



## BOARD OF REGENTS

### SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION, INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

---

**TOPIC:** 2011 USM Dashboard Indicators

**COMMITTEE:** Effectiveness and Efficiency

**DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING:** January 25, 2012

**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. They include pages of indicators focused on the external environment, the System as a whole, and each USM institution.

The 2011 Dashboard Indicators have incorporated a number of changes to reflect the adoption of the new USM Strategic Plan at the end of 2010 and incorporate general improvements in the DBIs. These changes include:

- A Key Indicators Summary to focus attention on specific trends,
- An External Fiscal Environment summary,
- Revised and expanded indicators reflecting Board interest and the new Strategic Plan,
- The pages have been reorganized to reflect the current Strategic plan's themes.

Key issues highlighted in this year's Dashboard Indicators include:

- Early progress toward Strategic Plan STEM production goals,
- Evidence of fiscal stress of USM Students,
- Continuing Challenges in the current economic environment.

**ALTERNATIVE(S):** This is an information item.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** This is an information item.

**CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION:** This is an information item.

---

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: .

DATE:

---

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

---

SUBMITTED BY: Joseph F. Vivona

(301) 445-1923

[jvivona@usmd.edu](mailto:jvivona@usmd.edu)

---

University System of Maryland



# **Dashboard Indicators**

## **2011**

**Board of Regents**  
**Committee on Effectiveness & Efficiency**  
**January 25, 2012**

---

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

## 2011 USM Dashboard Indicators

### Key Indicators

The 2011 Dashboard Indicators provides a “snapshot” overview of the USM and its institutions. It combines in one place data from dozens of USM reports and data sets. The indicators noted below were selected to highlight specific trends and challenges drawn from the Dashboards.

#### Early Indicator on Strategic Plan Attainment

- **Upper Division STEM Enrollment** – This measure was added this year as a leading indicator of progress on the Strategic Plan commitments to increase Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) degrees. The early indication is that significant progress has been made in increasing STEM production on all campuses. For the system as a whole STEM enrollment has increased by more than 1,000 majors in the past year and by over 3,000 since 2007. At all but one institution which enroll STEM majors, substantial increases occurred indicating the broad success of USM institutions at adding STEM majors. This will yield substantial growth in STEM graduates over the next few years.

#### Fiscal Stress on Students

There is substantial evidence that USM students are experiencing greater financial stress. Two indicators highlight this:

- **Undergraduates Receiving Financial Aid** – The percentage of undergraduate students receiving some type of financial aid rose at every institution. The percentage receiving financial aid is now above 90% at all of USM’s Historically Black Institutions and is above 70% at all of the residential institutions. These are easily the highest levels receiving financial aid demand since the Dashboards began tracking this measure.
- **Undergraduate Debt Burden Rising** – Although still below peer benchmarks in all but 1 case, debt burden upon graduation is rising at 4 of 7 institutions.

#### Overall Fiscal Environment

Several indicators highlight the ongoing economic challenges which the USM currently faces:

- **Expenditures for Instruction** – 7 of 11 institutions have successfully maintained levels of expenditures for instruction even in the face of constrained revenue.
- **Facilities Renewal** – Funding of facilities renewal missed the Regent’s benchmark in 8 of 11 cases. Most were able to maintain the previous year’s level but did not reach required levels.
- **Faculty Salary** – USM institutions have maintained salaries at approximately the same levels for the last few years. However, faculty salaries have fallen against peers in many cases, most notably at Comprehensive Institutions.
- **Alumni Giving** – Although 9 of 12 institutions exceeded 90% of their fund raising goals, 6 of 9 institutions saw the percentage of alumni giving decline. This may suggest greater difficulty in building a base of alumni givers in the current economic environment.

# Summary of 2011 Core Dashboard Indicators

As of 1/9/12

*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	1287	1206		889	874	984	1147	1087		879			
2	6-year graduation rate	82%	57%		37%	16%	48%	70%	68%		32%			63%
3	2nd-year retention rate	94%	85%		70%	61%	73%	81%	84%	75%	67%			73%
4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	19%	21%		93%	89%	27%	15%	16%	45%	80%	41%		32%
5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	45%	69%		53%	58%	60%	58%	65%	72%	53%			
6	MD community college transfers	1665	1267		238	200	354	673	2017	664	73	2750		10029
7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$8,655	\$9,467		\$6,347	\$5,491	\$7,128	\$7,332	\$7,906	\$7,494	\$6,482	\$6,246		\$7,992
8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	70%	74%		91%	91%	81%	80%	72%	81%	98%	61%		
9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$20,256	\$19,353		\$17,198	NA	\$18,255	\$17,521	\$13,245	NA	\$19,655			
10	Average alumni giving rate	6.9%	4.2%		4.0%	6.8%	5.6%	16.5%	4.4%	2.6%	7.0%	2.3%		
21	Average faculty salary	\$110,921	\$88,335		\$69,754	\$66,449	\$71,368	\$71,486	\$71,097		\$70,572			
22	Faculty salary %ile	85	65		66	54	49	57	62		63			71
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	5.3	2.0											
31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$296,300	\$189,401								\$67,604		\$291,399	
32	U.S. Patents issued	16	9	15										40
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$686,665	\$63,162	\$1,375,250										
34	Licenses & options executed	13	4	12										29
35	Upper division STEM enrollment	4819	2591		235	93	326	484	1216	250	394	3550		13921
41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	33%	34%	23%	36%	40%	40%	47%	40%	40%	36%	30%		
42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	7%	11%	9%	17%	26%	16%	15%	14%	21%	12%	16%		
43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	
44	% of fundraising goal achieved	94%	140%	112%	70%	72%	145%	220%	84%	105%	232%	96%	98%	
51	Classroom utilization rate	67%	63%		67%	58%	60%	65%	65%		71%			65%
52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.5%	0.3%	0.7%	1.3%	0.4%	2.4%	3.0%	4.0%	0.6%	0.6%		0.2%	1.3%
53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods		15.3%		11.1%	8.8%	12.6%	15.2%	7.7%		6.9%			
54	Time to degree	8.4	8.8		9.5	9.5	9.1	8.3	8.7		8.6			
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.8	6.9		8.3	9.0	7.5	7.7	7.7	7.8	8.1			

