### **BOARD OF REGENTS**



SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION, INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

**TOPIC**: 2013 USM Dashboard Indicators

**COMMITTEE**: Finance

**DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING**: March 27, 2014

<u>SUMMARY</u>: Each year, the Board of Regents receives the Dashboard Indicators (DBIs) which summarize critical measures of success and compliance in a wide array of Board initiatives. The DBIs are organized into categories based on the USM Strategic Plan. The indicators displayed are meant to remain reasonably stable over time in order to provide the Regents with a ready comparison to past performance. They also feature benchmarks wherever possible against either peers or based on Board or institutional policy. The DBIs include pages of indicators focused on the external environment, the System as a whole, and each USM institution.

In each year's DBIs, specific issues are highlighted in a single page summary. Key issues highlighted in this year's Dashboard Indicators include:

- Growth in key enrollment areas,
- Effectiveness and efficiency measures, and
- Alumni giving and fundraising.

**ALTERNATIVE(S)**: This item is presented for information purposes.

**FISCAL IMPACT**: This item is presented for information purposes.

**CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION**: This item is presented for information purposes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: ACCEPTED FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES DATE: 3/27/14

BOARD ACTION: DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joseph F. Vivona (301) 445-1923

# University System of Maryland



# Dashboard Indicators 2013

Board of Regents Committee on Finance March 27, 2014

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

# 2013 USM Dashboard Indicators Key Indicators

The 2013 Dashboard Indicators provides a "snapshot" overview of the USM and its institutions. It brings together data from many USM reports and data sets. The indicators noted below were selected to highlight specific trends and challenges drawn from the Dashboards.

### **Key Enrollment Growth Continues**

Although overall enrollment has been flat, indicators point to gains in specific areas of enrollment seen as critical to meeting the System's strategic goals. These include:

- Maryland Community College Transfers Driven by growth in the total number and
  improved academic qualifications of students transferring from Maryland's Community
  Colleges, every USM institution except UMUC saw an increase in the number of Maryland
  students coming from these institutions in 2013. This includes those USM institutions that
  historically have relied heavily on transfers as well as those that have focused on traditional
  freshmen. At UMUC, the number remained high, but somewhat less than the prior year.
- Upper Division STEM Enrollment This measure is a leading indicator of progress on the State's and the USM Strategic Plan's commitment 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 1,000 majors in the past year and by over 5,600 since 2007. In the last five years, the system has seen a 40% increase in majors at this level. 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 300 in the current academic year.

### **Effectiveness and Efficiency measures met**

Performance on academic initiatives created through the Effectiveness and Efficiency program of the last decade continued to be impressive in 2013. These include:

- Percent of Undergraduate Credits from Non-traditional sources As part of the effort to open class space and provide students with a more fully rounded educational experience, the Board mandated that undergraduates should receive 12 credits (or 10% of the total) during their college career from non-traditional sources, such as study abroad and internships. For the first time in 2013, this goal was achieved by all institutions with UMCP and UMBC leading this shift with approaching 20% of credits acquired by these methods.
- **Time to degree** Every institution measured in this area was successful at improving or maintaining rapid matriculation to graduation. This maintained several years of success in the time to degree for undergraduate students measure. It suggests that these changes have been effectively embedded in institutional practice over the last several years.

### **Alumni Giving and Fundraising**

Trends in alumni giving raised some concern this year but fundraising remains strong.

- Average Alumni Giving Rate This year 6 of 10 institutions saw their rate of alumni giving fall. This follows 2012, when rates dropped at 5 of 10 institutions. Although the rates generally were within the range of peers, this continues to be an issue worth noting.
- **Percent of Fundraising Goal Achieved** 9 of 12 institutions reached their fundraising goal in FY 2013, up from 6 of 12 the previous year. Further, 2 of the 3 that did not meet their goals achieved 90% or more of the goal.

