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FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Christina McGowan, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, March 6, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. in ATEC 1.201. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at cgm130130@utdallas.edu or x4791.
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AGENDA
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
March 6, 2019
ATEC 1.201

1. Call To Order, Announcements & Questions
   Richard Benson
2. Approval of the Agenda
   Ravi Prakash
3. Approval of Minutes
   Ravi Prakash
4. Speaker’s Report
   Ravi Prakash
5. THECB/ Legislative Updates
   Serenity King
6. TXCFS/FAC REPORT
   Murray Leaf & Bill Hefley
7. Student Government Report
   Eric Chen
8. CEP Recommendations- Pending March 5, 2019 meeting
   Clint Peinhardt
9. Update on OSA Accommodations for Testing Issue
   Tres Thompson
9. Discussion: Amazon and Procurement Issues
   Bill Hefley
10. Changing the date of the May 2019 Academic Senate meeting
    Ravi Prakash
11. Adjournment
    Richard Benson
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ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 6, 2018

PRESENT:  Inga Musselman, Lisa Bell, Dinesh Bhatia, Andrew Blanchard, Mathew Brown, William Hefley, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Syam Menon Ravi Prakash, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Tonja Wissinger

ABSENT:  Richard Benson,

VISITORS:  Eric Chen, Darren Crone, Naomi Emmett, Gene Fitch, Juan Gonzales, Rashaunda Henderson, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Sov, Jennifer McDowell, Jessica Murphy, Shuun Jones Ne, Terry Pankratz, Clint Peinhardt, Laura Smith, Kerry Tate,

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
Provost Musselman called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. President Benson was in Austin to be a part of the legislation deliberations. They are also addressing stakeholders in the TRIP. Following the incident with the former Baylor transfer student, a review is being conducted on the university’s admission process. The Dean search in ECS is in its second phase of meetings. The next meeting will be with small groups in 24-hour campus visits. The final stage will be a formal 48-hour campus visit including public interviews. The new Dean of BBS has been selected; Steven Small. He will take office on April 15, 2019. He is coming from the University of California – Irvine.

A response to the recent article and editorial in the Dallas Morning News was distributed. Much of the content of the Dallas Morning News article came from multiple Texas Open Records Act requests. The issue came to the University’s attention in December 2017. The University took very quick and decisive action upon it. The University has worked with UT System and SACSCOC to self-disclose and to address their concerns. This issue was addressed fully as part of the University’s reaffirmation process. The editorial was considered very inflammatory and disregarded all the work the university did once the issue came to light. UT System recommended the response due to editorial. The floor was opened to questions.

Lisa Bell commented that the discussion on new titles had stalled and must be revisited. The item had been referred to the Faculty Workload 3+3+3+3 Committee, which did not address this issue. Provost Musselman agreed and noted that the discussion must be revisited soon. There were no further questions.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to add a discussion on the Risk Assessment paperwork to the agenda. Bill Hefley seconded. Murray Leaf moved to place a discussion on the NSM bylaws on the Council agenda. Bill Hefley seconded. Murray Leaf moved to add these items to the agenda and to approve the Academic Council agenda as amended. Dinesh Bhatia seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the Academic Council minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Speaker’s Report – Ravi Prakash
1. The Commencement Committee met February 5, 2019. There will be ten ceremonies in addition to the Honors Commencement and Ph.D. hooding: 4 on Tuesday, 3 on Wednesday, and 3 on Thursday. The committee is considering making the handout a digital document.
2. The Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee noted that there are policies that have not been reviewed in five years. They must be reviewed. There were several policies that were for research and academic affairs. As they affect the faculty, they have asked Academic Government to assist in reviewing the policies as well.
3. There are two articles in the Mercury on the topic of Chartwells. There were students that were allegedly sexually harassed, and Chartwells has stated that it has conducted its own investigation. I am curious if the university has conducted its own investigation.
4. All other items that I have been working with are on the agenda.

5. SACSCOC/ THECB Updates – Serenity King
An update was given on the Field of Study (FOS) issue that has been ongoing. Also an update on the THECP and the QEP-Orbit, including a Technology Survey of students to understand what technologies they are using. The hand out that was distributed was included in appendix A.

