

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM
MEETING OF THE BOARD
NOVEMBER 4, 2004

1. **U. T. Board of Regents: Approval of system of accountability as required by Executive Order RP 31**

RECOMMENDATION

Chancellor Yudof concurs in the recommendation of Associate Vice Chancellor Malandra that the Board approve the comprehensive state system of accountability for higher education as required by Executive Order RP 31.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The U. T. System has been a leader in accountability, presenting a first report on accountability to the U. T. Board of Regents in February 2004, with a second report due in February 2005. On January 22, 2004, Governor Perry issued Executive Order RP 31, as attached on Page 1c, calling for each institution and system of higher education to work with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to create a comprehensive system of accountability to be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Boards of Regents no later than December 17, 2004.

The Coordinating Board will consider approval of a comprehensive system of accountability as required by Executive Order RP 31 and as attached on Pages 1d - 1v and dated October 21, 2004, at its next meeting on October 29, 2004. It is anticipated the Coordinating Board will approve an accountability system substantially similar to the draft attached that includes "Developing an Accountability System" on Pages 1d – 1e and "Accountability in Higher Education: Promoting Excellence in Texas Public Universities Through Institutional Groupings, Peers, and Benchmarks" on Pages 1f – 1v.

- The state framework contains a series of measures and performance targets that the Coordinating Board and the Governor's Office developed over the summer of 2004, in consultation with all public universities and health-related institutions. Through the Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors, presidents and chancellors of every public institution in Texas were asked to suggest measures and comment on the draft framework. The Coordinating Board also briefed board chairs or representatives on the accountability system in September 2004.

- The Coordinating Board worked closely and consultatively with all institutions and systems to select and define measures, set group performance targets, and design the report to minimize the extra work needed to comply with the Executive Order.
- Institutions will be given an opportunity in November 2004 to add brief analysis and comments to the data the Coordinating Board will load into the report, before it is made final.
- Following the December 17, 2004, deadline set by Executive Order RP 31 for completion of the first report, hard copy and Web-based versions of the report will be available, with separate sections for each system, and for each institution.
- Development of the state framework was based in part on the U. T. System report but the U. T. report could not substitute, because the state needed to develop something useful and acceptable to all public institutions in Texas.
- The measures and targets in the state report have been adjusted for groups of institutions of similar type—research, emerging research, doctoral, comprehensive, masters. The framework emphasizes comparisons among Texas institutions and group performance targets for key measures. To do this required a single framework for all institutions.
- The state framework is complementary and shares, to some extent, the data sets used by the U. T. System, but it is not identical to the U. T. System accountability framework.
- The U. T. System accountability framework measures more topics and includes more analysis (e.g., contributions to K-12 education, economic impact, and institutional rankings) and provides more detail in terms of institutional profiles and national comparisons than the state framework.
- The Coordinating Board has stated its expectation that their report will be adjusted following the next legislative session. Performance targets will be adjusted periodically.
- The Governor's Office has stated its hope that incentive funds will be available to distribute to institutions that exceed the performance targets in the state accountability system.

Executive Order

BY THE
GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS
Executive Department
Austin, Texas
January 22, 2004

EXECUTIVE ORDER RP 31

Relating to accountability of higher education systems and institutions.

WHEREAS, the people of the State of Texas expect the state to provide the highest quality of higher education; and

WHEREAS, Texas public institutions of higher education and the systems in which they operate are funded by both public funds and tuition paid by private citizens; and

WHEREAS, the public has the right to demand complete accountability for its investment in institutions of education; and

WHEREAS, public K-12 education has been required to provide comprehensive accountability to the citizens of Texas for more than 10 years; and

WHEREAS, systems and institutions of higher education must be able to clearly define the need for additional state-funding in a manner which will justify the public's continued investment of resources;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Rick Perry, Governor of the State of Texas, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the constitution and laws of the State of Texas, do hereby order the following:

The boards of regents for public institutions of higher education in the state shall direct that each institution and system work with the Higher Education Coordinating Board to create a comprehensive system of accountability.

This system will provide the citizens of Texas, the Governor, and the Legislature with the information necessary to determine the effectiveness and quality of the education students receive at individual institutions. It will also provide the basis to evaluate the institutions' use of state resources.

