

Institutional and Program Rankings

A. Ranking Highlights

National rankings interest many people who use them as a kind of “proxy of quality;” they cannot be ignored. Because there is no perfectly objective or comprehensive ranking system, public policy-makers should use such rankings with great caution.

There is no single accepted overall ranking of research universities, in part because institutions differ significantly in the variety of programs offered and in the different roles they play in each state’s higher education infrastructure. Rankings depend on what a particular study wishes to emphasize. The various national ranking systems are intended to serve differing purposes: some focus on institutions as a whole, some on the research quality of individual graduate programs, and others on the undergraduate experience. For these reasons, the lists of top schools are not identical across the rankings systems.

Overall, the lists of top schools do not change radically from year to year. To sustain its position, let alone move up in the rankings, an institution must continue to recruit strong faculty who perform at a high level in research productivity, invest in key areas expected to experience growth in federal research budgets, e.g., biomedical sciences or national security; invest in undergraduate improvement to increase retention and graduation rates, and increase selectivity. Size can matter: in rankings of research universities, those with more comprehensive portfolios of academic programs, larger numbers of faculty, and more research funding tend to rise to the top of the lists. Having a medical school adds to the size and research productivity. On the other hand, small, selective private schools tend to rise to the top of lists focusing on undergraduate education.

A more detailed discussion of national rankings with information about each institution may be found in Sections B–D, below.

Table V-1

National Institutional Rankings Summary of U. T. Academic Institutions		
U. T. System	#1 in total FY 2003 R&D expenditures #2 in total FY 2003 federal research expenditures	NSF 2005 NSF 2005
Arlington	4 th tier, national universities 232 of 619 in total R&D expenditures FY 2003	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005 NSF 2005
Austin	17 among top public universities; 52 among all universities; Tied for 18th of all public and private research universities (640 total); 11th in public research universities (389 total); 32 in total R&D expenditures funding FY 2003 36 among top 500 world universities	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2006 Lombardi Center, 2005 NSF 2005 Shanghai Jiao Tong ranking 2005
Brownsville/TSC	4 th tier, master’s universities – West	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005
Dallas	3 rd tier, national universities 184 of 619 in R&D expenditures FY 2003	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005 NSF 2005
El Paso	4 th tier, national universities 197 of 619 in R&D expenditures FY 2003	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005 NSF 2005
Pan American	4 th tier, master’s universities – West 351 of 619 in R&D expenditures FY 2003	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005 NSF 2005
Permian Basin	4 th tier, master’s universities – West	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005
San Antonio	4 th tier, master’s universities – West 242 of 619 in R&D expenditures FY 2003	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005 NSF 2005
Tyler	3 rd tier, master’s universities – West	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2005

Table V-2

National Institutional Rankings Summary of U. T. Health-Related Institutions		
SWMC	#48 in FY 2003 R&D expenditures	NSF Survey of R&D, 2005
	In top 25 of all public and private research universities (640 ranked)	Lombardi Center, 2005
UTMB	#88 in FY 2003 R&D expenditures	NSF, 2005
	In top 26-50 of public research universities (389 ranked)	Lombardi Center, 2005
HSC-H	#92 in FY 2003 R&D expenditures	NSF, 2005
	In top 26-50 of public research universities (389 ranked)	Lombardi Center, 2005
HSC-SA	#97 in FY 2003 R&D expenditures	NSF, 2005
MDACC	#1 cancer hospital	<i>U.S. News</i> , 2003, 2004
	#38 in FY 2003 R&D expenditures	NSF, 2005
	In top 25 of all public and private research universities(640 ranked)	Lombardi Center, 2005

Noteworthy 2004-05 Rankings and Awards by Institution

The following are noteworthy awards received by U. T. System health-related institution faculty in recent years. [*Sources: institutions; publications*].

