

UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

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 09 – FY 10:

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. 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.
3. 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.
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)	2001: 91.5% 2004: 92.7%	2005: 92.1%	94%	Persistence rates remain extremely high.
4-Year Graduation Rates – undergraduates graduating in four years or less from same institution (cohort)	1998: 38.9% 2001: 46.4%	2002: 47.7%	2010: 55%	Four year graduation rates continue to improve.
6-Year Graduation Rates – undergraduates graduating in six years or less from same institution (cohort)	1996: 71.9% 1999: 74.8%	2000: 76.4%	2010: 80%	Six year graduate rates continue to improve.
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 (2005-06 data are most recent available) New data not available until later in the year.

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
b. Comparative faculty salaries ranking among national comparison group of twelve universities	2003: Professors: 5 th Assoc. Profs: 11 th Asst. Profs: 6 th	2008: Professors: 5 th Assoc. Profs: 9 th Asst. Profs: 3 rd	Salaries for all three ranks competitive with the best public and private universities in the country	AAU Data Exchange – AAUP Salary Survey. Between 2003 and 2008 we have maintained our position with regard to compensation of Professors and experienced some relative improvement for Associate and Assistant Professors.
c. Comparative teaching assistant support among national comparison group	2002-2003 Residents: 5 th Nonresidents: 3 rd of 11 participating*	2007-2008 Residents: 6 th Nonresidents: 6 rd of 9 participating	Graduate student support competitive with the best universities in the country	AAU Data Exchange – Graduate Student Stipends Survey. (* not all comparison group schools provide these data every year.) Between 2002 and 2007 UT has lost ground in TA support relative to our national comparison group. From 05-06 to 07-08 UT dropped from 3 rd to 6 th for residents and from 3 rd to 6 th for nonresidents. However, this ranking does not take into consideration TA health benefits, which are generally superior to our peer institutions and help offset lower compensation.
d. Comparative research assistant support among national comparison group	2002-2003: Residents: 11 th Nonresidents: 11 th	2007-2008: Residents, 9 th Nonresidents, 9 th	Graduate student support competitive with the best universities in the country	AAU Data Exchange – Graduate Student Stipends Survey. (* not all comparison group schools provide these data every year.) UT has made some progress in graduate research assistant support during the past 5 years, but it is not reflected in higher relative ranking among peers. However, the majority of GRAs receive a tuition benefit, which is not included in reported compensation and which distorts UT's ranking. Most other schools include tuition in their reported compensation. UT also has more generous health benefits than most peer institutions. UT is working to develop a more accurate comparison.
e. Annual total of gifts	FY1998 \$138 million	FY2007 \$258 million	To be determined	All gifts including pledges and testamentary gifts. Year to date FY2008: \$217 million with three months remaining in the fiscal year.

UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

2. National stature

Rankings totals are comprehensive of all rankings programs identified by the Office of Information Management and Analysis. *U.S. News & World Report* 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 2008. Total for 2008 includes some programs ranked in previous years that have not been updated and thus remain current.

Indicator	Past	Current	Goal	Explanation
a. Number of programs in top 20	2002: 48 2007: 93	2008:91	More programs in the top 20, especially in core academic disciplines	US News and World Report
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	2008: 61 18 th among all national, 8 th among publics	Increase the number of University of Texas at Austin faculty in these and comparably prestigious organizations	The Center for Measuring University Performance (2006 data most recent available)

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 2008-09 and Fiscal Year 2009-10 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.

	FY2006	FY2007	
a. Federal	\$294,832,000	\$314,000,000	
b. Non-Federal	\$151,854,000	\$162,000,000	
c. Total research dollars	\$446,686,000	\$476,000,000	At an anticipated 5% growth rate, FY08-09 projected total is: \$499,000,000 At an anticipated 5% growth rate FY09-10 projected total: \$524,000,000

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	2002: White: 60.2% Amer In: 0.4% Afr Am: 3.2% Asian Am: 13.9% Hisp: 12.3% Foreign: 9.1%	2007: White: 55.1% Amer In: 0.4% Afr Am: 4.2% Asian Am: 15.0% Hisp: 15.6% Foreign: 9.1%	Achieve a diversity sufficient to realize the educational benefits that flow from a student body with diverse backgrounds and experiences
----------------------	---	---	---

