

University System of Maryland



Dashboard Indicators 2012

Board of Regents
Committee on Effectiveness & Efficiency
March 13, 2013

Office of the Chief Operating Officer/
Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance

2012 USM Dashboard Indicators

Key Indicators

The 2012 Dashboard Indicators provides a “snapshot” overview of the USM and its institutions. It combines in one place data from dozens of USM reports and data sets. The indicators noted below were selected to highlight specific trends and challenges drawn from the Dashboards.

STEM Enrollment Continues to Grow

- **Upper Division STEM Enrollment** – This measure is a leading indicator of progress on the State and Strategic Plan commitments to increase Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) degrees. The early indication is that significant progress has been made in increasing STEM production on all campuses. For the system as a whole, STEM enrollment at this level has increased by more than 1,600 majors in the past year and by over 4,600 since 2007. In the past year, every USM institution that enrolls STEM majors increased its upper division enrollment. The change in this year alone should increase the total number of undergraduate STEM degrees by more than 500 by the end of the current academic year.

Financial Aid Remains a Critical Issue

In FY 2012, institutional dollars going toward financial aid continued to rise. Despite this increase, the undergraduate debt burden at graduation rose this year. Three indicators are illustrative of the current state of financial aid within the USM:

- **Institutional Financial Aid** – Institutional aid rose again in FY 2012 to 116 million dollars or around 5%. The dollars devoted to institutional aid have risen on average by 5% for the last 4 years, while in-state tuition and fees have risen, on average, by approximately 3% per year.
- **Undergraduate Debt Burden** – Debt burden upon graduation rose sharply at all institutions reporting the measure with a median increase of over \$4,000 (17%) over the last two years. However, the current level of debt burden remains below that of peers at 5 of the 7 reporting institutions, and the neediest students are graduating with less debt (consistent with the Regent’s Financial Aid Policy).
- **Undergraduates Receiving Financial Aid** – The percentage of undergraduate students receiving some type of financial aid dropped at 7 of 10 institutions including all three of USM’s Historically Black Institutions. The reason(s) for this drop is not immediately clear, but it will remain an important indicator to monitor this coming year.

New Indicators Added

At the direction of the Regents, two new indicators were added for the 2012 report. These monitor critical areas of the strategic plan: economic development and quality of instruction. They are:

- **New Company Creation** – As part of the current USM Strategic Plan, the goal was set to establish 325 new companies by 2020. This required the creation of approximately 33 companies per year for the duration of the plan. Last year was the first year in which the data were uniformly collected and showed that 51 companies were created at 8 USM institutions.
- **Student to Faculty Ratio** – This has traditionally served as a proxy measure for the level of attention students receive from faculty and for quality of instruction overall. Eight of 10 institutions have maintained or improved their Student to Faculty ratios through the economic downturn, and 8 of 10 perform better than their peers.

Summary of 2012 Core Dashboard Indicators

As of 2/14/2013

Note: Data are the most recent available for any given indicator. Years are not the same for all indicators.

#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMCES	System
1	Average SAT	1290	1223		899	882	985	1155	1087		879			
2	6-year graduation rate	82%	57%		41%	15%	46%	67%	64%		31%			61%
3	2nd-year retention rate	94%	85%		72%	63%	72%	81%	84%	78%	68%			74%
4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	20%	21%		94%	88%	28%	15%	18%	47%	79%	47%		33%
5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	46%	66%		54%	35%	62%	57%	70%	71%	58%			
6	MD community college transfers	1679	1402		315	209	386	824	2420	625	90	2944		10994
7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$8,908	\$9,764		\$6,639	\$5,720	\$7,436	\$7,700	\$8,132	\$7,664	\$6,713	\$6,474		\$8,268
8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	66%	68%		87%	83%	81%	79%	71%	87%	88%	47%		
9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$24,180	\$20,902		\$24,291	NA	\$22,429	\$20,693	\$22,072	NA	\$36,493			
10	Average alumni giving rate	6.5%	4.1%		4.8%	7.1%	5.4%	15.3%	4.2%	3.9%	3.8%	2.2%		
21	Average faculty salary	\$112,050	\$87,769		\$69,364	\$67,399	\$69,914	\$71,437	\$72,400		\$72,172			
22	Faculty salary %ile	83	58		60	56	43	53	60		65			68
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	4.7	2.1											
24	Student to faculty ratio	18	20	8	16	16	16	17	17	20	16			
31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$319,012	\$206,282	\$254,028*							\$74,931			
32	U.S. Patents issued	38	9	30										77
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$716,873	\$196,921	\$385,815										
34	Licenses & options executed	14	1	14										29
35	Upper division STEM enrollment	5256	2783		263	95	436	536	1258	278	413	4256		15550
38	Number of start-up companies	11	4	9			1	11	2	8	5			51
41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	31%	34%	22%	39%	38%	39%	47%	41%	38%	38%	30%		
42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	7%	9%	8%	21%	26%	16%	14%	14%	23%	13%	16%		
43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal
44	% of fundraising goal achieved	120%	119%	100%	76%	139%	71%	92%	78%	131%	138%	52%	35%	
51	Classroom utilization rate	71%	62%		65%	67%	62%	67%	65%		69%			66%
52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.5%	0.2%	0.6%	4.0%	0.3%	1.0%	3.7%	3.0%	0.7%	0.6%		0.4%	1.3%
53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	16.6%	15.1%		10.7%	9.5%	13.7%	14.9%	8.7%		10.1%			13.2%
54	Time to degree	8.5	9.1		9.9	10.5	9.2	8.1	9.0		8.6			8.7
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.6	6.9		7.7	9.0	7.4	7.8	7.4	6.5	7.6			

*Includes only medical school faculty

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2012\DBI092612 UPDATED.XLS, 2/14/2013

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?*

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 2/14/2013

	#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMCES
Student Access, Affordability, and Attainment	1	Average SAT	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	2	6-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	3	2nd-year retention rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	●	●				●	●	●				●
	5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)												
	6	MD community college transfers	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees												
	8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	10	Average alumni giving rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Faculty	21	Average faculty salary	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	22	Faculty salary %ile	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	●	●										
	24	Student to faculty ratio	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
Economic & Workforce Development	31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	●	●								●		
	32	U.S. Patents issued	●	●	●									
	33	Adjusted gross license income received	●	●	●									
	34	Licenses & options executed	●	●	●									
	35	Upper division STEM enrollment	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	38	Number of start-up companies												
Stewardship	41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	44	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Effectiveness & Efficiency	51	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●
	53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	54	Time to degree	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		

Improved/Same
Worse

19 19 7 14 14 12 16 16 8 15 7 2
7 7 2 6 5 9 5 5 4 6 2 1

* The most recent year compared with the average of previous 3 years.

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2012\DBI092612 UPDATED.XLS, 2/14/2013

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 2/14/2013

	#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMCES
Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment	1	Average SAT	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	2	6-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	3	2nd-year retention rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	●	●				●	●	●				●
	5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)												
	6	MD community college transfers		●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	
	7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees												
	8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid		●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	●	●		●		●	●	●			●	
	10	Average alumni giving rate												
Faculty	21	Average faculty salary	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	22	Faculty salary %ile	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	●	●										
	24	Student to faculty ratio	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
Economic & Workforce Developmt.	31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	●	●								●		
	32	U.S. Patents issued			●									
	33	Adjusted gross license income received												
	34	Licenses & options executed												
	35	Upper division STEM enrollment												
	38	Number of start-up companies												
Stewardship	41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved												
	44	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Effectiveness & Efficiency	51	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●
	53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	54	Time to degree												
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	Meets benchmark	7	14	3	10	5	8	13	9	3	10	4	1	
	Does not meet benchmark	10	5	3	6	10	9	4	8	5	7	2	1	