U. T. Southwestern Medical Center: Individual faculty awards received in 2004-05

- American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators (2)
- Fulbright American Scholar
- Welch Foundation Hackerman Award
- Kinship Foundation's Searle Scholar Award
- American Association for the Advancement of Science Packard Scholar

U. T. Medical Branch at Galveston: Individual faculty awards received in 2004-05

- Fulbright American Scholar (2)
- Robert Wood Johnson Policy Fellows
- President, Texas Board of Nurse Examiners (BNE)
- ACG Presidential Poster Award Recipient (2)
- American College of Nurse-Midwives Foundation Teaching Excellence Award
- American Gastroenterological Association Research Mentors Award
- America's Best Doctors, Best Doctors, Inc. (10)
- America's Top Docs (3)
- America's Top Doctors Among Specialist in Pathology
- Appointed Mental Health Subject Matter Expert to the USAFR Surgeon General Command Chief Nurse
- Best Poster Award, Central Association of Obstetricians and Gynecologists 71st Annual meeting
- Best Practice Award from 'Cities United in Science Progress' - Lead-Safe...for Kids Sake Grant Competition July 2005
- Biophysical Society Young Investigator Award
- Certificate of Merit, Education Exhibit MR Imaging of Acute Abdomen during Pregnancy Radiological Society of North America meeting
- Chair (Second Term), Steering Committee, National NeuroAIDS Tissue Consortium, NIH
- Chair, Transfusion Medicine Resource Council, American Society for Clinical Pathology
- Chair, World Health Organization Steering Committee on Vaccine Research for Dengue and Other Flaviviruses
- Chumley award for advocacy from Texas Academy of Internal Medicine (Texas chapter of ACP)
- Consultant, National Infrared Spectroscopy Laboratory, Peking University
- CREOG National Award for Excellence in Resident Education
- Distinguished Alumnus Award, Berea College
- Editor-in-chief, Vector-Borne & Zoonotic Diseases
- Edmund Prince Fowler Award for Outstanding Basic Science Thesis from the Triological Society
- Elected Consultant of Neurology, Network of Advisors, NY

University of Florida Top American Research Universities Study.

The Lombardi Program on Measuring Institutional Performance at TheCenter of the University of Florida has published a ranking of research institutions for six years (most recently dated December 2005, but published in March 2006). Building on a benchmarking and accountability initiative required by the Florida legislature, this report is considered more objective than other studies, as it includes no reputational information. This ranking system is the one that best reflects the overall strength of research institutions.

Its primary focus is “the measure of a research university’s success as an enterprise . . . the quantity of high-quality human capital it can accumulate and sustain” (p. 10, 2004 edition). This approach is somewhat limited, however, in that it looks at institutions as a whole and is considered by some to underemphasize undergraduate education. Nine measures, including such criteria as research expenditures, size of endowment, and alumni giving, were identified specifically to measure competitiveness of research universities in garnering resources to support research. The most recent (2005-06) published ranking of the “top research universities” is based on data collection from 187 institutions that reported receiving at least \$20 million in federal research funding in FY 2003. Institutions are grouped on the basis of how many measures they have in the top 25. (In addition to these primary rankings, on its web site, TheCenter also publishes data on these indicators for a total of 640 institutions, including 389 public universities, that reported receiving any federal research funding.)

Using this cluster approach, TheCenter placed 51 institutions in the “top 25” of all public and private research universities in 2005, based on reaching the absolute top 25 in at least one of the nine measures.

The minimum level to reach the 25th position in each measure in 2005 was as follows (dates vary because of differences in sources this study uses):

- \$409,684,000 in total FY 2003 research expenditures
- \$238,206,000 in total FY 2003 federal research expenditures
- \$1,730,063,000 in endowment assets in FY 2004
- \$161,603,000 in annual giving in FY 2004
- 38 national academy members in 2004
- 24 faculty awards (national fellowships) received in 2004
- 407 doctorates awarded in 2004
- 521 postdoctoral appointments in 2003
- 600-720 verbal; 660-770 quantitative 25th and 75th percentile SAT scores for freshmen entering in 2003

The University of Florida Lombardi Center: *The Top America Research Universities, 2005.*

The table on page 28 displays the most current (2005) national ranking among all institutions and among public institutions alone, on each of nine measures for all U. T. System institutions included in the study by TheCenter at the University of Florida. It also includes an additional measure of undergraduate student quality. (Depending on institution mission, not every measure appears for all institutions ranked; each ranking is higher when only public institutions are compared.)

