

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 3/24/2016

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		\$30,300	NA	\$24,916	\$24,567	\$25,936	\$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	17	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	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	4.0	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, 3/24/2016

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?*

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 3/24/2016

	#	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
Worse

Improved/Same	25	20	9	14	14	15	18	14	12	16	7	2
Worse	2	7	2	6	4	7	4	8	3	6	2	1

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

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 3/24/2016

	#	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	6	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 3/24/2016

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment

Year	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)
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

Year	S21-1	S21-2	S22	S32	S34	S38	S35	S36	S37	S48	S49
	Aver. faculty salary (Research univ.)	Aver. faculty salary (Master's univ.)	Wgt. aver faculty salary %ile	U.S. Patents issued	Licenses & options executed	Number of start-up companies	Upper division STEM enrollment	Number of teaching graduates	Number of nursing graduates	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
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	S42	S43	S44	S45	S46	S47	S51	S52	S53	S54
	State appropriations per FTE student	System Office admin as % of System's total operating expend.	Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	Credit rating (Moody's)	% of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	Total funds raised (annual) (000s)	Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	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%	13.2%	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 3/24/2016

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)
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			
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	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
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						
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)
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						

Bowie State University
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

As of 3/24/2016

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)

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 +	
2010	889	37%	70%	93%	53%	238					5.9%	
2011	899	41%	72%	94%	54%	315					4.0%	
2012	890	35%	72%	92%	52%	315					4.8%	
2013	881	35%	72%	92%	54%	353					5.9%	
2014	874	33%	72%	90%	57%	310					5.7%	
2015					60%	419						
Benchmark*	858-1036 (25th & 75th %ile)	49%	75%	50%	45%	500	P	I			I	
Faculty						Affordability					Workforce 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 +	
2010	\$69,947	70	16	\$6,153	2%	80%					235	
2011	\$69,754	66	16	\$6,347	3%	83%					263	
2012	\$69,364	60	16	\$6,639	5%	81%					271	
2013	\$69,115	53	16	\$6,971	5%	82%					280	
2014	\$73,818	69	16	\$7,299	5%	\$30,300					319	
2015	\$75,770	71		\$7,657	5%						294	
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	17.0		P	68%	I			\$22,727		
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 years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +			
2010	36%	17%	Met goal	67%	67%	2.9%	11.1%	4.8	7.6			
2011	39%	21%	Met goal	70%	67%	1.3%	10.7%	5.0	8.3			
2012	38%	17%	Met goal	76%	65%	4.0%	11.1%	4.6	7.7			
2013	40%	18%	Met goal	138%	66%	4.6%	13.5%	4.7	8.0			
2014	38%	18%	Met goal	89%	65%	3.0%	12.7%	4.9	7.8			
2015			Met goal	113%	64%	1.6%		4.8	7.3			
Benchmark*	44%	15%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5			

Coppin State University
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 3/24/2016

* 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		
2010	874	16%	61%	89%		58%		200		6.8%		
2011	882	15%	63%	88%		35%		209		7.1%		
2012	877	17%	64%	86%		36%		236		6.3%		
2013	890	14%	64%	85%		39%		238		11.0%		
2014	895	18%	65%	85%		43%		256		9.6%		
2015						39%		186				
Benchmark*	869-1061 (25th & 75th %ile)	49%	76%	49%	P	53%	I	225				

Faculty					Affordability				Workforce 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	
2010	\$66,576	61	15	\$5,382	2%	83%		NA		93	
2011	\$66,449	54	16	\$5,491	2%	91%		NA		95	
2012	\$67,399	56	14	\$5,720	4%	83%		NA		97	
2013	\$67,647	55	14	\$6,252	9%	86%		NA		99	
2014	\$72,201	68	14	\$6,132	-2%	88%		NA		111	
2015	\$73,809	67		\$6,362	4%	92%				120	
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	19.7		P	82%	I	\$23,523			

