Update: Closing the Gaps in Excellence

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Division of Planning and Information Resources
P.O. Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 427-6101
http://www.thecb.state.tx.us

January 2003

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Board Member	Dates of Term	Hometown
Ms. Pamela P. Willeford, *Chair*	1997-2003	Austin
Dr. Martin Basaldua MD, *Vice Chair*	1997-2003	Houston
Mr. Raul B. Fernandez, *Secretary of the Board*	1997-2003	San Antonio
Gen. Marc Cisneros (ret.)	2001-2007	Corpus Christi
Mr. Neal W. Adams	2001-2007	Bedford
Dr. Ricardo G. Cigarroa MD	1999-2005	Laredo
Mr. Kevin P. Eltife	1997-2003	Tyler
Mr. Jerry Farrington	2001-2007	Dallas
Ms. Cathy Obriotti Green	1999-2005	San Antonio
Mr. Gerry Griffin	1999-2005	Hunt
Mr. Carey Hobbs	1999-2005	Waco
Ms. Adair Margo	1997-2003	El Paso
Ms. Lorraine Perryman	2001-2007	Odessa
Mr. Curtis E. Ransom	2001-2007	Dallas
Dr. Hector de J. Ruiz PhD	1999-2005	Austin
Mr. Robert W. Shepard	1997-2003	Harlingen
Ms. Windy Sitton	2001-2007	Lubbock
Mr. Terdema L. Ussery II	1999-2005	Dallas

Mission of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions and other entities to provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

Philosophy of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education; the agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Excellence: Goal Three of *Closing the Gaps by 2015* 4

National Rankings 6

Program Recognition 10

The Priority Plan 15

Beyond 2002: Next Steps 16

References 17

Appendix

Appendix A: National Research Council 1995 Rankings of Texas Institutions A-1

Tables

Table 1: Goal 3: Are we closing Excellence gaps? 1

Table 2: Texas Ranking of Top 50 Public Universities/Doctoral Universities, *U.S. News & World Report* 7

Table 3: *Excellence Target: Increase the Number of Research Institutions in Top 10 and Top 30*. Top American Research Universities (Public and Private Combined) 8

Table 4: *Excellence Target: Increase the Number of Public Research Institutions in Top 10 and Top 30.* Top American Research Universities (Public) 8

Table 5: Texas Institutions Ranked Among Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, *U.S. News & World Report* *9*

Table 6: Year-End Response to Identifying Current and Targeted Programs for National Recognition, 2002 11

Table 7: Programs Targeted for National Recognition, Texas Public Universities and Health-Related Institutions, 2002 12

Table 8: Programs Targeted for National Recognition, Texas Public Community and Technical Colleges, 2002 12

Executive Summary

The *Closing the Gaps by 2015* excellence goal is difficult to define and quantify clearly. The Coordinating Board and institutional representatives have developed a starting point to re-assess current and targeted areas of national recognition required to meet the goal. Knowledge of each institution's status and plans will help the state's colleges and universities introduce and upgrade programs to earn national recognition.

This document, focusing on excellence targets, is one of a series of annual reports on elements of *Closing the Gaps*. Related reports follow this schedule:

October	Preliminary Enrollment (Participation) Report
January	Excellence Goal
April	Participation and Success Goals
July	Research Goal and Annual Progress Report

Status to Excellence Targets

The following table provides a general summary of excellence target standing. Using a traffic light concept, G (green) is satisfactory, Y (yellow) or somewhat satisfactory, and R (red) or unsatisfactory:

Table 1

Goal 3: Are we closing Excellence gaps?

Ranking research universities	R
Ranking public liberal arts universities	R
Ranking health-related institutions	Y
Identification of programs for national recognition	Y
Benchmarks of the Priority Plan	G

The excellence goal contains targets in three areas: national ranking, national program recognition, and the *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University* (Priority Plan). The first area seeks nationally recognized universities. The search for a "best" university and "best" program—the second target area—leads to a variety of ranking surveys, and Texas has many top-ranked institutions.

Analysis of programs related to excellence should recognize:

- Rankings are useful as one reference point and should not be the only indicator of quality. Identifying peers and benchmarks will add additional indicators.

- Few national ranking processes focus on two-year colleges.

