



Performance Management Report

2010-11
Year-End University Report
Final

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
July 11, 2011

**CUNY Performance Management Process
University Year-End Report
2010-11**

Table of Contents

1 Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

Colleges will provide evidence of recognition/validation from external sources

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

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

1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially or totally online	1
Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered totally online.....	2
Context: Percentage of instructional (student) FTEs offered partially online.....	3
Colleges will prepare additional reports on the use of instructional technology	

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

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

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

2.2 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	4
Percentage of instructional FTEs in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty	5
Context: Percentage of instructional FTEs in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty	6
Context: Percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty	7
Context: Percentage of instructional hours in undergraduate courses delivered by full-time faculty	8
Context: Percentage of instructional hours in graduate courses delivered by full-time faculty	9
Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty	10
Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty	11
Mean teaching hours of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time	12
Context: Number of full-time faculty eligible for contractual release time	13
Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio	14
Context: Number of full-time faculty	15
Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty	16
Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff.....	17

2.4 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 Programs

Percentage of non-ESL SEEK students who pass all basic skills tests within one year	18
Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students.....	19
Percentage of ESL students (SEEK and regular) who pass all basic skills tests within two years	20
Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)	21

All Undergraduate Programs

Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their reading basic skills test score over the summer	22
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their writing (essay) basic skills test score over the summer	23
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their math COMPASS 1 (arithmetic) basic skills test score over the summer	24
Percentage of entering first-time freshmen who increased their math COMPASS 2 (algebra) basic skills test score over the summer	25

Associate Programs

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation	26
Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation	27
Pass rate in math on exit from remediation	28
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	29
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.....	30
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	31
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.....	32
Context: Average increase in basic skills reading test score after summer immersion.....	33
Context: Average increase in basic skills essay test score after summer immersion	34
Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 1 (pre-algebra) test score after summer immersion	35
Context: Average increase in COMPASS Math 2 (algebra) test score after summer immersion	36
Percentage of instructional FTEs in lower division courses delivered by full-time faculty	37

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	38
Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better.....	39
Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better	40

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

Gap in the one-year retention rate between underrepresented minority and non-underrepresented minority first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants)..... 41

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants) 44

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) 47

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in an associate program (full-time entrants)..... 50

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 Programs

Percentage of freshmen and transfers taking one or more courses the summer after entry 53

Percentage of baccalaureate students who have declared a major by the 70th credit 54

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) 55

All Undergraduate Programs

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs 56

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs 57

4.2 Retention rates will increase progressively.

Baccalaureate Programs

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later 58

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later 59

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) 60

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) 61

Associate Programs

One-year Retention Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate program still enrolled in the college of entry one year later 62

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 63

4.3 Graduation rates will progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's programs.

Baccalaureate Programs

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within four years 64

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 65

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years 66

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years 67

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of master's students who graduated within four years of entry into the master's program 68

Associate Programs

Six-year Graduation Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 69
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 70
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..... 71

5 Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Context: Number of credentialed teachers (from traditional and alternative certification programs)..... 72
Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification 73
Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam 74
Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification..... 75
Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam 76
Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST) 77
Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST) 78
Percentage passing the NCLEX exam 79
Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam 80
Context: Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license 81
Context: Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses..... 82
Percentage of test-takers without an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam 83
Percentage of test-takers with an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam..... 84

5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Six-month job placement rate in career and technical education programs 85
Context: Six-month education placement rate in career and technical education programs 86
Context: Six-month job and education placement rate in career and technical education programs..... 87
Colleges will report on post-graduate satisfaction rate of baccalaureate graduates one year after graduation (job and education)

6 Improve quality of student and academic support services

6.1 Colleges will improve the quality of academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction.

Student satisfaction with academic support services 88
Student satisfaction with student services 89
Student satisfaction with access to computer technology 90

3 Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Total Enrollment	91
Total FTEs.....	92
First-time Freshmen	93
Transfers	94
Total Undergraduates	95
New Graduates	96
Total Graduates	97
Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses	98
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs	99
Context: Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students	100
Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate..	101

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

Percentage of course evaluations completed in TIPPS (excluding special courses, electives and non-credit courses)	102
Context: Percentage of evaluated courses designated as non-transferable	103

