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Introduction

Graduate education plays a critical role in achieving the highly prestigious Carnegie Research 1 and National Research University Fund (NRUF) designations at The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA). Graduate students are essential in supporting faculty in UTSA’s dual mission of advancing excellence in research (as Graduate Research Assistants, GRAs) and undergraduate teaching (as Graduate Teaching Assistants, GTAs). Strong graduate programs are also a key element to recruiting and retaining the best scholars for a strong research-oriented faculty. Excellence in graduate education results in attracting competitive students, outstanding pedagogy and scholarly activities, and is therefore key to the UTSA’s mission. This excellence begins with understanding and identifying the gaps that currently exist, and then closing these gaps through the implementation of policies and processes that will ensure the success of graduate students and programs. For this purpose, President Eighmy and Provost Espy launched the Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence (GSS) Task Force, chaired by Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Ambika Mathur, in October 2019.

Charge

The Task Force was charged by Provost Espy to review all UTSA’s graduate education processes to determine whether they are optimally aligned, and to use data-driven evidence to inform ensuing recommendations for improving the broad graduate education landscape. At the inaugural meeting it was agreed that the Task Force would focus on doctoral education at this time.

Background

In Fall 2019, of the approximately 33,000 students enrolled at UTSA, about 4,100 were graduate students (3,200 masters and 900 doctoral students roughly). Graduate students thus represent just 12.5% of the total student population at UTSA, a percentage far lower compared to the 20-28% enrollment at other UT System research and emerging research universities. Hispanic doctoral student enrollment is around 25% compared to the undergraduate Hispanic student enrollment of about 55%. Doctoral student enrollment represents just 2.7% of the total enrollment and has remained relatively flat over the last five Fall semesters, reaching a high of ~900 in Fall 2019, which is 300 below our target of at least 1,200 to reach R1 status (Figure 1). A large number of UTSA’s doctoral students are enrolled part time; a research intensive institution must have a much higher proportion of full-time doctoral students. Additionally, UTSA’s ~40% attrition rate at the doctoral level is much higher than the rate at research-intensive institutions.
In the same five year period referenced above for doctoral enrollment, UTSA awarded an average of 120 doctoral degrees in 25 programs across six academic colleges (Figure 2). The number of doctoral degrees remained fairly constant over the 5 year period and falls far short of the desired number of 200 degrees awarded per year, a number consistent to achieve and maintain NRUF status; Carnegie R1 institutions average ~360 doctorates awarded annually.
The challenges of enrollment and degrees awarded at UTSA have been ascribed to lack of funding, inability to provide competitive funding packages, high opportunity costs, lackluster recruitment efforts, clunky admission processes, lack of subsidized health care, lack of dedicated graduate housing, inconsistent appointment processes and policies, lack of innovative doctoral programs and robust numbers of research faculty, insufficient attention to issues around health and well-being, and a lack of professional development opportunities for doctoral students. Lack of visibility of graduate education at UTSA is also viewed as a significant barrier where graduate students feel “invisible”. While there are a number of issues, the primary challenge is that of funding packages when compared to our peer and aspirant institutions.

As a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), UTSA has a special responsibility to increase participation and success of Hispanic students in graduate programs, especially at the doctoral level. As noted above, the percentage of Hispanic students enrolled at the doctoral level at UTSA is almost half that at the undergraduate level. This will increase the diversity of our nation’s faculty and leadership positions and enhance an inclusive workforce to better serve our students and communities. UTSA should be a destination of choice for Hispanic
students. Our non-competitive funding packages, however, disadvantage us from achieving this goal.

Master’s enrollment is similarly challenged, again primarily due to quality of programs and recruitment efforts. This also needs to be examined since master’s programs serve as a pipeline to doctoral programs, and the tuition revenue generated by master’s programs fuels doctoral funding. However, this Task Force report focuses on doctoral education, and master’s education will be addressed in subsequent initiatives.

Task Force Process

Task Force Chair, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Ambika Mathur used a multi-pronged approach towards this effort. First, a broadly representative task force of graduate students, graduate faculty, representatives of the Faculty Senate, Department Chairs Council, and Graduate Council, as well as other stakeholders across the university was assembled (listed above). Second, two surveys approved by the task force and by UTSA’s IRB, and led by Graduate School Associate Dean Rebecca Weston were used to assess the climate around graduate education: the first was administered to graduate students (Appendix A) and the second to faculty and staff involved with graduate education (Appendix B). Participants in both surveys are described in Appendix C. Third, as a component of the 2019 Tuition and Fee process, Drs. Mathur and Weston met with a focus group of graduate students representing race, ethnic, gender, and discipline diversity from all colleges (listed above); their valuable input was incorporated in the recommendations. Input was also sought from and provided by the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, Chairs’ Council, as well as Deans and Associate Deans for Graduate Studies of academic colleges. Data were provided by Institutional Research (IR) as requested to each group. Recommendations of the Task Force and other groups are summarized below.

Recommendations

1. Institutional funding packages

Of the current ~900 Fall 2019 enrolled doctoral students, ~500 are considered full-time and ~400 part-time, as defined by number of credits enrolled. Full-time enrollment tuition and fee cost averages ~$11,000 per student at in-state rates, although there is variability by college (Table 1).
Table 1: 2019-20 in-state graduate tuition and fee rate for full-time enrollment by college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$12,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td>$10,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>$11,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal and Fine Arts</td>
<td>$10,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Community, and Policy</td>
<td>$10,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>$11,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At UTSA, funding for graduate students is derived primarily from three sources: 1) institutional general funds budgeted in individual colleges ($5.2M), 2) funds from the Graduate School ($1.2M), and 3) further supplements by funding from external sources including faculty research grants, fundraising and endowments. As is evident, this funding is woefully inadequate to support our 900 doctoral students. Inconsistent with R1 institutions as well as most of our peer and inspirational institutions, we are therefore unable to provide competitive funding packages that include stipends, tuition reimbursement, and health care to our doctoral students. Such low funding levels place our PhD programs at a significant disadvantage and severely limits the ability to attract high caliber students.

Under UTSA’s IRM budgetary model, the $5.2M graduate student funding is allocated directly to academic colleges. Colleges typically fund students as GRAs or GTAs or a combination thereof using these funds and other college/department/faculty funds. The process of appointments and funding amounts of assistantship packages are highly variable across the institution and is consequently confusing to students and faculty. The first order of business is therefore to establish uniform definitions, appointment processes, eligibility requirements, and minimum funding packages that are consistent across UTSA. The Graduate School is tasked to work with HR to establish such a scaffolding. Because most doctoral students have families and reside in Bexar County, minimum stipend levels should be tied to Bexar County’s hourly living wage at $15.20, per MIT guidelines. With doctoral students compensated for 20 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, this then calculates to an approximate annual stipend of $16,000. This should be supplemented by full tuition and healthcare subsidy (example, $2,000 towards UT System’s Student Health Insurance Plan). These packages can be supplemented by colleges based on disciplinary benchmarking but may not exceed a set maximum determined by each college, with funds derived from increased revenue generation by colleges in the areas of Development, Online Programs, Student Credit Hours, and Research. These funds should also be used to increase the numbers of doctoral students as UTSA drives towards R1 status. We understand that...
colleges may not be able to achieve this funding level immediately and therefore propose that funding packages be adjusted in a step-wise manner over a three-year period, with minimum levels set at $14,000 in Year 1 (covering at least tuition, fees, and healthcare, paid directly by UTSA), $22,000 in Year 2 (tuition, fees, healthcare and ½ year stipend), and $30,000 in Year 3 (tuition, fees, healthcare, and stipend).

It is also expected that in STEM disciplines, and in other disciplines where possible, faculty will appoint students to their research grants where permitted and will request appropriate levels of funding for a GRA package in their grant proposal, if GRAs are appointed to work on faculty grant projects for their dissertation research. Research Service Center (RSC) and Business Service Center (BSC) staff must work with faculty to designate minimum levels of requested GRA funds in the proposal stage, and GRA compensation in the award stage.