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

	Unknown: 0.9%	Unknown: 0.7%		
b. Student gender	2002: Male: 50.2% Female: 49.8%	2007: Male: 49.0% Female: 51.0%	Achieve a diversity sufficient to realize the educational benefits that flow from a student body with diverse backgrounds and experiences	
c. Faculty ethnicity	2002: White: 84.4% Amer In: 0.3% Black: 3.2% Asian: 7.0% Hisp: 5.1%	2007: White: 81.6% Amer In: 0.4% Black: 3.7% Asian: 8.5% Hisp: 5.8%	Achieve a diversity sufficient for the faculty to provide an educational environment that reflects a diversity of backgrounds and experiences	UT Austin's faculty diversity initiative aggressively recruits and retains faculty who teach and research underrepresented subjects. Over the last year, the DDCE's Office of Thematic Initiatives and Community Engagement has helped recruit 12 new faculty members. 28% of tenured/tenure track faculty hires in 2007-08 were minorities.
d. Faculty gender	2002: Male – 66.1% Female – 33.9%	2007: Male – 63.7% Female – 36.3%	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	FY2007: 35	Goal: 30 per annum	225 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	2002: 20.79	2007: 19.23	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.

II. Update Strategic Initiatives from the 2008 Compact

a. Completed Initiatives

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Evaluation of initiative success
none				

b. Ongoing Initiatives

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
1. Reform the undergraduate curriculum	a. Status of implementing the new requirements in the degree programs of the colleges and schools	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	Make the necessary changes in all appropriate degree programs and implement the new university-wide requirements	Continue to make the necessary changes in all undergraduate degree programs. Continue to implement the first-year signature. Implement the

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
	<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>the curriculum. The freshman seminar program has been integrated into the first-year signature course format in fall 2008. The University Lecture Series was launched in 2007. Seven colleges will require the First Year Signature course in FY08-09.</p>	<p>(e.g., thematic strands and curricular flags) as recommended by the Faculty Council</p>	<p>second-year signature courses and the rest of the new requirements. Launch the Strategic Advising Center.</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 19.23 in 2007. 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>
3. Implement recommendations of the Commission of 125	<p>Progress on implementation of the Commission of 125 report</p>	<p>The Commission of 125 presented its recommendations in 2004. Its two strategic recommendations (curriculum reform and a higher standard for academic departmental leadership) are being pursued. A new School of Undergraduate Studies was established in 2008, with responsibility for much of the implementation of undergraduate curriculum reform. The First Year Signature Course program is now required in 7 colleges for their students entering in 2008. In 2006 and 2007 we made large commitments to strong leaders in the departments of History and English to recruit star faculty and outstanding graduate students, conduct symposia, and sponsor visiting scholars. In 2008 we recruited an internationally recognized scholar from UC Berkeley to lead our Department of Petroleum & Geosystems Engineering, which is ranked No. 1 in the nation according to U.S. News & World Report.</p>	<p>Implement Commission of 125 goals within 25 years (by 2029). See Commission Report (http://www.utexas.edu/com125/) for additional details.</p>	<p>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. Additional colleges will revise their degree requirements to implement curriculum reform. Many more First Year Seminars and First Year Signature Courses will be offered. The Strategic Advising Center will be established. Additional academic departments will be selected for enhancement through empowering outstanding leaders with the resources to build or maintain excellence.</p>

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
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	<p>In 2007-2008, the president and provost established the Policy and Planning Advisory Council (PPAC) to advise on major issues affecting the university's long-term goals, budget priorities, and strategic decisions. The council includes the campus's best expertise and executive talent in order to set and evaluate strategic goals, to help impose the fiscal discipline to fund them, and to hold those programs accountable for making progress.</p> <p>The PPAC identified common characteristics of leading peer institutions that could be used as benchmarks and targets for UT Austin. The Council then identified the areas, programs, and initiatives to which both recurring and one-time institutional resources should be devoted to increase the competitiveness and made recommendations to the president</p>	More effective use of available funds to meet strategic goals	The president is considering the recommendations in consultation with the University Budget Council, after which the accepted recommendations will be implemented.
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>	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>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>	The status of overall facility condition has not changed since the last update. The next assessment cycle has begun which will provide updated information next year. The institution continues to make progress on addressing code requirements. New building construction continues and one major renovation project has been completed. The age profile of campus buildings is still a major concern and will drive the need for increasing renovation. Significant progress has been made in the area of space management capability.