Baccalaureate Programs

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs	104
Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs	105

Associate Programs

Context: Percentage of AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program	106
Context: Percentage of AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program.....	107
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs	108
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs.....	109
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AA/AS transfers to baccalaureate programs	110
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AAS transfers to baccalaureate programs	111

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

Total College Now enrollment (high school and college credit courses)	112
Context: College Now enrollment in college credit courses.....	113
Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now high school and college credit	114
Context: Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now college credit courses	115
Percentage of College Now participants with previous enrollment in College Now high school and college credit	116

8 Increase revenues and decrease expenses

8.1 Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase or maintain current levels.

Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average)	117
Context: Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts)	118

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 Each college will lower or hold constant the percentage of its tax-levy budget spent on administrative services.

Institutional Support Services (administrative services) as a percentage of total tax levy budget.....	119
Context: Institutional Support Services (administrative services)	119
Context: General Administration as a percentage of total tax levy budget	120
Context: General Administration.....	120
Context: General Institutional Services as a percentage of total tax levy budget.....	121
Context: General Institutional Services	121
Context: Maintenance and Operations as a percentage of total tax levy budget.....	122
Context: Maintenance and Operations	122

8.4 Colleges will implement financial plans with balanced budgets.

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

8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.

Grants and contracts awarded (weighted, rolling, three-year average)	123
Context: Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research	124

8.6 Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve.

Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity.....	125
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----

9 Improve administrative services

9.1 Colleges will complete agreed-upon restructuring of their philanthropic foundations to comply with CUNY guidelines and document participation in the CUNY Compact.

Colleges will provide evidence of foundation restructuring

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

Student satisfaction with administrative services	126
---------------------------------------------------------	-----

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

Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends	127
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

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

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

9.5 All colleges will make timely progress on CUNYfirst implementation.

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.3
Brooklyn	2.4	7.3	10.5	11.5	13.3
City	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4
Hunter	0.2	0.8	3.8	4.6	5.0
Lehman	3.8	4.6	6.6	8.0	10.9
Queens	0.1	12.6	10.8	1.5	4.4
York	0.6	1.0	0.9	1.1	2.1
Senior College Average	0.9	4.1	5.1	3.8	5.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.3	2.3	3.4	3.3	4.2
Medgar Evers	1.0	1.7	2.9	2.3	2.6
NYCCT	2.4	3.3	1.4	5.0	4.0
Staten Island	0.2	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.7
Comprehensive College Average	1.6	2.2	2.0	3.1	3.2
Community					
BMCC	1.1	1.0	15.0	21.7	25.1
Bronx	0.7	1.4	1.2	2.0	2.2
Hostos	6.8	5.3	4.3	2.5	2.3
Kingsborough	8.1	9.8	10.9	13.7	14.3
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.9
Queensborough	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.3
Community College Average	2.6	2.8	6.8	8.9	10.0
University Average	1.6	3.3	5.1	5.4	6.6

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 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
Brooklyn	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.9	2.3
City	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.3
Hunter	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.3
Lehman	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.6	4.7
Queens	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.2
York	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6
Senior College Average	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.6
Medgar Evers	0.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.4
NYCCT	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.6	0.9
Staten Island	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.6	0.7
Comprehensive College Average	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.7
Community					
BMCC	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.8
Bronx	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.0	0.6
Hostos	3.1	1.8	1.7	1.1	1.3
Kingsborough	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.8
LaGuardia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5
Community College Average	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7
University Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.1
Brooklyn	1.6	6.1	9.2	9.5	10.9
City	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Hunter	0.1	0.7	3.7	4.0	4.7
Lehman	1.4	2.1	3.6	4.4	6.2
Queens	0.0	12.6	10.5	1.2	4.2
York	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.6	1.6
Senior College Average	0.4	3.6	4.4	2.9	4.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.6
Medgar Evers	0.4	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.3
NYCCT	2.2	3.0	0.5	4.4	3.1
Staten Island	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.6	1.1
Comprehensive College Average	0.7	1.0	0.5	1.6	1.5
Community					
BMCC	0.0	0.0	14.2	21.1	24.3
Bronx	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.0	1.6
Hostos	3.7	3.5	2.6	1.4	1.0
Kingsborough	7.9	9.4	10.4	13.3	13.5
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.7
Community College Average	2.0	2.3	6.2	8.2	9.3
University Average	1.0	2.6	4.2	4.5	5.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

