

USM DASHBOARD INDICATORS 2009



BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING
DECEMBER 4, 2009

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER/
VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE

Summary of 2009 Core Dashboard Indicators

As of 11/19/09

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	1268	1190		882	853	974	1126	1074		828			
2	6-year graduation rate	82%	59%		41%	16%	48%	69%	66%		38%			63%
3	Freshman year GPA for 1st-time, full-time freshmen	3.03	2.69		2.53	2.79	2.41	2.67	2.91		2.20			
4	2nd-year retention rate	93%	84%		72%	61%	71%	82%	82%		65%			71%
5	Acceptance rate for freshmen	39%	72%		46%	36%	60%	53%	61%		63%			
15	Afr.-Amer., Hispanics, Native Amer. as % of total undergraduates	19%	21%		92%	88%	24%	15%	15%	37%	83%	36%		30%
6	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty												\$573,521	
7	Awards per 100 full-time faculty (5yrs.)	4.6	3.8											
35	Average faculty salary	\$110,239	\$88,620		\$69,734	\$65,822	\$72,807	\$71,086	\$71,895		\$70,805			
36	Faculty salary %ile	91%	79%		71%	65%	59%	64%	70%		57%			79%
8	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	12%	5%		3%	NA	8%	16%	6%	NA	5%	2%		
9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	\$34,538	\$26,326	\$55,374	\$14,778	\$18,114	\$14,843	\$10,973	\$12,608	\$15,625	\$18,473	\$17,585		\$27,792
10	Funding guideline percent achieved	73%	65%	61%	74%	112%	77%	65%	68%	50%	69%	46%		70%
11	Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)	43%	75%		46%	46%	61%	58%	64%		62%			
12	MD community college transfers	1652	1052		302	199	313	524	1729		97			8993
13	Resident undergrad tuition & fees	\$8,053	\$8,872		\$6,040	\$5,276	\$6,684	\$6,618	\$7,418	\$7,171	\$6,082	\$5,820		\$7,462
34	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid	61%	61%		70%	78%	70%	65%	54%	61%	86%	27%		
32	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation	\$18,958	\$20,954		\$14,399	NA	\$18,035	\$17,669	\$11,844	NA	\$19,655			
17	Total R&D expenditure per full-time faculty	\$292,837	\$163,337								\$20,476			
18	U.S. Patents issued	24	5	14										43
33	Adjusted gross license income received	\$1,171,967	\$107,352	\$355,948										
19	Teacher licensure passing rates	100%	93%		95%	90%	97%	94%	96%		100%			
22	State appropriations per FTE student	\$12,220	\$8,451	\$13,641	\$7,558	\$10,266	\$6,853	\$5,021	\$4,939	\$5,260	\$8,374	\$1,890		\$8,500
23	Expenditures for instruction as % of total operating expenditures	35%	36%	23%	44%	34%	41%	56%	40%	38%	41%	33%		
21	Expenditures for instruction per FTE student	\$12,062	\$9,492	\$12,742	\$6,560	\$6,238	\$6,096	\$6,145	\$5,085	\$5,925	\$7,536	\$5,778		
24	Expenditures for administration as % of total operating expenditures	8%	11%	9%	23%	26%	16%	18%	14%	23%	13%	16%		
25	Fund balance increase: goal achievement	Met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Not met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	Met goal	
26	% of fundraising goal achieved	87%	80%	101%	100%	105%	155%	91%	103%	48%	171%	171%	36%	
27	Classroom utilization rate	67%	62%		67%	68%	62%	75%	67%		73%			68%
28	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacement value	1.5%	0.5%	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	1.5%	2.7%	0.7%		0.8%	1.2%
29	% of undergrad credits from non-traditional methods	10.4%	13.2%		5.8%	9.8%	9.6%	11.6%	7.6%		4.9%			9.6%
30	4-year graduation rate	63%	32%		18%	5%	22%	46%	37%		22%			41%
31	Teaching workload: courses per FTE faculty	5.7	6.5		8.0	8.2	7.6	7.9	7.4	7.5	7.9			

Is performance IMPROVING on the Dashboard Indicators?*

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 11/19/09

#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMCES	
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	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
9 Operating expenditures per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		
10 Funding guideline percent achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		
Access & Academic Success	11 Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)													
	12 MD community college transfers	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●			
	13 Resident undergrad tuition & fees					●								
	34 % of undergraduates receiving financial aid	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
	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	●	●	●										
Stewardship	19 Teacher licensure passing rates	●	●		●	●	●	●	●		●			
	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		22	22	7	23	16	17	19	20	8	17	5	2	
Worse		8	8	4	2	9	9	7	6	6	9	6	1	

* Average of most recent 3 years compared with previous 3 years (e.g., 2004-2006 compared with 2003-2005).
 Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2009\DBI111209.XLS, 11/19/09

Is performance ADEQUATE on the Dashboard Indicators?