Anatomy of a Dashboard Indicator

1. Indicator number -
(use to look up definitions,
sources)

5

2. Indicator -
(* means this
is used in US News
ratings)

Acceptance rate
for freshmen*

3. Desired direction
of measure over time
(This measure should
decrease over time.
Could also be + or NC.)

Year	
2006	54%
2007	61%
2008	57%
2009	55%
2010	

4. Year of data

5. Color code for
IMPROVEMENT
(trend)



6. peer data
compare to
italicized data

Benchmark

70%

8. Color code for
ADEQUACY
(benchmark comparison)



7. Benchmark data

9. Letter indicates benchmark group
(Peers, Natl. std., BOR policy, State
policy, Institutional goal).

University System of Maryland

Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

As of 2/14/2013

N = National standards based upon weighted average of 4-year public universities

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment												
Year	S2 6-year graduation rate	S3 2nd year retention rate	S4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	S5 % of total projected demand met	S6 MD comm. college transfers	S7 Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) chg.	S11 % of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)	S12 Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue	S13 Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)			
2008	63%	71%	30%	90%	8993	\$7,390 1%	42.5%	15%	\$96.5			
2009	63%	72%	31%	91%	9468	\$7,462 1%	41.8%	16%	\$106.0			
2010	63%	73%	32%	92%	10029	\$7,746 1%	41.4%	16%	\$111.6			
2011	61%	74%	33%	92%	10994	\$7,992 3%	41.7%	16%	\$110.9			
2012						\$8,268 3%	42.4%	15%	\$116.4			
Benchmark*	57%	74%	23%									

Faculty			Economic Development			Workforce Development			Funding		
Year	S21-1 Aver. faculty salary (Research univ.)	S21-2 Aver. faculty salary (Master's univ.)	S22 Wgt'd. aver faculty salary %ile	S32 U.S. Patents issued	S34 Licenses & options executed	S38 Number of start-up companies	S35 Upper division STEM enrollment	S36 Number of teaching graduates	S37 Number of nursing graduates	S48 Operating expendit. per FTE std. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	S49 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2008	\$100,923	\$69,634	79	52	47	NA	11797	1558	908	\$27,792	82%
2009	\$105,395	\$71,951	79	42	44	NA	12904	1560	899	\$25,070	70%
2010	\$105,878	\$72,021	76	40	29	NA	13921	1588	1005	\$26,741	65%
2011	\$105,812	\$71,240	71	77	29	NA	15550	1728	1,169	\$27,208	70%
2012	\$106,733	\$71,850	68			51					74%
Benchmark*	\$95,515	\$74,839	85%			33				\$26,515	100%

Stewardship							Effectiveness & Efficiency				
Year	S41 State appropriations per FTE student	S42 System Office admin as % of System's total operating expend.	S43 Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	S44 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	S45 Credit rating (Moody's)	S46 % of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	S47 Total funds raised (annual) (000s)	S51 Classroom utilization rate	S52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacment. value	S53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	S54 Time to Degree
2008	\$8,500	0.4%	89%	Met goal	Stable	NA	\$260,086	68%	1.9%	10.4%	8.8
2009	\$8,884	0.4%	87%	Met goal	Stable	12.9%	\$233,935	67%	1.2%	11.1%	8.7
2010	\$7,247	0.4%	85%	Met goal	Stable(recalibrated)	12.4%	\$222,396	65%	1.4%	12.3%	8.6
2011	\$8,151	0.4%	100%	Met goal	Stable	13.0%	\$242,343	66%	1.3%	13.2%	8.7
2012			113%	Met goal	Stable		\$242,056		1.3%		
Benchmark*	\$7,253	Rank 27 of 29						66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	

External Fiscal

Funding guideline % achieved (FY)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2002	86%	82%	74%	70%	75%	90%	74%	71%	76%	110%	58%
2003	65%	71%	80%	66%	82%	80%	63%	66%	76%	91%	46%
2004	53%	64%	73%	63%	77%	84%	56%	61%	65%	70%	43%
2005	51%	70%	78%	74%	80%	80%	53%	64%	67%	72%	34%
2006	94%	108%	90%	104%	100%	141%	72%	81%	82%	99%	40%
2007	74%	93%	82%	79%	90%	132%	73%	74%	78%	88%	61%
2008	87%	101%	93%	78%	88%	107%	75%	72%	82%	82%	39%
2009	74%	112%	77%	65%	68%	50%	61%	65%	73%	69%	46%
2010	62%	101%	67%	63%	63%	45%	57%	64%	72%	62%	43%
2011	70%	111%	69%	63%	66%	46%	69%	62%	75%	71%	37%
2012	77%	116%	75%	70%	76%	45%	71%	65%	76%	75%	54%
Benchmark											

Operating expend. per FTE student (Excl. auxil./hosp.)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2003	\$14,569	\$14,308	\$10,931	\$10,653	\$10,787	\$12,319	\$40,853	\$22,176	\$29,808	\$20,483	\$17,832
2004	\$13,696	\$14,149	\$10,808	\$10,308	\$10,773	\$12,741	\$41,427	\$22,449	\$29,973	\$17,786	\$16,898
2005	\$13,554	\$15,562	\$11,363	\$10,391	\$11,108	\$13,191	\$46,596	\$23,059	\$31,270	\$20,605	\$17,266
2006	\$13,885	\$13,736	\$12,764	\$10,859	\$11,881	\$14,230	\$48,802	\$23,979	\$33,087	\$21,009	\$18,961
2007	\$14,770	\$18,924	\$13,637	\$11,217	\$12,275	\$15,090	\$50,438	\$25,720	\$33,645	\$18,214	\$17,569
2008	\$14,778	\$18,114	\$14,843	\$10,973	\$12,608	\$15,625	\$55,374	\$26,326	\$34,538	\$18,473	\$17,585
2009	\$15,269	\$19,617	\$15,102	\$12,499	\$13,743	\$14,629	\$55,333	\$26,522	\$36,444	\$19,233	\$18,534
2010	\$15,821	\$21,749	\$14,598	\$11,892	\$13,009	\$15,606	\$56,458	\$25,759	\$36,281	\$18,353	\$18,704
2011	\$14,766	\$23,063	\$14,706	\$11,556	\$13,052	\$15,698	\$57,345	\$26,620	\$37,303	\$18,385	\$19,153
Benchmark	\$19,152	\$15,360	\$16,591	\$16,809	\$17,568	\$16,708	\$61,920	\$29,125	\$58,795	\$21,008	\$17,125

State appropriations per FTE student											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2003	\$5,524	\$6,569	\$5,317	\$4,358	\$4,104	\$4,530	\$11,679	\$6,917	\$10,286	\$6,707	\$1,419
2004	\$5,039	\$6,507	\$5,054	\$4,242	\$4,044	\$4,269	\$11,137	\$6,570	\$9,732	\$6,229	\$1,378
2005	\$5,074	\$6,161	\$5,231	\$4,199	\$4,012	\$4,380	\$11,249	\$6,667	\$9,955	\$6,396	\$1,277
2006	\$5,362	\$6,104	\$5,843	\$4,359	\$4,183	\$4,771	\$12,119	\$7,200	\$10,364	\$6,629	\$1,365
2007	\$7,418	\$9,482	\$6,691	\$4,957	\$4,783	\$5,420	\$12,966	\$8,094	\$11,735	\$7,593	\$1,492
2008	\$7,558	\$10,266	\$6,853	\$5,021	\$4,939	\$5,260	\$13,641	\$8,451	\$12,220	\$8,374	\$1,890
2009	\$7,586	\$10,715	\$6,731	\$5,201	\$4,842	\$5,219	\$11,162	\$8,404	\$12,003	\$8,072	\$2,034
2010	\$6,733	\$11,457	\$5,804	\$4,475	\$4,281	\$4,422	\$11,771	\$7,217	\$10,524	\$7,135	\$1,776
2011	\$7,521	\$12,150	\$6,475	\$5,001	\$4,796	\$4,859	\$13,231	\$8,534	\$12,035	\$7,589	\$1,972
Benchmark	\$7,276	\$6,044	\$6,023	\$6,452	\$6,417	\$5,270	\$11,075	\$9,658	\$10,690	\$7,668	\$5,701

University System of Maryland
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

As of 2/14/2013

Italicized figures are figures against which national comparisons should be made.

