



SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION,
INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: 2015 USM Dashboard Indicators

COMMITTEE: Finance

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: March 31, 2016

SUMMARY: 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:

- Faculty Workload
- Facilities Renewal,
- Fund Balance Goals,
- Enrollment of Transfer Students and,
- Workforce Development.

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:

DATE:

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

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

University System of Maryland



Dashboard Indicators 2015

**Board of Regents
Committee on Finance
March 31, 2016**

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

2015 USM Dashboard Indicators

Key Indicators

The 2015 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.

Effectiveness and Efficiency Indicators

- **Faculty Workload** – Core faculty (including Tenure/Tenure-track and Full-time Non-tenure track) did not teach as many classes in FY 2015. 7 of 9 institutions performed below Regents’ expectations for the year. This was not the result of consolidation of classes as credit hour production also fell in 2015.

Fiscal Indicators

- **Facilities Renewal** – For a second straight year, no USM institution met the Board of Regents’ policy goal for facilities renewal at two percent of replacement, and only two institutions were able to maintain or improve their performance at all. This reflects a growing crisis on campuses in the maintenance of the campus infrastructure.
- **Fund Balance** – For the first time in 3 years, all of the USM institutions successfully met their goals to increase their fund balance. The USM as a whole was also successful in meeting its fund balance goal.
- **New Peers** – This year’s Dashboards marked the first use of “competitor state” peers for USM institutions as approved by the chancellor and submitted to MHEC. Although the change in peers did not substantially impact performance against benchmarks in most instances, there were instances where fiscal indicators were affected. This is most evident in performance against Funding Guideline where 6-8 of the institutions moved substantially in their attainment based in part on the change in peers.

Access, Affordability and Attainment Indicators

Maryland Community College Transfers – After an unexpected dip in Maryland Community College transfers to USM in FY 2014, the number of transfers enrolled returned to an upward trajectory. The number rose by 400 overall, with 7 of 10 institutions seeing increases, including Bowie, Frostburg, and UB (all of which are seeking to increase transfer enrollment) and UMUC, which grew by nearly 500 transfers.

Economic Development Indicators

- **Upper Division STEM Enrollment** – This measure is a leading indicator of progress on the State’s and the USM’s commitments to increase Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) degrees. From Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 this figure rose by nearly 600 students. Although this rate of increase remained very positive, it represented a significant slowing from average increases of 1,500 students a year over the preceding 3 years. This will translate into some slowing in the growth in STEM degrees awarded in the next 2 to 4 years.

Summary of 2016 Core Dashboard Indicators

As of 3/22/2016

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	1306	1210		874	895	969	1160	1087		844			
2	6-year graduation rate	85%	61%		33%	18%	49%	66%	68%		37%			63%
3	2nd-year retention rate	95%	87%		72%	65%	75%	82%	86%	73%	70%			74%
4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	22%	22%		90%	85%	34%	17%	22%	53%	75%	50%		33%
5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	47%	63%		60%	39%	66%	64%	67%	67%	51%			
6	MD community college transfers	2142	1350		419	186	564	847	1937	651	152	3075		11603
7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$9,996	\$11,006		\$7,657	\$6,362	\$8,488	\$9,086	\$9,182	\$8,326	\$7,625	\$7,146		\$9,389
8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	67%	69%		86%	92%	80%	76%	71%	86%	87%	51%		
9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$25,131	\$25,831		NA	NA	\$24,916	\$24,567	\$25,926	\$23,627	\$20,375			
10	Average alumni giving rate	6.6%	3.6%		5.7%	9.6%	4.7%	6.4%	3.8%	5.0%	3.3%	1.8%		
21	Average faculty salary	\$125,559	\$96,271		\$75,770	\$73,809	\$76,281	\$79,589	\$79,751		\$70,881			
22	Faculty salary %ile	95	73		71	67	57	70	73		68			81
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	4.9	2.9											
24	Student to faculty ratio (X FTE students per 1 FTE faculty)	18	19	7	16	14	15	16	16	15	14			
31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$334,681	\$160,823	\$226,765*							\$54,442			
32	U.S. Patents issued	35	7	28										70
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$727,424	\$284,153	\$1,120,101										
34	Licenses & options executed	21	1	30										52
35	Upper division STEM enrollment	6201	3745		294	120	399	641	1672	287	369	6989		20717
38	Number of start-up companies	103	4	15			3	15	0	1	0			141
41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	32%	34%	25%	38%	35%	38%	45%	38%	40%	39%	29%		
42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	8%	11%	9%	18%	25%	15%	14%	14%	21%	13%	14%		
43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	
44	% of fundraising goal achieved	145%	199%	96%	113%	103%	109%	103%	99%	107%	95%	52%	95%	
51	Classroom utilization rate	71%	62%		64%	NA	55%	68%	63%	52%	69%			65%
52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.2%	0.8%	0.5%	1.6%	0.2%	0.4%	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%	0.2%		0.3%	0.9%
53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional method	21.0%	18.3%		12.7%	16.3%	21.6%	17.9%	11.1%		14.8%			16.9%
54	Time to degree (Semesters)	4.1	4.3		4.8	5.8	3.7	3.9	4.0		4.9			4.2
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.4	7.2		7.3	8.1	7.4	7.1	7.1	6.9	7.2			

