 22,218	\$ 3,337	\$ 7,027	\$ 6,714	\$ 5,140	\$ 30,168	\$ 5,200	\$ 10,026	\$ 8,618	\$ 6,323	35.8%	55.8%	42.7%	28.4%	23.0%
UT Dallas	\$ 11,461	\$ 2,662	\$ 4,939	\$ 1,903	\$ 1,956	\$ 14,601	\$ 3,552	\$ 5,834	\$ 2,966	\$ 2,248	27.4%	33.4%	18.1%	55.9%	14.9%
UT El Paso	\$ 8,519	\$ 1,334	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,107	\$ 2,770	\$ 11,455	\$ 2,396	\$ 3,964	\$ 2,076	\$ 3,019	<u>34.5%</u>	<u>79.6%</u>	<u>19.8%</u>	<u>87.5%</u>	<u>9.0%</u>
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	\$ 12,589	\$ 2,226	\$ 4,646	\$ 2,695	\$ 3,023	\$ 17,001	\$ 3,538	\$ 6,105	\$ 3,827	\$ 3,532	35.0%	59.0%	31.4%	42.0%	16.8%
UT Schools As % of All Public institutions in Report															
UT Arlington	33.4%	39.2%	46.8%	18.4%	29.2%	37.2%	54.9%	51.4%	21.1%	26.9%					
UT Austin	91.0%	83.5%	99.3%	117.2%	67.5%	95.3%	95.0%	112.2%	110.4%	66.9%					
UT Dallas	46.9%	66.6%	69.8%	33.2%	25.7%	46.1%	64.9%	65.3%	38.0%	23.8%					
UT El Paso	<u>34.9%</u>	<u>33.4%</u>	<u>46.8%</u>	<u>19.3%</u>	<u>36.4%</u>	<u>36.2%</u>	<u>43.8%</u>	<u>44.3%</u>	<u>26.6%</u>	<u>32.0%</u>					
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	51.6%	55.7%	65.7%	47.0%	39.7%	53.7%	64.7%	68.3%	49.0%	37.4%					

Source: Policy Report Goldwater Institute: Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education Report, Appendix B: Tables

1 Table A2: Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Institution specific data - Table A8 Per Student Spending in 1993 and 2007

2 Administration consist of Academic Support, Institutional Support and Student Services

3 Research and Services consist of Research and Public Service

4 Other consist of Auxiliary and Operation and Maintenance of Plant

1993

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 55.7% of All Public Institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Instruction expenditures per FTE are 65.7% of All Public Institutions included in the report.

2007

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 64.7% of All Public Institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Instruction expenditures per FTE are 68.3% of All Public Institutions included in the report.

Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Table 2B

	1993					2007					Percent Change '93 to '07				
	TOTAL	Admin. /2	Instruction	Research		TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research		TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research	
				& Service /3	Other/4				& Service	Other				& Service	Other
Average of All Eight Texas Public Institutions in Goldwater Report	\$ 13,509	\$ 2,287	\$ 5,105	\$ 2,994	\$ 3,123	\$ 17,411	\$ 3,756	\$ 6,020	\$ 4,018	\$ 3,617	28.9%	64.2%	17.9%	34.2%	15.8%
UT Arlington	\$ 8,158	\$ 1,569	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,227	\$ 11,781	\$ 3,002	\$ 4,596	\$ 1,647	\$ 2,537	44.4%	91.3%	38.9%	56.3%	13.9%
UT Austin	\$ 22,218	\$ 3,337	\$ 7,027	\$ 6,714	\$ 5,140	\$ 30,168	\$ 5,200	\$ 10,026	\$ 8,618	\$ 6,323	35.8%	55.8%	42.7%	28.4%	23.0%
UT Dallas	\$ 11,461	\$ 2,662	\$ 4,939	\$ 1,903	\$ 1,956	\$ 14,601	\$ 3,552	\$ 5,834	\$ 2,966	\$ 2,248	27.4%	33.4%	18.1%	55.9%	14.9%
UT El Paso	\$ 8,519	\$ 1,334	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,107	\$ 2,770	\$ 11,455	\$ 2,396	\$ 3,964	\$ 2,076	\$ 3,019	34.5%	79.6%	19.8%	87.5%	9.0%
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	\$ 12,589	\$ 2,226	\$ 4,646	\$ 2,695	\$ 3,023	\$ 17,001	\$ 3,538	\$ 6,105	\$ 3,827	\$ 3,532	35.0%	59.0%	31.4%	42.0%	16.8%
UT Schools As % of Average of Eight Texas Public institutions in Report															
UT Arlington	60.4%	68.6%	64.8%	35.2%	71.3%	67.7%	79.9%	76.3%	41.0%	70.2%					
UT Austin	164.5%	145.9%	137.7%	224.2%	164.6%	173.3%	138.4%	166.5%	214.5%	174.8%					
UT Dallas	84.8%	116.4%	96.8%	63.6%	62.6%	83.9%	94.6%	96.9%	73.8%	62.2%					
UT El Paso	63.1%	58.3%	64.8%	37.0%	88.7%	65.8%	63.8%	65.8%	51.7%	83.5%					
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	93.2%	97.3%	91.0%	90.0%	96.8%	97.6%	94.2%	101.4%	95.2%	97.7%					

Source: Policy Report Goldwater Institute: Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education

Report, Appendix B: Tables

1 Table A2: Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Institution specific data - Table A8 Per Student Spending in 1993 and 2007

2 Administration consist of Academic Support, Institutional Support and Student Services

3 Research and Services consist of Research and Public Service

4 Other consist of Auxiliary and Operation and Maintenance of Plant

1993

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 97.3% of the eight Texas institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Instruction expenditures per FTE are 91.0% of the eight Texas institutions included in the report.

