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Attracting the Best Graduate Students Survey
-- - December 2015

• 67 Departments responded, with 82 total majors and 134 degrees represented

• Survey question 4: What are the current barriers, internal and external, in attracting the best graduate students to apply and enroll in your program?

1. Student Funding
   • Limited scholarship/fellowship funding and number of assistantships, unstable funding
   • Late timing of offers including university fellowships
   • Non-competitive funding levels, in amount and duration (multi-years)
   • Non-payment of fees for GAs, Lack of tuition funding for master’s GAs
   • Struggle between master’s and doctoral student funding
   • Heavy teaching loads for GATs
   • Difficult for faculty to ensure continuous external funding for PhD level students
   • Need partners (significant others) placement for some top graduate students
Q4 (cont’d)

2. Recruitment
- Marketing – no central marketing for graduate students especially for domestic. Brand recognition, awareness. Website, social media
- Lack of strategic recruiting practices: limited face to face contact with prospective students including campus visits, limited faculty involvement in recruiting, limited staff for recruiting
- Reputation of programs
- Low diversity of students
- Location – Geographic location, size of BCS, reputation of Texas, awareness of Texas A&M
- Competition in job market – Decrease in domestic students interested in graduate school.

3. Faculty
- Retirement – some departments are replacing tenured faculty with non-tenured/instructors, limiting number of active research programs
- Lack of diversity in faculty
- Lack of specializations to meet students’ interests

4. Administrative Processes
- Time to admit is too slow. Time to offer award packages is too slow (diversity, merit, etc.).
**Fall 2015 CPI Survey**
(graduate student related questions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q56. Are there adequate financial support mechanisms for graduate students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPI responses to Q56 that are not included in Q4 of Programs/Departments survey input.

1. Need more training grants
2. Timing of external funding does not always synch up with availability of outstanding students. Hence may lose a good student because funding not available or can’t find a good student when funding is available.
3. Need more rigor in the application review process
4. Need strategic international student recruitment plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q58. Are the graduate students available highly qualified? How might we attract better students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations: Attracting the Best Graduate Students Survey -- December 2015**

- **Survey question 5:** If the university could provide matching of your funds, what actions would you take to resolve the barriers for your program?
  - **Recruitment activities**
    1. Matching funds for campus visits
    2. More stability in required matching for university fellowships, year to year
    3. TAMU-wide graduate programs marketing campaign
  
  (lower priority)
  4. Recruitment visits to targeted universities (MSI, PUIs, etc.), attendance at minority conferences, and locations to target working professionals
  5. Add recruiting staff in departments
  6. Funding for summer 2-3 week seminars, undergraduate research experiences, etc.
Recommendations: Attracting the Best Graduate Students Survey -- - December 2015

• **Survey question 5 (cont’d)**
  - **Graduate Student Funding**
    1. Flexible and local controlled funding to increase duration of financial commitments to new graduate students
    2. Funding focused on some of TAMU’s top graduate programs or strategic priorities for support for strategically targeted “best” graduate programs
    3. Professional development funding for current graduate students and activities for prospective graduate students
  - **Other (lower priority)**
    1. Payment of student Required Fees
    2. Support to secure more training grants
    3. Reduce number of full-time enrollment hours (e.g. for summer, at milestones such as PhD candidacy, etc.)
    4. Pool for one-time website enhancements for departments

August 2016 CPI Recommendations

CPI Recommendations for Increased Resources for Graduate Student Training

• Competitive, Sustainable Multi-year Funding Offers
• Coordinated Recruiting Efforts
• Professional Development Opportunities
• **Interdisciplinary Programs**
FY17 Graduate Student Support Funding
Allocated by OGAPS

1. Graduate Enhancement (GE) pool [determined based on SCH in graduate level courses, ~$6.3 million]
2. Graduate Tuition Payment (GT) pool [~$9 million]
3. Interdisciplinary Degree Programs (IDP) pool [$1 million]
4. Flexible pool [~$6.3 million]
5. TAMU Merit Fellowship pool [~$1.5 million]
6. New pool (in FY17) of funds to colleges for recruitment visits to campus [$1 million]
7. New pool (in FY17) for Back-stop “insurance” for honoring multi-year commitments when funding runs out [$1 million central funds]
   - GOC Deans subcommittee developed recommended guidelines
   - Karen Butler-Purry seeking input before finalizing guidelines
      - CPI EC – June 23, 2016 CPI EC memo
      - Currently compiling input from departments via GOC Deans on current practices for department offers
      - Later will seek input from faculty