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?\*

● Same or better      ● Worse

As of 1/9/12

	#	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.)	●	●										
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	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Stewardship	41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	44	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Effectiveness & Efficiency	51	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●
	53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	54	Time to degree	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		

Improved/Same	19	19	7	11	13	15	16	14	9	17	8	2
Worse	6	6	1	8	5	5	4	6	1	3	1	1

\*As of 1/9/12

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better      ● Worse

As of 1/9/12

	#	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.)	●	●										
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												
Stewardship	41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	43	Fund balance increase: goal achieved												
	44	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Effectiveness & Efficiency	51	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●
	53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	54	Time to degree												
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	

Meets benchmark	6	11	4	9	4	7	12	9	5	10	2	0
Does not meet benchmark	10	7	2	6	10	9	4	7	2	6	4	2

# Anatomy of a Dashboard Indicator

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

5

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

Acceptance rate  
for freshmen\*

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

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

4. Year of data

5. Color code for  
IMPROVEMENT  
(trend)



6. peer data  
compare to  
italicized data

Benchmark

70%

8. Color code for  
ADEQUACY  
(benchmark comparison)



7. Benchmark data

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

# University System of Maryland

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

As of 1/9/12

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment												
Year	S2 6-year graduation rate	S3 2nd year retention rate	S4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	S5 % of total projected demand met	S6 MD comm. college transfers	S7 Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	S11 % of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)	S12 Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue	S13 Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)			
2007	63%	71%	30%	88%	8974	\$7,325	42.2%	15%	\$90.1			
2008	63%	71%	30%	90%	8993	\$7,390	42.5%	15%	\$96.5			
2009	63%	72%	31%	91%	9468	\$7,462	41.8%	16%	\$106.0			
2010	63%	73%	32%	92%	10029	\$7,746	41.4%	16%	\$111.6			
2011						\$7,992	3%	16%	\$110.9			
Benchmark*	56%	74%	22%									

Faculty			Economic Development			Workforce Development			Funding	
Year	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	S35 Upper division STEM enrollment	S36 Number of teaching graduates	S37 Number of nursing graduates	S48 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	S49 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2007	\$96,153	\$67,463	77	43	65	10900	1700	882	\$28,467	80%
2008	\$100,923	\$69,634	79	52	47	11797	1558	908	\$27,792	82%
2009	\$105,395	\$71,951	79	42	44	12904	1560	899	\$25,070	70%
2010	\$105,878	\$72,021	76	40	29	13921	1588	1005	\$26,741	65%
2011	\$105,812	\$71,240	71							70%
Benchmark*	\$93,510	\$73,916	85%						\$25,794	100%

Stewardship							Effectiveness & Efficiency				
Year	S41 State appropriations per FTE student	S42 System Office admin System's total operating expend.	S43 Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	S44 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	S45 Credit rating (Moody's)	S46 % of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	S47 Total funds raised (annual) (000s)	S51 Classroom utilization rate	S52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	S53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	S54 Time to Degree
2007	\$8,025	0.5%	76%	Met goal	Stable	NA	\$241,105	67%	1.3%	9.8%	8.9
2008	\$8,500	0.4%	89%	Met goal	Stable	NA	\$260,086	68%	1.9%	10.4%	8.8
2009	\$8,884	0.4%	87%	Met goal	Stable	12.9%	\$233,935	67%	1.2%	11.1%	8.7
2010	\$7,247	0.4%	85%	Met goal	Stable(recalibrated)	12.4%	\$222,396	65%	1.4%	12.3%	8.6
2011			100%	Met goal	Stable	13.0%	\$242,343		1.3%		
Benchmark*	\$7,735	2.3%						66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	