This system of accountability shall be approved by the Boards of Regents and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board no later than December 17, 2004.

This executive order supersedes all previous orders inconsistent with its terms and shall remain in effect and in full force until modified, amended, rescinded, or superseded by me or by a succeeding Governor.

Given under my hand this the 22nd day of
January, 2004.

RICK PERRY
Governor

Attested by:

GEOFFREY S. CONNOR

Developing An Accountability System

Recent Events/Timetable

- **January:** Governor Perry's Executive Order is issued. The Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors identifies potential measures.
- **July:** The Council's accountability measures are aligned with *Closing the Gaps*. A fifth area, Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiencies, is added. Measures are identified as either key or contextual.
- **August/September:** Stakeholders (institutions, governor's office, and Legislative Budget Board) clarify accountability measure wording, definitions and data sources. University groups, health-related institutions (HRIs), Texas State Technical College System, and Lamar State Colleges establish key-measure targets.
- **October:** Coordinating Board update. Data available for institutional review/comment.
- **December 17:** Deadline for Performance System distribution and presentation.
- **Summer 2005:** Evaluate/modify System. Identify/add of out-of-state peer institutions.

Concept/Format

- **Participants:** 35 public universities, nine HRI's, the four Texas State Technical Colleges and three two-year Lamar State Colleges. The accountability measures vary between the universities, HRIs, and two-year colleges.
- **Online System:** Offers multiple viewing options—statewide, by each university system, and by group-type. Bar charts and graphs will also be available.
- **Paper Version:** Similar to the online version, but with space limits. The Coordinating Board will print and distribute these reports prior to the legislative session.
- **Data Sources:** With few exceptions, all data is currently collected by the Coordinating Board. Staff will calculate all measures to ensure reporting consistency.
- **Key Accountability Measures:** Address priority areas. One key measure for both universities and HRIs is "total enrollment disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, and level." There are 23 key measures each for university, 20 for each HRIs, and 17 for the TSTCs and Lamar State Colleges.
- **Contextual/Optional Measures:** Quantitatively explains the data, such as "percent of students on Pell grants." Contextual data is provided for all institutions; some institutions identified optional measures to provide further clarification and context to their measures.
- **Text Boxes:** A third contextual opportunity for institutions to respond to the data. This will be produced by each institution.

- **University Groups:** Aligns institutions with similar missions, student populations and/or programs. Neither permanent nor prescriptive, the groups are Research, Emerging Research, Doctoral, Comprehensive, and Master's.
- **Incentive Funding:** May be available from the state.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**Accountability in Higher Education:
Promoting Excellence in Texas Public
Universities Through Institutional Groupings,
Peers, and Benchmarks**

BACKGROUND

Texas' *Closing the Gaps* plan calls for each public higher education institution to engage in an ongoing pursuit of excellence. A strategy for carrying out that goal relies on the selection of institutional peers and benchmarks of performance against which progress can be measured. Because Texas has a wide variety of institutions, the state will need to develop an approach that acknowledges institutional differences, yet focuses on attaining and enhancing excellence in a broad range of equally important tasks. The following brief presents in concept form an approach that the state might take. Examples illustrative of what might result from such a process are provided in regard to universities.

Because comparisons between institutions are inevitable, institutions have been grouped according to general academic mission and certain key academic indicators such as size and number of graduate programs, research expenditures, and other factors. (A broader, but not complete, array of indicators is attached.) *The groupings are intended to be neither permanent nor prescriptive.* Rather, they are to be considered permeable, subject to revision as institutions evolve and shift their academic missions. As a way of recognizing that institutional missions change over time, these proposed groupings will be reconsidered - biennially with appropriate full participation by institutional leaders.

OVERVIEW

Making accountability more transparent and promoting excellence in Texas universities through institutional groupings, peers, and benchmarks will require:

- Establishing groupings of institutions of similar types and missions
- Determining for each group appropriate measures that reflect institutional performance
- Determining benchmarks against which to measure success
- Assessing progress annually and taking steps to improve performance

For purposes of this document, Coordinating Board staff presents the general characteristics we have used to differentiate groups of universities and the groupings that

result from applying those characteristics. As the “General Characteristics of University Groupings” chart at the end of this brief illustrates, no institution is purely a “teaching” or purely a “research” institution. Rather, each institution makes its contributions in ways that reflect its mission, its programs, and its students and faculty.

RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES For 2005-2006

Research universities provide a broad range of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs, place a greater emphasis on research than universities in other groups, and serve their regions, the state, and beyond. Excellent undergraduate education is a central function, but a significantly higher proportion of these institutions’ students will be enrolled in graduate and professional programs than is the case in Master’s, Comprehensive, Doctoral, or Emerging Research universities.

Research institutions:

- Offer a comprehensive range of excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
- Award 100 or more doctoral degrees annually in excellent programs that span at least 15 disciplines
- Place significant emphasis on research and creative activities and generate at least \$150 million annually in research expenditures

Texas institutions that presently meet the above criteria include:

- Texas A&M University
- The University of Texas at Austin

	Doctoral Programs	Doctoral Enroll	Doctorates Awarded	Research Expenditures
Texas A&M University	84	3,229	442	\$390,305,058
The University of Texas at Austin	113	5,188	668	\$376,403,651

EMERGING RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES For 2005-2006

Emerging Research universities are educational, scientific, engineering, business and cultural resource centers committed to the three-fold mission of teaching, research and service. As universities with extensive educational programs, academic efforts are directed to applied and basic research in selected fields, teaching and scholarship, and creative activities. The universities encourage faculty members to be active researchers/creators in their respective disciplines and to involve both undergraduate and graduate students in research and creative pursuits.

As the Texas population increases, some of these institutions – especially those located in metropolitan areas of more than one million people – will develop additional breadth and increase their research expenditures (now at least \$14 million per year) to address the need for additional access to research universities.

Emerging Research universities offer a wide range of baccalaureate and master's programs, serve a student population from within and outside the region, and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate in targeted areas of excellence. The institutions award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year, offer at least 10 doctoral programs, and/or enroll at least 150 doctoral students.

Texas institutions generally within the above criteria for Emerging Research Universities include:

- Texas Tech University
- The University of Texas at Arlington
- The University of Texas at Dallas
- The University of Texas at El Paso
- The University of Texas at San Antonio
- University of Houston
- University of North Texas

	Doctoral Programs	Doctoral Enroll	Doctorates Awarded	Research Expenditures
Texas Tech University	53	1,303	166	\$56,147,235
The University of Texas at Arlington	32	819	62	\$23,314,938
The University of Texas at Dallas	18	756	70	\$32,547,141
The University of Texas at El Paso	12	260	30	\$27,847,152
The University of Texas at San Antonio	13	220	6	\$14,547,732
University of Houston	51	1,372	207	\$88,608,021
University of North Texas	57	1,316	157	\$17,587,767

DOCTORAL UNIVERSITIES
For 2005-2006

Doctoral universities are educational and cultural resource institutions committed to the three-fold mission of teaching, research and service. With extensive educational programs, academic efforts are directed to both applied and basic research in selected fields, teaching and scholarship, and creative activities. The universities encourage faculty members

to be active researchers in their respective disciplines and to involve both undergraduate and graduate students in research and creative pursuits.

Doctoral universities offer a wide range of excellent baccalaureate and master's programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate in targeted areas of excellence and/or regional need. The institutions each award at least 10 doctoral degrees per year, offer at least 5 doctoral programs, and/or enroll 150 doctoral students. They generally have research expenditures of at least \$2 million per year.

Texas institutions generally within the above criteria for Doctoral Universities are:

- Sam Houston State University
- Texas A&M University-Commerce
- Texas A&M University-Kingsville
- Texas Southern University
- Texas State University at San Marcos
- Texas Woman's University

COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES For 2005-2006

Comprehensive universities offer a wide range of excellent baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. Comprehensive universities may also offer doctoral education in targeted program areas to address particular regional needs and/or in disciplines in which the university is nationally recognized for excellence. In most cases this will be one or two areas, but may be as many as five.