● Same or better ● Worse

As of 11/19/09

	#	Indicator	UMCP	UMBC	UMB	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMES	UMUC	UMCES
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	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
9	Operating expenditures per FTE student	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
10	Funding guideline percent achieved	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Access & Academic Success	11	Demand: % of applicants who were admitted (new freshmen & transfer students)												
	12	MD community college transfers		●		●	●	●	●	●		●		
	13	Resident undergrad tuition & fees												
	34	% of undergraduates receiving financial aid		●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	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			12	12	3	14	10	10	13	12	6	11	4	1
Does not meet benchmark			13	17	7	10	13	15	12	13	7	14	6	1

University System of Maryland
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09

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 Wgt'd. aver faculty salary %ile	S4 Operating expendit. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	S5 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2005	61%	77%	30%	\$89,109	\$62,679	78	\$23,442	65%
2006	62%	73%	31%	\$92,228	\$65,030	77	\$26,993	84%
2007	63%	71%	30%	\$96,153	\$67,463	77	\$28,467	80%
2008	63%	71%	30%	\$100,923	\$69,634	79	\$27,792	82%
2009	63%	71%	30%	\$105,395	\$71,951	79	\$27,792	70%
Benchmark*	55%	73%	22%	\$91,181	\$72,382	85%	\$25,954	100%

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development		Workforce Development		
	S6 % of total projected demand met	S7 MD comm. college transfers	S8 % of Maryland market share (Public/Private/CCs)	S9 Average weighted resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning % chg.)	S10 Institutional financial aid for undergrads as % of undergrad tuition revenue	S11 Institutional financial aid for undergraduate students (millions)	S12 Licenses & options executed	S13 U.S. Patents issued	S14 Number of teaching graduates	S15 Number of nursing graduates	
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	35	44	1741	848
2007	88%	8974	42.2%	\$7,325	1%	15%	\$90.1	65	43	1700	882
2008	90%	8993	42.5%	\$7,390	1%	15%	\$96.5			1558	908
2009				\$7,462	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'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)
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%	8.1%	40%	\$8,025	0.5%	76%	Met goal	Stable	25.0%	\$241,105
2008	68%	1.9%	9.6%	41%	\$8,500	0.4%	89%	Met goal	Stable	NA	\$260,086
2009		1.2%					87%	Met goal	Stable	17.1%	\$233,935
Benchmark*	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	30%	\$8,809	2.3%					

University System of Maryland
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09

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.	E30 % of Maryland residents with advanced degree or more	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	
2004	35.2%				677	\$39,333	4.3%	78	\$74,981	5,553,249
2005	36.3%				744	\$41,929	4.2%	79	\$77,035	5,589,599
2006	35.7%		26,160	(Combined w/E2)	840	\$44,077	3.9%	80	\$80,834	5,615,727
2007	35.1%	15.7%				\$46,021	3.5%	80	\$84,351	5,618,344
2008						\$48,532	4.3%			5,633,597
2009			No new data		No new data		7.2%			
Benchmark	27.0%	9.9%	6th (MD's rank)		11th (MD's rank)	5th (MD's rank)	9.5%	5th (MD's rank)	10th (MD's rank)	19th (MD's rank)

Year	R&D			Economic Development		
	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 (Cumulative)	E16 Venture capital investments (millions)	E15 High-tech establishments added in past year
2004	\$2,269	\$2,655		1,630		288
2005	\$2,357	NA	\$1,179.3		\$437.8	108
2006	\$2,530	NA	\$1,293.4	1,940	\$636.2	206
2007	\$2,542	NA	\$1,241.8		\$635.3	583
2008						
2009						
Benchmark		3rd (MD's rank)		4th (MD's rank)	7th (MD's rank)	7th (MD's rank)

Support of Higher Education			
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
\$5.56	\$206.94	\$4,677	16.8%
\$5.34	\$223.75	\$4,173	17.1%
			16.4%
\$5.57	\$255.78	\$4,572	
\$5.91	\$280.04	\$4,925	16.1%
\$6.02	\$292.33	\$5,027	15.4%
Benchmark	31st (MD's rank)	18th (MD's rank)	16th (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)
11th	8th	33rd	25th	6th	12th
5th	2nd	30th	11th	13th	6th
2007	3rd	4th	30th	2nd	11th
2008	3rd	4th	24th	9th	8th
2009					