*Includes only medical school faculty

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2015\DBI01222016.XLS, 3/22/2016

Is performance *IMPROVING* on the Dashboard Indicators?*

● Same or better

● Worse

As of 3/22/2016

	#	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 (X FTE students per 1 FTE faculty)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
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 (Semesters)	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
Improved/Same			25	20	9	13	14	15	18	14	12	16	7	2
Worse			2	7	2	6	4	7	4	8	2	6	2	1

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

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2015\DBI01222016.XLS, 3/22/2016

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 3/22/2016

	#	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 (X FTE students per 1 FTE faculty)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
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 (Semesters)												
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
Meets benchmark			11	10	3	5	6	11	14	11	6	7	4	0
Does not meet benchmark			5	8	5	10	8	6	3	6	4	10	2	2

University System of Maryland

Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

As of 3/22/2016

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

	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment																
	S2		S3		S4		S6		S7		S11		S12		S13		
	6-year graduation rate		2nd year retention rate		Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs		MD comm. college transfers		Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) chg.		% of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)		Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue		Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)		
Year	+		+		+		+				+		+		+		
2010		63%		73%		32%		10029		\$7,746	1%		41.4%		16%		\$111.6
2011		61%		74%		33%		10994		\$7,992	3%		41.7%		16%		\$110.9
2012		61%		74%		33%		11033		\$8,268	3%		42.4%		15%		\$117.1
2013		63%		73%		33%		11882		\$8,558	4%		42.9%		15%		\$123.9
2014		63%	■	74%	■	33%	■	11182		\$8,833	3%		45.1%		16%		\$132.5
2015								11603	■	\$9,389	6%		45.9%	■	17%	■	\$141.0
Benchmark		58%	■	74%	■	25%	■										

	Faculty			Economic Development			Workforce Development			Funding	
	S21-1 Aver. faculty salary (Research univ.) +	S21-2 Aver. faculty salary (Master's univ.) +	S22 Wgtd. 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 stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	S49 Funding guideline % achieved (FY) +
Year											
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	67	38	52	17043	1701	1,201	\$27,624	74%
2013	\$107,715	\$71,872	67	68	42	67	18098	1718	1,276	\$28,120	74%
2014	\$116,024	\$77,233	80	70	52	131	20130	1713	1,339	\$30,185	76%
2015	\$119,120	\$78,951	81			141	20717				72%
Benchmark	\$102,954	\$76,823	85%							\$29,325	100%

Stewardship							Effectiveness & Efficiency				
Year	S41 State appropriations per FTE student +	S42 System Office admin as % of System's total operating expend. NC	S43 Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio +	S44 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	S45 Credit rating (Moody's) NC	S46 % of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment +	S47 Total funds raised (annual) (000s) +	S51 Classroom utilization rate +	S52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	S53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	S54 Time to Degree -
2009	\$8,884	0.4%	87%	Met goal	Stable	12.9%	\$233,935	67%	1.2%	11.1%	4.4
2010	\$7,247	0.4%	85%	Met goal	Stable(recalibrated)	12.4%	\$222,396	65%	1.4%	12.3%	4.3
2011	\$8,151	0.4%	100%	Met goal	Stable	13.0%	\$242,343	66%	1.3%	12.2%	4.4
2012	\$8,150	0.4%	113%	Met goal	Stable	12.5%	\$242,056	66%	1.3%	14.0%	4.4
2013	\$8,136	0.4%	121%	Met goal	Stable	14.2%	\$232,150	66%	1.4%	14.5%	4.2
2014	\$8,591	0.5%	111%	Met goal	Stable		\$256,528	65%	1.1%	16.9%	4.2
2015			74%*	Met goal	Stable		\$335,074		0.9%		
Benchmark	\$7,379	Rank 29 of 33						66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	

