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Statewide Vision, Mission and Philosophy

Vision

Together, we can make Texas a beacon state. A state where our laws encourage jobs and justice. A state that frees our greatest resource --our people--to achieve their highest potential. A state where our children receive an excellent education so they have skills to compete in the next century. A state where people feel safe in their communities, and all people know the consequences of committing a crime are swift, sure, and outweigh any potential reward. And a state where each citizen accepts responsibility for his or her behavior. We envision a state where it continues to be true that what Texans can dream Texans can do.

Mission

To realize the vision of a better Texas, state government must focus on its key responsibilities to its citizenry. State government should prioritize its energies in a few areas where it can make a difference, clearly define its functions within those areas, and perform those functions well. State government must look for innovative ways to accomplish its ends, including privatization and incentive-based approaches. Our imperative should be: "Government if necessary, but not necessarily government."

The mission of Texas state government is to support and promote individual and community efforts to achieve and sustain social and economic prosperity.
Statewide Vision, Mission and Philosophy (Cont’d)

Philosophy

State government will be ethical, accountable, and dedicated to the public being served. State government will operate efficiently and spend the public’s money wisely.

State government will be based on four core principles that will guide decision-making processes.

**Limited and Efficient Government**

Government cannot solve every problem or meet every need. State government should do a few things and do them well.

**Local Control**

The best form of government is one that is closest to the people. State government should respect the right and ability of local communities to resolve issues that affect them. The state must avoid imposing unfunded mandates.

**Personal Responsibility**

It is up to each individual, not government, to make responsible decisions about his or her life. Personal responsibility is the key to a just society. State employees, too, must be accountable for their actions.

**Support for Strong Families**

The family is the backbone of society and, accordingly, state government must pursue policies that strengthen and nurture Texas families.

Texas state government should serve the needs of our state but also be mindful of those who pay the bills. By providing the best service at the lowest cost and working in concert with other partners, state government can effectively direct the public’s resources to create a positive impact on the lives of individual Texans. The people of Texas expect the best, and state government must give it to them.
Relevant Statewide Functional Goals and Benchmarks

Priority Goal (Higher Education)

To provide a cost-effective system of higher education which prepares individuals for workforce demands and furthers the development of knowledge through instruction and research.

Benchmarks

- Percent of recent high school graduates enrolled in a college or university
- Percent of higher education freshman from Texas high schools needing remediation
- Percent of first-time, full-time freshman retained after one academic year
- Percent of first-time, full-time freshman who graduate within six years
- Percent of Texans with a bachelor’s degree or higher
- Percent of adult population with a vocational/technical certificate or degree
- Texas public colleges’ and universities’ cost per student as a percent of the national average
- Percent of total federal research and development expenditures received by Texas institutions of higher education

Note: The State has yet to finalize definitions for these benchmarks and thus, linkages in this document are not provided.
Agency Mission and Philosophy

Prairie View A&M University, one of the Nation's oldest historically Black universities, is dedicated to excellence in teaching, research and service. Although its primary mission is to serve Texas through high quality undergraduate, graduate, special/continuing educations and research programs, its service area extends to the Nation and the world. Prairie View A&M University is deeply committed to cultural diversity, equal opportunity, and to meeting the needs of a diverse society and the priorities of Texas.

The University is a state assisted institution; a land-grant institution by federal statute; and a "state-wide special purpose" institution by legislative designation, serving a population with diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Prairie View A&M University is designated by the Texas Constitution as one of three "institutions of the first class".

From its special purpose designation, the University derives much of its uniqueness in Texas higher education, particularly its special responsibility to educate and elevate historically bypassed and under-privileged people. Additionally, this special designation commits the University to high intellectual rigor, relevance to the community it serves, and the high educational standards needed to prepare graduates for careers in architecture, arts and drama, business, computer science, criminal justice, education, engineering, food and agricultural sciences, human sciences, humanities, nursing, science and mathematics, social sciences, social work, technology, and many other disciplines.
External/Internal Assessment

The Resource Environment

Funding

Though better than anticipated, the U.S. and Texas economy has recovered. However, the recovery has not been significant enough to substantially increase allocations to public higher education. Low income families, from which a large proportion of Prairie View A&M University’s students come, are less able to afford college tuition, fees, books, and living expenses than they were in 1994. The University cannot expect to increase fees substantially since projected Texas tuition increases will occur during the Plan Period. As the state increases tuition, students who do not qualify for grants and scholarships will be forced to borrow more heavily to defray college expenses. At present, approximately 72% of Prairie View students are on some form of financial aid. The University’s need and non-need based scholarships must be increased by more than 20% to offset impact of tuition increases through 1999.