Bowie State University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09 *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					8		9	
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*		Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)		Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
	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						
2005	890	38%	2.48	74%	42%	92%	\$61,488	77	9%		\$13,554		51%	
2006	884	37%	2.53	75%	41%	92%	\$62,573	75	5%		\$13,885		94%	
2007	870	37%	2.53	75%	46%	92%	\$64,242	68	5%		\$14,770		74%	
2008	882	41%		72%	46%	92%	\$66,794	68	3%		\$14,778		87%	
2009							\$69,734	71					74%	
Benchmark*	798-980 (25th & 75th %ile)	31%	2.53	66%	57%	58%	\$72,382	85%	5%		\$18,830		100%	

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)		% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			Teacher licensure passing rate
			% chg.						
2005	43%	453	5%	\$5,481	74%	NA		95%	
2006	44%	290	5%	\$5,730	68%	\$16,754		92%	
2007	43%	281	4%	\$5,939	69%	\$14,399		89%	
2008	46%	302	1%	\$6,005	70%			98%	
2009			1%	\$6,040				95%	
Benchmark*	45%	500			68%	\$21,320		91%	

Year	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
2005	\$5,074	42%	\$5,651	21%	Did not meet goal	23%	51%	0.4%	4.1%	13%	8.5
2006	\$5,362	43%	\$5,909	23%	Did not meet goal	26%	58%	0.5%	2.3%	13%	7.5
2007	\$7,418	43%	\$6,303	24%	Met goal	116%	59%	1.0%	2.4%	15%	7.9
2008	\$7,558	44%	\$6,560	23%	Met goal	250%	59%	0.8%	5.8%	18%	8.0
2009					Met goal	100%	67%	1.0%			8.0
Benchmark*	\$9,015	36%	\$6,569	17%		100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	10%	7.5

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

Coppin State University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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					8		9		10
	1	2	3	4	5	15	35	36	8	9	10	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)					
2005	856	20%	2.70	63%	50%	95%	\$60,956	73	17%	\$15,562	70%				
2006	849	18%	2.71	64%	46%	95%	\$65,238	77	7%	\$13,736	108%				
2007	850	19%	2.79	62%	36%	87%	\$63,879	63	7%	\$18,924	93%				
2008	853	16%		61%	36%	88%	\$64,904	64	NA	\$18,114	101%				
2009							\$65,822	65			112%				
Benchmark*	856-1027 (25th & 75th %ile)	32%	No CSU goal set	64%	66%	58%	\$72,382	85%	6%	\$15,700	100%				

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
2005	55%	197	\$4,714	6%	\$13,632			100%
2006	51%	219	\$4,745	1%	\$14,701			95%
2007	36%	214	\$4,980	5%	NA			81%
2008	46%	199	\$5,140	3%				100%
2009			\$5,276	3%				90%
Benchmark*	53%	225			\$24,642			99%

Year	Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency					
	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 replacem. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2005	\$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
2007	\$9,482	29%	\$5,505	27%	Did not meet goal	19%	66%	0.2%	8.9%	7%	8.8
2008	\$10,266	34%	\$6,238	26%	Did not meet goal	68%	61%	0.9%	9.8%	5%	9.0
2009					Did not meet goal	105%	68%	0.9%			8.2
Benchmark*	\$7,889	41%	\$6,373	16%		100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	13%	7.5

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

Frostburg State University

Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09 *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)	
2005	1005	47%	2.39	71%	76%	17%	\$62,455	60	12%	\$11,363	78%
2006	976	47%	2.35	72%	70%	19%	\$65,173	60	10%	\$12,764	90%
2007	967	51%	2.41	70%	63%	22%	\$67,080	53	13%	\$13,637	82%
2008	974	48%		71%	60%	24%	\$69,733	55	12%	\$14,843	93%
2009							\$72,807	59	8%		77%
Benchmark*	899-1099 (25th & 75th %ile)	47%	2.42	74%	63%	11%	\$72,382	85%	10%	\$16,427	100%

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)		% of undergrads receiving financial aid	Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation			Teacher licensure passing rate
2005	75%	268	\$6,230	7%	71%	\$15,678			97%
2006	70%	277	\$6,392	3%	69%	\$15,801			98%
2007	63%	283	\$6,550	2%	70%	\$18,035			99%
2008	61%	313	\$6,614	1%	70%				99%
2009			\$6,684	1%					97%
Benchmark*	73%	282			72%	\$19,050			97%

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-FSU**	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 replacmt. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
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	\$6,691	45%	\$6,085	14%	Met goal	185%	61%	1.2%	9.2%	22%	8.0
2008	\$6,853	41%	\$6,096	16%	Met goal	124%	61%	1.1%	9.6%	22%	8.1
2009					Met goal	155%	62%	0.9%			7.6
Benchmark*	\$6,966	41%	\$6,581	14%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	23%	7.5