Comprehensive universities are expected to:

- Provide access to a broad range of excellent baccalaureate and master's programs
- Possibly provide doctoral-level education in targeted area(s) of excellence and/or regional need
- Provide excellent preparation not only for the workforce, but prepare students for professional schools and graduate education
- Focus on serving the student population within the region

Texas institutions generally meeting those criteria include:

- Lamar University-Beaumont
- Prairie View A&M University
- Stephen F. Austin University
- Tarleton State University
- Texas A&M International University
- Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
- The University of Texas-Pan American
- West Texas A&M University

MASTER'S UNIVERSITIES
For 2005-2006

Access to exemplary undergraduate institutions is critical to students and communities across Texas. Currently, almost 80 percent of public university students are at the undergraduate level. Master's institutions offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. Excellent undergraduate education is the primary mission of these universities, which generally offer smaller classes than would be expected in other universities.

Master's institutions are expected to:

- Concentrate on providing excellent broad-based undergraduate education
- Establish seamless transfer and facilitate success for Associate of Arts and Associate of Science graduates
- Offer smaller undergraduate class sizes
- Provide excellent developmental education and retention programs
- Provide access to critical and other excellent master's programs
- Provide excellent preparation not only for the workforce, but for professional schools and graduate education
- Have a critical role in the preparation of certified teachers
- Provide specialized programs recognized for their excellence

Master's Universities could include:

- Angelo State University
- Midwestern State University
- Sul Ross State University
- Sul Ross University - Rio Grande
- Texas A&M University- Galveston
- Texas A&M University-Texarkana
- The University of Texas at Brownsville
- The University of Texas at Tyler
- The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
- University of Houston- Clear Lake
- University of Houston- Downtown
- University of Houston-Victoria

Accountability System Online Format

Data available online for the Accountability System will be much more detailed than the traditional paper report. There will be three tiers, or layers, of data featured online for public universities (also available for public two-year colleges):

- (1) Statewide measures
- (2) Measures by members of each university system
- (3) Institution measures (specific institution)

Additional features include:

- Most measures will be calculated and loaded into the system by the Coordinating Board
- Text boxes provided by each institution as a descriptive opportunity in each section of measures (participation, success, excellence, research and institutional efficiencies & effectiveness)
- Institutions will have the option to add explanatory optional measures to the system in each goal area.
- Trend line data will be available
- Paper reports will be generated directly from the system for Regents, Legislature, and others
- Web Base Performance and Accountability System will be available to the public.
- Customized reports—identify a group of institutions and measures for comparison by institution/measures of personal interest
- Charts and graphs relative to each group for each measure
- Measure definitions, including data sources and calculations

Draft General Academic Accountability Measures						
Measure	Group Targets FY 08					
	Research	Emerging Research	Doctoral	Comp. Masters		
Participation						
Key Measures						
Percent Change						
1	Enrollment: Number and percent of undergraduate, master's, doctoral, and professional students enrolled on the 12th day of class, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, and level.	0%	6%	8%	12%	12%
	African-American Enrollment increase*	Improvement Over Time				
	Hispanic Enrollment increase*	Improvement Over Time				
2	FTE Enrollment: Number and percent of undergraduate, graduate, and professional FTE students enrolled, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, and age.	0%	4%	6%	10%	12%
	African-American FTE Enrollment increase*	Improvement Over Time				
	Hispanic FTE Enrollment increase*	Improvement Over Time				
Contextual Measure - Participation						
3	Percent of first-time undergraduates from the top ten percent of their Texas high school class					
4	Percentage of first-time entering applicants accepted, and the percentage of those accepted who enroll					
5	Ethnic composition of high school graduates in Texas					
6	Percent of enrollment that are transfers from Texas two-year colleges with at least 30 SCH.					
7	Semester Credit Hours: Total number of graduate and undergraduate semester credit hours					
Success						
Key Measures						
8	Graduation Rate: four, five, and six-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates by ethnicity	Percentage Point Change				
	Four-Year Rate	1.5 points		3 points	3 points	3 points
	Five-Year Rate	1 point	10 points	4.5 points	4 points	4 points
	Six-Year Rate	.5 point		3 points	5 points	5 points
9	Graduates: Number of graduates by level and race/ethnicity & gender	Percent Change				
	Total degrees	0%	15%	15%	15%	15%
	African-American degrees	3% ug/10% grad	10%	10%	10%	10%
	Hispanic degrees	3% ug/10% grad	10%	10%	10%	10%
10	Graduation and Persistence rate: Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates who have graduated or are still enrolled in higher education after six academic years (by total and race/ethnicity)					