6. FAC / TXCFS Report – Ravi Prakash, Murray Leaf, and Bill Hefley
The Texas Council of Faculty Senate will meet February 15-16, 2019. A report will be prepared for the Academic Senate.

7. Student Government – Eric Chen
The Office of Sustainability has approached SG to support UTD to join the Workers Rights Consortium and the Fair Labor Group. A copy of their resolution will be presented at the Academic Senate as an informational item during their report. SG will be hosting a Student Safety Town hall meeting on February 18, 2019. The town hall will address what the idea of what a safe campus feels and looks like. The SG election filings has opened. All of the SG committees are continuing their work on assigned projects.

8. Staff Council -
Staff Council President Naomi Emmet will give the report at the February Academic Senate.

9. Senate Election Calendar -
The faculty have been informed of the upcoming nominations period. It will go live February 25, 2019. A request for volunteers to the Election committee will take place at the Academic Senate meeting.

10. CEP Recommendation – Clint Peinhardt
The Committee on Education Policy move to place their recommendations on the February Academic Senate agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

11. Presentation: Wellness Committee – Bill Hefley
The Wellness committee moved to place on the February Academic Senate agenda the annual presentation to the Academic Senate by the Wellness Committee. The motion carried unanimously.

12. Presentation: Draft of new Academic Senate Website – Bill Hefley
Bill Hefley moved to place a presentation of draft design of the new Academic Senate website on the February Academic Senate agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

13. Revision to the charge of the University E-forms Committee – Bill Hefley
   The University eForms Committee proposed a change to its name to better reflect its purpose. The only change made to the charge was an update to the name in order for it to be more in line with the function the committee fills. Murray Leaf moved to place on the February Academic Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

   The Academic Council reviewed the memo distributed to the faculty in regards to accommodation procedures in test taking for student with disabilities. This memo caused a great deal of confusion to most faculty, who then contacted Speaker Prakash and Secretary Bill Hefley for clarification. The Vice President of Student Affairs; Assistant Provost, Educational Technology Services; Office of Student Accessibility and the Testing Center were invited to the Academic Council to discuss the concerns raised by faculty.

   Through the discussion it was found that the University Accessibility Committee had not been consulted when the memo and procedure were drafted. Per Laura Smith, the memo came about because the OSA no longer has the room or staffing to accommodate the students that need extra time and a distraction reduced environment. Laura Smith further noted the OSA is to determine appropriate accommodations, not implement them. It is up to the university to make sure the accommodations are made for the student. The OSA felt the Testing Center would be the best place to make the accommodations for those 150 students. Laura Smith further noted that many other of the UT System universities do not offer any proctoring of exams by OSA, and typically those schools do not have a University Testing Center either.

   One of the serious concerns raised by faculty is that the Testing Center requires exams or quizzes to be submitted to them 10 days in advance. This is an issue as many faculty do quizzes based on what they covered in the class just 2-5 days before. It was not possible to meet the 10-day deadline. Richard Scotch noted that problems like this could have been addressed before the memo was distributed had the OSA presented the proposal to the University Accessibility Committee. There are school-centric options for certain schools to accommodate the students, however that is not true in all schools. The Testing Center is an option; however a better procedure will need to determined to accommodate the needs of not just the students, but the faculty as well. The procedure addressed in the memo is very rigid and unworkable for people teaching classes.

   Again Kerry Tate noted that the Testing Center would better facilitate the needs of the students’ accommodations. Speaker Prakash agreed; however the issue of greatest concern was that the normal practice of self-governance was not done in this instance. The appropriate committee that has staff, faculty, student and administrators was not consulted in the creation of the memo, and therefore, caused more problems than it should have. If the OSA had worked together with the stakeholders involved, which included the University Committee on Accessibility, there would have been far fewer issues.
Laura Smith stated that the Office of Compliance was included in the creation of the memo, and only faculty they chose were consulted in the procedure. Speaker Prakash responded that one cannot “cherry pick” faculty to be consulted. Academic Senate appoints faculty to specific committees as they have expertise in that area. When situations like this arise, Academic Senate takes a very strong position to them. To bypass a Senate or University Committee and consult an ad-hoc group of faculty is not how shared governance works.