# Summary of 2013 Core Dashboard Indicators As of 3/12/2014

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	<u>NS</u>	II	E I	UMES	UMUC	UMCES	System
1 Average SAT	1299	1218		890	877	086	1160	1088		881			
2 6-year graduation rate	82%	61%		35%	17%	44%	%29	%99		32%			61%
3 2nd-year retention rate	%56	%58		72%	64%	72%	83%	85%	75%	%19			74%
AfrAmer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	20%	22%		92%	%98	29%	16%	19%	%05	%92	39%		33%
% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	47%	%19		54%	39%	62%	28%	62%	75%	57%			
6 MD community college transfers	1930	1418		353	238	412	915	2848	069	135	2840		11882
7 Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$9,161	\$10,068		\$6,971	\$6,252	\$7,728	\$8,128	\$8,342	\$7,838	\$6,998	\$6,642		\$8,558
8 % of undergraduates receiving financial aid	%99	%02		%98	%98	%08	75%	%02	%98	%88	47%		
Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$25,276	\$22,601		NA	NA	\$20,736	\$23,545	\$23,812	NA	\$27,215			
10 Average alumni giving rate	6.3%	3.7%		4.9%	6.3%	5.4%	15.0%	3.9%	5.6%	3.0%	2.4%		
21 Average faculty salary	\$113,372	\$87,894		\$69,115	\$67,647	\$69,213	\$72,039	\$72,444		\$70,881			
22 Faculty salary %ile	84	99		53	55	39	51	59		61			29
23 Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	4.6	2.8											
24 Student to faculty ratio	18	19	9	16	14	16	17	17	19	16			
31 Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$359,051	\$210,519	\$255,727*							\$67,604			
32 U.S. Patents issued	27	10	30										29
33 Adjusted gross license income received	\$662,148	\$182,626	\$955,703										
34 Licenses & options executed	13	4	21										38
35 Upper division STEM enrollment	5846	3284		280	66	423	612	1461	289	403	5401		18098
38 Number of start-up companies	29	10	8			3	5	1	6	2			29
Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	32%	35%	24%	38%	33%	40%	45%	40%	40%	37%	29%		
Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	7%	%6	%6	17%	22%	16%	14%	13%	23%	12%	13%		
43 Fund balance increase: goal achieved	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal Not met goal Met goal Met goal Not met goal Not met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	
44 % of fundraising goal achieved	109%	238%	129%	138%	115%	95%	295%	112%	304%	75%	%06	238%	
51 Classroom utilization rate	%69	%09		%99	%69	%09	%89	%19		%69			%99
52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.7%	%9.0	%6.0	4.6%	0.4%	1.2%	2.6%	3.0%	1.0%	0.7%		%8.0	1.4%
% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	17.7%	18.4%		13.5%	13.9%	16.7%	17.0%	10.8%		13.9%			14.5%
54 Time to degree	8.4	0.6		9.2	6.6	9.2	8.5	8.8		9.2			8.7
55 Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.6	6.9		8.0	0.6	7.4	7.4	7.3	6.4	8.1			

\*Includes only medical school faculty

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?\*

As of 3/12/2014

•

Same or better

Worse

UMCES																							•			•			
UMUC				•		•		•		•									•		•	•	•	•					
UMES	•	•	•			•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
(IB			•			•		•		•				•					•	•		•	•	•		•			•
TU	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•					•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
$\overline{\text{SU}}$	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
FSU	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
CSU	•	•	•			•		•		•	•	•		•					•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
BSU	•	•	•			•			•	•	•	•		•					•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
UMB														•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•			
UMBC	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
UMCP	•	•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
<u>Indicator</u>	Average SAT	6-year graduation rate		AfrAmer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD community college transfers	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	Average alumni giving rate	Average faculty salary		Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	_	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	U.S. Patents issued	Adjusted gross license income received	Licenses & options executed	Upper division STEM enrollment	Number of start-up companies	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures		Fund balance increase: goal achieved	% of fundraising goal achieved	Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	Time to degree	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty
#1	ueu	nnis 54	mA l ∞	ons , y	pilidet.	oroff	A, e	∞ səəə	A :tnəl	Stud	21	nIty	Fac 23	24	omt.			ono:	EQ Street	38 WC	qi 4	rdebrev 54	vət2	44	51	λ	ctivene fficienc		55

**₹** ∞

17

3 6

15

15

3

<del>1</del> <del>4</del>

**9** •

27

23

Improved/Same Worse

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

Worse

Same or better

As of 3/12/2014

	#   Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	ns	TU	E	UMES	UMUC	UMCES
tnə	Average SAT	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
muii	2 6-year graduation rate	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
sttA	3 2nd-year retention rate	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
pue '/	AftAmer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	•	•				•	•	•			•	
tilidet	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)												
oroff	6 MD community college transfers		•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	
A ,s	7 Resident undergrad tuition & fees												
səsə.	8 % of undergraduates receiving financial aid		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
A :tnəb	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	•	•		•		•	•	•		•		
outS	10 Average alumni giving rate												
	21 Average faculty salary	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
nĮţλ	22 Faculty salary %ile	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
Езс	23 Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	•	•										
	24 Student to faculty ratio	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
.imt.	31 Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	•	•								•		
	32 U.S. Patents issued			•									
oimi vəU	Adjusted gross license income received			•									
	34 Licenses & options executed												
	35 Upper division STEM eurollment												
PM													
ď	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•	
idsbra	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
VətZ	43 Fund balance increase: goal achieved												
	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
2	51 Classroom utilization rate	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
otivene onoioiti	53 % of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•		
	54 Time to degree												
	55 Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
	Meets benchmark Doos not most benchmark	<b>⊙</b> ∝	15	4 "	11 4	10	<b>∽</b> ∝	13	12	9 (	<b>∽</b> ∝	en e	7 -
	DOES HOU INCCL DENCHMAIN	0	r	0	0	0	0	r	n	4	0	0	>