



# 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

Q:\Dashboard Indicators\2016\Data

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.

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)



Bowie State University  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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 Average (3-yr.) 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 Alumni giving rate
2011	899	41%	72%	94%	54%	315					4.0%
2012	890	35%	72%	92%	52%	315					4.8%
2013	881	35%	72%	92%	54%	353					5.9%
2014	874	33%	72%	90%	57%	310					5.7%
2015	868	41%	72%	89%	60%	419					5.5%
2016					45%	227					
Benchmark*	854-1033 (25th & 75th %ile)	48%	75%	51%	45%	500	P	I			I
Faculty						Affordability					Workforce Dvlp.
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver. faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation					35 Upper division STEM enrollment
2011	\$69,754	66	16	\$6,347	83%	\$24,291					263
2012	\$69,364	60	16	\$6,639	81%	\$25,972					271
2013	\$69,115	53	16	\$6,971	82%	\$27,833					280
2014	\$73,818	69	16	\$7,299	86%	\$30,300					319
2015	\$75,770	71	16	\$7,657	86%	NA					294
2016	\$78,882	70		\$7,880	86%						309
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	17.1		68%	\$26,251	P				
Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency						
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacment. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in years	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty		
2011	39%	21%	Met goal	70%	67%	1.3%	10.7%	5.0	8.3		
2012	38%	17%	Met goal	76%	65%	4.0%	11.1%	4.6	7.7		
2013	40%	18%	Met goal	138%	66%	4.6%	13.5%	4.7	8.0		
2014	38%	18%	Met goal	89%	65%	3.0%	12.7%	4.9	7.8		
2015	41%	20%	Met goal	113%	64%	1.6%		4.8	7.3		
2016			Met goal	88%	65%	1.5%	13.9%	4.7	8.0		
Benchmark*	44%	15%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5			

Coppin State University  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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 Average (3-yr.) 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			
2011	882	15%	63%	88%	35%	209			
2012	877	17%	64%	86%	36%	236			
2013	890	14%	64%	85%	39%	238			
2014	895	18%	65%	85%	43%	256			
2015	862	18%	66%	84%	39%	186			
2016					39%	267			
Benchmark*	870-1054 (25th & 75th %ile)	51%	76%	50%	53%	225			

Alumni
10 Alumni giving rate
7.1%
6.3%
11.0%
9.6%
3.9%

Faculty					Affordability				
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			
2011	\$66,449	54	16	\$5,491	2%	91%	NA		
2012	\$67,399	56	14	\$5,720	4%	83%	NA		
2013	\$67,647	55	14	\$6,252	9%	86%	NA		
2014	\$72,201	68	14	\$6,132	-2%	88%	NA		
2015	\$73,809	67	13	\$6,362	4%	92%	NA		
2016	\$75,843	62		\$6,448	1%	85%	114		
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	19.2		P	82%	\$22,053		

Workforce Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM Enrollment
95
97
99
111
120
114

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in years	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2011	38%	26%	Did not meet goal	72%	69%	0.4%	9.5%	5.3	9.0
2012	33%	22%	Did not meet goal	139%	67%	0.3%	13.0%	5.0	9.0
2013	35%	23%	Met goal	115%	69%	0.4%	13.9%	4.8	9.0
2014	35%	25%	Met goal	92%	NA	0.2%	16.3%	5.8	8.5
2015	34%	24%	Met goal	103%	NA	0.2%		5.8	8.1
2016			Met goal	121%	71%	0.5%	20.9%	5.9	9.0
Benchmark*	40%	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	B

# Frostburg State University

## Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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 Average (3-yr.) 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					
2011	985	46%	72%	28%	62%	386					
2012	980	44%	72%	29%	62%	379					
2013	985	47%	73%	29%	62%	412					
2014	969	49%	75%	34%	62%	476					
2015	942	51%	76%	36%	66%	564					
2016					65%	525					
Benchmark*	868-1066	53%	77%	27%	73%	282					