Laura Smith noted that they did not intend to bypass the committee but they did seek out guidance and advise from the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance, as well as the Office of General Counsel in regards to guidance from the federal Office of Civil Rights, the OSA did NOT have to consult with faculty, and were told it was not necessarily recommended. Per the legal statues they didn’t have to consult faculty. Bill Hefley responded there is what is legal and what is right.

Murray Leaf noted that the law will never say to consult Academic Governance and such organizations, which is how universities work. If the OSA wanted the faculty to do something they need to make sure the faculty agree that they can do it. As Chair of the University Committee on Accessibility, Tres Thompson noted that situations such as this are what the committee was created to discuss. Laura Smith had advocated the creation of the committee, and when it came time to use it, they didn’t. Dr. Thompson further noted that it was disappointing that just two weeks after the Academic Senate had passed a resolution to offer support to the OSA with the intent of ensuring student success, the OSA issued such a memo without consulting the faculty.

Dr. Ne’shaun Jones, speaking on behalf of the Testing Center, agreed that the Testing Center would be the best place to accommodate the needs of students; however, the center would need to work with faculty to make the accommodations workable for the students, and faculty themselves. Speaker Prakash agreed that Academic Senate would gladly work with them to develop a solution to the problem. Tres Thompson agreed but felt that the details should have been worked out through the University Accessibility Committee, and then distributed to the faculty. The committee would have worked with the Testing Center to develop a way to allow the students to take their quizzes and tests, but without the heavy burden of the ten-day deadline causing problems for the faculty. This was not done, which is why so many faculty are upset.

On a related note, Tres Thompson stated that a Qualtrics form had been created, before the memo, to allow for students with need for accommodations to work with their faculty to meet their needs. The OSA noted that this was a new process this semester, and they have found that while meeting the needs of most students, the form is not reaching all faculty who need to accommodate students. Matt Brown suggested that the Qualtrics form be sent to the eForms committee to help work out the bugs that faculty and students are running into.

After lengthy discussion it was decided that the original memo would be retracted, and a new memo with an interim procedure be written by the OSA and Student Affairs. It will be distributed to all faculty, with note that a more comprehensive procedure is being developed by the Campus Accessibility Committee. Should the faculty have any questions they can contact the chair of the Campus Accessibility committee or the Testing Center. The memo retraction must be sent out as soon as possible to prevent further confusion. Once a final solution is developed, it will be sent to the Academic Senate for endorsement.
15. Risk Assessment forms and Procedures- Richard Scotch
   The administrative professionals and faculty on campus have expressed their difficulty in filling out forms for faculty in regards to events and other gatherings due to vagueness and over complexity of many of these forms. Richard Scotch recommended that the form be revised to allow for more specific situational sheets. Calvin Jamison will work with Tim Shaw to find out why this form was made, and how we can make it more user friendly. Murray Leaf moved to refer the issue to the eForms committee, who will return with a solution to place on the Academic Senate agenda. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

16. Approval of the NSM School By-laws- Ravi Prakash
   Murray Leaf moved to place the NSM School Bylaws on the Academic Senate agenda for approval. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

17. Senate Agenda for February 20, 2019:
   1. Call to Order, Announcements, and Questions
   2. Approval of the Agenda
   3. Approval of the Minutes
   4. Speaker’s Report
   5. SACSCOC/ THECB Updates
   6. TXCFS/ FAC Report
   7. Student Government Report
   8. Staff Council Report
   9. CEP Recommendations
      a. FY20 Undergraduate Course Additions and Changes
      b. FY20 Graduate Course Additions and Changes
      c. New Policy- Syllabus Policy
   10. Presentation: Wellness Committee
   11. Presentation: Draft of new Academic Senate Website
   12. Revision to UTDPP1106- University Committee on Eforms
   13. Approval of NSM School By-laws

   Murray Leaf moved to approve the agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. This agenda was approved unanimously.