## External Fiscal

Funding guideline % achieved (FY)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2001	95%	90%	89%	90%	92%	96%	85%	82%	90%	107%	64%
2002	86%	82%	74%	70%	75%	90%	74%	71%	76%	110%	58%
2003	65%	71%	80%	66%	82%	80%	63%	66%	76%	91%	46%
2004	53%	64%	73%	63%	77%	84%	56%	61%	65%	70%	43%
2005	51%	70%	78%	74%	80%	80%	53%	64%	67%	72%	34%
2006	94%	108%	90%	104%	100%	141%	72%	81%	82%	99%	40%
2007	74%	93%	82%	79%	90%	132%	73%	74%	78%	88%	61%
2008	87%	101%	93%	78%	88%	107%	75%	72%	82%	82%	39%
2009	74%	112%	77%	65%	68%	50%	61%	65%	73%	69%	46%
2010	62%	101%	67%	63%	63%	45%	57%	64%	72%	62%	43%
2011	70%	111%	69%	63%	66%	46%	69%	62%	75%	71%	37%
Benchmark	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Operating expend. Per FTE student (Excl. auxil./hosp.)											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2002	\$12,211	\$14,421	\$10,948	\$10,437	\$11,086	\$12,315	\$38,121	\$22,308	\$32,175	\$19,070	\$17,863
2003	\$14,569	\$14,308	\$10,931	\$10,653	\$10,787	\$12,319	\$40,853	\$22,176	\$29,808	\$20,483	\$17,832
2004	\$13,696	\$14,149	\$10,808	\$10,308	\$10,773	\$12,741	\$41,427	\$22,449	\$29,973	\$17,786	\$16,898
2005	\$13,554	\$15,562	\$11,363	\$10,391	\$11,108	\$13,191	\$46,596	\$23,059	\$31,270	\$20,605	\$17,266
2006	\$13,885	\$13,736	\$12,764	\$10,859	\$11,881	\$14,230	\$48,802	\$23,979	\$33,087	\$21,009	\$18,961
2007	\$14,770	\$18,924	\$13,637	\$11,217	\$12,275	\$15,090	\$50,438	\$25,720	\$33,645	\$18,214	\$17,569
2008	\$14,778	\$18,114	\$14,843	\$10,973	\$12,608	\$15,625	\$55,374	\$26,326	\$34,538	\$18,473	\$17,585
2009	\$15,269	\$19,617	\$15,102	\$12,499	\$13,743	\$14,629	\$55,333	\$26,522	\$36,444	\$19,233	\$18,534
2010	\$15,821	\$21,749	\$14,598	\$11,892	\$13,009	\$15,606	\$56,458	\$25,759	\$36,281	\$18,353	\$18,704
Benchmark	\$19,095	\$15,467	\$16,082	\$16,626	\$16,763	\$16,791	\$62,393	\$28,616	\$56,575	\$20,736	\$16,238

State appropriations per FTE student											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
2002	\$6,169	\$6,989	\$6,253	\$5,063	\$4,872	\$5,374	\$12,994	\$8,060	\$11,998	\$8,544	\$1,869
2003	\$5,524	\$6,569	\$5,317	\$4,358	\$4,104	\$4,530	\$11,679	\$6,917	\$10,286	\$6,707	\$1,419
2004	\$5,039	\$6,507	\$5,054	\$4,242	\$4,044	\$4,269	\$11,137	\$6,570	\$9,732	\$6,229	\$1,378
2005	\$5,074	\$6,161	\$5,231	\$4,199	\$4,012	\$4,380	\$11,249	\$6,667	\$9,955	\$6,396	\$1,277
2006	\$5,362	\$6,104	\$5,843	\$4,359	\$4,183	\$4,771	\$12,119	\$7,200	\$10,364	\$6,629	\$1,365
2007	\$7,418	\$9,482	\$6,691	\$4,957	\$4,783	\$5,420	\$12,966	\$8,094	\$11,735	\$7,593	\$1,492
2008	\$7,558	\$10,266	\$6,853	\$5,021	\$4,939	\$5,260	\$13,641	\$8,451	\$12,220	\$8,374	\$1,890
2009	\$7,586	\$10,715	\$6,731	\$5,201	\$4,842	\$5,219	\$11,162	\$8,404	\$12,003	\$8,072	\$2,034
2010	\$6,733	\$11,457	\$5,804	\$4,475	\$4,281	\$4,422	\$11,771	\$7,217	\$10,524	\$7,135	\$1,776
Benchmark	\$7,335	\$6,237	\$5,894	\$6,712	\$6,305	\$5,589	\$11,375	\$9,376	\$11,823	\$7,878	\$5,524

University System of Maryland  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012







As of 1/9/12

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

Workforce & Workforce Development										E23
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 High-tech workers per 1,000 private sector workers +	E14 Average high-tech wage +	E23 Current population estimates (as of July 1) (for comparison purposes) +	
2007	35.1%	15.7%		858	\$46,839	3.6%	80	\$84,351	5,618,344	
2008	35.2%	15.7%	28,100	910	\$48,854	4.3%			5,633,597	
2009	35.7%	16.0%			\$47,674	7.3%			5,699,478	
2010					\$49,070	7.4%	87	\$90,300	5,828,289	
2011						7.0%				
Benchmark	27.9%	10.3%	6th (MD's rank)	12th (MD's rank)	4th (MD's rank)	9.2%	4th (MD's rank)	9th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)	

R&D			Economic Development		
Year	E8 Academic R&D expenditures in science & engin. (millions) +	E22 University R&D expenditures in life sciences (millions)	E7 SBIR awards (\$ millions) +	E16 Venture capital investments (millions) +	E15 High-tech establishments +
2007	\$2,542	\$1,242	306	\$635.3	
2008	\$2,747	\$1,332	246		
2009	\$3,021	\$1,450			
2010				NA	11,600
2011					
Benchmark			6th (MD's rank)	7th (MD's rank)	13th (MD's rank)

