

USM DASHBOARD INDICATORS 2007



VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE

As of 11/29/07

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	UMBI	UMCES	System
1	Average SAT	1267	1190		884	849	976	1104	1072		814				
2	6-year graduation rate	79%	56%		37%	18%	47%	70%	64%		34%				62%
3	Freshman year GPA for 1st-time, full-time freshmen	2.97	2.66		2.57	2.10	2.39	2.68	2.83		2.20				
4	2nd-year retention rate	93%	82%		72%	65%	72%	81%	83%		66%				81%
5	Acceptance rate for freshmen	45%	72%		41%	46%	70%	55%	69%		66%				
15	Afr.-Amer., Hispanics, Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	19%	19%		92%	95%	19%	14%	14%	33%	83%	38%			31%
6	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty												\$729,026	\$546,960	
7	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	5.4	5.1												
35	Average faculty salary	\$100,958	\$80,224		\$64,242	\$63,879	\$65,173	\$66,479	\$68,735		\$64,575				
36	Faculty salary %ile	86%	79%		68%	63%	53%	64%	75%		58%				77%
8	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	14%	5%		5%	7%	19%	12%	7%	4%	8%	NA			
9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	\$33,087	\$23,979	\$48,802	\$13,885	\$13,736	\$12,764	\$10,859	\$11,881	\$14,230	\$21,009	\$18,961			\$26,993
10	Funding guideline percent achieved	82%	81%	72%	94%	108%	90%	104%	100%	141%	99%	40%			84%
11	Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	48%	74%		45%	51%	70%	60%	71%		66%				
12	MD community college transfers	1571	947		420	219	277	569	1483		77				8526
13	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$7,969	\$8,707		\$5,939	\$4,980	\$6,550	\$6,412	\$7,234	\$6,934	\$5,988	\$5,640			\$7,325
34	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	60%	61%		68%	77%	69%	64%	58%	56%	88%	33%			
17	graduation	\$14,451	\$19,018		\$16,754	\$14,701	\$15,678	\$15,831	\$14,808	\$8,059	NA				
17	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$252,722	\$149,532								\$51,556				
18	U.S. Patents issued	23	1	14											38
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$962,516	\$87,817	\$417,497											
19	Teacher licensure passing rates	100%	99%		89%	81%	99%	91%	93%		100%				
22	State appropriations per FTE student	\$10,364	\$7,200	\$12,119	\$5,362	\$6,104	\$5,843	\$4,359	\$4,183	\$4,771	\$6,629	\$1,365			\$7,793
23	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	32%	34%	26%	43%	36%	45%	46%	40%	37%	33%	36%			
21	Expenditures for instruction per FTE student	\$10,509	\$8,164	\$12,738	\$5,909	\$4,876	\$5,768	\$4,942	\$4,693	\$5,259	\$6,993	\$6,768			
24	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	7%	11%	10%	23%	33%	14%	17%	16%	25%	11%	18%			
25	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	
26	% of fundraising goal achieved	102%	137%	106%	116%	19%	185%	515%	110%	47%	60%	59%	46%	160%	
27	Classroom utilization rate	65%	63%		59%	66%	61%	86%	71%		68%				67%
28	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.6%	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%	1.2%	1.1%	3.2%	0.5%	0.5%		0.3%	0.3%	1.3%
29	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	7.4%	10.1%		2.3%	7.6%	7.8%	10.7%	6.1%		5.5%				6.2%
30	4-year graduation rate	55%	28%		13%	5%	19%	52%	32%		19%				38%
31	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.9	6.1		7.9	8.8	8.0	8.0	7.3	7.0	7.9				

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?*

● Same or better

● Worse

As of 11/29/07

	#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMBI	UMCES	System
Eminence/Quality	1	Average SAT	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	2	6-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	3	Freshman year GPA for 1st-time, full-time freshmen	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	4	2nd-year retention rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	5	Acceptance rate for freshmen	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	15	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	●	●				●	●	●	●		●			●
	7	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	●	●												
	35	Average faculty salary	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	36	Faculty salary %ile	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	8	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
Access & Academic Success	9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	10	Funding guideline percent achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	11	Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)														●
	12	MD community college transfers	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	32	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
Economic & Workforce Developmt.	17	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	●	●								●				
	18	U.S. Patents issued	●	●	●											●
	33	Adjusted gross license income received	●	●	●											
	19	Teacher licensure passing rates	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
Stewardship	22	State appropriations per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	23	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	21	Expenditures for instruction per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	24	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	25	Fund balance increase: goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	26	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Effectiveness & Efficiency	27	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	28	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●
	29	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●		●	●		●				●
	30	4-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	31	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●				
Improved/Same			28	24	8	18	12	18	25	25	9	17	8	2	3	13
Worse			2	6	3	7	13	7	1	1	5	8	3	1	0	3

* Average of most recent 3 years compared with previous 3 years (e.g., 2004-2006 compared with 2003-2005).

E:\FACTBOOK\DASHBD INDIC\2007\NEW VERSION\DBI120407FINAL.XLS, 12/4/07 CB

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?*



Same or better



Worse

As of 11/29/07

	#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMBI	UMCES	System
Eminence/Quality	1	Average SAT	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	2	6-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	3	Freshman year GPA for 1st-time, full-time freshmen	●	●		●		●	●	●		●				
	4	2nd-year retention rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	5	Acceptance rate for freshmen	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	15	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	●	●				●	●	●	●		●			●
	7	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	●	●												
	35	Average faculty salary	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	36	Faculty salary %ile	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	8	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
Access & Academic Success	9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	10	Funding guideline percent achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	11	Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)														
	12	MD community college transfers		●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
	32	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
Economic & Workforce Developmt.	17	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	●	●								●				
	18	U.S. Patents issued		●	●											
	33	Adjusted gross license income received		●	●											
	19	Teacher licensure passing rates	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				
Stewardship	22	State appropriations per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●
	23	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	21	Expenditures for instruction per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	24	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
	25	Fund balance increase: goal achieved														
	26	% of fundraising goal achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Effectiveness & Efficiency	27	Classroom utilization rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	28	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●
	29	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	30	4-year graduation rate	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●				●
	31	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●				
Meets benchmark			13	16	5	12	9	13	19	19	7	17	6	0	1	9
Does not meet benchmark			12	13	5	12	14	12	6	6	6	7	4	2	1	3

* Average of most recent 3 years compared with previous 3 years (e.g., 2004-2006 compared with 2003-2005).

