

UT Austin Compact for FY 08 – FY 09

Mission: The university is to achieve national and international leadership and renown in the interrelated areas of undergraduate education, graduate education, research, and public service, providing superior and comprehensive educational opportunities at the baccalaureate through doctoral and special professional educational levels.

Top 5 Priorities for FY 08 – FY 09:

1. Faculty compensation and support. If the university is to achieve and maintain national preeminence among institutions of higher education, it must be able to recruit and retain the best faculty. To accomplish this, the university must have a faculty compensation program that is fully competitive with the national leaders in higher education and it must have an equally competitive program of faculty support (research, travel, leave programs, etc.).
2. Faculty expansion. To improve the quality of undergraduate education and rise in national stature, the university must reduce the student-to-faculty ratio by increasing the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty while stabilizing or eventually lowering the overall enrollment.
3. Graduate student support. A preeminent research university must have a preeminent graduate program able to attract and retain the best graduate students. To achieve this, the university must develop and maintain graduate student support (fellowships, scholarships, assistantships) that is fully competitive with the national leaders in higher education.
4. Diversity. To serve an increasingly diverse population, the university must educate a diverse group of leaders to guide Texas and the nation into the future. This can be accomplished effectively only by attracting and retaining an increasingly diverse community of students, faculty, and staff.
5. Fiscal discipline. In order for the university to achieve and maintain national preeminence in higher education, it must identify and manage with greatest effectiveness the necessary financial resources. An essential component of successful fiscal management is disciplined decision making at all levels to use existing resources in the most effective ways to reach institutional strategic goals. This follows the mandate of the Commission of 125 that the university create a “disciplined culture of excellence” (see below).

I. Performance Summary Table and Analysis

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
Persistence Rates – first-year persistence rates for first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates (cohort)	2000: 91.0% 2003: 92.7%	2004: 92.7%	94%	The unaltered continuation of Texas House Bill 588 (1997), the so-called “Top 10%” law, makes effective management of freshman enrollments increasingly difficult and has consequences for our persistence and graduation rates and our ability to reach our goals.
4-Year Graduation Rates – undergraduates graduating in four years or less from same institution (cohort)	1997: 36.5% 2000: 44.8%	2001: 46.4%	2010: 55%	
6-Year Graduation Rates – undergraduates graduating in six years or less from same institution (cohort)	1995: 69.9% 1998: 73.8%	1999: 74.8%	2010: 80%	
1. Competitiveness				If the university is to rise to the highest levels of recognition, it must be aggressively competitive in the amount spent to educate students, for faculty salaries, and for graduate student support.
a. Comparative per student funding among national comparison group of twelve universities	FY2004: 10 th (\$27,961)	FY2006: 10 th (\$33,462)	Median of the national comparison group	Data from the NCES/IPEDS Peer Analysis System
b. Comparative faculty salaries ranking among national comparison group of twelve universities	2002: Professors: 6 th Assoc. Profs: 11 th Asst. Profs: 6 th	2007: Professors: 5 th Assoc. Profs: 8 th Asst. Profs: 2 nd	Salaries for all three ranks competitive with the best public and	

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
			private universities in the country	
c. Comparative faculty support (research, leave programs, travel)	Not available	Not available	To be determined	To recruit and retain the best faculty, the university must be competitive in faculty support beyond salaries (e.g., travel, research support, leave policies). Data about such support at other institutions will be obtained to provide benchmarks for comparison.
d. Comparative teaching assistant support among national comparison group of eight universities (average net comparison)	2000-2001: Residents, 5 th Nonresidents, 5 th	2005-2006: Residents, 3 rd Nonresidents, 3 rd	Graduate student support competitive with the best universities in the country	
e. Comparative research assistant support among national comparison group of eight universities (average net comparison)	2000-2001: Residents, 8 th Nonresidents, 8 th	2005-2006: Residents, 8 th Nonresidents, 8 th	Graduate student support competitive with the best universities in the country	
f. Annual total of gifts	FY1996 (prior to capital campaign): \$107 million	FY 2006: \$178 million	To be determined	These figures include all gifts except pledges and testamentary gifts. Comparable income for FY2007 approached \$200 million with two months remaining in the year.
2. National stature				Rankings totals are comprehensive of all rankings programs identified by the Office of Information Management and Analysis. <i>U.S. News & World Report</i> does not rank every program every year. It is selective in ranking graduate and undergraduate programs. The number of programs eligible for ranking in 2001 may not equal those eligible in 2007. Total for 2007 includes some programs ranked in previous years that have not been updated and thus remain current.
a. Number of programs in top 20	2002: 48	2007: 93	More programs in the top 20, especially in core academic disciplines	
b. Number of National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and National Academy of Engineering (NAE) members. (Includes <i>U.S. News & World Report</i> rankings and other recognized rankings of academic programs.)	2002: 52	2007: 56	Increase the number of University of Texas at Austin faculty in these and comparably prestigious organizations	