State appropriations comprised only 28% of the University’s $74 million in expenditures for fiscal year 1995. Since 1984, when the University began receiving $6 million of the Available University Fund annually from the University of Texas System and approximately $6 million annually from the Texas A&M University System, the number of special item requests funded declined precipitously initially but has increased in number and amount during the past two biennia. Critical is the fact that, following 1994, the University no longer receives an allocation from the University of Texas System. The use of these enhancements—from additional scholarships to laboratory development—are now woven into the fabric of the University and cannot easily or painlessly be isolated and removed as the enhancement support disappears. Further exacerbating the strained financial environment is the State’s legislating that the 1993 mandatory salary increases for faculty and staff be paid from University generated funds, starting in 1995.

While the University’s funded research expenditure has increased from $6.3 (1992) to $7.8 (1995) million and its endowment has increased from $5.6 million to $10 million, no means of substantially offsetting the decline in financial resources appears imminent. Not even an enrollment increase will produce enough revenue to address critical needs such as increases in salaries of faculty in general and of nursing in particular; increases in faculty positions in business, computer science, selected engineering fields, mathematics, and foreign languages; and construction of a much needed science building. A new series of residence halls (University Village) will open Fall, 1996 but the funding source is solely private sector dollars.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

Faculty

By the year 2009, it is projected that American colleges and universities will be in need of difficult to locate qualified faculty in computer science, business, engineering, mathematics, nursing and foreign languages. For institutions in which diversity remains a goal—the demographics will compel it to remain so—recruiting and employing minority faculty will remain challenging. In A Study of Faculty Needs in Texas: 1991-2008, a report of the Coordinating Board’s Advisory Committee on Faculty Shortages, it was reported that only three percent (3%) of the doctorates awarded to African Americans were in accounting and nursing; four percent (4%) were in sciences; and two percent (2%) were in engineering. At present, for example, 55% of Prairie View’s FTE nursing faculty with doctorates are African American.

Because several of its premiere programs could very well suffer from a shortage or minority faculty, or inability to compete in the market place, partially because of salaries, the University will require more faculty development to assist an aging faculty and increased non-state revenue that can be used to attract highly qualified mid-career professionals as faculty. Not to be ignored is the opportunity to increase doctorates by supporting minority graduate student opportunities such as those available through the Benjamin Banneker Honors College, the first full honors college at a Historically Black University, and its linkages with the Consortium for Institutional Cooperation (CIC), the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago, Dartmouth College of Medicine, University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston and more recently the Texas A&M University Summer Research Opportunity Program. Additionally, the Texas Alliance for Minority Participation (AMP) promises to increase the number of minorities qualified to enter and complete doctorate degrees by providing financial support, apprenticeship to researchers, and exposure to professional practice in science, mathematics, and engineering.

External Factors or Influences

Federal Standards and Mandates

In an effort to promote greater equity and integrity in American higher education, the federal government has initiated numerous standards through varied orders, laws, and mandates. Most notable among those whose impact - financial and otherwise - is being felt at Prairie View A&M University are (1) the Americans with Disabilities Act; (2) the implementation of the Adams Case (re: the desegregation of higher education); and (3), most recently, the Federal Courts’ rejection of affirmative action. In Hopwood v. State of Texas, for example, the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled that the University of Texas may not consider race as a factor in its law
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

school admissions. Compliance with each federal mandate will require reallocation of personnel and fiscal resources. Conversely, the redeeming feature from certain of these standards is expected to be the realization of a more diverse student, faculty and staff population as well as more efficient data collection and management of policies, procedures, and practices.

Increased Accountability

The mounting federal and state reporting requirements are coincident with the public’s increased demand for accountability and greater exercise of its right-to-know and reason-to-expect in reference to higher education. Despite 1970’s efforts to defuse the rise to vocationalism in the academy, report after report and commission after commission reveal that the economic value of a degree must be discerned and the decisions about programs must bear some relation to the cost of education and the expected uses of it in a rapidly changing socio-economic climate. In its April 1991 report, “The Economic Value of Higher Education for Texas,” the Texas Faculty Association found that Texas’ 48,000 baccalaureate degrees awarded yield $2.99 billion for the economy. Texas investment in producing those degrees was $2.687 billion. In addition to increased wages, research and development capabilities, and taxes that are produced by graduates, an educated citizenry makes better decisions. Crime decreases as education increases.

