THE UNIVERSITY *of* TEXAS SYSTEM
FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS. UNLIMITED POSSIBILITIES.

System Audit Office
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
512-499-4390 | Fax: 512-499-4426
WWW.UTSYSTEM.EDU

August 1, 2018

David E. Daniel, Ph.D.
Deputy Chancellor
The University of Texas System Administration
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Dr. Daniel:

The University of Texas (UT) System Audit Office has completed our audit of UT System initiatives funded by Available University Funds (AUF). The detailed report is attached for your review.

We conducted our audit in accordance with The Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.*

We will follow up on recommendations made in this report to determine their implementation status. Any requests for extension to the implementation dates require approval from the System Administration Internal Audit Committee. This process will help enhance accountability and ensure that audit recommendations are implemented in a timely manner.

We appreciate the support and assistance provided by your office and the UT System and institutional project owners of the initiatives selected for this audit.

Sincerely,

J. Michael Peppers, CPA, CIA, QIAL, CRMA
Chief Audit Executive

cc: Francie Frederick, General Counsel to the Board of Regents
        Barry McBee, Vice Chancellor and Chief Governmental Relations Officer
        David Lein, Senior Associate General Counsel and Managing Attorney
        Alan Werchan, Assistant Budget Officer
        Karen Rabon, Senior Associate General Counsel to the Board
        Emily Deardorff, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations

The University of Texas at Arlington · The University of Texas at Austin · The University of Texas at Dallas · The University of Texas at El Paso

The University of Texas of the Permian Basin · The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley · The University of Texas at San Antonio

The University of Texas at Tyler · The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center · The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston · The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center · The University of Texas Health Science Center at Tyler

The University of Texas System Administration
An Audit of AUF-Funded UT System Initiatives
FY 2018

August 2018

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM AUDIT OFFICE
210 WEST SEVENTH STREET
AUSTIN, TX 78701
(512) 499-4390

Audit Report
August 2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Article 7, Section 18(f) of the Texas Constitution requires that proceeds from the Available University Fund (AUF) be appropriated for the payment of principal and interest due on Permanent University Fund (PUF) bonds and for the support and maintenance of The University of Texas (UT) at Austin and UT System Administration. UT System describes "support and maintenance" as activities associated with furtherance of the responsibility of UT System, specifically, activities that provide oversight and coordination or technical assistance to UT System institutions. Generally, such activities should provide a Systemwide benefit and include both general operations of UT System and UT System initiatives. From September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2017, there were 40 active UT System initiatives for which the Board of Regents (BOR) approved the allocation of almost $450 million in AUF.

The objective of this audit was to determine whether there is adequate monitoring of UT System initiatives funded by AUF. This objective includes review of the monitoring process from eligibility determination and planning through completion. To achieve our objectives, we surveyed UT System and institutional project owners responsible for 19 UT System initiatives that were active during Fiscal Years 2015-2017. We also reviewed the following seven initiatives managed by a variety of UT System offices and UT Austin:

1. Transformation in Medical Education (TIME)
2. Information Security Assurance Initiative (ISAI)
3. Clinical Trials Network
4. Entrepreneurship Network
5. Research Experts Data Warehouse
6. Virtual Health Network
7. National Security Network

From the procedures we performed, we identified opportunities to strengthen processes for planning, monitoring, and evaluating initiatives to improve the likelihood that desired outcomes will be achieved. This includes securing buy-in from appropriate stakeholders, sustaining commitment from UT System amid changes in leadership, developing comprehensive business plans, and establishing a consistent, disciplined approach to monitoring and evaluating outcomes. We also identified opportunities to enhance reporting to the BOR on the progress of UT System initiatives and to standardize documentation of the process by which UT System determines eligibility of proposed uses of AUF in accordance with state constitutional requirements.

We appreciate the support and assistance provided by UT System and institutional project owners of the initiatives selected for this audit.

_____
J. Michael Peppers, CPA, CIA, QIAL, CRMA
Chief Audit Executive

_____
Eric J. Polonski, CPA, CIA
Director of Audits

BACKGROUND

Article 7, Section 18(f) of the Texas Constitution requires that proceeds from the Available University Fund (AUF) be appropriated for the payment of principal and interest due on Permanent University Fund (PUF) bonds and for the support and maintenance of The University of Texas (UT) at Austin and UT System Administration. UT System describes "support and maintenance" as activities associated with furtherance of the responsibility of UT System; specifically, activities that provide oversight and coordination or technical assistance to UT System institutions. This includes UT System initiatives approved by the UT System Board of Regents (BOR). To be eligible for AUF support, UT System initiatives should either provide a service for several campuses or provide oversight and coordination of activities that benefit a broad number of campuses and their students.

