



Performance Management Report

2011-12
Year-End University Report
Final

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
July 10, 2012

**CUNY Performance Management Process
2011-12 Year-End Report
Final**

Index of Main and Context Indicators

Part A Main Indicators	1
Part B Context Indicators	77

1 Raise Academic Quality

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

1.1 Colleges and programs will be recognized as excellent by all external accrediting agencies.

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

1.2 CUNY and its colleges will draw greater recognition for academic quality and responsiveness to the academic needs of the community.

Colleges will provide evidence of recognition/validation from external sources

1.3 Colleges will improve the use of program reviews, analyses of outcomes, enrollment, and financial data to shape academic decisions and resource allocation.

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

1.4 Use of technology to enrich courses and teaching will improve.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially or totally online 2

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered totally online..... 78

Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially online..... 79

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 Increase faculty research/scholarship.

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 3

Percentage of instructional FTEs in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 4

Context: Percentage of instructional FTEs in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 80

Context: Percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty 81

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 82

Context: Percentage of instructional hours in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty 83

Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty 5

Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty 84

Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time 6

Context: Number of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time 85

Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio 86

Context: Number of full-time faculty	87
Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty	88
Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff.....	89

2.4 Colleges will recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff.

Colleges will report on efforts to diversify faculty and staff

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.)

3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Baccalaureate

Percentage of non-ESL SEEK students who pass all basic skills tests within one year	7
Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students.....	90
Percentage of ESL students (SEEK and regular) who pass all basic skills tests within two years	8
Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)	91

All Undergraduate Programs

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their basic skills reading test score over the summer	9
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their basic skills writing (essay) test score over the summer	10
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their basic skills COMPASS Math 1 (pre-algebra) test score over the summer	11
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their basic skills COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score over the summer	12

Associate

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation	13
Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation	14
Pass rate in math on exit from remediation	15
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.....	16
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.....	92
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	93
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.....	94
Context: Average increase in basic skills reading test score after summer immersion.....	95
Context: Average increase in basic skills writing (essay) test score after summer immersion	96
Context: Average increase in basic skills COMPASS Math 1 (pre-algebra) test score after summer immersion...	97
Context: Average increase in basic skills COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score after summer immersion	98
Percentage of instructional FTEs in lower division courses delivered by full-time faculty	17

3.3 Colleges will improve student academic performance particularly in the first 60 credits of study.

Context: Percentage of students passing freshman composition and gateway mathematics courses with a C or better	99
Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better.....	18
Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better	19

3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or 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)..... 20

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants) 23

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) 26

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in an associate program (full-time entrants) 29

3.5 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

4 Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

Baccalaureate

Percentage of freshmen and transfers taking one or more courses the summer after entry 32

Percentage of baccalaureate students who have declared a major by the 70th credit 33

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) 34

All Undergraduate Programs

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs 35

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs 36

4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

Baccalaureate

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later 37

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later 38

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) 39

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) 40

Associate

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 41

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 100

4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters programs.

Baccalaureate

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within four years 42

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 43

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years 44

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years 45

Master's

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of master's students who graduated within four years of entry into the master's program 46

Associate

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 47
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 101
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..... 102

5 Improve post-graduate outcomes

5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Context: Number of credentialed teachers (from traditional and alternative certification programs)..... 103
Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification 48
Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam 104
Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification..... 49
Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam 105
Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST) 50
Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST) 106
Percentage passing the NCLEX exam 51
Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam 107
Context: Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license 108
Context: Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses..... 109
Percentage of first-time test-takers with baccalaureate degrees passing at least one section of the Uniform CPA exam..... 52
Percentage of first-time test-takers with advanced degrees passing at least one section of the Uniform CPA exam..... 53

5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Six-month job placement rate in career and technical education programs 54
Context: Six-month education placement rate in career and technical education programs 110
Context: Six-month job and education placement rate in career and technical education programs..... 111
Colleges will report on post-graduate satisfaction rate of baccalaureate graduates one year after graduation (job and education)

6 Improve quality of campus life and student and academic support services

6.1 Colleges will improve the quality of student support services and academic support services, including academic advising, and use of technology to augment student learning.

Student satisfaction with academic support services 55
Student satisfaction with student services 56
Student satisfaction with access to computer technology 57

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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Enrollment 58
Total FTEs 59
First-time Freshmen 60
Transfers 61
Total Undergraduates 62
New Graduates 63
Total Graduates 64
Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses 65
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs 66
Context: Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students 112
Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs 67

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

Colleges will document efforts to facilitate transfer via pipeline programs, transfer credit acceptance, e-permit, and joint programs, etc.

Baccalaureate

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs 113
Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs 114

Associate

Context: Percentage of AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program 115
Context: Percentage of AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program 116
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs 117
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs 118
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AA/AS transfers to baccalaureate programs 119
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AAS transfers to baccalaureate programs 120

7.3 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) 68
Context: College Now enrollment in college credit courses 121
Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now high school and college credit courses 69
Context: Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now college credit courses 122
Percentage of College Now participants with previous enrollment in College Now high school and college credit courses 70

8 Increase revenues and decrease expenses

8.1 Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase 10%.

Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average) 71
Context: Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts) 123

8.2 Each college will achieve its revenue targets including those for Adult and Continuing Education.

Colleges will provide evidence of meeting productivity and revenue targets

8.3 Colleges will improve or maintain sound financial management and controls.

Institutional Support Services (administrative services) as a percentage of total tax levy budget..... 72

Institutional Support Services (administrative services)..... 72

Context: General Administration as a percentage of total tax levy budget 124

Context: General Administration..... 124

Context: General Institutional Services as a percentage of total tax levy budget..... 125

Context: General Institutional Services 125

Context: Maintenance and Operations as a percentage of total tax levy budget..... 126

Context: Maintenance and Operations 126

Colleges will provide evidence of responsiveness to accounting and external/internal audit findings

8.4 Colleges will implement financial plans with balanced budgets that align their expenditures with their academic priorities.

Colleges will provide evidence of financial health and a solid financial plan

8.5 Contract/grant awards will increase.

Grants and contracts awarded (weighted, rolling, three-year average) 73

Context: Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research 127

8.6 Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve.

Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity..... 74

9 Improve administrative services

9.1 Colleges will make progress within a declared capital campaign.

Colleges will provide evidence of declared capital campaign with fund-raising goal (through FY15), campaign chairperson, vision/case statement, and detailed plan by FY11

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

Student satisfaction with administrative services 75

9.3 Colleges will improve space utilization.

Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends 76

9.4 All colleges will improve compliance with Board policies, Risk Management, collective bargaining agreements, and applicable laws.

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

9.5 All colleges will make progress on CUNYfirst implementation.

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

9.6 Each campus should have a functioning sustainability council with broad representation from the campus community, and have a recognized, multi-year sustainability plan.

Colleges will provide evidence of progress implementing multi-year sustainability plan measures

**University Performance Management Process
2011-12 Year-End Report
Final**

PART A. MAIN INDICATORS

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 Use of technology to enrich courses and teaching will improve.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.3	2.9
Brooklyn	7.3	10.5	11.5	13.3	15.4
City	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4	1.0
Hunter	0.8	3.8	4.6	5.0	6.5
John Jay	---	---	---	---	5.0
Lehman	4.6	6.6	8.0	10.9	13.6
Queens	12.6	10.8	1.5	4.4	1.8
York	1.0	0.9	1.1	2.1	3.0
Senior College Average	4.1	5.1	3.8	5.3	5.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.3	3.4	3.3	4.2	---
Medgar Evers	1.7	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.5
NYCCT	3.3	1.4	5.0	4.0	5.0
Staten Island	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.7	2.5
Comprehensive College Average	2.2	2.0	3.1	3.2	3.5
Community					
BMCC	1.0	15.0	21.7	25.1	28.8
Bronx	1.4	1.2	2.0	2.2	2.0
Hostos	5.3	4.3	2.5	2.3	2.9
Kingsborough	9.8	10.9	13.7	14.3	18.3
LaGuardia	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.9	1.2
Queensborough	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.3	2.4
Community College Average	2.8	6.8	8.9	10.0	12.1
University Average	3.3	5.1	5.4	6.6	7.8

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 the colleges' student information system and submitted to OIRA as part of the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Percentage of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	56.6	53.0	55.2	54.3	51.5
Brooklyn	47.1	43.5	49.3	47.2	45.4
City	44.6	44.9	49.9	48.9	50.4
Hunter	43.1	42.1	43.5	41.3	43.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	36.8
Lehman	50.3	49.3	49.5	48.9	51.3
Queens	46.6	42.1	49.7	46.4	44.9
York	42.5	50.3	51.8	56.0	51.3
Senior College Average	47.6	45.8	49.3	48.0	46.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	41.6	42.7	46.1	40.7	---
Medgar Evers	45.6	52.7	51.1	45.9	42.5
NYCCT	49.3	50.6	48.5	48.1	44.6
Staten Island	40.6	42.0	37.8	34.4	39.0
Comprehensive College Average	44.0	46.0	45.1	41.7	41.9
Community					
BMCC	52.1	46.2	47.7	46.2	43.1
Bronx	60.3	61.2	59.8	60.1	56.3
Hostos	64.1	62.0	62.4	57.6	52.1
Kingsborough	55.6	53.3	53.4	55.9	51.7
LaGuardia	45.8	44.1	42.7	42.5	40.4
Queensborough	53.1	51.0	50.9	52.6	50.9
Community College Average	53.3	50.5	50.8	50.9	47.7
University Average	48.8	47.4	49.0	47.8	46.2
Graduate					
School of Journalism	---	---	68.1	65.2	60.2
Graduate School	---	---	93.2	92.7	94.9
Law School	---	---	88.1	91.4	82.2

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. FTEs are apportioned for team-taught and cross-listed classes, but cannot be apportioned for a very small number of classes that are both team-taught and also cross-listed/combined, due to limitations in the available data. 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. 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, the School of Journalism and the Law School; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	54.8	51.1	51.0	49.7	49.1
Brooklyn	46.1	42.1	48.8	44.0	44.4
City	39.6	40.0	47.2	46.0	47.8
Hunter	37.9	37.2	41.4	38.5	40.8
John Jay	---	---	---	---	34.2
Lehman	46.7	46.4	45.5	45.1	47.9
Queens	42.9	38.6	46.7	43.9	42.2
York	42.1	50.0	51.7	55.8	51.1
Senior College Average	44.5	42.8	46.9	45.2	44.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	39.7	40.8	43.8	38.2	---
Medgar Evers	45.6	52.7	51.1	45.9	42.5
NYCCT	49.3	50.6	48.5	48.1	44.6
Staten Island	39.0	40.2	35.6	32.9	37.2
Comprehensive College Average	43.1	45.2	43.9	40.8	41.3
Community					
BMCC	52.1	46.2	47.7	46.2	43.1
Bronx	60.3	61.2	59.8	60.1	56.3
Hostos	64.1	62.0	62.4	57.6	52.1
Kingsborough	55.6	53.3	53.4	55.9	51.7
LaGuardia	45.8	44.1	42.7	42.5	40.4
Queensborough	53.1	51.0	50.9	52.6	50.9
Community College Average	53.3	50.5	50.8	50.9	47.7
University Average	47.4	46.2	47.7	46.5	45.1

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. FTEs are apportioned for team-taught and cross-listed classes, but cannot be apportioned for a very small number of classes that are both team-taught and also cross-listed/combined, due to limitations in the available data. 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. 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. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	7.6	7.8	7.4	8.2	7.9
Brooklyn	7.9	8.1	7.7	7.5	8.2
City	9.3	9.0	8.5	7.8	7.2
Hunter	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.5	7.3
John Jay	---	---	---	---	7.6
Lehman	7.7	8.0	8.2	7.3	8.2
Queens	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.1	8.5
York	7.4	8.1	8.2	8.1	8.4
Senior College Average	7.8	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	6.9	7.2	7.7	7.4	---
Medgar Evers	7.2	6.4	9.4	8.7	8.5
NYCCT	9.2	9.2	9.1	8.5	7.5
Staten Island	8.1	8.5	7.2	7.1	8.8
Comprehensive College Average	8.0	8.1	8.2	7.8	8.2
Community					
BMCC	11.5	11.7	12.2	11.9	12.4
Bronx	10.2	10.7	10.8	10.8	11.2
Hostos	10.1	10.9	10.9	10.4	10.9
Kingsborough	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.3	11.6
LaGuardia	10.4	10.3	10.9	10.1	11.1
Queensborough	11.6	11.8	12.0	12.1	12.1
Community College Average	10.8	11.1	11.3	11.0	11.7
Graduate					
Graduate School	---	---	6.0	4.9	5.3
School of Journalism	---	---	3.6*	4.5*	4.7*
Law School	---	---	5.0*	5.5*	5.7*
University Average	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.4	8.7

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the faculty workload collection from CUNYfirst and HR data from CUNYfirst. Eligibility for contractual release time is determined by the date of first appointment to the professorial title series at the college and tenure status. This indicator reflects the fall (and winter) contractual teaching hours of veteran full-time professorial faculty (not eligible for contractual release time) as reported by colleges in the CUNYfirst system. Teaching hours reflect the sum of instructional workload hours (non-overload) of veteran full-time professorial faculty divided 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). Teaching hours are credited to the faculty member's appointment college.

*Based on fewer than 25 faculty members.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	6.7	6.1	5.9	5.5	6.5
Brooklyn	7.3	7.1	6.9	6.8	7.3
City	6.9	7.2	7.8	7.1	6.2
Hunter	6.3	6.0	6.6	6.7	6.3
John Jay	---	---	---	---	7.2
Lehman	6.7	7.8	6.8	7.9	8.5
Queens	6.7	6.2	6.8	8.0	7.9
York	7.1	8.2	7.6	8.1	8.5
Senior College Average	6.8	6.8	6.9	7.2	7.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	7.1	7.0	6.6	6.7	---
Medgar Evers	6.2	7.4	7.9	8.3	8.4
NYCCT	9.7	9.7	8.4	8.7	6.0
Staten Island	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.7	7.6
Comprehensive College Average	7.7	8.0	7.5	7.8	6.9
Community					
BMCC	11.3	11.4	11.3	10.6	10.1
Bronx	10.3	9.8	11.6	11.8	10.3
Hostos	10.8	10.4	10.2	11.0	9.9
Kingsborough	10.7	10.3	9.9	10.2	12.6
LaGuardia	11.4	11.5	11.9	10.5	9.8
Queensborough	11.1	10.6	11.1	11.4	11.5
Community College Average	11.0	10.9	11.1	10.8	10.7
Graduate					
Graduate School	---	---	3.8*	6.0*	5.8*
School of Journalism	---	---	5.3*	6.0*	8.2*
Law School	---	---	4.5*	4.5*	3.2*
University Average	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.3	8.2

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the faculty workload collection from CUNYfirst and HR data from CUNYfirst. Eligibility for contractual release time is determined by the date of first appointment to the professorial title series at the college and tenure status. This indicator reflects the fall (and winter) contractual teaching hours of new full-time professorial faculty (eligible for contractual release time) as reported by colleges in the CUNYfirst system. Teaching reflect the sum of the total instructional workload hours (non-overload) of full-time professorial faculty eligible for contractual release time divided 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). Teaching hours are credited to the faculty member's appointment college.

*Based on fewer than 25 faculty members.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will 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</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	98.8	95.9	97.7	98.6	98.9
Brooklyn	88.9	97.5	93.9	98.9	98.4
City	96.6	96.4	93.1	91.3	98.4
Hunter	99.0	98.8	98.9	98.5	100.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	81.8
Lehman	96.6	95.3	83.5	89.5	92.0
Queens	98.9	97.7	95.8	98.4	95.8
York	94.2	78.0	85.7	91.6	73.6
Senior College Average	95.9	94.0	92.1	95.2	90.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	76.1	84.9	80.6	73.0	---
Medgar Evers	100.0	100.0	96.8	100.0*	80.0*
NYCCT	93.7*	100.0*	94.4*	100.0	93.3*
Staten Island	---	---	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Comprehensive College Average	81.6	89.2	85.1	78.3	87.5
University Average	93.8	93.4	90.8	91.2	90.8

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. The PMP continues to report the one-year proficiency rate for SEEK students even though, beginning with the fall 2009 entering cohort, SEEK students have two years to gain proficiency in math. Rates for all years have been recalculated to exclude students who were no longer enrolled in the fall term after entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will 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>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0	98.4	98.2	100.0	100.0
Brooklyn	85.4	100.0*	91.3*	87.1	86.2
City	94.1	87.5	92.3	95.2	87.5
Hunter	88.0	95.1	92.6	81.2*	90.0*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	81.2*
Lehman	70.0*	92.8	82.5	75.0*	76.5*
Queens	95.4	84.4	89.4	86.0	81.8
York	73.2	71.9	57.6	92.6	92.3
Senior College Average	89.4	91.4	89.3	92.7	90.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.0*	75.0*	66.7*	70.6*	---
Medgar Evers	---	---	---	100.0*	---
NYCCT	66.7*	100.0*	---	100.0*	---
Staten Island	---	100.0*	---	100.0*	50.0*
Comprehensive College Average	57.1*	83.3*	66.7*	76.2*	50.0*
University Average	88.7	91.3	89.1	91.7	90.5

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. Rates for all years have been recalculated to exclude students who were no longer enrolled two years after entry.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	86.7	92.0*	100.0*	90.9*	100.0*
Brooklyn	74.4	91.4	90.3	76.2*	63.6*
City	87.9	91.7	75.0*	83.3*	81.8*
Hunter	90.0*	81.3*	66.7*	80.0*	100.0*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	95.3
Lehman	76.5	90.6	100.0*	88.0	78.3*
Queens	85.7	89.7	93.2	89.3	89.3
York	85.4	89.3	84.5	86.2	83.7
Senior College Average	83.3	90.0	88.4	85.5	86.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	90.5	93.1	96.0	94.6	---
Medgar Evers	81.3	90.5	89.4	92.3	79.5
NYCCT	77.3	84.1	79.5	82.7	91.6
Staten Island	89.3	96.4	92.9	94.4	86.7
Comprehensive College Average	85.1	90.7	89.2	89.5	88.1
Community					
BMCC	80.3	84.4	92.3	88.4	87.4
Bronx	76.7	64.7*	68.8	82.4	85.5
Hostos	50.0*	80.0*	76.9*	95.0*	85.7
Kingsborough	87.2	82.5	86.2	81.4	90.5
LaGuardia	97.4	84.2	86.9	95.3	90.2
Queensborough	76.4	94.9	84.6	91.9	94.7
Community College Average	82.5	84.1	85.4	87.5	88.8
University Average	83.9	89.2	87.8	87.8	88.1

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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

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

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	87.3	83.9	85.7	100.0*	100.0*
Brooklyn	80.4	87.3	87.5	100.0*	66.7*
City	80.8	74.6	77.6	73.5*	83.3*
Hunter	55.2	75.9	53.8*	87.5*	55.6*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	96.7
Lehman	77.2	79.1	76.2	81.1	86.2
Queens	82.0	82.2	76.3	98.0	90.0
York	74.8	76.6	71.9	75.8	98.4
Senior College Average	78.4	79.8	76.0	83.5	90.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.6	86.1	71.0	78.7	---
Medgar Evers	62.8	70.0*	69.4	70.7	89.2
NYCCT	58.6	59.8	65.5	49.5	82.3
Staten Island	70.2	72.5	72.0	79.5	79.0
Comprehensive College Average	66.2	70.2	69.0	66.7	81.9
Community					
BMCC	60.3	67.4	70.2	60.0	77.0
Bronx	69.4	78.1	67.2	70.4	67.1
Hostos	66.7*	75.0*	56.0*	46.7	63.2
Kingsborough	73.1	71.6	63.2	57.1	93.0
LaGuardia	73.5	66.7	77.0	71.6	73.7*
Queensborough	71.9	65.3	67.2	73.5	91.4
Community College Average	69.9	68.8	67.4	64.8	79.0
University Average	71.9	73.8	69.9	69.1	82.6