Evidence of the value of higher education notwithstanding, the public is expected to continue to question the output of higher education in relation to the investment. Institutional response to the demand for accountability is deemed preferable to having more standards imposed on the academy from external agencies. Prairie View A&M University will be required to police itself more rigorously. Performance evaluations in the form of peer reviews and external agency assessments can be expected to intensify. The trend toward greater accountability will result in the University’s examining its priorities and restructuring its organization to achieve greater efficiency without compromising effectiveness. Program and personnel evaluation, tied to productivity, will become a firmly established component of the University. Not only will this present an opportunity to use resources more effectively, it will assist in increasing public confidence in the University.

Media v. Actual Image

Through strengthened management and improved public relations the University has begun to overcome the effects of a lingering negative press. Its strength and growing stability are the result of faculty, staff, students, and alumni breaking the silence and showcasing their genuine pride in the success of the University.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont'd)

Higher education, as an industry, continues to face a crisis of confidence that seemingly came fully to the forefront during the decade of the 80's. Prairie View A&M University, as an institution, has ostensibly recovered partially from some of the negative image resulting from sensationalism of irregularities and errors in past judgement. However, the importance of attracting attention to the positive aspects of the institution, such as teaching, research, and public service productivity will continue to be a challenge. Most promising in this regard is the exposure that the University gains from collaborating with other institutions and agencies to effect new initiatives and deliver community services.

Status of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's)

Before the United States v. Fordice, commonly termed the Ayers Case, and since that case the debate over the need for HBCU's has never ceased. Proportionately, the completion rates for the 35% of African Americans who attend HBCU’s are significantly higher than for the 65% who attend predominantly white colleges and universities. A perceived increase in overt racism in society and a rediscovered appreciation of a positive cultural environment where role models abound are among factors said to have contributed to the enrollment stability that HBCU’s have recently experienced. During the same period, the National Association for Equal Educational Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) reported that HBCU’s realized enrollment increases are among white, non-Hispanics; Hispanics; and Asian Americans.

That Prairie View A&M University has an enviable record of enrollment and graduation success despite limited resources and demands that are created by serving a large population of historically by-passed students has been well documented. A high percentage of specialized accreditations; a high production of African American engineers; a highly visible Cooperative Extension Program; the highest appropriation the University has ever received from the USDA for food and agricultural sciences research and cooperative extension programs; and a documented record of success in producing well-qualified nurses and life sciences graduates who become physicians are among evidences of the University's societal worth.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

Geographic Location

Once considered a locational disadvantage, the University’s being 45 miles northwest of Houston (Harris County) is beginning to be viewed as an advantage especially by undergraduates and their parents, a large segment of whom are urban dwellers who appreciate the ambiance of a traditional, secluded academy conducive to study and reflection. The area has a much lower rate of serious crimes and the small population bonds the town and gown in symbiotic ways that create a supportive atmosphere for students. Furthermore, the imminent expansion of a “superhighway” from Houston will shorten commuter time and, ostensibly, accelerate enrollment possibilities from the growing Northwest Houston Corridor.

The University has opened its Houston Northwest Center at Compaq on U.S. Highway 249 in Houston and it has retained its presence in the near downtown Medical Center through its Houston Nursing Facility. Already, there are enrollment increases resulting from the growth of a somewhat affluent, multi-ethnic population in northwest Houston. The University’s planned participation in the University Center Partnership project by the North Harris Montgomery Community College District promises to increase its presence in the Woodlands area 35 miles North of downtown Houston. Additional off-campus program locations, such as classes being offered at Fort Hood, will very likely increase the non-black student population (particularly at the graduate level), the University’s participation in the corporate and academic development of the region, and extension of the positive image of The Texas A&M University System.

Accreditation Reform

In December, 1993, the Council on Postsecondary Education, for decades the major membership organization for accrediting agencies, was disbanded. Prairie View A&M University and other institutions participating in the student Financial Aid Program of Title IV are subject to reviews of curriculum, student personnel policies, and quality assurances once the purview of accrediting agencies. As the leadership of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) has agreed, institutions must prepare for a tiered system of accreditation to include national baseline standards, standards for improvement of student learning, and standards for recognition of overall excellence. Reports of findings are likely to become public thus communicating institutional strengths and weaknesses to a broad segment of the population. Much of this trend is a part of the public’s growing demand for accountability, mentioned earlier.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

In the short term, the University’s improvement of its assessment procedures and its data collection and dissemination becomes imperative — if for no other reason than to meet accreditation mandates. Resources must be allocated to strengthen institutional research and information systems.