Alumni
10 Alumni giving rate
5.4%
5.4%
4.7%
4.7%
5.0%

Faculty						Affordability			
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			
2011	\$71,368	49	16	\$7,128	3%	\$22,429			
2012	\$69,914	43	16	\$7,436	4%	\$20,736			
2013	\$69,213	39	15	\$7,728	4%	\$20,058			
2014	\$74,693	52	15	\$7,982	3%	\$24,916			
2015	\$76,281	57	16	\$8,488	6%	\$25,463			
2016	\$77,035	50		\$8,702	3%	80%			
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	18.3		P	\$28,367			

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies
416	NA
432	1
423	3
445	4
399	3
481	6

Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency				
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	51 Classroom utilization rate	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	54 Time to degree in years	55 Tchng. workload courses per FTE faculty
2011	39%	16%	Met goal	145%	60%	2.4%	13.7%	4.6	7.5
2012	40%	16%	Did not meet goal	71%	62%	1.0%	14.9%	4.6	7.4
2013	40%	17%	Did not meet goal	92%	60%	1.2%	16.7%	4.5	7.4
2014	38%	15%	Did not meet goal	118%	55%	0.6%	21.6%	4.3	7.3
2015	40%	15%	Met goal	109%	55%	0.4%		3.7	7.4
2016			Met goal	91%	56%	1.2%	17.6%	3.7	7.2
Benchmark*	41%	13%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

Salisbury University  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										
	1	2	3	4	5	6				
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate	Average (3-yr.) 2nd year retention rate	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	% of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers				
Year	+	+	+	+	+	+				
2011	1155	67%	81%	15%	57%	824				
2012	1160	67%	83%	16%	57%	736				
2013	1156	67%	82%	16%	58%	915				
2014	1160	66%	82%	17%	60%	730				
2015	<i>1150</i>	67%	<i>81%</i>	<i>18%</i>	64%	847				
2016					68%	726				
Benchmark*	939-1128	61%	80%	22%	60%	530				

(25th & 75th %ile)

Alumni
10
Alumni giving rate
+

15.3%
15.0%
7.3%
6.4%
6.7%

Faculty				Affordability					
	21	22	24	7	8	9			
	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Student to Faculty Ratio	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			
Year	+	+		% chg.	+	-			
2011	\$71,486	57	17	\$7,332	6%	\$20,693			
2012	\$71,437	53	17	\$7,700	5%	\$23,159			
2013	\$72,039	51	16	\$8,128	6%	\$23,545			
2014	\$77,848	69	16	\$8,560	5%	\$24,567			
2015	\$79,589	70	16	\$9,086	6%	\$25,376			
2016	\$80,756	62		\$9,364	3%				
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	16.5		P	\$29,257			

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35	38
Upper division STEM enrollment	Number of start-up companies
+	+

536	NA
578	11
612	5
658	3
641	15
628	24

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
	41	42	43	44	51	52	53	54	55
	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved	Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	Time to degree in years	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
Year	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
2011	47%	14%	Met goal	220%	65%	3.0%	14.9%	4.1	7.7
2012	45%	14%	Met goal	92%	67%	3.7%	16.0%	4.3	7.8
2013	47%	14%	Met goal	295%	68%	2.6%	17.0%	4.3	7.4
2014	45%	14%	Met goal	146%	68%	1.2%	17.9%	3.9	7.3
2015	47%	14%	Met goal	103%	68%	1.7%		4.0	7.1
2016			Met goal	172%	65%	2.1%	15.0%	4.0	7.3
Benchmark*	45%	15%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	B

Towson University  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

As of 5/25/17

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

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment											
Year	1 Average SAT +	2 6-year graduation rate +	3 Average (3-yr.) 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 +					
2011	1087	64%	84%	18%	70%	2420					
2012	1088	66%	85%	19%	70%	2430					
2013	1084	65%	85%	21%	62%	2848					
2014	1087	68%	86%	22%	61%	2142					
2015	1080	70%	86%	24%	67%	1937					
2016					74%	2311					
Benchmark*	982-1167 (25th & 75th %ile)	63%	83%	19%	65%	1300	P	P	P	I	I