Workforce & Workforce Development									
Year	E1 % of Maryland residents with at least a bachelor's degr. +	E30 % of Maryland residents with advanced degree or more +	E2 Doctoral scientists, engineers, & health professionals employed in MD +	E4 Science & engineering doctorates awarded +	E5 Per capita personal income +	E6 Unemployment rate (June) -	E12 Persons in science & engineering occupations as % of workforce +	E14 Average high-tech wage +	E23 Current population estimates (as of July 1) (for comparison purposes) +
2008	35.2%	15.7%	28,100	910	\$48,864	4.3%			5,633,597
2009	35.7%	16.0%		839	\$47,419	7.5%			5,699,478
2010				874	\$48,621	7.8%	6.04%	\$90,300	
2011	36.9%	16.5%			\$50,656	7.2%		\$100,054	5,828,289
2012						6.9%			5,884,563
Benchmark	28.5%	10.6%	6th (MD's rank)	12th (MD's rank)	5th (MD's rank)	8.2%	4th (MD's rank)	6th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)

R&D		Economic Development			
Year	E8 Academic R&D expenditures in science & engin. (millions) +	E22 University R&D expenditures in life sciences (millions) +	E7 SBIR awards (\$ millions) +	E16 Venture capital disbursed per \$1,000 of Gross Domestic Product (\$) +	E15 High-tech establishments as % of business establishments +
2008	\$2,747	\$1,332	246		10.84%
2009	\$3,021	\$1,450	326		
2010	\$3,094	\$1,383	321	\$1.21	
2011					
2012					
Benchmark			6th (MD's rank)	8th (MD's rank)	5th (MD's rank)

Support of Higher Education				
Year	E17 St. gen. funds for higher educ. per \$1,000 of personal income (FY) +	E18 State gen. funds for higher educ. per capita +	E19 State gen. funds for higher educ. per headcount student +	E20 Tuition & fees (USM) as % of MD's per capita personal income -
2008	\$5.91	\$280.04	\$4,925	16.1%
2009	\$6.02	\$292.33	\$5,027	15.4%
2010	\$5.92	\$292.82	\$4,924	
2011	\$5.65	\$280.05	\$4,447	
2012	\$5.39	\$274.25	\$4,453	
Benchmark	28th (MD's rank)	15th (MD's rank)	16th (MD's rank)	37th (MD's rank)

New Economy Index						
Year	E24 New Economy Index: Overall (Maryland's rank) +	E25 New Economy Index: Knowledge jobs (Maryland's rank) +	E26 New Economy Index: Globalization (Maryland's rank) +	E27 New Economy Index: Economic dynamism (Maryland's rank) +	E28 New Economy Index: Digital economy (Maryland's rank) +	E29 New Economy Index: Innovation capacity (Maryland's rank) +
2002	5th	2nd	30th	11th	13th	6th
2007	3rd	4th	30th	2nd	11th	3rd
2008	3rd	4th	24th	9th	8th	5th
2009						
2010	3rd	3rd	21st	15th	4th	4th
2011						
2012	5th	3rd	26th	8th	11th	5th

Bowie State University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.
** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment											Alumni	
Year	1 Average SAT +	2 6-year graduation rate* +	3 2nd year retention rate +	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers +					10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +	
2008	882	41%	72%	92%	46%	302					5.5%	
2009	880	39%	70%	92%	52%	292					5.9%	
2010	889	37%	70%	93%	53%	238					4.0%	
2011	899	41%	72%	94%	54%	315					4.8%	
2012												
Benchmark*	802-986 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	P	P	63% P	45% I	500					I
Faculty					Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.		
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgt'd. aver. faculty salary %ile +	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -					35 Upper division STEM enrollment +	
2008	\$66,794	68	16	\$6,005 1%	70%	\$14,399					241	
2009	\$69,734	71	16	\$6,040 1%	82%	\$17,198					234	
2010	\$69,947	70	16	\$6,153 2%	83%	NA					235	
2011	\$69,754	66	16	\$6,347 3%	91%	\$24,291					263	
2012	\$69,364	60		\$6,639 5%	87%							
Benchmark*	\$74,839	P	85% B	17.8	P	68% I	\$24,844					
Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency							
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in semesters -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +			
2008	44%	23%	Met goal	250%	59%	2.4%	5.8%	9.7	8.0			
2009	39%	21%	Met goal	100%	67%	4.8%	5.5%	9.5	8.0			
2010	36%	17%	Met goal	67%	67%	2.9%	11.1%	9.5	7.6			
2011	39%	21%	Met goal	70%	67%	1.3%	10.7%	9.9	8.3			
2012			Met goal	76%	65%	4.0%			7.7			
Benchmark*	33% P	13% P	B	100% I	66% N	0.2% increase B	10.0% B		7.5			

Coppin State University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers				
2008	853	16%	61%	88%	46%	199				
2009	875	14%	60%	89%	54%	242				
2010	874	16%	61%	89%	58%	200				
2011	882	15%	63%	88%	35%	209				
2012										
Benchmark*	854-1019 (25th & 75th %ile)	30%	64%	57%	53%	225	P	P	P	I

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
2.9%
NA
6.8%
7.1%

Faculty					Affordability				
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			
2008	\$64,904	64	15	\$5,140	3%	\$9,488			
2009	\$65,822	65	14	\$5,276	3%	NA			
2010	\$66,576	61	15	\$5,382	2%	NA			
2011	\$66,449	54	16	\$5,491	2%	NA			
2012	\$67,399	56		\$5,720	4%				
Benchmark*	\$74,839	85%	18.0		P	\$28,220	I		

Workforce Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM Enrollment
71
86
93
95

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty	
2008	34%	26%	Did not meet goal	68%	61%	0.2%	9.8%	10.0	9.0	
2009	38%	25%	Did not meet goal	105%	68%	0.4%	7.2%	10.3	8.2	
2010	40%	26%	Met goal	110%	69%	0.3%	8.8%	9.5	10.5	
2011	38%	26%	Did not meet goal	72%	69%	0.4%	9.5%	10.5	9.0	
2012			Did not meet goal	139%	67%	0.3%			9.0	
Benchmark*	39%	15%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	B	

Frostburg State University

Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.
** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers				
2008	974	48%	71%	24%	61%	313				
2009	963	49%	71%	27%	59%	323				
2010	984	48%	73%	27%	60%	354				
2011	985	46%	72%	28%	62%	386				
2012										
Benchmark*	896-1089 (25th & 75th %ile)	48%	75%	14%	73%	282	P	P	I	I

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
6.6%
5.6%
5.6%
5.4%

Faculty						Affordability			Workforce Dvlp.		Economic Dvlp.
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies			
2008	\$69,733	55	17	\$6,614	1%	\$18,408	251	NA			
2009	\$72,807	59	16	\$6,684	1%	\$18,255	291	NA			
2010	\$72,093	52	17	\$6,904	3%	NA	334	NA			
2011	\$71,368	49	16	\$7,128	3%	\$22,429	416	NA			
2012	\$69,914	43		\$7,436	4%		436	1			
Benchmark*	\$74,839	85%	18.1		P	\$22,866					

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency						
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty		
2008	41%	16%	Met goal	124%	61%	2.8%	9.6%	9.2	8.1		
2009	40%	16%	Met goal	155%	62%	2.8%	10.0%	9.2	7.6		
2010	40%	16%	Met goal	156%	61%	3.3%	12.6%	9.1	7.5		
2011	39%	16%	Met goal	145%	60%	2.4%	13.7%	9.2	7.5		
2012			Did not meet goal	71%	62%	1.0%			7.4		
Benchmark*	44%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5		

Salisbury University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

As of 2/14/2013

* Measure used by U.S. News

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	1 Average SAT*	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers				
2008	1126	69%	82%	15%	58%	524				
2009	1138	66%	81%	15%	58%	657				
2010	1147	70%	81%	15%	58%	673				
2011	1155	67%	81%	15%	57%	824				
2012										
Benchmark*	972-1159 (25th & 75th %ile)	59%	80%	12%	60%	530				

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
17.8%
17.1%
16.5%
15.3%

Faculty				Affordability						
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation				
2008	\$68,599	62	16	\$6,492	1%	\$15,939				
2009	\$71,086	64	17	\$6,618	2%	\$17,521				
2010	\$71,572	61	17	\$6,908	4%	\$18,541				
2011	\$71,486	57	17	\$7,332	6%	\$20,693				
2012	\$71,437	53		\$7,700	5%					
Benchmark*	\$74,839	85%	19		P	\$24,592				