E:\FACTBOOK\DASHBD INDIC\2007\NEW VERSION\DBI120407FINAL.XLS, 12/4/07 CB

University System of Maryland
Systemwide Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

Year	National Eminence/Quality							
	Students			Faculty			Funding	
	S1 6-year graduation rate	S2 2nd year retention rate	S3 Afr.-Amer. Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	S28 Aver. faculty salary (Research univ.)	S29 Aver. faculty salary (Master's univ.)	S30 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	S4 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	S5 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2003	60%	82%	29%	\$85,300	\$61,000	79	\$22,374	77%
2004	61%	82%	29%	\$85,700	\$60,300	75	\$22,298	73%
2005	61%	81%	30%	\$89,109	\$62,679	78	\$23,442	64%
2006	62%		31%	\$92,228	\$65,030	77	\$26,993	65%
2007				\$96,153	\$67,463	77		84%
Benchmark*	55%	74%	21%	\$87,458	\$67,432	85%	\$23,850	100%

Year	Access & Academic Success									Economic Development		Workforce Development	
	S6	S7	S8		S9		S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	
	% of total projected demand met	MD comm. college transfers	% of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)	Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning % chg.	Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue	Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)	Licenses & options executed	U.S. Patents issued	Number of teaching graduates	Number of nursing graduates			
2003	95%	7063	41.1%	\$6,246	15%	14%	\$57.6	42	46	1639	716		
2004	94%	7706	41.4%	\$6,781	9%	13%	\$65.8	68	53	1802	750		
2005	89%	8048	41.3%	\$7,168	6%	13%	\$69.6	73	38	1689	871		
2006	90%	8526	42.3%	\$7,248	1%	13%	\$79.0			1741	848		
2007				\$7,325	1%								
Benchmark*													

Year	Effectiveness & Efficiency				Stewardship						
	S16 Classroom utilization rate	S17 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	S18 % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	S19 4-year graduation rate	S21 State appropriations per FTE student	S22 System Office admin. expenditures as % of System's total operating expend.	S23 Unrestricted net assets to debt ratio	S24 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	S25 Credit rating (Moody's)	S26 % of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	S27 Total funds raised (annual) (000s)
2003		0.9%		35%	\$7,156	0.5%	37%		Stable	14.9%	\$163,967
2004	63%	0.8%		34%	\$6,789	0.5%	44%	Met goal	Downgrade (S&P)	19.9%	\$158,674
2005	68%	1.1%	5.9%	36%	\$6,798	0.5%	52%	Met goal	Upgrade (Moody's)	31.1%	\$225,613
2006	65%	1.1%	6.2%	38%	\$7,793	0.4%	64%	Met goal	Stable	31.6%	\$236,510
2007	67%	1.3%					76%	Met goal	Stable	25.0%	\$241,105
Benchmark*	66%	0.2% increase	5.0%	29%	\$8,104	1.5%					

University System of Maryland

Environmental Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

Year	Workforce & Workforce Development								E23 Current population estimates (as of July 1) (for comparison purposes)
	E1 % of Maryland residents with at least a bachelor's degr.	E2 Doctoral scientists employed in MD	E3 Doctoral engineers employed in MD	E4 Science & engineering doctorates awarded	E5 Per capita personal income	E6 Unemployment rate (June)	E12 High-tech workers per 1,000 private sector workers	E14 Average high-tech wage	
2001		22,150	3,440		\$35,188	4.0%			5,379,795
2002	37.6%			638	\$36,121	4.5%			5,441,349
2003	37.2%	27,700	3,870		\$37,218	4.5%			5,506,684
2004	35.2%			677	\$39,333	4.2%	78	\$74,981	5,553,249
2005	36.3%			744	\$41,929	4.3%	79	\$77,035	5,589,599
2006					\$44,077	4.0%			5,615,727
2007						3.8%			
Benchmark	27.6%	5th (MD's rank)	11th (MD's rank)	11th (MD's rank)	4th (MD's rank)	4.5%	5th (MD's rank)	9th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)

Year	R&D			Economic Development			Support of Higher Education			
	E8 Academic R&D expenditures in science & engin. (millions)	E13 Total R&D per capita (includes private sector R&D)	E22 University R&D expenditures in life sciences (millions)	E7 Number of SBIR awards (4 yrs)	E16 Venture capital investments (millions)	E15 High-tech establishments added in past 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	E20 Tuition & fees (USM) as % of MD's per capita personal income
2001	\$1,645									
2002	\$1,880						\$8.10	\$238.63	\$4,772	
2003	\$2,031	\$1,843	\$992.6	958			\$6.10	\$189.05	\$4,233	
2004	\$2,269	\$2,655		1,630			\$5.56	\$206.94	\$4,677	16.8%
2005	\$2,357		\$1,179.3		\$437.8	108	\$5.34	\$223.75	\$4,173	17.1%
2006					\$636.2					16.4%
2007							\$5.57	\$255.78	\$4,572	
Benchmark		3rd (MD's rank)		8th (MD's rank)	8th (MD's rank)	23rd (MD's rank)	35th (MD's rank)	20th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)	26th (MD's rank)

New Economy Index					
E24 New Economy Index: Overall (Maryland's rank)	E25 New Economy Index: Knowledge jobs (Maryland's rank)	E26 New Economy Index: Globalization (Maryland's rank)	E27 New Economy Index: Economic dynamism (Maryland's rank)	E28 New Economy Index: Digital economy (Maryland's rank)	E29 New Economy Index: Innovation capacity (Maryland's rank)
1999	11th	8th	33rd	25th	6th
2002	5th	2nd	30th	11th	13th
2007	3rd	4th	30th	2nd	11th

Bowie State University

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

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

Year	Eminence/Quality											Alumni Satisf.		Funding								
	Students						Faculty															
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	8	9	10											
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver. faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)											
	+	+	+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+											
2003	887	38%	2.43	73%	48%	91%	\$61,500	85	12%	\$14,569	86%											
2004	892	36%	2.54	77%	43%	91%	\$60,100	79	10%	\$13,696	65%											
2005	890	38%	2.48	71%	42%	92%	\$61,488	77	9%	\$13,554	53%											
2006	884		2.53	72%	41%	92%	\$62,573	75	5%	\$13,885	51%											
2007			2.57				\$64,242		5%		94%											
Benchmark*	859-1047 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	32%	P	2.53	I	69%	P	69%	P	58%	P	\$67,432	B	85%	B	6%	P	\$16,580	P	100%	S

Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development			
11	12	13		34	32			19			
Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% chg.	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			Teacher licensure passing rate			
	+		-	+	-			+			
2003	53%	340	\$4,853	17%	NA			98%			
2004	42%	264	\$5,218	8%	57%			91%			
2005	43%	453	\$5,481	5%	74%			95%			
2006	44%	290	\$5,730	5%	68%			92%			
2007	45%	420	\$5,939	4%				89%			
Benchmark*	45%	I	500	I	P	68%	I	\$22,589	P	96%	P

Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency															
22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-BSU**	30	31											
State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	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	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty											
	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+											
2003	\$5,524	36%	\$5,271	22%	20%		0.8%		12%	8.2											
2004	\$5,039	41%	\$5,542	22%	16%	40%	0.5%		12%	8.6											
2005	\$5,074	42%	\$5,651	21%	Did not meet goal	51%	0.4%	4.1%	13%	8.5											
2006	\$5,362		\$5,909	23%	Did not meet goal	58%	0.5%	2.3%	13%	7.5											
2007					Met goal	116%	1.0%			7.9											
Benchmark*	\$8,058	P	37%	P	\$6,064	P	10/19/07	100%	I	11/8/07	66%	N	0.2% increase	B	11/8/07	5.0%	B	12%	P	7.5	B

Coppin State University

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

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

Year	Eminence/Quality											Year	Access & Academic Success					Economic Development			Workforce Development		
	Students						Faculty		Alumni Satisf.		Funding												
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	8	9	10		11	12	13	34	32	19					
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)		Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% chg.	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation		Teacher licensure passing rate			
	+	+	+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+			+			+			+			
2003	850	22%	2.15	65%	54%	97%	\$60,000	76	25%	\$14,308	82%		58%	140	\$4,240	7%		\$11,826		100%			
2004	858	26%	2.16	63%	47%	95%	\$59,300	72	24%	\$14,149	71%		52%	132	\$4,454	5%		\$13,251		100%			
2005	856	20%	2.08	63%	50%	95%	\$60,956	73	17%	\$15,562	64%		55%	197	\$4,714	6%		\$13,632		100%			
2006	849	18%	2.10	65%	46%	95%	\$65,238	77	7%	\$13,736	70%		51%	219	\$4,745	1%		\$14,701		95%			
2007							\$63,879	63	7%		108%				\$4,980	5%				81%			
Benchmark	797-1016 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	No CSU goal set	I	P	P	\$67,432	P	B	P	P		53%	I	225	P	I	19,398	P	96%			
Year	Stewardship											Year	Effectiveness & Efficiency										
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-CSU**	30	31		22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-CSU**	30	31
	State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	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	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty		State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	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	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	
2003	\$6,569	34%	\$4,867	34%		80%		0.2%		5%	7.9		\$6,569	34%	\$4,867	34%		80%		0.2%		5%	7.9
2004	\$6,507	40%	\$5,592	35%	Met goal	93%	60%	0.1%		7%	9.0		\$6,507	40%	\$5,592	35%	Met goal	93%	60%	0.1%		7%	9.0
2005	\$6,161	38%	\$5,842	29%	Met goal	102%	80%	0.2%	4.3%	9%	10.6		\$6,161	38%	\$5,842	29%	Met goal	102%	80%	0.2%	4.3%	9%	10.6
2006	\$6,104	36%	\$4,876	33%	Did not meet goal	19%	56%	0.1%	7.6%	5%	10.5		\$6,104	36%	\$4,876	33%	Did not meet goal	19%	56%	0.1%	7.6%	5%	10.5
2007					Did not meet goal	19%	66%	0.2%			8.8												
Benchmark	\$8,896	P	\$6,325	P	B	I	66%	N	B	P	B		\$8,896	P	\$6,325	P	B	I	66%	N	B	P	B

** This is an institution-specific indicator. See "Institution-Specific Indicators" for definition.

Frostburg State University

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

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

Year	Eminence/Quality										
	Students					Faculty		Alumni Satisf.	Funding		
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	8	9	10
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2003	1031	51%	2.56	74%	79%	15%	\$60,500	62	14%	\$10,931	74%
2004	1016	49%	2.44	70%	72%	15%	\$60,300	55	14%	\$10,808	80%
2005	1005	47%	2.39	72%	76%	17%	\$62,455	60	12%	\$11,363	73%
2006	976	47%		72%	70%	19%	\$65,173	60	10%	\$12,764	78%
2007								53	19%		90%
Benchmark*	931-1129 (25th & 75th %ile)	50%	2.42	76%	64%	11%	\$67,432	85%	11%	\$16,416	100%

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development
	11 Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	12 MD comm. college transfers	13 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)		34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	32 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			19 Teacher licensure passing rate
2003	78%	335	\$5,342	13%		\$14,757			91%
2004	72%	285	\$5,830	9%	73%	\$15,319			98%
2005	75%	268	\$6,230	7%	71%	\$15,678			97%
2006	70%	277	\$6,392	3%	69%				98%
2007			\$6,550	2%					99%
Benchmark*	73%	282		P	72%	\$17,826			97%

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22 State appropriations per FTE student	23 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	21 Expend. for instr. per FTE student	24 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	26 % of fundraising goal achieved	27 Classroom utilization rate	28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	29-FSU** % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	30 4-year graduation rate	31 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2003	\$5,317	46%	\$5,031	16%		97%		1.0%		24%	7.4
2004	\$5,054	47%	\$5,040	14%	Met goal	69%	60%	1.2%		19%	7.9
2005	\$5,231	47%	\$5,383	14%	Met goal	160%	62%	1.1%	13.3%	18%	8.0
2006	\$5,843	45%	\$5,768	14%	Met goal	91%	60%	0.7%	7.8%	19%	8.0
2007					Met goal	185%	61%	1.2%			8.0
Benchmark*	\$6,884	38%	\$6,063	14%		100%	66%	0.2% increase	5.0%	26%	7.5

Salisbury University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07 *Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.*
* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Year	Eminence/Quality										Faculty		Alumni Satisf.	Funding	
	Students										35	36	8	9	10
	1	2	3	4	5	15									
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs					Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2003	1134	67%	2.75	81%	54%	11%					\$59,900	67	14%	\$10,653	70%
2004	1121	67%	2.71	83%	61%	12%					\$59,500	65	15%	\$10,308	66%
2005	1136	69%	2.68	81%	57%	13%					\$60,853	67	9%	\$10,391	63%
2006	1104	70%		81%	55%	14%					\$63,117	65	9%	\$10,859	74%
2007											\$66,479	64	12%		104%
Benchmark*	940-1142 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	P	I	P	P	P	P	P	P	\$67,432	P	B	P	S

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development
	11	12	13		34	32			19
	Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% chg.	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			Teacher licensure passing rate
2003	56%	559	\$5,564	14%		NA			91%
2004	65%	519	\$5,976	7%	64%	\$16,557			92%
2005	62%	513	\$6,376	7%	64%	\$15,831			91%
2006	60%	569	\$6,412	1%	64%				90%
2007			\$6,412	0%					91%
Benchmark*	60% I	530 I		P	64% I	\$15,882 P			99% P

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-SU**	30	31
	State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	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	4-year graduation rate	Tchng. workload courses per FTE faculty
2003	\$4,358	45%	\$4,804	17%		156%		0.4%		47%	7.1
2004	\$4,242	44%	\$4,514	17%	Met goal	87%	87%	0.4%		47%	7.9
2005	\$4,199	46%	\$4,729	17%	Met goal	106%	87%	0.4%	8.4%	52%	7.9
2006	\$4,359	46%	\$4,942	17%	Met goal	792%	82%	0.6%	10.7%	52%	7.9
2007					Met goal	515%	86%	1.1%			8.0
Benchmark*	\$6,436 P	39% P	\$5,784 P	11% P	B	100% I	66% N	0.2% increase B	5.0% B	26% P	7.5 B