Alumni
10 Alumni giving rate +
4.2%
3.9%
4.3%
3.8%
5.1%

Faculty			Affordability					
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgt'd. aver faculty salary %ile +	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) %	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -		
2011	\$71,097	62	17	\$7,906	3%	\$22,072		
2012	\$72,400	60	17	\$8,132	3%	\$23,812		
2013	\$72,444	59	17	\$8,342	3%	NA		
2014	\$78,288	73	17	\$8,590	3%	\$25,936		
2015	\$79,751	73	17	\$9,182	7%	\$25,785		
2016	\$80,786	66		\$9,408	2%			
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	18.8		P	\$29,593	P	

Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
35 Upper division STEM enrollment	38 Number of start-up companies +
1258	NA
1390	2
1461	1
1530	0
1672	0
1732	0

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2011	41%	14%	Met goal	84%	65%	4.0%	8.7%	4.5	7.7
2012	40%	13%	Met goal	78%	65%	3.0%	8.3%	4.4	7.4
2013	42%	14%	Met goal	112%	67%	3.0%	8.7%	4.3	7.3
2014	38%	14%	Met goal	116%	65%	2.3%	11.1%	4.1	7.2
2015	40%	14%	Met goal	99%	63%	1.4%		4.0	7.1
2016			Met goal	87%	60%	2.1%	7.0%	4.0	7.1
Benchmark*	47%	12%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	7.5	B

University of Baltimore  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

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

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment										Alumni	
Year	1-UB % of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt +	3 Average (3-yr.) 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 Alumni giving rate +			
2011	82%	78%	47%	71%	625	465	73%	3.9%			
2012	80%	75%	50%	71%	654	514	74%	5.6%			
2013	84%	72%	51%	75%	690	604	75%	5.6%			
2014	83%	73%	53%	70%	630	635	70%	5.0%			
2015	80%	72%	53%	67%	651	676	78%	4.7%			
2016	66%			64%	655	716	66%				
Benchmark	75%		46%			426	75%				

Faculty				Affordability				Workforce Dvlp.	Economic Dvlp.
Year	2-UB Sponsored research \$ per F-T faculty (000s) +	3-UB % part-time faculty -	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg. +	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -	35 Upper division STEM enrollment +	38 Number of start-up companies +	
2011	\$39	55%	20	\$7,494 2%	81%	NA	278	NA	
2012	\$33	54%	19	\$7,664 2%	87%	NA	287	8	
2013	\$35	54%	16	\$7,838 2%	86%	NA	289	9	
2014	\$37	52%	15	\$8,018 2%	86%	\$23,627	286	0	
2015	\$38	52%	15	\$8,326 4%	86%	\$17,032	287	1	
2016		53%		\$8,596 3%	85%		275	0	
Benchmark*		49%	17.7	P	58%	\$23,996			

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 replacem. value +	7-UB % of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities +	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2011	38%	23%	Met goal	105%	54%	0.6%	42%	7.8
2012	40%	23%	Met goal	131%	55%	0.7%	44%	6.5
2013	39%	23%	Met goal	304%	48%	1.0%	44%	6.4
2014	40%	21%	Did not meet goal	111%	52%	0.6%	44%	7.3
2015	41%	21%	Met goal	107%		1.4%	45%	6.9
2016			Met goal	98%		0.5%	49%	6.7
Benchmark*	45%	14%	B	100%		0.2% increase	7.5	B