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies
406	NA
430	NA
484	NA
536	NA
	11

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency							
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty		
2008	56%	18%	Met goal	127%	75%	1.1%	11.6%	8.6	8.2		
2009	46%	15%	Met goal	91%	75%	1.2%	12.9%	8.7	7.9		
2010	47%	15%	Met goal	218%	67%	2.6%	15.2%	8.3	7.6		
2011	47%	14%	Met goal	220%	65%	3.0%	14.9%	8.1	7.7		
2012			Met goal	92%	67%	3.7%			7.8		
Benchmark*	44%	12%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5			

Towson University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers				
2008	1074	66%	82%	15%	64%	1729				
2009	1080	73%	84%	15%	57%	1889				
2010	1081	68%	84%	16%	65%	2017				
2011	1087	64%	84%	18%	70%	2420				
2012										
Benchmark*	935-1145 (25th & 75th %ile)	52%	79%	17%	65%	I	1300			I

10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
4.9%
4.6%
4.4%
4.2%

Faculty			Affordability					
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation		
2008	\$70,217	71	17	\$7,314	54%	\$10,772		
2009	\$71,895	70	17	\$7,418	65%	\$13,245		
2010	\$71,910	66	17	\$7,656	69%	\$19,069		
2011	\$71,097	62	17	\$7,906	72%	\$22,072		
2012	\$72,400	60		\$8,132	71%			
Benchmark*	\$74,839	85%	18.9		P	\$23,194		

35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies
931	NA
1080	NA
1216	NA
1258	NA
	2

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2008	40%	14%	Met goal	104%	73%	2.4%	7.6%	8.9	7.3
2009	36%	13%	Met goal	103%	67%	3.3%	7.1%	8.8	7.4
2010	40%	14%	Met goal	107%	67%	2.8%	7.7%	8.7	7.3
2011	41%	14%	Met goal	84%	65%	4.0%	8.7%	9.0	7.7
2012			Met goal	78%	65%	3.0%			7.4
Benchmark*	45%	10%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

University of Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

As of 2/14/2013

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

** Measure used by U.S. News*

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment							Alumni
	1-UB % of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers	4-UB Number of minority students graduating annually (UG & Grad/Prof)	5-UB % of economically disadvantaged students	10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
2008	75%	68%	37%		653	436	62%	NA
2009	74%	75%	41%		626	461	67%	NA
2010	85%	75%	45%	72%	664	455	66%	2.6%
2011	82%	78%	47%	71%	625	465	73%	3.9%
2012	80%					514	74%	
Benchmark*	75%	72%	30%			426	75%	

Year	Faculty			Affordability			Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
	2-UB Sponsored research \$ per F-T faculty (000s)	3-UB % part-time faculty	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies
2008	\$54	53%	12	\$7,051 2%	61%	NA	217	NA
2009	\$39	55%	20	\$7,171 2%	70%	NA	228	NA
2010	NA	52%	20	\$7,330 2%	78%	NA	250	NA
2011	\$39	55%	20	\$7,494 2%	81%	NA	278	NA
2012	\$33	54%		\$7,664 2%	87%			8
Benchmark*		49%	16		58%	\$20,837		

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency		
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	7-UB % of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2008	38%	23%	Did not meet goal	243%	1.3%	42%	7.5
2009	37%	23%	Met goal	48%	2.5%	42%	7.5
2010	40%	21%	Met goal	183%	0.6%	42%	7.6
2011	38%	23%	Met goal	105%	0.6%	42%	7.8
2012			Met goal	131%	0.7%	44%	6.5
Benchmark*	40%	13%		100%	0.2% increase		7.5

Note: Institutional goals are usually taken from institution's MFR and are usually set for FY 2008.

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.
** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment														Economic Dvlp.		
Year	1-UMB Passing rate on Bar (Law) exam		2-UMB Passing rate on medical licensure exam		3-UMB Passing rate on nursing licensure exam		4-UMB Passing rate on dentistry licensure exam		10-UMB Total headcount enrollmt.		11-UMB Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Nat. Amer. as % of total headcount enrollment		12-UMB Graduate & 1st prof. as % of total hdct. enrollment		38 Number of start-up companies	
2008	88%		96%		93%		97%		6,156		22%		86%		NA	
2009	84%		95%		89%		98%		6,382		21%		87%		NA	
2010	90%		96%		93%		98%		6,349		19%		88%		NA	
2011	85%		96%		90%		100%		6,395		19%		89%		NA	
2012	86%	■	99%	■	88%	■	97%	■	6,368	■	19%	■	87%	■	9	
Benchmark*	91%	P	96%	N	90%	N	NA	N	22,915	P	17%	P	40%	P		

Faculty					Economic Development					
Year	5-UMB Nat'l. ranking NIH awards to public medical schls.	6-UMB Nat'l. ranking: NIH awards to public & priv .dental schls.	7-UMB No. of specialty law programs ranked in top 10 nationally	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	13-UMB Grant & contract awards (millions)	14-UMB Total R&D expenditures in medicine per F-T medical faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed	
2008	15	13	3	10	\$446.2	\$300,750	13	\$343,047	26	
2009	14	7	3	10	\$516.0	\$267,799	NA	NA	NA	
2010	14	3	3	10	\$566.0	\$273,201	15	\$1,375,250	12	
2011	13	3	4	8	\$557.0	\$313,668	30	\$385,815	14	
2012	12	3	3		\$525.0	\$254,028				
Benchmark*	Top 10	Top 10	Top 10	15.3		\$337,444	I	5% annually	I	5% annually

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency			Workforce Development									
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	19-UMB Days of charity care provided by clinical medical faculty	16-UMB Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	17-UMB Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	18-UMB Number of dentistry grads (DDS)							
2008	23%	9%	Met goal	101%	0.8%	3,869	529	114	100							
2009	22%	8%	Did not meet goal	92%	0.8%	3,107	559	121	115							
2010	23%	9%	Met goal	112%	0.5%	3,038	635	114	117							
2011	22%	8%	Met goal	100%	0.7%	2,830	627	147	128							
2012			Met goal		0.6%	3,011	646	156	123							
Benchmark*	30%	P		B	100%	I	0.2% increase	B	3,625	I	5% annually	I	5% annually	I	5% annually	I

Note: Institutional goals are usually taken from institution's MFR and are usually set for FY 2010.

University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.
* Measure used by U.S. News

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										Alumni
	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate	
2008	1190	59%	84%	21%	75%	1052	\$8,780	1%	61%	\$20,002	4.3%
2009	1184	59%	86%	21%	72%	1059	\$8,872	1%	65%	\$19,353	4.1%
2010	1206	57%	85%	21%	69%	1267	\$9,171	1%	68%	NA	4.2%
2011	1223	57%	85%	21%	66%	1402	\$9,467	3%	74%	\$20,902	4.1%
2012							\$9,764	3%	68%		
Benchmark*	1017-1236 (25th & 75th %ile)	64%	83%	19%	73%	958		P	61%	\$24,890	

Year	Faculty				Economic Development				Workforce Dvlp	
	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	23 Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.)	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed	38 Number of start-up companies	35 Upper division STEM enrollment
2008	\$85,381	77	4.5	18	\$168,267	9	\$72,927	1	NA	2224
2009	\$88,620	79	3.8	19	\$189,401	NA	NA	NA	NA	2410
2010	\$88,303	72	2.8	19	\$206,282	9	\$63,162	4	NA	2591
2011	\$88,335	65	2.0	20		9	\$196,921	1	NA	2783
2012	\$87,769	58	2.1					4		
Benchmark*	\$85,551	85%	3.5	17.7	\$158,134	NA	NA			

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2008	36%	11%	Did not meet goal	103%	64%	0.2%	13.2%	9.1	6.3
2009	35%	11%	Met goal	80%	62%	0.2%	13.2%	9.2	6.5
2010	34%	11%	Met goal	97%	62%	0.2%	15.3%	8.8	6.5
2011	34%	9%	Met goal	140%	63%	0.3%	15.1%	9.1	6.9
2012			Met goal	119%	62%	0.2%			6.9
Benchmark*	31%	9%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	5.5	B