Internationalization of Higher Education

No longer is geopolitical isolation possible or desirable given the threats, opportunities, strengths and weaknesses found by world population groups. Truly well educated college graduates cannot expect to spend their career years in one geographic sector. Cultural diversity in the broadest sense must be emphasized in college curricula, student programs, and campus activities. Prairie View has been involved in a number of programs with an international focus. Among these have been USAID sponsored programs (in collaboration with other universities) for educators from Jamaica and a Russian Language and Culture Program with the University of Iowa. In addition, the College of Business at Prairie View A&M University has developed courses that focus on international markets. The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs is on the Commissioner’s Advisory Committee on International Issues which addresses ways in which higher education and the corporate sector can support such initiatives as The Texas Academy of Foreign Languages and Culture (TAFLC) and the Center for Western Hemispheric Trade. Within the next two to three years, the University will explore the potential of developing an international thrust involving student/faculty study abroad programs and joint degree programs.

Internal Factors or Influences

Inter-Institutional Relationships

That "teamwork and synergy among the universities and agencies of the System" is valued is evidenced by increased participation of each System member in programs of other academic institutions and agencies. For example, the interactive video network (ITVN) has strengthened communication among System members. Since 1992, Prairie View A&M University and Texas A&M University-Kingsville have collaborated on a Laboratory for Radiation Studies and on the HBCU/MI Environmental Technology and Waste Management Consortium. In education, Prairie View A&M University, Texas A&M University and selected school districts are members of a Texas Educational Collaborative for Educational Technology. Joint sponsorship of professional/scholarly organizations and annual meetings has provided opportunities for Prairie View A&M University and Texas A&M University to work cooperatively. Notable have been the efforts of the Honors education units on the two campuses. Continued sharing and exchanges of intellectual property and funding will facilitate prudent use of University and System resources.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

Capacity for Research

As a land-grant institution, Prairie View A&M University has a designated mission to combine instruction, research, and service. Research, teaching, and service are interdependent and result in a symbiotic relationship in which the whole is strengthened by a vital participation of the three parts. High quality programs demand creation of a discovery-oriented environment that capitalizes on modern technology. The U. S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) awarded Prairie View A&M University (PVAMU) a $3.6 million Future Aerospace, Science and Technology (FAST) Center. The Center is funded over a period of six years and focuses on Lightweight Structural Materials and Processing. The FAST Center places PVAMU as a national leader for the development of lightweight high temperature polymer matrix composites. In addition, PVAMU was one of seven universities selected to receive a Minority University Research Center (MURC) cooperative agreement award to enhance broad-based competitive research capability in NASA-related science and engineering pursuits. The MURC award provides Prairie View A&M University with research funding of $6.5 million for five years. Prairie View receives $1.5 million for the first three years and $750,000 to $1 million for the final years of research activity. Research conducted at PVAMU will involve the examination of the space radiation environment and the development of an effective ground-based test bed in the areas of radiation effects on electronic, photonic systems, and on bio-systems. The new center is titled the Center for Applied Radiation Research (CARR) and is an outgrowth of years of space radiation studies conducted at Prairie View. Although more internal emphasis is being placed on research, there is concurrently an increased external competition for available research funds as budget cuts continue, particularly at the Federal level, and as priorities of agencies shift. Other sources of funds to continue the research are being sought but not without some difficulty. During the past decade the amount of federal funds available for academic research and instruction has remained relatively constant and now are going into decline during the rest of the decade, despite increased costs of conducting research. It will be necessary for faculty to more aggressively seek support for research and to initiate collaborative efforts among related disciplines as well as with other institutions. In addition, the changing demography of Texas ought to be the focus of significant research efforts by social science scholars and researchers in the field of education. Prairie View would seem to be well situated to play a leadership role in the study of the expanding minority population predicted to characterize the state in the 21st Century.

Technological Infra-structure

Delivery of instruction, participation in alliances; pursuit of research dollars; and satisfaction of data collection/dissemination demands are dependent upon a technology infra-structure that the University began building quite vigorously in the mid 80’s but
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

is yet incomplete. The shortage of financial resources has meant that technology is often purchased at the end of its life cycle and too soon becomes obsolete. If the University is to succeed in making computer intensive academic programs its centerpiece, and in strengthening its planning and management, the investment in technology is crucial. It should be realized, however, that such an investment may very well come at the expense of other services and programs.

There is a major paradigm shift in the delivery of instruction within higher education in this country. This shift is from a mode of faculty-student program-centered interaction taking place in specific locations at specified times to a shift in which students will have more access to the information content of courses in a variety of formats at their convenience. This shift is fostered by developments in electronic technology which includes high-speed networks, video compression, and low-cost powerful computers. Implementation of these technologies will result in redesign of curricula as all higher education institutions seek to compete for higher quality students, faculty, and financial support. Redesigned curricula must support both synchronous and asynchronous interaction between the learner and the sources of knowledge and information. Real-time, simultaneous two-way video presentations, multi-media presentations, and "education on demand" must be delivered to students anywhere on campus, in their homes, or in the workplace in order for an institution to remain competitive.

