



Performance Management Report

2008-09
Year-End University Report
Final

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
July 30, 2009

**CUNY Performance Management Process
University Year-End Report
2008-09**

Table of Contents

1 Raise Academic Quality

1 Strengthen CUNY flagship and college priority programs, and continuously update curricula and program mix

1.1 Resources will be shifted to University flagship/college priority programs, to graduate programs and to support the University’s commitment to become a research-intensive institution.

Colleges will document efforts to move flagship/priority programs, graduate and scientific research programs to the next level

1.2 The University and its colleges will draw greater recognition for academic quality.

Colleges will provide evidence of recognition/validation from external sources

1.3 Program reviews, with analyses of enrollment and financial data, will demonstrably shape academic decisions and allocations by colleges.

Colleges will document efforts to include enrollment and financial data in program reviews

1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially or totally online 1

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered totally online 2

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially online 3

Colleges will prepare additional reports on the use of instructional technology

2 Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

2.1 Colleges will continuously upgrade the quality of their full-time and part-time faculty, as scholars and as teachers.

Colleges will report on their efforts to build faculty quality through hiring and tenure processes and through investments in faculty development

2.2 Faculty research/scholarship will increase from 2007-08 levels.

Colleges will report on faculty scholarship and creative activity

2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Percentage of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty 4

Context: Percentage of instructional FTEs in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 5

Context: Percentage of instructional FTEs in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 6

Context: Percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty 7

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 8

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 9

Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty 10

Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty 11

Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time 12

Context: Number of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time 13

Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio 14

Context: Number of full-time faculty 15

Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty 16

Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff 17

2.4 More under-represented faculty and staff will be recruited.

Colleges will report on efforts to diversify faculty and staff

2 Improve Student Success

3 Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better 18
Context: Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better..... 19
Context: Percentage of students passing freshman composition and gateway mathematics courses with a C or better 20
 Percentage of freshmen and transfers taking one or more courses the summer after entry 21
 Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs..... 22
 Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs 23

Baccalaureate Programs

Average number of credits earned by full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs in the first 12 months (fall, winter, spring and summer terms) 24
 Percentage of baccalaureate students who have declared a major by the 70th credit..... 25
 Percentage of instructional FTEs in lower division courses delivered by full-time faculty..... 26

3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their reading basic skills test score over the summer 27
Context: Average increase in basic skills reading test score after summer immersion 28
 Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their writing (essay) basic skills test score over the summer 29
Context: Average increase in basic skills essay test score after summer immersion 30
 Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their COMPASS 1 (arithmetic) basic skills test score over the summer 31
Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 1 (pre-algebra) test score after summer immersion..... 32
 Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their COMPASS 2 (algebra) basic skills test score over the summer 33
Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score after summer immersion 34

Baccalaureate Programs

Percentage of non-ESL SEEK students who pass all basic skills tests within one year 35
Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students 36
 Percentage of ESL students (SEEK and regular) who pass all basic skills tests within two years 37
Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular) 38

Associate Programs

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation 39
 Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation 40
 Pass rate in math on exit from remediation 41
 Percentage of associate degree students not fully skills proficient upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in reading, writing and math by the 30th credit 42
Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in reading upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in reading by the 30th credit 43
Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in writing upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in writing by the 30th credit 44
Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in math upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in math by the 30th credit..... 45

3.3 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will rise.

Percentage of required invitees who took the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE show rate)..... 46
 Percentage of required test-takers passing the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE pass rate)..... 47

4 Increase retention and graduation rates

4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

Baccalaureate Programs

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later 48

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later 49

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry one year later (or earned degree pursued)..... 50

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry two years later (or earned degree pursued) 51

Associate Programs

One-year Retention Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later 52

Context: One-year Retention Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in any CUNY college one year later 53

4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Baccalaureate Programs

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within four years 54

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 55

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years 56

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years 57

Master's Programs

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of master's students who graduated within four years of entry into master's program 58

Associate Programs

Six-year Graduation Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 59

Context: Six-year Graduation Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from any CUNY college within six years of entry 60

Context: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who transferred outside of CUNY within six years of entry without having earned a degree from the college of entry..... 61

5 Improve post-graduate outcomes

5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Number of credentialed teachers (from traditional and alternative certification programs) 62

Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification 63

Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam 64

Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification..... 65

Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam 66

Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST) 67

Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST) 68

Percentage passing the NCLEX exam 69

Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam 70

Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license 71

Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses 72

Percentage of test-takers without an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam 73

Percentage of test-takers with an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam 74

5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.	
Six-month job placement rate in career and technical education programs.....	75
<i>Context:</i> Six-month education placement rate in career and technical education programs	76
<i>Context:</i> Six-month job and education placement rate in career and technical education programs	77
6 Improve quality of student academic support services	
6.1 Student satisfaction with and quality of academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction will rise.	
Student satisfaction with academic support services	78
Student satisfaction with student services	79
Student satisfaction with access to computer technology	80
3 Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness	
7 Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses	
7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.	
Total Enrollment.....	81
Total FTEs	82
First-time Freshmen.....	83
Transfers.....	84
Total Undergraduates	85
New Graduates	86
Total Graduates	87
Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses.....	88
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs.....	89
<i>Context:</i> Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students	90
Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs.....	91
7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.	
Percentage of course evaluations completed in TIPPS (excluding special courses, electives and non-credit courses).....	92
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of evaluated courses designated as non-transferable.....	93
Baccalaureate Programs	
<i>Context:</i> Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs	94
<i>Context:</i> Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs.....	95
Associate Programs	
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program	96
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program.....	97
<i>Context:</i> Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs	98
<i>Context:</i> Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs	99
<i>Context:</i> One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AA/AS transfers to baccalaureate programs.....	100
<i>Context:</i> One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AAS transfers to baccalaureate programs	101
7.3 Enrollment of underrepresented groups will increase.	
Colleges will provide evidence of enrollment increases for under-represented groups	
7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or pre-college activity.	
Total College Now enrollment (high school and college credit courses).....	102
<i>Context:</i> College Now enrollment in college credit courses	103
Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now high school and college credit courses.....	104
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now college credit courses	105

Percentage of College Now participants with previous enrollment in College Now high school and college credit courses	106
8 Increase revenues and decrease expenses	
8.1 Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase 10%.	
Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average)	107
<i>Context:</i> Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts)	108
8.2 Each college will achieve its productivity savings target and revenue targets as set by the University Budget Office.	
Colleges will provide evidence of meeting productivity and revenue targets	
8.3 Every college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.	
Institutional Support Services (administrative services) as a percentage of total tax levy budget	109
<i>Context:</i> Institutional Support Services (administrative services)	109
<i>Context:</i> General Administration as a percentage of total tax levy budget	110
<i>Context:</i> General Administration	110
<i>Context:</i> General Institutional Services as a percentage of total tax levy budget	111
<i>Context:</i> General Institutional Services	111
<i>Context:</i> Maintenance and Operations as a percentage of total tax levy budget	112
<i>Context:</i> Maintenance and Operations	112
8.4 All colleges will have and implement financial plans with balanced budgets.	
Colleges will provide evidence of financial health and a solid financial plan	
8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.	
Grants and contracts awarded (weighted, rolling, three-year average)	113
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research	114
8.6 Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve.	
Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity	115
8.7 Each college will meet agreed upon revenue targets for adult and continuing education.	
Colleges will report on revenues generated by Adult and Continuing Education	
9 Improve administrative services	
9.1 Colleges will complete agreed-upon restructuring of their philanthropic foundations to comply with CUNY guidelines and document participation in the CUNY Compact.	
Colleges will provide evidence of foundation restructuring	
9.2 Student satisfaction with administrative services will rise or remain high at all CUNY colleges.	
Student satisfaction with administrative services	116
9.3 The percentage of instruction delivered on Fridays, nights, or weekends will rise to better serve students and use facilities fully.	
Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends	117
9.4 All colleges will establish campus risk management committees chaired by their University Risk Management Council designee.	
Colleges will provide evidence of a campus risk management committee chaired by the University Risk Management Council designee	
9.5 All colleges will make timely progress in CUNY FIRST implementation.	
Colleges will provide evidence of CUNY FIRST leadership and communication, training progress and equipment readiness.	
9.6 All colleges will set up a sustainability committee and have a validated plan.	
Colleges will provide evidence of a sustainability committee and a validated plan	

Supplement: New Indicators for 2009-10

2 Improve Student Success

3 *Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction*

3.1 Colleges will provide students with a cohesive and coherent general education.

Colleges will provide evidence of a cohesive and coherent general education (as implemented by CUE, general education reform, etc.)

3.5 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

Gap in the one-year retention rate between underrepresented minority and non-underrepresented minority first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants).....	118
Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants)	121
Gap in the one-year retention rate between underrepresented minority and non-underrepresented minority first-time freshmen enrolled in an associate program (full-time entrants)	124
Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in an associate program (full-time entrants)	127
Gap in the percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted between underrepresented minority and non-underrepresented minority undergraduates.....	130
Gap in the percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted between male and female undergraduates.....	134

3.6 Colleges will show progress on implementing faculty-driven assessment of student learning.

Colleges will provide evidence that faculty are assessing student learning, using results to make improvements, and documenting the process

3 Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

9 *Improve administrative services*

9.4 Colleges will prepare and implement a campus risk management plan that is integrated with the University's risk management program.

Colleges will present to the Risk Management Council the plan and metrics by which its successful implementation will be measured

9.5 All colleges will make timely progress in CUNY FIRST implementation.

Colleges will provide evidence of CUNY FIRST leadership and communication, deployment of supplied trainers, and organizational readiness

9.6 Each college should have a functioning campus sustainability council and have a recognized, multi-year campus sustainability plan.

Colleges will provide evidence that the sustainability committee meets regularly and progress is being made on implementation of the multi-year plan

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 1: Strengthen CUNY flagship and college priority programs, and continuously update curricula and program mix

University Target: 1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially or totally online

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior			
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.3
Brooklyn	2.4	7.3	10.5
City	0.0	0.3	0.2
Hunter	0.2	0.8	3.8
Lehman	3.8	4.6	6.6
Queens	0.1	12.6	10.8
York	0.6	1.0	0.9
Senior College Average	0.9	4.1	5.1
Comprehensive			
John Jay	2.3	2.3	3.4
Medgar Evers	1.0	1.7	2.9
NYCCT	2.4	3.3	1.4
Staten Island	0.2	1.1	0.9
Comprehensive College Average	1.6	2.2	2.0
Community			
BMCC	1.1	1.0	15.0
Bronx	0.7	1.4	1.2
Hostos	6.8	5.3	4.3
Kingsborough	8.1	9.8	10.9
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.1
Queensborough	0.8	0.6	0.5
Community College Average	2.6	2.8	6.8
University Average	1.6	3.3	5.1

Note: Values are computed as the number of student FTEs in sections designated as either partially or fully online divided by the total number of student FTEs. Both undergraduate and graduate courses are included. Sections with the instructional component either partially or totally online are determined by the designation in SIMS (or other student information system) and submitted to OIRA as part of the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 1: Strengthen CUNY flagship and college priority programs, and continuously update curricula and program mix

University Target: 1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered totally online

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior			
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1
Brooklyn	0.8	1.2	1.3
City	0.0	0.3	0.2
Hunter	0.1	0.1	0.1
Lehman	2.4	2.5	3.1
Queens	0.1	0.0	0.4
York	0.4	0.5	0.6
Senior College Average	0.4	0.5	0.7
Comprehensive			
John Jay	2.2	2.3	3.1
Medgar Evers	0.6	0.8	1.3
NYCCT	0.2	0.3	0.9
Staten Island	0.2	0.9	0.4
Comprehensive College Average	0.9	1.2	1.5
Community			
BMCC	1.1	1.0	0.8
Bronx	0.0	0.0	0.5
Hostos	3.1	1.8	1.7
Kingsborough	0.2	0.4	0.5
LaGuardia	0.0	0.0	0.0
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.4
Community College Average	0.6	0.5	0.6
University Average	0.6	0.7	0.8

Note: Values are computed as the number of student FTEs in sections designated as totally online divided by the total number of student FTEs. Both undergraduate and graduate courses are included. Sections with the instructional component totally online are determined by the designation in SIMS (or other student information system) and submitted to OIRA as the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 1: Strengthen CUNY flagship and college priority programs, and continuously update curricula and program mix

University Target: 1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially online

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior			
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1
Brooklyn	1.6	6.1	9.2
City	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hunter	0.1	0.7	3.7
Lehman	1.4	2.1	3.6
Queens	0.0	12.6	10.5
York	0.2	0.5	0.2
Senior College Average	0.4	3.6	4.4
Comprehensive			
John Jay	0.1	0.0	0.3
Medgar Evers	0.4	0.9	1.6
NYCCT	2.2	3.0	0.5
Staten Island	0.0	0.2	0.5
Comprehensive College Average	0.7	1.0	0.5
Community			
BMCC	0.0	0.0	14.2
Bronx	0.7	1.4	0.7
Hostos	3.7	3.5	2.6
Kingsborough	7.9	9.4	10.4
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.0
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.2
Community College Average	2.0	2.3	6.2
University Average	1.0	2.6	4.2

Note: Values are computed as the number of student FTEs in sections designated as partially online divided by the total number of student FTEs. Both undergraduate and graduate courses are included. Sections with the instructional component partially online are determined by the designation in SIMS (or other student information system) and submitted to OIRA as the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Percentage of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	59.1	58.4	57.1	58.7	55.7
Brooklyn	54.1	54.9	50.6	48.5	44.9
City	56.1	57.7	56.4	48.3	49.0
Hunter	56.5	52.7	51.2	48.1	48.9
Lehman	50.8	48.3	50.8	52.9	51.3
Queens	52.5	50.3	50.5	51.0	43.6
York	42.8	41.6	42.1	42.6	50.7
Senior College Average	54.4	53.1	52.1	50.6	48.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	45.1	40.1	41.5	43.8	44.9
Medgar Evers	47.3	50.8	43.7	45.7	53.3
NYCCT	47.8	46.9	47.1	49.3	50.6
Staten Island	47.1	46.8	43.8	43.2	44.4
Comprehensive College Average	46.6	44.9	43.9	45.4	47.4
Community					
BMCC	54.7	51.9	52.3	52.7	46.6
Bronx	62.5	63.7	62.1	61.0	61.7
Hostos	63.6	57.5	60.5	64.7	62.2
Kingsborough	61.4	60.6	57.9	55.8	53.3
LaGuardia	50.9	45.1	47.0	46.6	44.9
Queensborough	57.3	54.5	52.8	53.1	51.0
Community College Average	57.3	54.5	54.1	53.8	50.8
University Average	53.8	51.9	51.0	50.6	49.2

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs taught by full-time faculty members (undergraduate and graduate) by the total of all student FTEs. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Percentage of instructional FTEs in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	57.0	57.6	54.5	56.9	54.2
Brooklyn	53.6	55.0	50.5	47.8	43.9
City	52.2	54.2	52.7	44.0	44.7
Hunter	53.3	48.6	46.1	44.5	46.0
Lehman	47.4	45.1	46.7	49.1	48.5
Queens	49.2	47.3	47.5	47.7	40.4
York	42.7	41.2	41.7	42.2	50.3
Senior College Average	51.8	50.8	49.1	47.9	46.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	42.5	37.2	39.4	41.9	43.2
Medgar Evers	47.3	50.8	43.7	45.7	53.3
NYCCT	47.8	46.9	47.1	49.3	50.6
Staten Island	45.9	45.4	42.0	41.6	42.9
Comprehensive College Average	45.5	43.7	42.9	44.5	46.6
Community					
BMCC	54.7	51.9	52.3	52.7	46.6
Bronx	62.5	63.7	62.1	61.0	61.7
Hostos	63.6	57.5	60.5	64.7	62.2
Kingsborough	61.4	60.6	57.9	55.8	53.3
LaGuardia	50.9	45.1	47.0	46.6	44.9
Queensborough	57.3	54.5	52.8	53.1	51.0
Community College Average	57.3	54.5	54.1	53.8	50.8
University Average	52.5	50.6	49.5	49.3	48.1

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total FTEs in all undergraduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Context: Percentage of instructional FTEs in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	69.7	62.5	69.0	66.4	61.7
Brooklyn	55.7	54.7	50.9	52.0	49.8
City	72.0	72.1	72.3	68.1	69.9
Hunter	67.6	67.1	70.8	60.5	58.9
Lehman	67.4	63.7	72.1	71.1	64.1
Queens	63.3	62.3	63.1	67.1	59.6
York	100.0	100.0	83.6	100.0	100.0
Senior College Average	65.3	63.7	66.0	63.6	60.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	67.0	63.8	59.6	59.2	59.1
Staten Island	61.6	66.4	70.7	69.8	72.4
Comprehensive College Average	65.0	64.6	63.3	62.4	63.1
University Average	65.3	63.8	65.7	63.5	60.5

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in graduate (master's and Ph.D.) courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total FTEs in all graduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Context: Percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	53.2	53.7	52.6	52.9	49.6
Brooklyn	57.1	55.8	50.7	48.9	45.1
City	54.1	54.3	54.2	47.0	48.1
Hunter	53.3	50.0	46.6	45.6	46.2
Lehman	51.4	49.0	52.6	54.2	52.3
Queens	52.2	47.9	49.4	50.1	43.4
York	46.6	44.1	51.9	50.6	54.0
Senior College Average	53.1	51.0	50.8	49.5	47.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	45.6	41.6	43.4	46.0	45.9
Medgar Evers	48.1	50.0	44.4	45.4	51.6
NYCCT	47.9	46.1	45.2	47.2	49.7
Staten Island	49.3	49.1	46.9	46.2	46.8
Comprehensive College Average	47.6	45.9	45.0	46.4	48.2
Community					
BMCC	54.3	51.6	51.8	52.4	47.2
Bronx	60.7	63.7	62.1	62.6	63.3
Hostos	65.1	60.4	62.2	66.3	62.4
Kingsborough	61.6	59.7	57.1	54.3	53.8
LaGuardia	52.0	46.0	46.7	46.7	45.2
Queensborough	57.8	54.9	54.1	54.0	51.8
Community College Average	57.5	54.8	54.2	54.1	51.7
University Average	53.5	51.3	50.8	50.5	49.2

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours taught by full-time faculty members (undergraduate and graduate) by the total of all contact hours. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	49.9	51.7	48.9	50.2	46.9
Brooklyn	57.0	56.9	51.4	48.6	44.0
City	48.7	49.1	48.3	41.3	42.5
Hunter	46.5	41.8	38.6	38.7	39.6
Lehman	48.6	46.0	48.3	50.0	48.7
Queens	47.5	43.2	45.1	45.1	39.3
York	46.5	43.6	50.3	48.8	53.4
Senior College Average	49.3	47.4	46.8	45.7	44.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	42.7	38.2	40.9	43.9	44.1
Medgar Evers	48.1	50.0	44.4	45.4	51.6
NYCCT	47.9	46.1	45.2	47.2	49.7
Staten Island	47.6	47.1	44.3	43.6	44.4
Comprehensive College Average	46.4	44.7	43.7	45.2	47.2
Community					
BMCC	54.3	51.6	51.8	52.4	47.2
Bronx	60.7	63.7	62.1	62.6	63.3
Hostos	65.1	60.4	62.2	66.3	62.4
Kingsborough	61.6	59.7	57.1	54.3	53.8
LaGuardia	52.0	46.0	46.7	46.7	45.2
Queensborough	57.8	54.9	54.1	54.0	51.8
Community College Average	57.5	54.8	54.2	54.1	51.7
University Average	52.0	49.8	49.1	49.0	47.8

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours in undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total contact hours in all undergraduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

New Methodology

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	68.9	64.3	70.2	66.0	62.7
Brooklyn	57.2	52.6	48.5	49.7	49.0
City	73.5	73.4	74.2	70.5	70.8
Hunter	72.1	72.0	70.4	66.2	64.3
Lehman	65.7	63.3	73.5	71.9	66.7
Queens	66.6	63.1	64.3	68.0	61.0
York	100.0	100.0	96.2	100.0	100.0
Senior College Average	67.2	65.0	66.0	65.3	62.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	67.6	65.6	60.9	60.9	58.1
Staten Island	68.4	70.2	72.6	78.3	79.5
Comprehensive College Average	67.9	67.3	65.4	66.8	65.1
University Average	67.3	65.2	65.9	65.4	62.4

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours in graduate (master's and Ph.D.) courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total contact hours in all graduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	7.7	7.6	8.0	7.6	7.8
Brooklyn	8.0	8.3	8.1	7.9	8.1
City	7.9	7.7	8.2	9.3	9.0
Hunter	7.7	7.7	7.2	7.1	7.2
Lehman	7.6	7.5	7.8	7.7	8.0
Queens	8.5	8.2	7.9	7.4	7.4
York	9.5	8.7	7.8	7.4	8.1
Senior College Average	8.0	7.9	7.9	7.8	7.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	8.0	7.7	6.9	6.9	7.2
Medgar Evers	7.0	6.8	7.2	7.2	6.4
NYCCT	10.1	10.4	9.5	9.2	9.2
Staten Island	8.2	8.1	8.4	8.1	8.5
Comprehensive College Average	8.6	8.5	8.2	8.0	8.1
Community					
BMCC	11.2	11.0	11.3	11.5	11.7
Bronx	9.7	10.6	10.4	10.2	10.7
Hostos	10.5	10.5	10.3	10.1	10.9
Kingsborough	10.8	10.4	10.3	10.4	10.4
LaGuardia	10.0	9.9	9.7	10.4	10.3
Queensborough	11.8	11.3	11.7	11.6	11.8
Community College Average	10.8	10.6	10.7	10.8	11.1
University Average	8.8	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.8

Note: This indicator reflects the fall (and winter for 2006 and later) contractual teaching hours of full-time veteran professorial faculty (professorial faculty not eligible for contractual release time). The indicator is computed by summing the number of (non-overload) instructional hours delivered by veteran full-time professorial faculty and dividing by the number of veteran full-time professorial faculty. The computation of this indicator excludes those in non-teaching departments (counselors and librarians), those in substitute titles and those on leave (all types, not just unpaid as in the past). Eligibility for contractual release time is determined by the date of first appointment to the professorial title series at the college and tenure status as reported on the CUPS census file. Leave status is also based on data in CUPS. Teaching hours reflect data reported by colleges in the Staff and Teaching Load (STL) reports and are credited to the faculty member's appointment college.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	298	322	313	323	304
Brooklyn	317	332	320	314	294
City	306	321	342	312	320
Hunter	373	394	426	406	417
Lehman	198	198	206	201	203
Queens	337	357	349	346	321
York	103	102	107	106	104
Senior College Total	1,932	2,026	2,063	2,008	1,963
Comprehensive					
John Jay	158	164	192	194	176
Medgar Evers	84	84	84	76	79
NYCCT	175	187	199	207	209
Staten Island	185	201	215	191	206
Comprehensive College Total	602	636	690	668	670
Community					
BMCC	166	160	176	215	217
Bronx	127	127	131	132	140
Hostos	85	84	83	94	91
Kingsborough	150	145	146	159	160
LaGuardia	117	117	124	130	131
Queensborough	141	143	153	177	182
Community College Total	786	776	813	907	921
University Total	3,320	3,438	3,566	3,583	3,554

Note: The number of full-time professorial faculty who are not eligible for contractual release time in the term indicated. This is the denominator for the indicator "Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty".