Support of Higher Education				
Year	E17 St. gen. funds for higher educ. per \$1,000 of personal income (FY) +	E18 State gen. funds for higher educ. per capit +	E19 State gen. funds for higher educ. per headcount student +	E20 Tuition & fees (USM) as % of MD's per capita personal income -
2007	\$5.57	\$255.78	\$4,572	
2008	\$5.91	\$280.04	\$4,925	16.1%
2009	\$6.02	\$292.33	\$5,027	15.4%
2010	\$5.92	\$292.82	\$4,924	
2011	\$5.65	\$280.05	\$4,447	
Benchmark	29th (MD's rank)	15th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)	37th (MD's rank)

New Economy Index						
Year	E24 New Economy Index: Overall (Maryland's rank) +	E25 New Economy Index: Knowledge jobs (Maryland's rank) +	E26 New Economy Index: Globalization (Maryland's rank) +	E27 New Economy Index: Economic dynamism (Maryland's rank) +	E28 New Economy Index: Digital economy (Maryland's rank) +	E29 New Economy Index: Innovation capacity (Maryland's rank) +
1999	11th	8th	33rd	25th	6th	12th
2002	5th	2nd	30th	11th	13th	6th
2007	3rd	4th	30th	2nd	11th	3rd
2008	3rd	4th	24th	9th	8th	5th
2009						
2010	3rd 	3rd 	21st 	15th 	4th 	4th 
2011						

Bowie State University  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

\* 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 +	
2007	870	37%	75%	92%	43%	281					2.7%	
2008	882	41%	72%	92%	46%	302					5.5%	
2009	880	39%	70%	92%	52%	292					5.9%	
2010	889	37%	70%	93%	53%	238					4.0%	
2011												
Benchmark*	779-978 (25th & 75th %ile)	31%	65%	64%	45%	500	P	I			I	
Faculty				Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.			
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgtd. aver. faculty salary %ile +	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 +			
2007	\$64,242	68	\$5,939	4%	69%	\$14,399		245				
2008	\$66,794	68	\$6,005	1%	70%	\$14,399		241				
2009	\$69,734	71	\$6,040	1%	82%	\$17,198		234				
2010	\$69,947	70	\$6,153	2%	83%			235				
2011	\$69,754	66	\$6,347	3%	91%							
Benchmark*	\$73,916	85%	P		68%	\$21,025						
Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency							
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in semesters -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +			
2007	43%	24%	Met goal	116%	59%	1.0%	2.4%	10.0	7.9			
2008	44%	23%	Met goal	250%	59%	0.8%	5.8%	9.7	8.0			
2009	39%	21%	Met goal	100%	67%	1.0%	5.5%	9.5	8.0			
2010	36%	17%	Met goal	67%	67%	2.9%	11.1%	9.5	7.6			
2011			Met goal	70%	67%	1.3%			8.3			
Benchmark*	34%	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5				

# Coppin State University

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

*\* Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 1/9/12

\* 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	
2007	850	19%	62%	87%	36%	214					5.4%	
2008	853	16%	61%	88%	46%	199					2.9%	
2009	875	14%	60%	89%	54%	242					NA	
2010	874	16%	61%	89%	58%	200					6.8%	
2011												
Benchmark*	864-1031	32%	65%	56%	P	225						
(25th & 75th %ile)												
Faculty				Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.			
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile			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		
2007	\$63,879	63			\$4,980	5%	75%			68		
2008	\$64,904	64			\$5,140	3%	78%			71		
2009	\$65,822	65			\$5,276	3%	81%			86		
2010	\$66,576	61			\$5,382	2%	83%			93		
2011	\$66,449	54			\$5,491	2%	91%					
Benchmark*	\$73,916	85%				P	82%			\$15,035		
Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency							
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty			
2007	29%	27%	Did not meet goal	19%	66%	0.2%	8.9%	10.3	8.8			
2008	34%	26%	Did not meet goal	68%	61%	0.9%	9.8%	10.0	9.0			
2009	38%	25%	Did not meet goal	105%	68%	0.9%	7.2%	10.3	8.2			
2010	40%	26%	Met goal	110%	69%	0.3%	8.8%	9.5	10.5			
2011			Did not meet goal	72%	69%	0.4%			9.0			
Benchmark*	36%	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	B			

# Frostburg State University

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

*\* Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 1/9/12

\* 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 +		
2007	967	51%	70%	22%	63%	283					7.3%		
2008	974	48%	71%	24%	61%	313					6.6%		
2009	963	49%	71%	27%	59%	323					5.6%		
2010	984	48%	73%	27%	60%	354					5.6%		
2011													
Benchmark*	896-1090 (25th & 75th %ile)	49%	75%	12%	73%	282							

Faculty				Affordability				Workforce Dvlp.	
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +	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		
2007	\$67,080	53	\$6,550	2%	70%	\$18,035	204		
2008	\$69,733	55	\$6,614	1%	70%	\$18,408	246		
2009	\$72,807	59	\$6,684	1%	74%	\$18,255	284		
2010	\$72,093	52	\$6,904	3%	76%		326		
2011	\$71,368	49	\$7,128	3%	81%				
Benchmark*	\$73,916	85%		P	72%	\$21,717			