University of Maryland, College Park
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

As of 2/14/2013

** Measure used by U.S. News*

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										Alumni
	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate	
2008	1268	82%	93%	19%	43%	1652	\$8,005	1%	61%	\$20,091	8.2%
2009	1285	82%	93%	19%	44%	1658	\$8,053	1%	63%	\$20,256	7.4%
2010	1287	82%	94%	19%	45%	1665	\$8,416	1%	65%	\$22,696	6.9%
2011	1290	82%	94%	20%	46%	1679	\$8,655	3%	70%	\$24,180	6.5%
2012							\$8,908	3%	66%		
Benchmark*	1220-1432 (25th & 75th %ile)	88%	96%	15%	Note 1	No specific goal		P	Note 2	\$20,815	

Year	Faculty				Economic Development					Workforce Dvlp
	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	23 Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.)	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed	38 Number of start-up companies	35 Upper division STEM enrollment
2008	\$105,497	93	5.5	18	\$297,339	23	\$1,554,532	12	NA	4196
2009	\$110,239	91	4.6	18	\$296,300	NA	NA	NA	NA	4560
2010	\$110,930	90	4.6	18	\$319,012	16	\$686,665	13	NA	4819
2011	\$110,921	85	5.3	18		38	\$716,873	14	NA	5256
2012	\$112,050	83	4.7					11		
Benchmark*	\$101,725	85%	6.2	15.8	\$296,651	NA	NA	P		

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2008	35%	8%	Met goal	103%	66%	2.0%	12.5%	8.6	5.8
2009	32%	7%	Met goal	87%	67%	1.6%	14.2%	8.4	5.7
2010	33%	7%	Met goal	97%	69%	2.1%	14.4%	8.4	5.8
2011	31%	7%	Met goal	94%	67%	1.5%	15.1%	8.5	5.8
2012			Met goal	120%	71%	1.5%	16.6%		5.6
Benchmark*	35%	5%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	5.5	B

Note 1: Institutional goal on this measure is not appropriate to the enrollment management process used at UMCP.

Note 2: Institution awards financial aid on more specific institutional aid priorities; therefore, a goal for this measure is inappropriate for UMCP.

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.

** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment						10
	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate*	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers	Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
2008	828	38%	65%	83%	62%	97	4.8%
2009	847	32%	67%	84%	57%	92	4.3%
2010	857	32%	67%	80%	53%	73	4.2%
2011	879	31%	68%	79%	58%	90	3.8%
2012							
Benchmark*	784-943 (25th & 75th %ile)	36%	69%	84%	62%	53	

Year	Faculty			Affordability			Economic Dvlp.		Workforce Dvlp.
	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgted. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginnit % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	38 Number of start-up companies	35 Upper division enrollment enrollment
2008	\$68,418	59	18	\$6,042	86%	\$18,190	\$50,944	NA	328
2009	\$70,805	57	18	\$6,082	89%	\$19,655	\$67,604	NA	342
2010	\$71,201	59	17	\$6,305	90%	NA	\$74,931	NA	394
2011	\$70,572	63	16	\$6,482	98%	\$36,493		NA	413
2012	\$72,172	65		\$6,713	88%			5	
Benchmark*	\$74,839	85%	19.2		89%	\$29,133	\$108,446		

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty	
2008	41%	13%	Met goal	283%	66%	0.5%	4.9%	8.8	7.6	
2009	34%	11%	Met goal	171%	73%	0.5%	5.2%	8.7	7.9	
2010	36%	12%	Met goal	119%	73%	0.6%	6.9%	8.6	9.3	
2011	38%	13%	Met goal	232%	71%	0.6%	10.1%	8.6	8.1	
2012			Met goal	138%	69%	0.6%			7.6	
Benchmark*	32%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5	

University of Maryland University College
Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.
* Measure used by U.S. News

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment									
Stateside								Worldwide	
Year	1-UMUC Total undergraduate headcount enrollment +	4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs +	2-UMUC African-Amer. as % of total UGs +	3-UMUC % of students who are economically disadvantaged +	4-UMUC % of students who are 25 years of age or older NC +	6 MD comm. coll. transfers +	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses +	7-UMUC Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled) +	
2008	22,308	36%	30%	38%	82%	2118	782	189,505	
2009	24,284	38%	31%	38%	82%	2301	752	196,331	
2010	25,693	40%	32%	40%	83%	2750	813	222,268	
2011	28,119	41%	33%	41%	83%	2944	836	234,243	
2012	28,273	47%	34%	43%	83%		941	262,708	
Benchmark*	>22300	35%		Maintain or increase	≥80%	≥2800	Maintain or increase	≥175,000	

Affordability		Economic Dvlp.		Workforce Development		Alumni	
Worldwide		Worldwide		Stateside		Alumni	
Year	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg. +	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	8-UMUC Total no. of off campus or distance education enrollments +	10-UMUC No. of technology & management post-baccalaureates awarded +	35 Upper division STEM enrollment +	10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +	
2008	\$5,640 <1%	28%	251,111	1,845	2937	1.8%	
2009	\$5,820 3%	27%	253,271	1,813	3250	1.8%	
2010	\$6,078 4%	40%	282,627	2,064	3550	2.3%	
2011	\$6,246 3%	61%	296,492	2,532	4256	2.2%	
2012	\$6,474 4%	47%	327,608	2,816			
Benchmark*	P	25-30%	>251,000	≥1300			

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency		
Worldwide		Stateside		Stateside		
Year	41 Expend. for instruction as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	11-UMUC Operating budget savings as % of state-supported budget +	
2008	33%	16%	Met goal	87%	2%	
2009	32%	16%	Met goal	171%	2%	
2010	30%	16%	Met goal	54%	2%	
2011	30%	16%	Met goal	96%	2%	
2012			Met goal	52%	2%	
Benchmark*	43%	12%	B	100%	2%	

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences
 Dashboard Indicators, December 2012

As of 2/14/2013

* Benchmark = Comparison to external standard (P = peers; B = BOR policy; N = national standard; S = State policy; I = institutional goal)


National Eminence/Quality					
Year	Students		Faculty		
	1-UMCES Average GRE score of incoming students directed by UMCES faculty		2-UMCES Number of peer reviewed publications by UMCES faculty	3-UMCES Number of citations per peer reviewed publication	9 - UMCES Total R&D expendit. per Core faculty**
2008	1189		147	29.3	\$633,687
2009	1230		185	31.4	\$570,821
2010	1184		177	32.3	\$627,500
2011	1199		141	34.0	\$704,323
2012	1297	■	184	35.7	\$688,914
Benchmark*	I		I	I	I


Workforce & Economic Development				
Year	5-UMCES Number of UMCES-sponsored Chesapeake Bay restoration projects	6-UMCES Number of K-12 teachers trained in UMCES environmental projects	7-UMCES Number of K-12 students involved in UMCES environmental education projects	8-UMCES Total R&D expenditures (000s)
	2008	179	455	11,000
2009	191	450	11,000	\$41,670
2010	181	420	11,000	\$42,670
2011	185	429	11,000	
2012	209	377	11,000	
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I

Stewardship			
Year	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	
	2008	Met goal	21%
2009	Met goal	36%	
2010	Met goal	98%	
2011	Met goal	35%	■
2012	Met goal		■
Benchmark*	B	100%	I

Effectiveness & Efficiency	
Year	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value
	2008
2009	0.2%
2010	0.2%
2011	0.2%
2012	0.4%
Benchmark*	0.2% increase

IMPROVEMENT – a comparison with past performance

If currently at or above the average of the 3 previous years:  Green

If currently below the average of the 3 previous years:  Red

ADEQUACY – a comparison with peer, BOR policy, national standard, state policy or institutional goal