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

Q:\Dashboard Indicators\2016\Data

University of Maryland, Baltimore  
 Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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							10-UMB Total headcount enrollment.	11-UMB Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Nat. Amer. as % of total headcount enrollment	12-UMB Graduate & 1st prof. as % of total hdct. enrollment	Economic Dvlp. 38 Number of start-up companies
	1-UMB Passing rate on Bar (Law) exam	2-UMB Passing rate on medical licensure exam	3-UMB Passing rate on nursing licensure exam	4-UMB Passing rate on dentistry licensure exam	5-UMB Passing rate on nursing licensure exam	6-UMB Passing rate on dentistry licensure exam	7-UMB Passing rate on nursing licensure exam				
2011	85%	96%	90%	100%	6,395	19%	89%		NA		
2012	86%	99%	88%	97%	6,368	19%	87%		10		
2013	88%	99%	93%	96%	6,284	19%	89%		8		
2014	81%	97%	97%	99%	6,276	20%	87%		15		
2015	83%	96%	90%	94%	6,329	22%	86%		15		
2016	78%	96%	93%	98%	6,482	24%	86%		13		
Benchmark*	93%	96%	93%	NA	22,915	17%	40%				

Year	Faculty				Economic Development				
	5-UMB Natl. ranking NIH awards to public medical schls.	6-UMB Natl. ranking: NIH awards to public & priv. dental schls.	7-UMB No. of specialty law programs ranked in top 10 nationally	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	13-UMB Grant & contract awards (millions)	14-UMB Total R&D expenditures in medicine per F-T medical faculty	32 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	34 Licenses & options executed
2011	13	3	4	8	\$557	\$254,028	30	\$385,815	14
2012	13	6	3	6	\$525	\$255,727	30	\$955,703	21
2013	14	5	3	6	\$479	\$249,379	25	\$835,817	23
2014	15	6	2	7	\$499	\$245,876	28	\$1,120,101	30
2015	16	11	2	7	\$498	\$226,765	33	\$1,215,991	39
2016	17	9	2	7	\$494	\$224,977	30	\$1,341,140	34
Benchmark*	Top 10	Top 10	Top 10	16.3		\$268,353	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency			Workforce Development		
	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	16-UMB Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	17-UMB Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	18-UMB Number of dentistry grads (DDS)		
2011	22%	8%	Met goal	112%	0.7%	627	147	128		
2012	24%	9%	Met goal	100%	0.6%	646	156	123		
2013	25%	9%	Met goal	129%	0.9%	632	163	127		
2014	25%	9%	Met goal	66%	0.8%	614	153	128		
2015	25%	9%	Met goal	96%	0.5%	666	164	127		
2016	25%	9%	Met goal	71%	0.6%	636	152	124		
Benchmark*	34%	9%	B	100%	0.2% increase	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually		

University of Maryland, Baltimore County  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment											Alumni	
Year	1 Average SAT +	2 6-year graduation rate +	3 Average (3-yr.) 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 Alumni giving rate +		
2011	1223	57%	85%	21%	66%	1402	\$9,467	3%	74%	\$20,902	4.1%	
2012	1218	61%	85%	22%	66%	1368	\$9,764	3%	68%	\$22,601	3.7%	
2013	1214	65%	86%	22%	67%	1418	\$10,068	3%	70%	\$22,755	3.7%	
2014	1210	61%	87%	22%	64%	1351	\$10,384	3%	70%	\$25,831	3.6%	
2015	1217	63%	87%	23%	63%	1350	\$11,006	6%	69%	\$26,534	3.7%	
2016					61%	1380	\$11,264	2%	70%			
Benchmark*	1099-1290 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	P	P	P	I		P		P		

Faculty				Economic Development					Workforce Dvlp	
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +	23 Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.) +	24 Student to Faculty Ratio +	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty +	32 U.S. Patents issued +	33 Adjusted gross license income received +	34 Licenses & options executed +	38 Number of start-up companies +	35 Upper division STEM enrollment +
2011	\$88,335	65	2.0	20	\$210,519	9	\$196,921	1	NA	2783
2012	\$87,769	58	2.1	19	\$168,277	10	\$182,626	4	4	3048
2013	\$87,894	56	2.8	20	\$157,612	5	\$191,721	1	10	3284
2014	\$94,379	75	2.5	19	\$160,823	7	\$284,153	1	4	3582
2015	\$96,271	73	2.9	19	\$164,116	12	\$180,366	2	8	3745
2016	\$97,492	69	3.1			7	\$124,645	4	8	3793
Benchmark*	\$93,515	85%		17.3	\$195,769	NA	NA			