18. Adjournment
   There being no further business Provost Musselman adjourned the meeting at 3:04 PM.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: _____________________________

Ravi Prakash
Speaker of the Faculty
SACSCOC/THECB Update  
February 2019

Serenity Rose King  
Academic Council and Academic Senate

1. Field of Study (FOS) Updates  
   A. FOS Curricula and FOS Advisory Committees approved by Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)  
   B. Email Correspondence with Dr. Rex C. Peebles, THECB Assistant Commissioner, Academic Quality and Workforce; Economics FOS  
   C. Next Steps  
   D. Past FOS Curricula and FOS Advisory Committees

2. THECB Enrollment Projections and Demographic Population Estimates  
   A. THECB Enrollment Forecast 2019-2030  
   B. Demographic Characteristics and Trends in Texas and Higher Education

3. Orbit / QEP Update  
   A. Technology Scan  
   B. Transfer Seminar
FOSC approved by THECB
The THECB Board approved three Field of Study curricula at their January 24, 2019 meeting:

- Economics – see enclosures
- Mathematics
- Radio and Television (not offered at UTD)

The THECB also approved the following Field of Study Advisory Committees and proposed future advisory committees:

**Approved FOSACs**
- Kinesiology and Exercise Science
- Fine Arts
- Agricultural Business and Administration
- Journalism
- Animal Sciences

**Proposed FOSACs**
- Health Services
- Hospitality Administration
- Natural Resources Conservation & Research

Source:
THECB Quarterly Board Agenda, January 23-24, 2019
From: "Peebles, Rex" <Rex.Peebles@THECB.state.tx.us>
Subject: RE: BS in Economics FOS for Thursday's Board Meeting
Date: January 23, 2019 at 11:22:40 AM CST
To: "King, Serenity" <serenity.king@utdallas.edu>

Dear Serenity,

Thank you. I very much appreciated the conversation last night regarding FOS. I am more than willing to take a deeper look at the Economics FOS. I will get with staff and we will map a timetable for Biology and Mechanical Engineering and possibly another look at Economics. I doubt if we will ever make everyone happy with the results, but we can certainly make more people happy with the process.

Rex

Rex C Peebles, Ph.D
Assistant Commissioner
Academic Quality and Workforce
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
P. O. Box 12788
Austin, Texas 78711
512-427-6520

From: King, Serenity [mailto:serenity.king@utdallas.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2019 8:26 PM
To: Peebles, Rex <Rex.Peebles@THECB.state.tx.us>
Cc: foscontact@thecb.state.tx.us
Subject: BS in Economics FOS for Thursday's Board Meeting

Dear Rex,

Thank you for your time tonight at the TCCAO retreat's opening dinner. I appreciate that you said you all would be communicating with institutions soon about revisiting some of the more problematic FOSC that have passed, such as Biology and Mechanical Engineering, to see if changes should be made prior to implementation now that additional faculty are more aware of the implications.

As you and I discussed before the dinner tonight, we at UT Dallas have concerns about the BS in ECON FOSC feedback that appears in the agenda for Thursday's Board meeting. We at UT Dallas discussed whether providing this information through public testimony Thursday was the best avenue, but I was encouraged by our conversation tonight that you might be willing to take a deeper look without the need for the public testimony. Do you agree? I have created the attached handout that illustrates, I hope, the concern we have with the comments about Calculus II and the BS degree.

Thank you,
Serenity
Response: “The Committee noted that Calculus II or III are not regularly required in Economics BS or BA programs…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Designation</th>
<th>CIP Code Two Digit</th>
<th>Calculus II Required in BS</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><a href="http://economics.unt.edu/undergraduate/degree-requirements">http://economics.unt.edu/undergraduate/degree-requirements</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNT</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2018/undergraduate/programs/epps/economics">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2018/undergraduate/programs/epps/economics</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTD</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Austin</td>
<td>BA only</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N/A but yes for BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State</td>
<td>BA only</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton</td>
<td>BBA, BS in Bus</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU-CC</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Emerging/Emerged Universities Offering Economics:**

| Texas Tech    | BA, BS             | 45                 | Yes                         | https://catalog.ttu.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=9&poid=6918&returnto=938 |
| UTSA          | BA, BBA            | 52                 | N/A                         |                                                                        |
| UTEP          | BA, BBA            | 52                 | N/A                         |                                                                        |