Strategic use of graduate funds: Funding should be strategically allocated to fund graduate programs that are aligned with UTSA’s strategic mission of high growth and impact research areas, as well as with Key Performance Indicators. Fellowships/assistantships should be prioritized to attract, retain, and graduate a high caliber of diverse students that will be rigorously trained to meet the needs of the national and regional workforce. College graduate funding plans must align with the overall institutional plan to be developed by the colleges in partnership with the Graduate School. The funds available to the Graduate School will be used strategically to grow new interdisciplinary and niche programs and to assist in recruitment, retention and completion of the highest achieving students.

Housing: A large number of graduate students come from outside the San Antonio area and require housing. Unfortunately, UTSA does not have dedicated graduate student housing. Since one of UTSA’s missions is to recruit and retain Hispanic students from outside of San Antonio, it is important to provide university housing that is dedicated to graduate students. It is even more important for access to subsidized University housing since a number of students in this age group also have families, and need affordable and safe housing options.

NRUF funds: UTSA is working towards attaining NRUF status. President Eighmy has earmarked potential NRUF funds to be set aside for doctoral funding packages. Following achievement of NRUF status and disbursement of the approximately ~$7M annually to UTSA, we recommend that the majority of those funds be used to increase the numbers of doctoral students as well as to increase the minimum funding packages awarded to doctoral students. Using these funds accordingly will help us get closer to achieving a minimal enrollment of 1,200 doctoral
students and an expected 200 PhDs awarded each year. In addition, about 20% of the funds should be allocated to the Graduate School for competitive fellowships which should be prioritized to attract top students, needs for bridge funding, and to fund exceptional students who, by staying an additional year, can improve their placement, and to encourage progression towards graduation. This will better permit UTSA to be competitive towards achieving our goal to recruit, retain, and graduate Hispanic students with these funding packages.

*Expand funding sources:* As we grow our doctoral numbers, current institutional funding will not be sufficient for recruiting and successfully graduating our best students. Academic colleges and the Graduate School should partner and raise funds from training grants, corporate partnerships, faculty research grants, endowments and philanthropy. In disciplines where external graduate fellowships are available, programs should make it mandatory for students to apply for these prestigious awards and training should be provided by the Colleges to improve the quality and chances of funding. Where appropriate, an approved fellowship application should be used as a substitute for a written research prospectus in order to make this process more relevant.

### Key Recommendations

- Provide funding packages to doctoral students appointed as GTA/GRA, including stipend, tuition, and health care subsidy. Funding packages should be gradually increased over a period of three years from $14,000 to $30,000 per year:
  - FY 2021: full tuition, fees, and healthcare provided at a minimum of $14,000,
  - FY 2022: full tuition, fees, healthcare, and 1/2 year of stipend for a minimum of $22,000, and
  - FY 2023 and going forward: full tuition, fees, healthcare, and 1 year stipend for a minimum total of $30,000.

In addition:
- Funding could be derived from a mix of institutional and faculty grant funds, including funds from increased revenue generation by the colleges in the areas of Development, Online Programs, Student Credit Hours, and Research.
- Tuition, fees, and healthcare should be paid directly by UTSA
- Part-time or fractional appointments will be allowed in cases where funding is not available at the full rate. Full time appointments require a minimum of $30,000 total funding package.
- Dedicate NRUF funds to increase doctoral student numbers and to increase funding packages.
- Provide dedicated graduate student housing.
- Increase collaboration to obtain training grants and help students with prestigious graduate fellowships.
2. Recruitment and Admissions

Doctoral recruitment and enrollment at UTSA have not kept pace with the needs of an institution aspiring to Carnegie R1 and NRUF designations, and neither has the commitment to diversity at the doctoral level befitting our status as an HSI. It is incumbent upon us to increase our doctoral enrollment of Hispanic students from our current ~25% to around ~50%. UTSA must become the powerhouse that graduates the highest number of Hispanic PhD awardees. We must recruit nationally and from our own domestic pool of Hispanic and other URM students. To achieve this, aggressive and innovative recruitment and retention strategies are required, including the use of holistic review of applications that de-emphasize or eliminate the use of standardized test scores in the admission process. International recruitment was not considered by this Task Force as it is being addressed elsewhere.

Recruitment: The “siloed” recruitment approach without strong strategies has led to fewer applications than would be expected at an institution such as UTSA. Compared to institutions with comparable doctoral programs, our applicant pool should be at least 50% higher than current numbers. This leads to a downstream effect of a lack of selectivity and resultant yield. An example total graduate “funnel” that includes doctoral and master’s levels at UTSA is:

- Inquiries: 4,460
- Applications: 3,023
- Admissions: 2,160

Clearly, the funnel is narrow to begin with and selectivity at admission is low.

Recruitment efforts must be substantially improved using the following approaches:

- Improving outreach efforts using SalesForce platform
- Expanding the current work with Blackboard in partnership with the Graduate School and Strategic Enrollment to create centralized and program/discipline-specific messaging to potential applicants,
- Creating a coordinated virtual marketing campaign,
- Creating more opportunities, funding, and resources for in-person recruitment that use Graduate School recruiters, college recruiters, faculty, and students at career fairs and undergraduate research conferences,
- Creating intentional partnerships with Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) such as other HSIs and HBCUs. These partnerships are highly coveted so attractive funding packages must be made available to promising students,
- Providing research opportunities to undergraduates from the local area so they become acculturated to UTSA and understand the value of a research doctoral degree and preferentially choose UTSA for advanced degrees,
• Creating programs that auto-admit the best and brightest at UTSA, such as Keep Running With Us, and other pre-PhD programs,
• Partnering with UTSA’s First Generation and Transfer Center, pipeline programs such as MARC, RISE, McNair, the Jefferson Scholars Program, and the Tuggle Scholars Program through recruitment activities such as information sessions and mentoring,
• Publicizing holistic reviews of applications that de-emphasize or eliminate standardized test scores in consideration of admission decisions, Institute/mandate use of approved and well-defined rubrics for programs,
• Purchasing lists of standardized test takers and using SalesForce CRM messaging to contact prospects,
• Sustaining and growing international recruitment using virtual and in-person partnerships, and research partnerships between faculty,
• Building a more diverse faculty through Postdoc to Faculty Bridge programs, such as those at Wayne State University and other institutions.

Admissions processes: UTSA’s current graduate admissions process through EMBARK is a cumbersome, unwieldy, and time-consuming process that requires updates via multiple systems, resulting in delayed application processing and admission decision making, leading many top candidates to commit to other schools before receiving our offer. The process begun by the Graduate School in partnership with University Technology Systems must be expedited to accelerate automation of the admissions process so it is nimble and easily usable. This will ensure timely tracking and review of applications from in-progress to committee review and finally to admission decision. The transparent flow will help reduce application processing time. Communication with applicants and admitted students is essential to convert to yield: CRM messaging via SalesForce should be enhanced since increased contact with admitted students generally results in the highest yield. These efficiencies will in turn free up time in the Graduate School, colleges, and programs to dedicate towards recruitment, individualized out-reach, and professional program development for students.
3. Graduate Assistants

**Define Assistantships:** Create job descriptions for Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA)/Graduate Research Assistants (GRA)/Graduate Administrative Assistant (GAA) to include job duties and qualifications. Align position qualifications and limitations in the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) and Human Resources (HR) definitions in maximum number of hours to be worked and minimum number of hours to be enrolled.

Limit appointments to three levels at 0.50 (20 hours), 0.35 (14 hours) and 0.25 (10 hours) FTE and prorate funding package awards accordingly. Doctoral students receiving funding packages will be expected to be enrolled full-time in the first year of study for 9 credits in fall/spring and 3 hours in the summer term, and enrolled in all subsequent years for 6 credits in fall/spring and 3 hours in the summer term. Appointments must be made effective August 15 such that students receive first paycheck on September 1. Minimum funding levels must be used based on discipline; top-offs and supplements are permitted beyond the minimum for programs to be competitive. Per HR policies, GAAs are paid on an hourly basis, and GTAs and GRAs are salaried.