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2011	34%	9%	Met goal	140%	63%	0.3%	15.1%	4.6	6.9
2012	35%	9%	Met goal	119%	62%	0.2%	17.1%	4.5	6.9
2013	34%	11%	Met goal	238%	60%	0.6%	18.4%	4.3	6.9
2014	34%	11%	Met goal	84%	65%	0.7%	18.3%	4.5	6.9
2015	34%	11%	Met goal	199%	62%	0.8%		4.3	7.2
2016			Met goal	107%	59%	0.6%	11.0%	4.4	7.0
Benchmark*	39%	11%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		5.5



University of Maryland, College Park  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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 Average (3-yr.) 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 Alumni giving rate +		
2011	1290	82%	94%	20%	46%	1679	\$8,655	3%	70%	\$24,180	6.5%	
2012	1299	82%	95%	20%	46%	1695	\$8,908	3%	66%	\$25,276	6.3%	
2013	1305	84%	95%	21%	47%	1930	\$9,161	3%	66%	\$25,254	5.8%	
2014	1306	85%	95%	22%	49%	2234	\$9,427	3%	66%	\$25,131	6.6%	
2015	<i>1305</i>	86%	95%	22%	47%	2142	\$9,996	6%	67%	\$26,818	6.6%	
2016					49%	1911	\$10,182	2%	66%			
Benchmark*	1191-1405 (25th & 75th %ile)	86%	94%	14%	Note 1	No specific goal		P	Note 2	\$24,566		

Faculty				Economic Development						Workforce Dvlp.	
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +	23 Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.) +	24 Student to Faculty Ratio +	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty +	32 U.S. Patents issued +	33 Adjusted gross license income received +	34 Licenses & options executed +	38 Number of start-up companies +	35 Upper division STEM enrollment +	
2011	\$110,921	85	5.3	18	\$359,051	38	\$716,873	14	NA	5256	
2012	\$112,050	83	4.7	18	\$358,316	27	\$662,148	13	11	5580	
2013	\$113,372	84	4.6	18	\$348,602	38	\$575,485	18	29	5846	
2014	\$122,160	94	4.3	18	\$334,681	35	\$727,424	21	103	6161	
2015	\$125,559	95	4.9	17	\$329,693	44	\$847,046	17	94	6201	
2016	\$124,155	86	4.4			37	\$836,035	22	62	7200	
Benchmark*	\$112,411	85%		16.5	\$298,827	NA	NA	P			

Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency					
Year	41 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) +	42 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.) -	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement +	44 % of fundraising goal achieved +	51 Classroom utilization rate +	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2011	31%	7%	Met goal	94%	67%	1.5%	15.1%	4.3	5.8
2012	32%	7%	Met goal	120%	71%	1.5%	16.6%	4.2	5.6
2013	32%	8%	Met goal	109%	69%	1.7%	17.7%	4.0	5.6
2014	32%	8%	Did not meet goal	127%	71%	1.4%	21.0%	4.2	5.6
2015	33%	8%	Met goal	145%	71%	1.2%		4.1	5.4
2016			Met goal	105%	70%	1.1%	22.5%	3.9	5.5
Benchmark*	36%	8%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		5.5

Note 1: Institutional goal on this measure is not appropriate to the enrollment management process used at UMCP.

Note 2: Institution awards financial aid on more specific institutional aid priorities; therefore, a goal for this measure is inappropriate for UMCP.