Draft General Academic Accountability Measures						
Measure	Group Targets FY 08					Comp. Masters
	Research	Emerging Research	Doctoral			
11	Computer science, engineering, math, and physical science graduates both undergraduate and graduate					
12	Nursing and allied health graduates both undergraduate and graduate					
13	Number of students taking the certification exam for teacher education and the pass rates by ethnicity					
	Contextual Measure - Success					
14	Enrollment: Percent of first-time students 19 and under					
15	Financial aid: Percent of students receiving Pell Grants					
16	Part-time Undergraduate Students: The number and percent of part-time first-time degree seeking undergraduates.					
17	Persistence Rate: First-time degree-seeking undergraduate students who remain enrolled after one and two academic years (by total and race/ethnicity)					
18	Developmental education: Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates requiring developmental education who have graduated or are still enrolled in higher education after six academic years (by total and race/ethnicity)					
19	Developmental education: Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates requiring developmental education					
20	Graduation Rate for two-year college students who completed at least 30 SCH before transferring to a university					
21	Percent of baccalaureate graduates completing at least 30 SCH at a Texas two-year college					
22	Graduation Rates for master's, and doctoral programs					
	Excellence					
	Key Measures					
		Percent Change				
23	Percent lower division SCH taught by tenure/tenure-track faculty	3%	3%	3%	5%	4.5%
		Percentage Point Change				
24	FTE student/FTE faculty ratio	(.5 point)	(1 point)	(2 points)	(1 point)	Maintain current ratio
25	Percent of baccalaureate graduates either employed or enrolled in a Texas graduate or professional school within one year of graduation					
26	Certification or licensure, Licensure/certification rate on state or national exams (law, pharmacy, nursing, engineering)					
27	Class size: the average class size of lower division classes					

Draft General Academic Accountability Measures						
Measure	Group Targets FY 08					
	Research	Research	Doctoral	Comp. Masters		
28	Percent of FTE faculty who are Tenure/Tenure-Track					
Contextual Measure - Excellence						
29	Percent of FTE teaching faculty who are Tenure/Tenure-Track by ethnicity and gender					
30	Faculty: Ethnicity and gender by rank					
31	Faculty: salaries and trends, Compared to national average by rank and discipline					
32	Endowed Chairs: total number of endowed professorships and chairs, number and percent of those filled, and percent of total tenure/tenure-track faculty.					
33	Number of members in the National Academies					
34	Employment: Percent of baccalaureate graduates employed in Texas within 1 year following graduation					
35	Percent of baccalaureate graduates enrolled in a Texas graduate or professional school within one year of graduation					
36	Class size- the percentage of undergraduate classes with less than 20 students					
37	Class size- the percentage of undergraduate classes with more than 50 students					
Research						
Key Measures						
Percent Change						
38	FTE Faculty: Ratio of federal research expenditures to all FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty.	5%	9%	9%	6%	3%
39	Research expenditures	15%	15%	12%	10%	6%
40	Research funds: Amount of sponsored (external) research funds as a percent of general revenue appropriations.					
Contextual Measure- Research						
41	Research Expenditures by source of funds (federal, state, private, institutional)					
42	FTE Faculty: Number and percent of FTE tenured/tenure-track holding extramural grants (all sources and types).					
Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness						
Key Measures						
Percent Change						
43	Administrative costs: Amount expended for administrative costs as a percent of operating budget.	Less than or = 6% flat	-10%	-10%	-10%	-3%

Draft General Academic Accountability Measures						
Measure	Group Targets FY 08					
	Research	Research	Doctoral	Comp. Masters		
44	Facilities: Space utilization rate of classrooms and labs					
	Hours per Week Change					
	Classroom utilization	.5 hour	2 hours	2 hours	3 hours	3 hours
	Lab utilization	.5 hour	.5 hour	.5 hour	1.5 hours	.5 hours
45	Appropriations: Appropriated funds per FTE student and per FTE faculty.					
46	Historically Underutilized Business trends					
47	Expenditures: All funds expenditures per FTE student					
48	Total Revenue: Total general revenue per FTE student and per FTE faculty.					
	Contextual Measures- Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness					
49	Average cost of resident undergraduate tuition and fees for 30 semester credit hours*					
50	Square footage E&G classroom and square footage E&G lab space per full-time equivalent student*					
51	Endowment- Total					
52	Endowment- Per FTE Student					
53	Total Revenue: Total revenue by tuition, fees, state appropriation, reserves used, income from reserves, gifts, and income from gifts.					