Prairie View A&M University is poised to become a leader in this area. Construction of a fiber backbone for a campus-wide area network is near completion. There is an installed cable television network system as well as access to the Internet. Various departments have initiated and/or completed installation of local area networks.

To keep pace with changing technology, the University must provide and maintain the following:

- A campus-wide networked instructional environment
- Easy access to personal computers and work stations
- Institutional support for faculty and student development of computer-based communication skills
- Simplified interfaces, procedures, and documentation
- A system which encourages more faculty development for acquiring and using such skills
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

Student Readiness for College

Since the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) was established, Texas public colleges and universities have focused more intently on the preparation of students for college. Prairie View A&M University has historically accepted, remediated, and graduated capable students whose achievement in selected areas was below collegiate level when they entered the University. Approximately 86% of the University’s students are African American and over 85% of those who entered the University as first-time-in-college freshmen were from Texas. Of those, nearly all had graduated from Texas public schools. According to the Texas Education Agency, 32.1% of African American high school juniors compared to 68.8% of white juniors passed the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test which is required of all public school students.

Currently, the scope of remedial programs is expansive and, given the slow positive academic gains among public school students, it can be expected to remain so. A significant proportion of Title III funds will continue to be the funding source for remedial/developmental activities.

However, because the Title III Program requires that activities it supports become institutionalized, State funds or other local funds must be sought to continue some activities past 1997, the end of the current project cycle. At this writing, public and legislative support for remedial education is declining, and the potential for more state funds to replace Title III funding seems problematic.

Student Retention

Statistics from the Current Population Survey show that in 1989, 62% of the combined African American and Hispanic population 18 and older were high school graduates but that only 15% were college graduates. If by the year 2000, one will need a high school diploma and some college training to begin to compete in the labor force, college retention becomes a major goal of institutions enrolling proportionately large numbers of minorities. Nationally, the minority retention rate between the freshman and sophomore years is poor. Attrition is costly in loss of both finance and human capital. Prairie View A&M University, however, has sustained its trend toward increasing its enrollment and decreasing its attrition rate in the early years but has witnessed an erosion in its graduation rate. There will continue an increased need to focus attention on student support programs including advising, counseling, and classroom enrichment to ensure that students attain graduation. The opportunities exist to expand counseling services and to involve the teaching faculty in targeting instruction to meet students’ needs and to challenge their abilities.
External/Internal Assessment (Cont’d)

Adequacy and Maintenance of Physical Facilities

Prairie View A&M University’s physical plant is largely complete for this century, with the exception of the expected addition of a critically needed new science building. By Fall, 1996 the new University Village dormitory complex will come on line. The $100 million invested in the plant during the 80’s and 90’s exceeds that invested in it during the previous century, beginning with its inception in 1878. According to state formulas, however, the University has 56,000 square feet of excess space. Limited demand for evening classes by students, many of whom work in the Houston Northwest Corridor in the evenings, and other demands on the population that preclude full space use over the 14-hour day considered in the space utilization analysis have exacerbated this situation. Additionally, the classroom and laboratory configuration does not include a sufficient number of large lecture and lab facilities that could possibly accommodate undergraduate service courses that can be taught in large sections without compromising the quality of teaching and learning. Thus, despite the excess space finding, the University still has a shortage of space for large and specialized laboratories for teaching and research.

Beyond the excess-but-inadequate space scenario is the Higher Education Coordinating Board’s requirement that deferred maintenance be reduced annually. This will be especially costly since some older buildings must be modified to meet regulatory requirements. Furthermore, a large portion of the current physical plant was either built or refurbished during the eighties and early ‘nineties, and will soon need refurbishing or renovation, rather than routine maintenance. The challenge to the University will be to maintain a functional plant, comply with state and federal guidelines, add critically needed space, and achieve better utilization of existing space, within available resources.
Explanatory Page

The University utilized the State assigned goals, objectives and strategies contained in the Appropriations Act and legislative Appropriation Request for the 1996-97 Biennium. Additionally, the numbering scheme utilized was the same as that contained in the Legislative Appropriation Requests. The only exception is the non-financial, HUB Goal to which we assigned Goal #6. Thus, the reader should be able to link this document with the University’s Legislative Appropriation Request.
Agency Goal #1