Of the six BS in Economics programs in the state offered by Emerged/Emerging research universities, three require Calculus II and three do not. UT Austin requires a second semester of calculus for their BA degree. Texas Tech, though, did not have a representative on the committee. TAMU’s program is based within its College of Liberal Arts. Texas Tech’s, UNT’s, and UTD’s are more STEM-focused. Texas Tech, in fact, requires a Math minor with their BS in Economics. Hence, it appears that Calculus II is “regularly required” and the conversation should be revisited among those institutions that offer the BS as opposed to only BA or BBA. The discussion might be deeper if it involves feedback from industry on Marketable Skills.
Next Steps for Field of Study Curricula (FOSC) and Advisory Committees (FOSAC)

**FOSC Currently Released for Public Comment**

*History* (represented by Dr. Ben Wright, A&H)
The public comment period is open until February 10, 2019.

**Current FOSC / FOSACs**

*Drama & Performing Arts* (no UTD representative)
The FOSAC met on February 4, 2019 to review the received public comments and consider the steps to take next.

*Computer Science/Information Technology* (represented by Dr. Simeon Ntafos, ECS)
The FOSAC will meet February 11, 2019 to review Computer Science recommendations and the received public comments and consider the steps to take next.

*Communications* (not offered at UTD; no representative)
The FOSAC met in September 2018 and released their meeting notes.

**In Progress FOSC / FOSAC**

Communication Disorders Science and Services
The establishment of the FOSAC was approved in October 2018. The THECB requested and received nominations in November 2018. UTD has nominated Janice Lougeay, BBS, to serve on the FOSAC. However, the THECB has not yet established the FOSAC membership.

**Future FOSACs**

Accounting  
Business/Commerce  
Dance  
Engineering Technology  
Health and Wellness  
Management Information Systems

Sources:

THECB Field of Study Curricula  
[http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=7D02BA60-18B8-11E8-A6640050560100A9](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=7D02BA60-18B8-11E8-A6640050560100A9)

THECB Field of Study Advisory Committees  
Past Field of Study Curricula and Advisory Committees

Biology (represented by Dr. Uma Srikanth, NSM)
Business Administration and Management (no UTD representative)
Economics (represented by Dr. Susan McElroy, EPPS)
English Language and Literature (represented by Dr. Charles Hatfield, A&H)
Engineering (includes the majors for Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering; no UTD representative)
Finance – see Business Administration and Management
Marketing – see Business Administration and Management
Mathematics (represented by Dr. Brady McCary, NSM)
Political Science (represented by Dr. Jennifer Holmes, EPPS)
Psychology (no UTD representative)
Sociology (no UTD representative)

Other Past Field of Study Advisory Committees

Architecture
Criminal Justice
Mexican American Studies
Music
Multidisciplinary Studies
Nursing
Social Work

Source: THECB Field of Study Advisory Committees
http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=532179A0-1752-11E8-A6640050560100A9
Enrollment Forecast 2019-2030

Julie Eklund, PhD
Assistant Commissioner
Strategic Planning and Funding
January 24, 2019

The enrollment forecast informs state and institutional planning

• To advise institutions what their enrollments are projected to be if they do not change their demographic and geographic drawing patterns

• To provide statewide baseline enrollment figures for universities, two-year public colleges, and independent institutions

• To plan for statewide and regional efforts, including THECB planning activities
What is included in the forecast?

• Designed to reflect current trends and is intentionally conservative
• 5 years of historical enrollment by age, race/ethnicity, and county
• Updated Texas Demographic Center population projections by age, race/ethnicity, and county
• Non-resident participation factors
• Institutional input on local conditions

When are adjustments made to the enrollment projections?