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
3. Research expenditures				The University of Texas at Austin enjoys a mature and stable research environment with research and development (R&D) expenditures growing at a pace comparable to the growth of federal research investment in the physical/biological sciences, mathematics, computer sciences, and engineering. Over the last few years, the growth in federal R&D expenditures has been in the range of 6% to 8%. While other funding sources are less predictable, the overall annual growth has been in the range of 5%. This 5% growth figure has been used to set goals for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and Fiscal Year 2008-09 assuming that current faculty hiring practices and recent investments in research facilities will allow the university to remain competitive with the leading research universities in the country.
	FY2005:	FY2006:		
a. Federal	\$269,613,000	\$294,832,000		
b. Non-Federal	\$153,255,000	\$151,854,000		
c. Total research dollars	\$422,868,000	\$446,686,000	\$490,000,000 (Total estimated for FY2008) \$515,000,000 (Total estimated for FY2009)	
4. Diversity of student body and faculty				To prepare students adequately for leadership in a changing society, to reflect the changing demographics of Texas and the nation, and to create a climate of cultural understanding and respect, the university must attain greater diversity among its students and faculty.
a. Student ethnicity	2001: White 61.3% Amer In 0.4% Afr Am 3.2% Asian Am 13.2% Hisp 12.0% Foreign 8.9% Unknown 1.0%	2006: White 56.6% Amer In 0.5% Afr Am 3.9% Asian Am 14.4% Hisp 15.0% Foreign 8.9% Unknown 0.7%	Achieve a diversity sufficient to realize the educational benefits that flow from a student body with diverse backgrounds and experiences	
b. Student gender	2001: Male 50.3% Female 49.7%	2006: Male 48.9% Female 51.1%	Achieve a diversity sufficient to realize the educational	

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
			benefits that flow from a student body with diverse backgrounds and experiences	
c. Faculty ethnicity	2001: White 85.0% Amer In 0.3% Afr Am 3.2% Asian Am 6.5% Hisp 5.1%	2006: White 82.1% Amer In 0.5% Afr Am 3.5% Asian Am 8.3% Hisp 5.5%	Achieve a diversity sufficient for the faculty to provide an educational environment that reflects a diversity of backgrounds and experiences	
d. Faculty gender	2001: Male 66.1% Female 33.9%	2006: Male 63.6% Female 36.4%	Achieve a diversity sufficient for the faculty to provide an educational environment that reflects a diversity of backgrounds and experiences	
5. Faculty expansion (cf. student-to-faculty ratio)				
a. New faculty positions funded per annum	FY2001: 30	FY2006: 32	Goal: 30 per annum	190 new faculty positions have been funded since 2000-2001. Constraints on continuation of the program to add faculty and reduce the student-to-faculty ratio include availability of funding to hire faculty, availability of one-time start-up funding, availability of ongoing support beyond salary, and availability of space.
b. Student-to-faculty ratio	2001: 20.52	2006: 19.36	16.0	The university's Enrollment Strategy Task Force (2003) recommended a goal of 19.0 by the year 2009. However, a ratio competitive with our national comparison group is 16.0.

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

II. Update Strategic Initiatives from the 2006 Compact for FY 07 – FY 08

a. Completed Initiatives

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Evaluation of initiative success
Information technology and communication services review			The goal was to have an external study of information technology and communication services to improve those services	A steering committee was formed to prepare a Request for Qualifications for an external firm to undertake a study. However, the work of the committee and a change in leadership of Information Technology Services (ITS) precluded the need for an external study. With reorganization under new leadership, ITS is making progress toward the desired goals.