Salisbury University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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)		
2005	1136	69%	2.68	83%	57%	13%	\$60,853	67	9%	\$10,391	74%	
2006	1104	70%	2.66	81%	55%	14%	\$63,117	65	9%	\$10,859	104%	
2007	1120	68%	2.67	81%	56%	14%	\$66,479	64	12%	\$11,217	79%	
2008	1126	69%		82%	53%	15%	\$68,599	62	14%	\$10,973	78%	
2009							\$71,086	64	16%		65%	
Benchmark*	979-1162	58%	2.68	79%	65%	9%	\$72,382	85%	9%	\$16,585	100%	

(25th & 75th %ile)

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
2005	62%	513	\$6,376	64%	\$15,831			91%
2006	60%	569	\$6,412	64%	\$18,330			90%
2007	60%	601	\$6,412	62%	\$17,669			91%
2008	58%	524	\$6,492	65%				92%
2009			\$6,618					94%
Benchmark*	60%	530		64%	\$18,915			97%

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	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
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%	9.4%	52%	7.9
2007	\$4,957	46%	\$5,203	16%	Met goal	515%	86%	1.1%	9.4%	45%	8.0
2008	\$5,021	56%	\$6,145	18%	Met goal	127%	75%	1.1%	11.6%	46%	8.2
2009					Met goal	91%	75%	1.2%			7.9
Benchmark*	\$7,495	41%	\$6,761	13%		100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	35%	7.5

Towson University
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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	
	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)					
2005	1087	56%	2.83	79%	63%	13%	\$63,282	74	7%	\$11,108	80%					
2006	1072	64%	2.91	83%	69%	14%	\$65,589	73	7%	\$11,881	100%					
2007	1084	66%	2.91	83%	60%	14%	\$68,735	75	7%	\$12,275	90%					
2008	1074	66%		82%	61%	15%	\$70,217	71	6%	\$12,608	88%					
2009							\$71,895	70	6%		68%					
Benchmark*	929-1143	50%	2.95	77%	74%	15%	\$72,382	85%	8%	\$16,853	100%					

(25th & 75th %ile)

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			
2005	67%	1429	\$7,096	6%	\$14,808	94%			
2006	71%	1483	\$7,164	1%	\$12,472	94%			
2007	62%	1630	\$7,234	1%	\$11,844	93%			
2008	64%	1729	\$7,314	1%		95%			
2009			\$7,418	1%		96%			
Benchmark*	65%	1300		56%	\$18,237	98%			

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-TU**	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 replacem. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
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	\$4,783	40%	\$4,921	15%	Met goal	110%	71%	1.8%	7.3%	36%	7.3
2008	\$4,939	40%	\$5,085	14%	Met goal	104%	73%	1.1%	7.6%	37%	7.3
2009					Met goal	103%	67%	1.5%			7.4
Benchmark*	\$7,571	45%	\$7,778	11%	B	100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	25%	7.5

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

University of Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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-UB % of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt	15 Afr.-Amer., Hispan., Nat. Amer. as % of UGs	2-UB Sponsored research \$ per F-T faculty (000s)	3-UB % part-time faculty	8 Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	9 Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	10 Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2005	62%	34%	\$52	54%	10%	\$13,191	80%
2006	72%	33%	\$57	54%	9%	\$14,230	141%
2007	65%	38%	\$61	55%	4%	\$15,090	132%
2008	75%	37%	\$54	53%	6%	\$15,625	107%
2009	74%		\$39	55%	NA		50%
Benchmark*	75%	29%		49%	10%	\$16,017	100%

Year	Access & Academic Success				
	4-UB Number of minority students graduating annually (UG & Grad/Prof)	5-UB % of economically disadvantaged students	13 Resident UG tuition & fees (Yr. beginning)	34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	32 Average undergraduate debt burden upon graduation
			% chg.		
2005	344	62%	\$6,794	54%	\$6,816
2006	427	62%	\$6,814	56%	\$8,059
2007	426	63%	\$6,934	59%	NA
2008	436	62%	\$7,051	61%	
2009	461	67%	\$7,171		
Benchmark*	426	75%		58%	\$15,344

Economic Development	Workforce Development
	6-UB Number of IT graduates produced annually
	40
	35
	55
	42
	54
	55

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
2005	\$4,380	42%	\$5,585	18%	Did not meet goal	196%
2006	\$4,771	37%	\$5,259	25%	Met goal	67%
2007	\$5,420	38%	\$5,789	22%	Met goal	47%
2008	\$5,260	38%	\$5,925	23%	Did not meet goal	243%
2009					Met goal	48%
Benchmark*	\$6,160	38%	\$6,141	14%		100%

Effectiveness & Efficiency		
28 Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	7-UB % of stdts. involved with non-traditional learning activities	31 Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
0.5%	32%	6.9
0.5%	40%	6.9
0.5%	40%	7.0
2.3%	42%	7.5
2.7%	42%	7.5
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.