**Graduate Assistant Rights and Responsibilities:** Although most graduate students have productive relationships with research advisors and faculty instructors, conflicts sometimes arise involving inconsistent expectations about the responsibilities of each party. Departments and graduate programs do not always provide information about what graduate students should expect during their degree program or how conflicts can be resolved. As a result, graduate students may not know what is required of them as a GTA/GRA/GAA, or are sometimes confused by situations in which they perceive that they have few options when conflicts with faculty or staff members occur. The Graduate School should develop a Graduate
Assistant Student Handbook to guide students and faculty, underlying policies, and rights and responsibilities. This handbook can be customized by each program.

Key Recommendations

- Establish uniform definitions of graduate assistantship categories (GRA/GTA/GAA), with defined rights and responsibilities.
- Establish uniform appointment processes for GAs.
- Develop a Graduate Assistant Handbook.

4. Graduate Programs, Processes, and Faculty

All stakeholders – task force members, students, faculty, and staff – noted the need for regular reviews of outdated programs and curricula. Our graduate programs should be regularly reviewed for relevancy, currency, and fit with UTSA’s mission. Programs must be reimagined with curricular reform to decrease Time to Degree completion, career preparation, and placement of graduates. Sun-setting or combining/reinvigorating existing programs must be instituted. New programs that meet the labor market needs of the next 5-10 years should be developed in key niche areas of UTSA expertise. Partnerships with industry should be solicited to develop content. Transdisciplinary programs should be encouraged with institutional seed funding to recruit students for 3 years, with a solid business plan to support students beyond that. Programs that lead to undergraduate-master’s joint degree programs should be encouraged. Dual-degree programs should be encouraged with equivalent international and domestic institutions. Multiple delivery modes for courses and programs should be considered, such as face to face, online (asynchronous and synchronous), hybrid, etc.

Program Reviews: All doctoral programs should complete a self-review of the program every five years. This scope of the review should include

- Curriculum
  o Including assessment of program goals, course objectives, and course student learning outcomes
- Program processes
  o Including recruitment, admissions, funding, faculty : student ratio
- Evaluation of GARs
- Time to Degree
- Placement
- Pipeline projections
Program outcomes should be aligned with UTSA’s strategic plan and should include a goal of increasing recruitment, admission, retention, and graduation of Hispanic students. Curriculum should be reviewed with an eye to decreasing Time to Degree. In addition, doctoral dissertations in alternative formats should be encouraged.

The Computer Science graduate program recently undertook such a self-study and has graciously permitted the Task Force to share this document with other programs (Appendix E). This self-study should not exceed 5 pages and should be submitted to the Graduate School on a 5-year cycle. This doctoral program self-review is separate from the SACSCOC-required Academic Program Review, which encompasses the entire department and is on a 10-year cycle.

Programs for which self-reviews demonstrate declining or flat rates of student enrollment should partner with the Graduate School to rejuvenate their doctoral program of study. Individual programs can partner with the Graduate School to identify ways for existing programs to revise curriculum, create new tracks, or potentially merge with other programs. Programs should submit the results of their review with a plan for the next 5 years to their academic college dean and the Graduate School dean. Doctoral funding will be allocated under the IRM model to each college, per program plans aligned with degrees awarded, with a goal of providing funding to programs showing the most promise for graduating and placing diverse students.

Program Handbooks: Many students noted they received little guidance about their graduate program requirements. Most departments have documents that range from a short list of guidelines to a full handbook. Some programs do not have any document, and there is widespread variation in the nature, level, and transparency that such documents provide.

We recommend all programs be required to maintain on their websites an annually updated program handbook and provide students these documents with an orientation to them upon entry into the graduate program. Handbooks should also include procedures for formal evaluations, limitations on program duration or funding availability, and accommodations for parental leave and child-care-related absences.

Training for Graduate Advisors of Record (GAR): GARs should receive a course release and 1-month summer compensation due to the range of responsibilities and expectations throughout the year. However, GAR assignments should not be seen as a means for a faculty member to receive a course release, but as a service requirement to ensure graduate
student success. Inconsistencies across programs in GAR availability, helpfulness, and advising was noted by stakeholders. In response to these concerns, we are recommending the Graduate Council develop a training for GARs. Almost half of Graduate Council members are GARs and many have previously served as GARs. They are therefore well versed with the typical expectations for GARs, including chairing doctoral program committees that oversee admission, curriculum revision, and other program changes; orienting students to their programs, reviewing program requirements with students, conducting annual student evaluations; coordinating qualifying exams; and working with department chairs to ensure required graduate courses are taught as needed. Although Associate Deans within colleges coordinate with GARs, a more comprehensive training for new GARs is necessary to ensure students receive the advising necessary to complete their degree in a timely manner.

Annual Student Evaluations: GARs should conduct an annual evaluation of research and training milestones aligned with the Individual Development Plan for each student, with input from the student’s principal research advisor, instructors, GRA/GTA/GAA supervisors if applicable, and the graduate student. These should be field-specific and aim to give productive feedback to students as they pursue their graduate degrees. GARs should collect these evaluations and monitor their completion.

Key Recommendations

- Establish 5-year self review of each doctoral program.
- Review curriculum and milestone expectations to achieve better TTD and graduation rates and outcomes.
- Develop new innovative and interdisciplinary programs.
- Develop program handbooks to guide doctoral students.
- Establish guidelines for GAR expectations, compensation, and training.
- Mandate annual review of student progress.

5. Value Added Programming

National reports from researchers, federal agencies, and professional societies and organizations have underscored the importance of having well trained students from diverse backgrounds in careers that include the traditional research faculty roles as well as careers in industry, government, non-profits, science policy, among others. It is therefore UTSA’s responsibility to ensure that our doctoral students are ready and
prepared with these skills for success across multiple careers. However, while graduate training faculty recognize and understand that doctoral students need exposure and competencies to succeed in these careers, the reality is that in most cases doctoral programs either lack the resources or the experience in providing their students with either exposure to a greater variety of careers or training in transferrable skill sets. Additionally, even when such opportunities are provided, employers are left with insufficient information to judge mastery of such competencies, since this information is typically not recorded on academic transcripts. To address these issues, the Graduate School must serve as the central resource and partner with academic colleges, the University Career Center as well as internship partners, alumni, and potential employers, to provide career exploration and competency training centrally in an efficient one stop shop.

The Graduate School should 1) partner with area employers to lead the charge in transforming institutional culture to accept that all careers are successful outcomes, 2) provide doctoral students with exposures to these multiple career paths, 3) ensure training in disciplinary mentored research as well as in competencies and skillsets so that students are successful across career types, and 4) demonstrate student mastery of these competencies to potential employers using digital micro-credentialing. These objectives must be met in an atmosphere that advances diversity and inclusive excellence to ensure that our diverse student body exceeds, surpasses, and leads the nation in their desired careers. With this Value Added training,

Students will 1) be better able to identify and understand a variety of career sectors, 2) engage in professional development opportunities to prepare for their chosen career path, and 3) have research and transferrable/power skills that will make them competitive applicants in their chosen career.

Faculty will 1) be better able to identify non-academic career options for their students, 2) be able to identify appropriate opportunities for students to develop career specific skills and share these with students, 3) understand the benefit to UTSA of supporting student placement in multiple career paths, and 4) create and foster bridges and partnerships with internship partners and area employers.

Internship partners and potential employers will 1) help create opportunities for students to learn competencies and transferrable skills, 2) provide internships and career exploration opportunities, and 3) engage in a mentoring network for our students.
Annual Review and Individual Development Plan (IDP): The Graduate School, in partnership with academic colleges, should mandate the use of an electronic Annual Review of each doctoral student’s progress from admission to completion, for didactic, research, and value added programming. The annual IDP linked to the annual review should allow mentors and mentees to follow a plan that supports, develops and evolves with the student’s preparation for an eventual career post-completion of their doctoral program. The Graduate School should work closely with Institutional Research to track metrics and build dashboards for research and career success of graduate students while at UTSA, and follow alumni career outcomes following graduation for 15 years, as required by a growing number of federal funding agencies.