- Progress toward *Closing the Gaps* participation and success goals is meaningless without quality.

- Texas higher education institutions offer numerous exceptional programs, according to various national rankings.

- Significant progress has been reported toward the objectives of the first-year time line of the Priority Plan.

Caveats and Limitations

- Higher rankings are often difficult to achieve. Many ranking systems imply more precision than is possible. Also, a higher ranking for a particular institution depends on the level of improvement of all other surveyed institutions.

- Although debate and criticism frequently surround methodologies of nationally and regionally ranked institutions and programs, ranking should be acknowledged.

- Identification of nationally recognized programs is particularly challenging for two-year colleges, which by design prioritize service to their community and do not typically engage in extensive research.

- The years ahead will be challenging for planning and securing funds necessary to compete in the national arena.

Next Steps

- Identify peer institutions and benchmarks to help define and promote excellence, as recommended by a *Closing the Gaps* strategy.

- Develop alternative guidelines to allow community and technical colleges to meet the intent of the excellence goal. Service to their community is a priority for the institutions and they do not engage in extensive research.

- The Coordinating Board will continue to identify excellence where it exists and will encourage increased excellence as the state's participation increases.

- The Coordinating Board will continue to support efforts to achieve objectives in the *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University*.

Excellence: Goal Three of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*[1]

Closing the Gaps by 2015, the Texas higher education plan, was developed "to ensure an educated population and workforce for the future." The plan recognizes a declining "proportion of Texans enrolled in higher education" with "too few higher education programs … noted for excellence and … too few higher education research efforts [reaching] their full potential."

The plan establishes four goals—including closing the gaps in excellence—which are the most critical to meet for the future well-being of our state. The Coordinating Board has established an annual timetable for systematic review of the plan and each goal:

October	Participation Goal (Preliminary Enrollment Report)
January	Excellence Goal
April	Participation and Success Goals
July	Research Goal and Annual Progress Report for all goals

The excellence goal is described in *Closing the Gaps by 2015:*

Excellence Goal: *to substantially increase the number of nationally recognized programs/services.*

Each institution should develop to its greatest potential within its mission, whether dedicated to meeting the needs of its region or, for some, the entire state. Institutions should also coordinate their programs and services with other institutions to assure that needs are being met in every part of the state. Most universities should not strive to be research institutions, but rather focus on strengthening their own unique missions.

All institutions contribute to the state's economic, social and cultural prosperity whether their student populations are traditionally composed of undergraduates, graduates, professionals or some combination of these populations. Eighty percent of all Texas students are enrolled at the undergraduate level, so institutions offering associate's and bachelor's degrees play a significant role in the state's system of higher education. Institutions serving graduate students are important because they are training future faculty. Thus, these graduate students need to participate in high quality programs. Local institutional leaders are a key factor in exercising creativity and ingenuity as a means to excellence. Accomplishing the goals will require innovations in the use of faculty, facilities and student support for all student populations.

[1] The information provided in this section is from *Closing the Gaps by 2015,* the Texas higher education plan. The plan is available online at www.thecb.state.tx.us.

Six targets were developed for the excellence goal in these areas: national ranking, program recognition (national), and the *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University* (Priority Plan).

National Rankings

Background

The search for the "best" university or higher education program has led to a multitude of ranking sources, including the National Research Council, *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, the *Princeton Review*, *U.S. News & World Report*, *Maclean's*, the *Gourman Report, Kiplinger's Top 100 Values in Higher Education,* The Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance, *Rugg's Recommendations on the Colleges*, and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Ranking publications can also focus narrowly, as in the *Philosophical Gourmet Report* designed to "measure the philosophical distinction of faculty," according to the report's author.

The attempt to rank institutions and programs is difficult and all ranking efforts have shortcomings.[2] Many institutions, however, promote their status in national rankings. For example, The University of Texas at Austin's Office of Graduate Studies organizes its web page around "quality indicators" which include a summary of various national rankings and other measures such as job placement, research topics and output, partnerships, and student satisfaction surveys. The campus' national rankings summary is a good example of the various sources of recognition available at the national level—including professional and academic associations, commercial and trade publications, and academically-based research. As another example, the Texas A&M University System acknowledged the value of national rankings in its *Vision 2020* planning document, stating "Texas A&M University (will) strive to be recognized as one of the ten best public universities in the nation by the year 2020 …"

As illustrated by the two examples above, rankings provide data are useful to prospective parents and students and to the media. Rankings are used too by university administrators to promote improvement.