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	6.8	7.4	6.2	6.7	6.1
Brooklyn	7.8	7.4	7.6	7.3	7.1
City	6.0	6.7	6.4	6.9	7.2
Hunter	7.2	6.8	6.7	6.3	6.0
Lehman	7.1	7.4	7.4	6.7	7.8
Queens	6.8	6.8	7.3	6.7	6.2
York	8.1	8.0	8.1	7.1	8.2
Senior College Average	7.0	7.1	7.0	6.8	6.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	7.7	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.0
Medgar Evers	5.8	7.7	7.9	6.2	7.4
NYCCT	10.6	10.3	10.5	9.7	9.7
Staten Island	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.2	7.3
Comprehensive College Average	8.6	8.2	8.0	7.7	8.0
Community					
BMCC	11.8	12.0	12.1	11.3	11.4
Bronx	11.7	10.4	10.9	10.3	9.8
Hostos	11.5	11.3	10.6	10.8	10.4
Kingsborough	12.0	11.1	9.9	10.7	10.3
LaGuardia	12.1	11.9	10.4	11.4	11.5
Queensborough	11.6	10.3	11.7	11.1	10.6
Community College Average	11.8	11.2	11.1	11.0	10.9
University Average	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.1	8.1

Note: This indicator reflects the fall (and winter for 2006 and later) contractual teaching hours of full-time professorial faculty eligible for contractual release time. The indicator is computed by summing the number of (non-overload) instructional hours delivered by full-time professorial faculty eligible for contractual release time and dividing by the number of full-time professorial faculty eligible for contractual release time. The computation of this indicator excludes those in non-teaching departments (counselors and librarians), those in substitute titles and those on leave (all types, not just unpaid). Eligibility for contractual release time is determined by the date of first appointment to the professorial title series at the college and tenure status as reported on the CUPS census file. Leave status is also based on data in CUPS. Teaching hours reflect data reported by colleges in the Staff and Teaching Load (STL) reports and are credited to the faculty member's appointment college.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Number of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	66	50	45	63	78
Brooklyn	74	64	63	75	98
City	107	96	70	67	93
Hunter	95	94	71	84	89
Lehman	45	48	45	57	66
Queens	93	85	80	79	104
York	37	37	34	30	50
Senior College Total	517	474	408	455	578
Comprehensive					
John Jay	68	63	65	78	96
Medgar Evers	7	15	21	29	35
NYCCT	62	55	33	57	90
Staten Island	67	65	46	50	49
Comprehensive College Total	204	198	165	214	270
Community					
BMCC	87	95	80	59	77
Bronx	33	45	46	41	33
Hostos	33	31	31	23	29
Kingsborough	39	49	52	29	36
LaGuardia	41	51	40	42	55
Queensborough	63	73	67	51	47
Community College Total	296	344	316	245	277
University Total	1,017	1,016	889	914	1,125

Note: The number of full-time professorial faculty who are eligible for contractual release time in the term indicated. This is the denominator for the indicator "Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time".

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	21.8	21.8	21.5	20.4	19.8
Brooklyn	17.6	17.5	17.8	17.2	17.0
City	14.3	15.0	16.3	15.4	15.4
Hunter	19.6	19.7	18.9	19.1	18.4
Lehman	15.3	14.5	15.3	14.8	15.3
Queens	17.2	16.9	17.4	18.1	18.2
York	16.7	16.4	16.9	16.9	17.6
Senior College Average	17.8	17.7	17.9	17.7	17.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	21.2	21.0	20.3	19.5	19.2
Medgar Evers	15.5	17.5	17.1	15.9	17.8
NYCCT	16.4	15.6	15.8	15.4	16.0
Staten Island	18.5	18.2	18.8	18.6	18.2
Comprehensive College Average	18.2	18.1	18.0	17.4	17.7
Community					
BMCC	20.8	20.2	20.3	20.8	21.2
Bronx	17.6	17.3	17.6	16.8	17.2
Hostos	17.8	16.7	16.7	16.3	16.9
Kingsborough	20.1	19.3	18.4	18.9	19.6
LaGuardia	20.3	20.0	20.3	19.7	19.7
Queensborough	17.6	17.4	17.2	17.5	18.4
Community College Average	19.4	18.9	18.8	18.8	19.4
University Average	18.5	18.2	18.3	18.0	18.2

Note: Total student FTEs in undergraduate sections divided by total faculty FTEs in undergraduate sections (both based on data submitted by colleges in the Staff and Teaching Load report).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Number of full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	439	439	448	468	470
Brooklyn	483	494	488	511	512
City	498	502	491	498	541
Hunter	606	610	607	645	661
Lehman	318	306	327	349	358
Queens	567	559	566	609	620
York	155	164	160	167	188
Senior College Total	3,066	3,074	3,084	3,247	3,350
Comprehensive					
John Jay	322	323	359	382	400
Medgar Evers	123	132	136	148	156
NYCCT	280	289	297	327	366
Staten Island	308	306	306	322	329
Comprehensive College Total	1,033	1,050	1,098	1,179	1,251
Community					
BMCC	357	352	348	364	361
Bronx	236	251	245	255	256
Hostos	146	137	146	155	148
Kingsborough	287	295	292	282	296
LaGuardia	250	244	248	257	265
Queensborough	270	275	270	284	284
Community College Total	1,546	1,554	1,549	1,597	1,610
University Total	5,645	5,678	5,731	6,023	6,211

Note: This indicator reflects data in the CUPS census file and excludes graduate assistants, counselors and librarians, full-time faculty on unpaid leave and individuals on the Executive Compensation Plan even if they teach undergraduate or graduate courses at the college. Full-time instructors and lecturers are counted here.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	183	183	193	186	208
Brooklyn	185	205	231	247	295
City	188	202	212	123	318
Hunter	260	286	313	339	372
Lehman	183	209	196	192	202
Queens	252	275	285	284	323
York	109	115	109	115	110
Senior College Total	1,360	1,475	1,539	1,486	1,828
Comprehensive					
John Jay	250	274	289	268	278
Medgar Evers	76	84	98	113	101
NYCCT	264	284	298	294	285
Staten Island	200	206	215	234	247
Comprehensive College Total	790	848	900	909	911
Community					
BMCC	289	311	304	311	378
Bronx	116	121	121	118	117
Hostos	62	72	72	71	73
Kingsborough	180	187	192	202	212
LaGuardia	236	220	227	269	283
Queensborough	186	198	208	216	227
Community College Total	1,069	1,109	1,124	1,187	1,290
University Total	3,219	3,432	3,563	3,582	4,029

Note: Number of teaching hours of adjuncts divided by 13.5.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

University Target: 2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	227	240	257	266	267
Brooklyn	243	242	245	261	284
City	296	308	318	333	359
Hunter	440	464	460	492	518
Lehman	193	195	199	214	222
Queens	283	283	289	321	348
York	111	118	118	134	158
Senior College Total	1,793	1,850	1,886	2,021	2,156
Comprehensive					
John Jay	155	161	181	207	239
Medgar Evers	131	130	157	174	180
NYCCT	182	172	172	181	189
Staten Island	168	172	178	188	186
Comprehensive College Total	636	635	688	750	794
Community					
BMCC	173	182	195	203	207
Bronx	151	152	155	159	166
Hostos	117	114	119	126	133
Kingsborough	165	169	182	201	204
LaGuardia	227	234	245	266	291
Queensborough	156	167	168	176	190
Community College Total	989	1,018	1,064	1,131	1,191
University Total	3,418	3,503	3,638	3,902	4,141

Note: Includes individuals on the executive compensation plan and personnel in full-time professional titles.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	93.0	93.9	94.9	94.9
Brooklyn	82.6	78.5	80.9	79.5
City	92.7	90.5	92.1	91.5
Hunter	91.1	91.4	93.4	93.3
Lehman	90.1	91.6	90.4	87.7
Queens	91.0	93.0	90.7	93.1
York	74.2	72.1	73.9	81.3
Senior College Average	88.8	88.5	89.0	89.2
Comprehensive				
John Jay	77.9	76.7	77.5	82.2
Medgar Evers	69.1	75.9	68.0	71.8
NYCCT	82.1	82.1	83.3	84.2
Staten Island	93.1	91.6	92.0	91.5
Comprehensive College Average	82.1	82.3	81.9	84.0
Community				
BMCC	82.7	79.8	81.5	80.7
Bronx	77.9	80.7	78.4	84.1
Hostos	77.4	81.7	80.3	82.9
Kingsborough	89.0	87.8	88.0	86.7
LaGuardia	73.3	77.3	75.5	78.1
Queensborough	86.9	83.3	87.4	87.0
Community College Average	81.7	81.5	82.0	82.8
University Average	83.9	83.8	83.9	84.8

Note: Based on students completing freshman composition in the fall of a given term. Students earning a C- (or lower) are not included in the numerator of the percentage calculation. Students are counted once for each course in a given semester. Fall 2008 figures are revised slightly from the original version of this report to reflect a change in methodology.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	43.1	49.9	59.8	61.4
Brooklyn	63.1	70.2	69.6	74.2
City	63.1	69.6	62.9	67.0
Hunter	69.2	70.7	74.3	58.0
Lehman	66.7	60.8	62.7	63.7
Queens	69.8	66.8	69.7	73.4
York	87.7	71.6	68.9	59.3
Senior College Average	59.2	62.4	65.5	64.3
Comprehensive				
John Jay	61.4	63.0	60.1	61.6
Medgar Evers	69.2	75.7	73.1	68.7
NYCCT	54.8	53.6	55.4	55.5
Staten Island	68.8	71.0	72.7	70.8
Comprehensive College Average	61.3	62.4	61.6	61.4
Community				
BMCC	74.8	75.1	73.2	69.1
Bronx	60.9	44.1	61.5	56.8
Hostos	72.1	69.6	59.2	67.6
Kingsborough	64.0	59.7	59.1	74.4
LaGuardia	63.8	67.0	65.1	59.5
Queensborough	54.9	55.2	57.8	56.3
Community College Average	67.8	66.3	65.2	64.9
University Average	62.9	63.6	63.7	63.2

Note: Based on students completing a credit-bearing math course through pre-calculus in the fall of a given term. Students earning a C- (or lower) are not included in the numerator of the percentage calculation. Students are counted once for each course in a given semester. Fall 2008 figures are revised slightly from the original version of this report to reflect a change in methodology.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Context: Percentage of students passing freshman composition and gateway mathematics courses with a C or better

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	73.8	74.6	79.5	80.2
Brooklyn	79.4	76.6	78.2	78.2
City	83.2	83.3	82.0	83.2
Hunter	85.0	85.3	87.5	81.6
Lehman	84.3	82.8	82.1	78.9
Queens	86.6	87.0	85.3	87.9
York	76.4	72.0	72.9	76.4
Senior College Average	80.6	80.3	81.5	80.9
Comprehensive				
John Jay	69.7	70.0	69.0	72.0
Medgar Evers	69.1	75.8	70.1	70.5
NYCCT	69.1	68.2	68.6	68.7
Staten Island	85.5	84.9	85.8	84.8
Comprehensive College Average	73.0	73.4	72.6	73.6
Community				
BMCC	79.6	78.1	79.1	76.7
Bronx	74.9	73.5	75.4	78.7
Hostos	76.0	78.6	75.8	80.1
Kingsborough	83.8	82.4	83.3	84.7
LaGuardia	72.6	75.5	73.7	74.2
Queensborough	77.6	74.8	79.2	78.3
Community College Average	78.2	77.5	78.2	78.2
University Average	77.2	77.0	77.3	77.5

Note: Based on students completing freshman composition and/or a credit-bearing math course through pre-calculus in the fall of a given term. Students earning a C- (or lower) are not included in the numerator of the percentage calculation. Students are counted once for each course in a given semester. Fall 2008 figures are revised slightly from the original version of this report to reflect a change in methodology.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Percentage of freshmen and transfers taking one or more courses the summer after entry

	<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	42.8	44.0	40.7	42.0	46.8
Brooklyn	32.9	33.7	33.8	30.8	31.7
City	31.0	33.5	28.0	29.6	27.3
Hunter	33.3	31.6	28.7	31.5	34.4
Lehman	26.1	32.1	28.4	27.2	27.1
Queens	35.7	34.0	31.4	32.4	32.6
York	20.8	21.7	16.3	18.2	19.9
Senior College Average	33.3	34.1	30.9	31.6	32.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	19.6	19.5	20.3	16.6	16.7
Medgar Evers	27.0	21.7	22.2	29.0	27.9
NYCCT	24.1	27.7	25.8	24.9	25.6
Staten Island	17.5	16.0	17.2	17.3	24.0
Comprehensive College Average	21.0	21.0	21.3	20.7	22.6
Community					
BMCC	18.7	19.6	18.3	18.7	18.4
Bronx	29.4	25.6	22.7	24.4	22.0
Hostos	17.4	18.3	19.5	14.4	16.3
Kingsborough	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LaGuardia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Queensborough	19.8	19.3	22.3	17.7	23.5
Community College Average	20.9	20.6	20.4	19.0	20.3
University Average	26.5	26.8	25.6	25.3	26.5

Note: Based on a fall cohort of first-time freshmen and transfers still enrolled in the college of entry the following spring. Colleges are credited for students taking one or more summer courses at any CUNY college. Community college and university averages exclude Kingsborough and LaGuardia.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.815	0.827	0.826	0.825	0.830
Brooklyn	0.790	0.789	0.799	0.804	0.808
City	0.783	0.784	0.793	0.797	0.806
Hunter	0.758	0.775	0.776	0.784	0.791
Lehman	0.752	0.751	0.765	0.769	0.774
Queens	0.801	0.801	0.801	0.808	0.812
York	0.753	0.759	0.760	0.772	0.772
Senior College Average	0.782	0.788	0.792	0.797	0.802
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.800	0.811	0.804	0.811	0.807
Medgar Evers	0.701	0.727	0.724	0.730	0.707
NYCCT	0.766	0.743	0.743	0.735	0.739
Staten Island	0.807	0.803	0.823	0.822	0.831
Comprehensive College Average	0.787	0.787	0.786	0.787	0.789
University Average	0.783	0.788	0.791	0.795	0.799

Note: Based on undergraduate degree-seeking students in baccalaureate programs.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.805	0.801	0.830	0.814	0.786
Medgar Evers	0.730	0.740	0.752	0.792	0.785
NYCCT	0.760	0.742	0.751	0.747	0.752
Staten Island	0.758	0.746	0.775	0.772	0.739
Comprehensive College Average	0.762	0.753	0.772	0.770	0.757
Community					
BMCC	0.730	0.725	0.721	0.732	0.748
Bronx	0.746	0.755	0.733	0.725	0.720
Hostos	0.817	0.794	0.777	0.747	0.750
Kingsborough	0.916	0.906	0.889	0.893	0.890
LaGuardia	0.860	0.837	0.820	0.829	0.839
Queensborough	0.694	0.696	0.699	0.707	0.716
Community College Average	0.787	0.779	0.769	0.773	0.780
University Average	0.781	0.773	0.770	0.772	0.775

Note: Based on undergraduate degree-seeking students in associate programs.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Average number of credits earned by full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs in the first 12 months (fall, winter, spring and summer terms)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	26.3	26.4	26.1	27.0	28.2
Brooklyn	22.4	22.7	22.9	24.5	24.3
City	22.1	23.2	22.1	22.8	23.0
Hunter	24.3	24.3	24.6	24.9	25.5
Lehman	22.1	23.0	23.2	23.1	23.8
Queens	25.4	25.5	25.1	25.9	25.6
York	21.7	20.0	19.8	21.7	22.2
Senior College Average	23.9	24.1	23.8	24.6	24.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	24.6	22.8	22.7	23.5	23.4
Medgar Evers	12.9*	16.7	17.9*	19.2	19.1
NYCCT	21.5	21.1	20.7	21.4	20.1
Staten Island	26.0	25.9	25.9	25.8	26.3
Comprehensive College Average	24.1	22.8	22.9	23.5	23.5
University Average	24.0	23.9	23.7	24.4	24.7

Note: Based on a fall cohort of full-time first-time freshmen who were enrolled in the same college the following spring.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

Percentage of baccalaureate students who have declared a major by the 70th credit

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	82.7	85.9	84.5	90.4	90.0
Brooklyn	81.9	84.6	87.0	90.1	83.8
City	58.8	57.8	80.4	80.0	77.6
Hunter	59.6	68.8	61.4	60.5	65.1
Lehman	85.2	84.7	79.6	82.3	82.6
Queens	67.9	68.5	66.5	60.6	62.5
York	96.5	96.2	96.4	98.0	97.4
Senior College Average	73.9	76.7	77.0	77.0	77.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Medgar Evers	98.3	97.1	99.2	100.0	100.0
NYCCT	98.1	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.0
Staten Island	97.3	96.0	96.5	96.3	95.8
Comprehensive College Average	98.8	98.8	99.1	99.1	99.0
University Average	79.5	81.5	81.8	81.9	82.2

Note: Based on students who have earned between 60 and 75 credits at the start of the fall term. A student is considered to have declared a major if they have a valid SED program code on the fall Show-Registration file submitted to OIRA each fall.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.1 Colleges will implement approved CUE plans, make progress on Campaign for Success indicators, and use outcomes to drive improvements in academic support and student learning.