Ranking of systems. The U. T. System is noteworthy for the number of its institutions that appear in the lists of “top 25” public and private institutions on various measures. This is due to U. T. Austin’s strengths, combined with the research expenditures, private giving, and postdoctoral programs at U. T. health-related institutions. TheCenter study deliberately focuses on ranking individual institutions. The authors have argued that faculty are the primary drivers affecting research university performance and faculty are almost always associated with a specific institution. They contend, moreover, that “totals for systems reflect primarily the political and bureaucratic arrangements of public university campuses rather than any performance criteria.” In the 2004 edition, the Lombardi Center added a brief analysis of the performance of public research university systems (pp. 17-19, 36). It showed that the U. T. System as a whole was third nationally, behind the University of California System and Johns Hopkins University in

federal research expenditures (as reported to the NSF for FY 2002), and second nationally in total research expenditures; the U. C. System was first.

Highlights from the 2005 Report: Looking at change from 2002 to 2005, U. T. System institutions increased their ranking in a number of areas [increase is in both the national (public and private) and public-only rankings unless otherwise noted]:

Arlington	Federal research, endowment (public), faculty awards, postdoctoral appointments, national merit scholars
Austin	Endowment, annual giving, national academy members, faculty awards
Dallas	Total research, federal research, annual giving, national academy members, faculty awards, postdoctoral appointments (national) national merit scholars
El Paso	Endowment (national), faculty awards, postdoctoral appointments (national)
Pan American	Total research, federal research, endowment, annual giving, faculty awards, doctorates, national merit scholars
San Antonio	Federal research (national), endowment (public), annual giving, postdoctoral appointments
SWMC	Total research, federal research, endowments, annual giving, national academy members
UTMB	Total research, federal research, endowments, annual giving, faculty awards, doctorates, postdoctoral appointments
HSC-H	Endowments (national), annual giving, national academy members, faculty awards, doctorates
HSC-SA	Endowments, annual giving, postdoctoral appointments
MDACC	Total research, federal research, endowment, annual giving, postdoctoral appointments

U. T. Austin

- In 2005, U. T. Austin was once again ranked in the top 25, with five measures ranked in the top 25 and two measures ranked in the top 26-50.
- In 2004, U. T. Austin moved higher in the top 25 of all universities, ranking in the top 25 with six measures, and with one in the top 26-50. Based on the clustering of institutions, it was also among the top 10 public institutions.
- In 2005, the top ten public universities were: UC Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Washington, UCLA, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, University of Wisconsin-Madison, UC San Francisco, University of North Carolina, UC San Diego, and University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign.
- Small differences separate schools in some categories. For example, in 2005, U. T. Austin was ranked 26th in federal research expenditures (\$231,996,000); UC Berkeley was ranked 25th in this category (\$238,206,000), and Emory University ranked 27th (\$228,255,000). These differences could result from variations in cost items, like salaries, in grants.
- Based on 2003 data in the "Top American Research Universities" report for 2005, U. T. Austin ranked fifth in federal research expenditures and seventh in total research expenditures among universities without a medical school. Total research and development expenditures rankings for these universities are as follows: (1) Berkeley (\$507 million); (2) Illinois (\$494 million); (3) MIT (\$486 million); (4) Pennsylvania State University (\$480 million); (5) Texas A&M University (\$456 million); and (6) U. T. Austin (\$344 million). Federal research and development expenditures rankings are as follows: (1) MIT (\$356 million); (2) Pennsylvania State (\$271 million); (3) Illinois (\$266 million); (4) Berkeley (\$238 million); and (5) UT Austin (\$232 million).
- U. T. Austin continues to stand out in its very high ranking in numbers of National Merit and Achievement Scholars. Although not one of the nine formal indicators, this measure is used by the TheCenter as a supplement to show undergraduate quality. In 2005, U. T. Austin was ranked fifth among all institutions; it was third in 2004, second in 2003, third in 2002, and second in 2001.