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency				
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in semesters -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2007	45%	14%	Met goal	185%	61%	1.2%	9.2%	9.2	8.0
2008	41%	16%	Met goal	124%	61%	1.1%	9.6%	9.2	8.1
2009	40%	16%	Met goal	155%	62%	0.9%	10.0%	9.2	7.6
2010	40%	16%	Met goal	156%	61%	3.3%	12.6%	9.1	7.5
2011			Met goal	145%	60%	2.4%			7.5
Benchmark*	43%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

Salisbury University  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

\* 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		
2007	1120	68%	81%	14%		60%		601		16.4%		
2008	1126	69%	82%	15%		58%		524		17.8%		
2009	1129	66%	81%	15%		58%		657		17.1%		
2010	1138	70%	81%	15%		58%		673		16.5%		
2011	1147											
Benchmark*	979-1162 (25th & 75th %ile)	59%	79%	11%		60%	I	530				

Faculty				Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.	
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile		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		
2007	\$66,479	64		\$6,412	0%	\$17,669		377		
2008	\$68,599	62		\$6,492	1%	\$15,939		406		
2009	\$71,086	64		\$6,618	2%	\$17,521		430		
2010	\$71,572	61		\$6,908	4%			484		
2011	\$71,486	57		\$7,332	6%					
Benchmark*	\$73,916	85%			P	\$21,371				

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty	
2007	46%	16%	Met goal	515%	86%	1.1%	9.4%	8.5	8.0	
2008	56%	18%	Met goal	127%	75%	1.1%	11.6%	8.6	8.2	
2009	46%	15%	Met goal	91%	75%	1.2%	12.9%	8.7	7.9	
2010	47%	15%	Met goal	218%	67%	2.6%	15.2%	8.3	7.6	
2011			Met goal	220%	65%	3.0%			7.7	
Benchmark*	42%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5	

# Towson University

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

\* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	1 Average SAT +	2 6-year graduation rate* +	3 2nd year retention rate +	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs +		5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students) +	6 MD comm. college transfers +			
2007	1084	66%	83%	14%		62%	1630			
2008	1074	66%	82%	15%		64%	1729			
2009	1080	73%	84%	15%		57%	1889			
2010	<i>1087</i>	68%	84%	<i>16%</i>		65%	<i>2017</i>			
2011										
Benchmark*	934-1140 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	P	P	P	65%	I	1300	I	

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +
5.7%
4.9%
4.6%
4.4%

Faculty		
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgted. aver faculty salary %ile +
2007	\$68,735	75
2008	\$70,217	71
2009	\$71,895	70
2010	\$71,910	66
2011	\$71,097	62
Benchmark*	\$73,916	85%

Affordability			
Year	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg. +	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -
2007	\$7,234	1%	\$11,844
2008	\$7,314	1%	\$10,772
2009	\$7,418	1%	<i>\$13,245</i>
2010	\$7,656	3%	
2011	\$7,906	3%	
Benchmark*		P	\$19,585

Workforce Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM enrollment
866
931
1080
<i>1216</i>

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in semesters -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2007	40%	15%	Met goal	110%	71%	1.8%	7.3%	9.0	7.3
2008	40%	14%	Met goal	104%	73%	1.1%	7.6%	8.9	7.3
2009	36%	13%	Met goal	103%	67%	1.5%	7.1%	8.8	7.4
2010	<i>40%</i>	<i>14%</i>	Met goal	107%	67%	2.8%	7.7%	8.7	7.3
2011			Met goal	84%	65%	4.0%			7.7
Benchmark*	45%	11%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

University of Baltimore  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

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

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment							Alumni
	1-UB % of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt +	3 2nd year retention rate +	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs NC	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 +
2007	65%		38%		645	426	63%	NA
2008	75%	68%	37%		653	436	62%	NA
2009	74%	75%	41%		626	461	67%	NA
2010	85%	75%	45%	72%	664	455	66%	2.6%
2011	82%					465	73%	
Benchmark	75%	72%	29%			426	75%	

Year	Faculty		Affordability			Workforce Dvlp.
	2-UB Sponsored research \$ per F-T faculty (000s) +	3-UB % part-time faculty -	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 +
2007	\$61	55%	\$6,934	2%	NA	200
2008	\$54	53%	\$7,051	2%	NA	217
2009	\$39	55%	\$7,171	2%	NA	228
2010	NA	52%	\$7,330	2%	78%	250
2011	\$39	55%	\$7,494	2%	81%	
Benchmark*		49%		P	58%	\$20,325

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency		
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	7-UB % of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities +	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2007	38%	22%	Met goal	47%	0.5%	40%	7.0
2008	38%	23%	Did not meet goal	243%	2.3%	42%	7.5
2009	37%	23%	Met goal	48%	2.7%	42%	7.5
2010	40%	21%	Met goal	183%	0.6%	42%	7.6
2011			Met goal	105%	0.6%	42%	7.8
Benchmark*	40%	14%	B	100%	0.2% increase	7.5	B



