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**UT San Antonio Dashboard: Latest State Data**

This page presents the latest data available on graduation rates, revenue trends, administrative costs, student demographics, total giving, and research expenditures. Comparable data that exist at the statewide level have been included as well. For total giving, national peer comparisons are provided. Additional graphics with national peer comparisons have been included on the next page. However, please note that national-level data lag behind and are not as current as state-level data.

**What Does Administrative Costs & % Total Expenses Mean? (State-Level Data)**

% of funds expended for administrative costs as % of operating budget. Administrative costs = Institutional Support expenses as designated in the institution's annual financial reports included in the following subcategories: executive management, fiscal operations, general administration and logistical services, administrative computing support, and public relations/development.
National Peer Comparison Data

The data source for all of the national comparison data presented below is the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

UTSA Peers

**What Does Administrative Cost as % Instructional Cost Mean? (National-Level Data)**

The higher an institution’s ratio, the greater proportion of the institution’s spending on administration relative to its spending on instruction (i.e., a ratio of 0.22 means that an institution spends 22 cents on administration for every dollar it spends on instruction, based on the formula used in the study presented in the paper, How Much Is Too Much: Controlling Administrative Costs through Effective Oversight, produced by The American Council of Trustees & Alumni, Institute for Effective Governance).

- Administrative/instructional cost ratio = administrative cost divided by instructional cost
- Administrative cost = expenses reported in IPEDS as institutional support
- Instructional cost = expenses reported in IPEDS as instruction added to expenses reported in IPEDS as academic support
- Academic support = expenses for the support services that are an integral part of the institution’s primary missions of instruction, research, and public service and includes expenses for museums, libraries, galleries, audio/visual services, ancillary support, academic administration, personnel development, course and curriculum development, as well as expenses for academic administration where the primary function is administration (e.g., academic deans).

Note: Based on the broad definition of instructional cost and narrow definition of administrative cost, the ratios likely underestimate the amount institutions spend on administration.

In 2015-16, UTSA spent an estimated 21 cents on administration for every dollar spent on instruction.

Source: National Science Foundation (NSF) & IPEDS

Fig. B1 4-yr & 6-yr Graduation Rates at Same Institution First-time, Full-time Entering Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UTSA, 4-Yr</th>
<th>UTSA, 6-Yr</th>
<th>Aspirational Peer Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. B3 Administrative Cost as % Instructional Cost, 2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Administrative Cost as % Instructional Cost</th>
<th>Aspirational Peer Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Peer Median</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Median: 0.24

Fig. B4 Total Research Expenditures per Total Faculty FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UT San Antonio</th>
<th>Aspirational Peer Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$179K</td>
<td>$97K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$216K</td>
<td>$94K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$11,292</td>
<td>$7,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$11,243</td>
<td>$7,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$11,534</td>
<td>$7,777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. B2 Revenue Trends by Source per Full-Time Equivalent Student vs National Peers, FY 2012 – 2016 (Inflation-Adjusted to 2016 Dollars)

Lower half of bars: Tuition & Fees per Student FTE
Upper half of bars: State Appropriations per Student FTE

Source: National Science Foundation (NSF) & IPEDS
**THECB 60x30 Goals**

**Debt as a % of Income for 2014 Graduates vs THECB 60x30 Goal of 60%**

**Target:** By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60% of first-year wages for graduates of TX public institutions.

**Scenario 1: UT System Methodology**

- Median Loan
- Median 1st-Yr Earnings

**Target:** Less than 50% of undergraduate students graduate with debt

**Scenario 2: THECB Methodology**

- Statewide
- Debt as % of Earnings
- THECB Goal

**Target:** 80% of students found working/enrolled in TX within one year after earning a degree

**How Does the THECB’s methodology for calculating debt as a percent of income differ from UT System’s methodology?**

**UT System Methodology:**
- Median debt = loan amounts incurred while attending UT System institutions for first-time-in-college students (excludes debt incurred at other non-UT System campuses). Additionally, PLUS loans—unsubsidized loans for the parent of dependent students—were not included as this is debt taken on by parent.

**THECB Methodology:**
- Includes Parent PLUS loans and debt incurred at other institutions (i.e., debt incurred by students at non-UT institutions would be included).

**Calculating Debt: Methodological Drawbacks**

1Debt Incurred at non-UT Institutions

While the THECB includes all debt accrued at all Texas institutions in its calculation of a student’s debt, UT System calculations of student debt are limited to debt accrued while the student is enrolled at a UT System institution. While this is a limitation of the data available to us, it is also an important decision point when creating a metric for institutional accountability. Should loan amounts that are accrued while the student is at another institution be included in a metric gauging the affordability of a different institution?