Graduate Teaching Training: Many faculty do not necessarily have the time to train students in best teaching practices. For students interested in careers that involve teaching, whether at the K – 12, undergraduate, graduate, or adult learner level, development of teaching ability is crucial across disciplines. Development of teaching skills that address strengths and challenges of a growing diverse student population in a culture of inclusion is especially important. We propose two options for providing training in teaching.

The first option is open to all students, but is likely to appeal most to those in STEM fields. Students will be introduced to a new 12 credit graduate certificate in STEM Teaching developed collaboratively by COEHD, COE, and COS, where doctoral students are co-mentored and co-supervised by faculty in the COEHD and in the respective discipline. This certificate is built on best practices showing such training is successful in increasing participants’ self-efficacy in the area of teaching.

The second option will be a competitive opportunity that includes a funding package for doctoral students from any discipline. Four GTAs will be selected for one semester of intensive training to teach at the undergraduate level. Students will meet weekly in the fall semester with faculty teaching experts from UTSA and other institutions nationwide. They will develop and deliver guest lectures in courses relevant to their discipline with feedback from UTSA faculty. They will receive training in development of syllabi, course planning, selection of texts and supplemental course materials, and use of technology for online learning. In the spring semester, these GTAs will then train their fellow graduate students in teaching.

Well-being of graduate students as a priority: Graduate student advocacy and participation in student affairs events should be formalized. Workshops pertaining to wellness and mental health for graduate students
and post docs must be formalized. Leave of absence policies and parental leave policies must similarly be offered to all graduate students.

Key Recommendations

- Prepare doctoral students for a broad range of careers.
- Mandate use of Annual Review and IDP.
- Provide career exploration and competency training in an efficient one-stop shop.
- Develop Graduate Teaching Training programs for GTAs.
- Prioritize graduate student well-being, including developing policies for leaves of absence and parental leaves.
- Enhance community engagement by expanding digital micro-credentialing program to include alumni and community.

6. Postdoctoral Training

New postdoctoral trainees should be onboarded twice a year through a Postdoctoral Orientation, which includes an introduction to UTSA’s Graduate and Postdoctoral Success (GPS) for career development and community. Postdoctoral trainees will also have access to Career Builder Badges and GPS Career Stories, alongside graduate students. All postdocs will have the opportunity to participate in the 2-day Graduate School Research Days at UTSA and the 1-day San Antonio Postdoctoral Research Forum at UT-Health at San Antonio. Highly engaged postdocs will develop and facilitate activities for the Annual National Postdoc Appreciation Week at UTSA and will be invited to attend the Annual National Postdoctoral Association Conference. Exposing postdoctoral trainees to national programming will encourage the development of local programming, community, and a robust UTSA Postdoctoral Association. VPREDKE office supports postdoctoral training through self-paced proposal development courses – Essentials of Grant Proposal Development and NSF Career Web Series – as well as cradle-to-completion research administration support. The Graduate School will work closely with Institutional Research to track metrics and build dashboards for research and career success of postdocs while at UTSA and five years outside UTSA.
In addition to improving the student experience and career outcomes for UTSA's graduate students, this initiative recognizes the critical role that graduate students play in support of the university’s dual mission of teaching and research. The quality of doctoral education, in particular, is inextricably linked to the university’s visionary destination as a Great Public Research University. Graduate Research Assistants provide outstanding intellectual capital and partnership with faculty in conducting research; Graduate Teaching Assistants are essential in providing quality instruction to our diverse undergraduate student body and ensuring their timely completion and graduation. We must leverage UTSA's HSI status to recruit, retain, and graduate the best Hispanic students from our San Antonio community and around the country, providing them with funding and resources to succeed. This includes aggressive recruitment, holistic admission reviews, competitive funding packages, health care subsidies, dedicated graduate student housing, academic and professional/career development opportunities, as well as exposure and preparation for multiple career paths. UTSA should be the highest producer of Hispanic graduate alumni, given our status and location. The interventions developed through the Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence Initiative will better enable UTSA to meet targets to enroll at least 1,200 doctoral students by 2028, and to award at least 200 Ph.D. degrees annually in support of our goals to achieve and sustain designation as a Carnegie Research 1 institution and the National Research University Fund. It is heartening to note that across UT System, institutions have either recently conducted or are planning similar reviews of graduate education, such as the comprehensive report from UT Austin’s 2019-20 Graduate Education Task Force (https://utexas.app.box.com/v/graduate-education-reportps://utexas.app.box.com/v/graduate-education-report).
Appendices

Appendix A. Graduate Student Survey

Start of Block: Instructions

☐ I have read the Information Sheet about this study and wish to participate. (1)

End of Block: Instructions

Start of Block: Current Student Status

Q1 Thank you for agreeing to participate in this brief survey. Our goal is to determine what aspects of our graduate programs are successful and what areas need improvement. Please do NOT enter your name or ID in this survey - we are asking for anonymous responses. Your responses will not be connected to your identity. Data will be shared in aggregate form.

Q4 What is your status as a graduate student at UTSA?

☐ I am actively pursuing a graduate degree or certificate. (1)

☐ I am on a leave of absence. (2)

☐ I have withdrawn from UTSA. (3)

☐ I have earned my graduate degree or certificate and am no longer attending UTSA. (4)

Display This Question:
If Q4 = I have withdrawn from UTSA.

Q5 What are the top two reasons that you withdrew from your graduate program?

Skip To: End of Survey If Condition: What are the top two reason... Is Not Empty. Skip To: End of Survey.
Skip To: End of Survey If Condition: What are the top two reason... Is Empty. Skip To: End of Survey.
Q6 When did you graduate?

- Fall 2019  (1)
- prior to Fall 2019  (2)

Q34 Congratulations on graduating! We would especially appreciate your help as a recent graduate. Because most respondents are current students, all items are written in current tense. Please respond thinking about your most recent semester at UTSA.

Q8 Which of the following best describes you?

- I am a doctoral student  (1)
- I am a Master’s student  (2)
- I am a graduate student in a certificate program  (3)
Q56 How did you first learn about UTSA’s graduate programs?

☐ Faculty member at another institution (1)
☐ Faculty member at UTSA (2)
☐ Internet search (3)
☐ Current UTSA student (4)
☐ Recruiting event (5)
☐ As an undergraduate student (6)
☐ Other (7) ________________________________

Q10 Please select your program from the options below. SEE MAJOR CODE LIST
College (1)
Department (2)
Degree (3)
Major (4)

▼ Architecture, Construction and Planning (1) ... University College ~ University College ~ PhD
~ Translational Science (305)

Q11 Which of the following have you COMPLETED?

☐ All coursework (1)
☐ preliminary/ qualifying/ comprehensive exams (2)
☐ thesis/dissertation proposal (3)
☐ thesis/dissertation defense (4)
☐ none of these (you are still taking courses) (5)
Q12 Which of the following describes you best?

- Full-time student (1)
- Part-time student (2)

Q13 When did you first start in your current graduate program? (e.g., Fall 2019)

________________________________________________________________

Q14 What was the primary reason you decided to enroll in your graduate program at UTSA?

________________________________________________________________

Q15 Do you have any other graduate degrees?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:
If Q15 = Yes
Q17 How many graduate degrees have you earned?

○ 1 (1)
○ 2 (2)
○ 3 (3)
○ 4 or more (4)

Q24 Are you thinking about leaving UTSA without completing the graduate degree in which you are enrolled?

○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Display This Question:
If Q24 = Yes

Q25 Why are you thinking about leaving your program?
Q54 In what year did you earn your undergraduate degree? If you have earned multiple undergraduate degrees, indicate the year of your most recent undergraduate degree.