# University of Maryland, Baltimore

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

\* 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-UMB		2-UMB		3-UMB		4-UMB		10-UMB		11-UMB		12-UMB	
	Passing rate on Bar (Law) exam	Passing rate on medical licensure exam	Passing rate on nursing licensure exam	Passing rate on dentistry licensure exam	Total headcount enrollment	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Nat. Amer. as % of total headcount enrollment	Graduate & 1st prof. as % of total hdct. enrollment							
2007	80%	95%	87%	99%	5,884	22%	86%							
2008	88%	96%	93%	97%	6,156	22%	86%							
2009	84%	95%	89%	98%	6,382	21%	87%							
2010	90%	96%	93%	98%	6,349	19%	88%							
2011	85%	96%	90%	100%	6,395	19%	89%							
Benchmark*	91%	96%	90%	NA	22,915	17%	40%							

### Faculty

### Economic Development

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	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
2007	15	11	2	\$410.0	\$225,897	14	\$355,948	
2008	15	13	3	\$446.2	\$300,750	13	\$343,047	26
2009	14	7	3	\$516.0	\$267,799	NA	NA	NA
2010	14	3	3	\$566.0	\$273,201	15	\$1,375,250	12
2011	14	3	4	\$557.0	\$313,668			
Benchmark*	Top 10	Top 10	Top 10		\$230,988	5% annually	5% annually	

### Stewardship

### Effectiveness & Efficiency

### Workforce Development

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 replacem. 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)	
2007	25%	9%	Met goal	100%	0.7%	3,776	532	115	103	
2008	23%	9%	Met goal	101%	0.8%	3,869	529	114	100	
2009	22%	8%	Did not meet goal	92%	0.9%	3,107	559	121	115	
2010	23%	9%	Met goal	112%	0.5%	3,038	635	114	117	
2011			Met goal		0.7%	2,830	627	147	128	
Benchmark*	28%	6%	B	100%	0.2% increase	3,625	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually	

University of Maryland, Baltimore County  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

*\* Measure used by U.S. News*

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

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										Alumni
	1 Average SAT	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 2nd year retention rate	4 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	5 % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	6 MD comm. college transfers	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate	
2007	1191	61%	83%	20%	73%	961	\$8,707	1%	60%	\$20,954	5.3%
2008	1190	59%	84%	21%	75%	1052	\$8,780	1%	61%	\$20,002	4.3%
2009	1184	59%	86%	21%	72%	1059	\$8,872	1%	65%	\$19,353	4.1%
2010	1206	57%	85%	21%	69%	1267	\$9,171	1%	68%		4.2%
2011							\$9,467	3%	74%		
Benchmark*	1014-1235 (25th & 75th %ile)	63%	83%	18%	73%	958		P	61%	\$20,278	

Year	Faculty			Economic Development				Workforce Dvlp.
	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	23 Awards per 100 FT faculty (5 yrs.)	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed	35 Upper division STEM enrollment
2007	\$80,224	79	5.1	\$163,337	5	\$107,352		2214
2008	\$85,381	77	4.5	\$168,267	9	\$72,927		2224
2009	\$88,620	79	3.8	\$189,401	NA	NA	1	2410
2010	\$88,303	72	2.8		9	\$63,162	4	2591
2011	\$88,335	65	2.0					
Benchmark*	\$84,124	85%	3.3	\$191,586	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 semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2007	33%	12%	Met goal	137%	63%	0.3%	11.9%	9.2	6.1
2008	36%	11%	Did not meet goal	103%	64%	0.4%	13.2%	9.1	6.3
2009	35%	11%	Met goal	80%	62%	0.5%	13.2%	9.2	6.5
2010	34%	11%	Met goal	97%	62%	0.2%	15.3%	8.8	6.5
2011			Met goal	140%	63%	0.3%			6.9
Benchmark*	32%	9%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		5.5

# University of Maryland, College Park

## Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

As of 1/9/12 *Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.*  
 \* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Year	Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										Alumni
	1 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	
2007	1263	80%	93%	19%	50%	1557	\$7,969	1%	61%	\$18,958	8.8%
2008	1268	82%	93%	19%	43%	1652	\$8,005	1%	61%	\$20,091	8.2%
2009	1285	82%	93%	19%	44%	1658	\$8,053	1%	63%	\$20,256	7.4%
2010	1287	82%	94%	19%	45%	1665	\$8,416	1%	65%		6.9%
2011							\$8,655	3%	70%		
Benchmark*	1200-1406 (25th & 75th %ile)	90%	96%	16%	Note 1	No specific goal		P	Note 2	\$18,709	

Year	Faculty			Economic Development				Workforce Dvlp.
	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	23 Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.)	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed	35 Upper division STEM enrollment
2007	\$100,958	86	5.4	\$292,837	24	\$1,171,967		4008
2008	\$105,497	93	5.5	\$297,339	23	\$1,554,532	12	4196
2009	\$110,239	91	4.6	\$296,300	NA	NA	NA	4560
2010	\$110,930	90	4.6		16	\$686,665	13	4819
2011	\$110,921	85	5.3					
Benchmark*	\$99,455	85%	6.2	\$307,002	NA	NA	P	

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in semesters	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2007	32%	6%	Met goal	102%	65%	1.6%	12.4%	8.7	5.9
2008	35%	8%	Met goal	103%	66%	2.0%	12.5%	8.6	5.8
2009	32%	7%	Met goal	87%	67%	1.5%	14.2%	8.4	5.7
2010	33%	7%	Met goal	97%	69%	2.1%	14.4%	8.4	5.8
2011			Met goal	94%	67%	1.5%			5.8
Benchmark*	35%	5%	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.