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. Percentages for summer 2011 reflect changes from previous years in test forms used, score ranges, and populations retaking the writing essay. Percentages for summer 2011 reflect the use of the CAT-W test for retesting whereas summer 2010 reflects use of the COMPASS Writing test for retesting. CAT-W test scores ranged from 0 to 96, whereas COMPASS Writing test scores ranged from 0 to 12. The population retesting in summer 2011 was smaller than those who retested in summer 2010. Therefore rates for summer 2011 are not comparable to previous years.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	---	83.3*
Brooklyn	100.0	89.6	94.8	100.0	95.8
City	83.8	91.4	87.2	86.5	90.0*
Hunter	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	---	---
John Jay	---	---	---	---	98.4
Lehman	87.7	88.7	93.1	93.4	95.1
Queens	95.8*	88.2*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
York	90.7	96.2	95.8	89.1	93.6
Senior College Average	89.7	91.8	93.5	91.7	95.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	91.0	90.8	96.2	93.0	---
Medgar Evers	89.3	89.5	100.0	96.1	94.7
NYCCT	98.0	96.2	99.1	94.9	93.5
Staten Island	88.3	95.6	88.2	90.7	96.2
Comprehensive College Average	91.0	93.5	93.4	92.5	95.5
Community					
BMCC	92.2	91.1	95.5	92.0	90.0
Bronx	66.7*	100.0*	83.1	77.1	66.7
Hostos	90.0*	87.0*	78.9*	87.5*	88.2
Kingsborough	88.5	79.2	92.6	82.2	91.1
LaGuardia	97.6	93.3	93.0	94.4	93.0
Queensborough	50.0*	100.0*	93.2	93.3	90.1
Community College Average	90.3	88.8	91.3	87.9	89.3
University Average	90.3	91.6	92.8	90.9	93.1

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in math on the COMPASS Math 1 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 percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial COMPASS Math 1 test score.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	87.5*	100.0*	100.0*	88.9*
Brooklyn	96.5	93.5	98.7	100.0	87.2
City	89.7	92.5	90.1	84.8	85.1
Hunter	100.0*	100.0*	83.3*	80.0*	66.7*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	96.8
Lehman	86.2	87.0	92.8	92.1	97.5
Queens	96.4	97.7	100.0	100.0*	100.0*
York	93.6	91.0	93.0	91.4	93.5
Senior College Average	91.5	91.0	93.8	92.2	94.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	88.9	87.2	90.2	97.8	---
Medgar Evers	100.0*	91.4	94.2	98.6	99.1
NYCCT	100.0	97.8	99.4	95.5	97.3
Staten Island	89.4	93.0	89.0	87.9	90.2
Comprehensive College Average	91.6	92.3	92.1	92.2	93.3
Community					
BMCC	94.5	83.9	91.5	95.8	91.5
Bronx	79.3	84.6*	72.7	100.0*	62.5
Hostos	80.0*	90.9*	91.7*	95.2*	78.8
Kingsborough	89.2	92.6	87.2	81.6	90.1
LaGuardia	92.6	91.5	94.7	94.6	96.0
Queensborough	87.8	95.8*	97.3	95.4	94.8
Community College Average	89.2	88.5	90.0	92.0	89.7
University Average	91.1	91.1	92.1	92.1	92.6

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in math on the COMPASS Math 2 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 percentage of students whose last test taken during summer was higher than their initial COMPASS Math 2 test score. The population retesting in summer 2011 was substantially larger than those who retested in summer 2010.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.0	60.4	49.6	41.8	37.8
Medgar Evers	40.7	45.1	40.2	36.4	35.8
NYCCT	54.3	62.0	63.3	63.8	50.6
Staten Island	46.6	49.2	53.4	47.9	47.5
Comprehensive College Average	49.1	55.4	52.6	48.7	43.6
Community					
BMCC	38.5	47.3	45.0	46.6	44.7
Bronx	49.8	55.9	54.9	54.7	47.7
Hostos	33.8	35.0	35.6	32.8	33.9
Kingsborough	50.9	57.8	54.3	51.1	46.2
LaGuardia	39.0	38.4	35.4	33.8	37.7
Queensborough	48.5	46.3	52.8	48.4	42.0
Community College Average	42.6	45.3	45.1	43.3	42.2
University Average	43.9	47.1	46.3	44.1	42.3

Note: Pass rates reflect the number of students who passed the reading test divided by the number of students who took the reading test during the exit period or took the last-in-sequence reading course in the fall term.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	46.7	54.0	50.7	43.7	51.5
Medgar Evers	38.1	32.6	36.8	29.0	37.6
NYCCT	34.5	40.0	35.6	43.4	37.2
Staten Island	49.0	42.4	45.8	53.4	40.0
Comprehensive College Average	41.6	41.9	41.3	41.7	38.9
Community					
BMCC	43.8	38.1	44.1	38.6	33.1
Bronx	61.5	56.3	56.6	53.9	50.9
Hostos	35.0	33.4	35.9	33.9	34.8
Kingsborough	36.7	30.7	27.3	33.6	35.3
LaGuardia	35.1	33.4	34.3	43.6	41.2
Queensborough	38.7	45.4	41.2	47.4	40.0
Community College Average	40.8	37.5	39.0	41.1	38.0
University Average	41.0	38.5	39.5	41.2	38.1

Note: Pass rates reflect the number of students who passed the writing test divided by the number of students who took the writing test during the exit period or took the last-in-sequence writing course in the fall term.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

Pass rate in math on exit from remediation

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	29.6	30.8	47.8	45.5	44.7
Medgar Evers	23.2	14.2	22.4	24.8	30.5
NYCCT	31.0	30.1	30.5	28.2	36.9
Staten Island	14.7	28.8	29.2	30.1	47.6
Comprehensive College Average	23.9	26.4	31.4	29.9	38.4
Community					
BMCC	25.8	28.8	31.9	32.3	46.7
Bronx	22.8	27.6	30.1	20.8	38.4
Hostos	27.7	28.0	31.0	31.5	49.3
Kingsborough	49.1	29.4	25.7	32.8	39.3
LaGuardia	24.9	27.3	30.1	30.2	35.6
Queensborough	24.1	24.6	24.2	63.3	41.8
Community College Average	27.2	27.7	29.0	32.4	41.9
University Average	26.3	27.4	29.6	31.8	41.2

Note: Through fall 2010, pass rates reflect the number of students who passed the COMPASS Math 2 (Algebra) test divided by the number of students who took the COMPASS Math 2 test during the exit period or took the last-in-sequence Math course in the fall term. For fall 2011, pass rates reflect the number of students who passed the COMPASS Math 2 test or passed the last-in-sequence Math course (grade C or better) divided by the number of students who took the COMPASS Math 2 test during the exit period or took the last-in-sequence Math course in the fall term.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	72.5	71.5	74.9	78.5	76.5
Medgar Evers	64.2	64.5	66.6	69.3	73.7
NYCCT	91.7	92.0	90.6	91.4	88.9
Staten Island	91.4	89.2	88.9	85.4	86.5
Comprehensive College Average	83.3	82.3	82.8	83.8	83.7
Community					
BMCC	66.2	65.9	60.9	61.5	58.6
Bronx	56.1	52.7	45.5	45.8	46.1
Hostos	59.0	64.2	64.6	58.5	58.1
Kingsborough	62.1	57.1	52.3	46.1	43.7
LaGuardia	68.0	67.5	63.7	62.3	63.1
Queensborough	70.3	68.3	64.4	67.0	62.6
Community College Average	64.3	62.6	58.3	56.7	55.1
University Average	69.0	67.4	64.2	62.7	60.7

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. Through fall 2010, 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 fall 2011, students are considered fully proficient if he or she 1) is proficient in reading and writing and 2) passed the math test prior to the term or passed the last-in-sequence math course in spring 2011 (grade C or better). 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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	58.4	55.5	53.0	51.1	48.1
Brooklyn	43.3	39.1	44.8	39.6	39.3
City	35.0	36.9	41.6	38.5	40.3
Hunter	35.7	34.8	39.6	36.8	39.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	32.8
Lehman	38.4	39.1	37.7	36.8	39.4
Queens	41.1	35.0	44.0	40.5	39.1
York	39.9	47.3	46.5	50.5	45.1
Senior College Average	42.0	40.7	43.6	41.5	40.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	38.7	39.3	41.9	35.3	---
Medgar Evers	42.6	51.7	49.7	43.7	39.2
NYCCT	48.0	49.0	46.9	47.3	43.1
Staten Island	32.8	33.6	27.8	24.9	29.3
Comprehensive College Average	40.8	42.9	41.0	37.9	37.4
University Average	41.5	41.7	42.5	39.9	39.2

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. FTEs are apportioned for team-taught and cross-listed classes, but cannot be apportioned for a very small number of classes that are both team-taught and also cross-listed/combined, due to limitations in the available data. 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. 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. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.3 Colleges will improve student academic performance, particularly in the first 60 credits of study.

Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	94.9	94.9	95.9	94.2	94.4
Brooklyn	80.9	79.5	82.8	83.1	81.7
City	92.1	91.5	92.5	92.8	91.1
Hunter	93.4	93.3	95.4	95.2	96.8
John Jay	---	---	---	---	82.2
Lehman	90.4	87.7	90.1	88.3	92.9
Queens	90.7	93.1	91.8	92.8	91.9
York	73.9	81.3	80.9	84.7	84.8
Senior College Average	89.0	89.2	90.7	91.8	89.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.5	82.2	82.1	83.6	---
Medgar Evers	68.0	71.8	70.4	73.2	68.6
NYCCT	83.3	84.2	84.6	84.4	87.1
Staten Island	92.0	91.5	91.1	92.0	92.5
Comprehensive College Average	81.9	84.0	83.6	84.7	85.4
Community					
BMCC	81.5	80.7	80.4	81.1	82.3
Bronx	78.4	84.1	78.4	78.4	80.5
Hostos	80.3	82.9	80.5	81.1	81.1
Kingsborough	88.0	86.7	88.1	85.4	84.6
LaGuardia	75.5	78.1	75.6	76.4	79.6
Queensborough	87.4	87.0	86.6	85.1	83.1
Community College Average	82.0	82.8	81.8	81.4	82.2
University Average	83.9	84.8	84.4	84.3	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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.3 Colleges will improve student academic performance, particularly in the first 60 credits of study.

Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	59.8	61.4	50.6	54.9	51.4
Brooklyn	69.6	74.2	70.5	76.7	82.2
City	62.9	67.0	65.3	64.0	74.4
Hunter	74.3	58.0	72.8	78.3	77.1
John Jay	---	---	---	---	64.4
Lehman	62.7	63.7	67.6	69.8	77.7
Queens	69.7	73.4	64.2	75.8	69.3
York	68.9	59.3	69.9	63.9	67.3
Senior College Average	65.5	64.3	64.2	66.8	67.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.1	61.6	59.8	62.9	---
Medgar Evers	73.1	68.7	76.0	66.3	77.9
NYCCT	55.4	55.5	61.5	56.1	60.8
Staten Island	72.7	70.8	66.1	70.1	70.6
Comprehensive College Average	61.6	61.4	63.3	61.7	66.5
Community					
BMCC	73.2	69.1	71.3	74.9	73.4
Bronx	61.5	56.8	45.8	55.6	63.6
Hostos	59.2	67.6	68.1	66.1	74.9
Kingsborough	59.1	74.4	67.8	71.2	73.9
LaGuardia	65.1	59.5	59.6	62.5	62.8
Queensborough	57.8	56.3	57.1	60.3	60.5
Community College Average	65.2	64.9	63.8	67.0	67.2
University Average	63.7	63.2	63.7	64.6	67.1

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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	85.2	89.0	86.6	89.4	85.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	89.5	89.8	88.9	91.1	90.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.3	-0.8	-2.3	-1.7	-4.2
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	80.9	74.7	71.4	80.5	79.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.9	78.5	81.6	82.5	82.8
URM-non-URM Gap	1.0	-3.8	-10.1	-2.0	-2.9
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.3	81.9	79.9	82.9	85.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.6	80.6	78.9	83.9	85.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.3	1.3	1.0	-1.0	0.2
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.0	82.9	82.7	82.7	85.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.1	83.9	84.8	85.5	85.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.1	-1.0	-2.1	-2.8	0.6
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	---	---	---	---	79.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	---	---	---	---	76.5
URM-non-URM Gap	---	---	---	---	3.1
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.5	71.9	76.9	80.2	80.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	72.5	72.5	78.2	81.3	71.9
URM-non-URM Gap	1.0	-0.6	-1.2	-1.2	8.8
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	83.3	84.2	84.5	85.3	90.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	84.1	85.0	86.3	88.5	86.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.8	-0.8	-1.7	-3.1	4.1
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	71.9	70.2	75.0	73.7	77.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.9	67.3	75.6	77.5	78.0
URM-non-URM Gap	4.1	2.8	-0.6	-3.8	-0.3
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.5	78.3	79.1	81.3	82.1
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.9	83.3	84.1	86.1	84.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.4	-5.0	-5.0	-4.8	-2.1

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.8	73.6	75.3	76.2	---
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	71.7	70.1	74.1	77.4	---
URM-non-URM Gap	4.1	3.5	1.2	-1.1	---
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.2	56.6	68.7	63.9	64.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.7*	33.3*	100.0*	63.6*	56.3*
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.5*	23.3*	-31.3*	0.3*	8.2*
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.7	78.8	79.5	73.4	78.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	71.7	79.4	82.0	76.1	67.2
URM-non-URM Gap	5.0	-0.6	-2.5	-2.7	11.3
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	80.6	74.4	74.7	78.9	73.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.1	83.2	80.8	84.4	86.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.5	-8.8	-6.1	-5.4	-13.5
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.6	70.9	74.5	74.8	70.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.2	75.6	77.6	80.3	83.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.6	-4.7	-3.0	-5.5	-12.9

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

Gaps 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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.6	76.7	78.0	79.6	81.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.9	82.2	83.1	85.1	84.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.4	-5.5	-5.1	-5.6	-3.1

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch					
Males	87.2	87.9	87.6	89.1	88.3
Females	89.5	91.5	89.2	92.7	90.7
Male-Female Gap	-2.3	-3.6	-1.6	-3.6	-2.4
Brooklyn					
Males	79.2	76.2	77.3	80.8	80.5
Females	81.0	77.9	78.3	82.8	83.1
Male-Female Gap	-1.8	-1.7	-1.0	-2.0	-2.6
City					
Males	79.2	78.9	79.6	83.4	86.5
Females	79.7	83.5	79.3	83.3	84.8
Male-Female Gap	-0.5	-4.6	0.3	0.1	1.7
Hunter					
Males	77.7	80.1	81.8	80.6	81.5
Females	83.7	85.4	85.5	87.1	87.5
Male-Female Gap	-6.0	-5.3	-3.6	-6.5	-6.0
John Jay					
Males	---	---	---	---	77.7
Females	---	---	---	---	79.0
Male-Female Gap	---	---	---	---	-1.3
Lehman					
Males	71.3	70.5	76.0	75.1	75.1
Females	74.0	72.6	77.7	83.7	81.3
Male-Female Gap	-2.7	-2.2	-1.7	-8.6	-6.2
Queens					
Males	81.3	80.5	84.0	86.5	86.0
Females	85.5	87.6	87.1	88.8	87.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-7.1	-3.1	-2.3	-1.8
York					
Males	68.8	66.4	76.2	77.6	75.3
Females	72.1	71.3	74.6	73.2	79.4
Male-Female Gap	-3.4	-4.9	1.7	4.3	-4.1
Senior College Average					
Males	79.9	79.1	81.4	83.2	82.2
Females	81.7	82.5	82.2	85.1	84.2
Male-Female Gap	-1.8	-3.3	-0.8	-1.9	-2.0

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	73.7	70.8	71.6	76.2	---
Females	74.4	73.2	77.2	77.1	---
Male-Female Gap	-0.7	-2.4	-5.7	-1.0	---
Medgar Evers					
Males	61.4	58.8	76.9	65.7	60.0
Females	61.3	54.5	66.0	62.7	66.7
Male-Female Gap	0.1	4.3	10.9	3.0	-6.7
NYCCT					
Males	74.8	80.2	81.4	73.0	71.4
Females	75.9	75.0	77.3	77.0	81.3
Male-Female Gap	-1.1	5.2	4.1	-4.0	-9.8
Staten Island					
Males	80.3	81.6	77.7	79.9	80.2
Females	82.8	81.6	81.4	87.1	86.5
Male-Female Gap	-2.5	0.0	-3.6	-7.1	-6.2
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	74.5	73.1	74.5	76.3	75.0
Females	75.1	72.8	76.8	78.3	81.9
Male-Female Gap	-0.7	0.4	-2.3	-2.0	-6.9

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
University Average					
Males	79.0	78.1	80.0	81.6	81.5
Females	80.7	80.8	81.2	83.7	84.0
Male-Female Gap	-1.7	-2.8	-1.2	-2.1	-2.5

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

Gaps 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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.5	61.5	66.8	69.2	---
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.5	67.5	69.2	69.0	---
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.0	-6.0	-2.4	0.2	---
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	49.3	52.8	55.6	55.8	58.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.0*	55.6*	50.0*	52.0	69.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-30.7*	-2.8*	5.6*	3.8	-11.1
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.3	58.3	56.7	61.2	61.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.3	69.1	70.0	72.8	72.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-11.0	-10.8	-13.4	-11.6	-11.0
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.5	58.7	57.9	59.3	67.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	64.3	65.4	66.2	70.7	69.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.8	-6.8	-8.3	-11.4	-1.8
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.1	58.5	58.6	61.2	61.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.5	66.8	67.7	71.0	70.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.4	-8.3	-9.1	-9.8	-9.0

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

Gaps 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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Community					
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	55.9	59.9	58.9	63.6	60.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.0	65.6	65.6	72.3	73.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.2	-5.7	-6.7	-8.7	-12.4
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.6	61.1	64.9	60.9	57.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	58.0	62.9	72.1	60.2	65.2
URM-non-URM Gap	3.6	-1.8	-7.3	0.7	-7.6
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	57.7	60.5	56.7	62.7	63.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	60.9*	58.8	61.0	66.7	68.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.1*	1.7	-4.2	-4.0	-5.1
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.8	61.5	66.2	63.8	62.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	70.8	70.9	74.5	75.4	71.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-12.0	-9.4	-8.3	-11.5	-9.2
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.0	59.7	60.5	65.4	63.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	71.7	74.1	74.9	75.2	76.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.8	-14.4	-14.4	-9.8	-12.4
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	57.5	59.9	65.1	68.0	69.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.3	71.1	73.6	76.2	75.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-11.8	-11.2	-8.5	-8.2	-5.7
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.5	60.3	61.6	64.2	62.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.2	70.2	71.9	74.5	73.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.7	-9.9	-10.4	-10.3	-11.2

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

Gaps 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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.4	59.7	60.7	63.3	62.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.1	68.9	70.5	73.3	72.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.7	-9.1	-9.8	-10.0	-10.5

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 rate for non-URM. The gap is the difference between the two rates.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	60.1	62.6	68.5	67.3	---
Females	65.3	63.5	66.5	70.6	---
Male-Female Gap	-5.2	-0.9	2.0	-3.3	---
Medgar Evers					
Males	42.2	50.3	54.6	49.8	53.4
Females	52.5	53.9	55.8	58.0	61.1
Male-Female Gap	-10.3	-3.6	-1.2	-8.2	-7.7
NYCCT					
Males	59.9	59.2	60.0	63.5	62.8
Females	63.0	63.7	60.9	66.3	68.9
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	-4.5	-0.8	-2.8	-6.1
Staten Island					
Males	56.1	61.6	59.6	64.6	67.6
Females	69.0	64.9	66.9	69.1	69.6
Male-Female Gap	-12.9	-3.2	-7.3	-4.5	-2.0
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	58.0	60.1	60.7	63.2	63.2
Females	63.8	62.8	62.8	66.0	67.0
Male-Female Gap	-5.7	-2.7	-2.1	-2.8	-3.8

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

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

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2010</u>
Community					
BMCC					
Males	54.5	59.1	56.6	63.0	61.2
Females	61.5	63.0	63.4	67.6	65.4
Male-Female Gap	-7.1	-4.0	-6.8	-4.6	-4.1
Bronx					
Males	60.7	57.9	62.5	58.2	56.2
Females	61.9	63.7	67.5	63.0	59.6
Male-Female Gap	-1.2	-5.8	-5.1	-4.8	-3.4
Hostos					
Males	52.4	61.8	53.6	64.5	62.9
Females	60.6	59.8	58.7	62.5	64.2
Male-Female Gap	-8.2	2.0	-5.1	2.0	-1.2
Kingsborough					
Males	60.1	62.6	69.1	65.5	63.6
Females	68.5	69.4	71.4	72.1	69.1
Male-Female Gap	-8.4	-6.7	-2.3	-6.6	-5.5
LaGuardia					
Males	61.9	63.8	62.4	67.9	66.7
Females	66.1	64.7	67.4	69.2	68.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-0.8	-5.0	-1.3	-2.1
Queensborough					
Males	60.3	63.5	68.0	68.9	70.5
Females	65.1	66.5	69.6	74.0	73.5
Male-Female Gap	-4.8	-3.0	-1.6	-5.2	-3.0
Community College Average					
Males	58.7	61.5	62.5	65.2	64.0
Females	64.2	64.8	66.5	69.0	67.4
Male-Female Gap	-5.5	-3.4	-4.1	-3.8	-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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Colleges will reduce performance gaps among students from underrepresented groups and/or gender.