Percentage of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	54.6	56.6	53.0	55.2	54.3
Brooklyn	48.9	47.1	43.5	49.3	47.2
City	49.6	44.6	44.9	49.9	48.9
Hunter	45.1	43.1	42.1	43.5	41.3
Lehman	48.4	50.3	49.3	49.5	48.9
Queens	46.9	46.6	42.1	49.7	46.4
York	41.8	42.5	50.3	51.8	56.0
Senior College Average	48.5	47.6	45.8	49.3	48.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	40.5	41.6	42.7	46.1	40.7
Medgar Evers	43.3	45.6	52.7	51.1	45.9
NYCCT	47.0	49.3	50.6	48.5	48.1
Staten Island	41.6	40.6	42.0	37.8	34.4
Comprehensive College Average	43.0	44.0	46.0	45.1	41.7
Community					
BMCC	51.5	52.1	46.2	47.7	46.2
Bronx	61.5	60.3	61.2	59.8	60.1
Hostos	60.1	64.1	62.0	62.4	57.6
Kingsborough	57.5	55.6	53.3	53.4	55.9
LaGuardia	46.5	45.8	44.1	42.7	42.5
Queensborough	52.9	53.1	51.0	50.9	52.6
Community College Average	53.6	53.3	50.5	50.8	50.9
University Average					
	49.0	48.8	47.4	49.0	47.8
Graduate					
Graduate School				93.2	92.7
School of Journalism				68.1	69.6
Law School				88.1	91.4

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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 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. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	51.9	54.8	51.1	51.0	49.7
Brooklyn	48.6	46.1	42.1	48.8	44.0
City	44.6	39.6	40.0	47.2	46.0
Hunter	38.1	37.9	37.2	41.4	38.5
Lehman	44.5	46.7	46.4	45.5	45.1
Queens	43.5	42.9	38.6	46.7	43.9
York	41.4	42.1	50.0	51.7	55.8
Senior College Average	45.0	44.5	42.8	46.9	45.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	38.3	39.7	40.8	43.8	38.2
Medgar Evers	43.3	45.6	52.7	51.1	45.9
NYCCT	47.0	49.3	50.6	48.5	48.1
Staten Island	39.7	39.0	40.2	35.6	32.9
Comprehensive College Average	41.9	43.1	45.2	43.9	40.8
Community					
BMCC	51.5	52.1	46.2	47.7	46.2
Bronx	61.5	60.3	61.2	59.8	60.1
Hostos	60.1	64.1	62.0	62.4	57.6
Kingsborough	57.5	55.6	53.3	53.4	55.9
LaGuardia	46.5	45.8	44.1	42.7	42.5
Queensborough	52.9	53.1	51.0	50.9	52.6
Community College Average	53.6	53.3	50.5	50.8	50.9
University Average	47.5	47.4	46.2	47.7	46.5

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total FTEs in all undergraduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	67.4	65.2	60.5	72.2	71.7
Brooklyn	50.5	52.1	50.9	51.4	58.2
City	71.8	67.8	68.9	64.8	64.4
Hunter	69.9	59.5	57.3	51.1	49.3
Lehman	72.1	69.4	63.3	69.1	68.7
Queens	62.2	65.3	59.1	65.3	58.5
York	83.6	100.0	100.0	68.7	100.0
Senior College Average	65.3	62.7	59.5	60.6	59.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.3	58.6	58.0	64.5	61.6
Staten Island	68.9	68.6	72.8	73.1	55.6
Comprehensive College Average	63.2	61.6	62.4	67.3	59.4
University Average	65.0	62.5	59.8	61.3	59.8
Graduate					
Graduate School				93.2	92.7
School of Journalism				68.1	69.6
Law School				88.1	91.4