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2009\DBI111209.XLS, 11/19/09

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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				Funding		
	1-UMB	2-UMB	3-UMB	4-UMB	5-UMB	6-UMB	7-UMB	8-UMB	9-UMB	9	10
Passing rate on Bar (Law) exam	Passing rate on medical licensure exam	Passing rate on nursing licensure exam	Passing rate on dentistry licensure exam	Natl. ranking NIH awards to public medical schls.	Natl. ranking: NIH awards to public & priv. dental schls.	No. of specialty law programs ranked in top 10 nationally	R&D expenditures per F-T basic science faculty	R&D expenditures per F-T clinical faculty	Operating expend. per FTE stdt. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)	
2005	78%	96%	91%	99%	12	4	3	\$219,122	\$206,473	\$46,596	53%
2006	78%	96%	84%	99%	14	10	3	\$254,411	\$222,656	\$48,802	72%
2007	80%	95%	87%	99%	13	8	2	NA	NA	\$50,438	73%
2008	88%	96%	93%	97%	15	13	3	NA	NA	\$55,374	75%
2009	84%	95%	89%	98%	12	10	3	NA	NA		61%
Benchmark*	91%	96%	88%	NA	Top 10	Top 10	Top 10			\$61,318	100%

Year	Access & Academic Success				Economic Development			Workforce Development		
	10-UMB	11-UMB	12-UMB	13-UMB	14-UMB	33	18	16-UMB	17-UMB	18-UMB
	Total headcount enrollmt.	Afr.-Amer., Hispan., & Nat. Amer. as % of total headcount enrollment	Graduate & 1st prof. as % of total hdtd. enrollment	Grant & contract awards (millions)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per F-T medical faculty	Adjusted gross license income received	U.S. Patents issued	Number of nursing graduates (BSN, MS, PhD)	Number of pharmacy graduates (PharmD)	Number of dentistry grads (DDS)
2005	5,526	21%	85%	\$409.1	\$249,808	\$123,090	7	588	130	97
2006	5,636	22%	85%	\$379.4	\$247,402	\$417,497	8	547	158	106
2007	5,884	22%	86%	\$410.0	\$225,897	\$355,948	14	532	115	103
2008	6,156	22%	86%	\$446.2	\$300,750		12	529	114	100
2009	6,382	21%	87%	\$516.0	\$267,799		14	559	121	115
Benchmark*	22,915	17%	40%		\$230,988	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually	5% annually

Year	Stewardship					Effectiveness & Efficiency		
	22	23	21	24	25	26	28	19-UMB
	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	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	Days of charity care provided by clinical medical faculty
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	\$12,966	25%	\$12,434	9%	Met goal	100%	0.7%	3,776
2008	\$13,641	23%	\$12,742	9%	Met goal	101%	0.8%	3,869
2009					Did not meet goal		0.9%	3,107
Benchmark*	\$13,182	28%	\$17,813	6%		100%	0.2% increase	3,625

University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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 FT faculty (5 yrs.)	Aver. faculty salary	Wgtd. aver faculty salary %ile	Average (2-yr.) undergrad alumni giving rate*	Operating expend. per FTE std. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)		
2005	1216	58%	2.66	83%	71%	18%	4.9	\$74,169	77	7%	\$23,059	64%	
2006	1190	56%	2.70	82%	72%	19%	5.1	\$76,007	74	5%	\$23,979	81%	
2007	1191	61%	2.69	83%	69%	20%	5.1	\$80,224	79	5%	\$25,720	74%	
2008	1190	59%		84%	72%	21%	4.5	\$85,381	77	5%	\$26,326	72%	
2009							3.8	\$88,620	79	5%		65%	
Benchmark*	1014-1227 (25th & 75th %ile)	63%	2.70	83%	73%	17%	2.8	\$81,668	85%	14%	\$30,183	100%	

Year	Access & Academic Success						Economic Development			Workforce Development
	11	12	13	34	32	17	18	33	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	U.S. Patents issued	Adjusted gross license income received	Teacher licensure passing rate	
2005	74%	1030	\$8,520 6%	62%	\$19,018	\$149,532	1	\$87,817	94%	
2006	74%	947	\$8,622 1%	61%	\$22,856	\$166,797	9	\$121,785	93%	
2007	73%	961	\$8,707 1%	60%	\$20,954	\$163,337	5	\$107,352	99%	
2008	75%	1052	\$8,780 1%	61%					96%	
2009			\$8,872 1%						93%	
Benchmark*	73%	958		61%	\$17,348	\$194,539	11	\$6,617,281	97%	