Gaps 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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
University Average					
Males	58.4	61.0	61.9	64.5	63.8
Females	64.1	64.2	65.4	68.1	67.3
Male-Female Gap	-5.6	-3.2	-3.5	-3.6	-3.5

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

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

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	42.0	46.8	45.3	40.8	41.1
Brooklyn	30.8	31.7	34.0	33.9	29.4
City	29.6	27.3	26.8	27.7	30.2
Hunter	31.5	34.4	31.0	32.6	34.3
John Jay	---	---	---	---	21.6
Lehman	27.2	27.1	28.3	28.8	32.1
Queens	32.4	32.6	33.9	30.4	30.9
York	18.2	19.9	23.1	22.7	20.6
Senior College Average	31.6	32.6	32.5	31.4	30.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	16.6	16.7	18.6	22.7	---
Medgar Evers	29.0	27.9	30.3	24.2	25.8
NYCCT	24.9	25.6	24.0	24.5	21.0
Staten Island	17.3	24.0	20.4	20.3	18.7
Comprehensive College Average	20.7	22.6	22.1	22.7	20.8
Community					
BMCC	18.7	18.4	16.9	17.1	16.7
Bronx	24.4	22.0	20.2	19.2	19.1
Hostos	14.4	16.3	12.7	14.6	18.1
Kingsborough	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LaGuardia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Queensborough	17.7	23.5	21.8	24.7	22.0
Community College Average	19.0	20.3	18.3	19.7	18.8
University Average	25.3	26.5	25.6	25.5	25.0

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

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

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	90.4	90.0	88.8	84.2	92.1
Brooklyn	90.1	83.8	86.6	90.9	86.1
City	80.0	77.6	84.9	83.6	80.5
Hunter	60.5	65.1	69.0	69.6	68.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	99.9
Lehman	82.3	82.6	85.7	84.9	86.0
Queens	60.6	62.5	64.3	62.6	69.2
York	98.0	97.4	78.3	70.0	64.6
Senior College Average	77.0	77.6	78.1	76.9	81.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	---
Medgar Evers	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NYCCT	99.8	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.6
Staten Island	96.3	95.8	96.1	90.2	92.2
Comprehensive College Average	99.1	99.0	99.0	97.4	96.4
University Average	81.9	82.2	83.0	81.6	83.7

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	27.0	28.2	28.6	28.9	28.1
Brooklyn	24.5	24.3	24.5	25.6	25.1
City	22.8	23.0	23.2	24.1	24.6
Hunter	24.9	25.5	25.8	25.7	25.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	23.1
Lehman	23.1	23.8	24.4	25.3	26.2
Queens	25.9	25.6	25.8	26.7	27.0
York	21.7	22.2	22.8	23.5	24.6
Senior College Average	24.6	24.9	25.2	25.8	25.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	23.5	23.4	23.8	23.1	---
Medgar Evers	19.2	19.1	18.9	19.5	19.5
NYCCT	21.4	20.1	20.6	22.1	21.1
Staten Island	25.8	26.3	25.3	25.4	25.3
Comprehensive College Average	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.4	23.7
University Average	24.4	24.7	24.9	25.3	25.3

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.825	0.830	0.842	0.837	0.823
Brooklyn	0.804	0.808	0.820	0.827	0.822
City	0.797	0.806	0.808	0.822	0.807
Hunter	0.784	0.791	0.796	0.799	0.804
John Jay	---	---	---	---	0.824
Lehman	0.769	0.774	0.773	0.767	0.751
Queens	0.808	0.812	0.825	0.832	0.808
York	0.772	0.772	0.772	0.771	0.772
Senior College Average	0.797	0.802	0.809	0.812	0.805
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.811	0.807	0.817	0.822	---
Medgar Evers	0.730	0.707	0.740	0.771	0.762
NYCCT	0.735	0.739	0.745	0.745	0.760
Staten Island	0.822	0.831	0.817	0.824	0.823
Comprehensive College Average	0.787	0.789	0.796	0.805	0.794
University Average	0.795	0.799	0.806	0.810	0.803

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.1 Colleges will facilitate students' timely progress toward degree completion.

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.814	0.786	0.822	0.708	0.643
Medgar Evers	0.792	0.785	0.810	0.807	0.795
NYCCT	0.747	0.752	0.756	0.762	0.782
Staten Island	0.772	0.739	0.762	0.787	0.788
Comprehensive College Average	0.770	0.757	0.774	0.772	0.782
Community					
BMCC	0.732	0.748	0.774	0.763	0.770
Bronx	0.725	0.720	0.739	0.745	0.753
Hostos	0.747	0.750	0.760	0.765	0.759
Kingsborough	0.893	0.890	0.910	0.905	0.901
LaGuardia	0.829	0.839	0.834	0.850	0.840
Queensborough	0.707	0.716	0.747	0.768	0.746
Community College Average	0.773	0.780	0.800	0.804	0.798
University Average	0.772	0.775	0.794	0.798	0.795

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	88.2	89.6	88.3	90.7	89.3
Brooklyn	80.2	77.2	77.9	81.9	82.0
City	79.5	81.3	79.5	83.3	85.7
Hunter	81.7	83.6	84.2	84.7	85.4
John Jay	---	---	---	---	78.4
Lehman	73.3	72.0	77.1	80.4	79.0
Queens	83.8	84.8	85.8	87.8	87.0
York	70.9	69.6	75.1	74.9	77.8
Senior College Average	80.9	81.1	81.8	84.2	83.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74.1	72.3	74.9	76.7	---
Medgar Evers	61.4	56.0	69.2	63.9	63.8
NYCCT	75.0	79.0	80.2	74.4	74.1
Staten Island	81.8	81.6	79.7	83.4	83.6
Comprehensive College Average	74.8	72.9	75.8	77.3	78.4
University Average	80.0	79.7	80.7	82.7	82.9

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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	75.5	77.4	76.3	78.8	81.7
Brooklyn	67.4	68.0	65.4	66.5	70.4
City	63.1	66.9	67.7	65.5	67.0
Hunter	65.5	65.6	69.2	70.9	71.8
John Jay	---	---	---	---	60.2
Lehman	61.4	59.1	57.9	65.0	60.9
Queens	70.3	73.5	72.6	73.9	76.4
York	45.0	52.0	52.7	52.2	50.4
Senior College Average	66.0	67.8	67.5	68.6	68.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	56.3	58.7	59.6	61.9	---
Medgar Evers	61.1*	42.0	38.2	45.7	37.8
NYCCT	53.4	56.4	57.1	55.6	53.4
Staten Island	69.5	69.7	71.6	68.8	67.9
Comprehensive College Average	58.0	59.6	59.8	61.5	60.1
University Average	64.8	66.5	66.2	67.3	67.8

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	88.5	86.9	88.2	88.9	87.2
Brooklyn	70.8	72.7	75.3	76.5	77.3
City	71.4	72.9	74.0	71.5	74.9
Hunter	74.6	74.9	74.5	78.6	79.4
John Jay	---	---	---	---	78.6
Lehman	73.9	74.7	75.9	76.2	76.6
Queens	77.1	77.2	78.9	79.0	79.3
York	67.4	65.2	65.8	65.7	69.4
Senior College Average	75.5	75.8	77.0	77.4	79.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74.5	74.1	77.4	81.7	---
Medgar Evers	51.6	60.8	56.8	72.4	65.5
NYCCT	71.2	76.4	75.5	79.2	77.3
Staten Island	76.6	78.9	80.1	75.9	73.9
Comprehensive College Average	72.4	74.3	76.0	78.4	74.1
University Average	75.0	75.5	76.8	77.6	78.3

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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 Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	78.0	81.0	78.6	81.9	80.3
Brooklyn	63.2	63.2	64.3	66.6	67.8
City	58.1	62.2	62.3	64.5	62.1
Hunter	59.6	63.3	67.1	65.5	67.7
John Jay	---	---	---	---	71.3
Lehman	63.2	60.9	68.1	68.3	66.5
Queens	68.0	68.0	67.7	70.7	71.7
York	52.1	56.8	60.7	52.5	54.1
Senior College Average	64.4	66.0	67.5	68.5	68.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	66.9	67.3	63.1	69.6	---
Medgar Evers	49.4	33.3	43.7	46.4	54.1
NYCCT	58.8	63.3	64.4	62.9	59.2
Staten Island	66.7	70.5	71.7	68.5	65.0
Comprehensive College Average	63.9	64.4	63.6	65.9	61.9
University Average	64.3	65.7	66.8	67.9	67.9

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	63.0	63.1	67.3	69.1	---
Medgar Evers	49.8	52.8	55.5	55.7	59.0
NYCCT	61.3	61.2	60.4	64.7	65.3
Staten Island	62.9	63.4	63.5	67.0	68.7
Comprehensive College Average	61.1	61.5	61.8	64.6	65.1
Community					
BMCC	59.1	61.2	60.5	65.6	63.5
Bronx	61.4	61.2	65.2	60.9	58.0
Hostos	57.8	60.5	57.0	63.2	63.7
Kingsborough	64.6	66.2	70.3	69.1	66.5
LaGuardia	64.4	64.3	65.2	68.6	67.8
Queensborough	65.8	69.5	70.7	71.5	72.1
Community College Average	62.6	64.1	65.0	67.3	65.9
University Average	62.0	63.2	64.0	66.4	65.7

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 after entry. Prelude to Success students are excluded from the base.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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</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	32.8	33.7	35.5	33.3	39.4
Brooklyn	17.3	23.2	21.7	26.8	24.1
City	5.8	10.4	7.4	8.4	9.7
Hunter	16.9	17.1	19.9	19.4	21.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	25.3
Lehman	10.8	11.7	14.0	14.4	14.8
Queens	25.4	26.1	26.0	25.7	25.1
York	5.3	3.5	3.7	4.2	4.9
Senior College Average	19.0	20.3	21.0	20.9	21.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	23.1	21.2	19.0	21.0	---
Medgar Evers	0.0*	0.0	11.1*	5.1	5.3
NYCCT	5.9	5.2	2.9	5.1	3.4
Staten Island	22.9	25.8	25.2	24.2	27.1
Comprehensive College Average	19.4	18.4	17.8	18.9	17.4
University Average	19.0	20.0	20.5	20.6	21.6

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within 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. Students in five-year programs are excluded.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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 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>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>
Senior					
Baruch	59.8	57.6	60.3	60.5	63.3
Brooklyn	46.9	43.7	43.3	48.5	48.4
City	36.2	37.0	35.0	38.9	40.0
Hunter	35.9	41.9	43.7	46.2	45.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	39.4
Lehman	33.6	33.6	30.8	34.5	40.4
Queens	52.7	55.3	51.8	51.0	53.1
York	27.6	23.4	23.9	19.5	19.8
Senior College Average	44.7	44.8	44.5	45.7	46.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	42.1	42.7	41.7	40.1	---
Medgar Evers	10.3	21.9	5.3*	23.3	38.9*
NYCCT	11.1	18.2	17.3	24.5	23.5
Staten Island	44.3	45.6	45.2	48.1	48.0
Comprehensive College Average	39.3	39.2	37.1	38.0	37.0
University Average	43.9	44.0	43.3	44.4	45.8

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 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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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</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	63.9	65.1	65.5	67.4	68.3
Brooklyn	43.0	44.8	48.7	46.0	47.3
City	33.0	37.9	37.5	37.8	41.0
Hunter	41.0	46.5	47.2	47.0	50.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	52.1
Lehman	45.2	48.7	45.7	45.5	49.9
Queens	52.3	50.6	52.3	54.8	52.9
York	38.7	38.6	33.3	38.7	33.9
Senior College Average	45.9	48.5	48.9	49.6	50.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	49.8	48.8	52.8	53.7	---
Medgar Evers	36.2	30.8	20.5	18.3	16.6
NYCCT	31.0	35.1	32.0	33.6	38.7
Staten Island	61.2	57.1	59.7	55.3	56.6
Comprehensive College Average	48.7	46.2	46.6	47.7	44.0
University Average	46.4	48.1	48.6	49.3	50.0

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within 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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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</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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>
Senior					
Baruch	73.5	74.9	70.5	73.3	73.3
Brooklyn	52.8	54.0	52.0	53.9	56.0
City	50.4	46.1	45.0	47.6	49.0
Hunter	47.7	50.1	48.6	54.4	54.6
John Jay	---	---	---	---	60.5
Lehman	59.2	57.0	53.9	57.5	52.8
Queens	63.5	61.8	59.1	57.6	60.0
York	45.7	48.6	48.4	47.5	41.4
Senior College Average	56.7	56.7	54.3	56.9	57.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	58.6	57.3	56.0	56.0	---
Medgar Evers	18.3	36.4	40.4	39.7	31.3
NYCCT	45.6	50.7	39.3	41.8	36.6
Staten Island	66.7	67.1	66.9	60.1	63.9
Comprehensive College Average	57.4	57.5	55.1	52.9	41.0
University Average	56.8	56.8	54.5	56.2	56.4

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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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>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	75.2	74.4	77.9	79.3	76.7
Brooklyn	70.0	69.6	71.0	73.1	72.0
City	60.4	65.1	65.8	65.2	65.0
Hunter	67.7	71.9	72.9	73.5	74.1
John Jay	---	---	---	---	58.9
Lehman	73.9	71.4	65.0	72.3	73.6
Queens	70.6	73.0	69.7	65.0	71.8
Senior College Average	69.4	71.2	71.3	71.3	70.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	54.6	65.5	61.9	60.7	---
Staten Island	56.0	62.8	61.0	52.5	54.7
Comprehensive College Average	55.0	64.5	61.7	58.3	54.7
University Average	67.3	70.2	69.9	69.7	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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters 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>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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	26.0	24.3	26.6	24.7	24.5
Medgar Evers	17.8	16.9	21.8	16.9	15.9
NYCCT	19.8	19.7	22.1	20.6	21.7
Staten Island	26.5	24.9	22.7	24.4	28.0
Comprehensive College Average	22.6	22.1	23.4	22.5	23.6
Community					
BMCC	24.2	23.7	22.9	21.6	22.7
Bronx	20.4	22.1	20.3	19.7	20.1
Hostos	20.3	18.9	22.5	23.9	22.8
Kingsborough	28.7	34.9	34.5	32.7	34.0
LaGuardia	27.6	24.8	24.7	25.6	26.0
Queensborough	24.5	26.1	25.1	24.0	25.2
Community College Average	25.1	26.0	25.3	24.7	25.5
University Average	24.2	24.6	24.6	23.9	24.8

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 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

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	93	94	95	95	91
City	99	98	100	98	98
Hunter	100	100	100	100	100
Lehman	96	98	98	91	90
Queens	97	98	99	98	98
York	94*	100*	96	96*	95
Senior College Average	97	98	98	97	96
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	92*
NYCCT	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	99	96	98	98	99
Comprehensive College Average	99	95	98	98	98
University Average	97	97	98	97	97

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	98	97	97	98	97
City	99	100	100	100	99
Hunter	100	100	100	100	100
Lehman	99	100	99	96	96
Queens	98	99	99	99	99
York	100*	100*	100	100*	97
Senior College Average	99	99	99	99	98
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	77*
NYCCT	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	100	97	99	100	100
Comprehensive College Average	100	98	99	100	99
University Average	99	99	99	99	98

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	88	87	82	89	79
City	95	95	98	95	92
Hunter	98	96	96	97	96
Lehman	94	94	93	85	82
Queens	95	95	94	93	94
York	80*	86*	85	100*	91
Senior College Average	94	93	93	92	90
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	82*	93	64	48*
NYCCT	80*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	96	87	88	90	92
Comprehensive College Average	96	86	89	87	88
University Average	95	93	92	92	90

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Percentage passing the NCLEX exam

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior					
Hunter	88.2	91.9	89.2	90.1	75.8
Lehman	73.0	84.4	81.5	87.8	90.0
Senior College Average	79.5	87.6	86.2	89.4	81.1
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	94.4*	100.0*	100.0	82.9	89.1
NYCCT	88.2	90.7	82.1	95.2	91.5
Staten Island	88.6	80.3	84.7	90.8	78.0
Comprehensive College Average	88.9	85.3	85.2	91.2	84.3
Community					
BMCC	88.5	82.9	82.7	84.0	83.2
Bronx	74.1	86.0	81.4	90.6	71.8
Hostos	88.0	84.6	81.1	68.4	72.3
Kingsborough	86.9	89.9	91.7	91.7	80.6
LaGuardia	97.5	87.6	85.7	79.1	76.9
Queensborough	89.9	89.4	85.0	79.8	86.4
Community College Average	87.2	86.7	85.3	82.7	80.4
University Average	86.3	86.5	85.4	85.5	81.6

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

New Methodology

Percentage of first-time test-takers with baccalaureate degrees passing at least one section of the Uniform CPA exam

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior		
Baruch	40.4	43.2
Brooklyn	31.4	35.7
Hunter	18.0	29.1
Lehman	17.4	14.9
Queens	27.5	29.1
York	20.5	13.3*
Senior College Average	33.0	36.5
Comprehensive		
Medgar Evers	---	0.0*
Staten Island	13.8	23.3
Comprehensive College Average	13.8	21.2
University Average	32.4	35.7

Note: Beginning with AY10, NASBA publishes rates only for first-time test-takers; comparable data for earlier years are not available. The CPA exam contains four sections. Pass rates are computed as the number of testing events (sections) passed, divided by the total testing events. Pass rates for AY10 reflect N => 20.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

New Methodology

Percentage of first-time test-takers with advanced degrees passing at least one section of the Uniform CPA exam

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior		
Baruch	63.3	66.5
Brooklyn	---	11.1*
Queens	---	50.0*
Senior College Average	63.3	63.5

Note: Beginning with AY10, NASBA publishes rates only for first-time test-takers; comparable data for earlier years are not available. The CPA exam contains four sections. Pass rates are computed as the number of testing events (sections) passed, divided by the total testing events. Pass rates for AY10 reflect N => 20.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	81.4	90.2	93.9	69.6	65.8
Medgar Evers	97.1	86.0	86.7	72.3	75.0
NYCCT	81.6	93.2	87.3	78.7	69.5
Staten Island	93.2	84.1	92.8	70.8	68.2
Comprehensive College Average	85.5	89.5	89.3	74.8	69.9
Community					
BMCC	89.1	84.6	82.1	76.3	77.2
Bronx	86.3	89.3	79.1	76.5	74.7
Hostos	92.6	94.7	88.9	75.3	77.3
Kingsborough	80.7	87.2	82.6	71.0	70.7
LaGuardia	92.0	88.9	88.5	75.4	69.6
Queensborough	89.0	88.3	79.9	74.0	66.0
Community College Average	88.3	88.2	83.1	74.9	72.8
University Average	87.8	88.4	84.4	74.9	72.3

Note: Based on responses to a survey of certificate and associate 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 in the military six months after graduation.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of campus life and student and academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Colleges will improve the quality of student support services and academic support services, including academic advising, and use of technology, to augment student learning.