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in graduate (master's and Ph.D.) courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total FTEs in all graduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	52.2	52.7	49.0	49.4	49.4
Brooklyn	50.6	48.6	45.3	47.5	43.5
City	54.8	47.2	48.1	49.9	48.4
Hunter	45.6	44.8	45.2	40.2	39.5
Lehman	52.8	54.1	52.4	49.5	48.1
Queens	49.8	49.5	44.6	47.2	44.8
York	52.0	50.4	54.1	57.7	59.8
Senior College Average	50.7	49.2	47.5	47.7	46.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	43.1	45.6	45.7	47.3	40.9
Medgar Evers	46.1	46.7	53.5	53.3	47.1
NYCCT	44.8	47.2	49.7	47.8	48.4
Staten Island	47.6	47.1	46.7	38.4	35.8
Comprehensive College Average	45.2	46.7	48.2	45.7	42.5
Community					
BMCC	52.2	52.7	47.2	47.1	46.3
Bronx	62.4	62.8	63.4	58.7	59.0
Hostos	61.8	66.4	62.7	58.5	55.7
Kingsborough	56.3	53.3	52.9	53.8	54.2
LaGuardia	47.0	47.0	45.5	42.1	41.5
Queensborough	54.2	54.2	51.8	51.6	54.7
Community College Average	54.3	54.1	51.7	50.2	50.1
University Average	50.8	50.5	49.2	48.2	46.9

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours taught by full-time faculty members (undergraduate and graduate) by the total of all contact hours. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	48.7	50.3	46.4	45.4	44.7
Brooklyn	51.1	47.9	43.8	46.6	42.5
City	48.7	41.4	42.2	45.6	44.4
Hunter	37.1	37.4	38.1	34.9	34.8
Lehman	48.4	50.1	49.1	45.1	43.6
Queens	45.9	45.0	40.5	42.2	41.1
York	50.5	48.6	53.4	56.6	58.2
Senior College Average	46.8	45.4	43.8	44.3	42.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	40.5	43.5	44.0	45.2	38.1
Medgar Evers	46.1	46.7	53.5	53.3	47.1
NYCCT	44.8	47.2	49.7	47.8	48.4
Staten Island	45.0	44.7	44.4	35.9	33.8
Comprehensive College Average	43.9	45.6	47.4	44.5	41.5
Community					
BMCC	52.2	52.7	47.2	47.1	46.3
Bronx	62.4	62.8	63.4	58.7	59.0
Hostos	61.8	66.4	62.7	58.5	55.7
Kingsborough	56.3	53.3	52.9	53.8	54.2
LaGuardia	47.0	47.0	45.5	42.1	41.5
Queensborough	54.2	54.2	51.8	51.6	54.7
Community College Average	54.3	54.1	51.7	50.2	50.1
University Average	49.2	48.9	47.8	46.7	45.7

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours in undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total contact hours in all undergraduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	69.5	65.1	61.6	69.4	70.6
Brooklyn	49.2	51.4	50.7	50.3	47.0
City	74.9	70.9	71.6	70.1	69.5
Hunter	70.9	66.7	65.0	53.5	51.8
Lehman	75.1	71.2	65.8	69.4	71.2
Queens	63.6	66.8	61.2	68.4	59.7
York	96.1	100.0	100.0	89.8	100.0
Senior College Average	66.4	65.5	62.5	61.6	59.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	61.2	60.4	56.7	61.8	61.2
Staten Island	76.4	78.7	79.2	72.3	60.9
Comprehensive College Average	66.9	66.5	63.8	63.6	60.8
University Average	66.5	65.6	62.6	62.8	60.2