b. Ongoing Initiatives

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
1. Reform the undergraduate curriculum	<p>a. Status of implementing the new requirements in the degree programs of the colleges and schools</p> <p>b. Status of establishing university-wide courses newly required by the curriculum reform (e.g., thematic strands, flag requirements)</p> <p>c. Status of implementing other new curriculum requirements</p>	<p>In fall 2006, the Faculty Council passed legislation to reform the undergraduate curriculum. A new position, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, was created and filled in fall 2006; the dean is leading implementation of the curriculum. The freshman seminar program will be integrated into the first-year signature course format in fall 2008. To prepare the transition to the new curriculum, scores of freshman seminars have been added for fall 2007.</p>	<p>Make the necessary changes in all appropriate degree programs and implement the new university-wide requirements (e.g., thematic strands and curricular flags) as recommended by the Faculty Council</p>	<p>Make the necessary changes in all undergraduate degree programs. Implement the first-year signature courses and the accompanying speaker series. Implement the second-year signature courses and the rest of the new requirements.</p>
2. Faculty expansion (cf. student-to-faculty ratio)	<p>a. Number of new faculty positions funded per annum</p> <p>b. Student-to-faculty ratio</p>	<p>In 2000-2001, the university embarked upon a ten-year program to add 300 strategically placed faculty (i.e., 30 per year). With the exception of one year (when budget reductions precluded funding of new faculty positions), the program has continued.</p> <p>The student-to-faculty ratio has been reduced from 20.52 in 2001 to 19.36 in 2006. However, the constraints on enrollment management, explained in "Enrollment Management Plan Development and Targets" below, have made it increasingly difficult to make greater progress toward the goal.</p>	<p>30 new faculty positions per annum</p> <p>A student-to-faculty ratio of 16.0</p>	<p>Continue the faculty expansion program and continue the efforts to manage enrollments effectively.</p>

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
3. Implement recommendations of the Commission of 125	Progress on implementation of the Commission of 125 report	In fall 2004, the Commission of 125 (a group of distinguished citizens) presented a report recommending how the university could best serve Texas and society during the next 25 years. Initial steps have been completed on the Commission's two strategic initiatives (curriculum reform and a higher standard for academic leadership at the department level). Curriculum reform is under way. The departments of History and English have been recognized for having strong leadership, a clear strategic plan, and faculty unity of purpose; each is receiving new resources to advance academic aspirations and national stature. Several of the Commission's operational recommendations have been completed and others have been largely completed.	Implement Commission of 125 goals within 25 years (by 2029). See Commission Report (http://www.utexas.edu/com125/) for additional details.	Complete the curriculum reform and continue the academic leadership initiative. Focus on operational recommendations regarding diversity, student-to-faculty ratio, optimization of financial resources, and graduate education.
4. Identify and manage the financial resources necessary to maintain the university in a place of national preeminence in higher education, including competitive compensation and benefits programs	Funds to meet institutional strategic goals	Through self-imposed internal budget reductions and funding reallocations, the university is taking steps to increase the effectiveness of its available funds.	More effective use of available funds to meet strategic goals	In order for the university to achieve and maintain national preeminence in higher education, it must identify and manage with greatest effectiveness the necessary financial resources. An essential component of successful fiscal management is disciplined decision making at all levels to use existing resources in the most effective ways to reach institutional strategic goals.

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
5. Develop and fund a systematic plan for facilities enhancement and preservation	<p>a. Facility condition indices associated with systems, buildings, and the total campus</p> <p>b. Effectiveness of facilities preservation expenditures</p> <p>c. Expenditures for new facilities and major renovations</p>	<p>Availability of funding continues to impede progress on this initiative. In addition, the institution faces several significant challenges, including the age profile of existing facilities, increasing requirements for fire/life safety and ADA code compliance, changing teaching and research requirements, and lack of surge space.</p>	<p>a. Improve facility condition index for campus by 20% in ten years</p> <p>b. Increase funding for facilities preservation and enhancement by 10% per year</p> <p>c. Maintain facility preservation expenditures effectiveness at 80%</p> <p>d. Implement surge space capacity for both laboratory and classroom/office space</p> <p>e. Improve space management capability and link to capital planning process. This effort is under way.</p> <p>f. Maintain condition assessment effort and benchmark with other institutions. This effort is under way.</p>	<p>While facility condition has not improved, it has not declined over the past two years. At the same time, the institution has made noticeable progress in addressing code requirements and has begun several major new construction and renovation projects. However, the age of existing facilities means that there will be increasing funding needs merely to maintain current conditions.</p>