Student satisfaction with academic support services

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	3.04	3.02	2.93	2.92	2.83 (2.72,2.94)
Brooklyn	3.02	2.90	2.93	2.93	2.99 (2.90,3.07)
City	2.79	2.83	2.88	2.97	2.77 (2.65,2.88)
Hunter	2.83	2.78	2.82	2.84	2.78 (2.68,2.88)
John Jay	---	---	---	---	3.16 (3.06,3.26)
Lehman	3.10	3.01	3.02	3.00	2.99 (2.86,3.11)
Queens	2.91	3.03	2.85	3.00	2.89 (2.79,2.99)
York	2.81	2.86	2.88	2.82	2.71 (2.56,2.86)
Senior College Average	2.93	2.92	2.89	2.93	2.89 (2.85,2.93)
Comprehensive					
John Jay	3.01	2.99	2.96	2.99	---
Medgar Evers	2.84	2.82	2.93	2.78	2.81 (2.64,2.98)
NYCCT	2.93	2.94	2.94	2.91	2.95 (2.85,3.04)
Staten Island	2.94	2.89	3.00	2.80	2.87 (2.76,2.98)
Comprehensive College Average	2.94	2.93	2.96	2.88	2.89 (2.83,2.96)
Community					
BMCC	2.84	2.93	3.02	2.91	3.07 (3.01,3.13)
Bronx	2.82	2.92	2.91	2.91	2.96 (2.85,3.06)
Hostos	2.91	3.00	2.99	3.00	2.99 (2.84,3.14)
Kingsborough	3.03	3.03	3.05	3.00	3.04 (2.96,3.12)
LaGuardia	2.97	2.95	2.97	2.88	2.97 (2.89,3.04)
Queensborough	2.93	3.09	3.04	3.08	2.97 (2.87,3.07)
Community College Average	2.91	2.98	3.00	2.95	3.01 (2.97,3.05)
University Average	2.93	2.94	2.95	2.93	2.94 (2.92,2.96)

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This measure reflects responses to three items about satisfaction with academic advising, library services, 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 with confidence intervals. All items in this measure are weighted equally. For 2012, numbers in parenthesis represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimated mean.

University Performance Management Process

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of campus life and student and academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Colleges will improve the quality of student support services and academic support services, including academic advising, and use of technology, to augment student learning.

Student satisfaction with student services

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.82	2.92	2.82	2.75	2.62 (2.46,2.78)
Brooklyn	2.65	2.65	2.78	2.76	2.94 (2.82,3.07)
City	2.60	2.60	2.81	2.80	2.65 (2.49,2.82)
Hunter	2.62	2.59	2.59	2.53	2.70 (2.56,2.83)
John Jay	---	---	---	---	2.91 (2.73,3.09)
Lehman	3.11	2.96	2.93	3.04	3.07 (2.90,3.24)
Queens	2.76	2.87	2.67	2.86	2.64 (2.51,2.77)
York	2.82	2.69	2.45	2.60	2.66 (2.44,2.88)
Senior College Average	2.74	2.75	2.73	2.76	2.77 (2.72,2.83)
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.77	2.85	2.76	2.77	---
Medgar Evers	2.86	2.87	2.94	2.85	2.68 (2.44,2.91)
NYCCT	2.75	2.75	2.74	2.77	2.81 (2.66,2.96)
Staten Island	2.73	2.77	2.94	2.90	2.74 (2.59,2.90)
Comprehensive College Average	2.77	2.80	2.83	2.82	2.76 (2.66,2.86)
Community					
BMCC	2.65	2.58	2.89	2.83	2.86 (2.75,2.98)
Bronx	2.65	2.80	2.81	2.76	2.95 (2.80,3.11)
Hostos	2.76	2.85	2.82	2.93	2.93 (2.71,3.15)
Kingsborough	2.94	2.94	2.86	2.94	3.00 (2.87,3.13)
LaGuardia	2.75	2.77	2.84	2.88	2.83 (2.71,2.95)
Queensborough	2.76	2.88	2.94	3.09	3.00 (2.88,3.12)
Community College Average	2.74	2.77	2.87	2.89	2.92 (2.86,2.97)
University Average	2.75	2.77	2.80	2.83	2.83 (2.79,2.87)

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This measure reflects responses to three 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 with confidence intervals. All items in this measure are weighted equally. For 2012, numbers in parenthesis represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimated mean.

University Performance Management Process

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of campus life and student and academic support services

University Target: 6.1 Colleges will improve the quality of student support services and academic support services, including academic advising, and use of technology, to augment student learning.

Student satisfaction with access to computer technology

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	3.16	3.29	3.09	3.03	2.91 (2.81,3.01)
Brooklyn	3.20	3.24	3.23	3.11	3.14 (3.06,3.22)
City	2.64	2.67	2.76	2.96	2.98 (2.90,3.07)
Hunter	2.82	2.81	2.79	2.76	2.63 (2.53,2.72)
John Jay	---	---	---	---	3.18 (3.07,3.28)
Lehman	2.95	3.01	2.92	2.98	3.03 (2.92,3.14)
Queens	2.82	2.95	2.88	2.86	2.75 (2.65,2.85)
York	2.71	2.83	2.82	2.77	2.56 (2.41,2.72)
Senior College Average	2.92	2.99	2.94	2.93	2.90 (2.87,2.94)
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.90	3.13	2.98	3.09	---
Medgar Evers	2.90	2.81	2.89	2.70	2.78 (2.60,2.95)
NYCCT	2.90	2.95	2.91	3.01	2.93 (2.84,3.01)
Staten Island	2.96	3.01	3.08	2.79	2.77 (2.66,2.88)
Comprehensive College Average	2.91	3.00	2.97	2.93	2.84 (2.77,2.91)
Community					
BMCC	2.70	3.01	3.15	2.95	3.07 (3.00,3.13)
Bronx	2.98	3.08	3.12	3.11	3.02 (2.92,3.12)
Hostos	3.00	3.04	3.19	3.04	3.15 (3.02,3.29)
Kingsborough	2.97	2.92	2.98	2.87	2.97 (2.88,3.06)
LaGuardia	2.87	2.89	2.95	2.92	3.08 (3.00,3.17)
Queensborough	2.99	3.02	3.04	3.10	3.09 (2.99,3.18)
Community College Average	2.88	2.99	3.07	2.98	3.06 (3.02,3.09)
University Average	2.90	2.99	2.99	2.95	2.96 (2.93,2.98)

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This measure reflects responses to four items about access to computer technology, including: campus computing in general, computer lab hours, availability of computer labs on campus, and availability of 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 with confidence intervals. All items in this measure are weighted equally. For 2012, numbers in parenthesis represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimated mean.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Enrollment

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	16,097	16,321	16,195	17,063	18,055
Brooklyn	16,087	16,689	17,094	16,912	16,835
City	14,392	15,306	16,212	15,416	16,005
Hunter	20,845	21,258	22,168	22,407	22,822
John Jay	---	---	---	---	14,788
Lehman	10,922	11,860	12,195	12,115	12,287
Queens	18,728	19,572	20,711	20,906	20,993
York	6,727	7,157	7,780	7,821	8,242
Senior College Total	103,798	108,163	112,355	112,640	130,027
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14,841	14,844	15,330	15,206	---
Medgar Evers	5,550	6,036	7,080	6,920	6,966
NYCCT	13,502	14,268	15,399	15,366	15,961
Staten Island	12,517	13,092	13,858	13,894	14,199
Comprehensive College Total	46,410	48,240	51,667	51,386	37,126
Community					
BMCC	19,259	21,858	21,424	22,534	24,463
Bronx	9,003	9,117	10,420	10,740	11,450
Hostos	5,112	5,532	6,187	6,499	7,078
Kingsborough	14,962	15,739	18,204	18,606	19,261
LaGuardia	15,169	15,540	17,028	17,569	18,623
Queensborough	13,359	13,752	15,507	15,316	16,837
Community College Total	76,864	81,538	88,770	91,264	97,712
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,543	4,620	4,625	4,642	4,701
School of Journalism	99	111	144	169	185
School of Professional Studies	826	1,213	1,547	1,779	1,896
Law School	420	388	407	441	481
University Total	232,960	244,273	259,515	262,321	272,128

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total FTEs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,726	12,969	12,784	13,489	14,144
Brooklyn	11,867	12,243	12,549	12,385	12,471
City	10,278	11,047	11,868	11,639	11,875
Hunter	14,899	15,182	16,115	16,120	16,700
John Jay	---	---	---	---	11,430
Lehman	7,653	8,195	8,423	8,357	8,347
Queens	13,578	14,288	15,410	15,639	15,233
York	4,762	5,053	5,561	5,604	5,934
Senior College Total	75,762	78,975	82,710	83,233	96,134
Comprehensive					
John Jay	11,468	11,348	12,042	11,686	---
Medgar Evers	4,042	4,318	5,355	5,279	5,331
NYCCT	9,619	10,316	11,146	11,218	11,993
Staten Island	9,474	9,975	10,648	10,829	11,095
Comprehensive College Total	34,603	35,957	39,191	39,012	28,419
Community					
BMCC	13,808	16,088	16,350	16,955	18,564
Bronx	6,402	6,411	7,539	7,794	8,253
Hostos	3,447	3,732	4,356	4,653	5,088
Kingsborough	10,783	11,555	13,910	14,366	14,541
LaGuardia	11,250	11,743	13,064	13,829	14,317
Queensborough	8,644	8,991	10,804	11,007	11,760
Community College Total	54,334	58,521	66,022	68,604	72,522
Graduate					
Graduate School	3,555	3,592	3,667	3,671	3,750
School of Journalism	122	139	180	208	221
School of Professional Studies	335	523	645	790	834
Law School	515	487	512	533	575
University Total	169,225	178,194	192,928	196,051	202,452

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

First-time Freshmen

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,479	1,512	1,442	1,260	1,311
Brooklyn	1,322	1,358	977	1,157	1,153
City	1,831	1,776	1,773	1,389	1,517
Hunter	1,906	2,042	2,028	1,788	2,177
John Jay	---	---	---	---	1,766
Lehman	886	1,001	773	641	626
Queens	1,778	1,675	1,712	1,491	1,444
York	1,017	1,057	1,045	1,103	955
Senior College Total	10,219	10,421	9,750	8,829	10,949
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2,813	2,442	2,872	2,015	---
Medgar Evers	891	1,048	1,378	1,188	1,201
NYCCT	2,844	3,158	3,251	2,930	3,127
Staten Island	2,479	2,515	2,688	2,342	2,458
Comprehensive College Total	9,027	9,163	10,189	8,475	6,786
Community					
BMCC	3,904	4,949	4,301	5,176	6,270
Bronx	1,697	1,568	2,056	1,911	2,083
Hostos	813	905	1,178	1,073	1,230
Kingsborough	2,136	2,386	3,111	2,933	2,702
LaGuardia	2,573	2,613	2,871	3,205	3,175
Queensborough	2,812	2,849	3,705	3,209	3,934
Community College Total	13,935	15,270	17,222	17,507	19,394
University Total	33,231	34,872	37,241	34,829	37,129

Note: The university total includes 50 first-time freshmen enrolled in the School of Professional Studies in fall 2007, 18 in fall 2008, 80 in fall 2009 and 18 in fall 2010.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Transfers

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,397	1,254	1,260	1,595	2,100
Brooklyn	1,694	1,699	1,759	1,449	1,713
City	1,196	1,212	1,517	970	1,350
Hunter	1,542	1,470	1,540	1,663	1,741
John Jay	---	---	---	---	1,371
Lehman	1,061	1,209	1,255	1,169	1,520
Queens	1,951	2,081	2,305	1,896	2,156
York	694	697	833	633	988
Senior College Total	9,535	9,622	10,469	9,375	12,939
Comprehensive					
John Jay	997	1,207	1,193	1,167	---
Medgar Evers	561	643	779	389	618
NYCCT	942	1,093	1,045	1,055	1,123
Staten Island	1,175	1,653	1,489	1,537	1,384
Comprehensive College Total	3,675	4,596	4,506	4,148	3,125
Community					
BMCC	1,688	1,956	1,013	621	1,242
Bronx	697	694	975	586	1,181
Hostos	522	492	620	374	600
Kingsborough	1,416	1,558	2,129	1,563	1,720
LaGuardia	1,399	1,416	1,473	1,062	1,631
Queensborough	907	853	1,102	610	1,125
Community College Total	6,629	6,969	7,312	4,816	7,499
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	218	274	243	330	301
University Total	20,057	21,461	22,530	18,669	23,864

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,863	12,731	12,332	13,120	14,266
Brooklyn	12,495	13,011	13,069	12,804	13,096
City	11,181	11,977	12,878	12,263	12,863
Hunter	15,718	15,698	15,884	15,684	16,345
John Jay	---	---	---	---	12,887
Lehman	8,864	9,569	9,720	9,841	9,863
Queens	14,618	15,262	16,059	16,195	16,559
York	6,682	7,111	7,732	7,784	8,210
Senior College Total	82,421	85,359	87,674	87,691	104,089
Comprehensive					
John Jay	12,896	12,943	13,346	13,278	---
Medgar Evers	5,550	6,036	7,080	6,920	6,966
NYCCT	13,502	14,268	15,399	15,366	15,961
Staten Island	11,588	12,183	12,886	12,829	13,155
Comprehensive College Total	43,536	45,430	48,711	48,393	36,082
Community					
BMCC	19,259	21,858	21,424	22,534	24,463
Bronx	9,003	9,117	10,420	10,740	11,450
Hostos	5,112	5,532	6,187	6,499	7,078
Kingsborough	14,962	15,739	18,204	18,606	19,261
LaGuardia	15,169	15,540	17,028	17,569	18,623
Queensborough	13,359	13,752	15,507	15,316	16,837
Community College Total	76,864	81,538	88,770	91,264	97,712
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	694	966	1,117	1,136	1,220
University Total	203,515	213,293	226,272	228,484	239,103

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

New Graduates

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,064	1,159	1,245	1,229	1,214
Brooklyn	1,010	1,174	1,249	1,155	996
City	940	885	838	806	757
Hunter	950	1,092	1,406	1,548	1,555
John Jay	---	---	---	---	550
Lehman	383	641	613	624	653
Queens	1,062	1,278	1,437	1,440	1,232
Senior College Total	5,409	6,229	6,788	6,802	6,957
Comprehensive					
John Jay	567	573	582	495	---
Staten Island	203	211	302	309	271
Comprehensive College Total	770	784	884	804	271
Graduate					
Graduate School	725	655	698	721	751
School of Journalism	50	64	83	90	90
School of Professional Studies	58	129	210	264	252
Law School	146	130	161	164	174
University Total	7,158	7,991	8,824	8,845	8,495

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Total Graduates

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	3,234	3,590	3,863	3,943	3,789
Brooklyn	3,592	3,678	4,025	4,108	3,739
City	3,211	3,329	3,334	3,153	3,142
Hunter	5,127	5,560	6,284	6,723	6,477
John Jay	---	---	---	---	1,901
Lehman	2,058	2,291	2,475	2,274	2,424
Queens	4,110	4,310	4,652	4,711	4,434
York	45	46	48	37	32
Senior College Total	21,377	22,804	24,681	24,949	25,938
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,945	1,901	1,984	1,928	---
Staten Island	929	909	972	1,065	1,044
Comprehensive College Total	2,874	2,810	2,956	2,993	1,044
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,543	4,620	4,625	4,642	4,701
School of Journalism	99	111	144	169	185
School of Professional Studies	132	247	430	643	676
Law School	420	388	407	441	481
University Total	29,445	30,980	33,243	33,837	33,025

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses

	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>
Senior					
Baruch	8,643	9,336	11,527	10,814	11,356
Brooklyn	4,375	5,171	4,516	3,562	---
City	5,788	4,835	6,371	3,482	4,949
Hunter	14,521	11,629	8,987	9,142	9,897
John Jay	---	---	---	---	2,202
Lehman	8,904	9,562	10,175	10,708	11,811
Queens	15,220	14,282	12,093	8,775	6,493
York	12,586	14,809	18,043	14,611	16,810
Senior College Total	70,037	69,624	71,712	61,094	63,518
Comprehensive					
John Jay	9,098	16,613	9,380	347	---
Medgar Evers	12,856	12,561	2,120	2,377	2,567
NYCCT	13,885	14,359	16,358	14,612	12,800
Staten Island	5,464	4,783	4,446	4,225	5,572
Comprehensive College Total	41,303	48,316	32,304	21,214	20,939
Community					
BMCC	12,153	8,499	11,153	8,242	5,947
Bronx	13,474	12,949	13,588	15,597	13,288
Hostos	9,717	9,540	10,802	9,880	10,986
Kingsborough	23,476	24,590	23,806	24,029	25,971
LaGuardia	66,624	76,755	77,178	58,434	64,519
Queensborough	8,809	9,630	8,872	9,264	9,664
Community College Total	134,253	141,963	145,399	125,446	130,375
Graduate					
Graduate School	12,674	9,905	---	---	---
School of Professional Studies	14,642	5,755	7,773	9,640	3,251
University Total	272,909	275,563	257,188	217,394	218,083