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore  
 Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

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

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

As of 5/25/17

\* 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 Average (3-yr.) 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 Alumni giving rate +	
2011	879	31%	68%	79%	58%	90					3.8%	
2012	880	32%	67%	76%	58%	86					3.0%	
2013	861	32%	68%	75%	57%	135					2.5%	
2014	844	37%	70%	75%	63%	181					3.3%	
2015	921	33%	70%	76%	51%	152					2.9%	
2016					39%	114						
Benchmark*	831-1009 (25th & 75th %ile)	45%	74%	55%	62%	53	P	I			I	

Faculty			Affordability			Economic Dvlp.		Workforce Dvlp.	
Year	21 Aver. faculty salary +	22 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile +	24 Student to Faculty Ratio	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid +	9 Average* undergraduate debt burden upon graduation -	31 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty +	38 Number of start-up companies +	35 Upper division enrollment enrollment
2011	\$70,572	63	16	\$6,482	3%	98%	\$36,493	NA	413
2012	\$72,172	65	16	\$6,713	4%	88%	\$27,215	5	391
2013	\$70,881	61	14	\$6,998	4%	88%	\$28,486	2	403
2014	\$70,881	72	14	\$7,287	4%	86%	\$20,375	1	425
2015	\$76,049	68	15	\$7,625	5%	87%	\$21,000	0	369
2016	\$84,202	82		\$7,804	2%	85%		0	355
Benchmark*	\$79,802	85%	16.3		P	89%	\$27,268	\$23,557	

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 replacem. value +	53 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods +	54 Time to degree in years -	55 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty +
2011	38%	13%	Met goal	232%	71%	0.6%	10.1%	4.3	8.1
2012	37%	12%	Met goal	138%	69%	0.6%	10.9%	4.6	7.6
2013	41%	12%	Did not meet goal	75%	69%	0.7%	13.9%	4.7	8.1
2014	39%	13%	Did not meet goal	115%	69%	0.2%	14.8%	4.8	7.4
2015	39%	13%	Met goal	95%	69%	0.2%		4.9	7.2
2016			Met goal	116%	67%	0.2%	16.0%	4.8	8.2
Benchmark*	44%	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%		7.5

University of Maryland University College  
Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

As of 5/25/17

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

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

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment									
Year	Stateside							Worldwide	
	1-UMUC Total undergraduate headcount enrollment	4 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	2-UMUC African-Amer. as % of total UGs	3-UMUC % of students who are economically disadvantaged	4-UMUC % of students who are 25 years of age or older	6 MD comm. coll. transfers	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses	7-UMUC Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled in)	
2011	25,693	44%	32%	41%	83%	2944	836	234,243	
2012	28,119	45%	33%	43%	83%	2,997	941	262,708	
2013	28,273	44%	31%	47%	83%	2,840	978	261,101	
2014	26,740	46%	29%	50%	83%	2,574	981	243,303	
2015	35,154	43%	27%	49%	80%	3,075	956	248,104	
2016	42,892	44%	26%	48%	80%	3,131	923	265,520	
Benchmark*	>22300	20%		Maintain or increase	≥80%	≥2800	Maintain or increase	≥175,000	

Year	Affordability		Economic Dvlp.			Workforce Development			Alumni
	7 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	8 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	Worldwide		Stateside			10 Alumni giving rate	
	% chg.	%	8-UMUC Total no. of off campus or distance education enrollments	10-UMUC No. of technology & management post-baccalaureates awarded	35 Upper division STEM enrollment				
2011	\$6,246	3%	61%	296,492	2,532	4256			2.2%
2012	\$6,474	4%	47%	327,608	2,816	4969			2.4%
2013	\$6,642	3%	47%	318,074	2,864	5401			2.0%
2014	\$6,834	3%	52%	294,226	3,225	6613			1.8%
2015	\$7,146	5%	51%	294,568	3,283	6989			1.7%
2016	\$7,266	2%	42%	309,768	3,523	8290			
Benchmark*	P	25-30%	>251,000	≥1300					