2Parent PLUS Loans. The loans taken out by parents (Parent PLUS) rather than by students are an important consideration when discussing college cost of attendance. However, including them in the calculation of student debt—and the ratio of that debt to first-year earnings—misrepresents the burden on new graduates. For this reason, in most cases—including in calculations made by the federal government—the methodologies do not include parent loans. UT System has shared its concerns regarding including the parent loans in their calculations with the THECB, but the THECB plans to include them for this goal.

**Note:** The THECB’s 60x30 website has incorporated average debt of graduates with loans from “same” institution versus “other” institution(s) for additional context. But the goal calculation will still include debt incurred at non-UT institutions.
A Closer Look at Graduation Rates

URM = under represented minorities (all except White, Asian).
Non-URM = White only/Asian only or reported as multi-racial (White & Asian) students with no other reported race/ethnicity designations.
Excludes students with unknown race/ethnicity designations, as well as International students with no other reported race/ethnicity designations.

Fig. D1 4-yr & 6-yr Graduation Rates at Same Institution First-time, Full-time Entering Cohort, by Minority Status

Fig. D2 4-yr & 6-yr Graduation Rates at Same Institution First-time, Full-time Entering Cohort, by Pell Status

Fig. D3 4-yr Graduation Rates for Transfer students with 30+ SCH 2017 Graduating Cohort

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)
Contextual Data

Fig. E1  Total Degrees, AY

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)

Fig. E2  Total Fall Enrollment

Source: THECB FADS & IPEDS

Fig. E3  1st-Year Persistence at Same Institution (Fall to Fall)
% of First-time, Full-time Cohort that Return the Following Fall

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)

Note: The 2016 statewide persistence rate is not yet available.

Source: Council for Aid to Education, Voluntary Support of Education (VSE)

Fig. E4  Endowment per Student FTE, FY 2013 - 2017

Ratio to show the relationship between baccalaureate graduates in proportion to the total number of full-time equivalent undergraduates enrolled four years earlier.

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

Fig. E5  Degree Production Ratio

Source: THECB FADS & IPEDS
Progress to National Research University Fund (NRUF)

What Are The Requirements Needed to Receive NRUF Funding

Eligibility criteria require data for the two fiscal years preceding the state fiscal year for which the appropriation is made: FY 2018. The NRUF statute created two categories of eligibility criteria: Mandatory and Optional.

Mandatory Criteria (2 of 2):
1. Designation as an “emerging research university” in THECB’s Accountability System
   - TX State U
   - TX Tech U*
   - UT System Institutions: UTA, UTD, UTEP, and UTSA
   - U of Houston*
   - U of North Texas
   *Not included in the data as both institutions met eligibility in FY12 and began receiving distributions from NRUF.
2. At least $45 million in restricted research expenditures in each of the two state fiscal years preceding the state fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

Optional Criteria (4 of 6):
The optional category allows institutions flexibility in meeting the criteria—an institution must meet four of the six statutory established criteria:
1. Endowment funds
2. PhD degrees awarded
3. Freshman class of high academic achievement
   - % freshman class in top 25% of high school class
   - SAT/ACT scores
   - Progress toward Closing the Gaps participation/success
4. Research capabilities & scholarly achievement (Association Of Research Libraries/Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi)
5. High quality faculty
   - National Academy members and Nobel prize recipients
   - Other faculty awards
6. High quality graduate education
   - Number graduate level programs, master’s and doctoral graduation rates

History of and Future Funding:
In the FY 2012 NRUF Report, the THECB reported that Texas Tech University and University of Houston met eligibility. Both institutions received distributions from NRUF after the mandatory audit, was conducted in accordance with TEC 62.146(c) and completed by the State Auditor. Two of the universities, UTD and UTEP, reported restricted research expenditures at or above the statutory threshold of $45 million for both FY 2016 and 2017, a mandatory requirement to receive distributions from NRUF**. Institutional performance varied on the six measures specified in the optional category. UTD reported four of six optional criteria fulfilled for both consecutive FYs 2016 and 2017. UTD therefore is eligible for fund distribution in FY 2018, pending the requirement to undergo an audit conducted by the State Auditor’s Office in FY 2018.

![Graphs showing Restricted Research Expenditures, Endowment Funds, and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Degrees Awarded](Figures_F1_F2_F3)

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) National Research University Fund (NRUF) February 2018 Report
Progress to National Research University Fund (NRUF)
Optional Criteria (continued)

High-Quality Graduate Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Quality Graduate Education</th>
<th>UT Institutions FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>Non UT Institutions FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Institutions</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXSU</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTD</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Optional criteria of research capabilities and scholarly achievement (Association of Research Libraries/Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi) not shown above.

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) National Research University Fund (NRUF) February 2018 Report