III. New Strategic Initiatives

Initiative, Rationale, & Strategy	Expected Impact (Metrics)	Goal	Specific Steps in 2007-2008, 2008-2009
<p>1. Competitiveness. If the university is to achieve national and international leadership and renown, it must be aggressively competitive in the amount spent to educate students, for faculty salaries, and for graduate student support. Therefore, resources must be distributed on the basis of the institutional need to be competitive.</p>	<p>Effectiveness of resource distribution and rise in national rankings.</p>	<p>Rise in stature among universities in national comparison group</p>	<p>Resource distribution will be based on the need to increase our competitiveness.</p>
<p>2. Globalization. To rise in stature both nationally and internationally, the university must increase its presence and activity throughout the world. To accomplish this, the university must:</p> <p>a. Identify strategic areas for international program expansion,</p> <p>b. Increase the number of faculty teaching abroad in those areas and increase the number of student participating in those programs, and</p> <p>c. Increase the number of student exchanges between The University of Texas at Austin and strategic partners.</p>	<p>Number of students studying abroad (2005-06: 2,244 students) and scholarships for study abroad. Number of faculty teaching University of Texas at Austin courses abroad (2006-07: 110 faculty). Number of faculty-led programs, exchange programs, and affiliated programs (2006-07 total: 644).</p>	<p>Extend international relationships through selected partnerships in geographic areas of high strategic value and increase the number of students in exchange and study abroad programs.</p>	<p>Convene a Task Force on International Programs. Further develop the Mexico Working Group and deepen and expand the university's relationships in Mexico. Establish working groups for other strategic international areas of study. Consider creation of an international center and an international relations degree program.</p>

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

<p>3. Increased prominence of arts and humanities programs. With the national emphasis on the so-called STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), there has been a tendency to overlook the importance of the arts and humanities. The arts and humanities, however, continue to be essential to the core of higher education and there is a need to maintain their prominence in academic programming.</p>	<p>Financial expenditures in the arts and humanities. Course enrollments. Increases in national rankings of academic programs in the arts and humanities.</p>	<p>Increased prominence of arts and humanities programs</p>	<p>Identify the arts and humanities areas that can most effectively benefit from greater attention.</p>
--	---	---	---

IV. UT System Strategic Plan Initiatives

a. Enrollment Management Plan Development and Targets

The Task Force on Enrollment of The University of Texas at Austin, chaired by Professor Isabella Cunningham, was appointed by then President Larry Faulkner in fall 2002 and submitted its final report in fall 2003.

In fall 2002, enrollment at the university reached an all-time high of 52,261. The Task Force recognized the unsustainable stress put on institutional resources by this excessive enrollment which was manifest particularly in the shortage of laboratory space and availability of courses. The Task Force concluded that a continuing expansion of enrollment would compel the university to open a separate campus and thus adversely affect the character of the institution. The Task Force recommended reducing enrollment to a size commensurate with available fiscal and facilities resources and recommended a goal of 48,000 students.

The recommendation of the Task Force was adopted and the reduction of the University's population began. From 52,261 in fall 2002, enrollment fell to 51,426 in fall 2003, to 50,377 in fall 2004, and to 49,696 in fall 2005. These reductions relieved the pressure on the university's faculty and physical plant. A further reduction was planned for fall 2006 but the president's Tuition Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) recommended against such action because the resulting financial loss would have been more than the university could absorb while also maintaining a high quality of education. The TPAC recommended stabilization of enrollment for the near future and this recommendation is being followed.

The admission standards for the university continue to increase as pressure for available spaces increases. In 1997, the university received about 14,700 applications for freshman admission. In 2007, we received 28,000 freshman applications. We attempt to hold the overall student population at a constant level by admitting freshman classes of similar sizes. As the freshman application pool has increased in size, we have become a highly competitive institution.

A complicating factor of enrollment management has been the unaltered continuation of Texas House Bill 588 (1997), the so-called "Top 10%" law. The number of freshmen admitted to The University of Texas at Austin under HB 588 has continued to increase; it had already risen above 70% for fall 2006. If the university were to decrease the total number of freshmen admitted, i.e., with the goal of decreasing overall enrollment, then the percentage of freshman admitted under HB 588 would rise dramatically, thereby squeezing out almost all prospective freshmen not in the top 10% of their high school graduate class. Likewise complicating enrollment management has been the success of the Coordinated Admission Program (CAP). As this program has become increasingly popular and successful, the consequence has been fewer places for transfer students who are not admitted through the CAP.