Year	Stewardship						Effectiveness & Efficiency				
	22	23	21	24	25	26	27	28	29-UMBC**	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 replacem. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Tching. workload courses per FTE faculty
2005	\$6,667	34%	\$7,876	11%	Met goal	111%	62%	0.2%	8.7%	30%	5.9
2006	\$7,200	34%	\$8,164	11%	Met goal	108%	62%	0.3%	10.1%	28%	6.0
2007	\$8,094	33%	\$8,498	12%	Met goal	137%	63%	0.3%	11.9%	35%	6.1
2008	\$8,451	36%	\$9,492	11%	Did not meet goal	103%	64%	0.4%	13.2%	32%	6.3
2009					Met goal	80%	62%	0.5%			6.5
Benchmark*	\$11,137	29%	\$8,770	9%		100%	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	36%	5.5

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

University of Maryland, College Park

Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

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

Year	National Eminence/Quality											Faculty	Alumni Satisf.	Funding		
	Students													8	9	10
	1	2	3	4	5	15	7	35	36							
	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 FT faculty (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)				
2005	1271	77%	2.97	93%	49%	19%	5.4	\$93,468	85	16%	\$31,270	67%				
2006	1267	79%	3.00	93%	45%	19%	5.5	\$97,044	84	12%	\$33,087	82%				
2007	1263	80%	3.03	93%	47%	19%	5.4	\$100,958	86	14%	\$33,645	78%				
2008	1268	82%		93%	39%	19%	5.5	\$105,497	93	14%	\$34,538	82%				
2009							4.6	\$110,239	91	12%		73%				
Benchmark*	1196-1406 (25th & 75th %ile)	87%	Stable	96%	39%	15%	5.2	\$97,045	85%	16%	\$54,415	100%				

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	
2005	53%	1341	\$7,821	59%	\$14,451	6%
2006	48%	1571	\$7,906	60%	\$17,731	1%
2007	50%	1557	\$7,969	61%	\$18,958	1%
2008	43%	1652	\$8,005	61%		1%
2009			\$8,053			1%
Benchmark*	Note 1	No specific goal		Note 2	\$17,146	

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
2005	\$252,722	23	\$962,516	96%
2006	\$266,951	22	\$1,835,471	99%
2007	\$292,837	24	\$1,171,967	100%
2008				100%
2009				100%
Benchmark*	\$272,225	NA	NA	100%

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
2005	\$9,955	32%	\$10,089	7%	Met goal	128%
2006	\$10,364	32%	\$10,509	7%	Met goal	120%
2007	\$11,735	32%	\$10,886	6%	Met goal	102%
2008	\$12,220	35%	\$12,062	8%	Met goal	103%
2009					Met goal	87%
Benchmark*	\$13,191	34%	\$19,097	6%		100%

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
2005	67%	2.2%	2.4%	50%	5.2
2006	67%	1.7%	7.4%	55%	6.0
2007	65%	1.6%	8.0%	58%	5.9
2008	66%	2.0%	10.4%	63%	5.8
2009	67%	1.5%			5.7
Benchmark*	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	67%	5.5

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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 std. (Excl. auxil./hosp.)	Funding guideline % achieved (FY)
2005	815	42%	2.20	65%	66%	81%	\$60,181	77	3%	\$20,605	72%
2006	814	34%	2.27	65%	66%	83%	\$62,876	71	8%	\$21,009	99%
2007	818	37%	2.20	65%	58%	83%	\$64,575	58	8%	\$18,214	88%
2008	828	38%	2.20	65%	63%	83%	\$68,418	59	7%	\$18,473	82%
2009							\$70,805	57	5%		69%
Benchmark*	801-977 (25th & 75th %ile)	39%	2.20	71%	59%	85%	\$72,382	85%	7%	\$20,076	100%

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
2005	67%	44	\$5,808 4%	84%	\$12,389
2006	66%	77	\$5,908 2%	88%	\$14,608
2007	58%	48	\$5,988 2%	88%	\$16,210
2008	62%	97	\$6,042 2%	86%	\$18,190
2009			\$6,082 2%		\$19,655
Benchmark*	62%	53	P	89%	\$23,642

Economic Development	
17	
Total R&D expendit. per FT faculty	
2005	\$51,556
2006	\$38,657
2007	\$20,476
2008	
2009	
Benchmark*	\$37,097

Workforce Development	
19	
Teacher licensure passing rate	
2005	45%
2006	83%
2007	100%
2008	100%
2009	100%
Benchmark*	95%

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
2005	\$6,396	36%	\$7,459	11%	Met goal	348%
2006	\$6,629	33%	\$6,993	11%	Met goal	100%
2007	\$7,593	31%	\$5,723	13%	Met goal	60%
2008	\$8,374	41%	\$7,536	13%	Met goal	283%
2009					Met goal	171%
Benchmark*	\$9,651	35%	\$6,935	14%	B	100%