---

[2] Clarke (2001) cites two common criticisms to the *U.S. News & World Report* methodology: constant changes to the formula that prevent the interpretation of annual shifts in rank, and the "overly precise nature of the scores used to rank schools." Several additional studies have been conducted on the rankings provided by *U.S. News.* One 2001 study concluded that so few changes in national rankings occurred over a six-year period that efforts to improve an institution's rankings should be viewed skeptically (Ridley, Cuevas, Matveev). A second study determined that the priority assigned by *U.S. News* to academic reputation was outweighed by enrolled students' average SAT scores in determining the most significant ranking criterion (Webster, 2001).

Status of Progress Toward Targets 1, 2 and 3

Target 1:

- *Increase the number of research institutions ranked in the top 10 among all research institutions from zero to one, and two additional research universities ranked in the top 30 by 2010.*

- *Increase the number of public research universities ranked in the top 10 among all public research universities from zero to two, and four ranked among the top 30 by 2015.*

Several national research-university ranking surveys are available.[3] Two are discussed below for reporting current progress toward this target and a third survey is provided in Appendix A. Texas' research institutions have not yet achieved overall Top 10 status, but many appear in Top 30 rankings, depending on the source. Table 2 provides a summary of Texas institutions included in the Top 50 Public Universities by *U.S. News & World Report*.

Table 2
Texas Ranking of Top 50 Public Universities/Doctoral Universities
U.S. News & World Report

Institution	1999 Rank	2002 Rank	2003 Rank
Texas A&M University	15	15	24
University of Texas-Austin	17	15	14

The Top American Research Universities: An Annual Report from the Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance, is published by *TheCenter* at the University of Florida. Ranking American research universities on nine measures, only institutions with at least $20 million in federal research expenditures in Fiscal Year 2000 are included in the 2002 rankings. *TheCenter* includes five Texas institutions in its Top 25 American research universities: The University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University, Baylor College of Medicine, Rice University, and The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas. Texas Tech University is recognized in the Top 26-50 tier (see Table 3 and Table 4).

[3] Texas colleges and universities are represented on a variety of rankings. Though these rankings have shortcomings, identified programs are likely to be good. However, many unranked institutions and programs also offer high quality. Institutions are not ranked for many reasons. For example, a university may have opted not to participate in the survey or may have a program that is too new to provide comparative ranking data.

Table 3
Excellence Target: Increase the Number of Research Institutions in Top 10 and Top 30.
Top American Research Universities (Public and Independent Combined)

Institution	2000 Rankings		2001 Rankings		2002 Rankings	
	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50
University of Texas at Austin	Did not combine ranking of public and private institutions in 2000.		5	2	4	3
Texas A&M University			3	4	3	4
Baylor College of Medicine			1	4	2	3
Rice University			2	1	2	1
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center-Dallas			0	4	1	4
Texas Tech University			NR	NR	0	1
University of Texas M.D. Anderson Medical Center			0	1	0	0
University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston			0	1	0	0
Shaded rows indicate top 26-50 ranking; non-shaded rows indicate top 1-25 ranking. NR= Not Ranked.						

Table 4
Excellence Target: Increase the Number of Public Research Institutions in Top 10 and Top 30.
Top American Research Universities (Public)

Institution	2000 Rankings		2001 Rankings		2002 Rankings	
	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50	Measures in Top 1-25	Measures in Top 26-50
University of Texas at Austin	7	Did not rank Top 26-50 in 2000.	7	2	7	2
Texas A&M University	7		6	3	6	3
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center-Dallas	4		4	3	4	3
Texas Tech University	NR		0	2	1	1
University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center	1		1	4	0	4
University of Houston	NR		0	4	0	3
University of Texas Health Science Center-Houston	NR		0	3	0	2
University of Texas Medical Branch-Galveston	1		1	1	0	2
University of Texas Health Science Center-San Antonio	NR		NR	NR	0	1
Shaded rows indicate top 26-50 ranking; non-shaded rows indicate top 1-25 ranking. NR= Not Ranked.						