** This is an institution-specific indicator. See "Institution-Specific Indicators" for definition.

Towson University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07 *Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.*
* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Year	Eminence/Quality											
	Students						Faculty		Alumni Satisf.		Funding	
	1 Average SAT*	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	4 2nd year retention rate*	5 Acceptance rate for freshmen*	15 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	35 Aver. faculty salary	36 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	8 Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	9 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	10 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
2003	1096	57%	3.03	84%	52%	12%	\$61,300	68	7%	\$10,787	75%	
2004	1078	60%	2.92	82%	68%	12%	\$60,000	66	7%	\$10,773	82%	
2005	1087	56%	2.83	79%	63%	13%	\$63,282	74	7%	\$11,108	77%	
2006	1072			83%	69%	14%	\$65,589	73	7%	\$11,881	80%	
2007							\$68,735	75	7%		100%	
Benchmark*	907-1113	51%	2.95	79%	68%	21%	\$67,432	85%	8%	\$13,022	100%	
(25th & 75th %ile)												

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development
	11 Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	12 MD comm. college transfers	13 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)		34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	32 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			19 Teacher licensure passing rate
			% chg.						
2003	57%	1214	\$6,226	13%		\$15,750			92%
2004	72%	1335	\$6,672	7%	56%	\$15,575			92%
2005	67%	1429	\$7,096	6%	57%	\$14,808			94%
2006	71%	1483	\$7,164	1%	58%				94%
2007			\$7,234	1%					93%
Benchmark*	65%	1300		P	56%	\$14,877			96%

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency					
	22 State appropriations per FTE student	23 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	21 Expend. for instr. per FTE student	24 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	26 % of fundraising goal achieved	27 Classroom utilization rate	28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	29-TU** % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	30 4-year graduation rate	31 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty	
2003	\$4,104	40%	\$4,325	15%		88%		0.4%		31%	6.5	
2004	\$4,044	40%	\$4,331	15%	Met goal	105%	69%	0.4%		30%	7.2	
2005	\$4,012	41%	\$4,524	14%	Met goal	273%	71%	1.3%	4.3%	29%	7.4	
2006	\$4,183	40%	\$4,693	16%	Met goal	121%	67%	1.5%	6.1%	32%	7.4	
2007					Met goal	110%	71%	3.2%			7.3	
Benchmark*	\$6,082	42%	\$5,413	11%	B	100%	66%	2%	5.0%	23%	7.5	

** This is an institution-specific indicator. See "Institution-Specific Indicators" for definition.

University of Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

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

As of 11/29/07

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

Eminence/Quality							
Students		Faculty		Alumni Satisf.	Funding		
1-UB	15	2-UB	3-UB	8	9	10	
% of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	Sponsored research \$ per F-T faculty (000s)	% part-time faculty	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
Year	+	NC	+	-	+	+	+
2003	74%	37%	\$48	52%	20%	\$12,319	90%
2004	70%	35%	\$49	46%	8%	\$12,741	80%
2005	62%	34%	\$52	54%	10%	\$13,191	84%
2006	72%	33%	\$57	54%	9%	\$14,230	80%
2007	65%		\$61	55%	4%		141%
Benchmark*	75%		\$60	45%	7%	\$12,895	100%

Access & Academic Success					
4-UB	5-UB	13		34	32
Number of minority students graduating annually (UG & Grad/Prof)	% of economically disadvantaged students	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% chg.	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation
Year	+	+		+	-
2003	297	64%	\$5,913	16%	\$7,478
2004	310	61%	\$6,448	9%	\$7,957
2005	344	62%	\$6,794	5%	\$6,816
2006	427	62%	\$6,814	0%	\$8,059
2007	426	63%	\$6,934	2%	
Benchmark*	426	75%		P	\$15,296

Economic Development		Workforce Development
		6-UB
		Number of IT graduates produced annually
		+
		32
		37
		40
		35
		55
		55

Stewardship					
22	23	21	24	25	26
State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved
Year	+	+	-	+	+
2003	\$4,530	42%	\$5,119	16%	119%
2004	\$4,269	38%	\$4,894	18%	47%
2005	\$4,380	42%	\$5,585	18%	196%
2006	\$4,771	37%	\$5,259	25%	67%
2007					47%
Benchmark*	\$5,846	39%	\$5,310	12%	100%

Effectiveness & Efficiency		
28	7-UB	31
Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	% of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
+	+	+
1.1%	27%	5.7
0.4%	30%	7.0
0.5%	32%	6.9
0.5%	40%	6.9
0.5%	40%	7.0
0.2% increase	10% of credit hrs.	7.5

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

E:\FACTBOOK\DASHBD INDIC\2007\NEW VERSION\DBI120407\FINAL.XLS, 12/4/07 CB

University of Maryland, Baltimore

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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)

	National Eminence/Quality											
	Students				Faculty						Funding	
	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 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	8-UMB R&D expenditures per F-T basic science faculty	9-UMB R&D expenditures per F-T clinical faculty	9 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	10 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
Year	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	
2003	76%	96%	88%	NA	19	2	3	\$234,259	\$148,007	\$40,853	74%	
2004	85%	93%	91%	81%	13	3	3	\$235,033	\$172,171	\$41,427	63%	
2005	78%	96%	84%	82%	12	4	3	\$219,122	\$206,473	\$46,596	56%	
2006	78%	96%	87%	NA	14	10	3	\$254,411	\$222,656	\$48,802	53%	
2007	80%		93%		13	8	2				72%	
Benchmark*	91% P	95% N	88% N	NA N	Top 10 P	Top 10 P	Top 10 P	\$429,459 P	\$161,176 P	\$54,499 P	100% S	

	Access & Academic Success				Economic Development				Workforce Development			
	10-UMB Total headcount enrollmt.	11-UMB Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Nat. Amer. as % of total headcount enrollment	12-UMB Graduate & 1st prof. as % of total hdct. enrollment	13-UMB Grant & contract awards (millions)	14-UMB Total R&D expenditures in medicine per F-T medical faculty	33 Adjusted gross license income received	18 U.S. Patents issued	16-UMB Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	17-UMB Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	18-UMB Number of dentistry grads (DDS)		
	+	+	NC	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
2003	5,477	21%	83%	\$323.4	\$242,291	\$105,080	7		509	123	85	
2004	5,602	21%	83%	\$336.6	\$249,808	\$156,535	9		487	122	85	
2005	5,526	21%	85%	\$409.1	\$247,402	\$123,090	7		588	130	97	
2006	5,636	22%	85%	\$379.4	\$225,897	\$417,497	8		547	158	106	
2007	5,884	22%	86%	\$410.0			14		532	115	103	
Benchmark*	22,378 P	14% P	49% P		\$213,860 P	5% annually I	5% annually I		5% annually I	5% annually I	5% annually I	