Effectiveness & Efficiency					
27	28	29-UMES*	30	31	
Classroom utilization rate	Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacem. value	% of undergrad. credits from non-tradit. methods	4-year graduation rate	Finching. workloa courses per FTE faculty	
2005	60%	0.4%	4.3%	26%	8.2
2006	69%	0.3%	5.5%	19%	8.0
2007	68%	0.5%	5.7%	22%	7.9
2008	66%	0.6%	4.9%	22%	7.6
2009	73%	0.7%			7.9
Benchmark*	66%	0.2% increase	10.0%	17%	7.5

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

University of Maryland University College
Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

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

As of 11/19/09

* 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)	34 % of undergrads receiving financial aid	6-UMUC Number of stateside online courses					
	+	+	+	+	NC	+	% chg.	+	+	+	+			
2005	19,000	38%	32%	32%	83%	3,130	\$5,640	4%	27%	600				
2006	22,898	38%	32%	33%	82%	2,885	\$5,640	<1%	27%	652				
2007	21,853	35%	29%	37%	81%	2,745	\$5,640	<1%	33%	688				
2008	22,308	36%	30%	38%	82%	2,118	\$5,640	<1%	28%	782				
2009	24,284			38%			\$5,820	3%	27%	752				
Benchmark*	>22300	P	P	Maintain or increase	I	≥80%	P	≥2800	I	P	25-30%	I	Maintain or increase	I

Year	Access & Acad. Success				Quality (Stateside)				Economic Development		Workforce Development			
	Worldwide		Alumni Satisf.		Funding		Funding		Worldwide		Stateside			
	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)	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							
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			
2005	153,626	11%	\$17,266	34%	225,003	879	1,239							
2006	153,824	8%	\$18,961	40%	243,605	802	1,481							
2007	177,516	NA	\$17,569	61%	251,800	738	1,552							
2008	189,505	2%	\$17,585	39%	251,111	642	1,845							
2009	196,331	2%		46%	253,271	604	1,813							
Benchmark*	≥175,000	P	8%	P	\$15,526	P	100%	S	>251,000	I	>500	I	≥1300	I

Year	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				
+	+	+	+	-	+	+					
2005	\$1,277	173%	38%	\$6,491	19%	Met goal	6%				
2006	\$1,365	49%	36%	\$6,768	18%	Met goal	4%				
2007	\$1,492	59%	33%	\$5,864	19%	Met goal	3%				
2008	\$1,890	87%	33%	\$5,778	16%	Met goal	2%				
2009		171%				Met goal					
Benchmark*	\$6,466	P	100%	P	\$6,858	P	13%	P	B	2%	I

University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute
 Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09

* 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	+	+	+	+	+	+
2005		10	14	\$56,135	\$729,026	\$31,276
2006		10	16	\$59,297	\$705,917	\$32,005
2007	NA	15	17			
2008	42	17	15			
2009						
Updated	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08
Benchmark*				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	+	+	+	+	+	+
2005	505	7,009	\$20,835	7	6	27
2006	694	10,855	\$20,446	16	8	35
2007	704	12,307	\$22,765	19	6	48
2008	528	12,687	\$20,349	21	7	56
2009						
Updated	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08	11/17/08
Benchmark*				I	Incr. by 2 per year	1 new company every 2 years

Stewardship		
25	26	
Fund balance increase: goal achievement	% of fundraising goal achieved	
Year	+	
2005	Met goal	439%
2006	Did not meet goal	316%
2007	Met goal	46%
2008	Met goal	426%
2009		

Effectiveness & Efficiency	
28	
Facilities renewal \$ as % of replacemt. value	
Year	
2005	0.3%
2006	0.3%
2007	0.3%
2008	0.4%
2009	

Q:\ACCOUNTABILITY\DASHBOARD INDICATORS\2009\DBI11209.XLS, 11/19/09

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences

Dashboard Indicators, December 2009

As of 11/19/09


* 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
2005	1215	120	26.6	\$546,960
2006	1202	155	27.3	\$565,437
2007	1224	145	28.5	\$573,521
2008	1189	147	29.3	
2009	1230	150	31.4	
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)
2005	209	380	11,000	\$41,022
2006	185	400	11,000	\$40,146
2007	197	524	10,500	\$40,720
2008	179	455	11,000	
2009	191	450	11,000	
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
2005	Met goal	18%		0.2%
2006	Met goal	35%		0.2%
2007	Met goal	160%		0.3%
2008	Met goal	21%		0.6%
2009	Met goal	36%		0.8%


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 2009

USM

CORE INDICATORS				
#	<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	NCES, IPEDS, Retention Survey
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	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics
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

CORE INDICATORS				
#	<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

CORE INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
		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

CORE INDICATORS				
#	<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

CORE INDICATORS				
#	<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

CORE INDICATORS				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
36	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

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	<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.