Year (1)
1. 2020 (1)
2. 2019 (2)
3. 2018 (3)
4. 2017 (4)
5. 2016 (5)
6. 2015 (6)
7. 2014 (7)
8. 2013 (8)
9. 2012 (9)
10. 2011 (10)
11. 2010 (11)
12. 2009 (12)
13. 2008 (13)
14. 2007 (14)
15. 2006 (15)
16. 2005 (16)
17. 2004 (17)
18. 2003 (18)
19. 2002 (19)
20. 2001 (20)
21. 2000 (21)
22. 1999 (22)
23. 1998 (23)
24. 1997 (24)
25. 1996 (25)
26. 1995 (26)
27. 1994 (27)
28. 1993 (28)
29. 1992 (29)
30. 1991 (30)
31. 1990 (31)
32. 1989 (32)
33. 1988 (33)
34. 1987 (34)
35. 1986 (35)
36. 1985 (36)
37. 1984 (37)
End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Employment and Financial Aid

Q26 Are you currently employed?

- Yes, full-time (1)
- Yes, as a part-time employee in a capacity not related to my status as a student (2)
- Yes, as a Graduate Research Assistant (or research equivalent position) (3)
- Yes, as a part-time instructor (including GTA, lecturer and other positions held by graduate students) (4)
- Yes, other (explain) (5)
- No (6)

Q27 Do you receive any form of support through UTSA (e.g., stipend, scholarship, fellowship) because you are a graduate student?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q28 Please check all that you have received since you started your current graduate program at UTSA.

- [ ] Departmental stipend (1)
- [ ] Fellowship (2)
- [ ] Scholarship (3)
- [ ] Financial aid - grant (4)
- [ ] Financial aid - student loan (5)
- [ ] Employee Education Benefits tuition waiver (6)

Q29 Which of the following do/did you have to do to receive the stipend? (Please check all that apply.)

- [ ] Serve as a graduate research assistant (1)
- [ ] Serve as an instructor for an undergraduate class (2)
- [ ] Other tasks: (3) ____________________________________________________________
Q30 Approximately how much money have you PERSONALLY borrowed in STUDENT LOANS for your current graduate program?

- Less than $10,000 (1)
- $10,000 - $19,999 (2)
- $20,000 - $29,999 (3)
- $30,000 - $39,999 (4)
- $40,000 - $49,999 (5)
- $50,000 - $59,999 (6)
- $60,000 - $69,999 (7)
- $70,000 - $79,999 (8)
- $80,000 - $89,999 (9)
- $90,000 - $99,999 (10)
- $100,000 - $149,999 (11)
- More than $150,000 (12)

▼ Less than $10,000 (1) ... More than $150,000 (12)

Q64 Approximately how much money has YOUR FAMILY borrowed in STUDENT LOANS for your current graduate program?
SAME CODES AS ABOVE

▼ Less than $10,000 (1) ... More than $150,000 (12)
Q63 What is lacking in support in your current graduate program?

________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Employment and Financial Aid

Start of Block: GAR and program expectations

Q31 Have the following program expectations been clearly explained by your GAR, advisor, and/or department? (Each program should have a GAR or Graduate Advisor of Record. This person is typically a faculty member who advises students on courses to take, what forms need to be completed, and when deadlines are approaching.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
<th>Does Not Apply (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses to be completed (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary/qualifying exams (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research expectations (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation proposal (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation defense (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment after graduation (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q32 Since starting the program, how frequently have you met with your program's Graduate Advisor of Record (GAR)?

- More than once per month (1)
- Monthly (2)
- Once a semester (3)
- Once a year (4)
- Never (5)
Q33 Overall, how useful has the feedback from your GAR been?

- Very useful (1)
- Generally useful (2)
- Not very useful (3)
- Not at all useful (4)

End of Block: GAR and program expectations

Start of Block: Academic Advising

Q35 Do you currently have an academic advisor other than your program's GAR?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Block If Q35 = No
Q36 Has your academic advisor been available to meet and talk with you during the following stages of your graduate career? (Note that not all may apply to you.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
<th>Does not apply (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While completing all coursework</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary/qualifying exams</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation writing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation proposal</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation data analysis</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/dissertation defense</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment after graduation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q37 Since starting the program, how frequently have you met with your advisor(s)?

- ○ More than once per month  (1)
- ○ Monthly  (2)
- ○ Once a semester  (3)
- ○ Once a year  (4)
- ○ Never  (5)
Q38 Overall, how useful has the feedback from your advisor(s) been?

- Very useful (1)
- Generally useful (2)
- Not very useful (3)
- Not at all useful (4)

Q39 Using only a few words or short phrases, how would you describe your overall relationship with your advisor(s)?

________________________________________________________________

Q40 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the quality of the relationship you have with your advisor(s)?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Display This Question:
If Q40 = Somewhat dissatisfied
Or Q40 = Extremely dissatisfied

Q41 Why are you dissatisfied with the relationship you have with your academic advisor?

________________________________________________________________
Q42 Have you spoken with anyone in your department about your dissatisfaction?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q65 Do you have another mentor who is helping you in any way with your academic career?

- Yes (17)
- No (18)

Q66 Please briefly describe who your mentor is:

________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Academic Advising

Start of Block: Career goals
Q43 In which of the following broad areas do you expect to seek employment after you graduate?

- Academia (1)
- Industry (2)
- Government (3)
- Non-profit (4)
- Other (5)

Q44 Has your training at UTSA prepared you to be a competitive job applicant?

- Definitely yes (1)
- Probably yes (2)
- Probably not (3)
- Definitely not (4)

Display This Question:
If $Q44 = \text{Definitely yes}$
Or $Q44 = \text{Probably yes}$

Q45 What aspects of your training prepared you to be competitive?

Display This Question:
If $Q44 = \text{Probably not}$
Or $Q44 = \text{Definitely not}$

Q46 In what areas do you feel your training is lacking?

End of Block: Career goals

Start of Block: Expected completion
Q47 When do you expect to complete your degree or certificate?

Year (1)
Semester (2) CODE THIS RESPONSE FIRST, IF NONE, CODE YEAR

2019 (1)
2019 ~ Fall (2)
2020 (3)
2020 ~ Spring (4)
2020 ~ Summer (5)
2020 ~ Fall (6)
2021 (7)
2021 ~ Spring (8)
2021 ~ Summer (9)
2021 ~ Fall (10)
2022 (11)
2022 ~ Spring (12)
2022 ~ Summer (13)
2022 ~ Fall (14)
2023 (15)
2023 ~ Spring (16)
2023 ~ Summer (17)
2023 ~ Fall (18)
2024 (19)
2024 ~ Spring (20)
2024 ~ Summer (21)
2024 ~ Fall (22)
2025 (23)
2025 ~ Spring (24)
2025 ~ Summer (25)
2025 ~ Fall (26)
2026 (27)
2026 ~ Spring (28)
2026 ~ Summer (29)
2026 ~ Fall (30)
2027 (31)
2027 ~ Spring (32)
2027 ~ Summer (33)
2027 ~ Fall (34)
Q48 Have you ever had concerns about not being able to complete your graduate degree?

- Yes, frequently (1)
- Yes, occasionally (2)
- No (3)

Display This Question:
If Q48 = Yes, frequently
Or Q48 = Yes, occasionally

Q49 What are/were your primary concerns about not being able to complete your degree?

____________________________________________________________________

Page Break
Q54 To what extent have the following PROGRAM factors contributed to your ability to continue in your graduate program to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strong contributor to my continuation (1)</th>
<th>Moderate contributor to my continuation (2)</th>
<th>Small contributor to my continuation (3)</th>
<th>Does not affect my continuation at all (4)</th>
<th>Not applicable (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program GAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/career guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence (GSS) Task Force Report
Q55 To what extent have the following PERSONAL factors contributed to your ability to continue in your graduate program to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strong contributor to my continuation (1)</th>
<th>Moderate contributor to my continuation (2)</th>
<th>Small contributor to my continuation (3)</th>
<th>Does not affect my continuation at all (4)</th>
<th>Not applicable (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial support (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mentors (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and determination (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (non-financial) support (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social environment/peer group support (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/career guidance (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors: (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q67 Have you joined any UTSA organizations?