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 years	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2010	40%	26%	Met goal	110%		69%	0.3%	8.8%	4.8	10.5
2011	38%	26%	Did not meet goal	72%		69%	0.4%	9.5%	5.3	9.0
2012	33%	22%	Did not meet goal	139%		67%	0.3%	13.0%	5.0	9.0
2013	35%	23%	Met goal	115%		69%	0.4%	13.9%	4.8	9.0
2014	35%	25%	Met goal	92%		NA	0.2%	16.3%	5.8	8.5
2015			Met goal	103%		NA	0.2%		5.8	8.1
Benchmark*	41%	14%	B	100%	I	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	B	7.5

Frostburg State University
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

** 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										
	1	2	3	4		5		6		
	Average SAT	6-year graduation rate	2nd year retention rate	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs		% of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)		MD comm. college transfers		
Year	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2010	984	48%	73%	27%		60%		354		
2011	985	46%	72%	28%		62%		386		
2012	980	44%	72%	29%		62%		379		
2013	985	47%	73%	29%		62%		412		
2014	969	49%	75%	34%		62%		476		
2015						66%		564		
Benchmark*	868-1070	52%	77%	25%		73%		282		
	(25th & 75th %ile)									

Alumni
10
Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate
5.6%
5.4%
5.4%
4.7%
4.7%

Faculty					Affordability			
	21	22	24	7	8	9		
	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Student to Faculty Ratio	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation		
Year	+	+		% chg.	+	-	-	
2010	\$72,093	52	17	\$6,904	3%	NA		
2011	\$71,368	49	16	\$7,128	3%	\$22,429		
2012	\$69,914	43	16	\$7,436	4%	\$20,736		
2013	\$69,213	39	15	\$7,728	4%	\$20,058		
2014	\$74,693	52	15	\$7,982	3%	\$24,916		
2015	\$76,281	57		\$8,488	6%			
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	18.7		P	72%	\$24,431	

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35	38
Upper division STEM enrollment	Number of start-up companies
334	NA
416	NA
432	1
423	3
445	4
399	3

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	41	42	43	44	51	52	53	54	55
	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved	Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	Time to degree in years	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
Year	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
2010	40%	16%	Met goal	156%	61%	3.3%	12.6%	4.6	7.5
2011	39%	16%	Met goal	145%	60%	2.4%	13.7%	4.6	7.5
2012	40%	16%	Did not meet goal	71%	62%	1.0%	14.9%	4.6	7.4
2013	40%	17%	Did not meet goal	92%	60%	1.2%	16.7%	4.5	7.4
2014	38%	15%	Did not meet goal	118%	55%	0.6%	21.6%	4.3	7.3
2015			Met goal	109%	55%	0.4%		3.7	7.4
Benchmark*	41%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	

Salisbury University
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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											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					
2010	1147	70%	81%	15%	58%	673			16.5%					
2011	1155	67%	81%	15%	57%	824			15.3%					
2012	1160	67%	83%	16%	57%	736			15.0%					
2013	1156	67%	82%	16%	58%	915			7.3%					
2014	<i>1160</i>	66%	82%	17%	60%	730			6.4%					
2015					64%	847								
Benchmark*	945-1127 (25th & 75th %ile)	60%	79%	20%	60%	530								
Faculty						Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.		Economic 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)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies				
2010	\$71,572	61	17	\$6,908	4%	\$18,541			484	NA				
2011	\$71,486	57	17	\$7,332	6%	\$20,693			536	NA				
2012	\$71,437	53	17	\$7,700	5%	\$23,159			578	11				
2013	\$72,039	51	16	\$8,128	6%	\$23,545			612	5				
2014	\$77,848	69	16	\$8,560	5%	\$24,567			658	3				
2015	\$79,589	70		\$9,086	6%				641	15				
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	16.7		P	\$27,135								
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 years	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty					
2010	47%	15%	Met goal	218%	67%	2.6%	15.2%	4.2	7.6					
2011	47%	14%	Met goal	220%	65%	3.0%	14.9%	4.1	7.7					
2012	45%	14%	Met goal	92%	67%	3.7%	16.0%	4.3	7.8					
2013	47%	14%	Met goal	295%	68%	2.6%	17.0%	4.3	7.4					
2014	45%	14%	Met goal	146%	68%	1.2%	17.9%	3.9	7.3					
2015			Met goal	103%	68%	1.7%		4.0	7.1					
Benchmark*	45%	15%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5					