The *General Appropriations Act* requires UT System to report its uses of AUF to the Legislative Budget Board. In 2014, UT System developed a "finding of fact" process to determine whether proposed UT System initiatives are eligible to be supported with AUF in accordance with the Texas Constitution. Leadership from the Offices of the Board of Regents (Board Office), Controller, General Counsel (OGC), and Governmental Relations (OGR) participate in the finding of fact process. Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2016, Rider 8 of the General Appropriations Act[1] required that UT System provide written notification to the Legislative Budget Board at least 30 days prior to the BOR approving the allocation of AUF for UT System initiatives. Accordingly, UT System updated its existing finding of fact process in January 2016 to incorporate the notification requirement.

During the period from September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2017, there were 40 active UT System initiatives to which the BOR approved allocations of almost $450 million in AUF.

AUDIT OBJECTIVE

The audit objective was to determine whether there is adequate monitoring of UT System initiatives funded by AUF. This objective includes review of the monitoring process from eligibility determination and planning through completion.

SCOPE & METHODOLOGY

The audit scope included FY 2015 through 2017. While there were 40 UT System initiatives with activity during this period, we limited our audit procedures to 19 initiatives. We excluded initiatives that had limited activity during the audit scope, specifically, those that closed in early FY 2015 and those that were approved in late FY 2017. We also excluded the Institute for Transformational Learning (ITL) and the Diabetes and Obesity Control (ProjectDOC) initiatives because both have been sufficiently reviewed in prior engagements. Approximately $75 million and $25 million in AUF had been spent on ITL and ProjectDOC, respectively.

To achieve our objective, we reviewed applicable criteria related to use of AUF and distributed a survey to project owners of 19 AUF-funded initiatives. Additionally, we judgmentally selected a sample of seven initiatives for which we conducted interviews with project owners to gain an understanding of each initiative's history and related processes; reviewed supporting documentation of planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities; and solicited feedback from relevant stakeholders. However, we did not perform substantive testing of AUF expenditures.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

---

[1] House Bill 1, from the 84th Regular Legislative Session at Page III-63

CRITERIA
- Texas Constitution, Article 7, Section 18(f)
- *Texas Education Code*, Chapter 65, Subchapter A, Section 65.16
- *General Appropriations Act* for the 2016-2017 Biennium, Article III, Riders 3, 5, 7 and 8
- Board of Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 80303: Use of the Available University Fund
- The University of Texas System Available University Fund Usage and Expenditure Eligibility (Internal Document)

AUDIT RESULTS

We surveyed UT System and institutional project owners responsible for 19 UT System initiatives that were active during FY 2015-2017. A complete listing of the initiatives surveyed is presented in *Appendix A*. With respect to the 19 surveys collected, we relied on information provided by project owners. The survey responses provided indicated that project owners often engaged in similar planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities. From the surveys, we learned the following:

- Most initiatives were initially developed based on interest from multiple sources, specifically, five reported being heavily endorsed by a Regent, 16 cited UT System leadership as the primary driver, and seven indicated that UT institutions participated in development of the initiative. Project owners for seven initiatives established oversight committees with institutional representation to help sustain institutional support.
- Common planning activities included developing budgets, executing agreements with vendors and participating UT institutions, and defining performance measures and deliverables.
- Of the 19 initiatives surveyed, 12 were or are managed by a UT System office, five are jointly managed by UT System and a UT institution, and two are managed solely by a UT institution.
- Common monitoring activities included holding periodic meetings, conducting on-site visits, preparing progress reports, tracking performance metrics, and collecting feedback from stakeholders.
- Five of the 19 initiatives are no longer active. Project owners performed a final evaluation of the outcomes achieved for two of those five.

To ensure that we met our audit objective, we judgmentally selected a sample of seven initiatives for further review and inquiry. The seven selected initiatives are listed below.

1. Transformation in Medical Education (TIME)
2. Information Security Assurance Initiative (ISAI)
3. Clinical Trials Network
4. Entrepreneurship Network
5. Research Experts Data Warehouse
6. Virtual Health Network
7. National Security Network

Four of the seven initiatives are active and have made progress toward achieving stated objectives, one of which has been incorporated into UT System operations. Another is active but is no longer directly supported with AUF. The remaining two initiatives were determined to not be critical by UT System leadership and were closed in 2016. Unspent and unencumbered AUF balances from these and other non-critical initiatives were reallocated, with BOR approval, to support the Quantum Leap initiatives in November 2016.