01 Goal: To Provide Instruction

01-01 Objective: To Conduct Teaching

01-01.01 Outcome Measure: Percent of course completers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1994 Actual was 95%

01-01.02 Outcome Measure: Percent of lower division courses taught by tenured or tenure track faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1994 Actual was 50%

01-01.03 Outcome Measure: Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen who earn a baccalaureate degree within six academic years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1989 - 1995 PV Actual was 22.7%
FY1989 - 1995 State Actual was 40.5%
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

01-01.04  Outcome Measure: Retention rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen students after one academic year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1995 Actual for PV was 73.4%
      FY1995 Actual for the State was 76.2%

01-01.05  Outcome Measure: Retention rate of TASP students requiring remediation education after one academic year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1994 Actual was 50%

01-01.06  Outcome Measure: State licensure examination pass rate of engineering graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1995 pass rate for PV was 71.4%
      FY1995 pass rate for the State was 77.2%
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

01-01.07  Outcome Measure: State licensure examination pass rate of nursing graduates

FY1997     93%
FY1998     93%
FY1999     93%
FY2000     93%
FY2001     93%

Note: 1996 pass rate for PV was 86.1%
      1996 State pass rate was 91.5%

01-01.08  Outcome Measure: State pass rate of education EXCET exam

FY1997     86%
FY1998     86%
FY1999     86%
FY2000     86%
FY2001     86%

Note: FY1995 Actual for PV was 71%
      FY1995 Actual for State was 86%

01-01-01  Strategy: Faculty Salaries

Input Measure: State Appropriations

FY1997     $10,005,694
FY1998     $10,005,694
FY1999     $10,005,694
FY2000     $10,005,694
FY2001     $10,005,694

Note: FY1996 Actual was $9,891,283
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

01-01-01.01 Output Measure: Number of minority graduates

FY1997  727
FY1998  727
FY1999  727
FY2000  727
FY2001  727

Note:  FY1995 Actual was 610

01-01-01.02 Output Measure: Percent of graduates placed in a job related to their field of study

FY1997  83%
FY1998  83%
FY1999  83%
FY2000  83%
FY2001  83%

01-01-01.03 Output Measure: Percent of employers’ reporting satisfaction with graduates’ job performance

FY1997  90%
FY1998  90%
FY1999  90%
FY2000  90%
FY2001  90%
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

01-01-01.04 Output Measure: Percent of graduating students reporting satisfaction with what they have learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

01-01-02 Strategy: Faculty Salaries - Nursing

Input Measure: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$1,484,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$1,484,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$1,484,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$1,484,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$1,484,982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $1,469,020

01-01-03 Strategy: Departmental Operating Expenses

Input Measures: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$1,846,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$1,846,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$1,846,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$1,846,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$1,846,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $1,826,646
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

01-02 Objective: To Provide Academic Support

01-02-01 Strategy: Instructional Administration

Input Measures: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$351,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$351,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$351,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$351,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$351,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $347,242

01-02-02 Strategy: Library

Input Measures: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$736,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$736,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$736,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$736,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$736,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $729,037

01-03 Objective: To Provide Special Item Institutional Support

01-03-01 Strategy: Scholarships

Input Measures: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$596,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$596,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$596,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$596,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$596,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $596,346
Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Input Measures</th>
<th>State Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-03-02</td>
<td>Scholarships - Non-Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY1997 $125,474 FY1998 $125,474 FY1999 $125,474 FY2000 $125,474 FY2001 $125,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: FY1996 Actual was $125,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: FY1996 Actual was $194,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: FY1996 Actual was $41,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agency Goal #1 (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Input Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-03-05</td>
<td>Texas Medical Center Library</td>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$27,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$27,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$27,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$27,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$27,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $27,618

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Input Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-03-06</td>
<td>Public Education Grants</td>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$834,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$834,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$834,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$834,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$834,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $789,082
MEMORANDUM

TO: See Distribution List

SUBJECT: State Agency Plan, 1997-2001

I am pleased to share with you a copy of our state agency plan, which was submitted to Dr. Charles Lee's office at TAMUS. Dr. Lee will be distributing our plan, among others, to different State Offices in Austin and to the various member of the TAMUS.

Let me take this opportunity to express my appreciation to those of you who participated in the development of this plan. Our flexibility in preparing the plan was somewhat limited, but I am appreciative of comments and suggestions. Where possible we have incorporated suggestions from the campus.

Please share the plan with member of your staff as appropriate.