Towson University
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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 +				
2010	1081	68%	84%	16%	65%	2017				
2011	1087	64%	84%	18%	70%	2420				
2012	1088	66%	85%	19%	70%	2430				
2013	1084	65%	85%	21%	62%	2848				
2014	1087	68%	86%	22%	61%	2142				
2015					67%	1937				
Benchmark*	965-1155 (25th & 75th %ile)	62%	83%	18%	65%	1300				

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +
4.4%
4.2%
3.9%
4.3%
3.8%

Faculty						Affordability				
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 -				
2010	\$71,910	66	17	\$7,656	3%	\$19,069				
2011	\$71,097	62	17	\$7,906	3%	\$22,072				
2012	\$72,400	60	17	\$8,132	3%	\$23,812				
2013	\$72,444	59	17	\$8,342	3%	NA				
2014	\$78,288	73	17	\$8,590	3%	\$25,936				
2015	\$79,751	73		\$9,182	7%					
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	18.8		P	\$25,787				

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM enrollment +	38 Number of start-up companies +
1216	NA
1258	NA
1390	2
1461	1
1530	0
1672	0

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 years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +	
2010	40%	14%	Met goal	107%	67%	2.8%	7.7%	4.4	7.3	
2011	41%	14%	Met goal	84%	65%	4.0%	8.7%	4.5	7.7	
2012	40%	13%	Met goal	78%	65%	3.0%	8.3%	4.4	7.4	
2013	42%	14%	Met goal	112%	67%	3.0%	8.7%	4.3	7.3	
2014	38%	14%	Met goal	116%	65%	2.3%	11.1%	4.1	7.2	
2015			Met goal	99%	63%	1.4%		4.0	7.1	
Benchmark*	46%	12%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5	

University of Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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-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			
2010	85%	75%	45%	72%	664	455	66%	2.6%			
2011	82%	78%	47%	71%	625	465	73%	3.9%			
2012	80%	75%	50%	71%	654	514	74%	5.6%			
2013	84%	72%	51%	75%	690	604	75%	5.6%			
2014	83%	73%	53%	70%	630	635	70%	5.0%			
2015	80%			67%	651	676	78%				
Benchmark*	75%	78%	44%			426	75%				

Faculty				Affordability				Workforce Dvlp.		Economic Dvlp.	
Year	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			
2010	NA	52%	20	\$7,330	2%	78%	250	NA			
2011	\$39	55%	20	\$7,494	2%	81%	278	NA			
2012	\$33	54%	19	\$7,664	2%	87%	287	8			
2013	\$35	54%	16	\$7,838	2%	86%	289	9			
2014	\$37	52%	15	\$8,018	2%	86%	286	0			
2015		52%		\$8,326	4%	86%	287	1			
Benchmark*		49%	17.6		P	58%	\$21,481				

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	7-UB % of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2010	40%	21%	Met goal	183%	55%	0.6%	42%	7.6
2011	38%	23%	Met goal	105%	54%	0.6%	42%	7.8
2012	40%	23%	Met goal	131%	55%	0.7%	44%	6.5
2013	39%	23%	Met goal	304%	48%	1.0%	44%	6.4
2014	40%	21%	Did not meet goal	111%	52%	0.6%	44%	7.3
2015			Met goal	107%		1.4%	45%	6.9
Benchmark*	45%	14%		100%		0.2% increase		7.5

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

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\ASHBOARD INDICATORS\2015\DBI01222016.XLS, 3/24/2016

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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												Economic Dvlp.	
	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 enrollment	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						
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%	10						
2013	88%	99%	93%	96%	6,284	19%	89%	8						
2014	81%	98%	97%	99%	6,276	20%	87%	15						
2015	83%	99%	90%	94%	6,329	22%	86%	15						
Benchmark*	93%	96%	93%	NA	22,915	17%	40%							