Institutional/Local Factors
• Program or facilities expansions
• Increased online programs
• Local economic factors

Results often interact: accelerated enrollment increases at some institutions may result in slower increases or decreases at others.
Fall headcount enrollment forecast predicts growth in college and university populations for all sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
<th>Actual Prelim. 2018</th>
<th>Total Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>557,550</td>
<td>619,175</td>
<td>658,222</td>
<td>666,757 676,716 721,829 758,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Two-Year Colleges</td>
<td>743,252</td>
<td>718,547</td>
<td>758,061</td>
<td>768,477 779,740 832,640 877,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Universities</td>
<td>122,894</td>
<td>125,440</td>
<td>126,241</td>
<td>127,438 127,913 130,063 131,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,423,696</td>
<td>1,463,162</td>
<td>1,542,524</td>
<td>1,562,673 1,584,369 1,684,531 1,767,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment forecast predicts 1.77M enrollees in fall 2030; Public universities and two-year colleges show the strongest increases

- The enrollment forecast predicts Texas public and independent 2- and 4-year institutions’ enrollment to increase:
  - 42,200 from 2018 to 2020
    - 18,500 increase at 4-year public institutions
    - 22,000 increase at 2-year public institutions
    - 1,700 increase at independent institutions
  - 225,000 increase from 2018 to 2030
    - 100,000 increase at 4-year public institutions
    - 119,000 increase at 2-year public institutions
    - 6,000 increase at independent institutions
Public two-year colleges will continue to enroll the largest proportion of students

```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase/Decrease</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>61,625</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>57,541</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Two-Year</td>
<td>-24,705</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>61,193</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Universities</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td>39,466</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>121,207</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Forecasted increases in fall headcount participation indicate slowing growth over time
### Regional participation projections are valuable tools for local and statewide planning purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Enrollment Totals (Public Institutions Only)</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
<th>Actual Prelim. 2018</th>
<th>Total Projections</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>232,570</td>
<td>238,630</td>
<td>246,420</td>
<td>264,426</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>251,663</td>
<td>264,426</td>
<td>273,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>273,046</td>
<td>287,340</td>
<td>308,190</td>
<td>352,051</td>
<td>313,764</td>
<td>319,723</td>
<td>352,051</td>
<td>381,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Plains</td>
<td>63,910</td>
<td>66,739</td>
<td>70,083</td>
<td>76,875</td>
<td>70,961</td>
<td>71,631</td>
<td>74,850</td>
<td>76,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroplex</td>
<td>309,686</td>
<td>326,660</td>
<td>353,562</td>
<td>430,684</td>
<td>360,026</td>
<td>368,004</td>
<td>403,686</td>
<td>430,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>19,260</td>
<td>17,308</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>20,018</td>
<td>18,922</td>
<td>19,055</td>
<td>19,568</td>
<td>20,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>231,827</td>
<td>232,076</td>
<td>242,329</td>
<td>262,072</td>
<td>243,905</td>
<td>247,042</td>
<td>255,203</td>
<td>262,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Texas</td>
<td>40,968</td>
<td>39,089</td>
<td>40,076</td>
<td>42,296</td>
<td>40,201</td>
<td>40,387</td>
<td>41,470</td>
<td>42,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper East Texas</td>
<td>50,937</td>
<td>47,371</td>
<td>49,261</td>
<td>51,159</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>49,857</td>
<td>50,840</td>
<td>51,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rio Grande</td>
<td>51,435</td>
<td>53,063</td>
<td>55,189</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>55,408</td>
<td>55,323</td>
<td>54,923</td>
<td>56,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>27,163</td>
<td>29,446</td>
<td>32,535</td>
<td>40,917</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>33,771</td>
<td>37,450</td>
<td>40,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,300,802</td>
<td>1,337,722</td>
<td>1,416,283</td>
<td>1,635,970</td>
<td>1,435,235</td>
<td>1,456,456</td>
<td>1,554,468</td>
<td>1,635,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All regions show growth, but 90% of enrollment growth is predicted for four regions of the state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Enrollment Totals (public Institutions only)</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
<th>Actual Prelim. 2018</th>
<th>Total Projections</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>232,570</td>
<td>238,630</td>
<td>246,420</td>
<td>264,426</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>251,663</td>
<td>264,426</td>
<td>273,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>273,046</td>
<td>287,340</td>
<td>308,190</td>
<td>352,051</td>
<td>313,764</td>
<td>319,723</td>
<td>352,051</td>
<td>381,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Plains</td>
<td>63,910</td>
<td>66,739</td>
<td>70,083</td>
<td>76,875</td>
<td>70,961</td>
<td>71,631</td>
<td>74,850</td>
<td>76,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroplex</td>
<td>309,686</td>
<td>326,660</td>
<td>353,562</td>
<td>430,684</td>
<td>360,026</td>
<td>368,004</td>
<td>403,686</td>
<td>430,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>19,260</td>
<td>17,308</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>20,018</td>
<td>18,922</td>
<td>19,055</td>
<td>19,568</td>
<td>20,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>231,827</td>
<td>232,076</td>
<td>242,329</td>
<td>262,072</td>
<td>243,905</td>
<td>247,042</td>
<td>255,203</td>
<td>262,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Texas</td>
<td>40,968</td>
<td>39,089</td>
<td>40,076</td>
<td>42,296</td>
<td>40,201</td>
<td>40,387</td>
<td>41,470</td>
<td>42,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper East Texas</td>