2013-14 AY Direct Graduate Student Support
Data - TAMU Main Campus (slide 1 of 2)

Graduate Student Support | OGAPS Central Funds | Other Sources | Total -- all sources
--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------
Assistantships(2)        | $5,342,901          | 7.8%         | $6,886,540        | 92.2% | $72,121,806
Waivers - Tuition Payments via TWAPMTS(3) | $13,754,807 | 27.7% | $28,045,014 | 72.3% | $38,799,901
Campus Wages and Work Study(3) | $5,549,307 | 2.1% | $2,136,026 | 2.0% | $7,685,333
Grants(3) | $2,136,026 | 2.1% | $2,136,026 | 2.0% | $4,272,052
Loans(3) | $29,382,173 | 61.4% | $29,382,173 | 61.4% | $58,764,346
Scholarships/Fellowships (1&4) | $7,800,839 | 36.6% | $12,413,767 | 61.4% | $20,214,606

Total, Grad Student Support (all sources) | $23,798,031 | $184,382,181 | $208,180,122
Total, Grad Student Support (excluding loans) | $23,798,031 | $115,000,738 | $138,798,739
Percentage of Total, Grad Student Support (excluding Loans) | 17.15% | 82.85% | 100.00%

Waivers - Non Resident Waivers (**) | $29,562,934

(1) Data Source = Financial Aid
(2) Data Source = BPP/Data Warehouse
(3) Data Source = EIS
(4) Data Source = OIS-BPS

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
2013-14 AY Direct Graduate Student Support
Data - TAMU Main Campus (continued)

Definitions

- Waivers (also considered gift aid) are tuition waivers students receive as part of their aid package. The reported figure for Waivers -- Non Resident Waivers category is the value of the non resident waiver itself. The Waivers-Tuition Payments category includes in-state tuition paid via TWAPMTS in banner.

- Grants are a type of gift aid (need-based with specific qualification parameters) that do not have to be repaid (sources include institutional, state, or federal, as applicable).

- “Assistantships -- OGAPS Central Funds” = accounts with a Reporting Group code of GE, GS, or CH.

- “Assistantships – Other Sources” = accounts without a Reporting Group code GE, GS, or CH.

- “Scholarship/Fellowships -- OGAPS Central Funds” = TAMU Diversity, Merit, and Pathways to Doctorate Fellowships, and accounts with Reporting Group code of GE, GS, GR, or CH.

Examples of 2 Colleges’ Utilization of OGAPS allocated Funds

- Education – Dr. George Cunningham, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

- Agriculture & Life Sciences – Dr. Dave Reed, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Faculty Development
# Contact Information

Dr. Karen Butler-Purry  
Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies  
kbutler@tamu.edu
Graduate Funding in the College of Education and Human Development

George B. Cunningham
Professor and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Marilyn Kent Byrne Chair for Student Success

Student-Focused Strategic Priorities

• Manage student enrollment strategically, with a particular focus on high-need fields and reflecting the demographic character of the state.
• Enhance, recognize, and reward diversity and a climate of inclusion, equity, and respect for students, faculty, and staff.
• Prepare scholars for the professoriate
Graduate Enhancement Funding

• Half distributed based on WSCH generation

• Half distributed based on how well the department met PhD student training metrics
  • publications, presentations, prof. experiences, graduates enter academy, 6-yr graduation, program improvement

Graduate Tuition

• Priority for doctoral students
• State-funded GAT and GANT
• Based on FTE headcount
Flexible Pool

- CEHD Strategic Research Awards
- POWER Writing GA
- Scholarships
- Travel grants
- Research grants
- Dept. climate activities

Graduate Merit Fellowships

- Focus on strategic priorities
- 3-yr commitment, with match between college and departments

Criteria
- Superior academic achievement
- Relevant experiences outside the classroom
- Contribute to diversity mission of college
- Letters of recommendation
QUESTIONS?