Year	Faculty				Economic Development					
	5-UMB Natl. ranking NIH awards to public medical schls.	6-UMB Natl. 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	
2010	14	3	3	10	\$566.0	\$313,668	15	\$1,375,250	12	
2011	13	3	4	8	\$557.0	\$254,028	30	\$385,815	14	
2012	13	6	3	6	\$525.0	\$255,727	30	\$955,703	21	
2013	14	5	3	6	\$479.0	\$249,379	25	\$835,817	23	
2014	15	6	2	7	\$499.0	\$245,876	28	\$1,120,101	30	
2015	16	11	2		\$497.5	\$226,765				
Benchmark*	Top 10	Top 10	Top 10	15.8		\$275,518	5% annually	5% annually		

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency			Workforce Development		
	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)	
2010	23%	9%	Met goal	92%	0.5%	3,038	635	114	117	
2011	22%	8%	Met goal	112%	0.7%	2,830	627	147	128	
2012	24%	9%	Met goal	100%	0.6%	3,011	646	156	123	
2013	25%	9%	Met goal	129%	0.9%	2,894	632	163	127	
2014	25%	9%	Met goal	66%	0.8%	2,909	614	153	128	
2015			Met goal	96%	0.5%		666	164	127	
Benchmark*	34%	9%	B	100%	0.2% increase	3,625	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually	

Note: Institutional goals are usually taken from institution's MFR and are usually set for FY 2010.
Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2015\DBI01222016.XLS, 3/24/2016

University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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 +	
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	1218	61%	85%	22%	66%	1368	\$9,764	3%	68%	\$22,601	3.7%
2013	1214	65%	86%	22%	67%	1418	\$10,068	3%	70%	\$22,755	3.7%
2014	1210	61%	87%	22%	64%	1351	\$10,384	3%	70%	\$25,831	3.6%
2015					63%	1350	\$11,006	6%	69%		
Benchmark*	1080-1282 (25th & 75th %ile)	70%	88%	21%	73%	958		P	61%	\$25,522	

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 +
2010	\$88,303	72	2.8	19	\$206,282	9	\$63,162	4	NA	2591
2011	\$88,335	65	2.0	20	\$210,519	9	\$196,921	1	NA	2783
2012	\$87,769	58	2.1	19	\$168,277	10	\$182,626	4	4	3048
2013	\$87,894	56	2.8	20	\$157,612	5	\$191,721	1	10	3284
2014	\$94,379	75	2.5	19	\$160,823	7	\$284,153	1	4	3582
2015	\$96,271	73	2.9						4	3745
Benchmark*	\$90,110	85%		17.6	\$190,536	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 replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2010	34%	11%	Met goal	97%	62%	0.2%	15.3%	4.4	6.5
2011	34%	9%	Met goal	140%	63%	0.3%	15.1%	4.6	6.9
2012	35%	9%	Met goal	119%	62%	0.2%	17.1%	4.5	6.9
2013	34%	11%	Met goal	238%	60%	0.6%	18.4%	4.3	6.9
2014	34%	11%	Met goal	84%	65%	0.7%	18.3%	4.5	6.9
2015			Met goal	199%	62%	0.8%		4.3	7.2
Benchmark*	38%	11%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		5.5

University of Maryland, College Park
Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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											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 +	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 +	
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	1299	82%	95%	20%	46%	1695	\$8,908	3%	66%	\$25,276	6.3%
2013	1305	84%	95%	21%	47%	1930	\$9,161	3%	66%	\$25,254	5.8%
2014	1306	85%	95%	22%	49%	2234	\$9,427	3%	66%	\$25,131	6.6%
2015					47%	2142	\$9,996	6%	67%		
Benchmark*	1184-1396 (25th & 75th %ile)	86%	94%	13%	Note 1	No specific goal		P	Note 2	\$24,812	