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
6. Increased prominence of arts and humanities programs.	Financial expenditures in the arts and humanities. Course enrollments. Increases in national rankings of academic programs in the arts and humanities.	<p>The large financial commitments to the Departments of History and English during the past two years are also a part of our emphasis on the humanities. Our music programs will take an enormous step forward as a result of a \$55 million gift from Sarah and Ernest Butler, the largest single gift ever made to a public school of music in the U.S.</p> <p>A strategic plan for a Humanities Center was created that will build on our existing strengths and foster cross-disciplinary collaboration and research. The Center will bridge the colleges of Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, and Communication, connect more than a dozen research entities and bring visiting scholars from other institutions to Austin to interact and collaborate with our faculty and students.</p>	<p>Increased prominence of arts and humanities programs.</p> <p>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>	Secure funding for the Humanities Center. Execute the strategic plan for enhancement of the music programs funded by the Butler gift. Continue strategic acquisitions for the humanities collections. Continue to make strategic hires in English, History, and other departments within the liberal and fine arts.
7. 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.	Effectiveness of resource distribution and rise in national rankings.	See analysis for Ongoing Initiative 4.	Rise in stature among universities in national comparison group	More strategic redistribution of resources will occur, and its impact will be evaluated.

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

	Impact (Metrics)	Analysis	Goal	Next Steps
8. Globalization. To rise in stature both nationally and internationally, the university must increase its presence and activity throughout the world.	<p>Number of students studying abroad.</p> <p>Number of faculty teaching University of Texas at Austin courses abroad.</p> <p>Number of faculty-led programs, exchange programs, and affiliated programs</p>	<p>2006-2007: Number of students studying abroad: 2,170</p> <p>Number of faculty teaching University of Texas at Austin courses abroad: 110</p> <p>Number of faculty-led programs, exchange programs, and affiliated programs: 644</p> <p>2007-2008 Number of students studying abroad: n/a</p> <p>Number of faculty teaching University of Texas at Austin courses abroad: 88</p> <p>Number of faculty-led programs, exchange programs, and affiliated programs: 656</p> <p>Hired new director for Study Abroad Office in 2008.</p> <p>The Vice Provost for International Programs has traveled widely to forge new international partnerships.</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. Increase the number of faculty teaching abroad.</p>	<p>Consolidate exchange and affiliate agreements in consultation with Provost's cross college Council on International Study.</p> <p>Begin survey of faculty international research and interests.</p> <p>Work with colleges to develop strategic partnerships with institutions in Mexico, Costa Rica, and Korea.</p>

III. New Strategic Initiatives

Initiative, Rationale, & Strategy	Expected Impact (Metrics)	Goal	Specific Steps in 08-09, 09-10
none			

UT Austin Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

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. The task force was reconvened in 2008 to evaluate the status of its recommendations, analyze the current situation, and consider additional recommendations. Its report will be submitted by the year's end.

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, 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 2008, we received 29,000 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 selective 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; rising from 46 % in 1996 to 71% for fall 2006 and 81% for the fall 2008 class. 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 quickly rise to 100%, thereby squeezing out almost all prospective freshmen not in the top 10% of their high school graduating 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 (50,170 for fall 2007) 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 Policy and Planning Advisory Council (PPAC) advises the President and the University Budget Council by helping to 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 has focused on two strategic priorities needed to close the gaps between our university and those institutions recognized as the national leaders among public research universities: retention and recruitment of outstanding faculty and retention and recruitment of the best graduate students. In this regard, the University has dedicated substantial non-recurring monies to invest towards achieving these goals. The committee has made recommendations to the President regarding how to best allocate these resources.

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 09 – FY 10

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:

- Information Resources Use and Security Policy (<http://www.utexas.edu/vp/it/policies/uts165/index.php>)
- Acceptable Use Policy (<http://www.utexas.edu/vp/it/policies/aup/index.php>)
- 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>)
- Minimum Security Standards for Merchant Payment Card Processing (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/opsmanual/pcistd.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>)
- Secure Web Application Coding Guidelines (<https://security.utexas.edu/admin/checklists>)
- Security Checklist for Hosted IT Services (https://security.utexas.edu/risk/hosted_checklist.html)
- Disaster Recovery Planning Instructions and Templates (<http://security.utexas.edu/risk/planning/>)

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
- Offering Information Security Training and Certification program to some 350 campus IT support staff.
- Supporting and promoting the SeNF (Sensitive Number Finder) tool, which is designed to identify sensitive numbers, e.g., Social Security Numbers or Credit Card 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 includes providing specific in-house risk assessment training to more than 350 campus IT support staff and trend analysis from year-to-year to track progress
- Offering 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.
- Offering a regularly available hard drive destruction service to campus faculty and staff (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/hdddestruct>)
- Developing a Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Planning Tool to all campus units [Restarting Texas]
- Offering a 'Self-Serve' Distributed Vulnerability Scanning Service to all campus IT support staff
- Offering a Laptop Whole Disk Encryption Service to faculty and staff (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/encrypt>)
- Offering an Enterprise Digital Certificates Service to faculty and staff (<http://www.utexas.edu/its/user-certs>)
- Offering an Enterprise File/Folder Encryption Service to faculty and staff to faculty and staff

**UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10**

V. System Contributions and Investments

a. Summary of investments:

	FY 05 and FY 06 cumulative awards	Impact (FY 05 and FY 06 cumulative)	FY 07 awards
Noncompetitive STARS Awards:	\$4,550,500	Noncompetitive awards recruit junior faculty. The outcomes measures for these investments will take some time to develop.	\$10,841,780
Institutional Match:	\$6,960,623		\$8,988,191
Competitive STARS Awards:	\$11,270,000	Sponsored external funding:..... \$143,451,904 Net return on investment: \$123,651,628 Patents issued:25 Patents pending:55 Scientific publications:.....590 National awards:.....18 Collaborations:161 National academy appointments:1 Sponsored graduate students:.....230 Sponsored post-docs:.....91	\$4,175,000
Institutional Match:	\$8,530,276		

VI. New Faculty Positions Projected to 2011

FIELD	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	Total FY 06 – FY 11
STEM	13	12	11	12	10	11	60
Health Professions	3	1	2	1	2	1	9
Arts & Humanities	8	10	12	11	12	13	66
Professional Schools	6	11	5	6	6	5	37
TOTAL	30	35	30	30	30	30	185

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 09 – FY 10

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

The elements of the UT Austin strategic plan reflect 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-division course teaching supports an excellent education of students
- Student-to-faculty ratio: lower student-to-faculty ratios support educational excellence

UT Austin Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

- 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. Gloyna. 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 (Vice Presidents Council, Deans Council, Faculty Council Executive Committee, President's Student Advisory Council, University Budget Council, Policy Planning and Advisory Council, and the Facilities and Space Council).

UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

IX. Budget

The University of Texas at Austin
Operating Budget, Fiscal Year Ending August 31, 2008

	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Adjusted Budget	FY 2008 Operating Budget	Budget Increases (Decreases) From 2007 to 2008	
				Amount	Percent
Operating Revenues:					
Tuition and Fees	\$ 336,021,623	354,219,453	368,400,000	14,180,547	4.0%
Federal Sponsored Programs	328,722,170	320,993,230	339,805,674	18,812,444	5.9%
State Sponsored Programs	46,624,998	47,145,966	47,222,063	76,097	0.2%
Local and Private Sponsored Programs	63,130,875	73,544,462	72,317,672	(1,226,790)	-1.7%
Net Sales and Services of Educational Activities	129,625,145	144,253,243	143,997,612	(255,631)	-0.2%
Net Sales and Services of Hospital and Clinics	-	-	-	-	-
Net Professional Fees	-	-	-	-	-
Net Auxiliary Enterprises	142,861,553	161,808,661	174,047,531	12,238,870	7.6%
Other Operating Revenues	3,452,730	1,437,964	1,430,654	(7,310)	-0.5%
Total Operating Revenues	1,050,439,094	1,103,402,979	1,147,221,206	43,818,227	4.0%
Operating Expenses:					
Instruction	485,374,351	518,829,643	541,902,469	23,072,826	4.4%
Academic Support	107,487,941	136,827,057	136,741,991	(85,066)	-0.1%
Research	344,991,191	391,020,923	393,633,445	2,612,522	0.7%
Public Service	47,469,078	57,660,730	65,578,979	7,918,249	13.7%
Hospitals and Clinics	-	-	-	-	-
Institutional Support	89,336,136	92,896,604	97,104,600	4,207,996	4.5%
Student Services	43,716,450	45,704,041	49,794,930	4,090,889	9.0%
Operations and Maintenance of Plant	137,496,901	130,896,174	136,799,568	5,903,394	4.5%
Scholarships and Fellowships	75,635,212	72,435,590	92,624,419	20,188,829	27.9%
Auxiliary Enterprises	167,226,675	185,001,875	201,757,524	16,755,649	9.1%
Depreciation and Amortization	108,937,676	105,514,596	108,680,034	3,165,438	3.0%
Total Operating Expenses	1,607,671,611	1,736,787,233	1,824,617,959	87,830,726	5.1%
Operating Surplus/Deficit	(557,232,517)	(633,384,254)	(677,396,753)	(44,012,499)	6.9%
Budgeted Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses):					
State Appropriations & HEAF	300,676,150	301,602,920	322,408,844	20,805,924	6.9%
Gifts in Support of Operations	88,037,573	84,145,146	78,264,886	(5,880,260)	-7.0%
Net Investment Income	137,554,645	119,265,572	127,146,940	7,881,368	6.6%
Other Non-Operating Revenue	34,236	-	-	-	-
Other Non-Operating (Expenses)	(29,737)	-	-	-	-
Net Non-Operating Revenue/(Expenses)	526,272,867	505,013,638	527,820,670	22,807,032	4.5%
Transfers and Other:					
AUF Transfers Received	112,480,000	127,560,000	143,600,000	16,040,000	12.6%
AUF Transfers (Made)	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers for Debt Service - Interest	(24,552,819)	(22,714,402)	(27,119,414)	(4,405,012)	19.4%
Total Transfers and Other	87,927,181	104,845,598	116,480,586	11,634,988	11.1%
Budget Margin	56,967,531	(23,525,018)	(33,095,497)	(9,570,479)	40.7%
Reconciliation to Change in Net Asset:					
Net Non-Profit Health Corp Activity	-	-	-	-	-
Net Inc./(Dec.) in Fair Value of Investments	154,971,544	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense on Capital Asset Financings	(1,548,832)	(1,882,076)	(1,548,832)	333,244	-17.7%
Capital Approp., Gifts and Sponsored Programs	35,450,903	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	0.0%
Additions to Permanent Endowments	43,800,932	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	0.0%
Transfers for Debt Service - Principal	(19,057,036)	(18,001,468)	(28,983,379)	(10,981,911)	61.0%
Reverse Transfers for Debt Service (System Only)	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers and Other	198,908,969	107,300,000	222,810,500	115,510,500	107.7%
SRECNA Change in Net Assets	\$ 469,494,011	123,891,438	219,182,792	95,291,354	76.9%
Total Revenues and AUF Transfers	\$ 1,689,221,698	1,735,976,617	1,818,641,876	82,665,259	4.8%
Total Expenses (Including Transfers for Interest)	(1,632,254,167)	(1,759,501,635)	(1,851,737,373)	(92,235,738)	5.2%
Budget Margin	\$ 56,967,531	(23,525,018)	(33,095,497)	(9,570,479)	
Reconciliation to Use of Prior Year Balances					
Depreciation		105,514,596	108,680,034		
Capital Outlay		(42,808,174)	(44,092,421)		
Transfers for Debt Service - Principal		(18,001,468)	(28,983,379)		
Budgeted Transfers		(35,899,745)	(30,380,328)		
Use of Prior Year Balances		(14,719,809)	(27,871,591)		