Year	Stewardship				Effectiveness & Efficiency	
	Worldwide		Stateside		Stateside	
	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	
2011	30%	16%	Met goal	96%	2%	
2012	29%	13%	Met goal	52%	2%	
2013	28%	13%	Met goal	90%	2%	
2014	29%	14%	Met goal	133%	2%	
2015	27%	20%	Met goal	52%	2%	
2016			Met goal	67%	2%	
Benchmark*	41%	17%	B	100%	2%	

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences  
 Dashboard Indicators, June 2017

As of 5/25/17

\* 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	9 - UMCES Total R&D expendit. per Core faculty**
2011	1199		141	34.0	\$704,323
2012	1297		155	35.7	\$688,914
2013	1232		168	35.9	\$675,770
2014	1250		200	38.3	\$686,676
2015	1250		164	40.5	\$705,405
2016	1250		200	43.9	\$702,712
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)
	2011	185	429	11,000
2012	209	377	11,000	\$48,224
2013	183	442	11,000	\$53,683
2014	229	608	11,000	\$50,814
2015	214	888	11,000	\$52,200
2016	212	1309	11,000	\$52,000
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I

Stewardship		
Year	43 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	44 % of fundraising goal achieved
	2011	Met goal
2012	Met goal	238%
2013	Did not meet goal	180%
2014	Met goal	95%
2015	Met goal	99%
2016	Met goal	
Benchmark*	B	100%

Effectiveness & Efficiency	
Year	52 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value
	2011
2012	0.4%
2013	0.8%
2014	0.4%
2015	0.3%
2016	0.4%
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

If currently at or above the benchmark:  Green

If currently below the benchmark:  Red

Q:\Dashboard Indicators\2016\Data

## DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS, MARCH 2016

### USM

#### CORE INDICATORS

Student: Access, Affordability, and Attainment				
#	<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	Alumni giving rate	Alumni view of their education and institution	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. Benchmark is weighted average for 3 tenure-track ranks of all institutions in same Carnegie group.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
22	Weighted average faculty salary %ile	Relative strength in attracting outstanding faculty	%ile for each rank shows relative standing nationally. %ile at each rank is weighted by number of faculty at that rank to determine weighted average faculty salary percentile for all ranks.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
23	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (over 5-year period)	Third-party validation of the quality, reputation & promise of faculty members & their research	Cumulative number of selected prestigious awards over a 5-yr. period per 100 full-time instructional tenure-track faculty. Awards: Fulbright Scholarships, Guggenheim Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowships, NSF CAREER awards, & Sloan Fellowships.	USM, Admin. & Finance for awards; AAUP for faculty members

24	Student to faculty ratio	Number of faculty available to students.	FTE students per FTE instructional faculty.	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey
<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
38	Number of start-up companies	Success in economic development activities	The total of all new companies in the following categories: TIER 1 - University-Owned, IP-based companies & TIER 2 Venture Accelerator/Mentoring or Companies Recruited to the BioPark and Research Parks from Out-of-State or SBDC Mentoring	Institutional reporting
<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> (Non-traditional method defined separately for each institution for 2006 report only. See separate listings below.)	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research
54	Time to Degree	Success in shortening the overall time to degree	The average of time to degree of all students completing a degree within a 7 year time horizon.	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research, MHEC EIS and DIS
55	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	Success in achieving BOR policy of increasing teaching workload	Number of courses divided by number of FTE core instructional faculty, both tenure-track & non-tenure track	USM, Admin. & Finance, "Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty," Table 4
<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
S38	Number of start-up companies	Success in economic development activities	The total of all new companies in the following categories: TIER 1 - University-Owned, IP-based companies & TIER 2 Venture Accelerator/Mentoring or Companies Recruited to the BioPark and Research Parks from Out-of-State or SBDC Mentoring	Institutional reporting
<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>#</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, American Fact Finder, 2013 via Web ( <a href="http://www.census.gov">www.census.gov</a> ), Table S1501, Census Bureau Population Estimates.
E2	Doctoral scientists, engineers & health professionals employed in Maryland	Importance of advanced degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, <a href="#"><u>Science &amp; Engineering State Profiles, 2013 (updated May 27, 2014, Data from 2010).</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, 2013 (updated May 27, 2014, Data from 2012).</u></a>