Faculty				Economic Development						Workforce Dvlp.
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +	23 Awards per 100 FT faculty (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 +
2010	\$110,930	90	4.6	18	\$319,012	16	\$686,665	13	NA	4819
2011	\$110,921	85	5.3	18	\$359,051	38	\$716,873	14	NA	5256
2012	\$112,050	83	4.7	18	\$358,316	27	\$662,148	13	11	5580
2013	\$113,372	84	4.6	18	\$348,602	38	\$575,485	18	29	5846
2014	\$122,160	94	4.8	18	\$334,681	35	\$727,424	21	103	6161
2015	\$125,559	95	4.9						103	6201
Benchmark*	\$109,010	85%		16.3	\$303,280	NA	NA	P		

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 replacement value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2010	33%	7%	Met goal	97%	69%	2.1%	14.4%	4.2	5.8
2011	31%	7%	Met goal	94%	67%	1.5%	15.1%	4.3	5.8
2012	32%	7%	Met goal	120%	71%	1.5%	16.6%	4.2	5.6
2013	32%	8%	Met goal	109%	69%	1.7%	17.7%	4.0	5.6
2014	32%	8%	Did not meet goal	127%	71%	1.4%	21.0%	4.2	5.6
2015			Met goal	145%	71%	1.2%		4.1	5.4
Benchmark*	35%	8%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	5.5	

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, March 2016

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

As of 3/24/2016

* 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	
2010	857	32%	67%	80%	53%	73					4.2%	
2011	879	31%	68%	79%	58%	90					3.8%	
2012	880	32%	67%	76%	58%	86					3.0%	
2013	861	32%	68%	75%	57%	135					2.5%	
2014	844	37%	70%	75%	63%	181					3.3%	
2015					51%	152						
Benchmark*	840-1012 (25th & 75th %ile)	45%	73%	54%	62%	53	P	I			I	

Faculty			Affordability			Economic Dvlp.		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	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	38 Number of start-up companies	35 Upper division enrollment enrollment
2010	\$71,201	59	17	\$6,305	2%	90%	\$50,944	NA	394
2011	\$70,572	63	16	\$6,482	3%	98%	\$67,604	NA	413
2012	\$72,172	65	16	\$6,713	4%	88%	\$51,162	5	391
2013	\$70,881	61	14	\$6,998	4%	88%	\$54,774	2	403
2014	\$70,881	72	14	\$7,287	4%	86%	\$54,442	1	425
2015	\$70,881	68		\$7,625	5%	87%		0	369
Benchmark*	\$76,823	85%	16.6		P	89%	\$24,847	P	

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 years	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2010	36%	12%	Met goal	119%	73%	0.6%	6.9%	4.3	9.3
2011	38%	13%	Met goal	232%	71%	0.6%	10.1%	4.3	8.1
2012	37%	12%	Met goal	138%	69%	0.6%	10.9%	4.6	7.6
2013	41%	12%	Did not meet goal	75%	69%	0.7%	13.9%	4.7	8.1
2014	39%	13%	Did not meet goal	115%	69%	0.2%	14.8%	4.8	7.4
2015			Met goal	95%	69%	0.2%		4.9	7.2
Benchmark*	44%	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

University of Maryland University College

Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

As of 3/24/2016

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)

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	6 MD comm. coll. transfers	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses	7-UMUC Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled in)	
2010	24,284	40%	32%	40%	83%	2750	813	222,268	
2011	25,693	41%	33%	41%	83%	2944	836	234,243	
2012	28,119	42%	34%	43%	83%	2,997	941	262,708	
2013	28,273	44%	31%	47%	83%	2,840	978	261,101	
2014	26,740	46%	29%	50%	83%	2,574	981	243,303	
2015	35,154	50%	27%	49%	80%	3,075	956	248,104	
Benchmark*	>22300	19%		Maintain or increase	≥80%	≥2800	Maintain or increase	≥175,000	

Affordability				Economic Dvlp.			Workforce Development			Alumni	
Year	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid		Worldwide	Stateside						
	% chg.			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		
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	4969			2.4%		
2013	\$6,642	3%	47%	318,074	2,864	5401			2.0%		
2014	\$6,834	3%	52%	294,226	3,225	6613			1.8%		
2015	\$7,146	5%	51%	294,568	3,283	6989					
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				
2010	30%	16%	Met goal	54%	2%				
2011	30%	16%	Met goal	96%	2%				
2012	29%	13%	Met goal	52%	2%				
2013	28%	13%	Met goal	90%	2%				
2014	29%	14%	Met goal	133%	2%				
2015			Met goal	52%	2%				
Benchmark*	40%	19%	B	100%	2%				