As a result of these factors, the overall enrollment remains well above the goal of 48,000 (cf. 49,696 for fall 2006) and it will apparently remain higher than desirable for the foreseeable future.

b. Financial Management Plan

The general revenue increase to The University of Texas at Austin as a result of the 80th Session of the Texas Legislature was less than 2% per year for the coming biennium. This is commensurate with the pattern for the university over the past twenty years. The president has recently appointed a Policy and Planning Advisory Council (PPAC) to advise him and help him develop a strategic and business plan for the university so that more effective use can be made of the institutional resources available. This council includes faculty, student, staff, and administrative representation. The PPAC will consider strategic priorities needed to close the gaps between our university and those institutions recognized as the national leaders among public research universities and will advise the president on the difficult decisions needed to enable us to achieve our goals.

Improving productivity and efficiency remains a top priority. We continue to look for ways to collaborate and share resources. The Vice President and Chief Financial Officer has begun work on a plan in which he anticipates the collaboration of the PPAC and appropriate officials of The University of Texas System.

UT Austin Compact for FY 08 – FY 09

c. Information Security Plan

The University of Texas at Austin Information Security Office has established the following controls and measures to minimize the risk of loss or damage to information resources; to protect information resources from unauthorized access, modification, destruction or harm; to ensure the continued confidentiality, integrity and availability of mission critical information resources; and to provide a baseline from which to configure and audit computer systems and networks for compliance with University of Texas at Austin, state, and federal rules and regulations:

- Data Classification Standard (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/dataclassification.php>)
- Minimum Security Standards for Systems (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/secstd.php>)
- Minimum Security Standards for Application Development and Administration (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/appstd.php>)
- Minimum Security Standards for Data Stewardship (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/datastewardstd.php>)
- Change Management Guideline (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/chgmgmt.php>)
- Network Monitoring Standards (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/monitor.php>)
- Data Encryption Guidelines (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/encrypt-guide.php>)
- Server Hardening Checklists (<http://security.utexas.edu/admin>)

The University of Texas at Austin Information Security Office employs a variety of communication methods to inform staff, faculty, researchers, and students of essential requirements for protecting various assets, including hardware, software resources and data assets, namely:

- Offering Information Technology Security Awareness sessions to the public, targeting 20-25 staff members per session
- Creating and promoting the SeNF (Sensitive Number Finder) tool, which is designed to identify sensitive numbers, e.g., Social Security Numbers. SeNF has been deployed by most University of Texas at Austin departments, a number of University of Texas System institutions, as well as, several other universities around the country (<https://source.its.utexas.edu/groups/its-iso/projects/senf/>)
- Promoting National Cyber Security Awareness Month with a highly successful campus-wide information campaign (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/secure/>)
- Conducting a campus-wide Annual Risk Assessment (<https://security.utexas.edu/risk>). This included providing specific in-house risk assessment training to more than 350 local Information Technology support staff
- Developing an Information Technology Security Awareness Compliance Module for all staff and faculty members to complete biennially (<http://www.utexas.edu/administration/oic/cts/cw170e/alt/start.htm>)
- Developing an Information Technology Security Awareness Course for all new students to complete annually via the BlackBoard course management system
- Sponsoring a 6-day security-specific training program for 220 Information Technology support staff members from The University of Texas at Austin and several other representatives from other University of Texas System institutions
- Sponsoring an annual "Destruct-o-thon" to facilitate the secure destruction of orphaned or surplus digital media (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/news/062007/disk-destruction-062007.php>)

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

V. System Contributions and Investments

	\$ Amount, FY 05	\$ Amount, FY 06	Description / Metrics of Impact
STARs Program	13 @ \$ 500,000 \$ 150,000 \$ 400,000 \$ 420,000 \$1,000,000	5 @ \$500,000 \$300,000	Sponsored External Funding:\$114,101,241 Net \$ Return on Investment \$103,260,187 Patents Issued:..... 22 Patents Pending:..... 45 Scientific Publications: 350 Collaborations:..... 114 National Awards Received: 14 National Academy Appointments:..... 1 Sponsored Graduate Students: 171 Sponsored Post-Docs: 59
STARs Program – noncompetitive (16 combined awards) Institutional match:	\$4,550,500 \$6,960,623	NA	Noncompetitive awards recruit junior faculty. The outcomes measures for these investments will take some time to develop.