From the procedures we performed, we identified opportunities to strengthen processes for planning, monitoring, and evaluating initiatives to improve the likelihood that desired outcomes will be achieved. This includes securing buy-in from appropriate stakeholders, sustaining commitment from UT System amid changes in leadership, developing comprehensive business plans, and establishing a consistent, disciplined approach to monitoring and evaluating outcomes. We also identified opportunities to enhance reporting to the BOR on the

progress of UT System initiatives and to standardize documentation of the process by which UT System determines eligibility of proposed uses of AUF in accordance with state constitutional requirements.

Development and Planning

UT System initiatives may be developed by the BOR, UT System leadership, institutional representatives, or some combination of the above. Our survey responses indicated that most initiatives had a combination of drivers. Of the 19 initiatives surveyed, five reported being heavily endorsed by a member of the BOR, 16 cited UT System leadership as the primary driver, and seven indicated that UT institutions participated in development of the initiative. Additionally, project owners for seven of the initiatives surveyed established oversight committees with institutional representation to help sustain institutional support.

Requests for AUF to support a UT System initiative are reviewed by UT System leadership and then submitted to the Board Office for inclusion in a BOR meeting agenda. In many cases, agenda materials presented to the BOR include information about the proposed initiative such as background information and project objectives. While *Regents' Rule 80303: Use of the Available University Fund* provides justification criteria[2] for the preparation of recommendations for proposed initiatives, there is currently no UT System requirement for project owners to prepare any specific planning documents, and depending on the initiative's objectives, there are instances in which detailed planning activities may not be applicable. Survey responses indicated that project owners often engaged in similar planning activities. Specifically, for the 19 initiatives surveyed, project owners reported the following:

> - 15 developed a project budget,
> - 16 executed agreements with vendors and participating UT institutions,
> - 12 defined performance measures,
> - 14 defined deliverables, and
> - Seven developed a sustainability plan.

Our review of the seven selected initiatives revealed that the more recently approved initiatives demonstrated comprehensive planning efforts. We also identified an example in which project ownership changed during an initiative and course corrections were made to improve the likelihood of success. For some initiatives, planning activities occurred after AUF proceeds were allocated to the initiative. For example, project owners for one initiative stated that the initial AUF allocation was not based on actual cost estimates. Instead, budgets were subsequently prepared based on the approved allocation amounts. Based on the survey responses, this practice may have been more common for older initiatives. Of the 19 initiatives surveyed, 11 were approved by the BOR prior to FY 2015. In 2015, UT System leadership outlined a comprehensive planning process that could be used to accomplish an initiative's goals. This process was referred to as the agile decision process and is summarized in the following table. Application of the agile decision process or a similar framework to all UT System initiatives could help improve the likelihood that desired outcomes will be achieved.

---

[2] Regents' Rule 80303: Use of Available University Fund, Sec. 3 Individual Projects, Paragraph 3.2 "In preparing recommendations for projects to be approved, the staff will be guided by the following justification criteria: (a) consistency with institution's mission; (b) project need; (c) unique opportunity; (d) matching funds/leverage; (e) cost effectiveness; (f) state of existing facility condition; and (g) other available funding sources."

> ## The Agile Decision Process[3]
> - Begins with identification of the initiative and establishment of an integrated planning team composed of individuals from UT System and the institutions.
> - The planning team develops a preliminary action plan which is then presented to a steering committee composed of the UT System Deputy Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellors, institutional provosts, and other institutional representatives.
> - The steering committee reviews and provides recommendations to refine the action plan. The plan should include a well-defined scope, schedule, and budget.
> - A final action plan is presented to the Chancellor's Roundtable, which includes the UT System Chancellor and institutional presidents.
> - If approved by the Chancellor's Roundtable, the initiative may be presented to the BOR for funding approval, as required.

Additionally, UT System and institutional project owners consistently identified stakeholder buy-in as a contributing factor to an initiative's outcome, in particular, buy-in from institutional stakeholders at appropriate levels of leadership. Project owners also emphasized that sustaining commitment from UT System amid changes in leadership (both at the executive level and at the BOR level) has a significant impact on an initiative's outcome. For example, two initiatives in our sample were deemed non-critical by UT System leadership and closed in 2016 when AUF funding was reallocated to the Quantum Leap initiatives. In both cases, project owners informed us that they were not provided sufficient time and opportunity to achieve their initiative's stated objectives at the time the funding was reallocated. Prior to reallocation, approximately $11 million in AUF had already been spent on these two closed initiatives and outcomes as envisioned were not achieved. UT System and institutional project owners indicated that UT System initiatives can be driven by the BOR or UT System leadership without sufficient support from the institutions, which can result in closure of initiatives when changes in leadership occur.