New Methodology

Percentage of instructional FTEs in lower division courses delivered by full-time faculty

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	55.7	56.2	53.3	59.2	57.3
Brooklyn	51.2	53.2	47.8	44.3	40.7
City	47.7	50.3	49.6	38.9	40.6
Hunter	51.6	46.2	45.4	42.4	43.1
Lehman	39.0	35.8	38.0	39.1	40.1
Queens	46.7	43.8	45.0	44.1	36.3
York	40.2	39.8	38.6	39.8	47.4
Senior College Average	48.8	47.7	46.3	44.5	43.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	39.4	33.7	34.7	39.3	40.1
Medgar Evers	44.7	47.9	39.3	42.6	51.9
NYCCT	47.2	45.9	46.5	48.0	49.0
Staten Island	39.6	39.2	35.2	35.0	35.4
Comprehensive College Average	42.5	40.7	39.3	41.4	43.4
University Average	46.1	44.7	43.2	43.1	43.4

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in lower division courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total of all lower division student FTEs. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Beginning with the 2008-09 PMP data report, College Now sections are excluded from this analysis resulting in small differences in the percentages reported for all years in this report compared with values reported in last year's PMP report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Indicator

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their reading basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	95.8*	91.7*	91.7*	86.7	93.5
Brooklyn	88.2*	89.7	100.0	74.4	90.5
City	86.4	81.6	85.3	87.9	87.3
Hunter	95.0*	77.3*	100.0*	90.0*	82.4*
Lehman	84.2	100.0	83.8	76.5	89.3
Queens	90.5	84.6	90.0	85.7	91.5
York	93.2	93.1	94.1	85.4	86.4
Senior College Average	90.3	89.4	90.4	83.3	88.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	86.3	87.5	83.3	90.5	93.8
Medgar Evers	70.0*	92.9*	84.8	81.3	92.1
NYCCT	84.2	88.9	85.7	77.3	83.8
Staten Island	93.9	83.3	85.3	89.3	94.8
Comprehensive College Average	86.5	87.1	85.0	85.1	90.6
Community					
BMCC	94.9	88.6	72.1	80.3	84.4
Bronx	70.0	76.2*	80.6	76.7	69.0
Hostos	77.8*	62.5*	57.1*	50.0*	83.3*
Kingsborough	88.9	81.0	80.6	87.2	86.1
LaGuardia	84.1	75.7	95.7*	97.4	85.5
Queensborough	87.9	78.1	96.0*	76.4	94.1
Community College Average	84.6	78.7	81.6	82.5	85.1
University Average	87.3	85.9	86.2	83.9	88.8

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in reading with the initial attempt of the reading test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial reading test score.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Average increase in basic skills reading test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	20.2*	18.3*	20.0*	17.5	17.1
Brooklyn	15.6*	18.0	21.4	11.2	14.5
City	16.4	20.4	14.5	13.8	13.6
Hunter	20.0*	14.3*	22.3*	10.7*	15.0*
Lehman	13.0	19.4	14.0	7.5	15.1
Queens	20.4	16.1	14.1	13.5	15.0
York	17.3	18.9	17.6	12.8	13.7
Senior College Average	17.4	18.2	16.5	12.3	14.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	15.8	14.8	14.6	14.9	16.3
Medgar Evers	9.3*	14.5*	16.1	9.0	15.3
NYCCT	14.0	16.3	12.4	10.6	11.2
Staten Island	19.3	16.9	15.0	15.1	17.1
Comprehensive College Average	15.5	16.1	14.0	13.1	14.7
Community					
BMCC	19.5	17.2	12.6	12.2	13.8
Bronx	8.8	13.7*	11.4	11.4	9.7
Hostos	16.0*	13.9*	- 1.9*	1.5*	12.2*
Kingsborough	15.3	13.7	13.8	13.4	12.5
LaGuardia	15.3	12.9	15.8*	11.8	10.5
Queensborough	16.6	13.2	15.4	10.1	14.8
Community College Average	15.1	14.2	13.0	11.7	12.7
University Average	16.1	16.4	14.7	12.5	14.2

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in reading with the initial attempt of the reading test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the average difference in students' initial score on the basic skills reading test and the last reading test taken prior to the fall term of entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Indicator

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their writing (essay) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	83.5	95.9	94.0	87.3	79.7
Brooklyn	67.5	71.5	64.6	80.4	85.9
City	75.4	78.4	70.7	80.8	72.4
Hunter	63.8	66.7	71.4	55.2	77.4
Lehman	85.6	84.9	71.1	77.2	78.3
Queens	90.3	88.8	75.3	82.0	84.2
York	81.2	76.1	60.4	74.8	73.5
Senior College Average	79.7	79.9	70.0	78.4	78.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.3	75.9	65.4	75.6	86.6
Medgar Evers	72.0*	71.8	63.6	62.8	76.9
NYCCT	66.2	58.7	61.4	58.6	60.2
Staten Island	67.5	67.9	76.5	70.2	71.8
Comprehensive College Average	69.5	66.8	66.8	66.2	70.5
Community					
BMCC	72.7	56.1	61.9	60.3	64.3
Bronx	40.9	64.3	46.0	69.4	74.0
Hostos	76.5*	18.8*	72.7*	66.7*	78.9*
Kingsborough	62.5	60.5	50.7	73.1	72.7
LaGuardia	65.8	54.3	60.9*	73.5	68.1
Queensborough	67.3	43.9	53.8	71.9	67.5
Community College Average	64.2	51.6	55.2	69.9	69.0
University Average	72.8	69.6	65.8	71.9	73.3

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in writing with the initial attempt of the writing (essay) test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial writing test score.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Average increase in basic skills essay test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.7
Brooklyn	1.2	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.6
City	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.5
Hunter	1.2	1.1	1.3	0.9	1.5
Lehman	1.9	2.0	1.5	1.6	1.6
Queens	2.1	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9
York	1.8	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.7
Senior College Average	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.5	1.9
Medgar Evers	1.0*	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.4
NYCCT	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Staten Island	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4
Comprehensive College Average	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3
Community					
BMCC	1.3	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.2
Bronx	0.7	1.1	0.7	1.1	1.3
Hostos	1.7*	0.0*	1.4*	1.1*	1.2*
Kingsborough	1.1	1.0	0.7	1.3	1.1
LaGuardia	1.2	1.1	1.2*	1.7	1.3
Queensborough	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.4	1.3
Community College Average	1.1	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.2
University Average	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.4

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in writing with the initial attempt of the essay test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the average difference in students' initial score on the basic skills essay test and the last essay test taken prior to the fall term of entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Indicator

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their math COMPASS 1 (arithmetic) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Brooklyn	94.7*	100.0*	100.0	90.0
City	88.3	88.0	83.8	91.7
Hunter	100.0*	75.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Lehman	88.0	90.3	87.7	89.9
Queens	89.5*	95.5*	95.8*	90.0*
York	97.2	92.1	90.7	96.2
Senior College Average	92.2	91.2	89.7	92.4
Comprehensive				
John Jay	87.0	89.2	91.0	90.7
Medgar Evers	80.0	96.3	89.3	89.8
NYCCT	92.6	96.1	98.0	91.8
Staten Island	83.5	87.8	88.3	94.0
Comprehensive College Average	86.3	90.9	91.0	92.1
Community				
BMCC	84.3	93.5	92.2	89.1
Bronx	62.5*	57.1*	66.7*	100.0*
Hostos	78.6*	45.5*	90.0*	88.5
Kingsborough	92.7	84.6	88.5	81.7
LaGuardia	82.8	90.5*	97.6	92.3
Queensborough	100.0*	---	50.0*	100.0*
Community College Average	84.6	83.8	90.3	88.3
University Average	88.2	89.8	90.3	91.2

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in math on the COMPASS 1 with the initial attempt of the COMPASS 1 test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial COMPASS 1 test score.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 1 (pre-algebra) test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch		13.0*	34.0*	23.0*	34.5*
Brooklyn		17.0*	19.1*	17.0	16.2
City		17.2	15.2	13.4	20.3
Hunter		20.0*	16.8*	14.5*	20.0*
Lehman		14.1	14.9	12.3	10.6
Queens		17.4*	21.5*	15.1*	16.8*
York		16.8	15.2	12.5	14.6
Senior College Average		16.2	16.0	13.3	14.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay		13.1	15.3	13.4	14.0
Medgar Evers		11.6	19.4	15.4	24.7
NYCCT		21.0	20.1	18.6	15.5
Staten Island		13.6	14.5	13.1	16.9
Comprehensive College Average		14.7	16.5	14.4	17.1
Community					
BMCC		19.0	19.3	17.2	14.6
Bronx		6.6*	8.0*	3.4*	13.0*
Hostos		6.5*	5.5*	8.4*	13.0
Kingsborough		15.7	15.0	13.7	12.9
LaGuardia		14.0	13.2*	24.2	21.5
Queensborough		20.0*	---	11.0*	11.3*
Community College Average		15.0	15.1	16.1	15.4
University Average		15.4	16.1	14.3	15.8

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in pre-algebra with the initial attempt of the COMPASS Math 1 test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the average difference in students' initial score on the COMPASS Math 1 test and the last COMPASS Math 1 test taken prior to the fall term of entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Indicator

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their math COMPASS 2 (algebra) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	87.5*
Brooklyn	96.9	92.2	96.5	92.8
City	86.5	93.3	89.7	92.2
Hunter	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Lehman	89.2	87.3	86.2	87.6
Queens	97.4	96.5	96.4	96.2
York	95.6	89.8	93.6	90.0
Senior College Average	93.0	91.1	91.5	90.5
Comprehensive				
John Jay	90.3	89.5	88.9	87.8
Medgar Evers	100.0*	94.7*	100.0*	93.8
NYCCT	99.1	100.0	100.0	96.7
Staten Island	92.3	94.2	89.4	93.5
Comprehensive College Average	93.1	94.0	91.6	92.7
Community				
BMCC	84.9	90.9	94.5	81.8
Bronx	88.4	88.9*	79.3	77.8*
Hostos	92.3*	62.5*	80.0*	91.7*
Kingsborough	91.8	87.1	89.2	93.7
LaGuardia	85.7	91.5	92.6	91.7
Queensborough	94.2	85.0*	87.8	96.6
Community College Average	88.8	88.1	89.2	87.8
University Average	92.1	91.8	91.1	90.9

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in math on the COMPASS 2 with the initial attempt of the COMPASS 2 test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial COMPASS 2 test score.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2004</u>	<u>Summer 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch		15.2*	23.9*	8.0*	22.3*
Brooklyn		19.9	19.1	25.2	26.3
City		9.6	13.2	12.3	18.3
Hunter		18.3*	16.3*	19.5*	18.0*
Lehman		13.8	12.2	11.0	12.5
Queens		26.1	23.2	19.8	21.1
York		14.8	16.6	14.4	13.9
Senior College Average		15.2	15.6	14.7	16.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay		12.2	10.7	10.5	11.8
Medgar Evers		16.3*	19.5*	20.8*	26.2
NYCCT		17.8	17.1	16.5	19.2
Staten Island		15.4	15.0	14.0	19.9
Comprehensive College Average		14.7	14.3	13.6	18.2
Community					
BMCC		15.7	21.0	17.1	19.1
Bronx		8.9	9.4*	8.5	7.5*
Hostos		13.5*	5.5*	9.9*	22.2*
Kingsborough		11.9	12.6	11.8	21.1
LaGuardia		15.1	16.7	21.5	20.9
Queensborough		17.5	20.2*	13.8	18.6
Community College Average		14.1	16.1	14.9	19.4
University Average		14.8	15.1	14.3	17.7

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in algebra with the initial attempt of the COMPASS Math 2 test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the average difference in students' initial score on the COMPASS Math 2 test and the last COMPASS Math 2 test taken prior to the fall term of entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Percentage of non-ESL SEEK students who pass all basic skills tests within one year

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	97.0	97.0	91.3	98.8	96.3
Brooklyn	89.3	91.4	90.2	85.1	91.2
City	90.0	90.6	86.5	85.2	87.0
Hunter	92.0	91.1	88.5	96.5	92.0
Lehman	76.3	81.8	87.2	74.6	83.3
Queens	93.8	92.7	91.4	92.1	85.9
York	78.2	76.5	86.3	76.6	62.2
Senior College Average	87.2	88.3	88.4	84.6	83.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	80.5	71.2	80.1	66.3	75.5
Medgar Evers	66.7*	100.0*	0.0*	89.1	90.7
NYCCT	90.2	86.3	94.4*	89.5*	94.1*
Staten Island	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	---	---
Comprehensive College Average	83.2	76.6	81.8	72.8	79.9
University Average	86.7	86.6	87.5	82.7	83.1

Note: Students who are both SEEK and ESL (based on ESL course enrollment in the first term) are excluded from the base because they have two years to meet basic skills requirements.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	164	200	46	85	82
Brooklyn	178	174	225	195	239
City	221	255	281	277	193
Hunter	212	169	52	115	100
Lehman	333	325	218	280	210
Queens	195	232	175	214	220
York	147	187	139	205	225
Senior College Total	1,450	1,542	1,136	1,371	1,269
Comprehensive					
John Jay	123	177	141	187	159
Medgar Evers	6	5	1	55	43
NYCCT	61	80	18	19	17
Staten Island	1	3	5	0	0
Comprehensive College Total	191	265	165	261	219
University Total	1,641	1,807	1,301	1,632	1,488

Note: Students who are both SEEK and ESL (based on ESL course enrollment in the first term) are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Percentage of ESL students (SEEK and regular) who pass all basic skills tests within two years

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	84.7	89.4	89.4	90.5	96.5
Brooklyn	86.4	68.2	83.7	76.9	89.3
City	80.0	79.2	86.0	84.1	75.2
Hunter	82.3	86.7	81.0	81.8	89.7
Lehman	64.7*	78.6	68.9	39.1*	79.5
Queens	76.7	77.5	67.3	76.9	69.2
York	47.4	62.0	59.6	56.9	49.1
Senior College Average	77.5	78.3	77.5	76.3	80.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	---	33.3*	33.3*	60.0*	60.0*
Medgar Evers	100.0*	---	---	---	---
NYCCT	100.0*	50.0*	61.5*	60.0*	100.0*
Staten Island	---	100.0*	---	---	100.0*
Comprehensive College Average	100.0*	45.5*	46.4	60.0*	71.4*
University Average	77.7	77.4	75.4	75.9	80.5

Note: ESL students are identified as those students enrolled in at least one ESL course in their first term at CUNY, including those in the SEEK program.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	59	66	47	84	144
Brooklyn	59	44	43	52	28
City	65	72	86	44	101
Hunter	62	60	58	66	58
Lehman	17	28	45	23	44
Queens	60	71	52	65	65
York	38	50	47	58	55
Senior College Total	360	391	378	392	495
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0	6	15	5	5
Medgar Evers	2	0	0	0	0
NYCCT	1	4	13	5	1
Staten Island	0	1	0	0	1
Comprehensive College Total	3	11	28	10	7
University Total	363	402	406	402	502

Note: ESL students are identified as those students enrolled in at least one ESL course in their first term at CUNY, including those in the SEEK program.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74.8	56.1	69.0	58.2	67.6
Medgar Evers	70.3	50.9	65.4	54.9	58.7
NYCCT	70.3	54.2	64.6	63.2	72.6
Staten Island	69.3	58.5	61.0	52.5	55.8
Comprehensive College Average	71.0	55.7	64.7	58.3	65.4
Community					
BMCC	65.7	53.0	58.7	58.1	56.8
Bronx	61.4	54.6	66.1	60.1	66.1
Hostos	56.9	38.6	41.6	41.6	45.3
Kingsborough	68.7	56.3	60.3	58.1	65.6
LaGuardia	66.2	53.6	57.7	60.0	61.0
Queensborough	69.3	57.2	53.0	58.5	58.2
Community College Average	65.3	53.1	56.1	56.6	58.6
University Average	66.4	53.6	58.2	57.0	60.0

Note: Beginning in fall 2005, the passing score on the reading exam was raised to 70 from 65. Results for fall 2006 and later exclude students who took the reading test during the exit period for Ability-to-Benefit purposes and who were not also enrolled in a "last in sequence" developmental reading course. Exit results are based on all scores reported to UAPC between October 1 and December 31 (for fall 2005, the exit period was extended by some colleges as a result of the NYC transit strike).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.3	65.4	62.1	65.7	65.6
Medgar Evers	61.3	55.2	49.4	52.6	43.8
NYCCT	52.0	57.3	46.5	42.8	50.9
Staten Island	49.8	55.3	56.7	58.3	52.9
Comprehensive College Average	54.6	58.5	53.5	53.5	53.1
Community					
BMCC	49.0	59.9	57.8	55.6	48.4
Bronx	65.5	55.7	65.7	67.6	61.8
Hostos	46.7	35.1	37.2	44.5	43.8
Kingsborough	53.3	56.3	49.6	58.2	51.3
LaGuardia	57.0	58.4	53.4	57.4	49.0
Queensborough	55.9	53.7	46.9	45.6	54.7
Community College Average	54.2	55.5	53.3	55.4	50.6
University Average	54.3	56.3	53.4	54.9	51.2

Note: Exit results are based on all scores reported to UAPC between October 1 and December 31 (for fall 2005, the exit period was extended by some colleges as a result of the NYC transit strike).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Pass rate in math on exit from remediation

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	43.0	68.4	51.6	42.2	41.1
Medgar Evers	67.5	60.3	63.7	50.7	27.1
NYCCT	91.3	90.5	88.0	79.4	74.1
Staten Island	63.5	62.2	57.3	32.5	44.6
Comprehensive College Average	69.4	69.5	62.2	48.3	46.6
Community					
BMCC	74.3	57.8	60.8	51.9	75.7
Bronx	48.0	64.3	55.2	45.6	38.4
Hostos	55.9	48.8	51.6	44.6	52.7
Kingsborough	49.5	55.9	57.3	51.7	59.7
LaGuardia	72.4	76.2	77.9	68.7	68.4
Queensborough	66.0	61.3	56.7	48.9	63.8
Community College Average	63.9	60.3	60.4	52.3	62.0
University Average	65.0	62.7	60.9	51.2	57.4

Note: Exit results reflect basic skills proficiency on the COMPASS Math 2 (Algebra). Beginning in fall 2007, the passing score on the COMPASS math test was raised to 30 from 27. Beginning in October 2008, CUNY some colleges (senior and comprehensives) raised the passing score on the COMPASS to a higher cut off. Exit results reflect the passing score set by each college in use for the semester shown, and therefore rates over time are not comparable. Rates are based on all scores reported to UAPC between October 1 and December 31 (for fall 2005, the exit period was extended by some colleges as a result of the NYC transit strike).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Percentage of associate degree students not fully skills proficient upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in reading, writing and math by the 30th credit

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.0	53.4	67.5	72.5	71.5
Medgar Evers	63.9	68.8	66.5	64.2	64.5
NYCCT	89.5	87.9	91.3	91.7	92.0
Staten Island	87.8	89.2	90.9	91.4	89.2
Comprehensive College Average	78.5	77.2	82.3	83.3	82.3
Community					
BMCC	57.7	57.0	60.1	66.2	65.9
Bronx	50.7	57.3	54.5	56.1	52.7
Hostos	40.5	49.1	53.6	59.0	64.2
Kingsborough	61.0	59.8	59.1	62.1	57.1
LaGuardia	55.6	62.9	59.3	68.0	67.5
Queensborough	64.3	68.0	70.5	70.3	68.3
Community College Average	56.9	59.7	60.1	64.3	62.6
University Average	62.2	63.9	65.6	69.0	67.4

Note: This indicator is based on students who had earned between 25 and 35 credits by the start of the fall term and who were not initially proficient in one or more subject areas. Basic skills proficiency is based on data available in the SKAT database and reflects status at the beginning of the term. Students whose proficiency status is unknown because one or more test/exemption records is missing are excluded from the base. For comprehensive colleges, the rates include students who entered at the associate level but were enrolled at the baccalaureate level at the time they were identified as having earned 25-35 credits.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in reading upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in reading by the 30th credit

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	82.1	80.2	84.5	77.5	86.6
Medgar Evers	75.2	85.3	86.3	82.6	82.2
NYCCT	93.6	92.5	97.7	96.0	94.5
Staten Island	91.6	94.6	91.4	95.4	93.8
Comprehensive College Average	87.8	89.4	91.9	90.0	90.5
Community					
BMCC	85.1	85.9	83.6	85.2	86.9
Bronx	67.3	76.3	76.1	80.4	81.0
Hostos	54.5	66.2	72.3	67.7	74.4
Kingsborough	71.7	75.7	76.2	78.5	76.8
LaGuardia	79.8	85.0	83.0	86.0	83.6
Queensborough	88.7	89.8	90.9	90.1	89.9
Community College Average	76.8	81.4	81.0	82.2	82.6
University Average	78.9	82.8	83.1	83.8	84.3

Note: This indicator is based on students who have earned between 25 and 35 credits by the start of the fall term and who were not initially proficient in reading. Basic skills proficiency is based on data available in the SKAT database and reflects status at the beginning of the term. Students whose proficiency status is unknown because one or more test/exemption records is missing are excluded from the base. For comprehensive colleges, the rates include students who entered at the associate level but were enrolled at the baccalaureate level at the time they were identified as having earned 25-35 credits.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in writing upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in writing by the 30th credit

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.7	77.9	86.0	89.8	84.6
Medgar Evers	79.3	83.6	82.4	83.3	87.6
NYCCT	91.4	91.7	95.1	94.1	94.5
Staten Island	86.7	92.2	92.9	93.4	93.3
Comprehensive College Average	84.6	87.3	90.6	91.3	91.1
Community					
BMCC	69.8	72.7	78.3	80.8	82.2
Bronx	59.1	74.0	75.9	80.0	85.3
Hostos	50.8	69.6	72.6	75.1	81.3
Kingsborough	62.4	66.4	71.3	75.1	77.2
LaGuardia	64.9	73.1	71.6	77.3	80.8
Queensborough	73.9	78.3	81.3	84.8	84.9
Community College Average	65.1	72.4	75.6	79.2	81.9
University Average	69.6	75.7	78.9	81.9	83.8

Note: This indicator is based on students who have earned between 25 and 35 credits by the start of the fall term and who were not initially proficient in writing. Basic skills proficiency is based on data available in the SKAT database and reflects status at the beginning of the term. Students whose proficiency status is unknown because one or more test/exemption records is missing are excluded from the base.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will draw upon degree and adult and continuing education resources to improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Context: Percentage of associate degree students not proficient in math upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in math by the 30th credit

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	56.3	45.0	62.9	71.1	71.3
Medgar Evers	70.0	71.9	66.8	64.5	62.8
NYCCT	93.4	91.1	90.5	92.6	92.8
Staten Island	91.1	90.1	92.6	92.2	89.9
Comprehensive College Average	79.9	76.0	80.6	82.5	81.2
Community					
BMCC	64.7	59.5	63.4	67.9	65.9
Bronx	65.6	61.7	56.1	53.7	48.5
Hostos	54.3	51.1	57.5	65.3	69.9
Kingsborough	73.5	65.0	58.7	59.9	55.2
LaGuardia	64.9	64.0	62.1	69.9	66.5
Queensborough	69.5	71.6	70.2	66.2	62.6
Community College Average	66.3	62.6	61.5	64.0	60.7
University Average	69.5	65.7	66.1	68.7	65.7

Note: This indicator is based on students who have earned between 25 and 35 credits by the start of the fall term and who were not initially proficient in math. Basic skills proficiency is based on data available in the SKAT database and reflects status at the beginning of the term. Students whose proficiency status is unknown because one or more test/exemption records is missing are excluded from the base.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.3 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will rise.

