There are intangible realities which float near us, formless and without words; realities which no one has thought out, and which are excluded for lack of interpreters.

Natalie Clifford Barney
Data as Storytelling: The Evolution of the UT Data Ecosystem

AA&SS Summit — November 11, 2022
Overview

• My story
• The IE team’s story
• How we tell stories with data
• A few stories
• Looking forward through the IE lens
Jorge Antonio Julian de Jesús Pérez y García
Institutional Effectiveness Team

• Formed in January 2020 via merger of IR and BI
• IR + BI ≠ IE
Model of IE

planning

continuous improvement

duality enhancement

business intelligence

institutional research

accreditation

assessment
Mission of the IE Team

The institutional effectiveness team promotes a culture of continuous improvement and enhances evidence-based decision making by offering services in planning, assessment, accreditation, institutional research, and business intelligence.
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ENROLLMENT 2018-2022

Undergraduate | Graduate | Total Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40,043</td>
<td>10,787</td>
<td>50,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>40,089</td>
<td>10,993</td>
<td>51,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>45,384</td>
<td>11,776</td>
<td>52,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>42,207</td>
<td>11,776</td>
<td>53,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>44,280</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>56,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Residency

- 73.8% IN-STATE
- 26.2% OUT-OF-STATE

Pell Recipient

- 24.5% TOTAL

Total Gender

- 57.1% FEMALE
- 42.9% MALE

New Student Enrollment

- Total
- New Freshmen
- New Graduate
- New Transfers

- Note: UT System numbers in years prior to 2021 do not include UT Southern.
IE Infographics

Oct 2022 Student Success Indicators Report

DISAGGREGATED ENROLLMENT DATA 2018-2022

Online

- Total
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Total 5-Year Change +2.5%

Residency

Out-of-State

- Total
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Total 5-Year Change +8.9%

Pell Grant

- Total
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Year Change -1.5%

Gender

- Total
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Total 5-Year Change -2.5%

Note: UT System numbers in years prior to 2021 do not include UT Southem.
Institutional Effectiveness

Infographics

2022:

- UT System Student Success Indicators – October 2022
- UT System Performance Compared to Peers – June 2022
- UT System Performance Compared to Peers – June 2022
- UT System Student Success Indicators
- UT System Freshman Admission & Retention Snapshots

Digital Booklet | PDF

Admission & Retention Snapshots – February 2022

ie.tennessee.edu/infographics
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>7,764</td>
<td>15.41%</td>
<td>7,646.33</td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>7,937.73</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>15.66%</td>
<td>7,949.20</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8,338</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>8,258.27</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8,552</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>8,370.07</td>
<td>8,451</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>9,678</td>
<td>17.47%</td>
<td>9,489.47</td>
<td>9,580</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>6,188.60</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>12.64%</td>
<td>6,156.07</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>12.54%</td>
<td>6,386.53</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td>6,596.00</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>12.39%</td>
<td>6,482.37</td>
<td>6,457</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6,822</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
<td>6,662.93</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>13.63%</td>
<td>6,564.80</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6,299</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>6,433.80</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6,984</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>7,074.00</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
<td>6,873.50</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7,323</td>
<td>13.47%</td>
<td>6,927.60</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7,267</td>
<td>13.12%</td>
<td>6,885.53</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,589</td>
<td>17.04%</td>
<td>7,638.73</td>
<td>7,121</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,444</td>
<td>16.45%</td>
<td>7,546.13</td>
<td>7,049</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>7,668.60</td>
<td>7,207</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>16.24%</td>
<td>7,745.07</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>1,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>7,641.33</td>
<td>7,304</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
<td>7,676.87</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>5th Year Senior</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>5th Year Senior</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>5th Year Senior</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 313,601 | 99.08% | 294,563.16 | 265,661 | 47,340
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Employee Name</th>
<th>Primary Position Title</th>
<th>Primary Job Title</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Daniel White</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor &amp; Dir of Ath</td>
<td>Athletics Management 5</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Scott Strome</td>
<td>Executive Dean</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 2 Dean</td>
<td>$790,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>David Shibata</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$783,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Steve Schwab</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Administrative Management 7</td>
<td>$607,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Donde Plochan</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Administrative Management 6</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>David Hayes</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$592,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Kenneth Brown</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Administrative Management 8</td>
<td>$565,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Robert Shack</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 2 Dean</td>
<td>$554,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td>Wayne Davis</td>
<td>UT Promise Mentor</td>
<td>UT Promise Mentor</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Paul Hauptman</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 2 Dean</td>
<td>$549,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Stephen Mangum</td>
<td>Dean and Professor</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 2 Dean</td>
<td>$514,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Zhongjie Sun</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$487,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Leigh Graueres</td>
<td>Professor/Division Chief</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$451,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Maria Chisholm-Burns</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 2 Dean</td>
<td>$444,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Anthony Ferrara</td>
<td>Senior Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Financial Management 5</td>
<td>$441,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Christopher Cinino</td>
<td>Sr Vice Chancellor, F&amp;A</td>
<td>Financial Management 5</td>
<td>$336,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Muneeka Khan</td>
<td>Assoc Professor &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Associate Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$432,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Karen Johnson</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$417,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>G. Verne</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$417,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Matthew Erns</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$417,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>Sr VP &amp; Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Financial Management 6</td>
<td>$410,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Deborah Crawford</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
<td>Administrative Management 6</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>John Zomickich</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Senior VC</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 6</td>
<td>$406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Ronald Cowan</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$404,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Michael Schwartz</td>
<td>Coach II</td>
<td>Athletics Coach 1</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Jonathan McCullers</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>$396,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Andrew Griffith</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$396,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center</td>
<td>Cynthia Russell</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Academic Administrator 6</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Chattanooga</td>
<td>Steven Angle</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Administrative Management 7</td>
<td>$382,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Jimmy Cheek</td>
<td>Diet Prof &amp;Chanc Emeritus</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>$381,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Knoxville</td>
<td>Terry Neal</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$380,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note from Our Partners