Target 2: Increase the number of public liberal arts universities ranked in the top 30 among all public liberal arts institutions from zero to two by 2010, and four by 2015.

In the 2003 *U.S. News & World Report* list of top 50 liberal arts colleges, Austin College and Southwestern University rank in the second tier, the University of Dallas ranks in the third tier, and Texas A&M University-Galveston and Schreiner University rank in the fourth tier. No Texas institution is included in the Top 30, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Texas Institutions Ranked Among Best National Liberal Arts Colleges
U.S. News & World Report

Institution	**1999 Rank**	**2002 Rank**	**2003 Rank**
Austin College	2nd tier	2nd tier	2nd tier
Schreiner University	Not ranked	4th tier	4th tier
Southwestern University	2nd tier	2nd tier	2nd tier
Texas A&M University-Galveston	Not ranked	4th tier	4th tier
University of Dallas	4th tier	3rd tier	3rd tier

Target 3: Increase the number of health science centers ranked among the top 10 medical institutions from zero to one by 2010, and two by 2015.

Although the *U.S. News* does not consider medical programs overall, several Texas health science centers and hospitals earned Top 10 rankings in graduate programs or top hospital lists for 2002 or 2003. Top ranked graduate programs include Baylor College of Medicine, The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, and The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. The best hospitals list includes Baylor University Medical Center, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, and University Hospital-San Antonio.

Program Recognition

Background

This second group of excellence targets asks Texas public colleges and universities to identify programs to develop for national recognition and provides a time line for those improvements.

The previous section focused on overall institutional excellence, while this section and its related excellence targets discuss the recognition of specific instructional or service program areas. Program excellence represents an important component of the higher education plan because increases in participation and success rates are meaningless without continued program quality. A databank of high quality programs and plans at the state's higher education institutions allows the Coordinating Board to establish an inventory of the strengths and planned improvements at public institutions throughout the state. A review of the submissions provided by the colleges and universities indicates numerous high-quality and nationally recognized programs exist throughout Texas—with more on the way.

Before evaluating progress in these target areas, benchmarks were established through two approaches. First, institutions were asked to provide current areas of national excellence. These submissions will be reviewed and comments provided to the institutions. The focus in 2002 was on two-year college submissions; in 2003 submissions by universities and health-related institutions will be reviewed. The second benchmark process involved review of ranking instruments such as *U.S News & World Report, Top American Research Universities*, and the National Research Council[4]. A sampling of ranking reviews is provided in the previous section and Appendix A.

To identify previously recognized and targeted programs, institutions were provided with very general initial guidelines:

- **Excellence**: academic programs or student service areas within the mission and purpose of the college/university.
- **Current National Recognition**: recognition received 1997 to present.
- **Targeted Excellence/National Recognition**: provide the name of the organization anticipated to recognize the program.

[4] In an effort to reduce the reliance on numerical rankings, but continue to compare institutions, the National Research Council is considering reporting rankings within ranges. This addresses the criticism that there is no true difference between institutions ranked numerically ahead of, or behind, another institution. A comparison of Texas institutions ranked by the National Research Council is provided in Appendix A.

The request to identify nationally recognized programs was particularly challenging for community and technical colleges, because their priority is service to their community rather than pursue extensive research that often drives institutional rankings. The Coordinating Board is developing alternative guidelines based on a local/regional perspective to recognize exceptional quality in programs and services at community and technical colleges. The revised guidelines, which may stray from national recognition criteria, will be designed to satisfy the intent of the excellence goal.

Status of Programs Toward Targets 4 and 5

Target 4: Each college and university will have identified by 2002 at least one program to achieve nationally recognized excellence.

Although not a requirement of the plan, public colleges, universities and health science centers submitted current areas of excellence to establish an excellence baseline. As noted previously, current and targeted excellence submissions are being reviewed for alignment with institutional mission, stated goals, and priorities. The response to the request for current and national areas of recognition is provided in Table 6.