Note: Beginning with the 2009-10 academic year, The Graduate Center no longer offers Adult and Continuing Education except as through the School of Professional Studies.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets 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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1136	1153	1182	1217	1209
Brooklyn	1050	1040	1098	1110	1134
City	1000	1026	1044	1072	1080
Hunter	1095	1104	1137	1155	1149
John Jay	---	---	---	---	951
Lehman	899	921	989	1016	1008
Queens	1033	1061	1083	1113	1113
York	845	864	900	904	899
Senior College Average	1036	1050	1084	1100	1083
Comprehensive					
John Jay	931	943	942	939	---
Medgar Evers	853	875	887	852	837
NYCCT	918	908	905	929	952
Staten Island	1015	1008	1004	1008	1011
Comprehensive College Average	949	956	957	955	995
University Average	1021	1032	1057	1062	1075

Note: Based on recent graduates of domestic high schools.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets 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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	87.4	87.2	86.6	86.7	86.5
Brooklyn	85.1	85.9	87.0	86.3	86.9
City	85.2	85.2	85.8	86.9	87.6
Hunter	84.8	85.9	86.5	87.2	87.1
John Jay	---	---	---	---	82.9
Lehman	83.5	81.9	83.7	84.5	84.9
Queens	86.0	86.2	86.5	86.7	86.8
York	79.3	80.4	81.5	81.9	82.6
Senior College Average	85.0	85.2	85.8	86.1	85.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	81.6	81.1	81.2	82.2	---
Medgar Evers	75.2	74.7	77.6	77.1	77.5
NYCCT	78.0	77.8	79.9	79.8	79.2
Staten Island	84.5	83.6	83.9	84.3	84.5
Comprehensive College Average	81.7	81.1	81.8	82.4	83.2
University Average	84.5	84.5	84.9	85.1	85.6

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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: 7.3 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the # 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>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	751	694	903	791	773
Brooklyn	484	759	876	984	959
City	1,014	852	529	419	405
Hunter	733	902	863	765	708
John Jay	---	---	---	---	865
Lehman	1,188	1,162	1,233	1,356	1,507
Queens	1,127	1,070	1,073	1,038	1,043
York	2,816	2,000	2,015	1,867	1,754
Senior College Total	8,113	7,439	7,492	7,220	8,014
Comprehensive					
John Jay	586	789	953	693	---
Medgar Evers	735	658	598	489	272
NYCCT	1,036	956	941	957	824
Staten Island	536	465	705	865	940
Comprehensive College Total	2,893	2,868	3,197	3,004	2,036
Community					
BMCC	742	546	723	781	926
Bronx	447	513	747	847	999
Hostos	1,574	1,332	1,370	1,126	1,164
Kingsborough	9,900	9,383	9,453	9,348	10,037
LaGuardia	3,139	2,719	3,139	3,034	3,341
Queensborough	2,571	2,391	2,419	2,324	2,161
Community College Total	18,373	16,884	17,851	17,460	18,628
University Total	29,379	27,191	28,540	27,684	28,678

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Last year's figures have been revised to reflect final data. For the current year, spring performance data are not final at this time. Final data for the current year will be provided in next year's report. Figures for all years have been revised for the College of Staten Island, the comprehensive subtotal and University total to exclude students in CSI's Discovery Institute.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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: 7.3 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the # 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>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	93	94	95	95	94
Brooklyn	83	81	82	84	84
City	85	87	77	74	89
Hunter	87	92	87	90	93
John Jay	---	---	---	---	94
Lehman	93	95	94	94	96
Queens	85	83	87	90	94
York	85	90	88	88	89
Senior College Average	87	89	88	89	92
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77	83	91	94	---
Medgar Evers	85	89	78	85	88
NYCCT	84	66	70	80	82
Staten Island	93	88	93	94	95
Comprehensive College Average	85	79	83	88	90
Community					
BMCC	60	76	82	86	76
Bronx	60	88	80	83	84
Hostos	86	88	82	85	82
Kingsborough	92	93	94	93	92
LaGuardia	82	83	83	85	87
Queensborough	93	90	95	93	94
Community College Average	88	90	90	90	89
University Average	87	88	89	90	90

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. Last year's figures have been revised to reflect final data. For the current year, spring performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall only. Final data for the current year will be provided in next year's report. Figures for all years have been revised for the College of Staten Island, the comprehensive subtotal and university total to exclude students in CSI's Discovery Institute.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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: 7.3 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the # of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

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

	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	21	19	27	40	25
Brooklyn	24	27	37	40	33
City	30	38	31	23	25
Hunter	21	25	27	26	29
John Jay	---	---	---	---	21
Lehman	30	42	37	42	30
Queens	31	30	25	25	28
York	42	47	44	41	28
Senior College Average	31	35	34	36	28
Comprehensive					
John Jay	16	21	21	30	---
Medgar Evers	16	23	40	30	22
NYCCT	29	28	31	27	21
Staten Island	44	36	27	26	31
Comprehensive College Average	26	26	29	28	25
Community					
BMCC	26	24	21	21	19
Bronx	28	34	35	37	26
Hostos	35	41	31	35	31
Kingsborough	35	34	37	35	41
LaGuardia	36	37	34	36	23
Queensborough	36	35	34	33	15
Community College Average	35	35	35	35	31
University Average	33	34	34	34	29

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. Last year's re-enrollment rates have been revised to reflect final data. For the current year, spring performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall only. Final data for the current year will be provided in next year's report. Figures for all years have been revised for the College of Staten Island, the comprehensive subtotal and University total to exclude students in CSI's Discovery Institute.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$43,316,099	\$30,661,651	\$19,194,623	\$12,654,005	\$16,226,091
Brooklyn	\$11,798,827	\$8,928,984	\$11,726,044	\$18,704,317	\$16,313,760
City	\$62,752,168	\$63,585,449	\$46,703,422	\$40,358,974	\$38,893,452
Hunter	\$16,981,140	\$32,369,753	\$25,699,325	\$25,597,994	\$24,073,344
John Jay	---	---	---	\$5,951,446	\$8,690,846
Lehman	\$3,067,791	\$3,563,530	\$4,074,265	\$4,517,771	\$5,000,339
Queens	\$17,525,510	\$17,456,623	\$16,895,511	\$20,625,790	\$20,689,394
York	\$408,352	\$680,555	\$639,960	\$886,737	\$1,016,852
Senior College Total	\$155,849,886	\$157,246,544	\$124,933,151	\$125,802,570	\$129,187,420
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$2,227,428	\$3,597,305	\$6,364,597	---	---
Medgar Evers	\$1,895,108	\$3,077,974	\$1,993,971	\$1,048,649	\$423,075
NYCCT	\$1,268,449	\$1,175,077	\$1,116,864	\$1,063,346	\$953,444
Staten Island	\$1,416,752	\$1,433,696	\$1,989,687	\$2,798,980	\$3,161,541
Comprehensive College Total	\$6,807,738	\$9,284,052	\$11,465,119	\$8,405,441	\$6,254,716
Community					
BMCC	\$3,897,142	\$3,540,068	\$2,230,483	\$2,322,602	\$2,267,762
Bronx	\$1,508,550	\$1,705,253	\$1,694,148	\$1,681,549	\$1,807,120
Hostos	\$714,649	\$827,707	\$868,071	\$933,259	\$1,039,658
Kingsborough	\$1,120,921	\$1,410,179	\$1,628,689	\$2,763,789	\$2,347,973
LaGuardia	\$689,618	\$891,006	\$1,586,190	\$1,632,203	\$1,834,714
Queensborough	\$2,407,599	\$2,676,452	\$2,867,673	\$3,122,865	\$2,992,256
Community College Total	\$10,338,479	\$11,050,665	\$10,875,254	\$12,736,530	\$13,257,641
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$13,004,015	\$9,983,052	\$9,408,088	\$6,315,517	\$4,742,643
School of Journalism	\$4,357,633	\$3,081,728	\$2,454,933	\$4,625,387	\$3,322,076
Law School	\$904,921	\$1,009,391	\$1,136,125	\$1,265,187	\$1,541,260
University Total	\$201,223,094	\$198,614,807	\$161,131,341	\$160,944,419	\$159,952,335

Note: This indicator reflects a weighted, rolling, three-year average (50-30-20) of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts. Figures for the prior year have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect final values. The University Total includes contributions (\$17 thousand in FY2011 and \$74 thousand in FY2012) for the School of Professional Studies, and for the Macaulay Honors College; \$1 million for FY2008, \$705 thousand for FY2009, \$894 thousand for FY2010, \$2.8 million for FY2011, and \$1.2 million for FY2012. The Community College Total and the University Total also include contributions for the New Community College (\$561 thousand for FY2011 and \$1.6 million for FY2012).

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Colleges will improve or maintain sound financial management and controls.

Administrative Costs (Institutional Support Services)

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$26,323,749	\$24,956,811	\$26,088,992	\$24,736,348	25.4	23.9	23.8	23.3
Brooklyn	\$31,729,887	\$29,565,427	\$29,788,281	\$26,423,650	28.3	25.6	25.0	22.8
City	\$35,199,080	\$34,590,883	\$32,224,028	\$32,126,015	27.5	26.1	23.4	23.7
Hunter	\$36,838,001	\$35,840,429	\$35,856,711	\$35,077,596	27.6	26.2	24.6	23.5
John Jay	---	---	---	\$18,453,873	---	---	---	22.2
Lehman	\$20,420,936	\$19,684,135	\$21,260,254	\$18,982,756	26.5	24.7	24.7	22.2
Queens	\$34,994,532	\$31,462,198	\$35,104,214	\$32,781,367	29.4	26.4	27.0	25.9
York	\$15,814,468	\$15,533,006	\$16,893,097	\$15,199,317	33.8	32.1	32.0	29.4
Senior College Total/Avg	\$201,320,653	\$191,632,889	\$197,215,577	\$203,780,923	28.0	26.0	25.2	23.9
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$19,017,776	\$19,768,296	\$19,289,921	---	24.4	23.9	22.2	---
Medgar Evers	\$13,419,905	\$12,779,806	\$13,235,855	\$15,093,198	29.7	28.0	27.0	29.8
NYCCT	\$16,136,997	\$16,198,315	\$17,933,514	\$16,205,108	21.8	21.2	21.3	20.0
Staten Island	\$22,986,279	\$23,700,757	\$23,867,134	\$21,604,242	29.1	28.3	26.8	24.6
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$71,560,957	\$72,447,174	\$74,326,424	\$52,902,548	25.9	25.1	24.0	24.1
Community								
BMCC	\$33,276,974	\$36,267,448	\$40,299,198	\$39,334,850	36.0	34.1	35.4	34.5
Bronx	\$18,842,827	\$19,758,660	\$20,014,026	\$21,247,032	32.7	32.4	30.5	31.9
Hostos	\$14,245,535	\$15,521,500	\$16,250,206	\$15,159,554	34.7	35.3	34.2	32.4
Kingsborough	\$21,844,679	\$21,764,103	\$23,378,269	\$21,329,780	29.1	27.9	26.9	24.3
LaGuardia	\$23,343,946	\$25,097,692	\$27,823,426	\$28,381,541	28.6	29.0	29.7	30.0
Queensborough	\$15,673,587	\$17,436,889	\$17,285,581	\$17,118,874	24.3	24.3	21.5	21.6
Community College Total/Avg	\$127,227,548	\$135,846,292	\$145,050,706	\$142,571,630	30.9	30.4	29.7	29.2
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$19,898,164	\$22,364,968	\$19,331,205	\$17,563,740	19.0	17.0	17.9	15.7
University Total/Avg	\$420,007,322	\$422,291,323	\$435,923,912	\$416,818,841	27.8	26.3	25.8	24.9

Note: FY2010 "Percent of Total" has been revised since the 2010-11 PMP to correct community college vacation accruals. Data for FY 2012 will be available in next year's report. Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for general administration, general institutional services, and maintenance and operations (everything except instructional activities).

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will increase.

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

	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$5,424,298	\$5,417,250	\$6,106,267	\$6,721,694	\$6,872,197
Brooklyn	\$11,853,929	\$12,215,159	\$13,576,134	\$13,557,264	\$13,148,033
City	\$43,122,499	\$48,802,709	\$59,303,054	\$64,031,763	\$63,033,793
Hunter	\$37,113,200	\$42,244,156	\$46,999,342	\$48,027,876	\$49,360,285
John Jay	---	---	---	---	\$7,301,494
Lehman	\$16,041,390	\$17,387,991	\$21,669,114	\$20,935,606	\$18,003,894
Queens	\$21,576,884	\$21,667,450	\$28,933,290	\$25,622,011	\$28,991,460
York	\$6,014,578	\$6,341,443	\$7,495,168	\$6,888,864	\$6,254,765
Senior College Total	\$141,146,778	154,076,158	\$184,082,368	\$185,785,078	\$192,965,921
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$12,896,015	\$15,275,879	\$18,128,219	\$16,903,472	---
Medgar Evers	\$8,581,458	\$8,835,698	\$9,308,249	\$9,197,374	\$8,646,507
NYCCT	\$6,208,149	\$6,128,546	\$7,179,020	\$7,463,674	\$8,330,038
Staten Island	\$9,107,818	\$9,039,801	\$9,445,850	\$8,525,387	\$8,351,762
Comprehensive College Total	\$36,793,441	\$39,279,924	\$44,061,337	\$42,089,907	\$33,938,296
Community					
BMCC	\$6,591,445	\$6,735,194	\$7,867,265	\$8,723,970	\$7,446,371
Bronx	\$6,148,425	\$5,700,917	\$6,159,851	\$6,782,830	\$6,389,954
Hostos	\$3,777,250	\$3,932,899	\$3,588,387	\$4,452,458	\$5,348,630
Kingsborough	\$5,002,278	\$5,168,318	\$5,052,288	\$5,072,036	\$14,784,198
LaGuardia	\$13,193,066	\$14,638,288	\$16,902,509	\$16,975,518	\$16,986,775
Queensborough	\$3,836,512	\$4,131,033	\$3,672,917	\$4,371,047	\$4,433,992
Community College Total	\$38,548,977	\$40,306,648	\$43,243,217	\$46,377,858	\$55,910,536
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$13,386,035	\$12,970,438	\$13,115,331	\$11,796,016	\$11,646,380
School of Journalism	\$232,964 [^]	\$190,590	\$349,445	\$775,735	\$1,132,609
Law School	\$330,229	\$438,848	\$575,891	\$399,792	\$223,356
University Total	\$230,389,662	\$247,262,606	\$285,427,588	\$287,224,387	\$285,454,280

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. FY2011 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data and FY2012 figures are preliminary. Grants and contracts awards of \$520,617 for the New Community College have been included in the FY2012 community college and university totals.

[^]Not a weighted, rolling average.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	6.9	7.2	8.8	8.4	8.8
Brooklyn	23.6	15.1	15.4	16.0	17.3
City	20.4	18.2	18.9	19.3	18.3
Hunter	17.1	15.4	16.2	15.8	16.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	14.2
Lehman	13.5	11.8	12.4	11.7	11.4
Queens	11.4	9.1	12.2	12.6	13.0
York	13.3	7.6	8.7	9.4	7.6
Senior College Average	16.8	14.2	15.4	15.5	15.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10.1	10.5	9.4	12.5	---
Medgar Evers	7.3	7.6	7.4	7.2	7.1
NYCCT	7.0	6.5	7.0	8.5	8.4
Staten Island	13.2	10.5	16.6	10.5	10.2
Comprehensive College Average	9.7	9.2	10.1	10.1	8.5
Community					
BMCC	6.6	5.6	5.3	4.2	5.0
Bronx	7.8	8.0	6.7	6.2	6.2
Hostos	5.3	6.0	7.4	8.4	7.0
Kingsborough	5.7	5.8	6.1	7.1	6.6
LaGuardia	5.9	4.9	4.4	5.6	6.9
Queensborough	7.4	7.5	6.2	5.3	5.3
Community College Average	6.4	6.0	5.6	5.9	6.3
Graduate					
Graduate School	10.3	10.3	8.7	8.8	9.3
School of Journalism	3.7	13.3	2.8	4.6	3.0
Law School	0.6	3.9	8.4	43.4	14.3
University Average	13.4	11.8	12.6	12.6	12.6

Note: FY 2011 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.77	2.85	2.68	2.79	2.65 (2.54,2.77)
Brooklyn	2.90	2.78	2.76	2.72	2.92 (2.83,3.00)
City	2.84	2.93	2.80	2.76	2.53 (2.40,2.65)
Hunter	2.71	2.64	2.56	2.70	2.66 (2.57,2.75)
John Jay	---	---	---	---	2.92 (2.81,3.02)
Lehman	3.05	2.98	2.84	2.89	2.78 (2.63,2.93)
Queens	3.04	2.97	2.80	2.84	2.56 (2.45,2.67)
York	2.77	2.89	2.67	2.74	2.70 (2.55,2.86)
Senior College Average	2.85	2.85	2.72	2.78	2.71 (2.67,2.75)
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.95	3.01	2.89	2.90	---
Medgar Evers	2.87	2.91	2.93	2.94	2.95 (2.82,3.08)
NYCCT	2.75	2.97	2.82	2.87	2.77 (2.67,2.87)
Staten Island	2.91	2.90	2.94	2.87	2.74 (2.64,2.85)
Comprehensive College Average	2.87	2.95	2.89	2.89	2.79 (2.73,2.85)
Community					
BMCC	2.90	2.94	2.87	2.99	3.01 (2.94,3.08)
Bronx	2.65	2.82	2.82	2.87	2.99 (2.88,3.10)
Hostos	2.91	2.96	2.95	2.99	3.08 (2.95,3.22)
Kingsborough	2.70	2.97	2.94	2.94	3.06 (2.97,3.15)
LaGuardia	2.80	2.78	2.81	2.79	2.86 (2.77,2.95)
Queensborough	2.90	2.99	2.84	2.96	2.83 (2.72,2.94)
Community College Average	2.81	2.91	2.87	2.93	2.97 (2.93,3.01)
University Average	2.84	2.89	2.81	2.86	2.82 (2.80,2.85)

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This measure is based on responses to four items about satisfaction with administrative services, including: 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 with confidence intervals. All items in this measure are weighted equally. For 2012, numbers in parenthesis represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimated mean.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

University Target: 9.3 Colleges will improve space utilization.

Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	48.1	49.3	47.6	48.6	50.5
Brooklyn	45.0	42.7	41.0	40.2	39.2
City	41.4	42.2	42.4	41.9	44.0
Hunter	54.9	55.6	54.4	54.0	63.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	48.8
Lehman	49.5	49.7	49.8	50.2	50.6
Queens	45.2	45.7	44.7	44.8	44.8
York	51.8	50.1	50.7	50.6	54.1
Senior College Average	47.9	47.9	47.0	47.0	49.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	38.9	37.3	40.3	40.5	---
Medgar Evers	52.3	50.7	51.1	51.8	53.3
NYCCT	44.4	44.5	44.0	43.0	44.7
Staten Island	53.7	53.4	53.7	52.7	57.8
Comprehensive College Average	46.1	45.5	46.5	46.2	51.4
Community					
BMCC	44.7	47.6	39.0	37.0	42.5
Bronx	38.6	40.2	41.5	42.3	43.8
Hostos	36.8	33.2	33.0	32.9	35.4
Kingsborough	24.4	25.3	27.5	27.2	30.8
LaGuardia	38.2	36.6	36.7	36.8	42.5
Queensborough	33.2	34.1	37.5	35.2	39.7
Community College Average	36.7	37.6	36.1	34.9	39.3
University Average	43.8	44.0	43.1	42.5	46.0

**University Performance Management Process
2011-12 Year-End Report
Final**

PART B. CONTEXT INDICATORS

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 Use of technology to enrich courses and teaching will improve.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered totally online

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4
Brooklyn	1.2	1.3	1.9	2.3	2.3
City	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3
Hunter	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.2
John Jay	---	---	---	---	4.1
Lehman	2.5	3.1	3.6	4.7	5.7
Queens	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4
York	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.8
Senior College Average	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.6	---
Medgar Evers	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
NYCCT	0.3	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.8
Staten Island	0.9	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.6
Comprehensive College Average	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.7	0.8
Community					
BMCC	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.2
Bronx	0.0	0.5	2.0	0.6	0.1
Hostos	1.8	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.2
Kingsborough	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.8
LaGuardia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3
Queensborough	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5
Community College Average	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.4
University Average	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0

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 on the colleges' student information and submitted to OIRA as part of the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection. Fully online courses are those identified as "full online - all classwork is online".