Percentage of required invitees who took the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE show rate)

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.7	82.6	82.2	85.3	87.3
Brooklyn	80.4	82.1	78.5	84.3	83.1
City	76.5	71.9	86.8	84.8	80.7
Hunter	78.3	80.4	79.2	86.1	88.3
Lehman	70.9	69.1	69.0	71.2	76.6
Queens	75.4	72.7	71.7	75.1	78.3
York	77.2	75.8	66.1	66.5	83.8
Senior College Average	78.1	76.7	76.8	79.9	82.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.2	70.6	82.5	84.5	85.8
Medgar Evers	64.0	65.0	69.8	73.9	80.2
NYCCT	81.4	79.8	82.0	81.9	77.3
Staten Island	68.2	72.4	73.9	72.3	75.6
Comprehensive College Average	73.6	73.0	79.2	79.1	80.1
Community					
BMCC	77.6	76.5	77.0	77.0	81.0
Bronx	71.6	64.1	75.6	71.3	76.4
Hostos	81.1	79.3	80.0	83.7	85.4
Kingsborough	77.3	73.6	74.5	83.0	81.8
LaGuardia	79.8	73.4	79.7	84.6	84.0
Queensborough	77.8	76.2	78.2	80.0	76.6
Community College Average	77.5	74.0	77.1	80.1	80.9
University Average	76.9	75.1	77.5	79.8	81.5

Note: This indicator reflects the percentage of students required to take the CPE for the first time in the fall semester, who took it either that fall or in the subsequent winter or spring administrations. Values for the fall 2008 cohort have been revised from the preliminary report to reflect updated data (post-appeals processing).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

University Target: 3.3 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will rise.

Percentage of required test-takers passing the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE pass rate)

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	94.3	95.7	94.4	95.8	94.2
Brooklyn	93.5	95.4	92.6	93.4	94.4
City	89.4	90.9	92.2	90.7	92.8
Hunter	96.9	96.7	96.1	96.2	95.9
Lehman	90.2	90.5	91.6	89.7	88.9
Queens	93.7	94.0	93.9	94.4	93.3
York	86.4	88.8	87.2	87.1	85.4
Senior College Average	93.2	93.9	93.4	93.4	93.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	91.9	93.7	91.7	90.0	91.8
Medgar Evers	79.5	87.9	82.9	85.6	91.1
NYCCT	87.0	89.2	88.4	88.9	85.6
Staten Island	91.4	92.4	91.2	86.9	89.1
Comprehensive College Average	89.3	91.4	90.1	88.4	89.4
Community					
BMCC	87.4	91.1	87.3	85.1	93.1
Bronx	87.9	90.5	89.8	85.3	86.4
Hostos	80.1	93.6	91.1	87.4	90.4
Kingsborough	88.1	87.8	84.5	87.9	87.4
LaGuardia	89.8	91.2	94.6	92.7	91.2
Queensborough	90.7	93.9	90.6	92.1	90.6
Community College Average	88.3	91.0	89.1	88.7	90.3
University Average	91.0	92.6	91.4	91.0	94.7

Note: This indicator reflects the percentage of students who passed the CPE based on the students counted as test-takers for the CPE show rate. The pass rate reflects the best outcome for tests taken that fall or in the subsequent winter or spring administrations (longitudinal pass rate). Values for the fall 2008 cohort have been revised from the preliminary report to reflect updated data (post-appeals processing).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	87.5	87.7	88.2	88.2	89.6
Brooklyn	78.6	75.5	78.4	80.2	77.2
City	76.9	78.6	79.8	79.5	81.3
Hunter	81.5	82.3	80.2	81.7	83.6
Lehman	73.8	73.6	76.8	73.3	72.0
Queens	81.0	83.8	81.5	83.8	84.8
York	68.5	68.8	67.4	70.9	69.6
Senior College Average	79.9	80.2	80.2	80.9	81.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.6	72.7	74.0	74.1	72.3
Medgar Evers	63.2*	50.0	61.1*	61.4	56.0
NYCCT	73.3	77.8	77.5	75.0	79.0
Staten Island	80.1	82.7	79.3	81.8	81.6
Comprehensive College Average	75.8	74.7	75.1	74.8	72.9
University Average	79.3	79.3	79.4	80.0	79.7

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled in the college of entry one year later.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	73.4	77.1	75.0	75.5	77.4
Brooklyn	62.1	61.3	64.9	67.4	68.0
City	60.7	61.4	62.2	63.1	66.9
Hunter	62.0	66.5	66.7	65.5	65.6
Lehman	59.0	57.5	59.6	61.4	59.1
Queens	71.2	69.4	69.4	70.3	73.5
York	49.2	47.3	44.4	45.0	52.0
Senior College Average	64.5	65.4	65.4	66.0	67.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.2	62.8	57.2	56.3	58.7
Medgar Evers	59.4	26.3*	50.0	61.1*	42.0
NYCCT	55.6	51.8	56.3	53.4	56.4
Staten Island	68.9	65.4	69.2	69.5	69.7
Comprehensive College Average	61.4	60.7	58.6	58.0	59.6
University Average	64.0	64.7	64.2	64.8	66.5

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled in the college of entry (or earned the degree pursued from the college of entry) two years later. Students who earned a degree lower than that pursued and who are not still enrolled are not counted as retained.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry one year later (or earned degree pursued)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.2	87.5	85.6	88.5	86.9
Brooklyn	73.6	69.6	70.3	70.8	72.7
City	68.7	69.6	71.3	71.4	72.9
Hunter	66.3	72.3	70.6	74.6	74.9
Lehman	69.1	75.9	73.2	73.9	74.7
Queens	75.4	73.8	76.2	77.1	77.2
York	67.6	66.3	62.2	67.4	65.2
Senior College Average	72.7	74.1	73.6	75.5	75.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	73.9	74.4	77.9	74.5	74.1
Medgar Evers	76.6	62.8	59.0	51.6	60.8
NYCCT	72.1	74.7	75.3	71.2	76.4
Staten Island	85.3	80.4	75.0	76.6	78.9
Comprehensive College Average	76.1	74.5	75.6	72.4	74.3
University Average	73.4	74.2	73.9	75.0	75.5

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled one year later in the college into which they transferred (or earned the degree pursued from that college within one year of transfer entry). Students who earned a degree lower than that pursued and who are not still enrolled are not counted as retained.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry two years later (or earned degree pursued)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	77.7	77.4	81.0	78.0	81.0
Brooklyn	61.2	60.9	61.6	63.2	63.2
City	57.0	55.4	58.2	58.1	62.2
Hunter	57.9	56.6	60.6	59.6	63.3
Lehman	64.7	61.3	65.1	63.2	60.9
Queens	67.3	66.3	65.7	68.0	68.0
York	56.9	56.7	56.4	52.1	56.8
Senior College Average	63.7	62.5	64.8	64.4	66.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65.8	64.7	62.7	66.9	67.3
Medgar Evers	40.0	63.8	43.6	49.4	33.3
NYCCT	66.3	59.4	60.0	58.8	63.3
Staten Island	75.1	75.3	66.3	66.7	70.5
Comprehensive College Average	66.8	66.0	61.5	63.9	64.4
University Average	64.3	63.2	64.3	64.3	65.7

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled two years later in the college into which they transferred (or earned the degree pursued from that college within two years of transfer entry).

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

One-year Retention Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65.3	64.0	62.5	63.0	63.1
Medgar Evers	59.5	55.1	54.1	49.8	52.8
NYCCT	65.3	58.2	61.0	61.3	61.2
Staten Island	63.2	62.6	67.7	62.9	63.4
Comprehensive College Average	64.0	60.8	62.5	61.1	61.5
Community					
BMCC	60.2	58.3	59.0	59.1	61.2
Bronx	64.6	63.0	63.1	61.4	61.2
Hostos	64.4	60.4	58.4	57.8	60.5
Kingsborough	65.4	67.3	64.9	64.6	66.2
LaGuardia	62.1	63.1	62.1	64.4	64.3
Queensborough	67.4	68.3	68.5	65.8	69.5
Community College Average	63.5	63.3	62.9	62.6	64.1
University Average	63.7	62.4	62.7	62.0	63.2

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. Prelude to Success students are excluded from the base.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.

Context: One-year Retention Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in any CUNY college one year later

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	69.4	68.7	66.6	68.2	68.2
Medgar Evers	64.0	59.5	59.5	53.7	55.6
NYCCT	71.4	64.9	67.4	67.7	66.7
Staten Island	69.8	71.2	75.1	70.4	70.7
Comprehensive College Average	69.6	67.3	68.5	67.2	67.2
Community					
BMCC	63.7	61.0	62.8	61.9	63.4
Bronx	67.0	65.0	65.6	63.8	62.9
Hostos	66.6	62.4	60.5	60.2	62.9
Kingsborough	69.1	69.9	68.9	68.2	69.1
LaGuardia	64.5	65.2	64.5	66.9	66.8
Queensborough	69.6	71.7	71.0	68.3	72.2
Community College Average	66.4	65.9	65.9	65.3	66.5
University Average	67.5	66.4	66.9	66.0	66.8

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled at any CUNY college one year after entry. Prelude to Success students are excluded from the base.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within four years

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>
Senior					
Baruch	27.1	32.8	33.5	32.8	33.6
Brooklyn	17.7	20.7	19.9	17.3	23.2
City	3.2	7.7	6.9	5.5	9.1
Hunter	10.8	12.5	17.7	16.9	17.1
Lehman	8.3	12.0	10.0	10.8	11.7
Queens	23.4	27.0	27.6	25.3	26.0
York	6.6	7.5	6.0	5.3	3.7
Senior College Average	15.5	19.6	20.0	18.5	19.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	17.1	19.4	20.7	23.1	21.2
Medgar Evers	13.3*	5.2	12.5	0.0*	0.0
NYCCT	9.1*	0.0	5.1	5.9	5.2
Staten Island	20.6	20.9	23.3	22.9	25.8
Comprehensive College Average	17.7	18.0	18.8	19.4	18.4
University Average	15.7	19.4	19.8	18.7	19.5

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within four years from the college of entry. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. Students who earn more than one degree within the tracking period are counted only once.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>
Senior					
Baruch	53.1	58.7	56.8	59.8	57.6
Brooklyn	43.7	39.4	44.3	46.9	43.7
City	30.9	34.8	30.3	36.2	37.0
Hunter	31.9	36.7	37.5	35.9	41.9
Lehman	35.1	33.9	30.4	33.6	33.6
Queens	51.1	50.5	52.6	52.7	55.3
York	28.3	29.9	23.8	27.6	23.4
Senior College Average	40.2	41.8	42.2	44.7	44.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	31.6	35.7	42.3	42.1	42.7
Medgar Evers	7.4	17.6*	20.0*	10.3	21.9
NYCCT	6.9	6.1	9.1*	11.1	18.2
Staten Island	36.8	50.8	51.4	44.3	45.6
Comprehensive College Average	31.7	38.3	43.5	39.3	39.2
University Average	38.6	41.2	42.3	43.9	44.0

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within six years from the college of entry. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. Students who earn more than one degree within the tracking period are counted only once.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>
Senior					
Baruch	62.0	69.3	68.9	63.9	65.1
Brooklyn	41.8	43.3	44.0	43.0	44.8
City	37.2	37.9	34.1	33.0	37.9
Hunter	42.4	39.5	43.6	41.0	46.5
Lehman	46.9	52.9	50.1	45.2	48.7
Queens	62.0	57.0	53.7	52.3	50.6
York	39.9	37.2	40.0	38.7	38.6
Senior College Average	49.8	48.9	48.4	45.9	48.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	43.6	50.4	50.0	49.8	48.8
Medgar Evers	16.0*	14.1	20.0	36.2	30.8
NYCCT	42.3	38.8	43.4	31.0	35.1
Staten Island	59.4	62.0	61.4	61.2	57.1
Comprehensive College Average	48.1	50.8	50.1	48.7	46.2
University Average	49.6	49.2	48.7	46.4	48.1

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within four years of transfer entry, from the college of transfer entry. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. Students who earn more than one degree within the tracking period are counted only once.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 1998</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>
Senior					
Baruch	62.8	65.0	70.9	73.5	74.9
Brooklyn	50.9	47.1	50.6	52.8	54.0
City	43.1	46.7	48.3	50.4	46.1
Hunter	46.1	47.6	51.0	47.7	50.1
Lehman	53.9	55.3	54.9	59.2	57.0
Queens	62.6	62.5	67.4	63.5	61.8
York	53.9	57.1	48.6	45.7	48.6
Senior College Average	54.1	55.2	58.2	56.7	56.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.8	50.0	50.5	58.6	57.3
Medgar Evers	33.3	23.8*	28.0	18.3	36.4
NYCCT	56.5*	59.5	46.2	45.6	50.7
Staten Island	63.8	67.1	64.2	66.7	67.1
Comprehensive College Average	53.5	54.9	54.3	57.4	57.5
University Average	54.0	55.1	57.6	56.8	56.8

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within six years of transfer entry, from the college of transfer entry. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. Students who earn more than one degree within the tracking period are counted only once.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of master's students who graduated within four years of entry into master's program

Master's Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>
Senior					
Baruch	73.8	76.6	77.0	75.2	74.4
Brooklyn	61.9	60.3	67.6	70.0	69.6
City	54.9	58.0	53.2	60.4	65.1
Hunter	67.4	65.5	68.0	67.7	71.9
Lehman	68.0	67.9	68.5	73.9	71.4
Queens	69.6	67.9	70.0	70.6	73.0
Senior College Average	67.3	67.2	68.7	69.4	71.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	66.3	60.2	61.5	54.6	65.5
Staten Island	62.3	62.6	62.9	56.0	62.8
Comprehensive College Average	64.5	61.0	61.9	55.0	64.5
University Average	66.9	66.4	67.7	67.3	70.2

Note: Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. This is a system rate reflecting graduation from any CUNY college, which may not necessarily be the same college at which the student first entered the master's program.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Six-year Graduation Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	18.9	24.7	25.2	26.0	24.3
Medgar Evers	15.2	13.0	16.9	17.8	16.9
NYCCT	20.5	18.7	19.8	19.8	19.7
Staten Island	20.1	21.0	24.2	26.5	24.9
Comprehensive College Average	19.7	19.2	21.6	22.6	22.1
Community					
BMCC	24.1	21.9	23.5	24.2	23.7
Bronx	21.5	23.7	20.8	20.4	22.1
Hostos	21.3	22.6	18.2	20.3	18.9
Kingsborough	29.4	24.9	27.1	28.7	34.9
LaGuardia	28.5	27.6	27.4	27.6	24.8
Queensborough	26.6	22.2	27.1	24.5	26.1
Community College Average	26.0	23.9	25.0	25.1	26.0
University Average	23.9	22.4	23.9	24.2	24.6

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within six years from the college of entry. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. For students who earn more than one CUNY degree, the highest degree earned within six years is counted.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Context: Six-year Graduation Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from any CUNY college within six years of entry

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	22.2	27.3	29.5	30.5	28.9
Medgar Evers	18.2	14.8	21.0	20.7	20.0
NYCCT	25.4	24.3	25.5	25.8	26.0
Staten Island	24.8	25.7	29.3	31.7	30.5
Comprehensive College Average	24.1	23.7	26.7	27.8	27.5
Community					
BMCC	27.2	25.7	27.3	27.6	26.6
Bronx	22.5	25.7	22.3	22.3	23.7
Hostos	22.7	23.3	19.9	22.2	20.9
Kingsborough	33.3	27.8	30.1	32.0	38.8
LaGuardia	31.4	30.8	30.2	30.2	28.2
Queensborough	30.9	26.6	31.8	29.0	30.7
Community College Average	29.1	27.2	28.2	28.4	29.2
University Average	27.4	26.1	27.7	28.2	28.6

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within six years from any CUNY college. Graduation rates reflect all degrees conferred through August 31 of the last year of the tracking period. For students who earn more than one CUNY degree, the highest degree earned within six years is counted.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: 4.2 Graduation rates will progressively increase in baccalaureate/master's programs and in associate programs.

Context: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who transferred outside of CUNY within six years of entry without having earned a degree from the college of entry

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	16.4	14.8	11.0	13.5	12.7
Medgar Evers	14.5	13.4	13.7	10.8	14.6
NYCCT	13.1	14.5	13.2	12.4	12.7
Staten Island	13.3	16.1	13.8	13.3	14.5
Comprehensive College Average	13.7	14.8	13.1	12.7	13.4
Community					
BMCC	15.2	15.0	13.6	11.9	14.2
Bronx	15.1	13.6	15.3	14.3	13.2
Hostos	8.7	12.1	9.7	8.9	11.9
Kingsborough	13.5	12.9	12.9	12.1	10.4
LaGuardia	12.1	12.1	11.7	9.6	10.1
Queensborough	17.0	17.0	14.8	14.3	14.2
Community College Average	14.1	14.1	13.3	12.1	12.5
University Average	14.0	14.3	13.2	12.3	12.8

Note: Figures are based on a match to data from the National Student Clearinghouse student tracker database.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number of credentialed teachers (from traditional and alternative certification programs)

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	282	211	430	519	475
City	476	661	588	544	481
Hunter	411	359	383	426	419
Lehman	353	455	454	536	521
Queens	605	602	583	526	807
York	12	17	13	15	22
Senior College Total	2,139	2,305	2,451	2,566	2,725
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	0	7	4	8	12
NYCCT	9	11	13	5	0
Staten Island	122	136	216	304	236
Comprehensive College Total	131	154	233	317	248
University Total	2,270	2,459	2,684	2,883	2,973

Note: This indicator reflects the total number passing the LAST plus the total number of graduates from alternative certification programs in an academic year.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	91	95	95	93	94
City	95	99	98	99	98
Hunter	98	100	99	100	100
Lehman	98	98	99	96	98
Queens	97	98	98	97	98
York	86*	100*	93*	94*	100*
Senior College Average	96	98	98	97	98
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	NA	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	90*	69*	100*	100*	NA
Staten Island	98	98	99	99	96
Comprehensive College Average	98	95	99	99	95
University Average	96	98	98	97	97

Note: Prior to 2004-05, rates based on fewer than 10 test-takers were not available.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	310	202	299	406	398
City	352	438	376	345	295
Hunter	419	310	332	394	361
Lehman	336	338	312	397	373
Queens	581	559	451	392	698
York	14	17	14	16	22
Senior College Total	2,012	1,864	1,784	1,950	2,147
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	<10	7	4	8	12
NYCCT	10	16	13	5	2
Staten Island	124	136	178	259	225
Comprehensive College Total	>134	159	195	272	239
University Total	>2,146	2,023	1,979	2,222	2,386

Note: Prior to 2004-05, data were not available for colleges with fewer than 10 test-takers. Exact subtotals and totals cannot be computed when the number of test-takers is unknown for one or more colleges.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	95	95	98	98	97
City	97	100	100	99	100
Hunter	99	100	100	100	100
Lehman	98	98	98	99	100
Queens	99	99	99	98	99
York	100*	100*	93*	100*	100*
Senior College Average	98	99	99	99	99
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	NA	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	100*	76*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	100	99	100	100	97
Comprehensive College Average	100	96	100	100	98
University Average	98	99	99	99	99

Note: Prior to 2004-05, rates based on fewer than 10 test-takers were not available.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	302	200	308	409	402
City	313	416	330	315	266
Hunter	445	310	343	399	383
Lehman	343	319	305	411	374
Queens	590	552	454	392	704
York	12	18	15	15	23
Senior College Total	2,005	1,815	1,755	1,941	2,152
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	<10	7	4	8	12
NYCCT	10	17	15	15	15
Staten Island	88	138	179	264	223
Comprehensive College Total	>98	162	198	287	250
University Total	>2,103	1,977	1,953	2,228	2,402

