

**TOPIC:** 2017 USM Dashboard Indicators

**COMMITTEE:** Finance

**DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING:** June 8, 2017

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

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

- Financial Aid,
- Facilities Use,
- Fund Balance Goals and,
- Workforce Development.

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

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

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

---

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

DATE:

---

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

---

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

---



# UNIVERSITY SYSTEM *of* MARYLAND

## Dashboard Indicators 2017

Board of Regents  
Committee on Finance  
June 8, 2017

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

## 2017 USM Dashboard Indicators

### Key Indicators

The 2017 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.

#### Access, Affordability and Attainment Indicators

- **Institutional Financial Aid** – Institutional financial aid awarded to undergraduates reached record levels of nearly 145 million dollars. This represents institutional aid which is the equivalent of more than 17% of all undergraduate tuition revenue and equals the highest level since USM began tracking this figure (*System indicators 12 and 13*).
- **Recipients of Financial aid** – Although the percentage of those receiving some kind of aid remained relatively steady in FY 2016, 9 of 10 institutions awarded aid to a higher percentage of their students than did peer institutions. This suggests that the institutions are successfully reaching higher percentages of students needing financial aid to succeed (*Institutional indicator 8*).

#### Facilities Indicators

- **Facilities Renewal** – For the first time in three years, two USM institutions were able to meet the Board of Regents’ policy goal for facilities renewal at two percent of replacement, and three others exceeded one percent of replacement. Six institutions were able to maintain or improve their performance although in some cases well below the level indicated by the policy. Despite this mild improvement, facilities renewal remains a serious concern on most campuses (*Institutional indicator 52*).
- **Non-traditional Credit Activity** – More than 15% of all credits awarded to undergraduates in FY 2016 were delivered via a modality other than face-to-face instruction. This substantially exceeds the Regent’s target of 10%. This measure was originally established by the Board to measure the use of these non-traditional methods to more efficiently use facilities to support greater numbers of students (*Institutional indicator 53*).

#### Fiscal Indicators

- **Fund Balance** – For the second year in a row, all 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. (*Institutional indicator 43*)

#### 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 2015 to Fall 2016 this figure rose by nearly 2,500 students. This reflects a new surge in growth in this indicator after some slowing from Fall 2014 to 2015. This will likely translate into greater growth in STEM degrees over the next two to three years (*System indicator 35 & Institutional indicator 35*).

# Summary of 2017 Core Dashboard Indicators

As of 5/25/17

*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	1305	1217		868	862	942	1150	1080		921			
2	6-year graduation rate	86%	63%		41%	18%	51%	67%	70%		33%			65%
3	2nd-year retention rate	95%	87%		72%	66%	76%	81%	86%	72%	70%			74%
4	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	22%	23%		89%	84%	36%	18%	24%	53%	76%	44%		34%
5	% of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	49%	61%		45%	39%	65%	68%	74%	64%	39%			
6	MD community college transfers	1911	1380		227	267	525	726	2311	655	114	3131		11544
7	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$10,182	\$11,264		\$7,880	\$6,448	\$8,702	\$9,364	\$9,408	\$8,596	\$7,804	\$7,266		\$9,606
8	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	66%	70%		86%	85%	80%	76%	71%	85%	85%	42%		
9	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$26,818	\$26,534		NA	NA	\$25,463	\$25,376	\$25,785	\$17,032	\$21,000			
10	Average alumni giving rate	6.6%	3.7%		5.5%	3.9%	5.0%	6.7%	5.1%	4.7%	2.9%	1.7%		
21	Average faculty salary	\$124,155	\$97,492		\$78,882	\$75,843	\$77,035	\$80,756	\$80,786		\$84,202			
22	Faculty salary %ile	86	69		70	62	50	62	66		82			75
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	4.4	3.1											
24	Student to faculty ratio (X FTE students per 1 FTE faculty)	17	19	7	16	13	16	16	17	15	15			
31	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$329,693	\$164,116	\$224,977*							\$52,655			
32	U.S. Patents issued	37	7	30										74
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$836,035	\$124,645	\$1,341,140										
34	Licenses & options executed	22	4	34										60
35	Upper division STEM enrollment	7200	3793		309	114	481	628	1732	275	355	8290		23177
38	Number of start-up companies	62	8	13			6	24	0	0	0	1		114
41	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	33%	34%	25%	41%	34%	40%	47%	40%	41%	39%	27%		
42	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	8%	11%	9%	20%	24%	15%	14%	14%	21%	13%	20%		
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	105%	107%	71%	88%	121%	91%	172%	87%	98%	116%	67%	99%	
51	Classroom utilization rate	70%	59%		65%	71%	56%	65%	60%	52%	67%			64%
52	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	1.5%	0.5%	1.2%	2.1%	2.1%	0.5%	0.2%		0.4%	1.0%
53	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	22.5%	11.0%		13.9%	20.9%	17.6%	15.0%	7.0%		16.0%			15.6%
54	Time to degree (Years)	3.9	4.4		4.7	5.9	3.7	4.0	4.0		4.8			4.1
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.5	7.0		8.0	9.0	7.2	7.3	7.1	6.7	8.2			