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore  
 Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

\* 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 +				
2007	818	37%	65%	83%	58%	48				
2008	828	38%	65%	83%	62%	97				
2009	847	32%	67%	84%	57%	92				
2010	879	32%	67%	80%	53%	73				
2011										
Benchmark*	784-959 (25th & 75th %ile)	39% <b>P</b>	71% <b>P</b>	85% P	62% I	53 <b>I</b>				

Alumni
10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +
8%
7%
5%
7%

Faculty	
21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +
2007	\$64,575
2008	\$68,418
2009	\$70,805
2010	\$71,201
2011	\$70,572
Benchmark*	\$73,916 <b>P</b>

Affordability		
7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginni % chg.)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -
\$5,988	2%	\$16,210
\$6,042	2%	\$18,190
\$6,082	2%	\$19,655
\$6,305	2%	
\$6,482	3%	
	P	\$22,088 <b>P</b>

Economic Dvlp	Workforce Dvlp
31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty +	35 Upper division enrollment enrollment +
\$20,476	294
\$50,944	328
\$67,604	342
	394
\$49,005 <b>P</b>	

Stewardship			
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 +
31%	13%	Met goal	60%
41%	13%	Met goal	283%
34%	11%	Met goal	171%
36%	12%	Met goal	119%
		Met goal	232%
Benchmark*	31% <b>P</b>	13% <b>P</b>	100% <b>I</b>

Effectiveness & Efficiency				
51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in semesters -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
68%	0.5%	5.7%	9.0	7.9
66%	0.6%	4.9%	8.8	7.6
73%	0.7%	5.2%	8.7	7.9
73%	0.6%	6.9%	8.6	9.3
71%	0.6%			8.1
Benchmark*	66% <b>N</b>	0.2% increase <b>B</b>	10.0% <b>B</b>	7.5 <b>B</b>

University of Maryland University College  
Dashboard Indicators, January 2012

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

As of 1/9/12

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment												
Stateside											Worldwide	
Year	1-UMUC Total undergraduate headcount enrollment +	4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs +	2-UMUC African-Amer. as % of total UGs +	3-UMUC % of students who are economically disadvantaged +	4-UMUC % of students who are 25 years of age or older NC	6 MD comm. coll. transfers +	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses +	7-UMUC Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled) +				
2007	21,853	35%	29%	37%	81%	2745	688	177,516				
2008	22,308	36%	30%	38%	82%	2118	782	189,505				
2009	24,284	38%	31%	38%	82%	2301	752	196,331				
2010	25,693	40%	32%	40%	86%	2750	813	222,268				
2011	28,119	41%	33%	41%	86%	2750	836	234,243				
Benchmark*	>22300	34%		Maintain or increase	≥80%	≥2800	Maintain or increase	≥175,000				

Affordability				Economic Dvlp.			Workforce Development			Alumni	
Year	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg. +	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +				Worldwide	Stateside		10 Average (2-yr.) alumni giving rate +		
			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 +						
2007	\$5,640 <1%	33%	251,800	1,552	2424				2.1%		
2008	\$5,640 <1%	28%	251,111	1,845	2937				1.8%		
2009	\$5,820 3%	27%	253,271	1,813	3250				1.8%		
2010	\$6,078 4%	40%	282,627	2,064	3550				2.3%		
2011	\$6,246 3%	61%	296,492	2,532							
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 +		
2007	33%	19%	Met goal	59%	3%		
2008	33%	16%	Met goal	87%	2%		
2009	32%	16%	Met goal	171%	2%		
2010	30%	16%	Met goal	54%	2%		
2011			Met goal	96%	2%		
Benchmark*	43%	13%	B	100%	2%		

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

As of 1/9/12

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


National Eminence/Quality					
Year	Students		Faculty		
	1-UMCES Average GRE score of incoming students directed by UMCES faculty		2-UMCES Number of peer reviewed publications by UMCES faculty	3-UMCES Number of citations per peer reviewed publication	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty
2007	1224		145	28.5	\$573,521
2008	1189		147	29.3	\$596,412
2009	1230		185	31.4	\$291,399
2010	1184		177	32.3	
2011	1199		190	34.0	
Benchmark*		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)
	2007	197	524	10,500
2008	179	455	11,000	\$40,556
2009	191	450	11,000	\$41,670
2010	181	420	11,000	
2011	185	420	11,000	
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I

Stewardship		
Year	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved
	2007	Met goal
2008	Met goal	21%
2009	Met goal	36%
2010	Met goal	98%
2011	Met goal	
Benchmark*	B	100%


Effectiveness & Efficiency	
Year	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value
	2007
2008	0.6%
2009	0.8%
2010	0.2%
2011	0.2%
Benchmark*	0.2% increase

IMPROVEMENT – a comparison with past performance

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

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

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

If currently at or above the benchmark:  Green

If currently below the benchmark:  Red

## DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS, JANUARY 2012

### USM

#### CORE INDICATORS

<b>Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment</b>				
<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 <sup>st</sup> -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 <sup>st</sup> -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 <sup>st</sup> -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



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

<b>Economic &amp; Workforce Development</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b><u>Indicator</u></b>	<b><u>What it measures</u></b>	<b><u>Calculation</u></b>	<b><u>Source of data</u></b>
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