Note: Prior to 2004-05, data were not available for colleges with fewer than 10 test-takers. Exact subtotals and totals cannot be computed for the years when the number of test-takers was unknown for one or more colleges.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	97	92	89	88	87
City	94	96	94	95	95
Hunter	93	95	96	98	96
Lehman	93	97	96	94	94
Queens	90	91	93	95	95
York	NA	82*	90*	80*	86*
Senior College Average	92	94	94	94	93
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	NA	100*	100*	100*	82*
NYCCT	NA	67*	100*	80*	NA
Staten Island	90	89	93	96	87
Comprehensive College Average	90	89	93	96	86
University Average	92	94	94	95	93

Note: Prior to 2004-05, rates based on fewer than 10 test-takers were not available.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	39	157	238	320	402
City	248	384	318	288	330
Hunter	114	299	326	382	451
Lehman	107	284	289	342	434
Queens	210	407	416	347	837
York	<10	11	10	10	22
Senior College Total	>718	1,542	1,597	1,689	2,476
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	<10	7	4	9	22
NYCCT	<10	6	15	5	2
Staten Island	98	151	189	298	240
Comprehensive College Total	>98	164	208	312	264
University Total	>816	1,706	1,805	2,001	2,740

Note: Prior to 2004-05, data were not available for colleges with fewer than 10 test-takers. Exact subtotals and totals cannot be computed when the number of test-takers is unknown for one or more colleges.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage passing the NCLEX exam

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior					
Hunter	87.9	84.9	86.7	88.2	91.9
Lehman	76.3	63.5	70.1	73.0	84.4
Senior College Average	83.3	76.0	77.8	79.5	87.6
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	67.5	82.4*	84.2*	94.4*	100.0*
NYCCT	91.4	93.7	90.3	88.2	90.7
Staten Island	88.4	84.8	90.5	88.6	80.3
Comprehensive College Average	84.8	88.3	90.0	88.9	85.3
Community					
BMCC	78.8	80.7	83.2	88.5	82.9
Bronx	87.2	75.4	87.3	74.1	86.0
Hostos	100.0*	78.6*	86.7*	88.0	84.6
Kingsborough	89.3	88.6	77.9	86.9	89.9
LaGuardia	97.1	97.9	93.2	97.5	87.6
Queensborough	87.7	91.5	93.0	89.9	89.4
Community College Average	85.9	85.2	86.5	87.2	86.7
University Average	85.3	84.5	86.0	86.3	86.5

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior					
Hunter	58	73	75	76	74
Lehman	38	52	87	100	96
Senior College Total	96	125	162	176	170
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	40	17	19	18	14
NYCCT	58	79	93	85	107
Staten Island	86	92	137	132	152
Comprehensive College Total	184	188	249	235	273
Community					
BMCC	146	197	191	200	205
Bronx	39	61	55	108	50
Hostos	12	14	15	25	26
Kingsborough	75	70	86	122	119
LaGuardia	34	47	74	79	129
Queensborough	106	117	129	138	142
Community College Total	412	506	550	672	671
University Total	692	819	961	1,083	1,114

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license

	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Senior					
Hunter	59	76	79	73	76
Lehman	101	97	116	109	105
Senior College Total	160	173	195	182	181
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	41	14	15	18	14
NYCCT	57	74	92	84	108
Staten Island	83	97	133	135	151
Comprehensive College Total	181	185	240	237	273
Community					
BMCC	145	197	192	201	211
Bronx	37	64	52	112	44
Hostos	12	13	12	26	31
Kingsborough	70	72	85	119	120
LaGuardia	34	44	77	80	125
Queensborough	91	123	116	142	139
Community College Total	389	513	534	680	670
University Total	730	871	969	1,099	1,124

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Context: Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses

	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Senior					
Hunter	50	37	22	26	38
Lehman	0	0	12	21	48
York	21	18	16	21	24
Senior College Total	72	55	50	68	110
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	9	8	16	17	33
NYCCT	0	0	0	0	15
Staten Island	40	25	22	36	36
Comprehensive College Total	49	33	38	53	84
University Total	121	88	88	121	194

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage of test-takers without an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
Senior			
Baruch	36.5	44.1	47.6
Brooklyn	34.7	42.9	45.3
Hunter	33.9	46.8	34.6
Lehman	25.0	22.7*	14.7
Queens	44.2	37.8	40.9
York	35.5	32.0	16.0
Senior College Average	37.3	42.0	42.8
Comprehensive			
Medgar Evers	44.4*	8.3*	14.3*
Staten Island	21.4	37.2	32.6
Comprehensive College Average	27.0	30.9	28.3
University Average	36.8	41.2	42.1

Note: The Uniform CPA exam changed to a computer-administered test from a paper-and-pencil test in 2004. The pass rates are computed as the number of events passed divided by the total number of events taken, where each attempt at a subtest is counted as a separate event.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.

Percentage of test-takers with an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
Senior			
Baruch	72.2*	65.9*	75.5
Lehman	---	40.0*	---
Senior College Average	72.2*	63.0	75.5

Note: The Uniform CPA exam changed to a computer-administered test from a paper-and-pencil test in 2004. The pass rates are computed as the number of events passed divided by the total number of events taken, where each attempt at a subtest is counted as a separate event.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Six-month job placement rate in career and technical education programs

	<u>2002-03</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	82.9	71.4	80.0	81.4	90.2
Medgar Evers	78.8	90.7	95.2	97.1	86.0
NYCCT	81.7	86.1	85.3	81.6	93.2
Staten Island	85.1	93.5	88.2	93.2	84.1
Comprehensive College Average	81.8	86.6	86.6	85.5	89.5
Community					
BMCC	78.6	84.5	86.6	89.1	84.6
Bronx	82.2	74.8	90.1	86.3	89.3
Hostos	76.9	88.7	92.3	92.6	94.7
Kingsborough	75.8	85.4	85.4	80.7	87.2
LaGuardia	76.5	83.3	86.4	92.0	88.9
Queensborough	80.3	86.2	84.5	89.0	88.3
Community College Average	78.3	84.6	86.4	88.3	88.2
University Average	79.0	84.9	86.4	87.8	88.4

Note: Based on responses to a survey of graduates. Graduates were asked to report on their employment status six months after graduation. Figures reflect the percentage of respondents who reported being employed six months after graduation. Prior years' figures have been revised to reflect a slight change in how missing responses are counted.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Context: Six-month education placement rate in career and technical education programs

	<u>2002-03</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	71.1	79.2*	58.3*	69.8	65.9
Medgar Evers	74.5	66.7*	59.3*	56.8*	63.9
NYCCT	58.8	70.5	60.2	53.1	58.1
Staten Island	55.1	50.0*	48.3*	40.8	38.5
Comprehensive College Average	61.7	66.7	58.1	53.7	56.2
Community					
BMCC	68.5	70.2	63.8	52.6	61.0
Bronx	63.7	63.9	56.5	44.6	53.2
Hostos	49.4	56.4*	70.0	37.3	51.3
Kingsborough	69.9	72.2	59.6	52.1	55.9
LaGuardia	59.6	65.0	62.7	43.7	62.2
Queensborough	55.6	51.6	42.4	44.8	58.9
Community College Average	62.2	61.2	54.9	46.7	57.8
University Average	62.1	61.9	55.4	48.0	57.5

Note: Based on responses to a survey of graduates. Graduates were asked to report on their employment status six months after graduation. Figures reflect the percentage of respondents who reported being enrolled for additional education or training six months after graduation, regardless of employment status. Prior years' figures have been revised to reflect a slight change in how missing responses are counted.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Context: Six-month job and education placement rate in career and technical education programs

	<u>2002-03</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	97.3	93.9	97.4	96.8	97.6
Medgar Evers	90.7	95.5	100.0	97.3	100.0
NYCCT	93.4	96.9	97.4	94.1	98.6
Staten Island	93.9	95.2	100.0	94.7	92.4
Comprehensive College Average	93.5	96.0	98.3	95.0	97.4
Community					
BMCC	94.8	95.8	96.5	94.7	95.4
Bronx	96.2	91.8	96.5	92.5	96.7
Hostos	92.8	94.5	100.0	95.8	98.7
Kingsborough	93.0	96.4	94.3	90.7	95.2
LaGuardia	90.8	95.0	95.2	96.4	97.0
Queensborough	93.2	94.5	93.0	95.2	97.7
Community College Average	93.2	95.0	95.0	94.3	96.6
University Average	93.2	95.1	95.6	94.5	96.8

Note: Based on responses to a survey of graduates. Graduates were asked to report on their employment status six months after graduation. Figures reflect the percentage of respondents who reported being employed or pursuing additional education or training six months after graduation.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of student academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Student satisfaction with and quality of academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction will rise.

Student satisfaction with academic support services

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	2.89	3.04	3.02	2.93
Brooklyn	2.49	3.02	2.90	2.93
City	2.72	2.79	2.83	2.88
Hunter	2.75	2.83	2.78	2.82
Lehman	2.93	3.10	3.01	3.02
Queens	2.87	2.91	3.03	2.85
York	2.71	2.81	2.86	2.88
Senior College Average	2.77	2.93	2.92	2.89
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.84	3.01	2.99	2.96
Medgar Evers	2.75	2.84	2.82	2.93
NYCCT	2.95	2.93	2.94	2.94
Staten Island	2.80	2.94	2.89	3.00
Comprehensive College Average	2.85	2.94	2.93	2.96
Community				
BMCC	2.84	2.84	2.93	3.02
Bronx	2.92	2.82	2.92	2.91
Hostos	2.80	2.91	3.00	2.99
Kingsborough	2.92	3.03	3.03	3.05
LaGuardia	2.89	2.97	2.95	2.97
Queensborough	2.92	2.93	3.09	3.04
Community College Average	2.88	2.91	2.98	3.00
University Average	2.83	2.93	2.94	2.95

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. New data will be available in next year's report. This measure reflects responses to three items about satisfaction with library services, science labs and learning labs. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores were calculated for each student by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of student academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Student satisfaction with and quality of academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction will rise.

Student satisfaction with student services

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	2.55	2.82	2.92	2.82
Brooklyn	2.60	2.65	2.65	2.78
City	2.63	2.60	2.60	2.81
Hunter	2.53	2.62	2.59	2.59
Lehman	2.92	3.11	2.96	2.93
Queens	2.66	2.76	2.87	2.67
York	2.71	2.82	2.69	2.45
Senior College Average	2.63	2.74	2.75	2.73
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.65	2.77	2.85	2.76
Medgar Evers	2.72	2.86	2.87	2.94
NYCCT	2.79	2.75	2.75	2.74
Staten Island	2.69	2.73	2.77	2.94
Comprehensive College Average	2.71	2.77	2.80	2.83
Community				
BMCC	2.64	2.65	2.58	2.89
Bronx	2.71	2.65	2.80	2.81
Hostos	2.68	2.76	2.85	2.82
Kingsborough	2.74	2.94	2.94	2.86
LaGuardia	2.69	2.75	2.77	2.84
Queensborough	2.80	2.76	2.88	2.94
Community College Average	2.71	2.74	2.77	2.87
University Average	2.68	2.75	2.77	2.80

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. New data will be available in next year's report. This measure combines items about satisfaction with personal counseling, career planning and placement, and student health services. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores were calculated for each student by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of student academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Student satisfaction with and quality of academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction will rise.

Student satisfaction with access to computer technology

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	2.96	3.16	3.29	3.09
Brooklyn	2.85	3.20	3.24	3.23
City	2.62	2.64	2.67	2.76
Hunter	2.78	2.82	2.81	2.79
Lehman	2.88	2.95	3.01	2.92
Queens	2.70	2.82	2.95	2.88
York	2.52	2.71	2.83	2.82
Senior College Average	2.79	2.92	2.99	2.94
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.85	2.90	3.13	2.98
Medgar Evers	2.79	2.90	2.81	2.89
NYCCT	2.74	2.90	2.95	2.91
Staten Island	2.93	2.96	3.01	3.08
Comprehensive College Average	2.83	2.91	3.00	2.97
Community				
BMCC	2.71	2.70	3.01	3.15
Bronx	2.94	2.98	3.08	3.12
Hostos	2.91	3.00	3.04	3.19
Kingsborough	2.61	2.97	2.92	2.98
LaGuardia	2.83	2.87	2.89	2.95
Queensborough	2.91	2.99	3.02	3.04
Community College Average	2.79	2.88	2.99	3.07
University Average	2.80	2.90	2.99	2.99

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. New data will be available in next year's report. This measure reflects responses to four items about satisfaction with access to computers on campus. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores for each student were calculated by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Enrollment

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	15,537	15,756	15,730	16,097	16,321
Brooklyn	15,384	15,281	15,947	16,087	16,689
City	12,099	12,360	13,155	14,392	15,306
Hunter	20,243	20,843	20,899	20,845	21,258
Lehman	10,281	10,615	10,814	10,922	11,860
Queens	17,395	17,638	18,107	18,728	19,572
York	5,743	5,899	6,236	6,727	7,157
Senior College Total	96,682	98,392	100,888	103,798	108,163
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14,080	14,295	14,645	14,841	14,844
Medgar Evers	5,170	5,211	5,561	5,550	6,036
NYCCT	11,772	12,439	13,368	13,502	14,268
Staten Island	12,442	12,083	12,313	12,517	13,092
Comprehensive College Total	43,464	44,028	45,887	46,410	48,240
Community					
BMCC	18,854	18,776	18,457	19,259	21,858
Bronx	8,367	8,470	8,717	9,003	9,117
Hostos	4,340	4,477	4,697	5,112	5,532
Kingsborough	15,356	15,265	14,687	14,962	15,739
LaGuardia	13,592	13,489	14,185	15,169	15,540
Queensborough	12,798	12,838	13,150	13,359	13,752
Community College Total	73,307	73,315	73,893	76,864	81,538
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,234	4,313	4,445	4,543	4,620
School of Journalism	---	---	57	99	111
School of Professional Studies	---	241	367	826	1,213
Law School	447	438	425	420	388
University Total	218,134	220,727	225,962	232,960	244,273

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total FTEs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,223	12,527	12,601	12,726	12,969
Brooklyn	10,979	11,000	11,530	11,867	12,243
City	8,478	8,749	9,355	10,278	11,047
Hunter	14,065	14,668	14,646	14,899	15,182
Lehman	6,936	7,126	7,485	7,653	8,195
Queens	12,267	12,431	12,873	13,578	14,288
York	4,254	4,425	4,415	4,762	5,053
Senior College Total	69,201	70,925	72,904	75,762	78,975
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10,799	11,076	11,385	11,468	11,348
Medgar Evers	3,565	3,677	3,947	4,042	4,318
NYCCT	8,778	8,892	9,583	9,619	10,316
Staten Island	9,168	8,868	9,266	9,474	9,975
Comprehensive College Total	32,310	32,514	34,181	34,603	35,957
Community					
BMCC	13,484	13,311	13,029	13,808	16,088
Bronx	6,089	6,242	6,300	6,402	6,411
Hostos	3,327	3,289	3,369	3,447	3,732
Kingsborough	10,989	10,855	10,522	10,783	11,555
LaGuardia	10,420	10,127	10,447	11,250	11,743
Queensborough	7,892	8,024	8,241	8,644	8,991
Community College Total	52,202	51,847	51,908	54,334	58,521
Graduate					
Graduate School	3,256	3,287	3,446	3,555	3,592
School of Journalism	---	---	72	122	139
School of Professional Studies	---	76	178	335	523
Law School	551	544	526	515	487
University Total	157,520	159,193	163,216	169,225	178,194

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

First-time Freshmen

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,718	1,641	1,508	1,479	1,512
Brooklyn	1,215	1,413	1,379	1,322	1,358
City	1,215	1,326	1,565	1,831	1,776
Hunter	1,876	1,837	1,864	1,906	2,042
Lehman	873	804	932	886	1,001
Queens	1,384	1,509	1,662	1,778	1,675
York	764	780	693	1,017	1,057
Senior College Total	9,045	9,310	9,603	10,219	10,421
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2,706	2,704	2,783	2,813	2,442
Medgar Evers	722	787	943	891	1,048
NYCCT	2,471	2,499	2,883	2,844	3,158
Staten Island	2,250	2,198	2,281	2,479	2,515
Comprehensive College Total	8,149	8,188	8,890	9,027	9,163
Community					
BMCC	3,334	3,198	3,337	3,904	4,949
Bronx	1,495	1,457	1,611	1,697	1,568
Hostos	772	721	786	813	905
Kingsborough	1,941	1,970	1,977	2,136	2,386
LaGuardia	2,107	2,080	2,419	2,573	2,613
Queensborough	2,329	2,464	2,615	2,812	2,849
Community College Total	11,978	11,890	12,745	13,935	15,270
University Total	29,172	29,388	31,238	33,231	34,872

Note: The university total includes 50 first-time freshmen enrolled in the School of Professional Studies in fall 2007 and 18 in fall 2008.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Transfers

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,299	1,282	1,337	1,397	1,254
Brooklyn	1,490	1,521	1,590	1,694	1,699
City	1,144	1,115	1,129	1,196	1,212
Hunter	1,438	1,490	1,616	1,542	1,470
Lehman	1,097	1,090	1,184	1,061	1,209
Queens	1,642	1,812	1,938	1,951	2,081
York	642	727	590	694	697
Senior College Total	8,752	9,037	9,384	9,535	9,622
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,218	1,022	1,080	997	1,207
Medgar Evers	630	488	631	561	643
NYCCT	768	848	1,022	942	1,093
Staten Island	821	651	1,007	1,175	1,653
Comprehensive College Total	3,437	3,009	3,740	3,675	4,596
Community					
BMCC	1,784	1,791	1,542	1,688	1,956
Bronx	836	738	753	697	694
Hostos	523	410	497	522	492
Kingsborough	1,379	1,316	1,359	1,416	1,558
LaGuardia	1,284	1,136	1,453	1,399	1,416
Queensborough	861	962	959	907	853
Community College Total	6,667	6,353	6,563	6,629	6,969
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies			239	218	274
University Total	18,856	18,399	19,926	20,057	21,461

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,734	12,844	12,796	12,863	12,731
Brooklyn	11,172	11,364	12,111	12,495	13,011
City	9,098	9,418	10,231	11,181	11,977
Hunter	15,361	15,631	15,805	15,718	15,698
Lehman	8,108	8,442	8,747	8,864	9,569
Queens	12,628	13,018	13,662	14,618	15,262
York	5,743	5,882	6,197	6,682	7,111
Senior College Total	74,844	76,599	79,549	82,421	85,359
Comprehensive					
John Jay	12,252	12,436	12,784	12,896	12,943
Medgar Evers	5,170	5,211	5,561	5,550	6,036
NYCCT	11,772	12,439	13,368	13,502	14,268
Staten Island	11,130	10,920	11,263	11,588	12,183
Comprehensive College Total	40,324	41,006	42,976	43,536	45,430
Community					
BMCC	18,854	18,776	18,457	19,259	21,858
Bronx	8,367	8,470	8,717	9,003	9,117
Hostos	4,340	4,477	4,697	5,112	5,532
Kingsborough	15,356	15,265	14,687	14,962	15,739
LaGuardia	13,592	13,489	14,185	15,169	15,540
Queensborough	12,798	12,838	13,150	13,359	13,752
Community College Total	73,307	73,315	73,893	76,864	81,538
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	---	8	255	694	966
University Total	188,475	190,928	196,673	203,515	213,293

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

New Graduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	958	961	991	1,064	1,159
Brooklyn	1,045	982	901	1,010	1,174
City	659	708	847	940	885
Hunter	1,012	955	909	950	1,092
Lehman	291	265	358	383	641
Queens	1,325	1,108	1,215	1,062	1,278
Senior College Total	5,290	4,979	5,221	5,409	6,229
Comprehensive					
John Jay	521	585	506	567	573
Staten Island	312	217	219	203	211
Comprehensive College Total	833	802	725	770	784
Graduate					
Graduate School	726	753	713	725	655
School of Journalism	---	---	57	50	64
School of Professional Studies	---	65	41	58	129
Law School	153	168	143	146	130
University Total	7,002	6,767	6,900	7,158	7,991

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Graduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2,803	2,912	2,934	3,234	3,590
Brooklyn	4,212	3,917	3,836	3,592	3,678
City	3,001	2,942	2,924	3,211	3,329
Hunter	4,882	5,212	5,094	5,127	5,560
Lehman	2,173	2,173	2,067	2,058	2,291
Queens	4,767	4,620	4,445	4,110	4,310
York		17	39	45	46
Senior College Total	21,838	21,793	21,339	21,377	22,804
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,828	1,859	1,861	1,945	1,901
Staten Island	1,312	1,163	1,050	929	909
Comprehensive College Total	3,140	3,022	2,911	2,874	2,810
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,234	4,313	4,445	4,543	4,620
School of Journalism			57	99	111
School of Professional Studies		233	112	132	247
Law School	447	438	425	420	388
University Total	29,659	29,799	29,289	29,445	30,980