Table 6
Year-End Response to Identifying
Current and Targeted Programs for National Recognition, 2002

Type of Institution	Total	Universities	Two-year Colleges	Health-Related Institutions
Percent of reported existing nationally recognized programs as of 2002 (2005 target = 25%)	85%	60%	97%	75%
Percent of institutions that have identified programs for national recognition (2002 target = 100%)	90%	71%	100%	67%

In general, colleges and universities identified programs in instructional areas, including critical fields identified in *Closing the Gaps*. Health-related institutions, however, tended to identify research programs. More detailed information is provided in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7
Programs Targeted for National Recognition
Texas Public Universities and Health-Related Institutions, 2002

Public Universities		Public Health-Related Institutions	
Academic	Number Targeted	Academic	Number Targeted
Critical Field[1]	19	Academic	9
Specialty	24	Overall	3
Service		Service	
For Overall Institution	0	For Community	4
For Students	4	For Students	2
Miscellaneous		Research	
Overall	4	Academic	6
Specialty	5	Research Center/Institute	9
No Response	7	No Response	3

[1]Critical fields include science, nursing, teaching, and mathematics.

Table 8
Programs Targeted for National Recognition
Texas Public Community and Technical Colleges, 2002

Instructional Program	Number Targeted
Developmental Education	13
High-Need Discipline	46
Specialty/Other Instructional	45
Service	
For Community	2
For Students	9
Miscellaneous	
Best Practices	3
Faculty	3
Phi Theta Kappa	5
Specialty/Other	10
No Response/Clarify	1

Target 5: Community and technical colleges and universities will have at least one program or service nationally recognized: 25 percent of the institutions by 2005; 75 percent by 2010; and 100 percent by 2015.

For this report, rankings of Texas programs by *U. S. News & World Report* and the National Research Council were reviewed. The section concludes with a summary of additional ranking/recognition sources.

U.S. News & World Report Rankings

Many Texas public and independent universities and teaching hospitals are recognized by *U.S. News & World Report* each year. For example, Texas institutions appear in almost 100 program areas (academic graduate and undergraduate) in the most recent *U.S. News'* Top 10 program rankings.[5]

Texas institutions with programs appearing in recent *U.S. News & World Report*'s Top 10 rankings include: Baylor College of Medicine, Baylor University, Rice University, South Texas College of Law, Texas A&M University-College Station, Texas Tech University, Texas Woman's University, The University of Texas at Austin, The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center-Dallas, University of Houston, and the University of North Texas. These institutions frequently appear in the rankings for overall, top undergraduate, graduate, business, and/or engineering programs.

National Research Council Rankings

The National Research Council published *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States--Continuity and Change* in 1995 (Goldberger, Maher and Ebert Flattau; editors). The study compares 1992-1993 research-doctorate program rankings to similar rankings published in 1982. Institutions awarding a minimum of 500 doctorates in approximately 50 programs for the years 1986-1990 are included in this research, which specifically covers 41 fields within five program areas. The National Research Council intends to publish a new survey, with the process beginning as early as fall 2003. The revised survey will use updated methodology and expand the program fields included in the rankings. Although the 1995 rankings are several years old, the methodology is strong and the new rankings approximately 10 years later will provide opportunities to analyze change over more than a single year. Appendix A lists Texas institutions and their 1995 NRC rankings.[6]

---

[5] *U.S. News & World Report* does not rank all program areas on an annual basis.

[6] The authors noted interesting observations in1995 NRC publication, including that "patterns of stability and change were analyzed across each of the 27 fields" revealing 80 to 89 percent of the programs in 1982 remained in the top quarter in 1993.

Additional Forms of National Recognition

Alternatives to national ranking systems provide a statements recognizing exceptional quality for programs that fit within the defined notion of excellence. Sources of these include:

- Professional certification and licensure pass rates
- Awards and recognition bestowed by federal agencies
- Professional association recognition
- Specially commissioned studies
- Work published and cited by others (research productivity)
- Professional/peer review journal recognition
- Invited memberships, such as offered by the American Association of Universities

The Priority Plan

Target 6: Meet all benchmarks of the Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M University.

Background and Status of Progress Toward Target 6

The *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University* (*Priority Plan*) requires the State of Texas to submit an annual plan implementation report to the Office for Civil Rights U.S. Department of Education.

The first report, submitted in fall 2002, concluded that the institutions have substantially completed the tasks scheduled during this milestone period, making significant progress in the initial year of implementation. The mission, programs, facilities, and systems of each institution were reviewed and compared to a predetermined timetable. The complete report is available upon request from the Coordinating Board.