The observation described above is considered a **high-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

> **Recommendation:** Prior to requesting BOR approval for AUF funding, UT System leadership should formally adopt a consistent, collaborative approach to be used when planning UT System initiatives. This approach should include representatives from UT System and UT institutions at appropriate levels of leadership to ensure the appropriate level of buy-in for proposed initiatives, address key risks that may impair achievement of objectives, and incorporate development of a comprehensive business plan that addresses budget, deliverables, performance measures, and sustainability, as applicable. Formal adoption of the approach should be documented in a UT System policy or operating procedure to help ensure that sufficient planning steps are taken for each initiative. UT System leadership should also carefully evaluate the merit of proposed initiatives to encourage sustained commitment over time and to increase the likelihood that objectives can be achieved.

> **Management's Response:** *Initiatives vary widely in scope, budget, duration, and complexity. However, each initiative should have appropriate levels of planning, engagement of institutions, budget controls, leadership responsibility, leadership accountability, and reporting requirements. UT System Administration will develop guidelines for ensuring that future projects embrace these essential elements. A template will be developed to facilitate identification of key elements, and a plan will be developed for implementation.*

---

[3] Leading in Complex World, Chancellor William H. McRaven's Vision and Quantum Leaps for The University of Texas System, presented to the Board of Regents, November 2015

Anticipated Implementation Date: *Guidelines developed and in place for implementation no later than the February 2019 Board meeting cycle.*

Monitoring

Of the 19 initiatives surveyed, 12 were or are managed by a variety of UT System offices, including the Offices of Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, Information Security (ISO), Innovation and Strategic Investment (OISI), and Strategic Initiatives (OSI). Five initiatives are jointly managed by UT System and a UT institution and two are managed solely by a UT institution. While each initiative is unique, our survey responses indicated that project owners often performed similar monitoring activities. Specifically, project owners reported the following:

- Seven established an oversight/steering committee with institutional representation,
- 15 held periodic meetings with stakeholders,
- Six conducted on-site visits at participating UT institutions,
- 13 prepared periodic progress reports,
- 11 tracked performance metrics, and
- Four collected feedback from stakeholders, usually in the form of a survey.

UT System and institutional project owners for the seven selected initiatives demonstrated varied monitoring techniques, which included the following:

- Project owners for two initiatives used formal, prescribed processes. In other cases, project owners relied on less formal monitoring techniques such as e-mail, on-site visits, monthly conference calls, and annual conferences.
- Project owners for two of the seven selected initiatives tracked quantitative metrics.
- Project owners often collected stakeholder feedback during the course of an initiative, formally or informally. For example, project owners for two initiatives distributed participant satisfaction surveys to representatives from participating institutions.
- In most cases, project owners provided periodic, usually annual, progress reports to the BOR.
- In all cases, expenditures incurred for each initiative (which often included payments to vendors and participating UT institutions) were reviewed, processed, and reconciled by project owners in accordance with standard UT System accounting practices.
- Three of the seven initiatives selected for review were Quantum Leap initiatives. Project owners for all three coordinate with the UT System Project Management Office (PMO) to track project budgets, performance metrics, and milestones.

During interviews with project owners, we were informed that, historically, monitoring of UT System initiatives has not been centralized or largely data-driven. In 2015, UT System leadership implemented processes to improve monitoring and strengthen accountability. Specifically, the PMO centrally monitors all Quantum Leap initiatives (regardless of funding source) with project management software and provides periodic progress updates to executive leadership. However, we were informed that the frequency of these updates has declined over time and personnel from the PMO reported having encountered challenges when assisting the UT System offices with use of the project management software. UT System and institutional project owners interviewed expressed frustration that project management tools utilized by the PMO may not be suitable for all initiatives. Centralized monitoring and oversight of all UT System initiatives could help increase the likelihood that desired objectives will be achieved, strengthen oversight, and instill a culture of accountability regarding the use of AUF and other funding sources. Additionally, centralized monitoring could facilitate timely identification of issues and assist in future funding decisions.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation: UT System leadership should leverage existing efforts to encourage centralized monitoring and oversight of UT System initiatives which can have disparate objectives and are managed in a decentralized manner. This may include using centralized project management tools and providing relevant training to project owners. UT System leadership should also determine whether a single executive or team of executives should be charged with oversight of UT System initiatives and receive regular, consistent reports on each initiative's progress.