[Signature]
Charles A. Hines, Ph.D.
President

Excellence in Education, Research and Service
for Texas, the Nation and the World

(409) 857-2111 (VOICE)  (409) 857-3928 (FAX)
Agency Goal #2

Goal 02
  Conduct Research

Objective 01
  Conduct Basic Research

Strategy 01
  Research Enhancement

Strategy 02
  Indirect Cost Recovery
Agency Goal #2

02  Goal:  To Conduct Research

02-01  Objective:  To Conduct Basic Research

02-01.01  Outcome Measure:  External or sponsored research as a percent of state appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1994 Actual was 35.16%

02-01.02  Outcome Measure:  Dollar value of external or sponsored research funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1995 Actual was $7,800,000

02-01-01  Strategy:  Research Enhancement

Input Measures:  State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $81,982
Agency Goal #2 (Cont’d)

02-01-02 Strategy: Indirect Cost Recovery

Input Measures: State Appropriations

FY1997 $300,000
FY1998 $300,000
FY1999 $300,000
FY2000 $300,000
FY2001 $300,000

Note: FY1996 Actual was $300,000
Agency Goal #3

Goal 03: Provide Public Service

Objective 01: Provide Extension & Public Service

Strategy 01: Extension & Public Service
Agency Goal #3

03 Goal: To Provide Public Service

03-01 Objective: To Provide Extension and Public Service

03-01-01 Strategy: Extension/Public Service

Input Measure: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$371,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$371,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$371,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$371,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$371,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $371,268
Agency Goal #5

05 Goal: To Provide Institute and Ancillary Operations

05-01 Objective: To Provide Institutional Support

05-01-01 Strategy: Institutional Support

Input Measure: State Appropriations

FY1997 $1,231,705
FY1998 $1,231,705
FY1999 $1,231,705
FY2000 $1,231,705
FY2001 $1,231,705

Note: FY1996 Actual was $1,213,476

05-02 Objective: To Provide Student Services

05-02-01 Strategy: Student Services

Input Measure: State Appropriations

FY1997 $491,651
FY1998 $491,651
FY1999 $491,651
FY2000 $491,651
FY2001 $491,651

Note: FY1996 Actual was $486,373
Agency Goal #5 (Cont’d)

05-03
Objective: To Provide Staff Benefits to Eligible Employees

05-03-01
Strategy: Staff Group Insurance Premiums
Input Measure: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$580,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$580,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$580,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$580,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$580,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $580,833

05-03-02
Strategy: Workers’ Compensation Insurance
Input Measure: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$254,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$254,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$254,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$254,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$254,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $254,529

05-03-03
Strategy: Unemployment Insurance
Input Measure: State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$7,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $7,959
Agency Goal #5 (Cont'd)

05-04  Objective:  To Provide Operation and Maintenance of Plant

05-04-01  Strategy:  Plant Support Services

Input Measure:  State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$325,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$325,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$325,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$325,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$325,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $324,712

05-04-02  Strategy:  Building Maintenance

Input Measure:  State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$966,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$966,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$966,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$966,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$966,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $980,411

05-04-03  Strategy:  Custodial Services

Input Measure:  State Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$525,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$525,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$525,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$525,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$525,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $532,834
Agency Goal #5 (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-04-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$2,806,359</td>
<td>$2,806,359</td>
<td>$2,806,359</td>
<td>$2,806,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $347,919

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-05</td>
<td>To Provide Special Item Institutional Support</td>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
<td>$116,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1996 Actual was $116,600
Agency Goal #5 (Cont’d)

05-05-04  Strategy:  Academic/Research Support
           Input Measure:  State Appropriations
           FY1997   $252,952
           FY1998   $252,952
           FY1999   $252,952
           FY2000   $252,952
           FY2001   $252,952
           Note: FY1996 Actual was $252,952

05-05-05  Strategy:  System Office Operation
           Input Measures:  State Appropriations
           FY1997   $31,427
           FY1998   $31,427
           FY1999   $31,427
           FY2000   $31,427
           FY2001   $31,427
           Note: FY1996 Actual was $31,427

05-05-06  Strategy:  Educational Assessment (ACCESS)
           Input Measures:  State Appropriations
           FY1997   $445,000
           FY1998   $445,000
           FY1999   $445,000
           FY2000   $445,000
           FY2001   $445,000
           Note: FY1996 Actual was $445,000
Agency Goal #6

06  Goal:  To promote full and equal business opportunity for all businesses in University contracting.

06-01  Objective:  To include historically underutilized businesses (HUB’s) in at least 30 percent of the total value of contracts and subcontracts awarded annually by the agency in purchasing and public works contracting by fiscal year 2001.