	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency	
	22 State appropriations per FTE student	23 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	21 Expend. for instr. per FTE student	24 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	26 % of fundraising goal achieved	28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	19-UMB Days of charity care provided by clinical medical faculty
	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
2003	\$11,679	35%	\$14,366	9%		113%	0.5%	3,184
2004	\$11,137	35%	\$14,393	9%	Met goal	101%	0.3%	3,377
2005	\$11,249	34%	\$15,939	7%	Met goal	102%	0.7%	3,625
2006	\$12,119	26%	\$12,738	10%	Met goal	106%	0.8%	3,623
2007					Met goal		0.7%	3,776
Benchmark*	\$11,425 P	27% P	\$15,012 P	5% P	B	100% I	0.2% increase B	3,625 I

University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

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

Year	National Eminence/Quality												
	Students					Faculty			Alumni Satisf.		Funding		
	1 Average SAT*	2 6-year graduation rate*	3 Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	4 2nd year retention rate*	5 Acceptance rate for freshmen*	15 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	7 Awards per 100 FT faculty (5 yrs.)	35 Aver. faculty salary	36 Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	8 Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	9 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	10 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
2003	1219	55%	2.71	82%	58%	18%	3.9	\$71,300		9%	\$22,176	71%	
2004	1221	55%	2.70	81%	70%	18%	4.9	\$71,200	72	9%	\$22,449	66%	
2005	1216	58%	2.66	82%	71%	18%	4.9	\$74,169	77	7%	\$23,059	61%	
2006	1190	56%		82%	72%	19%	5.1	\$76,007	74	5%	\$23,979	64%	
2007							5.1	\$80,224	79	5%		81%	
Benchmark*	1017-1231 (25th & 75th %ile)	63%	2.70	84%	72%	15%	2.5	\$77,847	85%	16%	\$23,364	100%	

Year	Access & Academic Success					
	11 Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	12 MD comm. college transfers	13 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.		34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	32 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation
2003	64%	1295	\$7,388	14%		\$14,500
2004	72%	1486	\$8,020	9%	63%	\$14,500
2005	74%	1030	\$8,520	6%	62%	\$19,018
2006	74%	947	\$8,622	1%	61%	
2007			\$8,707	1%		
Benchmark*	73%	958			61%	\$16,455

Year	Economic Development			Workforce Development
	17 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	18 U.S. Patents issued	33 Adjusted gross license income received	19 Teacher licensure passing rate
2003	\$111,155	4	\$31,078	89%
2004	\$127,327	10	\$42,769	86%
2005	\$149,532	1	\$87,817	94%
2006				93%
2007				99%
Benchmark*	\$181,841	10	\$975,297	97%

Year	Stewardship					
	22 State appropriations per FTE student	23 Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	21 Expend. for instr. per FTE student	24 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	26 % of fundraising goal achieved
2003	\$6,917	36%	\$7,969	10%		169%
2004	\$6,570	34%	\$7,718	12%	Met goal	134%
2005	\$6,667	34%	\$7,876	11%	Met goal	111%
2006	\$7,200	34%	\$8,164	11%	Met goal	108%
2007					Met goal	137%
Benchmark*	\$8,464	29%	\$6,567	9%	B	100%

Year	Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	27 Classroom utilization rate	28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	29-UMBC** % of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	30 4-year graduation rate	31 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2003	64%	0.4%		30%	5.0
2004	62%	0.2%		28%	5.5
2005	62%	0.2%	8.7%	30%	5.9
2006	62%	0.3%	10.1%	28%	6.0
2007	63%	0.3%			6.1
Benchmark*	66%	0.2% increase	5.0%	39%	5.5

** This is an institution-specific indicator. See "Institution-Specific Indicators" for definition.

University of Maryland, College Park

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

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

Year	National Eminence/Quality													
	Students						Faculty				Alumni Satisf.	Funding		
	1	2	3	4	5	15		7	35	36	8	9	10	
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs		Awards per 100 FTfaculty (5 yrs.)	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
2003	1259	71%	3.00	92%	43%	18%		4.1	\$89,300		17%	\$29,808	76%	
2004	1254	73%	2.98	92%	52%	18%		5.0	\$89,900	84	17%	\$29,973	76%	
2005	1271	77%	2.97	91%	49%	19%		5.4	\$93,468	85	16%	\$31,270	65%	
2006	1267	79%		93%	45%	19%		5.5	\$97,044	84	12%	\$33,087	67%	
2007								5.4	\$100,958	86	14%		82%	
Benchmark*	1200-1402 (25th & 75th %ile)	P	86% P	Stable I	96% P	39% P	15% P	5.2 P	\$90,170 P	85% B	16% P	\$51,685 P	100% S	

Year	Access & Academic Success									
	11	12	13		34	32				
	Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning) % chg.		% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation				
2003	53%	1094	\$6,759	17%		\$14,076				
2004	53%	1040	\$7,410	10%	58%	\$13,243				
2005	53%	1341	\$7,821	6%	59%	\$14,451				
2006	48%	1571	\$7,906	1%	60%					
2007			\$7,969	1%						
Benchmark*	Note 1 I	No specific goal I		P	Note 2 I	\$15,908 P				

Year	Stewardship									
	22	23	21	24	25	26				
	State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved				
2003	\$10,286	33%	\$9,803	6%		90%				
2004	\$9,732	31%	\$9,405	9%	Met goal	105%				
2005	\$9,955	32%	\$10,089	7%	Met goal	128%				
2006	\$10,364	32%	\$10,509	7%	Met goal	120%				
2007					Met goal	102%				
Benchmark*	\$12,198 P	33% P	\$17,097 P	5% P	B	100% I				

Year	Economic Development				Workforce Development			
	17	18	33		19			
	Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	U.S. Patents issued	Adjusted gross license income received		Teacher licensure passing rate			
2003	\$237,564	20	\$788,460		89%			
2004	\$242,840	22	\$906,758		91%			
2005	\$252,722	23	\$962,516		96%			
2006					99%			
2007					100%			
Benchmark*	\$260,958 P	NA P	NA P		100% P			

Year	Effectiveness & Efficiency								
	27	28	29-UMCP*	30	31				
	Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty				
2003		1.4%		43%	5.0				
2004	67%	1.5%		46%	5.2				
2005	67%	2.2%	2.4%	50%	5.2				
2006	67%	1.7%	7.4%	55%	6.0				
2007	65%	1.6%			5.9				
Benchmark*	66% N	0.2% increase B	5.0% B	65% P	5.5 B				

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07 *Italicized figures are figures against which peer comparisons should be made.*
* Measure used by U.S. News