#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E5	Per capita personal income	Relative wealth of Maryland's residents	Includes Maryland residents only	U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program, Table: GCT-T1; Population Estimates Data Set; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table 1: Personal Income, by State & Region.
E6	Unemployment rate (June)	Relative health of Maryland's economy	Seasonally adjusted for June	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Tables LASST24000003 (MD) & LNS14000000 (US)
E7	Number of SBIR awards (4 yrs.)	Small Business Innovation Research program awards to Maryland businesses	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science &amp; Engineering State Profiles, 2013</u> . (Data from 2011).
E8	Academic R&D expenditures in science & engineering	Amount of research expenditures by Maryland's universities, public and private	Expenditures for R&D from all sources: federal, state & local govt., industry, institutional funds, & other sources	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures, FY 2004-13, Table 77.
E12	Persons in science & engineering occupations as % of workforce	How well Maryland is adapting to high-tech economy	Self-explanatory. High-tech industries are defined by specified NAICS* codes.	NSF, <u>Science and Engineering Indicators 2014</u> , Table 8-34. (Data from 2012).
E14	Average high-tech wage	Importance of R&D in Maryland and level of wages compared to other those in other states	Total annual payroll in high-tech manufacturing & services divided by average annual employment in high-tech	Tech America Foundation, <u>Cyberstates</u> , 2013. (2012 data)
E15	High-tech establishments as % of all business establishments	Importance of high-tech in contributing to Maryland's economic development	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science and Engineering Indicators 2014</u> , Table 8-53. (Data from 2010).
		Third-party validation of the	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science and</u>

<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>What it measures</b>	<b>Calculation</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
E16	Venture capital disbursed per \$1,000 of GDP (Gross Domestic Product)	importance of high-tech ventures in Maryland's economy		<a href="#">Engineering Indicators 2014</a> , Table 8-57. (Data for 2012).
E17	State general funds for higher education per \$1,000 of personal income	State's support of higher education compared with relative wealth of residents	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E18	State general funds for higher education per capita	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E19	State general funds for higher education per headcount student	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E20	Tuition & fees (USM) as percent of Maryland's per capita personal income	Extent to which the burden of financing a higher education falls on students when compared to state's relative wealth	Self-explanatory	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, State Personal Income; <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, Higher Education R&D Expenditures, by state, institution, R&D field, FY 2013, Table 67.
E23	Current population estimates	For comparison purposes	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau
E24	New Economy Index: Overall ranking	How well Maryland is competing in the new, knowledge-based economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on a series of measures relative to the new economy	Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (ITIF), <a href="#">2014 State New Economy Index</a> , June 2014.
E25	New Economy Index: Knowledge jobs	Skill- and education-levels of the workforce	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E26	New Economy Index: Globalization	Degree of integration into the world economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on three related measures	Same as above
E27	New Economy Index: Economic dynamism	Vitality of the state's economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above
E28	New Economy Index: Digital economy	Degree to which business and economic transactions are conducted through digital electronic means	Based upon relative standing among the states on six related measures	Same as above
		How efficiently capital is put	Based upon relative standing	Same as above

<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>What it measures</b>	<b>Calculation</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
E29	New Economy Index: Innovation capacity	to use	among the states on five related measures	
E30	% of Maryland residents with advanced degrees or more	Importance of graduate and professional degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, 2013, Table S1501, Census Bureau, Population Estimates, via Web ( <a href="http://www.census.gov">www.census.gov</a> ).

\* 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 <u>all levels</u> )
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
9-UMCES	Total R&D expenditures per core faculty (including Tenured/Tenure Track and Research Professor Lines)	UMCES, IR office, MFR