2007

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 94.2% of the eight Texas institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 101.4% of the eight Texas institutions included in the report.

Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Table 2C

	1993					2007					Percent Change '93 to '07				
	TOTAL	Admin. /2	Instruction	Research & Service /3	Other/4	TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research & Service	Other	TOTAL	Admin.	Instruction	Research & Service	Other
Average of Four Non-UT Public Institutions in Goldwater Report	\$ 14,429	\$ 2,349	\$ 5,564	\$ 3,294	\$ 3,222	\$ 17,820	\$ 3,975	\$ 5,935	\$ 4,210	\$ 3,701	23.5%	69.2%	6.7%	27.8%	14.9%
UT Arlington	\$ 8,158	\$ 1,569	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,227	\$ 11,781	\$ 3,002	\$ 4,596	\$ 1,647	\$ 2,537	44.4%	91.3%	38.9%	56.3%	13.9%
UT Austin	\$ 22,218	\$ 3,337	\$ 7,027	\$ 6,714	\$ 5,140	\$ 30,168	\$ 5,200	\$ 10,026	\$ 8,618	\$ 6,323	35.8%	55.8%	42.7%	28.4%	23.0%
UT Dallas	\$ 11,461	\$ 2,662	\$ 4,939	\$ 1,903	\$ 1,956	\$ 14,601	\$ 3,552	\$ 5,834	\$ 2,966	\$ 2,248	27.4%	33.4%	18.1%	55.9%	14.9%
UT El Paso	\$ 8,519	\$ 1,334	\$ 3,308	\$ 1,107	\$ 2,770	\$ 11,455	\$ 2,396	\$ 3,964	\$ 2,076	\$ 3,019	34.5%	79.6%	19.8%	87.5%	9.0%
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	\$ 12,589	\$ 2,226	\$ 4,646	\$ 2,695	\$ 3,023	\$ 17,001	\$ 3,538	\$ 6,105	\$ 3,827	\$ 3,532	35.0%	59.0%	31.4%	42.0%	16.8%
UT Schools As % of Average of Four Non-UT Public institutions in Report															
UT Arlington	56.5%	66.8%	59.5%	32.0%	69.1%	66.1%	75.5%	77.4%	39.1%	68.5%					
UT Austin	154.0%	142.1%	126.3%	203.9%	159.5%	169.3%	130.8%	168.9%	204.7%	170.8%					
UT Dallas	79.4%	113.3%	88.8%	57.8%	60.7%	81.9%	89.4%	98.3%	70.5%	60.7%					
UT El Paso	59.0%	56.8%	59.5%	33.6%	86.0%	64.3%	60.3%	66.8%	49.3%	81.6%					
Avg., These Four UT Institutions	87.3%	94.8%	83.5%	81.8%	93.8%	95.4%	89.0%	102.9%	90.9%	95.4%					

Source: Policy Report Goldwater Institute: Administrative Bloat at American Universities: The Real Reason for High Costs in Higher Education Report, Appendix B: Tables

1 Table A2: Inflation-Adjusted Spending per Student

Institution specific data - Table A8 Per Student Spending in 1993 and 2007

2 Administration consist of Academic Support, Institutional Support and Student Services

3 Research and Services consist of Research and Public Service

4 Other consist of Auxiliary and Operation and Maintenance of Plant

1993

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 94.8% of the four Non-UT Public Texas institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Instruction expenditures per FTE are 83.5% four Non-UT Public Texas institutions included in the report.

2007

UT institutions Administration expenditures per FTE are 89.0% of the four Non-UT Public Texas institutions included in the report.

UT institutions Instruction expenditures per FTE are 102.9% four Non-UT Public Texas institutions included in the report.

Definitions

Academic Support

A functional expense category that includes expenses of activities and services that support the institution's primary missions of instruction, research, and public service. It includes the retention, preservation, and display of educational materials (for example, libraries, museums, and galleries); organized activities that provide support services to the academic functions of the institution (such as a demonstration school associated with a college of education or veterinary and dental clinics if their primary purpose is to support the instructional program); media such as audiovisual services; academic administration (including academic deans but not department chairpersons); and formally organized and separately budgeted academic personnel development and course and curriculum development expenses. Also included are information technology expenses related to academic support activities; if an institution does not separately budget and expense information technology resources, the costs associated with the three primary programs will be applied to this function and the remainder to institutional support. GASB institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant and depreciation.

Student Services

A functional expense category that includes expenses for admissions, registrar activities, and activities whose primary purpose is to contribute to students emotional and physical well - being and to their intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. Examples include student activities, cultural events, student newspapers, intramural athletics, student organizations, supplemental instruction outside the normal administration, and student records. Intercollegiate athletics and student health services may also be included except when operated as self - supporting auxiliary enterprises. Also may include information technology expenses related to student service activities if the institution separately budgets and expenses information technology resources (otherwise these expenses are included in institutional support.) GASB institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant and depreciation.

Institutional Support

A functional expense category that includes expenses for the day-to-day operational support of the institution. Includes expenses for general administrative services, central executive-level activities concerned with management and long range planning, legal and fiscal operations, space management, employee personnel and records, logistical services such as purchasing and printing, and public relations and development. Also includes information technology expenses related to institutional support activities. If an institution does not separately budget and expense information technology resources, the costs associated with student services and operation and maintenance of plant will also be applied to this function. GASB institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant and depreciation.