* Recalibrated for new accounting standard on pensions

External Fiscal

Funding guideline % achieved (FY)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2005	53%	64%	73%	63%	77%	84%	56%	61%	65%	70%	43%
2006	51%	70%	78%	74%	80%	80%	53%	64%	67%	72%	34%
2007	94%	108%	90%	104%	100%	141%	72%	81%	82%	99%	40%
2008	74%	93%	82%	79%	90%	132%	73%	74%	78%	88%	61%
2009	87%	101%	93%	78%	88%	107%	75%	72%	82%	82%	39%
2010	74%	112%	77%	65%	68%	50%	61%	65%	73%	69%	46%
2011	62%	101%	67%	63%	63%	45%	57%	64%	72%	62%	43%
2012	70%	111%	69%	63%	66%	46%	69%	62%	75%	71%	37%
2013	77%	116%	75%	70%	76%	45%	71%	65%	76%	75%	54%
2014	84%	127%	90%	75%	87%	55%	60%	62%	78%	97%	40%
2015	95%	126%	86%	70%	65%	66%	72%	62%	80%	85%	53%
2016	89%	128%	85%	71%	60%	64%	68%	59%	75%	78%	53%

Operating expend. per FTE student (Excl. auxil./hosp.)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
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
2012	\$15,381	\$24,627	\$15,533	\$12,899	\$14,794	\$14,848	\$55,889	\$25,011	\$38,981	\$20,600	\$18,299
2013	\$16,942	\$22,270	\$16,103	\$13,088	\$13,639	\$15,608	\$56,435	\$25,690	\$40,232	\$21,036	\$19,399
2014	\$17,984	\$23,900	\$17,335	\$13,888	\$14,219	\$17,031	\$69,623	\$26,464	\$42,959	\$22,377	\$20,718
Benchmark	\$19,238	\$19,434	\$17,603	\$19,658	\$16,509	\$17,921	\$56,282	\$30,544	\$60,202	\$19,879	\$10,597

State appropriations per FTE student											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
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
2012	\$7,817	\$12,849	\$6,858	\$4,989	\$4,944	\$5,038	\$13,253	\$8,540	\$12,187	\$7,907	\$1,804
2013	\$8,177	\$13,006	\$6,943	\$5,043	\$4,887	\$4,996	\$13,232	\$8,339	\$12,218	\$7,902	\$1,850
2014	\$8,319	\$14,726	\$7,246	\$5,088	\$4,848	\$5,176	\$16,544	\$8,399	\$12,567	\$8,919	\$2,010
Benchmark	\$8,237	\$8,820	\$5,406	\$8,052	\$6,248	\$6,354	\$9,143	\$9,753	\$9,354	\$8,520	\$941

University System of Maryland
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

As of 3/22/2016

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

	Workforce & Workforce Development								
	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)
Year	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
2010			29,800	874	\$48,621	7.8%	6.80%	\$90,300	
2011	36.9%	16.5%		858	\$50,656	7.2%	7.00%	\$100,054	5,828,289
2012	36.9%	16.9%		900	\$53,816	7.0%	7.20%	\$96,500	5,884,868
2013	37.4%	17.1%	32,600	1,124		6.7%	7.40%		5,928,814
2014	38.2%	17.5%			\$55,478	5.8%	7.40%	\$101,849	5,976,407
2015					\$56,502	5.2%			6,006,401
2016									
Benchmark	30.1%	11.4%	5th (MD's rank)	11th (MD's rank)	6th (MD's rank)	5.3%	3rd (MD's rank)	8th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)
	R&D		Economic Development				Support of Higher Education		
	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	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	
Year	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
2010	\$3,094	\$1,383	321	\$1.51	11.60%	\$5.92	\$292.82	\$4,924	
2011	\$3,367	\$1,524	265	\$1.36	11.74%	\$5.65	\$280.05	\$4,447	
2012	\$3,308			\$1.23	11.87%			\$4,453	
2013	\$3,376	\$1,557	245	\$1.91		\$5.39	\$274.25	\$4,074	
2014	\$3,515	\$1,622		\$1.04		\$5.58	\$306.81	\$4,838	
2015									
2016						\$5.41	\$303.26	\$4,946	
Benchmark			4th (MD's rank)	16th (MD's rank)	4th (MD's rank)	29th (MD's rank)	14th (MD's rank)	13th (MD's rank)	
	New Economy Index								
	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)			
	+	+	+	+	+	+			
2010	3rd	3rd	21st	15th	4th	4th			
2011									
2012	5th	3rd	26th	8th	11th	5th			
2013									
2014	5th	3rd	25th	8th	25th	5th			
2015									
2016									

Anatomy of a Dashboard Indicator