Optional Measures Requested by some Institutions - all are contextual/explanatory	
Participation	Institution(s)
Number and percent of first-generation college students enrolled	UT Brownsville/TSC
Number of semester credit hours completed by pre-college (dual enrollment) students	UT Brownsville/TSC
Five-year enrollment trends on proportional representation by ethnicity and gender	UT Austin
Percent of undergraduate student population included as Hispanic for Hispanic Servicing Institutions (HIS) calculation purposes.	Tx State System
Percentage of students in the top 25% of their graduating class	UT Arlington
Percent of first-time freshmen not reporting a class rank	UT Arlington
Percent of first-time freshmen who are top-ten graduates of regional high schools (e.g. El Paso and surrounding counties)	UT El Paso
Percent of freshmen who are first-generation college students	UT El Paso
Success	
Number and percent of students successfully completing professional licensure and certification exams who took one or more developmental courses.	UT Brownsville/TSC
Percent increase in number of completed upper-division semester credit hours.	UT Brownsville/TSC
Seven and eight-year graduation and persistence rate of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates by ethnicity	Texas Southern Univ
Excellence	
Student satisfaction with their entire educational experience	UT Brownsville/TSC
Overall rating of instructors by the students.	UT Brownsville/TSC
Research	
Examples of high-priority externally funded research collaborations	UT Austin
Ratio of federal support for research and sponsored programs to the total state support for research and sponsored programs.	UT Brownsville/TSC
Percent of full-time staff and faculty FTE positions supported by research grants	UT Brownsville/TSC
Percent of tenure/tenure-track faculty on a research track and considering the dollar amount from external grants.	Sam Houston State
Percent increase in the award value of federal research grants	UT Brownsville/TSC
Amount of externally funded research projects as a percent of State-funded investment in research	UT El Paso
Institutional Effectiveness and Efficiency	
Examples of high-priority collaborations with business, industry, health, public, and community organizations	UT Austin
Percent of total expenditures supported by local property taxes	UT Brownsville/TSC
Percent of student credit hours offered in evening and weekend classes	UT Brownsville/TSC

Health-Related Institutions Draft Accountability Measures		Percent Change
Participation		
Key Measures		
1	Enrollment: Number and percent of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students enrolled on the 12th day of class, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, and level.	5.25%
	African-American Enrollment	Improvement Over Time
	Hispanic Enrollment	Improvement Over Time
Contextual Measures - Participation		
2	School Enrollment: Number and percent of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students enrolled on the 12th day of class, disaggregated by school (nursing, dental, pharmacy, etc.), gender, ethnicity, age, and level.	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
Key Measures - Success		
3	Graduates: Number of graduates by level, ethnicity, and gender both academic and professional.	5.25%
	African-American graduates	5.25%
	Hispanic graduates	5.25%
4	Nursing and allied health graduates both undergraduate and graduate.	12%
Contextual Measures - Success		
5	Graduation Rates for master's, and doctoral programs*	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
Key Measures - Excellence		
6	Certification or licensure, licensure/certification rate on state or national Nursing exams.	90% pass rate
7	Certification or licensure, licensure/certification rate on state or national Allied Health exams.	90% pass rate
8	National Board exam first-time pass rate for medical students.	95% pass rate
9	National board exam first-time pass rate for dental students.	95% pass rate
10	Percent of baccalaureate graduates either employed or enrolled in a Texas graduate or professional school within one year of graduation	
11	Faculty: Faculty awards (National Academy of Science, National Academy of Engineering, Nobel prize winners, Academy of Arts and Sciences, Institute of Medicine, Institute of Dental Research, American Academy of Nursing)	
Contextual Measures - Excellence		
12	FTE student/FTE faculty ratio.	
13	Percent of faculty who are Tenure/Tenure-Track by ethnicity and gender.	