The Coordinating Board will continue to provide guidance and support to Prairie View A&M University and Texas Southern University to ensure the objectives of the Priority Plan are achieved.

Beyond 2002: Next Steps

The excellence goal is difficult to define and quantify easily. With baselines established, rankings and other forms of national recognition may provide some indication of movement towards continued and enhanced excellence by Texas colleges and universities. Institutions in other states will be making similar efforts and their success may mask the increased excellence at Texas institutions and programs. At best, rankings provide a starting point or means to view excellence as judged by others with measures they deem important and constrained by available "data."

The Coordinating Board will continue to:

- Review current and targeted excellence submissions for alignment with institutional mission, stated goals and priorities

- Identify peer institutions and benchmarks that help define and promote excellence, as recommended in *Closing the Gaps* strategies.

- Develop alternative guidelines to help community and technical colleges meet the intent of the excellence goal among community and technical colleges. These institutions' priority is serving their communities. Additionally, they do not typically engage in extensive research, which is often a key factor in national ranking systems.

- Continue to support achievement of the objectives in The *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University*.

References

America's Best Colleges, *U.S. News & World Report*, 2002 Edition

America's Best Colleges, *U.S. News & World Report*, 2003 Edition

Clarke, Marguerite, "Quantifying Quality: Technical Issues Surrounding *U.S. News & World Report's* Rankings of U.S. Colleges and Graduate Schools," 2001, ED454257.

Closing the Gaps by 2015, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2000.

Goldberger, Marvin L.; Maher, Brendan A.; Ebert Flattau, Pamela (Editors), "Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change," National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1995.

Ridley, Dennis R.; Cuevas, Nuria M.; Matveev, Alexei G., "Transitions Between Tiers in *U.S. News & World Report* Rankings of Colleges and Universities," 2001, ED457817.

The Top American Research Universities, An Annual Report from The Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance, August 2002.

The University of Texas at Austin, Office of Graduate Studies, available at www.utexas.edu/ogs/outreach/quality/natrank.html (accessed January 3, 2003).

Vision 2020, Texas A&M University, available at http://www.tamu.edu/vision2020/ (accessed January 3, 2003).

Webster, Thomas J., "A Principal Component Analysis of the *U.S. News & World Report* Tier Rankings of Colleges and Universities," June 2001, EJ627896.

Related reports available from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Division of Planning and Information Resources:

- *Baccalaureate Graduation Rates*, July 1999
- *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, October 2000
- *Closing the Gaps by 2015: 2002 Progress Report,* July 2002
- *Regional Plan for Texas Higher Education*, October 2002
- *First Annual Report on* the *Priority Plan to Strengthen Education at Prairie View A&M University and at Texas Southern University*, October 2002

For more information, contact:

Dr. David W. Gardner or Dr. Rissa Potter
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Division of Planning and Information Resources
P O Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711-2788

(512) 427-6146 (Telephone)
(512) 427-6127 (Fax)
David.Gardner@thecb.state.tx.us
Rissa.Potter@thecb.state.tx.us

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, or disability in employment or the provision of services.

Appendix A
National Research Council 1995 Rankings of Texas Institutions

Faculty Quality Ratings of Research-Doctorate Programs	National Research Council 1995 Program Area Rankings: Arts and Humanities Texas Institutions										
Institution	Art History	Classics	Comp Lit	English L&L	French L&L	German L&L	Linguistics	Music	Philosophy	Religion	Spanish L&L
Baylor University				119						31	
Rice University				53	32		39		37	30	
Southern Methodist University										16	
Texas A&M University				56							
Texas Christian University				89							
Texas Tech University				107.5				57			54
Texas Woman's University				125							
University of Houston				88							
University of North Texas				94				21			
University of Texas at Arlington				99			40				
University of Texas at Austin	19	8	21	21	23	13	11	17	27		12
University of Texas at Dallas											
University of Texas at El Paso											
UT Medical Branch at Galveston											
UT Southwestern Medical Cntr											
UTHSC-Houston											
UTHSC-San Antonio											
Notes: Blank cells indicate no ranking in that program area.											