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
S5	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
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	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

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	<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,	NCES, IPEDS, Finance Survey and Fall Enrollment Survey

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>What it measures</u>	<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Source of data</u>
			graduate & 1 st professional 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	AAUP, Annual Survey of Faculty Salaries

SYSTEMWIDE INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
			weighted figure.	
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

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
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, 2005-2007</u>
E3	Doctoral engineers employed in Maryland (combined with E2 after 2005)	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, 2005-2007</u>
E5	Per capita personal income	Relative wealth of Maryland's residents	Includes Maryland residents only	U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program, Table: GCT-T1; Population Estimates Data Set; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table 1: Personal Income, by State & Region.
E6	Unemployment rate (June)	Relative health of Maryland's economy	Seasonally adjusted for June	U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Tables LASST24000003 (MD) & LNS14000000 (US)
		Small Business Innovation	Self-explanatory	NSF, <u>Science & Engineering</u>

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
E7	Number of SBIR awards (4 yrs.)	Research program awards to Maryland businesses		State Profiles
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 2009 , Appendix C.4
E13	Total R&D per capita (includes private sector R&D) <i>(Data no longer available)</i>	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 2009 , 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 2009 , 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	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS				
#	Indicator	What it measures	Calculation	Source of data
			receives state general funds	Education Policy, Grapevine
E19	State general funds for higher education per headcount student	State's support of higher education	Self-explanatory. Includes all of higher education that receives state general funds	Illinois State University, Center for the Study of Education Policy, Grapevine
E20	Tuition & fees (USM) as percent of Maryland's per capita personal income	Extent to which the burden of financing a higher education falls on students when compared to state's relative wealth	Self-explanatory	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, State Personal Income; Chronicle of Higher Education
E21	Skip			
E22	University R&D expenditures in life sciences	Importance of R&D in the life sciences within Maryland's economy (all universities)	Self-explanatory	NSF, 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, The 2007 State New Economy Index, 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
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, Statistical Abstract of the United States

* North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

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

DESCRIPTION OF DASHBOARD INDICATORS

SPECIFIC USM INSTITUTIONS

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UB	Percent of graduates who pass bar exam on initial attempt	UB, MFR
2-UB	Sponsored research dollars per full-time faculty	UB, MFR
3-UB	Percent of part-time faculty	IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position (Peer Performance Measures)
4-UB	Number of minority students graduating annually (all levels)	UB, MFR
5-UB	Percent of students who are economically disadvantaged	UB, MFR
6-UB	Number of IT graduates produced annually	UB, MFR
7-UB	Percent of students involved with non-traditional learning activities	UB, MFR

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UMB	Passing rate on Bar exam	ABA-LSAC, <u>Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools</u> (Peer Performance Measures)
2-UMB	Passing rate on Medical licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
3-UMB	Passing rate on Nursing licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
4-UMB	Passing rate on Dentistry licensure exam	UMB, IR office (Peer Performance Measures)
5-UMB	National ranking NIH awards to medical schools (public only)	UMB, MFR, IR office
6-UMB	National ranking NIH awards to dental schools (public & private)	UMB, MFR, IR office
7-UMB	Number of specialty law programs ranked among top 10 nationally	UMB, MFR (Data from U.S. News, America’s Best Graduate Schools)
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 <u>all</u> 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

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
		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

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE			
#	Indicator	Stateside/Worldwide	Source of data
1-UMUC	Total undergraduate headcount enrollment (AY)	Stateside	USM office, EIS
2-UMUC	African-Americans as percent of total undergraduates	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
3-UMUC	Percent of students who are economically disadvantaged	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, MFR
4-UMUC	Percent of students who are 25 years of age or older	Stateside	UMUC, IR office, Peer Performance
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	Worldwide	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

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BIOTECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE		
#	Indicator	Source of data
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

INSTITUTION – SPECIFIC INDICATORS – UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES		
#	Indicator	Source of data
1-UMCES	Average GRE score of incoming students directed by UMCES faculty	UMCES, IR office, MFR
2-UMCES	Number of peer reviewed publications by UMCES faculty	UMCES, IR office, MFR
3-UMCES	Number of citations per peer reviewed publication	UMCES, IR office, MFR
5-UMCES	Number of UMCES-sponsored Chesapeake Bay restoration projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
6-UMCES	Number of K-12 teachers trained in UMCES environmental projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
7-UMCES	Number of K-12 students involved in UMCES environmental education projects	UMCES, IR office, MFR
8-UMCES	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	NSF, Academic R&D Expenditures; MFR

E:\FACTBOOK\DASHBD INDIC\2009\INDICDESCRIP111909.DOC, 11-19-09 CB

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2009

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

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

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

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

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2009

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

U. of Baltimore

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

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

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

U. of Maryland, Baltimore County

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

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

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

PERFORMANCE PEERS FOR USM INSTITUTIONS 2009

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

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