Management's Response: *These recommendations will be considered and included as appropriate in the guidelines (mentioned above) to be developed.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: *Guidelines developed and in place for implementation no later than the February 2019 Board meeting cycle.*

Reporting on AUF Initiatives

As required by Riders 5 and 7 of the *General Appropriations Act*, UT System Administration and UT Austin must report to the Legislative Budget Board on AUF-funded initiatives on a quarterly and annual basis. These reports present a description of each initiative's objectives and a high-level summary of financial activity. The reports do not include information concerning each initiative's progress toward accomplishment of stated objectives.

Project owners may also provide periodic updates to members of the BOR on AUF-funded initiatives; however, the content of those updates can vary widely. Additionally, there is no comprehensive report provided to the BOR presenting the total number of active projects, current amounts spent, status of progress toward achieving objectives, or the final outcomes of closed initiatives. As previously mentioned, in November 2016, UT System leadership recommended budget reductions for 16 projects with unspent balances totaling $59.5 million from multiple funding sources, including $28.5 million in AUF. These projects were deemed non-critical, and $13.8 million of AUF was reallocated to support the Quantum Leap initiatives. However, the BOR materials did not provide further project information for the non-critical projects such as the project titles, the amounts spent, whether desired outcomes were achieved, or whether the reduction in budgets would result in project closure. Providing a comprehensive annual report addressing financial status and progress toward achievement of objectives on all active and recently closed UT System initiatives could assist the BOR in providing oversight of UT System initiatives.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation: UT System leadership should develop a comprehensive status report of UT System initiatives to be provided to the BOR. This report should include the financial status and progress toward achievement of desired objectives of UT System initiatives funded with AUF and other UT System sources of funds. This report could be provided to the BOR in coordination with the annual budget process and could assist in decision-making with respect to allocation of resources.

Management's Response: *Status report to BOR to be developed on a recurring basis in alignment with annual budget process. A one-time status report in late 2018 is planned to assist the new Chancellor in understanding status of various projects.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: *No later than December 2018 for initial report, and August of each year beginning in 2019 on a recurring basis.*

Post-Initiative Evaluation

Of the 19 initiatives surveyed, five were closed and 14 were active. We observed that project owners performed a final evaluation of the outcomes achieved for only two of the five closed initiatives. Project owners of the TIME initiative hired an external consultant with expertise in medical education to prepare three progress reports, including a final report written in November 2015. The final report outlined the initiative's accomplishments and challenges. Similarly, during the final months of the Research Experts Data Warehouse initiative, project owners summarized open issues, documented a final project timeline, and collected feedback from the institutions to determine whether they would continue to use the systemwide research database (Influuent) developed through the initiative. A final evaluation of outcomes provides accountability and compels project owners to formally document lessons learned that could potentially be applied in the development of future UT System initiatives.

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

> **Recommendation:** UT System leadership should develop a consistent approach which project owners should utilize to evaluate closed initiatives. This approach should be designed to capture best practices and lessons learned that could be applied to the development of future initiatives.

> **Management's Response:** *Recommended approach will be included in guidelines document to be developed.*

> **Anticipated Implementation Date:** *Guidelines developed and in place for implementation no later than the February 2019 Board meeting cycle.*

Finding of Fact for AUF Eligibility

While the Texas Constitution allows AUF proceeds to be spent in support of UT System Administration operations, not all UT System Administration expenses are AUF-eligible. That UT System may pursue a particular initiative does not mean that the expenses incurred for it may be legally funded with AUF. To be eligible, expenses incurred must be reasonably classified within one of the general or specific responsibilities of UT System. Historically, UT System has reviewed proposed initiatives to ensure AUF eligibility using a process referred to as a finding of fact. This process was formalized in 2014.