U. T. Southwestern Medical Center

- In 2005, U. T. Southwestern Medical Center moved into the top 25 with one measure in the top 25 (postdoctoral appointments) and five measures in the top 26-50 among all institutions: total research expenditures, federal research expenditures, annual giving, national academy members, and faculty awards.
- Other institutions in this group include the University of Colorado - Boulder and Michigan State University.

U. T. M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

- The M. D. Anderson Cancer Center also moved into the top 25 of all public and private institutions with one measure in the top 25 (postdoctoral appointments) and two measures in the top 26-50: total research expenditures and annual giving.
- Among other institutions in this group are Brown University and Rockefeller University.

Other U.T. System health-related institutions ranked comparatively highly among *public* research institutions in 2005, as they did in 2002, 2003, and 2004. The U. T. Medical Branch at Galveston and U. T. Health Science Center-Houston ranked in the top 26-50 among public institutions.

U. T. Medical Branch at Galveston

- UTMB ranked in the top 26-50 public universities in the 2005 study.
- Among public institutions, it was ranked 44th in endowments and 32nd in numbers of postdoctoral appointments.
- Other schools in this group include: University of California-Riverside, University of Houston – University Park, and University of Massachusetts Medical School – Worcester.

U. T. Health Science Center-Houston

- The Health Science Center-Houston was ranked in 2005 in the top 26-50 public universities, with one measure in the top 26-50 of public institutions: federal research expenditures.
- Other institutions in this group include: the Medical University of South Carolina, University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, Mississippi State University, Oklahoma State University - Stillwater, and the University of New Mexico-Albuquerque.

U. T. Health Science Center-San Antonio

- Although the Health Science Center-San Antonio was not ranked in the top 26-50 public institutions this year, it had been in that group for the past four years.
- It had four measures ranked in the top 100 of all institutions and seven measures in the top 100 of public institutions.

Conclusions. Over the past four years, relative positions have changed only slightly. The impact of medical schools deserves particular attention in the U. T. System context. Earlier editions of the Florida study pointed out that the presence of medical schools on a campus provides a distinct advantage to universities in competing for research grants. The authors argued that medical centers that are part of research campuses also have a greater impact on research activities of faculty in related and allied disciplines. In the 2005 report, only four institutions ranked in the top 25 in federal research expenditures do not have medical schools (MIT, Pennsylvania State University, University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign, and UC Berkeley). All of the top 10 institutions in research expenditures have medical schools.¹³ If U. T. Austin and U. T. Medical Branch federal R&D expenditures in FY 2003 were combined, the total (\$325 million) would rank fifteenth among all institutions. If U. T. Austin and U. T. Southwestern Medical Center's federal FY 2003 R&D expenditures were combined, the total (\$409 million) would rank seventh among all institutions.

¹³ *The Top American Research Universities*, December 2005, p. 192.

TheCenter's conclusion is if U. T. Austin had a medical school, it is likely that it would appear much higher in the rankings, but this would not be the case for all institutions currently lacking medical schools.

This year, TheCenter looked again at the question of impact of medical schools on the rankings. But TheCenter widened their perspective to include the impact of engineering schools. This new study shows that if the national rankings were to exclude federal research expenditures by AAMC medical schools and ASEE engineering schools, UT Austin would rank 11 rather than 24.¹⁴

TheCenter concludes that "highly competitive research oriented medical schools contribute substantially to the success of many American research campuses."¹⁵ Still, as top-ranked MIT demonstrates, it is possible to be "exceptionally effective" without the presence of a medical school.

Moreover, the comparatively high ranking of U. T. System health-related institutions is noteworthy, given their more focused mission. They are included in the Florida study because they receive federal research funding, but other ranking systems, for example from the National Institutes of Health, provide a more focused assessment of their competitive position among peers.

¹⁴ *The Top American Research Universities*, December 2005, pp. 20-21.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.16.

Data summary. The following summary displays data on all U. T. System institutions noted in the *Top American Research Universities* report for 2002 through 2005, distinguishing ranking on each measure for all universities (first number) and all public universities (second number).

Data are collected on universities receiving any federal research funding. It is important to note that this system therefore excludes many universities. Even if not ranked highly, being included in the survey is an indication of an institution's success in obtaining federal research support.