<b>Stewardship</b>				
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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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
<b>Effectiveness &amp; Efficiency</b>				
51	Classroom utilization rate	Classroom use	Use of general purpose classrooms as % of total available classrooms during a 45-hour week (8-5, M-F). Classrooms include only lecture type classrooms that are owned and operated (scheduled) by the institution. It does not include classrooms that are managed by individual departments. One-time events are generally not reflected in the utilization rate.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Programs

52	Facilities renewal as percent of replacement value	Expenditures on facilities renewal, enabling evaluation of success in meeting BOR's goal of 2%	Sum of operating facilities renewal & capital facilities renewal as % of replacement value	USM, Admin. & Finance, Capital Planning
53	Percentage of undergraduate credits generated by non-traditional methods	Success in achieving BOR's policy	Sum of credits earned in non-traditional methods each year by undergraduates divided by total hours earned by <i>undergraduates</i> ( <i>Non-traditional method defined separately for each institution for 2006 report only. See separate listings below.</i> )	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research
54	Time to Degree	Success in shortening the overall time to degree	The average of time to degree of all students completing a degree within a 7 year time horizon.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research, MHEC EIS and DIS
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	Success in achieving BOR policy of increasing teaching workload	Number of courses divided by number of FTE core instructional faculty, both tenure-track & non-tenure track	USM, Admin. & Finance, "Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty," Table 4
<b>External Fiscal</b>				
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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey

## SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS

<b>Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>What it measures</b>	<b>Calculation</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
S2	6-year graduation rate	Relative quality of new 1 <sup>st</sup> -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 <sup>st</sup> -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
<b>Faculty</b>				
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
<b>Economic &amp; Workforce Development</b>				
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
<b>Stewardship</b>				
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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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 <sup>st</sup> professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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



<b>Effectiveness &amp; Efficiency</b>				
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**

<b><u>#</u></b>	<b><u>Indicator</u></b>	<b><u>What it measures</u></b>	<b><u>Calculation</u></b>	<b><u>Source of data</u></b>
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, <a href="#"><u>Statistical Abstract of the United States</u></a>
E2	Doctoral scientists, engineers & health professionals employed in Maryland	Importance of advanced degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, <a href="#"><u>Science &amp; Engineering State Profiles, 2009</u></a>
E4	Science & engineering doctorates awarded	Production of science & engineering doctorates by Maryland's universities	Self-explanatory	NSF, <a href="#"><u>Science &amp; Engineering State Profiles, 2009</u></a>

#	<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, <a href="#">Science &amp; Engineering State Profiles</a>
E8	Academic R&D expenditures in science & engineering	Amount of research expenditures by Maryland's universities, public and private	Expenditures for R&D from all sources: federal, state & local govt., industry, institutional funds, & other sources	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures
E12	High-tech workers per 1,000 private sector workers	How well Maryland is adapting to high-tech economy	Number of workers in high-tech manufacturing & services per 1,000 workers in the entire private sector. High-tech industries are defined by 49 NAICS* codes and do not include biotech.	American Electronics Association, <a href="#">Cyberstates 2011</a> ,
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	American Electronics Association, <a href="#">Cyberstates 2012</a> ,

#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E15	High-tech establishments added in past year	Importance of high-tech in contributing to Maryland's economic development	An economic unit is usually a location engaged in one type of economic activity for which a single industrial classification may be employed. An economic unit is not a "company," which in fact often has multiple establishments.	American Electronics Association, <a href="#">Cyberstates 2011</a> ,
E16	Venture capital investments	Third-party validation of the importance of high-tech ventures in Maryland's economy	Total venture capital investments for all high-tech industry sectors	American Electronics Association, <a href="#">Cyberstates 2007</a> , Appendix C.10
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; <a href="#">Chronicle of Higher Education</a>
E21	Skip			
E22	University R&D expenditures in life sciences	Importance of R&D in the life sciences within Maryland's economy (all universities)	Self-explanatory	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures, FY 2005, Table 26
E23	Current population estimates	For comparison purposes	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau
E24	New Economy Index: Overall ranking	How well Maryland is competing in the new, knowledge-based economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on a series of measures relative to the new economy	Kauffman Foundation & Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, <a href="#">The 2007 State New Economy Index, 2007</a> .
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

<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>What it measures</b>	<b>Calculation</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
E26	New Economy Index: Globalization	Degree of integration into the world economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on three related measures	Same as above
E27	New Economy Index: Economic dynamism	Vitality of the state's economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E28	New Economy Index: Digital economy	Degree to which business and economic transactions are conducted through digital electronic means	Based upon relative standing among the states on six related measures	Same as above
E29	New Economy Index: Innovation capacity	How efficiently capital is put to use	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E30	% of Maryland residents with advanced degrees or more	Importance of graduate and professional degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau, <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States</u>

\* North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

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

## DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS

### SPECIFIC USM INSTITUTIONS

<b>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
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

<b>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
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 all levels)
12-UMB	Graduate & 1 <sup>st</sup> 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

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

<b>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Stateside/Worldwide</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
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

<b>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
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

**PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2011**

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

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

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

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

**PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2011**

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

**U. of Baltimore**

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

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

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

**U. of Maryland, Baltimore County**

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

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

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



**PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2011**

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

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