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload collection from CUNYfirst. Fall 2009 figures are restated from last year's report to reflect substantially improved faculty workload data that was not available at this time last year. 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 cross-listed/combined, due to limitations in the available data. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours in graduate (master's and Ph.D.) courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total contact hours in all graduate courses. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	8.0	7.6	7.8	7.4	8.2
Brooklyn	8.1	7.9	8.1	7.7	7.5
City	8.2	9.3	9.0	8.5	7.8
Hunter	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.5
Lehman	7.8	7.7	8.0	8.2	7.3
Queens	7.9	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.1
York	7.8	7.4	8.1	8.2	8.1
Senior College Average	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.7	7.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	6.9	6.9	7.2	7.7	7.4
Medgar Evers	7.2	7.2	6.4	9.4	8.7
NYCCT	9.5	9.2	9.2	9.1	8.5
Staten Island	8.4	8.1	8.5	7.2	7.1
Comprehensive College Average	8.2	8.0	8.1	8.2	7.8
Community					
BMCC	11.3	11.5	11.7	12.2	11.9
Bronx	10.4	10.2	10.7	10.8	10.8
Hostos	10.3	10.1	10.9	10.9	10.4
Kingsborough	10.3	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.3
LaGuardia	9.7	10.4	10.3	10.9	10.1
Queensborough	11.7	11.6	11.8	12.0	12.1
Community College Average	10.7	10.8	11.1	11.3	11.0
Graduate					
Graduate School				6.0	4.9
School of Journalism				3.6*	4.5*
Law School				5.0*	5.5*
University Average	8.6	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.4

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new 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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	313	323	304	306	303
Brooklyn	320	314	294	313	292
City	342	312	320	321	296
Hunter	426	406	417	451	414
Lehman	206	201	203	196	185
Queens	349	346	321	343	340
York	107	106	104	97	90
Senior College Total	2,063	2,008	1,963	2,027	1,920
Comprehensive					
John Jay	192	194	176	175	163
Medgar Evers	84	76	79	77	80
NYCCT	199	207	209	205	187
Staten Island	215	191	206	228	211
Comprehensive College Total	690	668	670	685	641
Community					
BMCC	176	215	217	223	210
Bronx	131	132	140	147	131
Hostos	83	94	91	82	81
Kingsborough	146	159	160	170	160
LaGuardia	124	130	131	129	129
Queensborough	153	177	182	166	151
Community College Total	813	907	921	917	862
Graduate					
Graduate School				112	110
School of Journalism				5	4
Law School				24	24
University Total	3,566	3,583	3,554	3,770	3,561

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	6.2	6.7	6.1	5.9	5.5
Brooklyn	7.6	7.3	7.1	6.9	6.8
City	6.4	6.9	7.2	7.8	7.1
Hunter	6.7	6.3	6.0	6.6	6.7
Lehman	7.4	6.7	7.8	6.8	7.9
Queens	7.3	6.7	6.2	6.8	8.0
York	8.1	7.1	8.2	7.6	8.1
Senior College Average	7.0	6.8	6.8	6.9	7.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	7.0	7.1	7.0	6.6	6.7
Medgar Evers	7.9	6.2	7.4	7.9	8.3
NYCCT	10.5	9.7	9.7	8.4	8.7
Staten Island	7.9	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.7
Comprehensive College Average	8.0	7.7	8.0	7.5	7.8
Community					
BMCC	12.1	11.3	11.4	11.3	10.6
Bronx	10.9	10.3	9.8	11.6	11.8
Hostos	10.6	10.8	10.4	10.2	11.0
Kingsborough	9.9	10.7	10.3	9.9	10.2
LaGuardia	10.4	11.4	11.5	11.9	10.5
Queensborough	11.7	11.1	10.6	11.1	11.4
Community College Average	11.1	11.0	10.9	11.1	10.8
Graduate					
Graduate School				3.8*	6.0*
School of Journalism				5.3*	6.0*
Law School				4.5*	4.5*
University Average	8.7	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.3

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new 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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	45	63	78	81	83
Brooklyn	63	75	98	103	113
City	70	67	93	99	113
Hunter	71	84	89	109	118
Lehman	45	57	66	63	69
Queens	80	79	104	119	124
York	34	30	50	57	74
Senior College Total	408	455	578	631	694
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65	78	96	122	130
Medgar Evers	21	29	35	36	35
NYCCT	33	57	90	115	132
Staten Island	46	50	49	82	88
Comprehensive College Total	165	214	270	355	385
Community					
BMCC	80	59	77	88	100
Bronx	46	41	33	37	47
Hostos	31	23	29	33	37
Kingsborough	52	29	36	46	59
LaGuardia	40	42	55	73	96
Queensborough	67	51	47	59	78
Community College Total	316	245	277	336	417
Graduate					
Graduate School				6	4
School of Journalism				4	6
Law School				2	2
University Total	889	914	1,125	1,334	1,508