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 Use of technology to enrich courses and teaching will improve.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially online

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.1	2.5
Brooklyn	6.1	9.2	9.5	10.9	13.1
City	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.8
Hunter	0.7	3.7	4.0	4.7	6.3
John Jay	---	---	---	---	0.9
Lehman	2.1	3.6	4.4	6.2	8.0
Queens	12.6	10.5	1.2	4.2	1.5
York	0.5	0.2	0.6	1.6	2.1
Senior College Average	3.6	4.4	2.9	4.3	4.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.6	---
Medgar Evers	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.3	1.1
NYCCT	3.0	0.5	4.4	3.1	4.2
Staten Island	0.2	0.5	0.6	1.1	1.8
Comprehensive College Average	1.0	0.5	1.6	1.5	2.7
Community					
BMCC	0.0	14.2	21.1	24.3	28.6
Bronx	1.4	0.7	0.0	1.6	1.9
Hostos	3.5	2.6	1.4	1.0	1.7
Kingsborough	9.4	10.4	13.3	13.5	17.5
LaGuardia	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.9
Queensborough	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.7	1.9
Community College Average	2.3	6.2	8.2	9.3	11.6
University Average	2.6	4.2	4.5	5.5	6.8

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 on the colleges' student information system and submitted to OIRA as part of the fall Show-Reg/Performance data collection. Partially online courses include those identified as "hybrid - between 20% and 80% of classwork is online", "partially online - some of the classwork is online" and "online - more than 80% of the classwork is online".

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	65.2	60.5	72.2	71.7	62.8
Brooklyn	52.1	50.9	51.4	58.2	76.0
City	67.8	68.9	64.8	64.4	66.9
Hunter	59.5	57.3	51.1	49.3	51.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	58.7
Lehman	69.4	63.3	69.1	68.7	67.5
Queens	65.3	59.1	65.3	58.5	59.9
York	100.0	100.0	68.7	100.0	99.7
Senior College Average	62.7	59.5	60.6	59.9	59.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	58.6	58.0	64.5	61.6	---
Staten Island	68.6	72.8	73.1	55.6	66.3
Comprehensive College Average	61.6	62.4	67.3	59.4	66.3
University Average					
	62.5	59.8	61.3	59.8	60.3
Graduate					
School of Journalism	---	---	68.1	65.2	60.2
Graduate School	---	---	93.2	92.7	94.9
Law School	---	---	88.1	91.4	82.2

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. FTEs are apportioned for team-taught and cross-listed classes, but cannot be apportioned for a very small number of classes that are both team-taught and also cross-listed/combined, due to limitations in the available data. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in graduate courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total FTEs in all graduate courses. 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, the School of Journalism and the Law School; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	52.7	49.0	49.4	49.4	46.1
Brooklyn	48.6	45.3	47.5	43.5	42.6
City	47.2	48.1	49.9	48.4	45.4
Hunter	44.8	45.2	40.2	39.5	37.8
John Jay	---	---	---	---	37.2
Lehman	54.1	52.4	49.5	48.1	49.3
Queens	49.5	44.6	47.2	44.8	42.5
York	50.4	54.1	57.7	59.8	57.7
Senior College Average	49.2	47.5	47.7	46.1	43.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	45.6	45.7	47.3	40.9	---
Medgar Evers	46.7	53.5	53.3	47.1	44.7
NYCCT	47.2	49.7	47.8	48.4	43.7
Staten Island	47.1	46.7	38.4	35.8	39.5
Comprehensive College Average	46.7	48.2	45.7	42.5	42.2
Community					
BMCC	52.7	47.2	47.1	46.3	43.4
Bronx	62.8	63.4	58.7	59.0	55.7
Hostos	66.4	62.7	58.5	55.7	50.9
Kingsborough	53.3	52.9	53.8	54.2	49.9
LaGuardia	47.0	45.5	42.1	41.5	39.7
Queensborough	54.2	51.8	51.6	54.7	50.0
Community College Average	54.1	51.7	50.2	50.1	46.6
University Average	50.5	49.2	48.2	46.9	44.5

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. 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. 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, the School of Journalism and the Law School; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections, tutorial and office hours, and courses with less than 5 students are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	50.3	46.4	45.4	44.7	42.7
Brooklyn	47.9	43.8	46.6	42.5	41.5
City	41.4	42.2	45.6	44.4	41.0
Hunter	37.4	38.1	34.9	34.8	32.8
John Jay	---	---	---	---	33.9
Lehman	50.1	49.1	45.1	43.6	45.5
Queens	45.0	40.5	42.2	41.1	37.7
York	48.6	53.4	56.6	58.2	56.5
Senior College Average	45.4	43.8	44.3	42.9	40.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	43.5	44.0	45.2	38.1	---
Medgar Evers	46.7	53.5	53.3	47.1	44.7
NYCCT	47.2	49.7	47.8	48.4	43.7
Staten Island	44.7	44.4	35.9	33.8	37.3
Comprehensive College Average	45.6	47.4	44.5	41.5	41.4
Community					
BMCC	52.7	47.2	47.1	46.3	43.4
Bronx	62.8	63.4	58.7	59.0	55.7
Hostos	66.4	62.7	58.5	55.7	50.9
Kingsborough	53.3	52.9	53.8	54.2	49.9
LaGuardia	47.0	45.5	42.1	41.5	39.7
Queensborough	54.2	51.8	51.6	54.7	50.0
Community College Average	54.1	51.7	50.2	50.1	46.6
University Average	48.9	47.8	46.7	45.7	43.1

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. 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. 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. College Now sections, tutorial and office hours, and courses with less than 5 students are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	65.1	61.6	69.4	70.6	63.3
Brooklyn	51.4	50.7	50.3	47.0	72.6
City	70.9	71.6	70.1	69.5	68.2
Hunter	66.7	65.0	53.5	51.8	51.9
John Jay	---	---	---	---	60.9
Lehman	71.2	65.8	69.4	71.2	66.6
Queens	66.8	61.2	68.4	59.7	63.0
York	100.0	100.0	89.8	100.0	100.0
Senior College Average	65.5	62.5	61.6	59.3	61.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.4	56.7	61.8	61.2	---
Staten Island	78.7	79.2	72.3	60.9	66.2
Comprehensive College Average	66.5	63.8	63.6	60.8	66.2
University Average	65.6	62.6	62.8	60.2	61.6

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the CUNYfirst faculty workload data collection. 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. 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, the School of Journalism and the Law School; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. Tutorial and office hours, and courses with less than 5 students are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of veteran full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	323	304	306	303	298
Brooklyn	314	294	313	292	308
City	312	320	321	296	318
Hunter	406	417	451	414	404
John Jay	---	---	---	---	174
Lehman	201	203	196	185	175
Queens	346	321	343	340	330
York	106	104	97	90	93
Senior College Total	2,008	1,963	2,027	1,920	2,100
Comprehensive					
John Jay	194	176	175	163	---
Medgar Evers	76	79	77	80	77
NYCCT	207	209	205	187	186
Staten Island	191	206	228	211	201
Comprehensive College Total	668	670	685	641	464
Community					
BMCC	215	217	223	210	210
Bronx	132	140	147	131	124
Hostos	94	91	82	81	81
Kingsborough	159	160	170	160	143
LaGuardia	130	131	129	129	117
Queensborough	177	182	166	151	149
Community College Total	907	921	917	862	824
Graduate					
Graduate School	---	---	112	110	114
School of Journalism	---	---	5	4	7
Law School	---	---	24	24	20
University Total	3,583	3,554	3,770	3,561	3,529

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from CUNYfirst Human Capital Management (HCM). Figures reflect the number of veteran full-time professorial faculty (not eligible for contractual release time) in the term indicated. This indicator excludes those in non-teaching departments (counselors and librarians), those in substitute titles and those on leave (all types, not just unpaid). This is the denominator for the indicator "Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty".

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	63	78	81	83	60
Brooklyn	75	98	103	113	90
City	67	93	99	113	97
Hunter	84	89	109	118	113
John Jay	---	---	---	---	99
Lehman	57	66	63	69	75
Queens	79	104	119	124	108
York	30	50	57	74	61
Senior College Total	455	578	631	694	703
Comprehensive					
John Jay	78	96	122	130	---
Medgar Evers	29	35	36	35	33
NYCCT	57	90	115	132	133
Staten Island	50	49	82	88	78
Comprehensive College Total	214	270	355	385	244
Community					
BMCC	59	77	88	100	96
Bronx	41	33	37	47	50
Hostos	23	29	33	37	36
Kingsborough	29	36	46	59	76
LaGuardia	42	55	73	96	98
Queensborough	51	47	59	78	83
Community College Total	245	277	336	417	439
Graduate					
Graduate School	---	---	6	4	3
School of Journalism	---	---	4	6	3
Law School	---	---	2	2	4
University Total	914	1,125	1,334	1,508	1,396

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from CUNYfirst Human Capital Management (HCM). Figures reflect the number of new full-time professorial faculty (eligible for contractual release time) in the term indicated. This indicator excludes those in non-teaching departments (counselors and librarians), those in substitute titles and those on leave (all types, not just unpaid). This is the denominator for the indicator "Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time".

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Undergraduate student-faculty ratio

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	20.4	19.8	18.9	18.1	19.8
Brooklyn	17.2	17.0	14.4	13.7	14.0
City	15.4	15.4	14.2	13.2	13.2
Hunter	19.1	18.4	17.5	14.5	16.0
John Jay	---	---	---	---	17.5
Lehman	14.8	15.3	13.4	13.3	13.7
Queens	18.1	18.2	16.1	16.4	16.5
York	16.9	17.6	17.0	17.1	18.4
Senior College Average	17.7	17.5	15.9	15.0	15.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	19.5	19.2	18.2	18.1	---
Medgar Evers	15.9	17.8	18.8	18.1	19.3
NYCCT	15.4	16.0	16.5	16.8	17.5
Staten Island	18.6	18.2	17.0	16.5	17.6
Comprehensive College Average	17.4	17.7	17.4	17.2	17.9
Community					
BMCC	20.8	21.2	20.2	20.6	21.0
Bronx	16.8	17.2	18.2	18.0	18.5
Hostos	16.3	16.9	17.4	17.3	17.9
Kingsborough	18.9	19.6	20.6	20.1	19.8
LaGuardia	19.7	19.7	18.0	17.2	18.1
Queensborough	17.5	18.4	20.2	18.9	19.3
Community College Average	18.8	19.4	19.4	18.9	19.3
University Average	18.0	18.2	17.5	16.9	17.5

Note: This indicator is calculated by summing the student FTEs in undergraduate sections and dividing by the sum of faculty FTEs in undergraduate sections. FTEs are apportioned for team-taught and cross-listed classes, but cannot be correctly apportioned for a very small number of classes that are both team-taught and also crosslisted/combined, due to limitations in the available data. Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the faculty workload collection from CUNYfirst. Prior to 2009, student and faculty FTEs were computed from data from the legacy Staff and Teaching Load collection.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	468	470	458	479	421
Brooklyn	511	512	500	467	476
City	498	541	535	513	522
Hunter	645	661	654	630	631
John Jay	---	---	---	---	332
Lehman	349	358	349	354	336
Queens	609	620	610	612	574
York	167	188	199	204	189
Senior College Total	3,247	3,350	3,305	3,259	3,481
Comprehensive					
John Jay	382	400	414	335	---
Medgar Evers	148	156	170	169	159
NYCCT	327	366	393	369	365
Staten Island	322	329	339	324	311
Comprehensive College Total	1,179	1,251	1,316	1,197	835
Community					
BMCC	364	361	392	385	396
Bronx	255	256	247	268	264
Hostos	155	148	157	158	156
Kingsborough	282	296	315	325	333
LaGuardia	257	265	266	293	287
Queensborough	284	284	305	321	313
Community College Total	1,597	1,610	1,682	1,750	1,749
University Total	6,023	6,211	6,303	6,206	6,065

Note: This indicator reflects data in the HR employee 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. City includes Sophie Davis.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of FTE part-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	186	208	256	237	238
Brooklyn	247	295	355	299	302
City	123	318	449	330	330
Hunter	339	372	549	409	434
John Jay	---	---	---	---	297
Lehman	192	202	279	227	190
Queens	284	323	311	345	322
York	115	110	116	120	135
Senior College Total	1,486	1,828	2,315	1,967	2,247
Comprehensive					
John Jay	268	278	364	249	---
Medgar Evers	113	101	180	153	146
NYCCT	294	285	367	335	375
Staten Island	234	247	286	309	275
Comprehensive College Total	909	911	1,198	1,046	796
Community					
BMCC	311	378	401	425	476
Bronx	118	117	177	151	172
Hostos	71	73	86	100	117
Kingsborough	202	212	251	259	247
LaGuardia	269	283	306	336	352
Queensborough	216	227	274	257	304
Community College Total	1,187	1,290	1,496	1,528	1,669
University Total	3,582	4,029	5,009	4,541	4,712

Note: Number of teaching appointment hours of adjuncts divided by 13.5. City includes Sophie Davis.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of full-time executive and professional staff

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	266	267	281	282	274
Brooklyn	261	284	283	298	293
City	333	359	367	380	380
Hunter	352	383	395	400	400
John Jay	---	---	---	---	249
Lehman	214	222	242	267	263
Queens	321	348	313	321	308
York	134	158	180	188	179
Senior College Total	1,881	2,021	2,061	2,136	2,346
Comprehensive					
John Jay	207	239	250	235	---
Medgar Evers	174	180	180	182	180
NYCCT	181	189	222	216	198
Staten Island	188	186	201	209	210
Comprehensive College Total	750	794	853	842	588
Community					
BMCC	203	207	212	225	209
Bronx	159	166	177	187	180
Hostos	126	133	141	145	148
Kingsborough	201	204	223	243	238
LaGuardia	266	291	301	287	291
Queensborough	176	190	203	219	220
Community College Total	1,131	1,191	1,257	1,306	1,286
University Total	3,762	4,006	4,171	4,284	4,220

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Number of non-ESL SEEK students

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	83	74	89	72	98
Brooklyn	170	206	151	191	211
City	219	148	179	128	131
Hunter	100	92	95	67	74
John Jay	---	---	---	---	302
Lehman	200	151	183	136	168
Queens	188	197	241	198	225
York	147	167	154	141	156
Senior College Total	1,107	1,035	1,092	933	1,365
Comprehensive					
John Jay	141	123	182	242	---
Medgar Evers	33	35	33	17	17
NYCCT	17	13	18	33	18
Staten Island	---	---	16	6	2
Comprehensive College Total	191	171	249	298	37
University Total	1,298	1,206	1,341	1,231	1,402

Note: Students who are both SEEK and ESL (based on ESL course enrollment in the first term) are excluded. Counts for all years have been recalculated to exclude students who were no longer enrolled in the fall term after entry.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	69	129	119	128	113
Brooklyn	41	21	23	31	29
City	35	85	53	43	40
Hunter	51	41	27	17	21
John Jay	---	---	---	---	17
Lehman	13	30	40	16	18
Queens	45	46	47	58	44
York	43	33	36	28	40
Senior College Total	297	385	345	321	322
Comprehensive					
John Jay	4	5	4	17	---
Medgar Evers	---	---	---	1	---
NYCCT	3	1	---	2	---
Staten Island	---	1	---	1	3
Comprehensive College Total	7	7	4	21	3
University Total	304	392	349	342	325

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. Counts for all years have been recalculated to exclude students who were no longer enrolled two years after entry.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.5	86.6	92.0	95.0	88.7
Medgar Evers	82.6	82.2	82.2	87.0	88.4
NYCCT	96.0	94.5	94.5	96.6	94.3
Staten Island	95.4	93.8	92.9	94.2	93.8
Comprehensive College Average	90.0	90.5	91.0	93.9	92.2
Community					
BMCC	85.2	86.9	87.0	86.2	86.9
Bronx	80.4	81.0	81.8	81.4	81.2
Hostos	67.7	74.4	78.2	78.0	77.9
Kingsborough	78.5	76.8	77.0	76.3	73.1
LaGuardia	86.0	83.6	83.7	84.6	89.3
Queensborough	90.1	89.9	88.3	88.0	87.5
Community College Average	82.2	82.6	82.9	82.6	82.9
University Average	83.8	84.3	84.6	84.6	84.4

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 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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	89.8	84.6	91.4	92.0	93.8
Medgar Evers	83.3	87.6	82.9	86.9	86.2
NYCCT	94.1	94.5	94.1	95.1	93.9
Staten Island	93.4	93.3	92.5	93.8	93.6
Comprehensive College Average	91.3	91.1	91.1	92.9	92.1
Community					
BMCC	80.8	82.2	82.9	82.5	80.2
Bronx	80.0	85.3	83.1	84.6	82.4
Hostos	75.1	81.3	83.8	81.4	75.7
Kingsborough	75.1	77.2	72.6	67.7	67.8
LaGuardia	77.3	80.8	78.9	79.3	85.3
Queensborough	84.8	84.9	84.5	88.3	86.6
Community College Average	79.2	81.9	80.5	79.9	79.6
University Average	81.9	83.8	82.7	82.3	81.8

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 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. 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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

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 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	71.1	71.3	69.1	77.5	73.8
Medgar Evers	64.5	62.8	63.4	68.8	75.3
NYCCT	92.6	92.8	90.7	92.2	88.2
Staten Island	92.2	89.9	89.5	84.6	86.5
Comprehensive College Average	82.5	81.2	80.2	82.7	83.1
Community					
BMCC	67.9	65.9	58.8	60.3	57.4
Bronx	53.7	48.5	40.0	40.9	42.0
Hostos	65.3	69.9	69.5	61.6	65.1
Kingsborough	59.9	55.2	49.7	43.9	40.7
LaGuardia	69.9	66.5	61.5	61.3	61.4
Queensborough	66.2	62.6	59.8	60.3	61.1
Community College Average	64.0	60.7	55.5	54.1	53.5
University Average	68.7	65.7	61.5	60.6	59.4