Faculty Quality Ratings of Research-Doctorate Programs	National Research Council 1995 Program Area Rankings: Engineering Texas Institutions							
Institution	Aerospace	Biomedical	Chemical	Civil	Electrical	Industrial	Materials	Mechanical
Baylor University								
Rice University		10	21.5	23	26			27.5
Southern Methodist University					76			92
Texas A&M University	17.5	43	37	17.5	32	5		27.5
Texas Christian University								
Texas Tech University				60	69			
Texas Woman's University								
University of Houston			17	51	89.5	36	59	37
University of North Texas								
University of Texas at Arlington					63			83.5
University of Texas at Austin	8	19.5	10	4	14		20	15
University of Texas at Dallas								
University of Texas at El Paso								
UT Medical Branch at Galveston								
UT Southwestern Medical Cntr		28						
UTHSC-Houston								
UTHSC-San Antonio								
Notes: Blank cells indicate no ranking in that program area.								

Faculty Quality Ratings of Research-Doctorate Programs	National Research Council 1995 Program Area Rankings: Physical Sciences and Mathematics Texas Institutions							
Institution	Astro-physics - Astronomy	Chemistry	Computer Science	Geo-sciences	Mathematics	Oceanography	Physics	Statistics - Biostatistics
Baylor University		141					145	
Rice University		28.5	19	25	38/24.5(1)		42.5	
Southern Methodist University			89.5	55	116			39.5
Texas A&M University		15	63	49/36.5(2)	63.5	12	47.5	15
Texas Christian University		112					146	
Texas Tech University		90		91	107		118.5	
Texas Woman's University								
University of Houston		50	75	64.5	68		61.5	
University of North Texas		124	94.5		105.5		104.5	
University of Texas at Arlington		114	85		108		117	
University of Texas at Austin	10	13	7	15.5	23		11	
University of Texas at Dallas		151	76	67	137		91.5	57
University of Texas at El Paso				85				
UT Medical Branch at Galveston								
UT Southwestern Medical Cntr								
UTHSC-Houston								
UTHSC-San Antonio								

Notes: Blank cells indicate no ranking in that program area.
(1) Program in Computational and Applied Mathematics
(2) Program in Optics

Faculty Quality Ratings of Research-Doctorate Programs	National Research Council 1995 Program Area Rankings: Social and Behavioral Sciences Texas Institutions						
Institution	Anthropology	Economics	Geography	History	Political Science	Psychology	Sociology
Baylor University						165	
Rice University		46		34	53	66	
Southern Methodist University	33	59					
Texas A&M University		34		87		71	50.5
Texas Christian University				101		129.5	
Texas Tech University				98	91	118.5	
Texas Woman's University						184	
University of Houston		57		63.5	33	69	
University of North Texas				100	84	158	92
University of Texas at Arlington						102	
University of Texas at Austin	12	31	14	21.5	19	16.5	16
University of Texas at Dallas		98		104	92	129.5	
University of Texas at El Paso							
UT Medical Branch at Galveston							
UT Southwestern Medical Cntr						89.5	
UTHSC-Houston							
UTHSC-San Antonio							
Notes: Blank cells indicate no ranking in that program area.							

Faculty Quality Ratings of Research-Doctorate Programs	National Research Council 1995 Program Area Rankings: Biological Sciences Texas Institutions						
Institution	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	Cell & Developmental Biology	Ecology, Evolution & Behavior	Molecular & General Genetics	Neurosciences	Pharmacology	Physiology
Baylor College of Medicine	19	24		14	19.5	44.5	5.5
Baylor University							
Rice University	45	89					
Southern Methodist University	174						
Texas A&M University	87.5/70(1)	65	80	38		62.5	109
Texas Christian University							
Texas Tech University	126	90.5	72			115.5	104
Texas Woman's University	182				96.5		
University of Houston	95	96.5	102	88		111	124
University of North Texas	153.5	141	118				99
University of Texas at Arlington							
University of Texas at Austin	33	43	10.5	28	49.5	28	34.5
University of Texas at Dallas	129.5						
University of Texas at El Paso							
UT Medical Branch at Galveston	99	111			42	65	34.5
UT Southwestern Medical Cntr	20	18		18	36.5	2	
UTHSC-Houston	42.5	38		26	51	38	23.5
UTHSC-San Antonio	64	57.5				71	41.5

Notes: Blank cells indicate no ranking in that program area.
(1) School of Agriculture