<td>50,937</td>
<td>47,371</td>
<td>49,261</td>
<td>51,159</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>49,857</td>
<td>50,840</td>
<td>51,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rio Grande</td>
<td>51,435</td>
<td>53,063</td>
<td>55,189</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>55,408</td>
<td>55,323</td>
<td>54,923</td>
<td>56,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>27,163</td>
<td>29,446</td>
<td>32,535</td>
<td>40,917</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>33,771</td>
<td>37,450</td>
<td>40,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,300,802</td>
<td>1,337,722</td>
<td>1,416,283</td>
<td>1,635,970</td>
<td>1,435,235</td>
<td>1,456,456</td>
<td>1,554,468</td>
<td>1,635,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

- Recent enrollments have remained high despite very low levels of unemployment in Texas, bucking the trend in many states across the country.
- Current enrollment projections predict steady increases in enrollment, but unexpected economic changes may alter these predictions, as might a range of other variables.
- The population growth shows slowing growth for our younger aged population as we near 2030, which is reflected in the forecast.
- Growth is not consistent across regions of the state.

Questions?
AGENDA ITEM IV-A

Demographic Characteristics and Trends in Texas and Higher Education

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Austin, Texas
January 24, 2019

Growing States, 2010-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25,146,114</td>
<td>28,322,717</td>
<td>28,701,845</td>
<td>379,128</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18,804,580</td>
<td>20,976,812</td>
<td>21,299,325</td>
<td>322,513</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>37,254,523</td>
<td>39,399,349</td>
<td>39,557,045</td>
<td>157,696</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6,392,288</td>
<td>7,048,876</td>
<td>7,171,646</td>
<td>122,770</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9,535,736</td>
<td>10,270,800</td>
<td>10,383,620</td>
<td>112,820</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas added 379,128 people between July 1, 2017 and July 1, 2018.

- About 1,039 people per day added to our population.
- About 524 persons per day from natural increase (more births than deaths)
- About 515 per day from net migration (288 international and 227 domestic migrants per day).
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Estimated Population Change, Texas Counties, 2010 to 2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates

Estimated Percent Change of the Total Population by County, Texas, 2010 to 2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates
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**Estimated Numeric Population Change from Domestic Migration by County, Texas, 2010 to 2017**

-136 counties lost population from net out domestic migration

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates

**Estimated Population Change from International Migration by County, Texas, 2010 to 2017**

-238 counties gained population from international migration

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates
Estimated net-migration by county, Texas, 2010-2017

Blue counties added population
Orange counties lost population

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates

Estimated Population Change from Natural Increase (Decrease) by County, Texas, 2010 to 2017

76 counties lost population from natural decrease

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates
### Top Counties for Numeric Growth in Texas, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>U.S. Rank</th>
<th>Population Change</th>
<th>Percent of Change from Natural Increase</th>
<th>Percent Change from Domestic Migration</th>
<th>Percent Change from International Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35,939</td>
<td>128.8%</td>
<td>-126.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32,729</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30,831</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30,686</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27,911</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bend</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22,870</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22,116</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19,776</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16,412</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>105.9%</td>
<td>-34.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Harris and Harris Counties had negative net migration (Harris: -10,332 and Hidalgo: -525).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Census Population Estimates

---

### Top Counties for Percent Growth* in Texas, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>U.S. Rank</th>
<th>2015 2016 Percent Population Change</th>
<th>Percent Change from Domestic Migration</th>
<th>Percent Change from International Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rains</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>103.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llano</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>119.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bend</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among Counties with 10,000 or more population in 2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Census Population Estimates
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Annual Shares of Recent Non-Citizen Immigrants to Texas by World Area of Birth, 2005-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Africa and Other</th>
<th>Estimated Number of International Migrants to Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>101,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>77,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>98,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The 15 Most Populous Cities, July 1, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>2017 total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8,622,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,999,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2,716,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,312,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1,626,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,580,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1,511,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,419,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1,341,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,035,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>950,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>892,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>884,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>879,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>874,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates

---

### The 15 Cities With the Largest Numeric Increase Between July 1, 2016, and July 1, 2017 (Populations of 50,000 or more in 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Numeric increase</th>
<th>2017 total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>24,208</td>
<td>1,511,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>1,626,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18,935</td>
<td>1,341,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18,664</td>
<td>874,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>3,999,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>17,490</td>
<td>724,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15,551</td>
<td>859,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15,429</td>
<td>879,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>13,470</td>
<td>177,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>13,323</td>
<td>486,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>12,834</td>
<td>1,419,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12,515</td>
<td>950,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates
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The 15 Fastest-Growing Large Cities and Towns Between July 1, 2016, and July 1, 2017 (populations of 50,000 or more in 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>2017 Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>177,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Braunfels</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>79,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pflugerville</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>63,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ankeny</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>62,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Buckeye</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>68,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>70,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Castle Rock town</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>62,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>78,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>181,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>99,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flower Mound town</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>76,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>94,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cedar Park</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>75,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doral</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>61,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>79,94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the 15 fastest growing cities

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates

Population estimates, places, Texas, 2010 and 2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 Vintage Population Estimates
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Census Tracts with an Increase in Density, Texas, 2011-2016

Change in Housing Units by County: 2009 to 2017
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Percent of Housing Units Built Before 1960 and After 1999, Census Tracts, Houston Area, Texas, 2012-2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012-2016 5-Year Sample

Percent of Housing Units Built Before 1960 and After 1999, Census Tracts, MetroPlex area, Texas, 2012-2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012-2016 5-Year Sample
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Percent of housing stock build before 1960 and 2000 and after, census tracts, Austin area, Texas, 2012-2016

Before 1960

2000 and after

Texas Projected Population Pyramid by Race/Ethnicity, 2020

Source: Texas Demographic Center 2018 Population Projections
Source: Texas Demographic Center 2018 Population Projections

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2011-2015 5-Year Sample
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Percent of the population aged 25 years and older with a bachelor’s degree or higher, Texas counties, 2012-2016

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012-2016 5-Year Samples

Percent of the population enrolled in college for persons aged 18-24 years, 25-34 years, and the total population aged 15 years and older, 2010-2017

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2010-2017 1-Year Samples
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Projected population aged 18-24 by race and ethnicity, Texas, 2010-2050

Source: Texas Demographic Center 2018 Population Projections

Percent Distribution of Educational Attainment of Persons Aged 25 Years and Older, Texas, 2008, 2011, and 2015

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 3-Year Sampling, 2008-2015
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Projected County Population, Texas, 2020-2050

Source: Texas Demographic Center 2018 Population Projections

Projected County Population, Texas, 2020-2050

Source: Texas Demographic Center 2018 Population Projections
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Contact

State Demographer
Texas Demographic Center
Office: (210) 458-6530
Email: Lloyd.Potter@UTSA.edu
Internet: Demographics.Texas.gov
@TexasDemography
1. Marketable Skills
   A. Due on UTD website for each degree program (all levels) by Fall 2020
   B. Only two examples for all programs so far (as of 2/27/2019)
      i. University of North Texas: THECB Marketable Skills website
         http://vpaa.unt.edu/thecb
      ii. Angelo State University: published under “Career Opportunities and
          Marketable Skills” for each degree program on its Inventory of
          Academic Programs
         http://www.angelo.edu/dept/aaffairs/inventory.php

2. Graduate Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) February 20 Meeting
   Highlights

3. Field of Study Update

4. Preliminary Legislative Bills filed re: transfer

5. Committee on Academic & Workforce Success (CAWS) March 20 Meeting
   Highlights