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Baruch	9,998	9,864	9,023	8,643	9,336
Brooklyn	4,186	5,201	3,322	4,375	5,171
City	6,451	5,181	6,529	5,788	4,835
Hunter	14,383	14,936	14,673	14,521	11,629
Lehman	9,040	10,139	9,175	8,904	9,562
Queens	17,262	16,898	17,776	15,220	14,282
York	10,103	9,685	7,428	12,586	14,809
Senior College Total	71,423	71,904	67,926	70,037	69,624
Comprehensive					
John Jay	9,832	8,707	11,208	9,098	47,768
Medgar Evers	9,011	3,719	3,216	12,856	12,561
NYCCT	14,315	15,381	15,503	13,885	14,359
Staten Island	4,826	4,723	5,159	5,464	4,783
Comprehensive College Total	37,984	32,530	35,086	41,303	79,471
Community					
BMCC	12,240	12,057	9,852	12,153	8,499
Bronx	19,436	16,929	15,457	13,474	12,949
Hostos	6,292	9,189	8,136	9,717	9,540
Kingsborough	19,974	20,041	20,423	23,476	24,590
LaGuardia	41,830	48,772	55,190	66,624	76,755
Queensborough	8,734	9,213	8,694	8,809	9,630
Community College Total	108,506	116,201	117,752	134,253	141,963
Graduate					
Graduate School	39,138	23,405	10,326	12,674	9,905
School of Professional Studies				14,642	5,755
University Total	257,051	244,040	231,090	272,909	306,718

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1104	1107	1120	1136	1153
Brooklyn	1059	1053	1050	1050	1040
City	1029	1027	1005	1000	1026
Hunter	1065	1073	1088	1095	1104
Lehman	930	913	907	899	921
Queens	1034	1036	1034	1033	1061
York	845	835	849	845	864
Senior College Average	1041	1041	1041	1036	1050
Comprehensive					
John Jay	946	958	941	931	943
Medgar Evers	710*	853*	872	853	875
NYCCT	913	939	920	918	908
Staten Island	1041	1054	982	1015	1008
Comprehensive College Average	958	972	949	949	956
University Average	1026	1029	1026	1021	1032

Note: Based on current graduates of domestic high schools.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Context: Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1109	1113	1123	1139	1156
Brooklyn	1067	1061	1058	1058	1053
City	1050	1043	1016	1009	1032
Hunter	1069	1078	1089	1096	1106
Lehman	942	918	914	906	925
Queens	1041	1042	1039	1039	1067
York	850	844	856	852	867
Senior College Average	1050	1049	1047	1043	1055
Comprehensive					
John Jay	949	960	943	934	944
Medgar Evers	710*	840*	873	855	875
NYCCT	920	947	922	921	909
Staten Island	1042	1055	985	1016	1009
Comprehensive College Average	962	974	951	951	957
University Average	1034	1036	1031	1027	1037

Note: Based on current graduates of domestic high schools. ESL students are identified as students whose first basic skills essay test was flagged as ESL.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.1 Colleges will increase or maintain enrollment for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.8	85.8	85.8	87.4	87.2
Brooklyn	84.5	84.3	84.4	85.1	85.9
City	84.9	84.6	84.8	85.2	85.2
Hunter	84.1	84.7	85.3	84.8	85.9
Lehman	82.3	82.2	83.1	83.5	81.9
Queens	85.1	85.0	85.6	86.0	86.2
York	76.4	76.8	79.8	79.3	80.4
Senior College Average	84.1	84.2	84.8	85.0	85.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	80.4	79.9	80.5	81.6	81.1
Medgar Evers	73.3*	74.7*	75.1	75.2	74.7
NYCCT	77.1	76.7	77.5	78.0	77.8
Staten Island	84.9	85.3	84.4	84.5	83.6
Comprehensive College Average	80.5	80.4	81.1	81.7	81.1
University Average	83.5	83.6	84.2	84.5	84.5

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Percentage of course evaluations completed in TIPPS (excluding special courses, electives and non-credit courses)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior			
Baruch	81.9	83.2	91.4
Brooklyn	94.5	92.7	90.6
City	74.1	95.0	95.2
Hunter	83.2	92.6	94.8
Lehman	65.8	98.8	98.8
Queens	76.0	88.8	94.3
York	82.5	98.2	98.6
Senior College Average	78.9	92.8	94.8
Comprehensive			
John Jay	61.5	98.2	100.0
Medgar Evers	81.9	81.7	99.9
NYCCT	67.3	92.1	90.8
Staten Island	66.5	74.4	100.0
Comprehensive College Average	68.9	86.7	97.7
Community			
BMCC	84.9	96.1	99.9
Bronx	80.5	99.9	100.0
Hostos	82.1	99.3	99.9
Kingsborough	79.1	96.0	99.9
LaGuardia	46.6	78.9	98.3
Queensborough	99.9	98.0	99.3
Community College Average	78.8	94.7	99.6
University Average	76.5	92.0	97.2

Note: Figures were computed by dividing the number of course equivalencies completed by May of the year indicated by the total number of possible course equivalencies (undergraduate courses only). Electives, non-credit courses and special courses (independent study, internships, cooperative education courses, etc.) are excluded from the base. Upper division courses at the senior colleges are included in the base for community colleges even if the community college has no equivalent course. Colleges are expected to indicate "no equivalency" in TIPPS for such courses. Courses that were not registered in the TIPPS course catalog prior to the current calendar year are excluded from the numerator and the denominator; colleges are not held accountable for evaluating new courses until the following year.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Percentage of evaluated courses designated as non-transferable

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior			
Baruch	32.3	30.1	30.8
Brooklyn	30.1	23.6	21.6
City	25.3	22.3	21.8
Hunter	23.4	23.4	24.6
Lehman	5.9	18.3	18.8
Queens	13.5	11.5	10.3
York	23.8	23.3	23.3
Senior College Average	22.3	21.8	21.6
Comprehensive			
John Jay	6.6	4.2	3.9
Medgar Evers	39.7	39.6	33.0
NYCCT	30.2	45.6	45.9
Staten Island	19.3	22.7	16.7
Comprehensive College Average	24.8	27.5	24.4
Community			
BMCC	52.2	51.9	52.5
Bronx	29.0	25.2	24.0
Hostos	35.8	36.7	36.7
Kingsborough	66.7	57.0	55.2
LaGuardia	66.5	75.0	41.3
Queensborough	80.5	80.4	19.6
Community College Average	55.1	53.5	38.2
University Average	35.2	35.0	28.5

Note: Values for this indicator are calculated by dividing the number of courses evaluated as non-transferable (no equivalent course) by the total number of courses evaluated by the college. Electives, non-credit and special courses (independent study, internships, cooperative education courses, etc.) are excluded, as are courses new to the TIPPS course catalog in the current calendar year.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	355	343	351	400	373
Brooklyn	393	438	478	473	501
City	269	268	286	309	355
Hunter	359	358	360	374	349
Lehman	264	261	325	301	312
Queens	380	437	454	451	492
York	137	224	172	185	178
Senior College Total	2,157	2,329	2,426	2,493	2,560
Comprehensive					
John Jay	347	276	306	155	337
Medgar Evers	15	17	32	32	56
NYCCT	39	48	42	57	69
Staten Island	112	43	234	377	538
Comprehensive College Total	513	384	614	621	1,000
University Total	2,670	2,713	3,040	3,114	3,560

Note: Includes students who transferred with or without an associate degree.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	228	240	206	189	168
Brooklyn	204	213	227	231	201
City	145	100	79	92	72
Hunter	94	71	96	82	97
Lehman	129	127	140	121	142
Queens	139	101	119	111	129
York	76	60	53	50	51
Senior College Total	1,015	912	920	876	860
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74	53	50	66	66
Medgar Evers	14	6	22	33	25
NYCCT	128	84	105	76	100
Staten Island	40	15	97	178	399
Comprehensive College Total	256	158	274	353	590
University Total	1,271	1,070	1,194	1,229	1,450

Note: Includes students who transferred with or without an associate degree.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Percentage of AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program

Associate Programs

	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	71.6	62.4	72.8	60.7	62.9
Medgar Evers	53.6	58.0	58.7	58.9	54.5
NYCCT	59.7	51.6	45.2	38.7	41.0
Staten Island	55.2	53.1	50.4	61.0	56.4
Comprehensive College Average	57.9	55.7	56.7	58.5	55.7
Community					
BMCC	51.3	48.5	49.1	46.6	47.5
Bronx	53.9	52.8	52.0	49.6	45.9
Hostos	47.0	44.7	37.2	46.6	41.6
Kingsborough	46.5	46.0	47.7	45.0	48.5
LaGuardia	45.4	42.0	46.5	46.3	47.5
Queensborough	55.4	54.3	53.0	51.8	56.5
Community College Average	50.0	48.0	48.7	47.3	48.8
University Average	51.2	49.2	50.0	49.2	50.1

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program by the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2007-08 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program by fall 2008.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Percentage of AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program

Associate Programs

	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	6.5	25.0*	15.0*	16.7*	56.5*
NYCCT	42.9	43.7	45.0	39.3	39.4
Staten Island	31.3	37.0	38.8	41.3	49.0
Comprehensive College Average	38.8	41.7	42.7	39.4	42.6
Community					
BMCC	31.8	29.3	29.1	28.1	25.4
Bronx	27.8	23.4	22.5	22.3	23.8
Hostos	22.2	24.1	18.3	20.8	19.4
Kingsborough	38.8	36.4	35.1	30.6	32.5
LaGuardia	28.9	25.4	25.0	27.7	25.5
Queensborough	26.2	20.4	20.0	17.9	20.6
Community College Average	31.4	28.1	27.2	26.1	26.0
University Average	33.1	31.5	31.4	29.7	30.5

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program by the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2007-08 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program by fall 2008.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.31	2.37	2.44	2.41	2.40
Medgar Evers	2.40	2.27	2.34	2.70	1.97
NYCCT	2.80*	2.62*	2.46	2.30	2.43*
Staten Island	2.78	2.63	2.75	2.72	2.52
Comprehensive College Average	2.50	2.43	2.60	2.64	2.46
Community					
BMCC	2.53	2.60	2.59	2.56	2.61
Bronx	2.51	2.49	2.67	2.54	2.73
Hostos	2.39	2.41	2.67	2.69	2.48
Kingsborough	2.48	2.52	2.35	2.49	2.59
LaGuardia	2.55	2.61	2.69	2.57	2.70
Queensborough	2.44	2.40	2.44	2.45	2.54
Community College Average	2.50	2.53	2.54	2.53	2.61
University Average	2.50	2.52	2.55	2.55	2.58

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program within two years of leaving the associate program (with or without the associate degree).

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	2.29*	2.56*	2.26*	2.43*	2.67*
NYCCT	2.00	2.33	2.38	2.52	2.49
Staten Island	2.93	2.76	2.68	2.83	2.59
Comprehensive College Average	2.44	2.53	2.57	2.74	2.58
Community					
BMCC	2.54	2.59	2.58	2.68	2.77
Bronx	2.71	2.55	2.57	2.68	2.76
Hostos	2.52	2.49	2.59	2.45	2.81
Kingsborough	2.40	2.34	2.46	2.32	2.56
LaGuardia	2.51	2.50	2.58	2.65	2.74
Queensborough	2.47	2.43	2.32	2.59	2.53
Community College Average	2.51	2.48	2.52	2.55	2.69
University Average	2.50	2.48	2.53	2.59	2.65

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program within two years of leaving the associate program (with or without the associate degree).

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AA/AS transfers to baccalaureate programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2003</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.5	77.4	83.3	79.8	82.5
Medgar Evers	75.4	73.5	70.7	77.8	88.9
NYCCT	87.0*	81.0*	64.3*	77.8	73.3
Staten Island	83.1	81.9	80.5	77.1	80.2
Comprehensive College Average	80.3	78.8	80.2	78.1	80.7
Community					
BMCC	74.8	78.2	77.6	78.4	76.8
Bronx	76.0	78.7	77.4	78.9	76.6
Hostos	69.0	77.5	76.8	78.2	71.9
Kingsborough	76.8	72.7	74.3	71.0	73.4
LaGuardia	78.6	80.9	76.5	81.4	80.2
Queensborough	78.9	76.0	74.9	79.5	77.9
Community College Average	76.5	77.2	76.1	77.7	76.8
University Average	77.3	77.5	76.6	77.8	77.6

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program within two years of leaving the associate program (with or without the associate degree).

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.2 Colleges will achieve and maintain high levels of program cooperation with other CUNY colleges.

Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AAS transfers to baccalaureate programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2003</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	55.6*	57.1*	81.8*	45.5*	41.7*
NYCCT	72.0	79.2	54.8*	64.9	72.2
Staten Island	76.5	83.7	86.1	80.0	79.9
Comprehensive College Average	73.9	79.8	70.8	73.6	76.3
Community					
BMCC	76.6	75.3	76.0	78.2	77.4
Bronx	57.1	72.6	74.1	75.9	73.5
Hostos	61.7	72.7	74.5	63.2*	64.3
Kingsborough	79.3	77.1	69.3	71.6	72.5
LaGuardia	77.1	72.4	71.8	80.8	77.8
Queensborough	75.8	75.0	72.2	70.3	73.7
Community College Average	75.0	74.9	72.6	75.1	74.5
University Average	74.8	75.3	72.4	74.9	74.9

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program within two years of leaving the associate program (with or without the associate degree).

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

Total College Now enrollment (high school and college credit courses)

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	625	890	908	751	712
Brooklyn	312	344	481	484	761
City	1,806	894	1,021	1,014	853
Hunter	844	677	792	733	913
Lehman	789	958	1,083	1,188	1,152
Queens	860	834	987	1,127	1,070
York	3,420	3,205	2,615	2,816	2,000
Senior College Total	8,656	7,802	7,887	8,113	7,461
Comprehensive					
John Jay	501	595	579	586	789
Medgar Evers	720	682	419	735	606
NYCCT	1,213	764	881	1,036	920
Staten Island	22,010	19,854	16,134	16,591	14,444
Comprehensive College Total	24,444	21,895	18,013	18,948	16,759
Community					
BMCC	517	718	821	742	550
Bronx	1,225	1,465	465	447	483
Hostos	416	711	1,165	1,574	1,335
Kingsborough	8,707	9,329	9,026	9,900	9,183
LaGuardia	3,282	3,366	3,001	3,139	2,646
Queensborough	2,895	3,121	2,956	2,571	2,453
Community College Total	17,042	18,710	17,434	18,373	16,650
University Total	50,142	48,407	43,334	45,434	40,870

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. This indicator has changed to reflect enrollments (excluding withdrawals) rather than registrations as reported in prior years. Enrollment figures for 2008-09 are estimates because spring 2009 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2008-09 will be provided in next year's report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

Context: College Now enrollment in college credit courses

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	311	353	419	392	456
Brooklyn	139	169	247	193	270
City	1,713	789	799	696	743
Hunter	665	599	792	703	708
Lehman	540	687	805	1,080	1,088
Queens	517	464	542	618	631
York	1,219	1,241	961	1,332	1,785
Senior College Total	5,104	4,302	4,565	5,014	5,681
Comprehensive					
John Jay	249	295	352	428	531
Medgar Evers	481	408	324	425	356
NYCCT	526	568	629	755	650
Staten Island	301	367	369	420	444
Comprehensive College Total	1,557	1,638	1,674	2,028	1,981
Community					
BMCC	433	690	776	689	512
Bronx	376	535	230	259	309
Hostos	416	633	809	1,118	1,075
Kingsborough	8,596	9,198	8,763	9,715	9,013
LaGuardia	2,988	3,015	2,859	2,765	2,325
Queensborough	2,174	2,108	2,258	1,966	1,945
Community College Total	14,983	16,179	15,695	16,512	15,179
University Total	21,644	22,119	21,934	23,554	22,841

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Enrollment figures for 2008-09 are estimates because spring 2009 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2008-09 will be provided in next year's report.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now high school and college credit courses

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	83	91	94	93	90
Brooklyn	82	77	84	83	82
City	96	93	93	85	87
Hunter	77	84	85	87	96
Lehman	94	90	91	93	97
Queens	88	86	84	85	85
York	87	79	81	85	91
Senior College Average	88	85	86	87	90
Comprehensive					
John Jay	84	76	76	77	82
Medgar Evers	83	79	80	85	93
NYCCT	82	85	80	84	75
Staten Island	90	88	79	79	---
Comprehensive College Average	89	88	79	79	83
Community					
BMCC	89	82	87	60	69
Bronx	89	91	77	60	85
Hostos	78	89	88	86	89
Kingsborough	91	91	91	92	91
LaGuardia	74	77	82	82	82
Queensborough	90	90	88	93	91
Community College Average	87	88	88	88	88
University Average	88	88	84	84	88

Note: College Now success rates are based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Students who withdrew from a College Now college credit course are excluded from the computation of this indicator. For the current year, spring 2009 performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall 2008 only.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

Context: Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now college credit courses

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	91	96	96	93	95
Brooklyn	89	80	89	87	81
City	95	92	92	86	88
Hunter	80	86	85	87	95
Lehman	96	92	95	96	99
Queens	88	86	87	92	94
York	91	87	85	89	91
Senior College Average	91	89	89	90	93
Comprehensive					
John Jay	87	76	74	73	82
Medgar Evers	84	72	77	79	88
NYCCT	79	86	81	83	81
Staten Island	90	95	89	91	87
Comprehensive College Average	84	83	81	82	84
Community					
BMCC	88	81	87	58	68
Bronx	87	96	67	66	84
Hostos	78	89	88	87	87
Kingsborough	91	91	91	92	91
LaGuardia	74	76	82	82	81
Queensborough	94	91	88	93	91
Community College Average	87	88	88	88	88
University Average	88	88	84	88	89

Note: College Now success rates are based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Students who withdrew from a College Now college credit course are excluded from the computation of this indicator. For the current year, spring 2009 performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall 2008 only.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

University Target: 7.4 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

New Indicator

Percentage of College Now participants with previous enrollment in College Now high school and college credit courses

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	11	17	17	21	18
Brooklyn	23	24	29	24	18
City	26	25	21	30	30
Hunter	23	23	31	21	25
Lehman	45	28	33	30	39
Queens	25	28	26	31	29
York	45	45	42	42	45
Senior College Average	33	32	31	31	32
Comprehensive					
John Jay	29	28	19	16	18
Medgar Evers	27	19	20	16	23
NYCCT	47	25	24	29	29
Staten Island	54	38	24	44	44
Comprehensive College Average	41	27	22	26	36
Community					
BMCC	29	18	29	26	22
Bronx	32	40	43	28	35
Hostos	21	32	28	35	40
Kingsborough	37	38	34	35	34
LaGuardia	32	37	40	36	37
Queensborough	42	38	40	36	34
Community College Average	36	37	36	35	34
University Average	35	34	33	33	33

Note: College Now re-enrollment is based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. The rate reflects students enrolled in the academic year who enrolled in College Now in any prior semester over the previous two years and including the current year. Re-enrollment rates for 2008-09 are estimates because spring 2009 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2008-09 will be provided in next year's report. College of Staten Island data represent only those students who enrolled in college credit courses. The comprehensive subtotal and university total exclude the College of Staten Island. Figures for Kingsborough, LaGuardia and Queensborough are available in this version of the report but were not included in prior versions; the community college and university averages have been revised accordingly.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.1 Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase 10%.

Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average)

	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u> <u>(preliminary)</u>
Senior			
Baruch	\$37,275,990	\$43,316,099	\$30,661,651
Brooklyn	\$10,777,893	\$11,798,827	\$8,928,984
City	\$53,405,587	\$62,752,168	\$63,585,449
Hunter	\$16,076,117	\$16,981,140	\$37,369,753
Lehman	\$2,989,776	\$3,067,791	\$3,563,530
Queens	\$16,658,809	\$17,525,510	\$17,456,623
York	\$176,915	\$408,352	\$680,555
Senior College Total	\$137,361,087	\$155,849,886	\$162,246,544
Comprehensive			
John Jay	\$986,184 [^]	\$2,227,428	\$3,597,305
Medgar Evers	\$924,336	\$1,895,108	\$3,077,974
NYCCT	\$1,035,375	\$1,268,449	\$1,175,077
Staten Island	\$1,403,142	\$1,416,752	\$1,433,696
Comprehensive College Total	\$4,166,992	\$6,807,738	\$9,284,052
Community			
BMCC	\$5,086,954	\$3,897,142	\$3,540,068
Bronx	\$1,177,605	\$1,508,550	\$1,705,253
Hostos	\$521,228	\$714,649	\$827,707
Kingsborough	\$753,675	\$1,120,921	\$1,410,179
LaGuardia	\$761,303	\$689,618	\$891,006
Queensborough	\$2,052,999	\$2,407,599	\$2,676,452
Community College Total	\$10,353,765	\$10,338,479	\$11,050,665
Graduate			
Graduate School	\$10,675,684	\$13,004,015	\$9,983,052
School of Journalism	\$2,850,000	\$4,357,633	\$3,081,728
Law School	\$840,995 [^]	\$904,921	\$1,009,391
University Total	\$181,849,300[^]	\$201,223,094[^]	\$203,614,807[^]

Note: This indicator reflects a weighted, rolling, three-year average (50-30-20) of the sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts, rather than the total for a given fiscal year as had been reported in previous PMP reports. FY 2007 figures for John Jay and the CUNY Law School reflect a 40/60 weighted average because FY 2005 figures were not available for these colleges. The university total rolling averages include contributions to the Macaulay Honors College; \$3.5 million for FY 2007, \$1 million for FY 2008 and \$704 thousand for FY2009.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.1 Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase 10%.