“I just wanted to send a quick note that I am so thankful for your team’s hard work on the UT presence data. I was on a zoom with government relations teams from other universities who were all stressing out about how they were going to pull the data for their district snapshots. It really put in perspective how fortunate we are to have such a great IE team.”
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Common SIS
Some stories...
The UT Systemwide strategic plan establishes a vision and direction for success. Clearly defined goals ensure good stewardship and purposeful use of resources. The plan is also used to help identify potential risks and opportunities for UT and where important investments are needed.
UT System Student Success Achievement Gaps based on Retention Rates

Filter by Campus
- UTK
- UTC
- UTM

Filter by Success Gap
- Male vs Female
- Minority vs Non-Minority
- Pell vs Non-Pell
- Rural vs Urban

Clear Filters

Note: Retention rate is the measure of new, full-time undergraduate students retained Fall-to-Fall. Minority counts reflect those that identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Multi-Racial.

Source: Campus Data Submissions
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UT System Student Success Achievement Gaps based on Retention Rates

Note: Retention rate is the measure of new, full-time undergraduate students retained Fall-to-Fall. Minority counts reflect those that identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Multi-Racial.

Source: Campus Data Submissions
“Just 29% of rural Americans aged 18-24 are enrolled in colleges and universities, compared to 42% of all Americans in this age range.”
UT System Student Success Achievement Gaps based on 6-Year Graduation Rates

Filter by Campus
- [ ] UTK
- [ ] UTC
- [ ] UTM

Filter by Success Gap
- [ ] Male vs Female
- ☐ Minority vs Non-Minority
- ☐ Pell vs Non-Pell

4-Year Graduation Rates

Clear Filters

Note: Minority counts reflect those that identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Multi-Racial.

Source: Campus Data Submissions
UT System Student Success Achievement Gaps based on 6-Year Graduation Rates

Note: Minority counts reflect those that identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Multi-Racial.

Source: Campus Data Submissions
UT System Student Success Achievement Gaps based on 6-Year Graduation Rates

Filter by Campus:
- UTK
- UTC
- UTM

Filter by Success Gap:
- Male vs Female
- Minority vs Non-Minority
- Pell vs Non-Pell

Cohort Year:
- 2013: Pell 45.1%, Non-Pell 50.9%
- 2014: Pell 45.1%, Non-Pell 50.9%
- 2015: Pell 45.1%, Non-Pell 50.9%
- 2016: Pell 50.30%, Non-Pell 66.93%

Note: Minority counts reflect those that identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Multiracial.

Source: Campus Data Submissions
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS
Board of Trustees – June 23-24, 2022

Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

TN State Population
27.3%
Minorities

July 2021

State of TN Public School Enrollment
Fall 2020

Campus Enrollment
Fall 2021

UTC 21.4%
UTK* 18.2%
UTHSC 27.8%
UTM 20.5%
UTS 16.8%

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE SYSTEM
Institutional Effectiveness
### Racial/Ethnic Minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total 5-Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian*</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Asian also includes Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Race/Ethnicity.
Current information gaps ignore critical outcomes disparities for students of color, students from low-income backgrounds, and women.

Data Insights to Data Action

“The focus of data analytics needs to change from an historical approach using data to understand what’s happened to a future-oriented approach of using data to project where we’re heading.”

Trends
• Social
• Technological
• Economic
• Environmental
• Political

Implications For
• CIOs
• IR Leaders
• CAOs
• CDOs
• Enterprise Architects

Key Technologies
• Data Management and Governance
• Unifying Data Sources
• Modern Data Architecture
• Data Literacy Training
• DEI for Data and Analytics
• Assessing and Improving Data and Analytics Capabilities
Data Summit

• Virtual summit hosted by the UT System IE team to foster more systemwide collaboration and sharing of best practices

• Spring 2023
What are your biggest obstacles to using data?
What are your biggest obstacles to using data?
In what areas is better data needed?
In what areas is better data needed?
**Biggest Obstacles**

When asked to identify the biggest obstacles to using data, the top three answers were:

1. Trouble turning data into action
2. Decentralized/siloed data collection
3. Budget constraints

**Areas of Need**

When asked to identify the areas where better data is most needed, the top three answers were:

1. Academic advising
2. Admissions and recruitment
3. Post-graduation attainment
Questions?

jperez@tennessee.edu
GREAT QUESTION
Roundtable Questions

1. What data would help you identifying gaps and barriers in student experiences?
2. What is the best format for that data (e.g., dashboard, report, infographic)?
3. What comparison or contextual data be useful (e.g., state, regional, national)?
4. What are other institutions doing in data analytics that you would like to see at UT?
5. How could the IE team partner better with you to identify gaps and barriers?