- Yes (28)
- No (29)

Display This Question:
If Q67 = Yes

Q68 What organizations are you involved in?

________________________________________________________________

Q69 Have you used the services available at UTSA’s Career Center?

- Yes (5)
- No (6)

Display This Question:
If Q69 = Yes

Q70 What services were most helpful?

________________________________________________________________

Q71 Have you attended any workshops or events held for UTSA students?

- Yes (23)
- No (24)
Q72 Which events were the most helpful to you?
________________________________________________________________

Page Break

Q50 What has been the MOST POSITIVE aspect of your graduate program?
________________________________________________________________

Q51 What has been the LEAST POSITIVE aspect of your graduate program?
________________________________________________________________

Q52 What would you recommend your program and/or UTSA do to help students complete their graduate program?
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Expected completion

Start of Block: demographics

Q18 Please list your other degrees below (degree, major, institution, year):

☐ Degree #1 (e.g., MS) (1)

☐ Degree #1 Major/area of study (2)

☐ Degree #1 Institution (3)

☐ Year degree #1 was earned (4)
Q19 Please list your other degrees below (degree, major, institution, year):

- Degree #1 (e.g., MS) (1)
- Degree #1 Major/area of study (2)
- Degree #1 Institution (3)
- Year degree #1 was earned (4)
- Degree #2 (e.g., MS) (5)
- Degree #2 Major/area of study (6)
- Degree #2 Institution (7)
- Year degree #2 was earned (8)

Q20 Please list your other degrees below (degree, major, institution, year):

- Degree #1 (e.g., MS) (1)
- Degree #1 Major/area of study (2)
- Degree #1 Institution (3)
- Year degree #1 was earned (4)
- Degree #2 (e.g., MS) (5)
- Degree #2 Major/area of study (6)
- Degree #2 Institution (7)
- Year degree #2 was earned (8)
- Degree #3 (e.g., MS) (9)
Q21 Please list your other degrees below (degree, major, institution, year):

- Degree #1 (e.g., MS) (1)
- Degree #1 Major/area of study (2)
- Degree #1 Institution (e.g. University of Texas at San Antonio) (3)
- Year degree #1 was earned (4)
- Degree #2 (e.g., MS) (5)
- Degree #2 Major/area of study (6)
- Degree #2 Institution (7)
- Year degree #2 was earned (8)
- Degree #3 (e.g., MS) (9)
- Degree #3 Major/area of study (10)
- Degree #3 Institution (11)
- Year degree #3 was earned (12)
- Degree #4 (e.g., MS) (13)
- Degree #4 Major/area of study (14)
- Degree #4 Institution (15)
○ Year degree #4 was earned (16)

Q57 What is your age?
   Under 18 (11)
   18 - 24 (12)
   25 - 34 (13)
   35 - 44 (14)
   45 - 54 (15)
   55 - 64 (16)
   65 - 74 (17)
   75 - 84 (18)
   85 or older (19)

▼ Under 18 (11) ... 85 or older (19)

Q60 Are you Hispanic?
   ○ Yes (1)
   ○ No (2)

Q58 Which of the following best describes you?
   ○ White (11)
   ○ Black or African American (12)
   ○ American Indian or Alaska Native (13)
   ○ Asian (14)
   ○ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (15)
   ○ Other (16) ________________________________
Q59 With which gender do you identify?

☐ Male (11)

☐ Female (12)

☐ Other (13) ________________________________________________

End of Block: demographics
Appendix B. Faculty and Staff Survey

Start of Block: included

Q3
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this brief survey. Our goal is to determine what aspects of our graduate programs are successful and what areas need improvement. Please do NOT enter your name or ID in this survey - we are asking for anonymous responses. Your responses will not be connected to your identity. Data will be shared in aggregate form.

Q12 Please select the option that best describes your position at UTSA:

- I am a staff member (1)
- I am a member of the faculty (2)
- Other (please describe): (3)

Q4 Please use the scale below to rate the overall quality of the graduate students you interact with on a regular basis at UTSA.

- Excellent (1)
- Very Good (2)
- Good (3)
- Fair (4)
- Poor (5)
Q5 In your experience, how quickly do graduate students at UTSA complete their degrees?

- Much faster than expected (1)
- Moderately faster than expected (2)
- Slightly faster than expected (3)
- About as expected (4)
- Slightly slower than expected (5)
- Moderately slower than expected (6)
- Much slower than expected (7)

Q6 Is the funding provided to graduate students at UTSA (including stipend, tuition, and healthcare) acceptable?

- Far exceeds expectations (1)
- Exceeds expectations (2)
- Equals expectations (3)
- Short of expectations (4)
- Far short of expectations (5)

Q7 What changes should be made with regard to funding for graduate education?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence (GSS) Task Force Report
Q8 Should value-added programming (e.g., career preparation, developing oral and written communication skills) be delivered by programs or the Graduate School?

- Delivered primarily by the Graduate School (1)
- Delivered both by the Graduate School and programs (2)
- Delivered primarily by the program (3)

Q9 What value added programming would you like to see delivered by the Graduate School?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Page Break

Q10 Are postdoctoral fellows at UTSA provided adequate support in terms of professional development?

- Definitely yes (11)
- Probably yes (12)
- Uncertain (13)
- Probably not (14)
- Definitely not (15)
Q11 What additional support, if any, should be provided to postdoctoral fellows?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Q8 This is our final question - what other comments or feedback do you have about graduate education at UTSA?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: included
Appendix C. Method

Graduate Student Survey

To ensure graduate students had an opportunity to share their experiences, opinions, and concerns, we conducted an online survey. The survey in Appendix A was developed with input from task force members, current and former graduate students, graduate faculty, and staff. The survey was approved by UTSA’s IRB. No incentives were provided.

Procedures

Graduate students were recruited to participate in our online survey through an initial mass email sent on February 18, 2020. All 3,988 graduate students enrolled in Spring 2020 were emailed the following message through Marketing Cloud:

“A task force has been convened to advance graduate education at UTSA by enhancing value-added programming and postdoctoral training; graduate programs and faculty; and career outcomes. You can read more about the task force and goals here. As part of the initiative, the task force is reviewing graduate education processes to ensure they are aligned with UTSA’s dual missions of teaching and research. The task force is using evidence-based and data-based decision making to provide UTSA leadership with recommendations for improving graduate recruitment and retention, determining what value-added programming will best help prepare graduates for careers across multiple sectors and benefit society, and demonstrating ways in which our students make intellectual and economic contributions to San Antonio and Texas - this is where we need your help!

We are seeking your feedback as a graduate student at UTSA. We are emailing to ask you to participate in a brief online survey about your experiences as a graduate student at UTSA. The survey will not take longer than 10 minutes to complete. Please click here to complete the survey: UTSA Graduate Student Survey. You can also copy and paste this link: https://utsa.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6ikB8yw0OhmdLo1. Thank you for taking the time to help us improve your experience as a Roadrunner!”

All students were sent the following reminder to complete the online survey on February 28, 2020. Because responses are anonymous, the reminder was sent to all enrolled students.

“Thank you very much to all graduate students who have responded to our survey! We appreciate the time you have taken to share your thoughts, experiences, and feedback.

If you have not yet completed the survey - you still have time to respond! We need to close the survey on Friday so we can spend Spring Break analyzing your responses. Most participants have taken no more than 15 minutes to complete the survey. However, we should note that there are several open-ended questions and the more detail you provide, the longer the survey may take you to complete. Please click here to complete the survey: UTSA Graduate Student Survey. You can also copy and paste this link: https://utsa.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6ikB8yw0OhmdLo1. Thank you for taking the time to help us improve your experience as a Roadrunner!”