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	21.5	20.4	19.8	18.9	18.1
Brooklyn	17.8	17.2	17.0	14.4	13.7
City	16.3	15.4	15.4	14.2	13.2
Hunter	18.9	19.1	18.4	17.5	14.5
Lehman	15.3	14.8	15.3	13.4	13.3
Queens	17.4	18.1	18.2	16.1	16.4
York	16.9	16.9	17.6	17.0	17.1
Senior College Average	17.9	17.7	17.5	15.9	15.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	20.3	19.5	19.2	18.2	18.1
Medgar Evers	17.1	15.9	17.8	18.8	18.1
NYCCT	15.8	15.4	16.0	16.5	16.8
Staten Island	18.8	18.6	18.2	17.0	16.5
Comprehensive College Average	18.0	17.4	17.7	17.4	17.2
Community					
BMCC	20.3	20.8	21.2	20.2	20.6
Bronx	17.6	16.8	17.2	18.2	18.0
Hostos	16.7	16.3	16.9	17.4	17.3
Kingsborough	18.4	18.9	19.6	20.6	20.1
LaGuardia	20.3	19.7	19.7	18.0	17.2
Queensborough	17.2	17.5	18.4	20.2	18.9
Community College Average	18.8	18.8	19.4	19.4	18.9
University Average	18.3	18.0	18.2	17.5	16.9

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of full-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	448	468	470	458	479
Brooklyn	488	511	512	500	467
City	491	498	541	535	513
Hunter	607	645	661	654	630
Lehman	327	349	358	349	354
Queens	566	609	620	610	612
York	160	167	188	199	204
Senior College Total	3,087	3,247	3,350	3,305	3,259
Comprehensive					
John Jay	359	382	400	414	335
Medgar Evers	136	148	156	170	169
NYCCT	297	327	366	393	369
Staten Island	306	322	329	339	324
Comprehensive College Total	1,098	1,179	1,251	1,316	1,197
Community					
BMCC	348	364	361	392	385
Bronx	245	255	256	247	268
Hostos	146	155	148	157	158
Kingsborough	292	282	296	315	325
LaGuardia	248	257	265	266	293
Queensborough	270	284	284	305	321
Community College Total	1,549	1,597	1,610	1,682	1,750
University Total	5,734	6,023	6,211	6,303	6,206

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.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	193	186	208	256	237
Brooklyn	231	247	295	355	299
City	212	123	318	449	330
Hunter	313	339	372	549	409
Lehman	196	192	202	279	227
Queens	285	284	323	311	345
York	109	115	110	116	120
Senior College Total	1,539	1,486	1,828	2,315	1,967
Comprehensive					
John Jay	289	268	278	364	249
Medgar Evers	98	113	101	180	153
NYCCT	298	294	285	367	335
Staten Island	215	234	247	286	309
Comprehensive College Total	900	909	911	1,198	1,046
Community					
BMCC	304	311	378	401	425
Bronx	121	118	117	177	151
Hostos	72	71	73	86	100
Kingsborough	192	202	212	251	259
LaGuardia	227	269	283	306	336
Queensborough	208	216	227	274	257
Community College Total	1,124	1,187	1,290	1,496	1,528
University Total	3,563	3,582	4,029	5,009	4,541

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	257	266	267	281	282
Brooklyn	245	261	284	283	298
City	318	333	359	367	380
Hunter	322	352	383	395	400
Lehman	199	214	222	242	267
Queens	289	321	348	313	321
York	118	134	158	180	188
Senior College Total	1,748	1,881	2,021	2,061	2,136
Comprehensive					
John Jay	181	207	239	250	235
Medgar Evers	157	174	180	180	182
NYCCT	172	181	189	222	216
Staten Island	178	188	186	201	209
Comprehensive College Total	688	750	794	853	842
Community					
BMCC	195	203	207	212	225
Bronx	155	159	166	177	187
Hostos	119	126	133	141	145
Kingsborough	182	201	204	223	243
LaGuardia	245	266	291	301	287
Queensborough	168	176	190	203	219
Community College Total	1,064	1,131	1,191	1,257	1,306
University Total	3,500	3,762	4,006	4,171	4,284