UT Austin
Compact for FY 09 – FY 10

X. Data Summary

<i>fall</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Undergraduate	38,162	38,609	39,391	38,112	37,101	36,291	36,775	37,459
Graduate/professional	11,834	12,007	12,870	13,314	13,276	12,942	12,922	12,711
Total enrollment	49,996	50,616	52,261	51,426	50,377	49,233	49,697	50,170
<i>yr of matriculation</i>	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1st year persistence	89.9%	91.0%	90.5%	91.4%	92.7%	92.7%	92.7%	92.1%
<i>yr of matriculation</i>	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
4-year graduation rate	35.6%	39.2%	36.5%	38.9%	41.3%	44.8%	46.4%	47.7%
6-year graduation rate	69.9%	71.9%	70.1%	73.8%	74.8%	76.4%		
<i>academic year</i>	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Baccalaureate degrees	7,803	7,624	8,005	8,463	8,959	8,705	8,878	8,473
Master's degrees	2,540	2,567	2,644	2,650	2,835	2,884	2,834	2,886
Doctorate degrees	703	720	644	668	683	755	813	788
Professional degrees	526	577	586	596	588	688	624	546
<i>fall</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Faculty	2,801	2,875	2,949	2,901	2,968	3,096	3,164	3,130
Administrative		664	691	684	708	706	743	794
Other, Non-Faculty		9,647	9,642	8,771	9,035	9,192	9,441	9,590
Student employees		8,676	8,948	9,315	9,568	9,602	10,025	10,258
<i>fall</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
FTE student / FTE	21 to 1	21 to 1	21 to 1	20 to 1	19 to 1	19 to 1	19 to 1	18 to 1
<i>fiscal year</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Federal research exp	\$185,190,446	\$202,440,085	\$235,436,101	\$240,537,689	\$249,014,154	\$269,612,823	\$294,832,202	\$314,130,646
<i>fiscal year</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Revenue / FTE student	\$12,000	\$13,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$13,000	\$13,000	\$14,000	\$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*	8/31/2007
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	\$7,190,136,000

* 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.