Context: Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts)

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u> <u>(preliminary)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$23,000,000	\$25,092,157	\$50,296,685	\$46,417,325	\$13,354,232
Brooklyn	\$9,374,292	\$15,563,038	\$8,468,247	\$12,291,490	\$7,095,776
City	\$15,244,779	\$63,000,000	\$62,913,263	\$62,556,378	\$64,471,766
Hunter	\$13,645,753	\$13,177,707	\$18,787,308	\$17,418,812	\$56,773,295
Lehman	\$2,242,289	\$3,370,579	\$3,060,289	\$2,951,176	\$4,132,238
Queens	\$12,579,658	\$15,468,764	\$19,004,497	\$17,460,816	\$16,834,958
York	\$96,230	\$108,897	\$250,000	\$623,145	\$887,222
Senior College Total	\$76,183,001	\$135,781,142	\$162,780,289	\$159,719,142	\$163,549,487
Comprehensive					
John Jay	NA	\$530,428	\$1,290,022	\$3,468,672	\$4,597,398
Medgar Evers	\$695,355	\$260,160	\$1,414,433	\$2,837,493	\$3,887,678
NYCCT	\$1,086,336	\$834,519	\$1,135,505	\$1,521,788	\$982,879
Staten Island	\$1,176,425	\$1,280,944	\$1,567,147	\$1,380,839	\$1,412,030
Comprehensive College Total	\$2,958,116	\$2,906,051	\$5,407,107	\$9,208,792	\$10,879,985
Community					
BMCC	\$1,501,535	\$923,654	\$9,019,102	\$2,013,362	\$2,264,478
Bronx	\$406,376	\$1,317,594	\$1,402,104	\$1,648,799	\$1,860,384
Hostos	\$542,731	\$335,715	\$623,934	\$920,651	\$853,450
Kingsborough	\$142,511	\$793,552	\$974,215	\$1,339,893	\$1,626,737
LaGuardia	\$1,140,638	\$268,771	\$905,089	\$728,674	\$982,772
Queensborough	\$1,462,247	\$2,043,110	\$2,295,233	\$2,620,815	\$2,862,322
Community College Total	\$5,196,038	\$5,682,396	\$15,219,677	\$9,272,194	\$10,450,143
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$4,684,544	\$6,822,588	\$15,383,997	\$14,048,597	\$5,383,347
School of Journalism	\$50,000	\$4,800,000	\$2,800,000	\$5,115,266	\$1,974,297
Law School	NA	\$792,789	\$873,132	\$968,847	\$1,088,221
University Total	\$89,071,699	\$156,784,966	\$233,998,940[^]	\$199,332,838[^]	\$194,030,336[^]

Note: This indicator reflects a sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts. The university totals include contributions to the Macaulay Honors College; \$3.5 million for FY 2007, \$1 million for FY 2008 and \$704 thousand for FY2009.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Every college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.

Administrative Costs (Institutional Support Services)

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$23,210,869	\$23,998,853	\$24,410,444	\$26,323,749	27.3	26.8	26.2	25.4
Brooklyn	\$26,321,101	\$25,949,492	\$27,411,261	\$31,729,887	29.3	27.9	27.6	28.3
City	\$22,484,874	\$23,054,182	\$26,035,361	\$35,199,080	25.5	24.9	23.9	27.5
Hunter	\$29,967,625	\$31,710,090	\$33,534,966	\$36,838,001	28.5	28.2	27.8	27.6
Lehman	\$16,334,346	\$15,790,609	\$18,937,436	\$20,420,936	26.7	25.5	27.7	26.5
Queens	\$24,977,525	\$25,069,950	\$27,641,948	\$34,994,532	26.8	26.1	26.9	29.4
York	\$10,675,433	\$11,616,128	\$14,112,427	\$15,814,468	29.7	29.9	33.3	33.8
Senior College Total/Avg	\$153,971,774	\$157,189,304	\$172,083,843	\$201,320,653	27.6	26.9	27.1	28.0
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$15,453,883	\$16,101,922	\$18,249,110	\$19,017,776	26.1	25.1	25.3	24.4
Medgar Evers	\$9,988,748	\$9,720,576	\$13,819,907	\$13,419,905	30.0	27.1	32.6	29.7
NYCCT	\$15,505,201	\$14,871,060	\$14,943,596	\$16,136,997	26.1	24.6	22.5	21.8
Staten Island	\$21,477,968	\$20,957,563	\$21,656,768	\$22,986,279	32.6	31.1	30.4	29.1
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$62,425,800	\$61,651,120	\$68,669,381	\$71,560,957	28.6	27.1	27.2	25.9
Community								
BMCC	\$30,306,800	\$30,831,293	\$31,950,140	\$33,276,974	37.3	37.0	36.5	36.0
Bronx	\$17,931,126	\$16,782,857	\$17,257,002	\$18,842,827	35.1	33.0	32.2	32.7
Hostos	\$11,802,570	\$11,927,950	\$12,814,591	\$14,245,535	34.0	33.7	34.1	34.7
Kingsborough	\$18,182,130	\$18,117,377	\$19,545,414	\$21,844,679	28.4	27.4	27.8	29.1
LaGuardia	\$18,783,767	\$20,053,286	\$21,270,696	\$23,343,946	28.3	29.0	29.4	28.6
Queensborough	\$14,216,616	\$13,742,877	\$14,869,417	\$15,673,587	26.4	24.8	24.6	24.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$111,223,010	\$111,455,638	\$117,707,260	\$127,227,548	31.7	30.9	30.8	30.9
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$13,183,151	\$14,064,514	\$15,380,065	\$19,898,164	17.8	17.6	17.2	19.0
University Total/Avg	\$340,803,735	\$344,360,575	\$373,840,549	\$420,007,322	28.4	27.5	27.5	27.8

Note: Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for general administration, general institutional services, and maintenance and operations (everything except instructional activities). FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Every college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.

Context: General Administration Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$6,279,072	\$6,400,329	\$6,952,629	\$7,677,759	7.4	7.2	7.5	7.4
Brooklyn	\$6,214,809	\$6,287,448	\$6,561,956	\$7,055,560	6.9	6.8	6.6	6.3
City	\$5,298,680	\$5,282,903	\$6,567,898	\$6,976,236	6.0	5.7	6.0	5.4
Hunter	\$7,803,696	\$8,167,200	\$8,535,126	\$9,169,877	7.4	7.3	7.1	6.9
Lehman	\$3,618,184	\$3,610,309	\$4,125,839	\$4,170,532	5.9	5.8	6.0	5.4
Queens	\$5,083,172	\$5,425,100	\$6,462,265	\$7,242,914	5.4	5.7	6.3	6.1
York	\$3,179,817	\$3,511,781	\$4,896,963	\$5,147,699	8.8	9.0	11.6	11.0
Senior College Total/Avg	\$37,477,429	\$38,685,070	\$44,102,676	\$47,440,578	6.7	6.6	6.9	6.6
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$4,783,321	\$4,448,661	\$5,978,681	\$6,533,244	8.1	6.9	8.3	8.4
Medgar Evers	\$3,938,101	\$3,728,647	\$7,017,087	\$6,675,574	11.8	10.4	16.5	14.8
NYCCT	\$4,871,580	\$4,625,335	\$4,582,811	\$4,959,967	8.2	7.7	6.9	6.7
Staten Island	\$4,484,504	\$4,712,817	\$4,850,762	\$4,969,216	6.8	7.0	6.8	6.3
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$18,077,506	\$17,515,459	\$22,429,341	\$23,138,000	8.3	7.7	8.9	8.4
Community								
BMCC	\$16,517,620	\$16,582,859	\$14,086,099	\$13,785,038	20.3	19.9	16.1	14.9
Bronx	\$5,376,497	\$4,865,166	\$5,025,520	\$5,588,380	10.5	9.6	9.4	9.7
Hostos	\$3,373,958	\$3,592,715	\$3,835,116	\$3,974,827	9.7	10.2	10.2	9.7
Kingsborough	\$5,450,311	\$4,641,150	\$5,298,602	\$4,974,770	8.5	7.0	7.5	6.6
LaGuardia	\$4,502,612	\$4,610,449	\$5,124,367	\$5,665,386	6.8	6.7	7.1	6.9
Queensborough	\$3,948,741	\$3,579,292	\$3,785,854	\$3,917,933	7.3	6.5	6.3	6.1
Community College Total/Avg	\$39,169,740	\$37,871,631	\$37,155,558	\$37,906,334	11.2	10.5	9.7	9.2
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$2,450,717	\$2,838,593	\$3,106,833	\$3,354,976	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.2
University Total/Avg	\$97,175,392	\$96,910,753	\$106,794,408	\$111,839,888	8.1	7.7	7.9	7.4

Note: Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for president and provost offices, legal services, fiscal operations, campus development, and grants office. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Every college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.

Context: General Institutional Services Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Senior								
Baruch	\$9,778,382	\$10,229,781	\$10,773,613	\$10,933,931	11.5	11.4	11.6	10.6
Brooklyn	\$9,821,908	\$10,950,671	\$11,567,547	\$12,505,208	10.9	11.8	11.7	11.2
City	\$7,076,054	\$7,797,703	\$8,551,872	\$10,911,540	8.0	8.4	7.9	8.5
Hunter	\$8,692,954	\$9,767,649	\$10,401,077	\$11,282,248	8.3	8.7	8.6	8.4
Lehman	\$5,471,575	\$5,357,676	\$6,629,658	\$7,379,239	8.9	8.6	9.7	9.6
Queens	\$8,858,950	\$9,294,448	\$10,025,216	\$12,814,363	9.5	9.7	9.8	10.8
York	\$3,011,362	\$3,447,990	\$4,153,781	\$5,197,739	8.4	8.9	9.8	11.1
Senior College Total/Avg	\$52,711,185	\$56,845,918	\$62,102,764	\$71,024,267	9.4	9.7	9.8	9.9
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$5,821,886	\$6,432,926	\$7,461,730	\$7,281,030	9.8	10.0	10.3	9.3
Medgar Evers	\$2,727,916	\$2,682,657	\$3,003,858	\$2,699,319	8.2	7.5	7.1	6.0
NYCCT	\$6,271,678	\$6,009,360	\$6,129,738	\$6,588,042	10.6	10.0	9.2	8.9
Staten Island	\$7,031,061	\$7,144,646	\$7,421,927	\$7,929,913	10.7	10.6	10.4	10.0
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$21,852,541	\$22,269,588	\$24,017,253	\$24,498,304	10.0	9.8	9.5	8.9
Community								
BMCC	\$5,733,589	\$6,030,633	\$8,367,095	\$9,133,409	7.1	7.2	9.6	9.9
Bronx	\$5,002,845	\$5,141,849	\$5,340,383	\$5,594,525	9.8	10.1	10.0	9.7
Hostos	\$4,020,898	\$4,284,077	\$4,571,401	\$5,571,989	11.6	12.1	12.2	13.6
Kingsborough	\$5,108,847	\$5,893,201	\$6,803,935	\$6,992,720	8.0	8.9	9.7	9.3
LaGuardia	\$7,008,998	\$7,830,248	\$8,240,062	\$8,855,132	10.6	11.3	11.4	10.8
Queensborough	\$4,438,239	\$4,791,436	\$4,960,859	\$5,098,196	8.3	8.7	8.2	7.9
Community College Total/Avg	\$31,313,417	\$33,971,445	\$38,283,735	\$41,245,971	8.9	9.4	10.0	10.0
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$5,737,360	\$6,036,411	\$6,803,054	\$8,454,266	7.8	7.6	7.6	8.1
University Total/Avg	\$111,614,504	\$119,123,361	\$131,206,806	\$145,222,808	9.3	9.5	9.7	9.6

Note: Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for mail and printing, institutional research, public relations, computing and telephone services, and security. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process

2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Every college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.

Context: Maintenance and Operations Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$7,153,415	\$7,368,742	\$6,684,202	\$7,712,059	8.4	8.2	7.2	7.4
Brooklyn	\$10,284,384	\$8,711,373	\$9,281,758	\$12,169,119	11.4	9.4	9.4	10.9
City	\$10,110,140	\$9,973,577	\$10,915,591	\$17,311,304	11.5	10.8	10.0	13.5
Hunter	\$13,470,975	\$13,775,241	\$14,598,763	\$16,385,876	12.8	12.2	12.1	12.3
Lehman	\$7,244,587	\$6,822,624	\$8,181,939	\$8,871,165	11.8	11.0	12.0	11.5
Queens	\$11,035,404	\$10,350,402	\$11,154,467	\$14,937,255	11.8	10.8	10.8	12.6
York	\$4,484,254	\$4,656,357	\$5,061,683	\$5,469,031	12.5	12.0	12.0	11.7
Senior College Total/Avg	\$63,783,159	\$61,658,316	\$65,878,403	\$82,855,808	11.4	10.6	10.4	11.5
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$4,848,677	\$5,220,335	\$4,808,699	\$5,203,502	8.2	8.1	6.7	6.7
Medgar Evers	\$3,322,731	\$3,309,272	\$3,798,962	\$4,045,013	10.0	9.2	9.0	8.9
NYCCT	\$4,361,942	\$4,236,365	\$4,231,047	\$4,588,988	7.3	7.0	6.4	6.2
Staten Island	\$9,962,404	\$9,100,101	\$9,384,079	\$10,087,150	15.1	13.5	13.2	12.8
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$22,495,753	\$21,866,073	\$22,222,787	\$23,924,653	10.3	9.6	8.8	8.7
Community								
BMCC	\$8,055,592	\$8,217,801	\$9,496,946	\$10,358,527	9.9	9.9	10.8	11.2
Bronx	\$7,551,784	\$6,775,842	\$6,891,099	\$7,659,922	14.8	13.3	12.9	13.3
Hostos	\$4,407,713	\$4,051,158	\$4,408,074	\$4,698,719	12.7	11.4	11.7	11.4
Kingsborough	\$7,622,972	\$7,583,025	\$7,442,877	\$9,877,189	11.9	11.5	10.6	13.2
LaGuardia	\$7,272,156	\$7,612,588	\$7,906,267	\$8,823,428	11.0	11.0	10.9	10.8
Queensborough	\$5,829,636	\$5,372,149	\$6,122,704	\$6,657,458	10.8	9.7	10.1	10.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$40,739,853	\$39,612,562	\$42,267,967	\$48,075,243	11.6	11.0	11.1	11.7
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$4,995,074	\$5,189,510	\$5,470,178	\$8,088,922	6.8	6.5	6.1	7.7
University Total/Avg	\$132,013,839	\$128,326,461	\$135,839,335	\$162,944,627	11.0	10.2	10.0	10.8

Note: Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for administrative, maintenance and custodial activities associated with the college's physical plant. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.

Grants and contracts awarded (weighted, rolling, three-year average)

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u> <u>(preliminary)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$3,695,408	\$4,512,675	\$4,763,520	\$5,424,298	\$5,417,250
Brooklyn	\$10,029,911	\$11,488,483	\$12,618,228	\$11,853,929	\$12,215,159
City	\$38,492,762	\$38,586,123	\$40,279,622	\$43,122,499	\$48,802,709
Hunter	\$39,849,722	\$39,864,685	\$37,361,993	\$37,113,200	\$42,244,156
Lehman	\$13,722,055	\$16,210,917	\$16,951,744	\$16,041,390	\$17,387,991
Queens	\$16,281,379	\$18,430,264	\$18,634,893	\$21,576,884	\$21,667,450
York	\$4,694,105	\$6,041,668	\$5,184,664	\$6,014,578	\$6,343,513
Senior College Total	\$126,765,342	\$135,134,815	\$135,794,664	\$141,146,778	\$154,078,228
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$7,604,670	\$6,583,688	\$9,705,446	\$12,896,015	\$15,275,879
Medgar Evers	\$6,307,224	\$7,758,782	\$8,057,150	\$8,581,458	\$8,835,698
NYCCT	\$4,775,650	\$5,790,224	\$6,271,530	\$6,208,149	\$6,128,546
Staten Island	\$8,557,022	\$9,546,013	\$8,990,931	\$9,107,818	\$9,039,801
Comprehensive College Total	\$27,244,566	\$29,678,706	\$33,025,057	\$36,793,441	\$39,279,924
Community					
BMCC	\$5,883,889	\$7,665,563	\$6,231,737	\$6,591,445	\$6,735,194
Bronx	\$8,095,602	\$7,677,016	\$7,244,448	\$6,148,425	\$5,700,917
Hostos	\$2,345,189	\$2,830,744	\$3,351,333	\$3,777,250	\$3,932,899
Kingsborough	\$3,010,592	\$3,529,371	\$4,566,973	\$5,002,278	\$5,168,318
LaGuardia	\$13,824,250	\$14,634,607	\$12,984,479	\$13,193,066	\$14,638,288
Queensborough	\$2,755,451	\$2,656,446	\$3,464,844	\$3,836,512	\$4,131,033
Community College Total	\$35,914,972	\$38,993,747	\$37,843,814	\$38,548,977	\$40,306,648
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$13,380,461	\$13,365,270	\$14,208,620	\$13,386,035	\$12,970,438
School of Journalism	---	---	\$225,735^	\$232,964^	\$190,590
Law School	\$245,150	\$215,200	\$240,798	\$330,229	\$438,848
University Total	\$203,550,491	\$217,387,738	\$221,225,820	\$230,389,662	\$247,264,676

Note: This indicator reflects a weighted, rolling, three-year average (50-30-20) of awards of grants and contracts administered by the Research Foundation. Student Financial Aid, PSC-CUNY grants, and grants and contracts generated by the Central Office are not included.

^Not a weighted, rolling average.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.

Context: Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u> <u>(preliminary)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	48.7	53.7	52.5	57.0	33.1
Brooklyn	34.3	39.9	43.7	50.2	34.2
City	80.3	75.6	80.2	74.2	79.4
Hunter	57.0	58.0	54.8	56.2	51.1
Lehman	34.0	24.2	27.7	22.1	11.6
Queens	51.8	53.9	51.0	62.2	50.6
York	10.5	43.4	15.0	33.8	16.9
Senior College Total	56.9	55.4	56.3	58.1	52.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	20.1	30.9	39.0	39.9	31.2
Medgar Evers	15.6	6.8	4.7	6.8	5.1
NYCCT	3.7	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.5
Staten Island	20.5	46.6	22.5	28.7	27.3
Comprehensive College Total	15.6	23.4	21.0	24.2	20.1
Community					
BMCC	10.3	2.9	1.2	0.8	0.8
Bronx	0.7	7.0	0.4	0.1	0.1
Hostos	9.0	8.6	0.5	0.3	0.2
Kingsborough	13.5	10.7	5.0	9.9	8.9
LaGuardia	2.4	7.9	3.0	4.6	7.2
Queensborough	12.4	1.6	5.6	5.1	10.7
Community College Total	5.7	6.5	2.6	3.6	5.0
Graduate					
Graduate School	61.0	45.8	43.4	46.1	46.7
School of Journalism			77.9	3.2	3.8
Law School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
University Total	42.9	41.4	40.9	42.7	39.0

Note: This indicator is calculated as research dollars divided by total awards for a given fiscal year.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.6 Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve.

Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity

	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u> <u>(preliminary)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	9.3	8.2	7.6	6.9	7.2
Brooklyn	9.1	13.1	20.9	23.6	15.1
City	18.2	17.4	21.8	20.4	18.2
Hunter	16.9	14.5	16.7	17.1	15.4
Lehman	12.8	13.9	17.0	13.5	11.8
Queens	9.7	7.9	11.1	11.4	9.1
York	10.7	13.0	13.0	13.3	7.6
Senior College Average	14.7	14.0	17.3	16.8	14.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	9.9	8.3	10.7	10.1	10.5
Medgar Evers	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.3	7.6
NYCCT	5.6	4.3	7.2	7.0	6.5
Staten Island	11.6	10.0	9.3	13.2	10.5
Comprehensive College Average	8.9	7.7	7.2	9.7	9.2
Community					
BMCC	7.1	5.8	8.3	6.6	5.6
Bronx	7.4	7.2	10.1	7.8	8.0
Hostos	5.0	5.5	6.2	5.3	6.0
Kingsborough	5.3	5.8	6.4	5.7	5.8
LaGuardia	7.0	6.7	7.1	5.9	4.9
Queensborough	5.5	7.1	6.0	7.4	7.5
Community College Average	6.7	6.4	7.6	6.4	6.0
Graduate					
Graduate School	12.7	12.3	12.3	10.3	10.3
School of Journalism	12.7	12.3	0.0	3.7	13.3
Law School	3.1	3.4	2.4	0.6	3.9
University Average	12.2	11.6	14.8	13.4	11.8

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

University Target: 9.2 Student satisfaction with administrative services will rise or remain high at all CUNY colleges.