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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>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	94.9	98.8	95.9	97.7	98.6
Brooklyn	94.2	88.9	97.5	93.9	98.9
City	96.5	96.6	96.4	93.1	91.3
Hunter	91.7	99.0	98.8	98.9	98.5
Lehman	96.9	96.6	95.3	83.5	89.5
Queens	96.0	98.9	97.7	95.8	98.4
York	94.8	94.2	78.0	85.7	91.6
Senior College Average	95.5	95.9	94.0	92.1	95.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	85.6	76.1	84.9	80.6	73.0
Medgar Evers	0.0*	100.0	100.0	96.8	100.0*
NYCCT	100.0*	93.7*	100.0*	94.4*	100.0
Staten Island	100.0*	---		100.0*	100.0*
Comprehensive College Average	87.0	81.6	89.2	85.1	78.3
University Average	94.4	93.8	93.4	90.8	91.2

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 2010-11 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.

Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students

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	41	83	74	89	72
Brooklyn	193	170	206	151	191
City	219	219	148	179	128
Hunter	37	100	92	95	67
Lehman	163	200	151	183	136
Queens	155	188	197	241	198
York	100	147	167	154	141
Senior College Total	908	1,107	1,035	1,092	933
Comprehensive					
John Jay	116	141	123	182	242
Medgar Evers	1	33	35	33	17
NYCCT	16	17	13	18	33
Staten Island	3	---	---	16	6
Comprehensive College Total	136	191	171	249	298
University Total	1,044	1,298	1,206	1,341	1,231

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 2010-11 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>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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	94.3	100.0	98.4	98.2	100.0
Brooklyn	97.0	85.4	100.0*	91.3*	87.1
City	96.8	94.1	87.5	92.3	95.2
Hunter	95.6	88.0	95.1	92.6	81.2*
Lehman	96.5	70.0*	92.8	82.5	75.0*
Queens	83.3	95.4	84.4	89.4	86.0
York	75.9	73.2	71.9	57.6	92.6
Senior College Average	92.4	89.4	91.4	89.3	92.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.0*	50.0*	75.0*	66.7*	70.6*
Medgar Evers	---	---	---	---	100.0*
NYCCT	77.8*	66.7*	100.0*	---	100.0*
Staten Island	---	---	100.0*	---	100.0*
Comprehensive College Average	63.2*	57.1*	83.3*	66.7*	76.2*
University Average	90.5	88.7	91.3	89.1	91.7

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 2010-11 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.

Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)

Baccalaureate Programs

	<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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	36	69	129	119	128
Brooklyn	33	41	21	23	31
City	66	35	85	53	43
Hunter	47	51	41	27	17
Lehman	31	13	30	40	16
Queens	33	45	46	47	58
York	30	43	33	36	28
Senior College Total	276	297	385	345	321
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10	4	5	4	17
Medgar Evers	---	---	---	---	1
NYCCT	9	3	1	---	2
Staten Island	---	---	1	---	1
Comprehensive College Total	19	7	7	4	21
University Total	295	304	392	349	342

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 2010-11 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 reading basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	91.7*	86.7	92.0*	100.0*	90.9*
Brooklyn	100.0	74.4	91.4	90.3	76.2*
City	85.3	87.9	91.7	75.0*	83.3*
Hunter	100.0*	90.0*	81.3*	66.7*	80.0*
Lehman	83.8	76.5	90.6	100.0*	88.0*
Queens	90.0	85.7	89.7	93.2	89.3*
York	94.1	85.4	89.3	84.5	86.2
Senior College Average	90.4	83.3	90.0	88.4	85.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	83.3	90.5	93.1	96.0	94.6
Medgar Evers	84.8	81.3	90.5	89.4	92.3
NYCCT	85.7	77.3	84.1	79.5	82.7
Staten Island	85.3	89.3	96.4	92.9	94.4
Comprehensive College Average	85.0	85.1	90.7	89.2	89.5
Community					
BMCC	72.1	80.3	84.4	92.3	88.4
Bronx	80.6	76.7	64.7*	68.8	82.4
Hostos	57.1*	50.0*	80.0*	76.9*	95.0*
Kingsborough	80.6	87.2	82.5	86.2	81.4
LaGuardia	95.7*	97.4	84.2	86.9	95.3
Queensborough	96.0*	76.4	94.9	84.6	91.9
Community College Average	81.6	82.5	84.1	85.4	87.5
University Average	86.2	83.9	89.2	87.8	87.8