> *"The BOR should make a finding of fact that describes how the expenditure constitutes support and maintenance of system administration, most commonly in the furtherance of the responsibility of UT System Administration to provide oversight and coordination of activities or in the provision of technical assistance to System institutions."[4]*

As part of this process, leadership from the Board Office, Controller's Office, OGC, and OGR reviewed proposed initiatives to determine whether expenses to be incurred for those initiatives were AUF eligible. To provide guidance for the finding of fact process, the Controller's Office, in coordination with OGC and OGR, developed an internal document titled "The University of Texas System Available University Fund Usage and Expenditure Eligibility." This internal document was updated in January 2016 to provide additional guidance to ensure compliance with Rider 8 of the *General Appropriations Act*. Rider 8 requires that UT System provide written notification to the Legislative Budget Board at least 30 days prior to the BOR approving the allocation of AUF to UT System initiatives. After the finding of fact has been completed by leadership, UT System sends a notification letter to the Legislative Budget Board. Finally, the BOR's finding of fact is documented in the meeting minutes along with the BOR approval for the allocation of AUF toward the approved initiative.

---

[4] "The University of Texas System Available University Fund Usage and Expenditure Eligibility" Internal Document, January 2016

Currently, the finding of fact process is not addressed in any operating procedure and the January 2016 internal document contains no guidance as to how a finding of fact should be documented. We reviewed examples of finding of fact determinations made by UT System leadership and found that they have been primarily documented through e-mails. In one instance, the relevant e-mail correspondence exceeded 30 pages. Given the volume of documentation provided to the audit team to demonstrate leadership's eligibility determinations, there is opportunity to clearly and succinctly document findings of fact in a standardized form.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

> **Recommendation:** Leadership from the Offices of the Board of Regents, Controller, General Counsel, and Governmental Relations should coordinate to develop a standard, finding of fact document that clearly supports management's eligibility determination prior to BOR approval for the allocation of AUF. Management should also consider formalizing its January 2016 internal guidance document as a UT System policy or operating procedure and, within that, include guidance for completing the standard finding of fact document.

> **Management's Response:** *Standard documentation for procedures for the review of eligibility for allocation of AUF will be drafted and in place for implementation for reviews in time for preparation for any items submitted for Board review at the February 2019 Board meeting.*

> **Anticipated Implementation Date:** *No later than February 2019.*

APPENDIX A – Listing of Initiatives Surveyed

Initiative	Fiscal Year Funded	AUF Approved	AUF Spent (as of 1/31/2018)	Current Status
Clinical Data Network (aka UT Health Intelligence Platform)	FY16[5]	$ 12,400,000.00	$ 815,641.08	Active
Clinical Trials Network (aka Clinical Trials Xpress)	FY14[5,6]	$ 3,585,000.00	$ 3,530,638.69	Active
CONACYT	FY16	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 1,252,212.38	Active
Cultivating Learning and Safe Environments (CLASE)	FY15 and FY18	$ 3,007,696.00	$ 1,265,294.65	Active
Engineering Initiative	FY14	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 1,976,651.72	Closed
Entrepreneurship Academy (aka Entrepreneurship Network or Texas Venture Connect)	FY14[6]	$ 2,700,000.00	$ 1,467,286.54	Active
Horizon Fund	FY13 and FY15	$ 30,000,000.00	$ 18,311,978.71	Active
Information Security (ISAI)	FY12 and FY14	$ 35,922,000.00	$ 28,913,107.88	Active
National Security Network (TNSN)	FY16[5] and FY17	$ 19,015,729.00	$ 3,232,604.44	Active
Oracle Advanced Security	FY14	$ 1,440,000.00	$ 1,428,783.78	Closed
Productivity and Excellence Framework (aka UT System Productivity Dashboard)	FY12	$ 6,500,000.00	$ 5,884,669.70	Active
Proteomics Research Core Infrastructure (aka Core Facilities Network or iLabs)	FY14	$ 900,000.00	$ 552,834.70	Active
Public Health Initiative (aka Population Health)	FY15	$ 5,000,000.00	$ 3,354,072.84	Active
Research Experts Data Warehouse (aka Influuent)	FY14[6]	$ 5,540,000.00	$ 4,694,382.83	Closed
Spend Analytics	FY15	$ 7,000,000.00	$ 824,891.21	Active
Systemwide Mental Health, Student Safety, and Alcohol-Related	FY18	$ 5,995,237.00	$ 309,188.84	Active
Texas FreshAIR	FY14[6]	$ 275,000.00	$ 288,314.65	Closed
Transformation in Medical Education Initiative (TIME)	FY10 and FY13	$ 8,000,000.00	$ 6,333,508.69	Closed
Virtual Health Care Network	FY16[5]	$ 10,800,000.00	$ 1,678,965.42	Active

---

[5] This initiative was part of the 2015 Quantum Leaps.
[6] This initiative was part of the 2014 Innovation Framework.