If currently at or above the benchmark:  Green

If currently below the benchmark:  Red

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS, DECEMBER 2012

USM

CORE INDICATORS

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
1	Average SAT	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen	Combined average of SAT Math & Verbal scores	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS
2	6-year graduation rate	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen & their success in college	Students graduating at the end of 4 years & 5 years & 6 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 6 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
3	Second-year retention rate	Relative quality of new freshmen & their success in their freshman year	3 year average of the % of 1 st -time full-time degree-seeking freshmen who return the following fall	NCES, IPEDS, Retention Survey
4	African-Americans, Hispanics, & Native Americans as percent of total undergraduates	Access	African-American, Hispanic, & Native American undergraduates as % of total undergraduates	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey
5	Demand: Percent of applicants who were admitted	% of actual demand that is being met by USM institutions	New freshmen & transfer students who were admitted divided by total new freshmen & transfer students who applied	USM, Admin. & Finance, AIS
6	Maryland community college transfers	Success of MD community college transfers in gaining access to USM institutions	All new undergraduate transfers from MD's community colleges	USM, Admin. & Finance, TSS
7	Resident undergraduate tuition & fees	Rates of increase in tuition & fees for full-time resident undergraduates as indicator of affordability	Dollar amounts and percent increases over the previous year	USM, Admin. & Finance, Chronicle of Higher Education

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
8	Percent of undergraduates receiving financial aid	Access & affordability	Unduplicated undergraduate headcount students; <u>all</u> types of financial aid: grants, all types of loans, work study, scholarships	USM, Admin. & Finan., Financial Aid report (FAIS)
9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	Affordability	Average debt for undergraduates who graduated in the specified year & who borrowed money to finance their education	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide
10	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	Alumni view of their education and institution	Two-year average of the % of alumni of record who donated money to the university	CAE, Voluntary Support of Education
Faculty				
21	Average faculty salary	Ability to attract outstanding faculty	Average salary by rank weighted by number of faculty at that rank. Average is weighted figure.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
22	Weighted average faculty salary %ile	Relative strength in attracting outstanding faculty	%ile for each rank shows relative standing nationally. %ile at each rank is weighted by number of faculty at that rank to determine weighted average faculty salary percentile for all ranks.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (over 5-year period)	Third-party validation of the quality, reputation & promise of faculty members & their research	Cumulative number of selected prestigious awards over a 5-yr. period per 100 full-time instructional tenure-track faculty. Awards: Fulbright Scholarships, Guggenheim Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowships, NSF CAREER awards, & Sloan Fellowships.	USM, Admin. & Finance for awards; AAUP for faculty members
24	Student to faculty ratio	Number of faculty available to students.	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty.	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey

Economic & Workforce Development				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
31	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	Contribution of R&D expenditures as a tool of economic development	Total R&D expenditures per full-time instructional faculty	NSF for R&D expenditures; AAUP for number of faculty
32	U.S. Patents issued	University's contribution to economic development, since patent protection is important in providing the incentive for companies to commercialize research discoveries	U.S. Patents issued or reissued to the university	AUTM, Licensing Survey
33	Adjusted gross license income received	Success of technology transfer efforts	Includes: license issue fees, payment under licensing options, annual minimums, running royalties, termination payments, amount of equity received when cashed in, & software & biological material end-user fees equal to \$1,000 or more. Excludes license income paid to other institutions under inter-institutional agreements	AUTM, Licensing Survey
34	Licenses & options executed	Commercial interest in a university's research. Transfer of research from university to commercial interests is accomplished through the licensing of intellectual property by the institution to industry.	Self-explanatory	AUTM, Licensing Survey
35	Upper Division STEM enrollment	A leading indicator of future STEM production	Count of all Junior and Senior level majors in Hegis discipline Areas: 01 Agriculture and Natural Resources, 04 Biological Sciences, 07 Computer and Information Science, 09 Engineering, 17 Mathematics, 19 Physical Science. In addition, Science and Mathematics education are included: Hegis 0833 and 0834	MHEC EIS

38	Number of start-up companies	Success in economic development activities	The total of all new companies in the following categories: TIER 1 - University-Owned, IP-based companies & TIER 2 Venture Accelerator/Mentoring or Companies Recruited to the BioPark and Research Parks from Out-of-State or SBDC Mentoring	Institutional reporting
Stewardship				
41	Expenditures for instruction as percent of total operating expenditures	Relative amount spent on instruction, which is the university's primary mission	Instructional expenditures divided by total operating expenditures minus auxiliary & hospital expenditures. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey
42	Expenditures for administration as percent of total operating expenditures	Relative amount spent on administration, indicating how prudently the resources are used.	Institutional support expenditures divided by total operating expenditures minus auxiliary & hospital expenditures. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey
43	Fund balance increase goal achievement	Indicates effectiveness of institutional financial management. Sound financial management is a key to continued high bond ratings	Comparison of balance of unrestricted net assets at the beginning and end of a fiscal year	USM Comptroller's office with data from USM's audited financial statements
44	Percent of fundraising goal achieved	Success of fundraising efforts	Funds raised as % of fundraising goal for the year. It is possible to exceed 100% of this goal, but no more than 100% is expected for this indicator.	USM Foundation

Effectiveness & Efficiency				
51	Classroom utilization rate	Classroom use	Use of general purpose classrooms as % of total available classrooms during a 45-hour week (8-5, M-F). Classrooms include only lecture type classrooms that are owned and operated (scheduled) by the institution. It does not include classrooms that are managed by individual departments. One-time events are generally not reflected in the utilization rate.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Programs
52	Facilities renewal as percent of replacement value	Expenditures on facilities renewal, enabling evaluation of success in meeting BOR's goal of 2%	Sum of operating facilities renewal & capital facilities renewal as % of replacement value	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Planning
53	Percentage of undergraduate credits generated by non-traditional methods	Success in achieving BOR's policy	Sum of credits earned in non-traditional methods each year by undergraduates divided by total hours earned by <i>undergraduates</i> (<i>Non-traditional method defined separately for each institution for 2006 report only. See separate listings below.</i>)	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research
54	Time to Degree	Success in shortening the overall time to degree	The average of time to degree of all students completing a degree within a 7 year time horizon.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research, MHEC EIS and DIS
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	Success in achieving BOR policy of increasing teaching workload	Number of courses divided by number of FTE core instructional faculty, both tenure-track & non-tenure track	USM, Admin. & Finance, "Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty," Table 4

External Fiscal				
External Fiscal-1	Funding guideline percent achieved	% of the peer target which is attained by each USM institution. A proxy for quality.	Total of tuition & fee revenues & state approp. compared with those at the peer target	USM, Admin. & Finance, Budget Office
External Fiscal-2	Operating expenditures per FTE student	A proxy for quality of a university, assuming that quality is related in part to the dollars spent per student	Operating expenditures minus expenditures for auxiliaries & hospitals per FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey.
External Fiscal-3	State appropriations per FTE student	Level of state general funds support for the university	State appropriations divided by adjusted FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
S2	6-year graduation rate	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen & their success in college	Students graduating at the end of 4 years & 5 years & 6 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 6 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
S3	Second-year retention rate	Relative quality of new freshmen & their success in their freshman year	% of 1 st -time full-time degree-seeking freshmen who return the following fall	NCES, IPEDS, Retention Survey
S4	Minorities as percent of total undergraduates	Access	African-American, Hispanic, & Native American undergraduates as % of total undergraduates	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey

S5	Percent of total projected demand met	How well projected undergraduate demand is being met by USM institutions	Actual undergraduate headcount enrollment as % of gross demand	USM, Admin. & Finance, Enrollment Demand Study
S6	Maryland community college transfers	Success of MD community college transfers in gaining access to USM institutions	All new undergraduate transfers from MD's community colleges	USM, Admin. & Finance, TSS
S7	Average weighted undergraduate tuition & fees	Rates of increase in tuition & fees for full-time resident undergraduates as indicator of affordability	Tuition & fees at each institution weighted by undergraduate FTE enrollment. Average for USM institutions.	Chronicle of Higher Education
S11	Percent of Maryland market share (public/private/community colleges)	Success of USM in maintaining its market share of students attending college in Maryland	USM undergraduates as % of total undergraduates attending MD's public & private universities & community colleges	MHEC, Trend Book; USM, Admin. & Finance, Opening Fall Enrollment data
S12	Institutional financial aid for undergraduates as percent of undergraduate tuition revenue	Whether increases in institutional financial aid to undergraduates are keeping up with increases in undergraduate tuition & fees	Self-explanatory	USM, Admin. & Finance, FAIS; USM, Admin. & Finance, Financial Aid Report, issued annually
S13	Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (Millions)	Degree of commitment to financial aid	Self-explanatory	USM, Admin. & Finance, FAIS; USM, Admin. & Finance, Financial Aid Report, issued annually
Faculty				
S21-1	Average faculty salary (Research universities)	Ability to attract outstanding faculty	Average salary by rank weighted by number of faculty at that rank. Only tenure track ranks are included. Average is weighted figure.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
S21-2	Average faculty salary (Master's universities)	Ability to attract outstanding faculty	Average salary by rank weighted by number of faculty at that rank. Only tenure track ranks are included. Average is weighted figure.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries

S22	Weighted average faculty salary %ile	Relative strength in attracting outstanding faculty	%ile for each rank shows relative standing nationally. %ile at each tenure track rank is weighted by number of faculty at that rank to determine weighted average faculty salary percentile for all ranks.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
Economic & Workforce Development				
S32	U.S. Patents issued	University's contribution to economic development, since patent protection is important in providing the incentive for companies to commercialize research discoveries	U.S. Patents issued or reissued to the university	AUTM, Licensing Survey
S34	Licenses & options executed	Commercial interest in a university's research. Transfer of research from university to commercial interests is accomplished through the licensing of intellectual property by the institution to industry.	Self-explanatory	AUTM, Licensing Survey
S35	Upper division STEM enrollment		Count of all Junior and Senior level majors in Hegis discipline Areas: 01 Agriculture and Natural Resources, 04 Biological Sciences, 07 Computer and Information Science, 09 Engineering, 17 Mathematics, 19 Physical Science. In addition, Science and Mathematics education are included: Hegis 0833 and 0834	MHEC EIS

S36	Number of teaching graduates	Number of graduates in an occupation experiencing critical workforce shortages	Number of students graduating from undergraduate & graduate programs who are prepared to teach in MD. Teacher education grads eligible for certification.	USM roll-up for System MFR
S37	Number of nursing graduates	Number of graduates in an occupation experiencing critical workforce shortages	Number of students graduating from undergraduate & graduate nursing programs	USM, Admin. & Finance, DIS
S38	Number of start-up companies	Success in economic development activities	The total of all new companies in the following categories: TIER 1 - University-Owned, IP-based companies & TIER 2 Venture Accelerator/Mentoring or Companies Recruited to the BioPark and Research Parks from Out-of-State or SBDC Mentoring	Institutional reporting
Stewardship				
S41	State appropriations per FTE student	Level of state general funds support for the university	State appropriations divided by adjusted FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey
S42	System Office administrative expenditures as percent of the System's total operating expenditures	Relative amount spent on administration at the System Office, an indication of how prudently the resources are used	Institutional support (administrative) expenditures at the System Office as % of total USM operating expend. (with no deductions). This represents total operating expenditures at all USM institutions, including UMBI, UMCES & the USM Office, but the administrative expenditures are those of the USM Office only.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey

S43	Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	Financial health of an institution at fiscal year's end and indication of how well System is managing its finances	Ratio of reserves to debt outstanding	USM, Admin. & Finance, Comptroller
S44	System fund balance increase: goal achievement	Indicates effectiveness of systemwide financial management. Sound financial management is a key to continued high bond ratings	Comparison of balance of unrestricted net assets at the beginning and end of a fiscal year	USM Comptroller's office with data from USM's audited financial statements
S45	Credit rating (Moody's)	Third party validation of the financial health of the System	Self-explanatory	USM, Admin. & Finance
S46	Percent of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	Success of fundraising efforts	Fund-raising cash dedicated to endowment divided by total cash donations in a year	CAE, Voluntary Support of Education
S47	Total funds raised (annual)	Success of fundraising efforts	Self-explanatory	USM Foundation
S48	Operating expenditures per FTE student	A proxy for quality of a university, assuming that quality is related in part to the dollars spent per student	Operating expenditures minus expenditures for auxiliaries & hospitals per FTE students. <i>For this calculation: At UMB, 1st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.</i>	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey.
S49	Funding guideline percent achieved	% of the peer target which is attained by each USM institution. A proxy for quality.	Total of tuition & fee revenues & state approp. compared with those at the peer target	USM, Admin. & Finance, Budget Office
Effectiveness & Efficiency				
S51	Facilities utilization	Classroom use	% of total available classrooms used during a 45-hour week (8-5, M-F) divided by standard utilization rate	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Programs
S52	Facilities renewal as percent of replacement value	Expenditures on facilities renewal, enabling evaluation of success in meeting BOR's goal of 2%	Sum of operating facilities renewal & capital facilities renewal as % of replacement value	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Programs

S53	Percentage of undergraduate credits generated by non-traditional methods	Success in achieving BOR's policy	Sum of credits earned in non-traditional methods each year by undergraduates divided by total hours earned by undergraduates	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research
S54	Time to degree	Success in shortening the overall time to degree	The average of time to degree of all students completing a degree within a 7 year time horizon.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research, MHEC EIS and DIS

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
E1	Percent of Maryland residents with at least bachelor's degree	Importance of college degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, 2011, American Community Survey via Web (www.census.gov)
E2	Doctoral scientists, engineers & health professionals employed in Maryland	Importance of advanced degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2010</u>
E4	Science & engineering doctorates awarded	Production of science & engineering doctorates by Maryland's universities	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2010</u>
E5	Per capita personal income	Relative wealth of Maryland's residents	Includes Maryland residents only	U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program, Table: GCT-T1; Population Estimates Data Set; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table 1: Personal Income, by State & Region.
E6	Unemployment rate (June)	Relative health of Maryland's economy	Seasonally adjusted for June	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Tables LASST24000003 (MD) & LNS14000000 (US)
E7	Number of SBIR awards (4 yrs.)	Small Business Innovation Research program awards to Maryland businesses	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2010</u>

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E8	Academic R&D expenditures in science & engineering	Amount of research expenditures by Maryland's universities, public and private	Expenditures for R&D from all sources: federal, state & local govt., industry, institutional funds, & other sources	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures
E12	Science & engineering employees as % of workforce	How well Maryland is adapting to high-tech economy	Self-explanatory. High-tech industries are defined by specified NAICS* codes.	NSF, Science and Engineering Indicators 2012 , Table 8-33.
E14	Average high-tech wage	Importance of R&D in Maryland and level of wages compared to other those in other states	Total annual payroll in high-tech manufacturing & services divided by average annual employment in high-tech	[San Francisco] Bay Area Council Economic Institute, Technology Works: High-Tech Employment and Wages in the U.S. , December 2012, Appendix 3, based on BLS data.
E15	High-tech establishments as % of all business establishments	Importance of high-tech in contributing to Maryland's economic development	Self-explanatory	NSF, Science and Engineering Indicators 2012 , Table 8-52.
E16	Venture capital disbursed per \$1,000 of GDP (Gross Domestic Product)	Third-party validation of the importance of high-tech ventures in Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, Science and Engineering Indicators 2012 , Table 8-56.
E17	State general funds for higher education per \$1,000 of personal income	State's support of higher education compared with relative wealth of residents	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E18	State general funds for higher education per capita	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E19	State general funds for higher education per headcount student	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E20	Tuition & fees (USM) as percent of Maryland's per capita personal income	Extent to which the burden of financing a higher education falls on students when compared to state's relative	Self-explanatory	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, State Personal Income; Chronicle of Higher