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

Year	National Eminence/Quality												
	Students						Faculty			Alumni Satisf.		Funding	
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	8	9	10		
	Average SAT*	6-year graduation rate*	Fresh. yr. GPA for 1st time F-T freshmen	2nd year retention rate*	Acceptance rate for freshmen*	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)		
	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+		
2003	848	44%	2.16	67%	57%	79%	\$57,100	70	10%	\$20,483	110%		
2004	838	42%	2.08	64%	63%	76%	\$57,600	71	1%	\$17,786	91%		
2005	815	42%	2.20		66%	81%	\$60,181	77	3%	\$20,605	70%		
2006	814			66%	66%	83%	\$62,876	71	8%	\$21,009	72%		
2007							\$64,575	58	8%		99%		
Benchmark*	788-998	41%	2.20	72%	64%	85%	\$67,432	85%	7%	\$17,870	100%		
	(25th & 75th %ile)												

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development	
	11	12	13		34	32		17		19
	Demand: % of applicants admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	MD comm. college transfers	Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	% chg.	% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation		Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty		Teacher licensure passing rate
		+		-	+	-		+		+
2003	62%	28	\$5,105	13%		\$13,250		\$50,235		45%
2004	62%	58	\$5,558	9%	86%	\$14,500		\$52,057		31%
2005	67%	44	\$5,808	4%	84%	NA		\$51,556		45%
2006	66%	77	\$5,908	2%	88%					83%
2007			\$5,988	2%						100%
Benchmark*	62%	I	53	I	P	89%	I	\$20,592	P	P

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-UMES*	30	31
	State appropriations per FTE student	Expend. for instr. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Expend. for instr. per FTE student	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	4-year graduation rate	Enriching workloa courses per FTE faculty
Year	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2003	\$6,707	37%	\$7,486	21%		40%		0.3%		27%	6.1
2004	\$6,229	38%	\$6,802	13%	Met goal	73%	60%	0.4%		25%	8.4
2005	\$6,396	36%	\$7,459	11%	Met goal	348%	60%	0.4%	4.3%	26%	8.2
2006	\$6,629	33%	\$6,993	11%	Met goal	100%	69%	0.3%	5.5%	19%	8.0
2007					Met goal	60%	68%	0.5%			7.9
Benchmark*	\$8,300 P	33% P	\$5,879 P	13% P	B	100% I	66% N	0.2% increase B	5.0% B	18% P	7.5 B

** This is an institution-specific indicator. See "Institution-Specific Indicators" for definition.

University of Maryland University College

Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

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

** Measure used by U.S. News*

As of 11/29/07

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

Access & Academic Success											
Stateside											
Year	1-UMUC Total undergraduate headcount enrollment	15 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	5-UMUC Number of new MD comm. coll. transfers	13 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	14 Average loan per headcount undergrad borrower	34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses	
2003	18,133	38%	32%	26%	84%	2,973	\$5,328	5%		540	
2004	19,857	38%	32%	26%	83%	2,794	\$5,424	2%	25%	561	
2005	18,573	38%	32%	32%	83%	3,130	\$5,640	4%	27%	600	
2006	22,898	38%	32%	33%	82%	2,885	\$5,640	0%	27%	652	
2007	21,853			37%	81%	2,745	\$5,640	0%	33%	688	
Benchmark*	23,905	P	P	Maintain or increase	≥80%	≥2800	P	<\$7,000	33-40%	Maintain or increase	I

Access & Acad. Success		Quality (Stateside)		
Worldwide	Alumni Satisf.	Funding		
7-UMUC Number of worldwide online enrollments (students x classes enrolled in)	8 Undergraduate alumni giving rate (1 yr.)*	9 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	10 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
Year				
2003	110,423	9%	\$17,832	58%
2004	126,650	9%	\$16,898	46%
2005	143,544	11%	\$17,266	43%
2006	153,626	8%	\$18,961	34%
2007	177,516	NA		40%
Benchmark*	≥175,000	P	\$15,143	100%

Economic Development		Workforce Development	
Stateside		Stateside	
8-UMUC Total no. of off campus or distance education enrollments		9-UMUC Number of IT baccalaureates awarded	10-UMUC No. of technology & management post-baccalaureates awarded
Year			
2003	74,309	889	1,017
2004	83,524	881	1,137
2005	99,202	879	1,239
2006	102,426	802	1,481
2007	120,679	738	1,552
Benchmark*	169,944	800	≥1300

Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency	
Stateside		Worldwide				Stateside	
22 State appropriations per FTE student	26 % of fundraising goal achieved	23 Expend. for instruction as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	21 Expend. for instr. per FTE student	24 Expend. for admin. as % of oper. expend. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	11-UMUC Operating budget savings as % of state- supported budget	
Year							
2003	\$1,419	106%	37%	\$6,640	20%	4%	
2004	\$1,378	68%	38%	\$6,477	19%	5%	
2005	\$1,277	173%	38%	\$6,491	19%	6%	
2006	\$1,365	49%	36%	\$6,768	18%	4%	
2007		59%				3%	
Benchmark*	\$6,186	P	43%	\$6,496	12%	2%	I

University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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

National Eminence/Quality						
Students		Faculty				
1-UMBI		2-UMBI	3-UMBI	4-UMBI	6	5-UMBI
No. of research grad assistants supervised by UMBI faculty		Number of active inter-institutional research programs	Number of multi-project awards received	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	Federally financed R&D expenditures (000s)
Year	+	+	+	+	+	+
2003	65			\$45,140	\$626,944	\$19,989
2004	50		19	\$47,725	\$627,961	\$24,436
2005	55	15	19	\$56,135	\$729,026	\$31,276
2006	59	18	19			
2007	53	24	19			
Benchmark*	50 I	15 I	21 I	I	I	I
Workforce & Economic Development						
6-UMBI	7-UMBI	8-UMBI	9-UMBI	10-UMBI	11-UMBI	12-UMBI
Number of K-12 science teachers served by UMBI science programs	Number of K-12 students served by UMBI science programs	Grant & contract revenues (000s)	Number of active sponsored research agreements with industry	Number of U.S. patents issued	Number of licensing agreements (Cumulative)	Number of start-up companies produced (Cumulative)
Year	+	+	+	+	+	+
2003				15	20	6
2004	474	4,684		12	22	6
2005	505	7,009	\$32,332	10	6	7
2006	694	10,855	\$33,155	17	35	9
2007	704	12,307	\$34,240	21	48	9
Benchmark*	610 I	10,500 I	\$34,813 I	20 I	Incr. by 2 per year I	1 new company every 2 years I
Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency
25	26					28
Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved					Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value
Year	+					+
2003						0.2%
2004	Met goal					0.2%
2005	Met goal					0.3%
2006	Did not meet goal					0.3%
2007	Met goal					0.3%
Benchmark*	B					0.2% increase B

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences
Dashboard Indicators, December 2007