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences
 Dashboard Indicators, March 2016

As of 3/24/2016


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


National Eminence/Quality						
Students			Faculty			
Year	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**
2010	1184		177		32.3	\$627,500
2011	1199		141		34.0	\$704,323
2012	1297		184		35.7	\$688,914
2013	1232		168		35.9	\$675,770
2014	1250		200		38.3	
2015	1250					
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)
2010	181	420	11,000	\$42,670
2011	185	429	11,000	\$50,007
2012	209	377	11,000	\$48,224
2013	183	442	11,000	\$53,683
2014	229	608	11,000	\$50,814
2015	214	888	11,000	
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I

Stewardship		Effectiveness & Efficiency	
Year	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value
2010	Met goal	98%	0.2%
2011	Met goal	35%	0.2%
2012	Met goal	238%	0.4%
2013	Did not meet goal	180%	0.8%
2014	Met goal	95%	0.4%
2015	Met goal		0.3%
Benchmark*	B	100%	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

If currently at or above the benchmark  Green

If currently below the benchmark  Red

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%

4. Year of data

2008

57%

2009

55%

2010



5. Color code for
IMPROVEMENT
(trend)

Benchmark

70%

6. peer data
compare to
italicized data



8. Color code for
ADEQUACY
(benchmark comparison)

7. Benchmark data

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

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS, MARCH 2016

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 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. Benchmark is weighted average for 3 tenure-track ranks of all institutions in same Carnegie group.	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 FTE 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> (Non-traditional method defined separately for each institution for 2006 report only. See separate listings below.)	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				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
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:</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.
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, 2013 via Web (www.census.gov), Table S1501, Census Bureau Population Estimates.
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. 2013 (updated May 27, 2014, Data from 2010).</u>
E4	Science & engineering doctorates awarded	Production of science & engineering doctorates by Maryland's universities	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles. 2013 (updated May 27, 2014. (Data from 2012).</u>

#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</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, 2013</u> . (Data from 2011).
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, FY 2004-13, Table 77.
E12	Persons in science & engineering occupations as % of workforce	How well Maryland is adapting to high-tech economy	Self-explanatory. High-tech industries are defined by specified NAICS* codes.	NSF, <u>Science and Engineering Indicators 2014</u> , Table 8-34. (Data from 2012).
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	Tech America Foundation, <u>Cyberstates</u> , 2013. (2012 data)
E15	High-tech establishments as % of all business establishments	Importance of high-tech in contributing to Maryland's economic development	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science and Engineering Indicators 2014</u> , Table 8-53. (Data from 2010).
		Third-party validation of the	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science and</u>

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E16	Venture capital disbursed per \$1,000 of GDP (Gross Domestic Product)	importance of high-tech ventures in Maryland's economy		Engineering Indicators 2014 , Table 8-57. (Data for 2012).
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 wealth	Self-explanatory	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, State Personal Income; Chronicle of Higher Education
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, Higher Education R&D Expenditures, by state, institution, R&D field, FY 2013, Table 67.
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), 2014 State New Economy Index , June 2014.
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
		How efficiently capital is put	Based upon relative standing	Same as above

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E29	New Economy Index: Innovation capacity	to use	among the states on five related measures	
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, 2013, Table S1501, Census Bureau, Population Estimates, 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 levels</u>)
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 2015