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
		wealth		<u>Education</u>
E21	Skip			
E22	University R&D expenditures in life sciences	Importance of R&D in the life sciences within Maryland's economy (all universities)	Self-explanatory	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures, FY 2005, Table 26
E23	Current population estimates	For comparison purposes	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau
E24	New Economy Index: Overall ranking	How well Maryland is competing in the new, knowledge-based economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on a series of measures relative to the new economy	Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (ITIF), <u>2012 State New Economy Index</u> , December 2012
E25	New Economy Index: Knowledge jobs	Skill- and education-levels of the workforce	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E26	New Economy Index: Globalization	Degree of integration into the world economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on three related measures	Same as above
E27	New Economy Index: Economic dynamism	Vitality of the state's economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E28	New Economy Index: Digital economy	Degree to which business and economic transactions are conducted through digital electronic means	Based upon relative standing among the states on six related measures	Same as above
E29	New Economy Index: Innovation capacity	How efficiently capital is put to use	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E30	% of Maryland residents with advanced degrees or more	Importance of graduate and professional degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, 2011, American Community Survey via Web (www.census.gov)

* North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

** U.S. Department of Labor, BLS Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) code

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS

SPECIFIC USM INSTITUTIONS

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UB	Percent of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt	UB, MFR
2-UB	Sponsored research dollars per full-time faculty	UB, MFR
3-UB	Percent of part-time faculty	IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position (Peer Performance Measures)
4-UB	Number of minority students graduating annually (all levels)	UB, MFR
5-UB	Percent of students who are economically disadvantaged	UB, MFR
7-UB	Percent of students involved with non-traditional learning activities	UB, MFR

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UMB	Passing rate on Bar exam	ABA-LSAC, <u>Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools</u> (Peer Performance Measures)
2-UMB	Passing rate on Medical licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
3-UMB	Passing rate on Nursing licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
4-UMB	Passing rate on Dentistry licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
5-UMB	National ranking NIH awards to medical schools (public only)	UMB, MFR, IR office
6-UMB	National ranking NIH awards to dental schools (public & private)	UMB, MFR, IR office
7-UMB	Number of specialty law programs ranked among top 10 nationally	UMB, MFR (Data from U.S. News, America's Best Graduate Schools)
10-UMB	Total headcount enrollment	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS
11-UMB	Afr. Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as percent of total headcount enrollment	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey (Includes African-American, Hispanic & Native American at <u>all</u> levels)
12-UMB	Graduate & 1 st professional as percent of total headcount enrollment	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey (Peer Performance Measures)
13-UMB	Grant & contract awards	UMB, IR office, from USM Extramural Funding Report, MFR
14-UMB	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per full-time medical faculty	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures; UMB, IR office, for faculty numbers
16-UMB	Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	UMB, IR
17-UMB	Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	UMB, MFR

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
18-UMB	Number of dentistry graduates (DDS)	UMB, MFR
19-UMB	Days of charity care provided by clinical medical faculty	UMB, MFR

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE			
#	Indicator	Stateside/Worldwide	Source of data
1-UMUC	Total undergraduate headcount enrollment (AY)	Stateside	USM office, EIS
2-UMUC	African-Americans as percent of total undergraduates	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
3-UMUC	Percent of students who are economically disadvantaged	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, MFR
4-UMUC	Percent of students who are 25 years of age or older	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
6-UMUC	Number of stateside online courses	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
7-UMUC	Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled in)	Worldwide	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
8-UMUC	Total number of off campus or distance education enrollments	Worldwide	UMUC, IR office, MFR
10-UMUC	Number of technology & management post-baccalaureates awarded	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
11-UMUC	Operating budget savings as percent of state-supported budget	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, MFR

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UMCES	Average GRE score of incoming students directed by UMCES faculty	UMCES, IR office, MFR
2-UMCES	Number of peer reviewed publications by UMCES faculty	UMCES, IR office, MFR
3-UMCES	Number of citations per peer reviewed publication	UMCES, IR office, MFR
5-UMCES	Number of UMCES-sponsored Chesapeake Bay restoration projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
6-UMCES	Number of K-12 teachers trained in UMCES environmental projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
7-UMCES	Number of K-12 students involved in UMCES environmental education projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
8-UMCES	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures; MFR
9-UMCES	Total R&D expenditures per core faculty (including Tenured/Tenure Track and Research Professor Lines)	UMCES, IR office, MFR

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2012

<u>University</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>UNITID</u>
<u>Bowie State U.</u>		
Alabama A&M U.	AL	100654
Alabama State U.	AL	100724
Auburn U., Montgomery	AL	100830
California State U., Bakersfield	CA	110486
Columbus State U.	GA	139366
Indiana U., Southeast	IN	151379
New Jersey City U.	NJ	185129
Norfolk State U.	VA	232937
Prairie View A & M U.	TX	227526
Sul Ross State U.	TX	228501

<u>Coppin State U.</u>		
Albany State U.	GA	138716
Alcorn State U.	MS	175342
Augusta State U.	GA	138983
Cheyney U. of Penn.	PA	211608
Henderson State U.	AR	107071
Louisiana State U., Shreveport	LA	159416
Nicholls State U.	LA	159966
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	NC	199281
Virginia State U.	VA	234155
Western New Mexico U.	NM	188304

<u>Frostburg State U.</u>		
Bridgewater State C.	MA	165024
Clarion U. of Penn.	PA	211644
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	PA	212115
Indiana U., South Bend	IN	151342
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	MA	167987
Rhode Island C.	RI	217420
Sonoma State U.	CA	123572
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	NY	196246
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	NY	196200
Western Connecticut State U.	CT	130776

<u>Salisbury U.</u>		
Bloomsburg U. of Penn.	PA	211158
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	MA	167987
Millersville U. of Penn.	PA	214041
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	NC	199218
Northern Iowa, U. of	IA	154095
Sonoma State U.	CA	123572
Southeast Missouri State U.	MO	179557
SUNY, C. at Oswego	NY	196194
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	NY	196246
SUNY, Fredonia	NY	196158

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2012

<u>University</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>UNITID</u>
<u>Towson U.</u>		
Ball State U.	IN	150136
California State U., Sacramento	CA	110617
East Carolina U.	NC	198464
Eastern Michigan U.	MI	169798
James Madison U.	VA	232423
Massachusetts, U. of, Boston	MA	166638
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	NC	199139
Northern Iowa, U. of	IA	154095
Portland State U.	OR	209807
Western Kentucky U.	KY	157951

U. of Baltimore

Auburn University-Montgomery	AL	100830
Citadel Military College of South Carolina	SC	217864
Governors State University	IL	145336
New Jersey City University	NJ	185129
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	TX	224147
University of Houston-Clear Lake	TX	225414
University of Illinois at Springfield	IL	148654
University of Michigan-Dearborn	MI	171137
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	WI	240189
Western Connecticut State University	CT	130776

U. of Maryland, Baltimore (same as aspirational peers)

Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	AL	100663
California, U. of, San Francisco	CA	110699
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	IL	145600
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	MD	163259
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	MI	170976
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	NC	199120

U. of Maryland, Baltimore County

Arkansas, U. of, Main	AR	106397
California, U. of, Riverside	CA	110671
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	CA	110714
Clemson U.	SC	217882
Massachusetts, U. of, Amherst	MA	166629
Mississippi State U.	MS	176080
New Jersey Institute Tech.	NJ	185828
Oklahoma State U., Main	OK	207388
Rhode Island, U. of	RI	217484
Wyoming, U. of	WY	240727

U. of Maryland, College Park (same as aspirational peers)

California, U. of, Berkeley	CA	110635
California, U. of, Los Angeles	CA	110662
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	IL	145637
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	MI	170976
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	NC	199120

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2012

<u>University</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>UNITID</u>
<u>U. of Maryland, Eastern Shore</u>		
Alabama A&M U.	AL	100654
Albany State U.	GA	138716
Alcorn State U.	MS	175342
California State U., Bakersfield	CA	110486
Fort Valley State U.	GA	139719
North Carolina A&T State U.	NC	199102
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	NC	199281
Prairie View A & M U.	TX	227526
South Carolina State C.	SC	218733
Virginia State U.	VA	234155

<u>U. of Maryland, University College</u>		
Boise State U.	ID	142115
California State U., Dominguez Hills	CA	110547
California State U., Fullerton	CA	110565
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	NY	190512
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	NY	190637
CUNY Hunter C.	NY	190594
CUNY Queens C.	NY	190664
Eastern Michigan U.	MI	169798
Florida Gulf Coast U.	FL	433660
Southern Connecticut State U.	CT	130493