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 math. Through fall 2010, 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 fall 2011, students are considered math proficient if he or she passed the math test prior to the term or passed the last-in-sequence math course in spring 2011 (grade C or better). 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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Average increase in basic skills reading test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	17.5	16.6*	19.2*	12.7*	18.1*
Brooklyn	11.2	13.5	13.9	12.0*	6.2*
City	13.8	13.8	14.1*	13.2*	10.2*
Hunter	10.7*	13.9*	7.0*	7.4*	13.5*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	14.2
Lehman	7.5	14.9	17.5*	12.8*	9.5*
Queens	13.5	14.3	17.7	19.3	16.5
York	12.8	13.8	12.6	13.4	12.3
Senior College Average	12.3	14.3	14.7	13.9	13.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14.9	15.8	17.1	16.2	---
Medgar Evers	9.0	14.8	13.6	14.8	10.6
NYCCT	10.6	11.2	10.4	12.9	12.3
Staten Island	15.1	17.3	15.8	17.8	12.8
Comprehensive College Average	13.1	14.5	14.3	15.1	12.2
Community					
BMCC	12.2	14.2	15.1	13.4	14.2
Bronx	11.4	7.5*	8.5	10.9	12.8
Hostos	1.5*	14.4*	9.5*	18.2*	12.0
Kingsborough	13.4	11.8	12.8	10.6	10.1
LaGuardia	11.8	11.6	13.7	15.7	12.5
Queensborough	10.1	13.8	11.6	13.7	15.8
Community College Average	11.7	12.7	12.8	12.9	12.9
University Average	12.5	14.1	13.8	13.8	12.7

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

New Methodology

Average increase in basic skills writing (essay) test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.1*	13.4*
Brooklyn	1.4	1.6	1.6	2.2*	3.3*
City	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	8.3*
Hunter	0.9	1.5	0.9*	1.5*	2.3*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	11.0
Lehman	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	8.0
Queens	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.1	11.5
York	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	12.1
Senior College Average	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	10.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1.5	1.9	1.5	1.7	---
Medgar Evers	1.1	1.4*	1.2	1.1	8.5
NYCCT	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8	8.8
Staten Island	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	6.6
Comprehensive College Average	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	8.0
Community					
BMCC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.0	7.1
Bronx	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.1	3.5
Hostos	1.1*	1.2*	0.8*	0.8	3.8
Kingsborough	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	8.0
LaGuardia	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	8.5*
Queensborough	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	8.7
Community College Average	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	6.6
University Average	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	7.9

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. Average increases for summer 2011 reflect changes from previous years in test forms used, score ranges, and populations retaking the writing essay. Percentages for summer 2011 reflect the use of the CAT-W test for retesting whereas summer 2010 reflects use of the COMPASS Writing test for retesting. CAT-W test scores ranged from 0 to 96, whereas COMPASS Writing test scores ranged from 0 to 12. The population retesting in summer 2011 was smaller than those who retested in summer 2010. Therefore average increases in test scores for summer 2011 are not comparable to previous years.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

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

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	23.0*	34.5*	29.0*	---	20.0*
Brooklyn	17.0	17.7	22.8	26.2	27.0
City	13.4	19.9	19.7	17.7	20.9*
Hunter	14.5*	20.0*	8.5*	---	---
John Jay	---	---	---	---	21.4
Lehman	12.3	10.4	22.2	22.3	23.3
Queens	15.1*	16.8*	30.4*	37.8*	45.7*
York	12.5	14.7	16.5	15.0	20.6
Senior College Average	13.3	14.9	20.3	19.5	22.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	13.4	14.1	20.1	17.6	---
Medgar Evers	15.4	24.3	31.6	33.8	30.8
NYCCT	18.6	15.5	17.9	18.5	18.2
Staten Island	13.1	17.2	16.2	14.8	18.7
Comprehensive College Average	14.4	16.8	19.0	18.3	20.4
Community					
BMCC	17.2	15.3	19.7	19.4	16.0
Bronx	3.4*	13.0*	7.9	7.4	5.1
Hostos	8.4*	12.5*	11.8*	12.1*	17.5
Kingsborough	13.7	11.3	16.9	10.8	17.7
LaGuardia	24.2	23.0	24.2	20.4	20.3
Queensborough	11.0*	12.5*	22.2	16.9	18.2
Community College Average	16.1	15.6	18.3	15.0	16.9
University Average	14.3	15.8	19.2	17.5	19.7

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.2 Colleges will improve basic skills and ESL outcomes.

Average increase in basic skills COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score after summer immersion

	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>	<u>Summer 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	8.0*	22.3*	15.6*	27.3*	9.3*
Brooklyn	25.2	26.8	31.6	31.4	18.4
City	12.3	17.9	18.5	13.8	15.6
Hunter	19.5*	18.6*	15.0*	27.4*	2.0*
John Jay	---	---	---	---	23.9
Lehman	11.0	12.3	22.5	25.5	26.2
Queens	19.8	22.4	30.5	36.9*	44.0
York	14.4	14.3	16.5	20.2	24.4
Senior College Average	14.7	16.8	22.0	23.1	23.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10.5	11.4	15.8	18.4	---
Medgar Evers	20.8*	29.1	35.0	44.1	44.6
NYCCT	16.5	19.1	19.2	17.4	18.2
Staten Island	14.0	19.9	15.6	14.7	21.2
Comprehensive College Average	13.6	17.8	17.9	18.3	22.7
Community					
BMCC	17.1	19.7	25.8	27.1	19.8
Bronx	8.5	9.4*	8.7	16.6*	4.6
Hostos	9.9*	19.1*	22.8*	20.2*	12.6
Kingsborough	11.8	17.3	14.5	12.6	18.5
LaGuardia	21.5	22.4	20.4	23.2	21.6
Queensborough	13.8	18.1*	20.1	18.7	20.4
Community College Average	14.9	19.0	19.3	20.4	18.5
University Average	14.3	17.6	19.4	20.0	21.8

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. The population retesting in summer 2011 was substantially larger than those who retested in summer 2010.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.3 Colleges will improve student academic performance, particularly in the first 60 credits of study.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	79.5	80.2	76.8	76.8	74.2
Brooklyn	78.2	78.2	79.6	81.6	81.7
City	82.0	83.2	82.9	81.6	84.8
Hunter	87.5	81.6	87.9	89.0	89.4
John Jay	---	---	---	---	72.3
Lehman	82.1	78.9	80.3	80.3	86.5
Queens	85.3	87.9	84.8	88.3	85.3
York	72.9	76.4	77.7	80.1	80.6
Senior College Average	81.5	80.9	81.6	82.6	89.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	69.0	72.0	71.0	73.0	---
Medgar Evers	70.1	70.5	72.6	70.1	72.8
NYCCT	68.6	68.7	72.2	69.1	73.9
Staten Island	85.8	84.8	82.7	84.8	85.1
Comprehensive College Average	72.6	73.6	74.2	73.8	77.1
Community					
BMCC	79.1	76.7	77.4	79.3	79.6
Bronx	75.4	78.7	73.0	75.4	78.6
Hostos	75.8	80.1	78.3	78.7	80.3
Kingsborough	83.3	84.7	84.8	83.1	82.9
LaGuardia	73.7	74.2	72.2	73.2	73.6
Queensborough	79.2	78.3	76.7	77.0	75.7
Community College Average	78.2	78.2	77.2	77.9	78.3
University Average	77.3	77.5	77.3	77.7	78.6

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.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

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>2006</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2007</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	68.2	68.2	71.5	71.7	---
Medgar Evers	53.7	55.6	59.4	58.1	62.0
NYCCT	67.7	66.7	66.9	68.3	69.4
Staten Island	70.4	70.7	71.5	70.8	72.8
Comprehensive College Average	67.2	67.2	68.1	67.9	69.1
Community					
BMCC	61.9	63.4	63.3	67.0	65.2
Bronx	63.8	62.9	66.6	61.5	59.7
Hostos	60.2	62.9	58.4	64.2	65.0
Kingsborough	68.2	69.1	73.1	71.2	68.2
LaGuardia	66.9	66.8	67.4	70.0	69.4
Queensborough	68.3	72.2	73.5	72.9	73.9
Community College Average	65.3	66.5	67.5	68.7	67.5
University Average	66.0	66.8	67.7	68.4	67.9

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters programs.

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 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>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	30.5	28.9	30.8	29.6	29.7
Medgar Evers	20.7	20.0	24.9	21.6	18.9
NYCCT	25.8	26.0	29.8	28.6	31.3
Staten Island	31.7	30.5	27.9	31.4	33.9
Comprehensive College Average	27.8	27.5	28.9	29.0	30.2
Community					
BMCC	27.6	26.6	27.5	25.7	27.1
Bronx	22.3	23.7	22.7	22.2	22.1
Hostos	22.2	20.9	24.1	25.5	24.6
Kingsborough	32.0	38.8	38.7	36.3	37.1
LaGuardia	30.2	28.2	27.7	28.2	29.5
Queensborough	29.0	30.7	28.8	28.1	30.6
Community College Average	28.4	29.2	28.9	28.0	29.3
University Average	28.2	28.6	28.9	28.4	29.6

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 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates and ensure students make timely progress toward degree completion

University Target: 4.3 Graduation rates will increase progressively in associate, baccalaureate, and masters programs.

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>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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	13.5	12.7	15.8	13.1	11.6
Medgar Evers	10.8	14.6	11.9	14.6	10.2
NYCCT	12.4	12.7	10.9	10.1	8.5
Staten Island	13.3	14.5	12.5	12.0	10.2
Comprehensive College Average	12.7	13.4	12.8	11.9	10.0
Community					
BMCC	11.9	14.2	12.5	13.9	10.7
Bronx	14.3	13.2	13.1	13.4	11.3
Hostos	8.9	11.9	8.7	9.7	11.1
Kingsborough	12.1	10.4	10.6	9.9	7.9
LaGuardia	9.6	10.1	11.1	10.1	8.5
Queensborough	14.3	14.2	14.2	11.8	12.7
Community College Average	12.1	12.5	12.1	11.8	10.3
University Average	12.3	12.8	12.3	11.8	10.2

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	519	475	491	483	418
City	544	481	618	476	488
Hunter	426	419	436	528	767
Lehman	536	521	495	521	290
Queens	526	807	890	746	661
York	15	22	26	22	37
Senior College Total	2,566	2,725	2,956	2,776	2,661
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	8	12	15	14	11
NYCCT	5	0	0	5	4
Staten Island	304	236	223	217	237
Comprehensive College Total	317	248	238	236	252
University Total	2,883	2,973	3,194	3,012	2,913

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

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	406	398	405	392	375
City	345	295	355	184	233
Hunter	394	361	335	396	537
Lehman	397	373	341	298	237
Queens	392	698	789	680	595
York	16	22	27	23	39
Senior College Total	1,950	2,147	2,252	1,973	2,016
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	8	12	15	14	12
NYCCT	5	2	9	5	4
Staten Island	259	225	213	215	235
Comprehensive College Total	272	239	237	234	251
University Total	2,222	2,386	2,489	2,207	2,267

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	409	402	403	397	357
City	315	266	330	180	239
Hunter	399	383	351	428	560
Lehman	411	374	332	299	244
Queens	392	704	805	712	602
York	15	23	26	24	38
Senior College Total	1,941	2,152	2,247	2,040	2,040
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	8	12	16	13	13
NYCCT	15	15	23	18	10
Staten Island	264	223	221	214	236
Comprehensive College Total	287	250	260	245	259
University Total	2,228	2,402	2,507	2,285	2,299

University Performance Management Process

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	320	402	433	451	407
City	288	330	425	251	321
Hunter	382	451	416	530	641
Lehman	342	434	412	400	354
Queens	347	837	945	829	690
York	10	22	27	23	34
Senior College Total	1,689	2,476	2,658	2,484	2,447
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	9	22	28	28	23
NYCCT	5	2	9	5	4
Staten Island	298	240	254	218	283
Comprehensive College Total	312	264	291	251	310
University Total	2,001	2,740	2,949	2,735	2,757

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Number taking the NCLEX exam

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior					
Hunter	76	74	102	101	99
Lehman	100	96	65	41	80
Senior College Total	176	170	167	142	179
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	18	14	27	35	46
NYCCT	85	107	106	83	94
Staten Island	132	152	124	98	141
Comprehensive College Total	235	273	257	216	281
Community					
BMCC	200	205	173	162	184
Bronx	108	50	59	32	39
Hostos	25	26	37	57	47
Kingsborough	122	119	132	132	155
LaGuardia	79	129	126	134	169
Queensborough	138	142	133	129	132
Community College Total	672	671	660	646	726
University Total	1,083	1,114	1,084	1,004	1,186

University Performance Management Process

2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Hunter	73	76	102	89	98
Lehman	109	105	67	34	77
Senior College Total	182	181	169	123	175
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	18	14	28	34	48
NYCCT	84	108	107	80	95
Staten Island	135	151	127	101	143
Comprehensive College Total	237	273	262	215	286
Community					
BMCC	201	211	175	169	187
Bronx	112	44	55	35	40
Hostos	26	31	39	58	39
Kingsborough	119	120	138	131	159
LaGuardia	80	125	132	143	171
Queensborough	142	139	137	132	136
Community College Total	680	670	676	668	732
University Total	1,099	1,124	1,107	1,006	1,193

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: 5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain the quality of successful graduates.

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

	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Senior					
Hunter	26	38	34	60	77
Lehman	21	48	79	104	98
York	21	24	26	34	34
Senior College Total	68	110	139	198	209
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	17	33	22	31	43
NYCCT	0	15	15	45	81
Staten Island	36	36	40	37	42
Comprehensive College Total	53	84	77	113	166
University Total	121	194	216	311	375

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	69.8	65.9	65.4	68.4	71.4
Medgar Evers	56.8*	63.9	63.3	76.1	61.4
NYCCT	53.1	58.1	51.5	62.3	66.9
Staten Island	40.8	38.5	46.8	38.5*	77.8
Comprehensive College Average	53.7	56.2	53.6	62.5	68.1
Community					
BMCC	52.6	61.0	62.8	66.8	74.4
Bronx	44.6	53.2	51.2	52.4	59.8
Hostos	37.3	51.3	42.2	61.8	65.4
Kingsborough	52.1	55.9	62.8	70.1	69.8
LaGuardia	43.7	62.2	57.0	56.5	63.4
Queensborough	44.8	58.9	60.0	46.3	69.0
Community College Average	46.7	57.8	57.6	58.0	66.9
University Average	48.0	57.5	56.8	58.8	67.1

Note: Based on responses to a survey of certificate and associate graduates. Graduates were asked to report on their education 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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	96.8	97.6	98.1	92.9	87.8
Medgar Evers	97.3	100.0	95.8	94.4	87.7
NYCCT	94.1	98.6	94.6	92.7	89.7
Staten Island	94.7	92.4	98.8	77.6	89.1
Comprehensive College Average	95.0	97.4	96.2	90.9	89.0
Community					
BMCC	94.7	95.4	93.9	92.0	94.0
Bronx	92.5	96.7	90.7	88.5	91.1
Hostos	95.8	98.7	91.6	95.4	92.4
Kingsborough	90.7	95.2	95.5	94.1	90.2
LaGuardia	96.4	97.0	95.8	90.4	89.0
Queensborough	95.2	97.7	93.8	87.8	91.8
Community College Average	94.3	96.6	93.8	90.6	91.4
University Average	94.5	96.8	94.2	90.7	90.9

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 meet established enrollment targets for degree programs; mean SATs/CAAs of baccalaureate entrants will rise.

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

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1139	1156	1183	1218	1210
Brooklyn	1058	1053	1106	1113	1134
City	1009	1032	1049	1076	1083
Hunter	1096	1106	1138	1155	1151
John Jay	---	---	---	---	954
Lehman	906	925	989	1017	1011
Queens	1039	1067	1089	1117	1116
York	852	867	901	908	903
Senior College Average	1043	1055	1087	1103	1086
Comprehensive					
John Jay	934	944	943	942	---
Medgar Evers	855	875	889	856	849
NYCCT	921	909	906	928	958
Staten Island	1016	1009	1007	1010	1013
Comprehensive College Average	951	957	959	958	999
University Average	1027	1037	1060	1066	1078

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	400	373	412	495	616
Brooklyn	473	501	516	470	568
City	309	355	403	343	475
Hunter	374	349	369	391	474
John Jay	---	---	---	---	526
Lehman	301	312	305	317	381
Queens	451	492	615	535	484
York	185	178	210	200	293
Senior College Total	2,493	2,560	2,830	2,751	3,817
Comprehensive					
John Jay	155	337	338	500	---
Medgar Evers	32	56	42	30	36
NYCCT	57	69	62	96	109
Staten Island	377	538	584	643	365
Comprehensive College Total	621	1,000	1,026	1,269	510
University Total	3,114	3,560	3,856	4,020	4,327

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	189	168	183	218	218
Brooklyn	231	201	247	183	243
City	92	72	111	102	84
Hunter	82	97	92	127	95
John Jay	---	---	---	---	79
Lehman	121	142	138	146	218
Queens	111	129	157	116	146
York	50	51	79	58	76
Senior College Total	876	860	1,007	950	1,159
Comprehensive					
John Jay	66	66	86	75	---
Medgar Evers	33	25	20	10	18
NYCCT	76	100	110	118	134
Staten Island	178	399	252	352	342
Comprehensive College Total	353	590	468	555	494
University Total	1,229	1,450	1,475	1,505	1,653

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

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program

Associate Programs

	<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>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.7	62.9	58.7	65.9	61.2
Medgar Evers	58.9	54.5	59.1	62.5	59.8
NYCCT	38.7	41.0	47.3	51.8	56.3
Staten Island	61.0	56.4	60.2	66.8	64.3
Comprehensive College Average	58.5	55.7	58.2	63.6	61.0
Community					
BMCC	46.6	47.5	51.2	51.0	47.7
Bronx	49.6	45.9	49.2	50.3	50.1
Hostos	46.6	41.6	46.3	46.3	54.5
Kingsborough	45.0	48.5	45.8	46.4	47.8
LaGuardia	46.3	47.5	50.7	50.1	49.5
Queensborough	51.8	56.5	58.0	57.4	54.9
Community College Average	47.3	48.8	50.5	50.6	49.7
University Average	49.2	50.1	51.8	52.7	51.3

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program in the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2009-10 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program in fall 2010.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program

Associate Programs

	<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>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	16.7*	56.5*	43.8	34.0	13.6
NYCCT	39.3	39.4	44.0	44.5	49.4
Staten Island	41.3	49.0	49.1	54.2	60.6
Comprehensive College Average	39.4	42.6	45.2	45.9	50.0
Community					
BMCC	28.1	25.4	30.5	35.5	30.0
Bronx	22.3	23.8	25.0	24.9	32.2
Hostos	20.8	19.4	26.5	29.8	31.6
Kingsborough	30.6	32.5	35.5	36.8	37.2
LaGuardia	27.7	25.5	28.6	23.8	32.1
Queensborough	17.9	20.6	21.5	23.6	27.1
Community College Average	26.1	26.0	29.4	30.3	32.1
University Average	29.7	30.5	33.4	34.1	36.7

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program in the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2009-10 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program in fall 2010.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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.

Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.41	2.40	2.55	2.52	2.45
Medgar Evers	2.70	1.97	2.14*	2.35	2.57
NYCCT	2.30	2.43*	2.12*	2.86	2.60
Staten Island	2.72	2.52	2.47	2.54	2.49
Comprehensive College Average	2.64	2.46	2.47	2.54	2.52
Community					
BMCC	2.56	2.61	2.62	2.70	2.62
Bronx	2.54	2.73	2.66	2.72	2.73
Hostos	2.69	2.48	2.55	2.61	2.60
Kingsborough	2.49	2.59	2.64	2.69	2.62
LaGuardia	2.57	2.70	2.72	2.64	2.68
Queensborough	2.45	2.55	2.49	2.59	2.63
Community College Average	2.53	2.61	2.61	2.66	2.64
University Average	2.55	2.58	2.58	2.63	2.62

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 2011-12 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.

Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	2.43*	2.67*	3.41*	3.02*	3.10*
NYCCT	2.52	2.49	2.51	2.54	2.70
Staten Island	2.83	2.60	2.62	2.64	2.73
Comprehensive College Average	2.74	2.59	2.61	2.63	2.73
Community					
BMCC	2.68	2.78	2.79	2.69	2.61
Bronx	2.68	2.76	2.79	2.85	2.88
Hostos	2.45	2.81	2.77	2.95	2.69
Kingsborough	2.32	2.56	2.54	2.75	2.63
LaGuardia	2.65	2.74	2.68	2.72	2.77
Queensborough	2.59	2.53	2.57	2.60	2.69
Community College Average	2.55	2.69	2.67	2.74	2.69
University Average	2.59	2.66	2.66	2.71	2.70

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 2011-12 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.

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	79.8	82.5	81.7	86.9	81.5
Medgar Evers	77.8	88.9	78.6	58.8*	76.3
NYCCT	77.8	73.3	79.2*	78.9*	89.7
Staten Island	77.1	80.2	76.3	71.5	72.2
Comprehensive College Average	78.1	80.7	78.0	75.2	75.3
Community					
BMCC	78.4	76.8	79.2	78.3	82.7
Bronx	78.9	76.6	81.3	79.4	82.0
Hostos	78.2	71.9	64.8	75.0	78.9
Kingsborough	71.0	73.4	75.7	79.0	80.2
LaGuardia	81.4	80.2	79.7	82.9	79.8
Queensborough	79.5	77.9	79.1	82.8	82.2
Community College Average	77.7	76.8	78.3	80.2	81.4
University Average	77.8	77.6	78.2	79.1	79.9

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 2011-12 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.

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	45.5*	41.7*	60.0*	50.0*	100.0*
NYCCT	64.9	72.2	76.9	89.7	73.4
Staten Island	80.0	79.9	81.4	78.2	71.5
Comprehensive College Average	73.6	76.3	80.7	79.8	72.2
Community					
BMCC	78.2	77.4	77.5	79.3	80.4
Bronx	75.9	73.5	72.2	79.3	77.5
Hostos	63.2*	64.3	76.5	73.2	73.6
Kingsborough	71.6	72.5	80.3	80.9	85.9
LaGuardia	80.8	77.8	81.3	71.6	84.5
Queensborough	70.3	73.7	76.5	74.3	77.8
Community College Average	75.1	74.5	78.2	77.1	81.3
University Average	74.9	74.9	79.0	77.7	78.8

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 2011-12 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: 7.3 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the # of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

College Now enrollment in college credit courses

	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	392	453	485	392	524
Brooklyn	193	268	272	313	330
City	696	742	469	358	375
Hunter	703	700	689	707	679
John Jay	---	---	---	---	652
Lehman	1,080	1,098	1,112	1,248	1,458
Queens	618	631	604	611	692
York	1,332	1,785	1,775	1,631	1,626
Senior College Total	5,014	5,677	5,406	5,260	6,336
Comprehensive					
John Jay	428	532	652	533	---
Medgar Evers	425	365	457	489	256
NYCCT	755	651	706	722	673
Staten Island	420	427	565	705	717
Comprehensive College Total	2,028	1,975	2,380	2,449	1,646
Community					
BMCC	689	508	529	615	760
Bronx	259	309	370	587	555
Hostos	1,118	1,074	858	844	938
Kingsborough	9,715	9,232	7,906	7,972	8,463
LaGuardia	2,765	2,419	2,063	2,144	2,663
Queensborough	1,966	1,883	1,602	1,444	1,409
Community College Total	16,512	15,425	13,328	13,606	14,788
University Total	23,554	23,077	21,114	21,315	22,770

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Last year's figures have been revised to reflect final figures. Current year figures are estimates because spring data are not final at this time. Final data for the current year will be provided in next year's report. Figures for all years have been revised for the College of Staten Island, the comprehensive subtotal and university total to exclude students in CSI's Discovery Institute.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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: 7.3 Colleges will meet 95% of enrollment targets for College Now, achieve successful completion rates, and increase the # 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 college credit courses

	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	93	95	92	94	93
Brooklyn	87	78	84	91	96
City	85	87	78	79	90
Hunter	87	89	86	91	93
John Jay	---	---	---	---	92
Lehman	96	96	96	95	97
Queens	92	89	89	94	96
York	89	91	88	88	89
Senior College Average	90	91	89	91	93
Comprehensive					
John Jay	73	80	90	93	---
Medgar Evers	78	84	85	85	89
NYCCT	83	64	69	79	81
Staten Island	91	89	92	93	94
Comprehensive College Average	82	77	83	87	89
Community					
BMCC	58	76	77	83	75
Bronx	68	89	88	83	86
Hostos	87	87	85	89	82
Kingsborough	92	93	93	93	91
LaGuardia	82	82	86	86	87
Queensborough	93	91	96	90	82
Community College Average	88	90	91	90	89
University Average	88	89	90	90	90

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. Last year's figures have been revised to reflect final data. For the current year, spring performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall only. Final data for the current year will be provided in next year's report. Figures for all years have been revised for the College of Staten Island, the comprehensive subtotal and University total to exclude students in CSI's Discovery Institute.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 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 (annual amounts)

	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$46,417,325	\$13,354,232	\$11,809,778	\$12,880,451	\$20,000,000
Brooklyn	\$12,291,490	\$7,095,776	\$14,278,026	\$26,003,508	\$11,314,204
City	\$62,556,378	\$64,471,766	\$29,701,234	\$37,108,502	\$43,641,310
Hunter	\$17,418,812	\$46,773,295	\$16,367,149	\$22,666,381	\$28,000,000
John Jay	---	---	---	\$4,913,961	\$11,000,000
Lehman	\$2,951,176	\$4,132,238	\$4,488,716	\$4,689,417	\$5,391,542
Queens	\$17,460,816	\$16,834,958	\$16,705,721	\$24,494,165	\$20,000,000
York	\$623,145	\$887,222	\$498,329	\$1,119,588	\$1,162,619
Senior College Total	\$159,719,142	\$153,549,487	\$93,848,953	\$133,875,973	\$140,509,675
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$3,468,672	\$4,597,398	\$8,583,287	---	---
Medgar Evers	\$2,837,493	\$3,887,678	\$520,338	\$230,024	\$500,000
NYCCT	\$1,521,788	\$982,879	\$1,035,285	\$1,112,370	\$825,351
Staten Island	\$1,380,839	\$1,412,030	\$2,579,820	\$3,485,255	\$3,200,000
Comprehensive College Total	\$9,208,792	\$10,879,985	\$12,718,730	\$4,827,649	\$4,525,351
Community					
BMCC	\$2,013,362	\$2,264,478	\$2,296,934	\$2,361,252	\$2,200,000
Bronx	\$1,648,799	\$1,860,384	\$1,612,546	\$1,651,416	\$1,978,371
Hostos	\$920,651	\$853,450	\$855,811	\$1,011,651	\$1,130,000
Kingsborough	\$1,339,893	\$1,626,737	\$1,745,379	\$3,829,656	\$1,700,000
LaGuardia	\$728,674	\$982,772	\$2,291,248	\$1,496,549	\$1,855,000
Queensborough	\$2,620,815	\$2,862,322	\$2,969,627	\$3,319,024	\$2,805,247
Community College Total	\$9,272,194	\$10,450,143	\$11,771,545	\$14,230,075	\$13,268,618
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$14,048,597	\$5,383,347	\$9,966,729	\$4,497,657	\$2,800,000
School of Journalism	\$5,115,266	\$1,974,297	\$1,679,181	\$7,453,546	\$1,500,352
Law School	\$968,847	\$1,088,221	\$1,231,778	\$1,356,019	\$1,776,197
University Total	\$199,332,838	\$184,030,336	\$132,111,346	\$169,009,896	\$165,654,193

Note: This indicator reflects a sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts. Figures for the prior year have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect final values. The University Total includes contributions (\$17 thousand in FY2011 and \$74 thousand in FY2012) for the School of Professional Studies, and for the Macaulay Honors College; \$1 million for FY2008, \$705 thousand for FY2009, \$894 thousand for FY2010, \$2.8 million for FY2011, and \$1.2 million for FY2012. The Community College Total and the University Total also include contributions for the New Community College (\$561 thousand for FY2011 and \$1.6 million for FY2012).

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Colleges will improve or maintain sound financial management and controls.

General Administration Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$7,677,759	\$7,243,226	\$7,524,534	\$6,876,131	7.4	6.9	6.9	6.5
Brooklyn	\$7,055,560	\$7,281,612	\$7,282,097	\$6,206,902	6.3	6.3	6.1	5.4
City	\$6,976,236	\$7,495,839	\$7,862,564	\$8,379,868	5.4	5.7	5.7	6.2
Hunter	\$9,169,877	\$9,431,240	\$9,472,225	\$8,565,236	6.9	6.9	6.5	5.7
John Jay	---	---	---	\$6,540,557	---	---	---	7.9
Lehman	\$4,170,532	\$3,868,044	\$4,335,890	\$4,562,261	5.4	4.9	5.0	5.3
Queens	\$7,242,914	\$6,474,324	\$8,086,647	\$7,217,915	6.1	5.4	6.2	5.7
York	\$5,147,699	\$4,349,905	\$4,995,713	\$4,145,131	11.0	9.0	9.4	8.0
Senior College Total/Avg	\$47,440,578	\$46,144,190	\$49,559,670	\$52,494,000	6.6	6.3	6.3	6.1
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$6,533,244	\$6,411,860	\$6,860,722	---	8.4	7.7	7.9	---
Medgar Evers	\$6,675,574	\$5,629,224	\$5,305,255	\$5,403,414	14.8	12.3	10.8	10.7
NYCCT	\$4,959,967	\$5,190,483	\$5,615,103	\$5,190,125	6.7	6.8	6.7	6.4
Staten Island	\$4,969,216	\$5,228,326	\$5,709,361	\$5,434,496	6.3	6.2	6.4	6.2
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$23,138,000	\$22,459,893	\$23,490,441	\$16,028,035	8.4	7.8	7.6	7.3
Community								
BMCC	\$13,785,038	\$15,631,736	\$5,494,607	\$5,477,813	14.9	14.7	4.8	4.8
Bronx	\$5,588,380	\$5,686,690	\$5,826,634	\$6,458,164	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.7
Hostos	\$3,974,827	\$4,195,948	\$4,862,246	\$4,262,750	9.7	9.5	10.2	9.1
Kingsborough	\$4,974,770	\$4,971,085	\$5,901,487	\$5,840,627	6.6	6.4	6.8	6.7
LaGuardia	\$5,665,386	\$6,444,486	\$7,088,432	\$6,886,105	6.9	7.5	7.6	7.3
Queensborough	\$3,917,933	\$4,154,289	\$4,097,631	\$4,177,241	6.1	5.8	5.1	5.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$37,906,334	\$41,084,234	\$33,271,037	\$33,102,699	9.2	9.2	6.8	6.8
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$3,354,976	\$4,767,649	\$3,665,178	\$3,672,997	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.3
University Total/Avg	\$111,839,888	\$114,455,967	\$109,986,326	\$105,297,732	7.4	7.1	6.5	6.3

Note: FY2010 "Percent of Total" has been revised since the 2010-11 PMP to correct community college vacation accruals. Data for FY 2012 will be available in next year's report. Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for president and provost offices, legal services, fiscal operations, campus development, and grants office.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Colleges will improve or maintain sound financial management and controls.

General Institutional Services Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Senior								
Baruch	\$10,933,931	\$10,191,530	\$11,495,562	\$11,445,695	10.6	9.8	10.5	10.8
Brooklyn	\$12,505,208	\$11,344,262	\$11,905,467	\$11,168,612	11.2	9.8	10.0	9.6
City	\$10,911,540	\$13,170,849	\$11,767,383	\$11,205,185	8.5	9.9	8.6	8.3
Hunter	\$11,282,248	\$10,909,586	\$11,486,059	\$13,023,423	8.4	8.0	7.9	8.7
John Jay	---	---	---	\$6,984,796	---	---	---	8.4
Lehman	\$7,379,239	\$6,926,287	\$7,782,152	\$7,087,091	9.6	8.7	9.1	8.3
Queens	\$12,814,363	\$11,788,245	\$12,902,159	\$12,986,000	10.8	9.9	9.9	10.3
York	\$5,197,739	\$5,624,407	\$6,288,783	\$6,357,071	11.1	11.6	11.9	12.3
Senior College Total/Avg	\$71,024,267	\$69,955,165	\$73,627,565	\$80,257,875	9.9	9.5	9.4	9.4
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$7,281,030	\$7,566,881	\$7,041,246	---	9.3	9.1	8.1	---
Medgar Evers	\$2,699,319	\$3,126,774	\$3,473,936	\$4,055,270	6.0	6.9	7.1	8.0
NYCCT	\$6,588,042	\$6,632,557	\$7,456,819	\$6,503,072	8.9	8.7	8.8	8.0
Staten Island	\$7,929,913	\$8,165,614	\$9,113,880	\$8,942,442	10.0	9.7	10.2	10.2
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$24,498,304	\$25,491,826	\$27,085,881	\$19,500,783	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.9
Community								
BMCC	\$9,133,409	\$10,696,504	\$12,502,521	\$12,137,110	9.9	10.1	11.0	10.6
Bronx	\$5,594,525	\$6,522,122	\$6,113,370	\$5,896,065	9.7	10.7	9.3	8.9
Hostos	\$5,571,989	\$5,894,444	\$5,672,175	\$5,564,971	13.6	13.4	11.9	11.9
Kingsborough	\$6,992,720	\$7,036,379	\$7,473,643	\$6,881,037	9.3	9.0	8.6	7.8
LaGuardia	\$8,855,132	\$9,725,163	\$10,381,857	\$9,511,347	10.8	11.3	11.1	10.1
Queensborough	\$5,098,196	\$6,441,296	\$6,175,037	\$6,364,833	7.9	9.0	7.7	8.0
Community College Total/Avg	\$41,245,971	\$46,315,907	\$48,318,603	\$46,355,362	10.0	10.3	9.9	9.5
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$8,454,266	\$9,917,077	\$8,711,025	\$7,923,154	8.1	7.5	8.1	7.1
University Total/Avg	\$145,222,808	\$151,679,975	\$157,743,073	\$154,037,174	9.6	9.5	9.4	9.2

Note: FY2010 "Percent of Total" has been revised since the 2010-11 PMP to correct community college vacation accruals. Data for FY 2012 will be available in next year's report. Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for mail and printing, institutional research, public relations, computing and telephone services, and security.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.3 Colleges will improve or maintain sound financial management and controls.

Maintenance and Operations Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Senior								
Baruch	\$7,712,059	\$7,522,056	\$7,068,896	\$6,414,522	7.4	7.2	6.4	6.0
Brooklyn	\$12,169,119	\$10,939,553	\$10,600,717	\$9,048,136	10.9	9.5	8.9	7.8
City	\$17,311,304	\$13,924,194	\$12,594,081	\$12,540,962	13.5	10.5	9.2	9.2
Hunter	\$16,385,876	\$15,499,603	\$14,898,427	\$13,488,937	12.3	11.3	10.2	9.0
John Jay	---	---	---	\$4,928,520	---	---	---	5.9
Lehman	\$8,871,165	\$8,889,803	\$9,142,212	\$7,333,404	11.5	11.2	10.6	8.6
Queens	\$14,937,255	\$13,199,630	\$14,115,408	\$12,577,452	12.6	11.1	10.8	9.9
York	\$5,469,031	\$5,558,695	\$5,608,601	\$4,697,115	11.7	11.5	10.6	9.1
Senior College Total/Avg	\$82,855,808	\$75,533,534	\$74,028,342	\$71,029,048	11.5	10.3	9.5	8.3
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$5,203,502	\$5,789,555	\$5,387,953	---	6.7	7.0	6.2	---
Medgar Evers	\$4,045,013	\$4,023,807	\$4,456,664	\$5,634,514	8.9	8.8	9.1	11.1
NYCCT	\$4,588,988	\$4,375,275	\$4,861,592	\$4,511,911	6.2	5.7	5.8	5.6
Staten Island	\$10,087,150	\$10,306,817	\$9,043,893	\$7,227,304	12.8	12.3	10.1	8.2
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$23,924,653	\$24,495,454	\$23,750,102	\$17,373,730	8.7	8.5	7.7	7.9
Community								
BMCC	\$10,358,527	\$9,939,208	\$22,302,070	\$21,719,927	11.2	9.3	19.6	19.0
Bronx	\$7,659,922	\$7,549,849	\$8,074,022	\$8,892,803	13.3	12.4	12.3	13.4
Hostos	\$4,698,719	\$5,431,108	\$5,715,785	\$5,331,833	11.4	12.3	12.0	11.4
Kingsborough	\$9,877,189	\$9,756,639	\$10,003,139	\$8,608,116	13.2	12.5	11.5	9.8
LaGuardia	\$8,823,428	\$8,928,043	\$10,353,137	\$11,984,089	10.8	10.3	11.0	12.7
Queensborough	\$6,657,458	\$6,841,304	\$7,012,913	\$6,576,800	10.3	9.5	8.7	8.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$48,075,243	\$48,446,151	\$63,461,066	\$63,113,569	11.7	10.8	13.0	12.9
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$8,088,922	\$7,680,242	\$6,955,002	\$5,967,589	7.7	5.8	6.4	5.3
University Total/Avg	\$162,944,627	\$156,155,381	\$168,194,512	\$157,483,936	10.8	9.7	10.0	9.4

Note: FY2010 "Percent of Total" has been revised since the 2010-11 PMP to correct community college vacation accruals. Data for FY 2012 will be available in next year's report. Dollar amounts reflect expenditures for administrative, maintenance and custodial activities associated with the college's physical plant.

University Performance Management Process 2011-12 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will increase.

Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research

	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>
Senior					
Baruch	57.0	33.1	42.4	29.2	23.2
Brooklyn	50.2	34.2	55.9	51.9	67.9
City	74.2	79.4	83.4	81.5	77.2
Hunter	56.2	51.2	61.5	59.7	52.2
John Jay	---	---	---	---	40.0
Lehman	22.1	11.6	14.7	20.1	23.0
Queens	62.2	50.6	67.6	57.0	66.8
York	33.8	16.8	24.0	28.5	15.2
Senior College Total	58.1	52.3	61.4	60.4	58.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	39.9	31.2	33.7	37.8	---
Medgar Evers	6.8	5.1	15.9	12.3	12.9
NYCCT	2.4	2.5	1.6	0.0	5.6
Staten Island	28.7	27.3	34.6	31.6	42.4
Comprehensive College Total	24.2	20.1	24.8	23.5	20.1
Community					
BMCC	0.8	0.8	2.6	0.9	9.4
Bronx	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.1
Hostos	0.3	0.2	3.6	1.9	2.3
Kingsborough	9.9	8.9	11.6	9.0	1.7
LaGuardia	4.6	7.2	6.3	5.4	5.8
Queensborough	5.1	9.5	20.0	8.1	3.5
Community College Total	3.6	4.9	6.0	4.3	3.5
Graduate					
Graduate School	46.1	46.7	46.6	37.6	40.4
School of Journalism	3.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Law School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
University Total	42.7	39.2	42.9	42.5	43.5

Note: This indicator is calculated as research dollars divided by total awards for a given fiscal year. FY 2011 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data and FY2012 figures are preliminary.