VI. New Faculty Positions Projected to 2010

FIELD	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	Total FY 06 – FY 10
STEM	13	13	10	10	9	55
Health Professions	3	0	2	1	2	8
Arts & Humanities	8	10	13	14	13	58
Professional Schools	6	9	5	4	6	30
TOTAL	30	32	30	29	30	151

Comments: STEM includes the College of Engineering, John A. and Katherine G. Jackson School of Geosciences, College of Natural Sciences; Health Professions include the School of Nursing, College of Pharmacy, School of Social Work; Arts and Humanities include the College of Communication, College of Fine Arts, College of Liberal Arts; Professional Schools include the School of Architecture, Red McCombs School of Business, College of Education, School of Information, School of Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

UT Austin Compact for FY 08 – FY 09

VII. Status of Campus Strategic/Long-Range Plan:

The strategic plan of The University of Texas at Austin is in its formative phase. The elements of the plan are mostly in place and the process reflects the planning methodologies of the Commission of Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS-COC), the University of Michigan, and the Pennsylvania State University. Combining the SACS-COC (1996) planning and evaluation steps with those of the University of Michigan (Duderstadt, 2000) and Penn State (2004), the steps for The University of Texas at Austin planning and evaluation process are:

1. Develop a clearly defined statement of institutional purpose through statements of mission, vision, core purpose, core values, and strategic intent;
2. Formulate goals that embrace the institution's mission and the environment in which it finds itself;
3. Develop procedures for evaluating the extent to which those goals are being achieved; and
4. Use evaluation results to improve educational programs and other elements of the institution's mission as well as its services and operations.

Step 1:

The university has a clearly defined mission statement, a vision statement proposed for it by the Commission of 125, statements of core purpose and core values, and the president's statement of strategic intent to become the great public university in America.

Step 2:

The six basic proposed goals for The University of Texas at Austin are drawn from several sources and are stated as:

Goal 1: Create within the university a disciplined culture of excellence.

Goal 2: Educate students to their highest potential of intellectual achievement and personal growth.

Goal 3: Develop scholars, professionals, artists, and scientists who contribute to the advancement of society, nationally and internationally, through research, creative activity, scholarly inquiry, and the development of new knowledge.

Goal 4: Create a more inclusive, civil, and diverse university learning community.

Goal 5: Align missions, programs, facilities, and services with available fiscal resources to better serve our students and their communities.

Goal 6: Foster a deep connection with, and a profound influence on, higher education and society.

Step 3:

To evaluate the extent to which these goals are being achieved, we have established outcomes with which to assess the progress of each goal. They are grouped into major categories with key measures in each category tracked by the university annually for The University of Texas System Accountability and Productivity Report and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) Accountability System and Closing the Gaps initiative. A selected number of these key measures are used for major decisions at the institutional level. These major categories and their relationship to goals and initiatives are:

Student participation (Goals 2 and 4)

- Head count enrollments: stabilize student body size to match resources available and to support an excellent education of students
- Percent of top 10% freshmen: monitor proportion of incoming first-year students who are from the top 10% of their high school graduating class so that this group is a reasonable proportion of that incoming group, again to support an excellent education
- Enrollment by ethnicity: create a more inclusive and diverse community on campus

Student success (Goals 2 and 4)

- 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates (total and by ethnicity): ensure student success and support the THECB's Closing the Gaps initiative
- Degrees awarded overall: ensure student success and support the THECB's Closing the Gaps initiative
- Degrees awarded in key fields: ensure student success and support the THECB's Closing the Gaps initiatives
- Student learning: While it is not yet a metric that the university is using for planning purposes because it is still being developed and tested, the Collegiate Learning Assessment instrument has been used on campus for the past three years as a measure of critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and writing ability for our incoming freshmen and graduating seniors.
- Student engagement: While it is not yet a metric that the university is using for planning purposes, the NSSE and FSSE surveys are being administered on campus, and it is likely that the results will be used in the near future.

Excellence (Goals 3 and 4)

- Faculty and lower division teaching: involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty in undergraduate and lower-

UT Austin Compact for FY 08 – FY 09

division course teaching supports an excellent education of students

- Student-to-faculty ratio: lower student-to-faculty ratios support educational excellence
- State and national exams success: pass rates on pharmacy, engineering, nursing, and teaching certificate tests are a measure of student learning
- Faculty ethnicity: supports creating a more inclusive and diverse community on campus

Research (Goal 3)

- Research expenditures: measure of research activity and contribution to new knowledge
- Expenditures per faculty: measure of faculty productivity and contribution to new knowledge

Institutional efficiency and effectiveness (all Goals)

- Administrative cost ratio: measure of institutional financial efficiency
- Space use: measure of institutional space efficiency
- Appropriated funds per FTE student: measure of how well state funding is aligned with mission, programs, facilities, and services
- Operating funds per FTE student: measure of how well overall funding is aligned with mission, programs, facilities, and services
- Tuition and fees per student: measure of students' cost of education

Disciplined culture of excellence:

- In its final report (2004), the Commission of 125 made the following comment:

The University of Texas will be the best in the world at creating a disciplined culture of excellence that generates intellectual excitement, transforms lives and develops leaders.