Table V-5

**Top American Research Universities
University of Texas System Institutions – Overview of 2002-2005 National Rankings**

In 2005, 640 total institutions were ranked, including 389 public institutions. This table displays ranking among all institutions (first number) / ranking among all public institutions only (second number).

	Research Expenditures	Federal Research	Endowment Assets	Annual Giving	National Academy Members	Faculty Awards	Doctorates Granted	Postdoc Appointees	25th-75th percentile/ Median SAT	National Merit Scholars**
U. T. System Academic Institutions*										
UTA 02	243 / 177	264 / 188	534 / 177	409 / 171	135 / 82	287 / 176	135 / 88	188 / 129	666 / 189	--
03	221 / 159	221 / 158	558 / 184	507 / 198	137 / 82	285 / 175	160 / 100	193 / 134	610 / 160	--
04	237 / 175	243 / 176	540 / 177	467 / 196	140 / 83	195 / 127	178 / 107	193 / 136	not provided	--
05	245 / 180	255 / 187	537 / 175	525 / 205	144 / 88	203 / 132	197 / 119	174 / 122	not provided	291 / 118
Austin 02	31 / 19	26 / 14	25 / 6	25 / 12	20 / 9	27 / 15	2 / 2	62 / 37	170 / 32	3 / 1
03	32 / 20	25 / 14	25 / 5	30 / 14	18 / 8	25 / 13	3 / 3	67 / 41	149 / 27	2 / 1
04	33 / 21	22 / 11	24 / 5	8 / 4	18 / 8	21 / 10	3 / 2	65 / 40	144 / 23	3 / 2
05	31 / 19	26 / 15	23 / 4	11 / 1	18 / 8	18 / 8	3 / 2	67 / 40	138 / 23	5 / 2
UTD 02	225 / 162	243 / 174	193 / 70	535 / 207	135 / 82	287 / 176	174 / 108	170 / 117	221 / 46	110 / 51
03	228 / 165	244 / 173	200 / 74	548 / 210	137 / 82	153 / 96	172 / 107	164 / 113	237 / 49	107 / 49
04	197 / 145	212 / 152	193 / 71	444 / 188	140 / 83	195 / 127	191 / 114	173 / 121	not provided	80 / 35
05	194 / 142	210 / 150	204 / 75	291 / 137	105 / 62	159 / 107	187 / 114	168 / 117	143 / 25	61 / 26
UTEP 02	203 / 146	174 / 120	305 / 105	235 / 116	--	287 / 176	272 / 156	222 / 152	1,171 / 411	--
03	205 / 148	183 / 127	307 / 108	194 / 103	--	199 / 123	282 / 160	--	1,258 / 429	--
04	211 / 156	191 / 135	291 / 102	248 / 129	--	274 / 175	278 / 160	249 / 170	not provided	--
05	207 / 153	195 / 138	300 / 111	247 / 121	--	135 / 93	278 / 161	220 / 153	not provided	--
UTPA 02	398 / 275	376 / 268	513 / 171	569 / 217	--	287 / 176	411 / 202	--	1,184 / 414	--
03	376 / 265	371 / 267	539 / 177	404 / 171	--	199 / 123	414 / 205	--	1,272 / 434	--
04	389 / 270	376 / 269	532 / 175	616 / 234	--	--	417 / 201	--	not provided	--
05	369 / 267	364 / 267	462 / 157	268 / 130	--	203 / 132	389 / 194	--	not provided	291 / 118
UTSA 02	247 / 179	238 / 170	583 / 199	554 / 214	--	126 / 85	480 / 222	--	939 / 307	286 / 110
03	251 / 179	236 / 168	613 / 204	527 / 205	--	--	467 / 219	224 / 53	1,002 / 320	--
04	261 / 193	251 / 183	625 / 204	500 / 205	--	147 / 95	448 / 209	215 / 150	not provided	--
05	255 / 189	232 / 170	594 / 192	367 / 162	--	203 / 132	497 / 228	203 / 143	not provided	--

* U. T. Brownsville, U. T. Permian Basin, U. T. Tyler, and U. T. Health Center-Tyler are not listed because they did not report federal research funding for the period 1999-2003 to the NSF R&D survey.