\*Includes only medical school faculty

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?\*

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 5/25/17

	#	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 (Years)	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●		

Improved/Same

Worse

21

23

8

14

12

18

15

15

7

14

4

2

6

4

3

5

7

4

7

7

8

7

5

1

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

Q:\Dashboard Indicators\2016\Data

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better      ● Worse

As of 5/25/17

	#	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 (Years)												
	55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Meets benchmark			12	10	3	5	8	8	13	10	3	11	3	1
Does not meet benchmark			4	8	5	10	7	9	4	7	6	6	3	1

University System of Maryland  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

As of 5/25/17

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
Year	S2 6-year graduation rate	S3 Average (3-yr.) 2nd year retention rate	S4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	S6 MD comm. college transfers	S7 Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) chg.	S11 % of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)	S12 Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue	S13 Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)		
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	65%	74%	34%	11603	\$9,389	6%	45.9%	17%	\$141.0	
2016				11544	\$9,606	2%	47.4%	17%	\$144.7	
Benchmark	59%	75%	25%							

  

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	S38 Number of start-up companies	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)
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	89	58	141	20717		1,459	\$29,549	72%
2016	\$118,385	\$80,799	75	74	60	114	23177				72%
Benchmark	\$106,377	\$79,802	85%							\$30,412	100%

  

Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	S41 State appropriations per FTE student	S42 System Office admin as % of System's total operating expend.	S43 Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	S44 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	S45 Credit rating (Moody's)	S46 % of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	S47 Total funds raised (annual) (000s)	S51 Classroom utilization rate	S52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	S53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	S54 Time to Degree
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	12.5%	\$256,528	65%	1.1%	16.9%	4.2
2015	\$9,063	0.4%	74%*	Met goal	Stable	14.2%	\$335,074	64%	0.9%		4.1
2016			82%	Met goal	Stable	16.3%	\$276,594		1.0%	15.6%	
Benchmark	\$7,501	Rank 27 of 29						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%
2017	86%	138%	85%	74%	68%	63%	71%	61%	80%	78%	26%

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
2015	\$17,118	\$25,800	\$17,811	\$14,026	\$14,918	\$18,108	\$73,671	\$27,319	\$42,972	\$24,293	\$15,550
Benchmark	\$19,927	\$19,610	\$17,817	\$20,255	\$16,785	\$18,472	\$58,385	\$29,641	\$62,178	\$20,843	\$10,548

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
2015	\$8,651	\$16,869	\$7,725	\$5,571	\$5,359	\$5,696	\$19,007	\$9,096	\$13,520	\$9,512	\$1,793
Benchmark	\$8,735	\$9,079	\$6,801	\$7,902	\$5,498	\$6,615	\$9,079	\$9,811	\$9,347	\$8,912	\$1,523



University System of Maryland  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

As of 5/25/17

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

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) +
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%	<i>32,600</i>	1,124		6.7%	7.40%		5,928,814
2014	38.2%	17.5%		<i>1,066</i>	\$55,478	5.8%	<i>7.40%</i>	\$101,849	5,976,407
2015	38.8%	17.7%			\$56,502	5.2%		<i>\$104,659</i>	6,006,401
2016					<i>\$58,149</i>	<i>4.2%</i>			<i>6,016,447</i>
Benchmark	30.6%	11.6%	5th (MD's rank)	11th (MD's rank)	7th (MD's rank)	4.6%	3rd (MD's rank)	11th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)

R&D		
Year	E8 Academic R&D expenditures in science & engin. (millions) +	E22 University R&D expenditures in life sciences (millions) +
2011	\$3,367	\$1,524
2012	\$3,308	
2013	\$3,376	\$1,557
2014	\$3,515	\$1,622
2015	\$3,705	<i>\$1,737</i>
2016		
Benchmark		

Economic Development			
Year	E7 SBIR awards (\$ millions) +	E16 Venture capital disbursed per \$1,000 of Gross Domestic Product (\$) +	E15 High-tech establishments as % of business establishments +
2011	265	\$1.36	11.74%
2012		\$1.23	<i>11.87%</i>
2013	245	\$1.91	
2014	<i>234</i>	<i>\$1.04</i>	
2015			
2016			
Benchmark	4th (MD's rank)	16th (MD's rank)	4th (MD's rank)

Support of Higher Education			
Year	E17 St. gen. funds for higher educ. per \$1,000 of personal income (FY) +	E18 State gen. funds for higher educ. per capita +	E19 State gen. funds for higher educ. per headcount student +
2011	\$5.65	\$280.05	\$4,447
2012			\$4,453
2013	\$5.39	\$274.25	\$4,074
2014	\$5.58	\$306.81	\$4,838
2015	\$5.60	\$302.57	
2016	<i>\$5.41</i>	<i>\$303.26</i>	<i>\$4,946</i>
Benchmark	29th (MD's rank)	14th (MD's rank)	13th (MD's rank)