As the institution responds to this mandate at all levels, the means to measure progress will be increasingly apparent.

Step 4:

In a number of ways, it is possible to show that The University of Texas at Austin is using its evaluation results to improve educational programs and other elements of the institution's mission as well as its services and operations.

References:

Duderstadt, James J. 2000. *A University for the 21st Century*. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

McCaslin, Richard B. and Earnest F. Gloyne. 1986. *Commitment to Excellence: One Hundred Years of Engineering Education at The University of Texas at Austin*. The Engineering Foundation of the College of Engineering.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Colleges. 1996. *Resource Manual of Institutional Effectiveness*.

VIII. Campus Consultation to Develop Compact: As indicated above, the 2004 report of the Commission of 125 had a profound and continuing influence on the university and its strategic planning. This update of the compact is based upon the recommendations of the Commission, the preceding version of the compact, and the ongoing discussions the president of the university has had with campus leaders about the strategic goals of the university (cf. Vice Presidents Council, Deans Council, Faculty Council Executive Committee, President's Student Advisory Council, University Budget Council, Facilities and Space Council).

UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09

IX. Budget

The University of Texas at Austin
Operating Budget
Fiscal Year Ending August 31, 2007

	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Adjusted Budget	FY 2007 Operating Budget	Budget Increases (Decreases) From 2006 to 2007	
				Amount	Percent
Operating Revenues:					
Tuition and Fees	\$ 309,746,870	327,630,610	354,219,453	26,588,843	8.1%
Federal Sponsored Programs	304,839,455	290,205,464	320,993,230	30,787,766	10.6%
State Sponsored Programs	39,782,059	40,686,113	47,145,966	6,459,853	15.9%
Local and Private Sponsored Programs	63,934,418	66,489,723	73,544,462	7,054,739	10.6%
Net Sales and Services of Educational Activities	127,032,201	115,429,488	144,253,243	28,823,755	25.0%
Net Sales and Services of Hospital and Clinics	-	-	-	-	-
Net Professional Fees	-	-	-	-	-
Net Auxiliary Enterprises	140,253,340	147,102,674	161,808,661	14,705,987	10.0%
Other Operating Revenues	2,304,912	1,904,120	1,437,964	(466,156)	-24.5%
Total Operating Revenues	987,893,255	989,448,192	1,103,402,979	113,954,787	11.5%
Operating Expenses:					
Instruction	441,773,879	433,060,041	518,829,643	85,769,602	19.8%
Academic Support	101,798,935	175,511,256	136,827,057	(38,684,199)	-22.0%
Research	343,499,577	357,100,189	391,020,923	33,920,734	9.5%
Public Service	47,041,181	49,741,792	57,660,730	7,918,938	15.9%
Hospitals and Clinics	-	-	-	-	-
Institutional Support	78,749,965	84,349,675	92,896,604	8,546,929	10.1%
Student Services	39,652,129	44,307,804	45,704,041	1,396,237	3.2%
Operations and Maintenance of Plant	108,626,735	118,774,946	130,896,174	12,121,228	10.2%
Scholarships and Fellowships	68,706,282	55,760,028	72,435,590	16,675,562	29.9%
Auxiliary Enterprises	159,167,933	177,014,134	185,001,875	7,987,741	4.5%
Depreciation and Amortization	99,457,626	102,441,355	105,514,596	3,073,241	3.0%
Total Operating Expenses	1,488,474,242	1,598,061,220	1,736,787,233	138,726,013	8.7%
Operating Surplus/Deficit	(500,580,987)	(608,613,028)	(633,384,254)	(24,771,226)	4.1%
Budgeted Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses):					
State Appropriations & HEAF	288,728,350	301,206,911	301,602,920	396,009	0.1%
Gifts in Support of Operations	77,369,387	51,203,651	84,145,146	32,941,495	64.3%
Net Investment Income	115,583,793	106,592,904	119,265,572	12,672,668	11.9%
Other Non-Operating Revenue	-	-	-	-	-
Other Non-Operating (Expenses)	(60,901)	-	-	-	-
Net Non-Operating Revenue/(Expenses)	481,620,629	459,003,466	505,013,638	46,010,172	10.0%
Transfers and Other:					
AUF Transfers Received	106,335,000	112,480,000	127,560,000	15,080,000	13.4%
AUF Transfers (Made)	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers for Debt Service - Interest	(18,852,517)	(17,505,057)	(22,714,402)	(5,209,345)	29.8%
Total Transfers and Other	87,482,483	94,974,943	104,845,598	9,870,655	10.4%
Budget Margin (Deficit)	68,522,125	(54,634,619)	(23,525,018)	31,109,601	-56.9%
Reconciliation to Change in Net Assets:					
Net Non-Profit Health Corp Activity	-	-	-	-	-
Net Inc./(Dec.) in Fair Value of Investments	262,745,964	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense on Capital Asset Financings	(1,846,643)	(1,856,205)	(1,882,076)	(25,871)	1.4%
Capital Approp., Gifts and Sponsored Programs	14,804,077	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	0.0%
Additions to Permanent Endowments	33,201,086	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	0.0%
Transfers for Debt Service - Principal	(23,353,331)	(17,298,000)	(18,001,468)	(703,468)	4.1%
Reverse Transfers for Debt Service (System Only)	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers and Other	73,623,548	80,300,000	107,300,000	27,000,000	33.6%
SRECNA Change in Net Assets	\$ 427,696,826	66,511,176	123,891,438	57,380,262	86.3%
Total Revenues and AUF Transfers	\$ 1,575,909,785	1,560,931,658	1,735,976,617	175,044,959	11.2%
Total Expenses (Including Transfers for Interest)	(1,507,387,660)	(1,615,566,277)	(1,759,501,635)	(143,935,358)	8.9%
Budget Margin (Deficit)	\$ 68,522,125	(54,634,619)	(23,525,018)	31,109,601	
Reconciliation to Use of Prior Year Balances					
Depreciation		102,441,355	105,514,596		
Capital Outlay		(39,808,174)	(42,808,174)		
Transfers for Debt Service - Principal		(17,298,000)	(18,001,468)		
Budgeted Transfers		(17,241,573)	(35,899,745)		
Use of Prior Year Balances		(26,541,011)	(14,719,809)		