Participants

Responses were received from 472 graduate students for a response rate of 11.8%. Demographic information for participants is included in Table 1 below.
Table 1. Demographic information for student participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Pursued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Student</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEHD</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCaP</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLFA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (not as student)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receiving any support from UTSA as a Graduate Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students were asked about their career goals and whether their programs have prepared them to be competitive job applicants. Responses are in Table 2.

Table 2. Responses to career related questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Pathway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has your training prepared you to be a competitive job applicant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Not</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Not</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and Staff Survey Participants

To capture the perspective of UTSA’s faculty and staff on graduate education, we conducted a separate online survey. The very brief survey is included in Appendix B. Due to the multiple other, more urgent communications from UTSA to the campus community, the survey link was not distributed until April 1, 2020. All UTSA faculty and staff (N = 4,334) received the following email from University Communications:

“A task force has been convened to advance graduate education at UTSA by enhancing value-added programming and postdoctoral training; graduate programs and faculty; and career outcomes. You can read more about the task force and goals here: https://www.utsa.edu/strategicplan/academic-initiatives/graduate-success/index.html. As part of the initiative, the task force is reviewing graduate education processes to ensure they are aligned with UTSA’s dual missions of teaching and research.

We are seeking feedback from staff and faculty at UTSA. We are emailing to ask you to participate in a very brief online survey about your experiences working with graduate students at UTSA. The survey consists of 10 questions and will not take longer than 10 minutes to complete. Please click here to complete the survey: Task Force Survey on Graduate Education. You can also copy and paste this link: https://utsa.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6DrT8470eG38IKJ. Thank you for taking the time to help us improve graduate education at UTSA!”

Responses were received from 333 faculty and staff for a response rate of 7.7%. Responses to all scaled items are included below in Table 3. Qualitative responses were coded and informed our recommendations.
Table 3. Summary of faculty and staff responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., staff member on graduate faculty, emeritus, adjoint faculty)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much faster than expected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately faster than expected</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly faster than expected</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About as expected</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly slower than expected</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately slower than expected</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much slower than expected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far exceeds expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals expectations</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short of expectations</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far short of expectations</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value added programs should be delivered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primarily by the Graduate School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both by the Graduate School and programs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primarily by the program</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are postdocs provided adequate support?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Business PhD Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship/Scholarships</th>
<th>Base Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Research Budget</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total (Exclude Tuition)</th>
<th>Tuition Amount</th>
<th>Total (Include Tuition)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Private vs. Public</th>
<th>US vs. Foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT - Dallas</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$21,452</td>
<td>$63,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Austin</td>
<td>$38,480</td>
<td>$38,480</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$38,480</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$50,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>$12,936</td>
<td>$43,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$9,473</td>
<td>$43,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>$31,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
<td>$11,604</td>
<td>$44,804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td>$35,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT - El Paso</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$11,833</td>
<td>$50,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>$7,515</td>
<td>$28,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT - Arlington</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$10,248</td>
<td>$29,148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$30,570</td>
<td>$25,126</td>
<td>$7,050</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>$31,414</td>
<td>$45,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$31,750</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$44,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTSA’s stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than Texas’ averages by: 13.5%
UTSA’s stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than the Texas’ median by: 27.6%

Main Findings as we compare UTSA to other Universities in Texas:
- The average (median) Texas Accounting PhD program annual base stipend and fellowship is $28,379 ($31,750), which is 13.5% (27%) higher than the one offered at UTSA.

UTSA Peer Models of Excellence PhD Annual Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship/Scholarships</th>
<th>Base Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Research Budget</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total (Exclude Tuition)</th>
<th>Tuition Amount</th>
<th>Total (Include Tuition)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Private vs. Public</th>
<th>US vs. Foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore CC</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$13,986</td>
<td>$53,986</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$66,480</td>
<td>ACc</td>
<td>Public US</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Irvine*</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$11,338</td>
<td>$44,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Santa Cruz*</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$10,017</td>
<td>$35,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
<td>$10,017</td>
<td>$38,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$10,017</td>
<td>$38,017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>$9,148</td>
<td>$37,089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$10,017</td>
<td>$35,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$10,017</td>
<td>$35,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Riverside*</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$3,795</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$13,494</td>
<td>$38,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida*</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$8,872</td>
<td>$31,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$5,626</td>
<td>$23,626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>Public US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$26,489</td>
<td>$26,489</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,933</td>
<td>$2,359</td>
<td>$29,833</td>
<td>$42,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>$42,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTSA’s stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than the peers models of excellence’s average by: 5.8%
UTSA’s stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than the peers models of excellence’s median by: 11.6%

Main Findings as we compare UTSA to peer models of excellence:
- The average (median) Texas Accounting PhD program annual base stipend and fellowship is $28,379 ($31,750), which is 13.5% (27%) higher than the one offered at UTSA.

The data that is grouped below is not updated - Canas Updated the tables above on Sep 28 2019

U.S. Public Universities PhD Annual Compensation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Depend + Fellowship/Scholarships ($)</th>
<th>Base Stipend ($)</th>
<th>Fellowship ($)</th>
<th>Research Budget ($)</th>
<th>Insurance ($)</th>
<th>Other ($)</th>
<th>Total (Exclude Tuition) ($)</th>
<th>Tuition Amount ($)</th>
<th>Total (Include Tuition) ($)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$24,649</td>
<td>$12,069</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22,639</td>
<td>$35,645</td>
<td>$30,889</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>$38,109</td>
<td>$33,109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>42,600</td>
<td>45,525</td>
<td>87,125</td>
<td>[Link](http:// examplesite.com)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley University</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>14,085</td>
<td>$46,885</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>$35,192</td>
<td>$30,192</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,379</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>43,652</td>
<td>16,590</td>
<td>60,152</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>$32,750</td>
<td>$32,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$36,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>$32,600</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$32,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>38,325</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$63,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>$33,625</td>
<td>$33,625</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>39,320</td>
<td>48,136</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>$29,725</td>
<td>$29,725</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,725</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,725</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>$23,250</td>
<td>$23,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$25,050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$33,185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>$28,212</td>
<td>$24,712</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,712</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>36,950</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>$25,900</td>
<td>$25,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>27,377</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Madison</td>
<td>$25,688</td>
<td>$15,688</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>8,182</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>35,030</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>$27,900</td>
<td>$27,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>$25,600</td>
<td>$25,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>$25,900</td>
<td>$25,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$28,830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,751</td>
<td>29,012</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>31,103</td>
<td>18,340</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$32,721</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>$19,629</td>
<td>$15,629</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$23,629</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$27,772</td>
<td>$26,174</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>$31,772</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="http://examplesite.com">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The average annual base stipend and fellowship of accounting PhD programs is $27,772, which is 10.9% greater than the US Public Universities' averages.

**Link:** [GSS Task Force Report](https://www.gssreport.org)

**Main Findings:**
- The stipend + fellowship/scholarship is lower than the US Public Universities' averages by 10.9%.
- The US Public Universities' averages is 6.0% higher than the average.
- The graduate assistantship is lower than the US Public Universities' averages by 9.1%.

---

**UTSA's Stipends + Fellowship/Scholarship is lower than the US Public Universities' averages by:** 10.9%
### U.S. Private Universities PhD Annual Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Stipend + Fellowships/Scholarships</th>
<th>Base Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Research Budget</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total (Exclude Tuition)</th>
<th>Tuition Amount</th>
<th>Total (Include Tuition)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Private vs. Public</th>
<th>US Vs Foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,590</td>
<td>$50,990</td>
<td>$81,940</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.admin.emory.edu/graduate-science/financial-aid">Link</a></td>
<td>Private-US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$28,350</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.uncwil.edu/grad-students/admissions/financial-aid/">Link</a></td>
<td>Private-US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,500</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.utexas.edu/graduate-students/financial-aid">Link</a></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$35,496</td>
<td>$36,996</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,921</td>
<td>$3,107</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,890</td>
<td>$50,107</td>
<td>$81,997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UTSA's stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than the US Private Universities' averages by: 42.6%

#### Main Findings of Private Universities in the U.S.
- The average annual base stipend and fellowship of accounting PhD program in private U.S. universities is $34,957, which is 39.3% higher than that offered at UTSA.
- The average annual total financial package (excluding tuition) of accounting PhD program in private U.S. universities is $54,445, which is 65.8% higher than that offered at UTSA.
- 60% universities provide research budget (average of $2,652) on top of PhD stipend.
- 60% of universities provide health insurance benefits to PhD students.
- The average miscellaneous financial support is $887.