06-01.01  Outcome Measure:  Percent of Total Dollar Value of Purchasing and Public Works Contracts and Subcontracts Awarded to HUB’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1995 Actual was 6.3%

06-01-01  Strategy:  Develop and implement a plan for increasing the use of HUB’s through purchasing and public works contracts and subcontracts.

06-01.01.01  Output Measure:  Number of HUB Contractors and Subcontractors Contacted for Bid Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

06-01.01.02  Output Measure:  Number of HUB Contracts and Subcontracts Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agency Goal #6 (Cont’d)

06-01-01.03 Output Measure: Dollar Value of HUB Contracts and Subcontracts Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
<td>$2,283,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
<td>$2,936,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$3,588,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$4,241,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001</td>
<td>$4,893,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY1995 Actual was $1,034,115
APPENDICIES
AGENCY PLANNING PROCESS
Agency Planning Process

In 1991, the Legislature adopted H.B. 2009 for use by the Seventy-third Legislature to implement a new Strategic Planning and Budgeting system (SPB). As a part of these new requirements, each state agency was now required to produce a plan and submit it to the state. For institutions of higher education, the process incorporated a blend of items in accordance with the statewide vision and functional goals presented in Texas Tomorrow. The first iteration of this planning provision occurred in 1992, was repeated in 1994, and is now occurring again in 1996.

Strategic planning was an institutionalized component of the Texas A&M University System and its members before this legislative mandate. Under the current H.B. 2009 mandate, each campus prepares its agency plan and submits the document to the System office, which, in turn, prepares a System-wide plan and submits the agency documents to the required state distribution list (see Appendix).

At Prairie View A&M University, the planning requirements are quite comprehensive and have supported the development of an agency plan as required by H.B. 2009. The President utilized two co-chairs to direct the preparation of the University’s plan. In addition, the President’s Executive Council received copies of the state issued planning guidelines and distributed these documents to their respective department and unit heads.

A draft plan was presented by the co-chairs to the Executive Council for their review as well as comments from their reporting units. Feedback and suggestions were then incorporated into the planning document by the co-chairs and resubmitted to the Executive Council for final review. Following reexamination the President submitted the requisite number of copies of the planning document to the Texas A&M University System for additional signatures and distribution.
ILLUSTRATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN
GOAL
Provide Instruction

OBJECTIVE
- Conduct Teaching
- Academic Support
- Special Item Institutional Support

STRATEGIES
- Faculty Salaries
- Faculty Salaries - Nursing
- Dept. Operating Expenses
- Instructional Administration
- Library
- Scholarships
- Scholarships - Non-Black
- Student Nurse Stipends
- Banneker College
- Texas Med. Center Library Assessment
- Public Education Grants

INPUT MEASURE
State Appropriations

OUTCOME/OUTPUT MEASURE
- Course completers
- Lower div. courses taught
- Six year graduation rate
- Retention rate
- TASP retention
- Placement in field of study
- State licensure pass rate
  - Engineering
  - Nursing
  - EXCET
- Minority graduates
- Employer satisfaction
- Student satisfaction
GOAL
Conduct Research

OBJECTIVE
Conduct Basic Research

STRATEGIES
- Research Enhancement
- Indirect Cost Recovery

INPUT MEASURE
State Appropriations

OUTCOME/OUTPUT MEASURE
- Research as a percent of state appropriations
- Dollar value of external or sponsored research funds
GOAL
Provide Public Service

OBJECTIVE
Provide Extension & Public Service

STRATEGIES
- Extension & Public Service

INPUT MEASURE
State Appropriations
GOAL
Provide Institute & Ancillary Operations

OBJECTIVE
- Provide Institutional Support
- Provide Student Services
- Provide Staff Benefits
- Provide Oper. & Maintenance
  - Special Item Institutional Support

STRATEGIES
- Institutional Support
- Student Services
- Staff Group Insurance
- Workers’ Comp. Insurance
- Unemployment Insurance
- Plant Support Services
- Buildings Maintenance
- Custodial Services
- Grounds Maintenance
- Utilities
- Counseling Services
- Academic/ Research Support
- System Office Operation
- Educational Assessment

INPUT MEASURE
State Appropriations
GOAL
Promote Full and Equal Business Opportunity

OBJECTIVE
Award 30% of Contracts and Grants to HUBs

STRATEGIES
• Include HUBs in All Request for Bids

OUTCOME/ OUTPUT MEASURE
• Percent of total Dollar value awarded to HUBs
• Number of HUB contractors contacted for bids
• Number of HUB contracts and subcontracts awarded
• Dollar Value of HUB contracts awarded
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