As of 11/29/07

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


Year	National Eminence/Quality			
	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	6 Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty
2003	1203	100		\$563,882
2004	1250	124	20.5	\$582,809
2005	1215	120	26.6	\$546,960
2006	1202	155	27.3	
2007	1224	150	28.5	
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I


Year	Workforce & Economic Development			
	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)
2003	135	330	10,000	\$38,344
2004	142	351	10,205	\$39,631
2005	209	380	11,000	\$41,022
2006	185	400	11,000	
2007	197	524	10,500	
Benchmark*	I	I	I	I

Year	Stewardship		Effectiveness & Efficiency	
	25 Fund balance increase: goal achievement	26 % of fundraising goal achieved		28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value
2003		24%		0.4%
2004	Did not meet goal	10%		0.2%
2005	Met goal	18%		0.2%
2006	Met goal	35%		0.2%
2007	Met goal	160%		0.3%

Decision Rules for Dashboard Indicators

IMPROVEMENT – a comparison with past performance

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

currently below the average of the 3 previous years:  Red

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

currently at or above the benchmark:  Green

currently below the benchmark:  Red

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS, DECEMBER 2007

USM

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
1	Average SAT	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen	Combined average of SAT Math & Verbal scores	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS
2	6-year graduation rate	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen & their success in college	Students graduating at the end of 4 years & 5 years & 6 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 6 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
3	Freshman year GPA for first-time full-time freshmen	Relative quality of new 1 st -time freshmen and their success in their first year in college	Average grades earned in freshman year for those attending USM institution immediately after high school graduation	USM, Admin. & Finance, HGS
4	Second-year retention rate	Relative quality of new freshmen & their success in their freshman year	% of 1 st -time full-time degree-seeking freshmen who return the following fall	U.S. News, <u>America's Best Colleges</u>
5	Acceptance rate for freshmen	Selectivity of a university, which is one measure of the quality of its entering freshmen	Number of freshmen accepted as a % of new freshmen applicants	For USM institutions, USM, Admin. & Finance from MHEC, Form S-3; for peers, U.S. News, <u>America's Best Colleges</u>
6	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	Third-party validation of the importance & quality of faculty research	Total R&D expenditures per full-time instructional faculty ("Ladder-rank" for UMBI)	NSF for R&D expenditures; AAUP for number of faculty
7	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

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
8	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	How undergraduate alumni view the quality of their undergraduate education	Two-year average of the % of undergraduate alumni of record who donated money to the university	U.S. News, <u>America's Best Colleges</u> or CAE, <u>Voluntary Support of Education</u>
9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	A proxy for quality of a university, assuming that quality is related in part to the dollars spent per student	Operating expenditures minus expenditures for auxiliaries & hospitals per FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey.
10	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
11	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
12	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, EIS, AIS & TSS
13	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	Chronicle of Higher Education
14	Discontinued			
15	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
16	Discontinued			
17	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
18	U.S. Patents issued	University's contribution to economic development, since patent protection is important in providing the incentive for companies to commercialize	U.S. Patents issued or reissued to the university	AUTM, Licensing Survey, Table 13

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
		research discoveries		
19	Teacher licensure passing rates	% of students qualifying in a given year to teach in Maryland	Proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took for their area of specialization as % of those taking one or more tests in their specialization area	Title II, State Report, Assessments, Pass Rates via Web
20	Skipped			
21	Expenditures for instruction per FTE student	Dollars spent on instruction per FTE student, which is the university's primary mission	Instructional expenditures divided by adjusted FTE students.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey
22	State appropriations per FTE student	Level of state general funds support for the university	State appropriations divided by adjusted FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey
23	Expenditures for instruction as percent of total operating expenditures	Relative amount spent on instruction, which is the university's primary mission	Instructional expenditures divided by total operating expenditures minus auxiliary & hospital expenditures. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey
24	Expenditures for administration as percent of total operating expenditures	Relative amount spent on administration, indicating how prudently the resources are used.	Institutional support expenditures divided by total operating expenditures minus auxiliary & hospital expenditures. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey
25	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

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
26	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
27	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
28	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
29	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 (Non-traditional method defined separately for each institution for 2006 report only. See separate listings below.)</i>	USM, Admin. & Finance, Institutional Research
29-BSU			Distance education, online & off-campus student credit hrs.	S-6
29-CSU			Distance education, online & off-campus student credit hrs. & independent study	S-6; CSU, Institutional Research
29-FSU 29-SU 29-TU 29-UMBC			Distance education, online & off-campus student credit hrs., AP/IB credits, independent study and study	S-6; Institutional Research offices at each institution

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
29-UMES			abroad	
29-UMCP			Distance education, online & off-campus student credit hours, independent study & study abroad	S-6; UMCP, Institutional Research
30	Four-year graduation rate	Success in lowering time to degree	Students graduating at the end of 4 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 4 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
31	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
32	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, <u>Ultimate College Guide</u>
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, Table 8
34	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
35	Average faculty salary	Ability to attract outstanding faculty	Average salary by rank weighted by number of faculty at that rank. Average is weighted figure.	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries
		Relative strength in attracting	%ile for each rank shows	AAUP, Annual Survey of

<u>CORE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
36	Weighted average faculty salary %ile	outstanding faculty	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.	Faculty Salaries

<u>SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
S1	6-year graduation rate	Relative quality of new 1 st -time full-time freshmen & their success in college	Students graduating at the end of 4 years & 5 years & 6 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 6 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
S2	Second-year retention rate	Relative quality of new freshmen & their success in their freshman year	% of 1 st -time full-time degree-seeking freshmen who return the following fall	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS; USM, Admin. & Finance, "Retention & Graduation Rates of First-Time Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduates," issued annually
S3	Minorities as percent of total undergraduates	Access	African-American, Hispanic, & Native American undergraduates as % of total undergraduates	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey
S4	Operating expenditures per FTE student	A proxy for quality of a university, assuming that quality is related in part to the dollars spent per student	Operating expenditures minus expenditures for auxiliaries & hospitals per FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional students = 1.8 FTEs.	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey.
		% of the peer target which is	Total of tuition & fee	USM, Admin. & Finance,

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
S5	Funding guideline percent achieved	attained by each USM institution. A proxy for quality.	revenues & state approp. compared with those at the peer target	Budget Office
S6	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
S7	Maryland community college transfers as percent of new undergraduate headcount enrollment	Success of MD community college transfers in gaining access to USM institutions	All new undergraduate transfers from MD's community colleges as % of new undergraduate headcount enrollment	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS, AIS & TSS
S8	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
S9	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
S10	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
S11	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
S12	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