### International Universities PhD Annual Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Average of Stipend + Fellowships/Scholarships</th>
<th>Base Stipend</th>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Research Budget</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total (Exclude Tuition)</th>
<th>Tuition Amount</th>
<th>Total (Include Tuition)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Private vs. Public</th>
<th>US Vs Foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSEAD</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,080</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$105,080</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.insead.edu/admissions/financial-aid">Link</a></td>
<td>Private-US</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td>$30,876</td>
<td>$30,876</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,000</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.london.edu/education-development/phd/scholarships-and-support/WHYI9KLV.MustCreateNewExternalLink">Link</a></td>
<td>Private-US</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www2.mcgill.ca/graduatestudies/financialaid">Link</a></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC Paris</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,500</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.hec.ca/phd/admissions/financial-aid">Link</a></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,125</td>
<td>$27,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,425</td>
<td>$32,425</td>
<td>$64,850</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ucr.edu/cas/graduate/financial-aid.html">Link</a></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$35,500</td>
<td>DocNet Survey 2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.utexas.edu/graduate-students/financial-aid">Link</a></td>
<td>Public-US</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UTSA's stipends + fellowships/scholarships is lower than the US Private Universities' averages by: 3.4%

#### Main Findings of International Universities.
- The average International Accounting PhD Program yearly base stipend and fellowship is $24,973, which is comparable to the one offered at UTSA.
- The average International Accounting PhD Program annual total financial package is $28,137 (excluding tuition), which is 12.5% higher than the one offered at UTSA.
- 71% international universities provide research budget (average of $2,652) on top of PhD stipend.
- The average miscellaneous financial support is $4,297.
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CS @ UTSA

- Rising Enrollment 10-15% nationally and locally (slides 4-7)
  - For better student success need for TT, NTT, TAs/Graders for bringing TT/student ratio from 70 to 30 (National Av.) (UTSA goal of Model for Student Success)
  - TA and related needs (recitations, grading & tutoring):
    About 60 in FY19 to 80 in FY24
- High PhD Productivity (slides 8-11)
  - 0.47 vs 0.3 National Av.; Enrollment/faculty 3.5 vs. 3 Natl Av.
- Average Annual Research Expenditure/faculty of $150K+ exceeds national average of $125K (slides 12-13)
- PhD Pipeline – model, projections (slides 14-21)
  - 15-20 PhD graduations/year in 5 yrs (UTSA goal for R1/NRUF)
  - Funding Model: Institutional 50-55%; External 45-50% (to match national average) - Has been Av. External 55%; Institutional 45%, which may not be sustainable
- Requesting 22 new PhD students for Fall’20
  - To support TA needs, incoming TT faculty in Fall’20, and projected graduations

Summary – current and future

- Current state (Faculty: 20 T/TT)
  - PhD students:
    • 73 for Fall 2019
    • 68 Spring 2020 (1 quit, 2 graduated, 4 dismissed, 2 new)
    • Including 7 part-time → 61 Full-Time PhDs
  - PhD Graduates in past 6 years
    • (FY19: 12, FY18: 10, FY17: 7, FY16 10, FY15 12, FY14 15)

- Future objectives in 5 Years
  - PhD Graduates: ~ 15 to 20 per year
  - Faculty: 40-50 T/TT
  - PhD students: ~ 120 to 150 (3 to 4 PhDs per faculty)
CS Undergraduate Enrollment:
National Trend: 12-13% increase per year
CRA-Taulbee Survey Average of 97 public CS Dept.

Undergraduate Enrollment vs. T/TT Faculty Ratio

UTSA CS is here: > 70!
#TT => 2X-3X increase for student success
Undergraduate Enrollments in CS @ UTSA and Teaching Needs

- Projected 12% increase based on national average

Teaching needs for student success
- More T/TT faculty: 40-50 in 5 years
- TAs/Graders: 70 to 80 in 5 years

PhD Support vs. Teaching needs of Graders/Tutors (Current & Past)

- Teaching needs (recitations, grading & tutoring)
  - About 60+ TAs/Graders/Tutors
PhD Productivity
National Average: 0.3

Figure D3. PhD Degrees Granted by Tenure-Track Size
ORSA Tauee Survey 2018

CS is at top range: 0.47!

PhD Productivity: CS @ UTSA

- PhD Graduates per T/TT faculty
- Average: 0.47 in last 6 years
PhD Enrollment/TT faculty
National Average: 3

Figure D4. PhD Enrollment Normalized by Tenure-Track Size
CRA Taubman Survey 2018

CS is here: 3.5!
Larger departments, better synergy

Whiskers show 90th and 10th percentiles
Lighter box: 25th percentile to median
Darker box: median to 75th percentile

PhD Enrollments: 3 to 4 per faculty

Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence (GSS) Task Force Report
Research Expenditure
(Taulbee Survey)

CS is here: ~ $150K+
Larger department have synergy

Research Expenditure of CS Faculty
@UTSA

- Average of last 4 years: $220K per T/TT faculty
PhDs: New Admissions vs. Graduations (Current and Past)

PhD Pipeline Model
(based on past dropout #)

- Y1 dropout: 10% to 20% (average 15%)
- Y2 dropout: 10% to 15% (average 12%)
- Y3-5 dropout: 5% to 10% (average 8%)

Graduate Student Success for Faculty Excellence (GSS) Task Force Report
Projected PhD Pipeline

PhDs: New Admissions vs. Graduations (5-Year Projection: assuming 10% enrollment growth)
National CS PhD Funding
Institutional vs External
(Taulbee Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Type</th>
<th># Dept</th>
<th>On Institutional Funds</th>
<th>On External Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>Full-Support Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US CS Public</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3,395.0 38.3%</td>
<td>867.0 9.8%</td>
<td>476.0 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US CS Private</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>763.3 19.2%</td>
<td>1,144.0 28.8%</td>
<td>373.0 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US CS Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4,158.3 32.4%</td>
<td>2,911.0 15.7%</td>
<td>849.0 6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.0 30.6%</td>
<td>32.0 17.6%</td>
<td>0.0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>302.8 38.2%</td>
<td>77.0 9.7%</td>
<td>67.0 8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>332.5 50.9%</td>
<td>117.0 17.9%</td>
<td>6.0 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4,848.6 33.5%</td>
<td>2,237.0 15.5%</td>
<td>922.0 6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- National average
  - Institutional/Dept. funds: about 55%
  - External funds: about 45%

PhD Program & Funding Model
CS @ UTSA

- Year 1: Department fellowship/assistantship
  - Prepare and pass QE, explore research w. faculty
- Year 2: Transit to external funding w. faculty
  - Identify PhD advisor and continue research
- Years 3-4: most on external funding w. advisor
  - Continue research and pass PhD proposal
- Year 5+: combination of dept./external funding
  - Needs for teaching training
  - Complete research and defend dissertation
CS PhD Funding: TAs vs. RAs (Current and Past)

• Average Ratio: ~45% TAs vs. ~55% RAs

PhD Program and Funding Model (Projection in 5 Years)

• Institutional Support 50% to 55%: ~ 50 to 75 PhD students
  – Year 1: 25 to 30 new PhDs
  – Year 2: ~ 10 to 15 continue w. TAs
  – Year 3/4/5: ~ 5 to 10 w. TAs
• External fund: 45% to 50%
  – About 45 to 75 PhDs
• Total PhD students in 5 years: ~ 100 to 150
• PhD Graduates: ~ 15 to 20 per year
• Requesting 22 new PhD students for Fall’20
  • To support TA needs, incoming TT faculty in Fall’20, and projected graduations