Student satisfaction with administrative services

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	2.61	2.77	2.85	2.68
Brooklyn	2.71	2.90	2.78	2.76
City	2.77	2.84	2.93	2.80
Hunter	2.70	2.71	2.64	2.56
Lehman	2.88	3.05	2.98	2.84
Queens	2.95	3.04	2.97	2.80
York	2.76	2.77	2.89	2.67
Senior College Average	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.72
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.80	2.95	3.01	2.89
Medgar Evers	2.73	2.87	2.91	2.93
NYCCT	2.81	2.75	2.97	2.82
Staten Island	2.66	2.91	2.90	2.94
Comprehensive College Average	2.76	2.87	2.95	2.89
Community				
BMCC	2.73	2.90	2.94	2.87
Bronx	2.74	2.65	2.82	2.82
Hostos	2.63	2.91	2.96	2.95
Kingsborough	2.20	2.70	2.97	2.94
LaGuardia	2.68	2.80	2.78	2.81
Queensborough	2.82	2.90	2.99	2.84
Community College Average	2.63	2.81	2.91	2.87
University Average	2.71	2.84	2.89	2.81

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. New data will be available in next year's report. This measure is based on responses to items about satisfaction with administrative services: registration procedures, testing office, financial aid services, and billing and payment procedures. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores for each student were calculated by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

University Target: 9.3 The percentage of instruction delivered on Fridays, nights, or weekends will rise to better serve students and use facilities fully.

Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior				
Baruch	46.9	45.9	48.1	49.3
Brooklyn	46.8	46.3	45.0	42.7
City	41.3	40.5	41.4	42.2
Hunter	54.7	55.0	54.9	55.6
Lehman	50.6	49.5	49.5	49.7
Queens	47.9	46.3	45.2	45.7
York	50.4	52.1	51.8	50.1
Senior College Average	48.6	47.9	47.9	47.9
Comprehensive				
John Jay	35.9	37.4	38.9	37.3
Medgar Evers	52.4	50.9	52.3	50.7
NYCCT	45.0	44.9	44.4	44.5
Staten Island	53.9	54.3	53.7	53.4
Comprehensive College Average	45.2	45.7	46.1	45.5
Community				
BMCC	48.8	44.7	44.7	47.6
Bronx	41.9	41.1	38.6	40.2
Hostos	35.2	32.1	36.8	33.2
Kingsborough	24.3	25.4	24.4	25.3
LaGuardia	39.4	38.3	38.2	36.6
Queensborough	33.1	32.3	33.2	34.1
Community College Average	38.2	36.7	36.7	37.6
University Average	44.5	43.8	43.8	44.0

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Baruch					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	86.8	83.7	87.8	85.2	89.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	87.7	89.2	88.3	89.5	89.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.9	-5.5	-0.5	-4.3	-0.8
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.7	73.5	77.0	80.9	74.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.1	76.5	79.2	79.9	78.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.4	-3.1	-2.1	1.0	-3.8
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.1	75.9	78.2	79.3	81.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.2	82.7	82.3	79.6	80.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.1	-6.8	-4.2	-0.3	1.3
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.1	80.6	76.5	79.0	82.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.3	83.2	82.0	83.1	83.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.2	-2.5	-5.5	-4.1	-1.0
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.8	74.3	77.3	73.5	71.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.0	69.5	73.7	72.5	72.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.2	4.8	3.6	1.0	-0.6
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.5	83.1	77.4	83.3	84.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.9	84.1	82.9	84.1	85.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.4	-1.0	-5.5	-0.8	-0.8
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	68.4	67.0	65.4	71.9	70.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.9	75.0	75.3	67.9	67.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.5	-8.0	-10.0	4.1	2.8
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.2	76.4	76.7	78.5	78.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.9	83.2	82.8	82.9	83.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.6	-6.7	-6.1	-4.4	-5.0

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process

2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.1	72.1	76.7	75.8	73.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	73.7	73.5	69.9	71.7	70.1
URM-non-URM Gap	3.5	-1.4	6.8	4.1	3.5
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	66.7*	51.7	61.1*	61.2	56.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	0.0*	0.0*	---	66.7*	33.3*
URM-non-URM Gap	66.7*	51.7*	---	-5.5*	23.3*
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	70.1	78.3	79.0	76.7	78.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.6	76.7	74.2	71.7	79.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.6	1.6	4.7	5.0	-0.6
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.5	63.0	73.5	80.6	74.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.2	85.0	80.2	82.1	83.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.7	-22.0	-6.7	-1.5	-8.8
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.1	72.8	76.6	73.6	70.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.5	77.1	73.2	76.2	75.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.5	-4.3	3.4	-2.6	-4.7

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.0	75.7	76.7	77.6	76.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.0	82.3	81.6	81.9	82.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.9	-6.6	-4.9	-4.4	-5.5

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
Baruch					
Males	86.0	86.1	87.2	87.2	87.9
Females	89.0	89.2	89.3	89.5	91.5
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	-3.1	-2.1	-2.3	-3.6
Brooklyn					
Males	76.4	72.1	75.3	79.2	76.2
Females	80.7	78.2	81.0	81.0	77.9
Male-Female Gap	-4.3	-6.1	-5.7	-1.8	-1.7
City					
Males	73.7	78.0	78.7	79.2	78.9
Females	80.3	79.3	81.1	79.7	83.5
Male-Female Gap	-6.6	-1.3	-2.4	-0.5	-4.6
Hunter					
Males	77.9	80.8	79.9	77.7	80.1
Females	83.2	83.0	80.3	83.7	85.4
Male-Female Gap	-5.3	-2.2	-0.4	-6.0	-5.3
Lehman					
Males	66.3	71.5	78.1	71.3	70.5
Females	77.5	74.6	76.2	74.0	72.6
Male-Female Gap	-11.2	-3.1	1.8	-2.7	-2.2
Queens					
Males	79.2	81.6	76.3	81.3	80.5
Females	82.2	85.3	85.0	85.5	87.6
Male-Female Gap	-3.0	-3.7	-8.7	-4.2	-7.1
York					
Males	68.3	65.3	63.6	68.8	66.4
Females	68.6	70.9	69.4	72.1	71.3
Male-Female Gap	-0.2	-5.5	-5.8	-3.4	-4.9
Senior College Average					
Males	77.7	78.6	78.8	79.9	79.1
Females	81.6	81.4	81.2	81.7	82.5
Male-Female Gap	-3.9	-2.9	-2.4	-1.8	-3.3

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process

2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
John Jay					
Males	73.6	70.9	70.6	73.7	70.8
Females	77.0	73.8	76.5	74.4	73.2
Male-Female Gap	-3.4	-2.9	-5.9	-0.7	-2.4
Medgar Evers					
Males	62.5	40.0	57.1	61.4	58.8
Females	63.6	60.0	63.6	61.3	54.5
Male-Female Gap	-1.1	-20.0	-6.5	0.1	4.3
NYCCT					
Males	72.7	76.6	74.8	74.8	80.2
Females	75.0	80.8	84.9	75.9	75.0
Male-Female Gap	-2.3	-4.2	-10.1	-1.1	5.2
Staten Island					
Males	74.6	79.0	81.9	80.3	81.6
Females	84.1	85.2	76.5	82.8	81.6
Male-Female Gap	-9.5	-6.1	5.4	-2.5	0.0
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	73.4	73.1	73.1	74.5	73.1
Females	78.2	76.2	76.9	75.1	72.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.8	-3.1	-3.7	-0.7	0.4

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
University Average					
Males	76.9	77.5	77.8	79.0	78.1
Females	81.1	80.6	80.6	80.7	80.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-3.0	-2.8	-1.7	-2.8

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	65.8	63.1	62.0	61.5	61.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	64.1	66.3	63.9	67.5	67.5
URM-non-URM Gap	1.7	-3.1	-2.0	-6.0	-6.0
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.2	55.9	54.1	49.3	52.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	71.4*	26.7*	55.6*	80.0*	55.6*
URM-non-URM Gap	-12.2*	29.2*	-1.5*	-30.7*	-2.8*
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	62.8	55.5	58.0	58.3	58.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	71.5	64.7	68.8	69.3	69.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.6	-9.2	-10.8	-11.0	-10.8
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	57.8	57.4	64.1	59.5	58.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	65.3	64.8	69.1	64.3	65.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.6	-7.4	-5.1	-4.8	-6.8
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	62.3	58.2	59.3	58.1	58.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.5	64.8	68.0	66.5	66.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.2	-6.5	-8.7	-8.4	-8.3

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	56.5	56.2	55.9	55.9	59.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	65.7	61.1	66.0	66.0	65.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.2	-4.9	-10.1	-10.2	-5.7
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.9	63.0	63.1	61.6	61.1
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.3	61.2	62.0	58.0	62.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.4	1.8	1.1	3.6	-1.8
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	64.6	60.9	58.1	57.7	60.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	62.1	50.0	62.9	60.9*	58.8
URM-non-URM Gap	2.5	10.9	-4.8	-3.1*	1.7
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.2	63.6	60.1	58.8	61.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.9	70.1	69.4	70.8	70.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.6	-6.4	-9.2	-12.0	-9.4
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.8	59.5	58.1	61.0	59.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.9	69.0	68.6	71.7	74.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.1	-9.5	-10.5	-10.8	-14.4
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.1	59.7	58.3	57.5	59.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	70.4	68.4	69.9	69.3	71.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-12.3	-8.7	-11.6	-11.8	-11.2
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.5	59.7	58.5	58.5	60.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.8	67.2	68.5	69.2	70.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.3	-7.5	-9.9	-10.7	-9.9

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	60.4	59.2	58.8	58.4	59.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.3	66.2	68.3	68.1	68.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.9	-6.9	-9.5	-9.7	-9.1

Note: These indicators show the percentage of black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rate for URM, and the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry as the retention rates for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
John Jay					
Males	62.3	63.1	60.2	60.1	62.6
Females	67.4	64.8	64.2	65.3	63.5
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-1.7	-4.0	-5.2	-0.9
Medgar Evers					
Males	53.2	48.5	52.4	42.2	50.3
Females	62.2	57.8	54.8	52.5	53.9
Male-Female Gap	-8.9	-9.3	-2.4	-10.3	-3.6
NYCCT					
Males	62.8	55.1	58.2	59.9	59.2
Females	68.4	61.8	64.3	63.0	63.7
Male-Female Gap	-5.5	-6.7	-6.1	-3.1	-4.5
Staten Island					
Males	60.4	60.3	65.8	56.1	61.6
Females	65.7	64.4	69.1	69.0	64.9
Male-Female Gap	-5.3	-4.1	-3.3	-12.9	-3.2
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	61.3	58.3	60.4	58.0	60.1
Females	66.4	62.9	64.3	63.8	62.8
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-4.7	-3.9	-5.7	-2.7

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
BMCC					
Males	56.0	54.3	55.8	54.5	59.1
Females	60.7	59.4	60.0	61.5	63.0
Male-Female Gap	-4.6	-5.1	-4.2	-7.1	-4.0
Bronx					
Males	61.0	61.7	59.7	60.7	57.9
Females	66.1	63.8	65.9	61.9	63.7
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-2.0	-6.2	-1.2	-5.8
Hostos					
Males	61.2	52.5	53.2	52.4	61.8
Females	66.1	64.0	61.3	60.6	59.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.9	-11.5	-8.1	-8.2	2.0
Kingsborough					
Males	58.1	63.8	59.2	60.1	62.6
Females	69.1	69.2	69.5	68.5	69.4
Male-Female Gap	-10.9	-5.4	-10.3	-8.4	-6.7
LaGuardia					
Males	60.6	60.4	61.1	61.9	63.8
Females	62.0	63.9	61.6	66.1	64.7
Male-Female Gap	-1.4	-3.5	-0.5	-4.2	-0.8
Queensborough					
Males	62.1	62.2	61.2	60.3	63.5
Females	65.9	64.7	65.9	65.1	66.5
Male-Female Gap	-3.8	-2.5	-4.7	-4.8	-3.0
Community College Average					
Males	59.3	59.6	58.8	58.7	61.5
Females	64.2	63.7	63.8	64.2	64.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.8	-4.1	-5.0	-5.5	-3.4

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

One-year retention rate of first-time freshmen enrolled in associate programs (full-time entrants)

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>
University Average					
Males	60.0	59.1	59.4	58.4	61.0
Females	64.9	63.4	64.0	64.1	64.2
Male-Female Gap	-4.8	-4.3	-4.6	-5.6	-3.2

Note: These indicators show the percentage of male and female freshmen who were still enrolled in the college of entry one year after entry. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Baruch					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	83.8	81.6	82.9	82.8	84.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	87.1	85.1	87.1	87.7	89.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.2	-3.5	-4.2	-4.9	-4.7
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.4	77.4	80.0	79.9	81.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.2	81.3	84.7	84.8	85.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.8	-3.9	-4.7	-5.0	-3.9
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.7	77.7	81.1	81.3	82.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.8	81.3	84.7	84.0	85.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.1	-3.6	-3.5	-2.7	-3.4
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	82.7	79.5	79.9	81.8	83.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	87.4	83.7	84.6	86.2	87.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.7	-4.1	-4.7	-4.4	-3.7
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	83.2	80.6	82.5	82.6	84.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.2	83.8	86.7	85.6	87.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.0	-3.1	-4.1	-3.0	-3.2
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	81.2	79.5	79.8	79.7	81.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.7	85.1	85.6	85.4	86.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.5	-5.6	-5.9	-5.7	-4.8
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	80.1	78.9	80.6	83.1	82.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.8	80.0	82.2	83.5	85.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.7	-1.1	-1.7	-0.4	-2.7
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	81.4	79.3	81.1	81.6	82.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.6	83.6	85.4	85.8	86.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.2	-4.3	-4.3	-4.2	-4.0

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen as the percentage for URM, and the percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen as the percentage for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.1	76.0	77.5	78.4	81.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	84.3	80.4	82.5	83.2	85.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.2	-4.4	-5.0	-4.7	-4.7
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	70.4	68.3	67.2	68.0	70.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	74.2	75.1	75.1	70.6	81.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.8	-6.8	-8.0	-2.7	-10.5
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.9	72.1	71.0	71.3	71.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.1	79.5	79.2	81.2	80.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.3	-7.4	-8.2	-9.8	-9.3
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	74.9	75.8	74.9	73.7	74.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.0	80.7	79.9	80.9	80.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.1	-5.0	-5.1	-7.1	-5.5
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	74.8	73.1	72.9	73.4	74.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.2	80.3	80.4	81.5	81.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.4	-7.2	-7.5	-8.1	-6.8

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen as the percentage for URM, and the percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen as the percentage for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	67.1	67.4	68.6	66.1	64.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.0	75.0	76.8	75.7	75.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.9	-7.7	-8.3	-9.6	-10.4
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	69.6	67.4	68.6	67.9	71.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	75.1	74.2	75.0	74.0	79.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.6	-6.8	-6.4	-6.1	-8.2
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	69.2	66.7	70.0	70.3	69.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.6	78.9	83.9	79.8	80.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.4	-12.3	-14.0	-9.5	-10.5
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.5	71.7	72.8	74.4	74.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.0	78.4	79.5	80.2	79.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.6	-6.6	-6.7	-5.8	-5.2
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	70.5	71.4	72.0	70.4	70.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	77.1	79.1	81.0	80.1	80.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.5	-7.8	-9.0	-9.7	-10.1
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.6	68.4	69.0	68.4	71.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.8	76.1	75.1	74.7	77.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.2	-7.6	-6.0	-6.3	-5.3
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	69.8	68.9	70.0	69.1	69.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	77.4	77.2	78.3	77.8	78.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.6	-8.4	-8.2	-8.7	-8.7

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen as the percentage for URM, and the percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen as the percentage for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	74.8	73.4	74.5	74.4	75.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.3	81.2	82.4	82.7	83.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.5	-7.8	-7.9	-8.3	-8.1

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by black, Hispanic and Native American freshmen as the percentage for URM, and the percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by Asian/Pacific Islander and white freshmen as the percentage for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Baruch					
Males	83.9	82.3	84.8	85.3	86.7
Females	87.7	85.5	86.8	87.3	88.8
Male-Female Gap	-3.8	-3.2	-1.9	-2.0	-2.0
Brooklyn					
Males	78.5	77.2	80.9	81.2	81.9
Females	83.1	81.4	84.1	83.9	85.2
Male-Female Gap	-4.6	-4.2	-3.2	-2.6	-3.3
City					
Males	78.4	77.5	81.2	80.6	82.5
Females	83.5	80.8	84.0	84.3	84.6
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-3.3	-2.8	-3.7	-2.1
Hunter					
Males	83.5	79.2	80.5	82.8	83.6
Females	86.6	83.6	84.1	85.6	86.8
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	-4.4	-3.6	-2.8	-3.2
Lehman					
Males	81.8	79.7	82.7	82.3	83.3
Females	84.2	81.7	83.4	83.4	85.4
Male-Female Gap	-2.4	-2.0	-0.6	-1.0	-2.2
Queens					
Males	80.9	80.1	81.0	80.7	82.5
Females	86.8	85.9	86.0	85.9	87.3
Male-Female Gap	-5.9	-5.8	-4.9	-5.2	-4.8
York					
Males	77.4	77.1	78.4	81.0	83.0
Females	81.9	80.1	82.2	84.3	83.7
Male-Female Gap	-4.5	-3.0	-3.8	-3.2	-0.7
Senior College Average					
Males	81.0	79.3	81.7	82.2	83.5
Females	85.3	83.2	84.6	85.1	86.2
Male-Female Gap	-4.3	-3.9	-2.9	-3.0	-2.7

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by male and female undergraduates in a given semester. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
John Jay					
Males	80.0	76.0	78.1	80.0	82.6
Females	81.5	78.5	80.0	80.1	82.8
Male-Female Gap	-1.4	-2.5	-1.9	-0.1	-0.2
Medgar Evers					
Males	67.2	65.6	65.7	66.0	69.7
Females	71.6	69.3	67.9	68.7	71.3
Male-Female Gap	-4.4	-3.8	-2.2	-2.7	-1.6
NYCCT					
Males	72.1	71.9	71.4	71.7	72.0
Females	78.2	76.9	75.9	77.5	76.6
Male-Female Gap	-6.1	-5.0	-4.5	-5.8	-4.6
Staten Island					
Males	75.7	76.7	75.3	76.1	75.2
Females	81.3	81.7	81.2	81.3	81.3
Male-Female Gap	-5.6	-5.0	-5.9	-5.3	-6.1
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	75.1	74.0	74.1	74.9	75.7
Females	79.2	77.6	77.4	78.0	79.0
Male-Female Gap	-4.1	-3.5	-3.3	-3.1	-3.3

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by male and female undergraduates in a given semester. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
BMCC					
Males	67.0	66.9	69.2	67.3	65.9
Females	71.2	71.2	72.2	70.2	69.1
Male-Female Gap	-4.1	-4.4	-3.0	-3.0	-3.2
Bronx					
Males	67.5	66.1	67.4	66.5	70.4
Females	71.2	68.9	70.0	69.4	72.4
Male-Female Gap	-3.7	-2.8	-2.6	-2.8	-2.0
Hostos					
Males	67.2	66.1	69.8	70.6	69.1
Females	70.7	68.0	71.2	71.1	71.0
Male-Female Gap	-3.5	-1.9	-1.4	-0.5	-1.9
Kingsborough					
Males	73.2	71.8	73.3	75.0	75.1
Females	77.7	77.5	78.6	79.2	79.2
Male-Female Gap	-4.5	-5.8	-5.3	-4.2	-4.1
LaGuardia					
Males	69.8	72.2	73.6	72.8	72.5
Females	74.9	75.6	76.8	75.3	76.0
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-3.4	-3.2	-2.5	-3.5
Queensborough					
Males	72.2	69.5	68.8	69.0	72.2
Females	76.6	74.2	74.6	73.7	76.0
Male-Female Gap	-4.4	-4.7	-5.9	-4.7	-3.7
Community College Average					
Males	69.9	69.3	70.7	70.4	70.8
Females	73.9	73.3	74.4	73.5	73.9
Male-Female Gap	-4.0	-4.0	-3.7	-3.1	-3.1

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by male and female undergraduates in a given semester. The gap is the difference between the two.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a quality general education and effective instruction

University Target: Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Indicator

Percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted by undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
University Average					
Males	75.6	74.5	76.0	76.3	77.0
Females	79.7	78.3	79.4	79.4	80.2
Male-Female Gap	-4.1	-3.8	-3.3	-3.1	-3.1

Note: These indicators show the average percentage of semester credit hours earned of those attempted by male and female undergraduates in a given semester. The gap is the difference between the two.