<u>SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
S13	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
S14	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
S15	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
S16	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
S17	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
S18	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
S19	Four-year graduation rate	Success in lowering time to degree	Students graduating at the end of 4 years divided by the total adjusted cohort of freshmen beginning 4 years earlier at the same institution	NCES, IPEDS, Graduation Rates survey
S20	Skipped			
S21	State appropriations per FTE student	Level of state general funds support for the university	State appropriations divided by adjusted FTE students. <i>For this calculation:</i> At UMB, 1 st professional students = 4 FTEs. At UB, graduate & 1 st professional	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey

<u>SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
			students = 1.8 FTEs.	
S22	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
S23	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
S24	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
S25	Credit rating (Moody's)	Third party validation of the financial health of the System	Self-explanatory	USM, Admin. & Finance
S26	Percent of annual fundraising dedicated to endowment	Success of fundraising efforts	Self-explanatory	USM Foundation
S27	Total funds raised (annual)	Success of fundraising efforts	Self-explanatory	USM Foundation
S28	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
S29	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

<u>SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
S30	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

<u>ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
E1	Percent of Maryland residents with at least bachelor's degree	Importance of college degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau, <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States</u>
E2	Doctoral scientists employed in Maryland	Importance of advanced degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2001-2003; 2003-2004</u>
E3	Doctoral engineers employed in Maryland	Importance of advanced degrees to Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2001-2003; 2003-2004</u>
E4	Science & engineering doctorates awarded	Production of science & engineering doctorates by Maryland's universities	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles, 2001-2003; 2003-2004</u>
E5	Per capita personal income	Relative wealth of Maryland's residents	Includes Maryland residents only	U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program, Table: GCT-T1; Population Estimates Data Set; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table 1: Personal Income, by State & Region.
E6	Unemployment rate (June)	Relative health of Maryland's economy	Seasonally adjusted for June	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics
E7	Number of SBIR awards (4 yrs.)	Small Business Innovation Research program awards to Maryland businesses	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering State Profiles</u>

<u>ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
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
E9-E11	Skip			
E12	High-tech workers per 1,000 private sector workers	How well Maryland is adapting to high-tech economy	Number of workers in high-tech manufacturing & services per 1,000 workers in the entire private sector. High-tech industries are defined by 49 NAICS* codes and do not include biotech.	American Electronics Association, Cyberstates 2007 , Appendix C.4
E13	Total R&D per capita (includes private sector R&D)	Importance of R&D within Maryland's economy	Total R&D for all sectors divided by Maryland's population	American Electronics Association, Cyberstates 2007 , Appendix C.13
E14	Average high-tech wage	Importance of R&D in Maryland and level of wages compared to other those in other states	Total annual payroll in high-tech manufacturing & services divided by average annual employment in high-tech	American Electronics Association, Cyberstates 2007 , Appendix C.1
E15	High-tech establishments added in past year	Importance of high-tech in contributing to Maryland's economic development	An economic unit is usually a location engaged in one type of economic activity for which a single industrial classification may be employed. An economic unit is not a "company," which in fact often has multiple establishments.	American Electronics Association, Cyberstates 2007 , Appendix C.10
E16	Venture capital investments	Third-party validation of the importance of high-tech ventures in Maryland's economy	Total venture capital investments for all high-tech industry sectors	American Electronics Association, Cyberstates 2007 , Appendix C.10
E17	State general funds for higher education per \$1,000 of personal income	State's support of higher education compared with relative wealth of residents	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E18	State general funds for higher education per capita	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E19	State general funds for higher education per headcount student	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of

<u>ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS</u>				
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
			receives state general funds	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; <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u>
E21	Skip			
E22	University R&D expenditures in life sciences	Importance of R&D in the life sciences within Maryland's economy	Self-explanatory	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures, FY 2005, Table 26
E23	Current population estimates	For comparison purposes	Self-explanatory	U.S. Census Bureau
E24	New Economy Index: Overall ranking	How well Maryland is competing in the new, knowledge-based economy	Based upon relative standing among the states on a series of measures relative to the new economy	Kauffman Foundation & Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, <u>The 2007 State New Economy Index</u> , 2007.
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
E29	New Economy Index: Innovation capacity	How efficiently capital is put to use	Based upon relative standing among the states on five related measures	Same as above

* North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

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

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS

SPECIFIC USM INSTITUTIONS

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE</u>		
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
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
6-UB	Number of IT graduates produced annually	UB, MFR
7-UB	Percent of students involved with non-traditional learning activities	UB, MFR

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE</u>		
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
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)
8-UMB	R&D expenditures per full-time basic science faculty	UMB, School of Medicine, Special Report from AAMC
9-UMB	R&D expenditures per full-time clinical faculty	UMB, School of Medicine, Special Report from AAMC
10-UMB	Total headcount enrollment	USM, Admin. & Finance, EIS
11-UMB	Afr. Amer., Hispan., & Native Amer. as percent of total headcount enrollment	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey (Includes African-American, Hispanic & Native American at all levels)
12-UMB	Graduate & 1 st professional as percent of total headcount enrollment	NCES, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey (Peer Performance Measures)
13-UMB	Grant & contract awards	UMB, IR office, from USM Extramural Funding

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE</u>		
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
		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
15-UMB	Skipped	
16-UMB	Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	UMB, IR
17-UMB	Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	UMB, MFR
18-UMB	Number of dentistry graduates (DDS)	UMB, MFR
19-UMB	Days of charity care provided by clinical medical faculty	UMB, MFR

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE</u>			
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Stateside/Worldwide</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
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
5-UMUC	Number of new Maryland community college transfers	Stateside	UMUC, IR office
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	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, MFR
9-UMUC	Number of IT baccalaureates awarded	Stateside	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

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BIOTECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE</u>		
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
1-UMBI	Number of research graduate assistants supervised by UMBI faculty	UMBI, IR office, MFR
2-UMBI	Number of active inter-institutional research programs	UMBI, IR office, MFR
3-UMBI	Number of multi-project awards received	UMBI, IR office, MFR
4-UMBI	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures
5-UMBI	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures
6-UMBI	Number of K-12 science teachers served by UMBI science programs	UMBI, IR office, MFR
7-UMBI	Number of K-12 students served by UMBI science program	UMBI, IR office, MFR
8-UMBI	Grant & contract revenues	UMBI, IR office, MFR
9-UMBI	Number of active SRAs with industry	UMBI, IR office, MFR
10-UMBI	Number of patents issued	UMBI, IR office, MFR
11-UMBI	Number of licensing agreements (Cumulative)	UMBI, IR office, MFR
12-UMBI	Number of start-up companies produced (Cumulative)	UMBI, IR office, MFR

<u>INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</u>		
<u>#</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
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
4-UMCES	Number of UMCES-sponsored Chesapeake Bay restoration projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
5-UMCES	Number of K-12 teachers trained in UMCES environmental projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
6-UMCES	Number of K-12 students involved in UMCES environmental education projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
7-UMCES	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures; MFR

E:\FACTBOOK\DASHBD INDIC\2007\INDICDESCRIP112807.DOC, 11-28-07 CB