<u>University</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>UNITID</u>
<u>Bowie State U.</u>		
California State U., Bakersfield	CA	110486
Humboldt State U.	CA	115755
Fitchburg State C.	MA	165820
North Carolina Central U.	NC	199157
Winston-Salem State U.	NC	199999
New Jersey City U.	NJ	185129
William Paterson U. of New Jersey	NJ	187444
SUNY, New Paltz	NY	196176
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	PA	212115
Virginia State U.	VA	234155
<u>Coppin State U.</u>		
California State U., Channel Islands	CA	441937
California State U., Monterey Bay	CA	409698
California State U., San Marcos	CA	366711
Humboldt State U.	CA	115755
Fayetteville State U.	NC	198543
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	NC	199281
Winston-Salem State U.	NC	199999
SUNY at Geneseo	NY	196167
Virginia State U.	VA	234155
Evergreen State C.	WA	235167
<u>Frostburg State U.</u>		
California State U., Northridge	CA	110608
Sonoma State U.	CA	123572
Bridgewater State C.	MA	165024
Fitchburg State C.	MA	165820
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	MA	167987
Western Carolina U.	NC	200004
Kean U.	NJ	185262
Buffalo State C. (SUNY)	NY	196130
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	NY	196200
Clarion U. of Penn.	PA	211644
<u>Salisbury U.</u>		
Framingham State C.	MA	165866
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	NC	199218
Western Carolina U.	NC	200004
Rowan U.	NJ	184782
William Paterson U. of New Jersey	NJ	187444
Buffalo State C. (SUNY)	NY	196130
SUNY, C. at Brockport	NY	196121
SUNY, C. at Oswego	NY	196194
West Chester U. of Penn.	PA	216764
Radford U.	VA	233277

Towson U.

California State U., Fullerton	CA	110565
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	MA	167987
Minnesota State U., Mankato	MN	173920
Appalachian State U.	NC	197869
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	NC	199139
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	NC	199218
Montclair State U.	NJ	185590
Indiana U. of Penn.	PA	213020
West Chester U. of Penn.	PA	216764
James Madison U.	VA	232423
Western Washington U.	WA	237011

Baltimore, U. of

California State U., East Bay (Hayward)	CA	110574
California State U., Stanislaus	CA	110495
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	MA	167987
North Carolina Central U.	NC	199157
New Jersey City U.	NJ	185129
Rutgers U., Camden	NJ	186371
CUNY Brooklyn C.	NY	190549
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	NY	190637
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	PA	212115
Radford U.	VA	233277

Maryland, U. of, Baltimore

California, U. of, Los Angeles	CA	110662
California, U. of, San Francisco	CA	110699
Minnesota, U. of, Twin Cities	MN	174066
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	NC	199120
Buffalo, U. at (SUNY)	NY	196088
Cincinnati, U. of, Main	OH	201885
Ohio State U., Main	OH	204796
Pittsburgh, U. of, Main	PA	215293
Virginia, U. of, Main	VA	234076
Washington, U. of, Seattle	WA	236948

Maryland, U. of, Baltimore County

California, U. of, Riverside	CA	110671
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	CA	110714
Massachusetts, U. of, Amherst	MA	166629
Massachusetts, U. of, Lowell	MA	166513
North Carolina State U., Raleigh	NC	199193
New Jersey Institute Tech.	NJ	185828
Binghamton U. (SUNY)	NY	196079
SUNY, Albany	NY	196060
Miami U., Main	OH	204024
George Mason U.	VA	232186

Maryland, U. of, College Park

California, U. of, Berkeley	CA	110635
California, U. of, Los Angeles	CA	110662
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	IL	145637
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	MI	170976
Minnesota, U. of, Twin Cities	MN	174066
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	NC	199120
Rutgers U., New Brunswick/Piscataway	NJ	186380
Ohio State U., Main	OH	204796
Pennsylvania State U., Main	PA	214777
Washington, U. of, Seattle	WA	236948

Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore

California State U., Bakersfield	CA	110486
Fayetteville State U.	NC	198543
North Carolina A&T State U.	NC	199102
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	NC	199281
Winston-Salem State U.	NC	199999
New Jersey City U.	NJ	185129
Rutgers U., Camden	NJ	186371
SUNY, Fredonia	NY	196158
Lock Haven U. of Penn.	PA	213613
Virginia State U.	VA	234155

Maryland, U. of, University College

Colorado State University-Global Campus	CO	476975
Charter Oak State College	CT	128780
Granite State College	NH	183257
Thomas Edison State College	NJ	187046