** Although not one of the study's primary measures, TheCenter provides data on National Merit and Achievement Scholars to supplement information about quality of undergraduate students.

Source: *Top American Research Universities* publication and web site: http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research_data.html

Top American Research Universities (continued)

University of Texas System Institutions – Overview of 2002-2005 National Rankings

In 2005, 640 total institutions were ranked, including 389 public institutions. This table displays ranking among all institutions (first number) / ranking among all public institutions only (second number).

	Research Expenditures	Federal Research	Endowment Assets	Annual Giving	National Academy Members	Faculty Awards	Doctorates Granted	Postdoc Appointees	25th-75th percentile/ Median SAT	National Merit Scholars**
U. T. System Health-Related Institutions*										
SWMC 02	50 / 33	49 / 28	67 / 18	52 / 27	34 / 17	36 / 22	215 / 128	19 / 10	NA	NA
03	44 / 29	45 / 25	57 / 18	40 / 22	35 / 18	56 / 33	213 / 128	26 / 13	NA	NA
04	42 / 28	44 / 25	60 / 17	52 / 27	35 / 18	50 / 29	237 / 135	43 / 22	NA	NA
05	45 / 30	45 / 26	55 / 16	29 / 15	32 / 15	41 / 24	220 / 130	20 / 12	NA	NA
UTMB 02	97 / 67	88 / 56	134 / 45	124 / 74	115 / 70	202 / 132	261 / 151	61 / 36	NA	NA
03	100 / 70	91 / 58	132 / 47	106 / 62	115 / 70	199 / 123	233 / 137	58 / 33	NA	NA
04	94 / 67	88 / 57	127 / 43	113 / 69	116 / 70	108 / 68	252 / 147	75 / 48	NA	NA
05	86 / 59	83 / 55	130 / 44	103 / 58	117 / 71	135 / 93	259 / 150	56 / 32	NA	NA
HSC-H 02	85 / 56	69 / 43	330 / 110	181 / 96	97 / 57	106 / 70	156 / 100	65 / 40	NA	NA
03	84 / 56	68 / 42	327 / 113	121 / 72	89 / 53	104 / 66	144 / 92	130 / 88	NA	NA
04	87 / 60	67 / 43	308 / 109	141 / 84	87 / 51	97 / 61	162 / 99	111 / 76	NA	NA
05	90 / 63	69 / 43	306 / 113	126 / 75	90 / 53	88 / 56	138 / 89	119 / 79	NA	NA
HSC-SA 02	94 / 64	81 / 50	161 / 56	137 / 83	135 / 82	79 / 51	236 / 138	110 / 73	NA	NA
03	90 / 62	82 / 51	170 / 64	139 / 83	137 / 82	69 / 44	260 / 150	97 / 66	NA	NA
04	93 / 66	80 / 51	153 / 52	152 / 89	140 / 83	79 / 47	296 / 166	87 / 57	NA	NA
05	97 / 69	88 / 60	156 / 55	132 / 79	144 / 88	98 / 65	263 / 152	87 / 56	NA	NA
MDACC 02	54 / 36	66 / 40	146 / 49	75 / 41	135 / 82	--	--	63 / 38	NA	NA
03	47 / 31	65 / 40	150 / 54	84 / 49	137 / 82	--	--	37 / 19	NA	NA
04	43 / 29	57 / 34	177 / 64	65 / 36	140 / 83	274 / 175	--	25 / 13	NA	NA
05	36 / 22	62 / 38	128 / 43	48 / 24	144 / 88	--	--	21 / 13	NA	NA

* U. T. Brownsville, U. T. Permian Basin, U. T. Tyler, and U. T. Health Center-Tyler are not listed because they did not report federal research funding for the period 1999-2003 to the NSF R&D survey.

** Although not one of the study's primary measures, TheCenter provides data on National Merit and Achievement Scholars to supplement information about quality of undergraduate students.

Source: *Top American Research Universities* publication and web site: http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research_data.html