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 08 – FY 09**

X. Data Summary

<i>fall</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Undergraduate headcount	38,162	38,609	39,391	38,112	37,101	36,291	36,775
Graduate/professional headcount	11,834	12,007	12,870	13,314	13,276	12,942	12,922
Total enrollment	49,996	50,616	52,261	51,426	50,377	49,233	49,697
<i>yr of matriculation</i>	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
1st year persistence	89.9%	91.0%	90.5%	91.4%	92.7%	92.7%	92.1%
<i>yr of matriculation</i>	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
4-year graduation rate	35.6%	39.2%	36.5%	38.9%	41.3%	44.8%	46.4%
6-year graduation rate	69.9%	71.9%	70.1%	73.8%	74.8%		
<i>academic year</i>	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
Baccalaureate degrees granted	7,803	7,624	8,005	8,463	8,959	8,705	8,878
Master's degrees	2,540	2,567	2,644	2,650	2,835	2,884	2,834
Doctorate degrees	703	720	644	668	683	755	813
Professional degrees	526	577	586	596	588	688	624
<i>academic year</i>	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Faculty	2,801	2,875	2,949	2,901	2,968	3,096	3,164
Administrative		664	691	684	708	706	743
Other, Non-Faculty		9,647	9,642	9,235	9,549	9,619	9,874
Student employees		8,676	8,948	8,853	9,058	9,179	9,596
<i>fall</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FTE student / FTE faculty ratio	21 to 1	21 to 1	21 to 1	20 to 1	19 to 1	19 to 1	19 to 1
<i>fiscal year</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Federal research expenditures	\$185,190,446	\$202,440,085	\$235,436,101	\$240,537,689	\$249,014,154	\$269,612,823	\$294,832,202
<i>fiscal year</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Revenue / FTE student	\$12,000	\$13,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$13,000	\$13,000	\$14,000
(nearest thousand)							
<i>as of</i>	8/31/2000	8/31/2001	8/31/2002	8/31/2003	8/31/2004	8/31/2005	8/31/2006*
Endowment total value	\$1,611,050,000	\$1,463,114,000	\$1,350,816,000	\$1,640,724,000	\$2,038,938,000	\$2,346,903,000	\$6,268,407,000

* Beginning in FY 2006, endowments for UT Austin were increased to include 30 percent of the PUF market value and endowments for the UT System were decreased correspondingly to 37 percent of the PUF market value.