Health-Related Institutions Draft Accountability Measures		Percent Change
14	Faculty: Ethnicity and gender.	
15	Faculty: Salaries and trends, compared to national average by appointment level.	
16	Endowed Chairs: Total number of endowed professorships and chairs, number and percent of those filled, and percent of total tenure/tenure-track faculty.	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
Key Measures - Research		
17	Research Funds: Dollar amount of sponsored (external) research expenditures.	9%
18	FTE Faculty: Ratio of sponsored research expenditures to FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty.	9%
19	Research Funds: Amount of sponsored (external) research funds as a percent of formula-derived general appropriations revenue.	
Contextual Measures - Research		
20	FTE Faculty: Number and percent of FTE tenured/tenure-track holding extramural grants (all sources and types).	
21	Research expenditures by source of funds (federal, state, private, institutional).	
22	Patents: Number of patents issued.	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
Key Measures - Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness		
24	Administrative Costs: Amount expended for administrative costs as a percent of operating budget.	5% decrease
25	When Appropriate: Hospital administrative costs as a percent of hospital total expenditures.	TBD
26	Total revenue from tuition, fees, state appropriation, reserves used, income from reserves, gifts, and income from gifts.	
27	Appropriations: Appropriated funds per FTE student and per FTE faculty.	
28	Facilities: Total replacement cost value of existing physical plant	
29	Expenditures: E&G expenditures per FTE student.	
Contextual Measures - Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness		
30	Average cost of tuition and fees for 30 resident undergraduate semester credit hours*	
31	Endowment: Total dollar amount of endowment and ratio per FTE student and per FTE faculty.	
32	Construction projects: Total projected cost, number of projects, # sq. ft. to be added	
33	Total revenue by tuition, fees, state appropriation, gifts, and income from gifts.	
34	Historically Underutilized Business trends	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	
	Optional Measure: for institutional selection if desired	

Health-Related Institutions Draft Accountability Measures		Percent Change
Patient Care Measures		
35	Resident Physicians: Number of residents in ACGME or AOA -accredited programs	6%
36	Resident Physicians: Number of primary care residents in ACGME or AOA -accredited programs	1.50%
37	Total charges for inpatient and outpatient unsponsored charity care in state-owned and affiliated facilities.	
38	Total charges for inpatient and outpatient care in state-owned and affiliated facilities.	
39	Total number of outpatient visits	
40	Total number of inpatient days	
41	WHEN APPROPRIATE: Ratio of admissions, charity care, hospital days, and clinic visits to General Revenue for state-owned hospitals	
42	WHEN APPROPRIATE: TDCJ inpatient and outpatient care provided in ON-campus facilities	

Draft Texas State Technical Colleges and Lamar State College		
Accountability Measures		Targets
Participation		Percent Change
Key Measures		
1	Enrollment: Number and percent of undergraduate students enrolled on the census day, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, FT/PT, academic/technical and age.	9%
	African-American Enrollment	9%
	Hispanic Enrollment	9%
2	FTE Enrollment: Number and percent of FTE students enrolled, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity and age.	
	Credit FTE	9%
	African-American FTE	5%
	Hispanic FTE	5%
	Continuing Education FTE	9%
Contextual Measures - Participation		
3	Ethnic composition of high school graduates in Texas (by service area for each CTC, if possible); disaggregate by age and ethnicity	
4	Semester Credit Hours: Total number of semester credit hours	
5	Contact Hours: Total number of undergraduate contact hours	
6	Financial aid: Percent of students receiving Pell Grants by gender/ethnicity	
7	Number of faculty who are FT/PT by gender and ethnicity	
Success		
Key Measures - Success		Percent Change
8	Graduation Rate: three-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time credential seeking undergraduates by gender and ethnicity	3%age points
9	Graduation Rate: three-year graduation rate of first-time, part-time credential seeking undergraduates by gender and ethnicity	3%age points
10	Graduates: Number of graduates by gender, ethnicity	5%
11	Computer science, engineering, math, and physical science graduates	8%
12	Nursing and allied health graduates	8%
13	Graduation and Persistence rate: Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates who have graduated or are still enrolled in higher education after six academic years (by gender and ethnicity)	
14	Graduation and Persistence rate: Percent of first-time, part-time, degree-seeking undergraduates who have graduated or are still enrolled in higher education after six academic years (by gender and ethnicity)	
15	Percent of students who transfer to senior institutions with at least 30 SCH	
Contextual Measures - Success		
16	Financial aid: Percent of students receiving Pell Grants by gender/ethnicity	
17	Part-time Undergraduate Students: The number and percent of credential seeking students by FT/PT and gender/ethnicity	