gbcunningham@tamu.edu
Revenue by Source of Funding
TAMU-Combined

Total Revenues (in millions)
$2,210.3

- Investment Income: 2%
- Sales & Services: 15%
- Grants: 6%
- Student Financial Aid: 4%
- Contracts & Grants: 16%
- Tuition and Fees: 26%
- State Appropriations: 23%

Revenue by Source of Funding
TAMU

Total Revenues Main (in millions) $1,772.7
Total Revenues TAMU HSC (in millions) $356.0

Total Revenues TAMUG (in millions) $81.6
### State's General Appropriations by Institutions

**Formula Allocation 16/17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16/17 Final Cost Matrix</th>
<th>18/19 Preliminary Cost Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lib Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teach Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agricul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Engin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Library Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dev.Ed/VM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Voc Tng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Phys Tng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Health Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Busi Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Optome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tchg Tchr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Technol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10/2016 Rate per Weighted Semester Credit Hour**

\[
2016/2017 \text{Rate per WSCH} = \$55.39 \text{per year.}
\]
Expenses by Category
TAMU-Combined

Total Expenses (in millions)
$1,992.4

- Personnel Costs: 56%
- Operations and Maintenance: 34%
- Utilities: 3%
- Scholarships: 2%
- Equipment (Capitalized): 2%

Total Budget = $1,993 M

Shared Costs = $279 M
Auxiliary = $205 M

Available for Allocation = $1,509 M

Academic Colleges = $903 M
Academic (Non-Colleges) = $514 M
Administrative = $92 M

Shared costs include utilities, employee benefits, landscaping/custodial/maintenance, mandated financial aid, etc.
Budget allocation FY17 compared to FY13 (except Law compared to FY14)
Introducing iLab Solutions for Core Facilities

Clare A. Gill
Faculty Fellow – Core Facilities
cclare-gill@tamu.edu

NIH Definition

“Core facilities are centralized shared research resources that provide access to instruments, technologies, services, as well as expert consultation and other services to scientific and clinical investigators. The typical core facility is a discrete unit within an institution and may have dedicated personnel, equipment, and space for operations. In general, core facilities recover their cost, or a portion of their cost, of providing service in the form of user fees that are charged to an investigator's funds.”

https://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/core_facilities_faq.htm#3597
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 NIH Funded Institutions FY2016</th>
<th>Web Presence for Cores</th>
<th>Dedicated Admin</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Online Scheduling</th>
<th>Expo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California San Francisco</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Los Angeles</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://report.nih.gov/award/index.cfm

Core Facilities
TAMU and Affiliated Agencies

- Determined by web mining and input from URC Deans
- 110 self-described core facilities
- 87 cores with a website and contact information

- Tremendous heterogeneity
  - Full service
  - Self service
  - Business models
  - Access

- Directors’ listserv established
  - CORE-FACILITIES-DIRECTORS@LISTSERV.TAMU.EDU

- Centralized list of core facilities is now available
  - Highlighted on Division of Research homepage
  - Also on Resources page: http://vpr.tamu.edu/resources
Responses from representatives for 36 cores, 12/2/16

**What is your core's annual recharge revenue?**

- We do not charge: 29%
- <$75,000: 48%
- $75,001 to $350,000: 19%
- $350,001 to $550,000: 5%
- >$550,000: 0%

**About what proportion of your operating budget is covered by recharge?**

- 0-20%: 57%
- 21-40%: 14%
- 41-60%: 19%
- 61-80%: 10%
- 81-100%: 0%

Responses from representatives for 36 cores, 12/2/16
iLab Solutions

- Web-based core facility management tools
  - Cores can post available services, equipment, prices, control who can access the core, track requests, and bill customers
  - Researchers can identify and reserve equipment or services and track status of requests
  - Administrators can produce revenue and equipment usage reports.

- Piloted in one core

- Institutional Site License for 30 cores
  - Core Facility Management Module
  - Identity Management Integration [DONE]
  - Full Financial Integration

Project Plan
Priority for iLabs Queue

1. Core has received a review from a funding agency requiring such a system be used

1. Core has received RDF support or continuing support from DOR

1. Core billing ranked highest to lowest amongst interested cores

2. For early waves, simplicity of work flows

3. Co-location of cores in the same building for ease of communication