Draft Texas State Technical Colleges and Lamar State College		Targets
Accountability Measures		Percent Change
18	Persistence Rate: First-time credential-seeking undergraduate students who remain enrolled after one and two academic years (by gender, ethnicity and age)	
19	Developmental education: Number and percent of developmental education students who subsequently meet TSI requirements and who then successfully complete a general education core curriculum course in the area of deficiency (by gender/ethnicity and age) – {data not available until 2005}	
20	Percent of graduates either employed or enrolled in a Texas senior institution within one year of graduation, by gender and ethnicity	
21	Number of Marketable Skills Awards completers by gender and ethnicity	
22	Number of students obtaining alternative certification for teacher education and the pass rates by gender and ethnicity	
23	Number of Associates of Arts completers in Teaching by gender and ethnicity.	
	Excellence:	
	Key Measures - Excellence	Percent Change
24	Percent of contact hours taught by full-time faculty	6%
25	FTE student/FTE faculty ratio	
	Contextual Measures - Excellence	
26	Certification or licensure: Licensure/certification rate on state or national exams (e.g., nursing, cosmetology, EMT, etc.)	
27	Percent of faculty who have advanced degrees, by gender/ethnicity	
28	Class size: the average class size	
29	Faculty: Number and percent of faculty who are FT/PT by gender and ethnicity	
30	Employment: Percent of associate graduates employed in Texas within one year following graduation	
31	Percent of associate degree graduates enrolled in a Texas senior institution within one year of graduation	
32	Percent of course sections taught by faculty who are full-time faculty.	
	Research:	
	Key Measures - Research	
	Another qualitative item will be added to allow local listing of federal \$ dedicated to research.	
	Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness	
	Key Measures - Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness	Percent Change
32	Administrative costs: Amount expended for administrative costs as a percent of operating budget.	(5%) decrease

Draft Texas State Technical Colleges and Lamar State College		Targets
Accountability Measures		Percent Change
33	Facilities: Space utilization rate of classrooms and labs	
	Classroom utilization	2 hrs/wk
	Lab utilization	.5 hrs/wk
34	Appropriations: Appropriated funds per FTE student and per FTE faculty.	
35	Historically Underutilized Business trends	
36	Expenditures: Instructional expenditures per FTE student	
	Contextual Measures- Institutional Efficiencies and Effectiveness	

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 4-5, 2004

11. U. T. Arlington: Affirmation for approval to offer academic courses in Fort Worth

RECOMMENDATION

Chancellor Yudof concurs in the recommendation of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and President Spaniolo that, in response to a request from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the approval of the U. T. Board of Regents be affirmed for The University of Texas at Arlington to offer academic courses in Fort Worth.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The University of Texas at Arlington has, in good faith, offered academic courses in Fort Worth for several years. These courses have been highly successful, with evidence of demand for additional courses and programs. To date, courses have been workforce-related in the areas of business, education, engineering, and social work. The existing course offerings in Fort Worth were approved by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the regional accrediting agency for U. T. Arlington, in 2001. In reviewing U. T. Arlington's request for tuition revenue bond authorization related to a classroom building, the Coordinating Board asked for documentation concerning the authority for U. T. Arlington to offer academic courses in Fort Worth. Minutes of the Board of Regents from 2000 to the present document U. T. Board of Regents' action on at least five items related to academic course offerings in Fort Worth. While these actions show knowledge and constructive approval by the U. T. Board of Regents for the Fort Worth course offerings, formal affirmation of this approval has been requested by the Coordinating Board staff to allow the Coordinating Board to consider the U. T. Arlington tuition revenue bond request at the meeting in January 2005.