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 writing (essay) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	94.0	87.3	83.9	85.7	100.0*
Brooklyn	64.6	80.4	87.3	87.5	100.0*
City	70.7	80.8	74.6	77.6	73.5*
Hunter	71.4	55.2	75.9	53.8*	87.5*
Lehman	71.1	77.2	79.1	76.2	81.1
Queens	75.3	82.0	82.2	76.3	98.0
York	60.4	74.8	76.6	71.9	75.8
Senior College Average	70.0	78.4	79.8	76.0	83.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65.4	75.6	86.1	71.0	78.7
Medgar Evers	63.6	62.8	70.0*	69.4	70.7
NYCCT	61.4	58.6	59.8	65.5	49.5
Staten Island	76.5	70.2	72.5	72.0	79.5
Comprehensive College Average	66.8	66.2	70.2	69.0	66.7
Community					
BMCC	61.9	60.3	67.4	70.2	60.0
Bronx	46.0	69.4	78.1	67.2	70.4
Hostos	72.7*	66.7*	75.0*	56.0*	46.7*
Kingsborough	50.7	73.1	71.6	63.2	57.1
LaGuardia	60.9*	73.5	66.7	77.0	71.6
Queensborough	53.8	71.9	65.3	67.2	73.5
Community College Average	55.2	69.9	68.8	67.4	64.8
University Average	65.8	71.9	73.8	69.9	69.1

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 math COMPASS 1 (arithmetic) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	---
Brooklyn	100.0*	100.0	89.6	94.8	100.0
City	88.0	83.8	91.4	87.2	86.5
Hunter	75.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	---
Lehman	90.3	87.7	88.7	93.1	93.4
Queens	95.5*	95.8*	88.2*	100.0*	100.0*
York	92.1	90.7	96.2	95.8	89.1
Senior College Average	91.2	89.7	91.8	93.5	91.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	89.2	91.0	90.8	96.2	93.0
Medgar Evers	96.3	89.3	89.5	100.0	96.1
NYCCT	96.1	98.0	96.2	99.1	94.9
Staten Island	87.8	88.3	95.6	88.2	90.7
Comprehensive College Average	90.9	91.0	93.5	93.4	92.5
Community					
BMCC	93.5	92.2	91.1	95.5	92.0
Bronx	57.1*	66.7*	100.0*	83.1	77.1
Hostos	45.5*	90.0*	87.0*	78.9*	87.5*
Kingsborough	84.6	88.5	79.2	92.6	82.2
LaGuardia	90.5*	97.6	93.3	93.0	94.4
Queensborough	---	50.0*	100.0*	93.2	93.3
Community College Average	83.8	90.3	88.8	91.3	87.9
University Average	89.8	90.3	91.6	92.8	90.9

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 math COMPASS 2 (algebra) basic skills test score over the summer

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	87.5*	100.0*	100.0*
Brooklyn	92.2	96.5	93.5	98.7	100.0
City	93.3	89.7	92.5	90.1	84.8
Hunter	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	83.3*	80.0*
Lehman	87.3	86.2	87.0	92.8	92.1
Queens	96.5	96.4	97.7	100.0	100.0*
York	89.8	93.6	91.0	93.0	91.4
Senior College Average	91.1	91.5	91.0	93.8	92.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	89.5	88.9	87.2	90.2	97.8
Medgar Evers	94.7*	100.0*	91.4	94.2	98.6
NYCCT	100.0	100.0	97.8	99.4	95.5
Staten Island	94.2	89.4	93.0	89.0	87.9
Comprehensive College Average	94.0	91.6	92.3	92.1	92.2
Community					
BMCC	90.9	94.5	83.9	91.5	95.8
Bronx	88.9*	79.3	84.6*	72.7	100.0*
Hostos	62.5*	80.0*	90.9*	91.7*	95.2*
Kingsborough	87.1	89.2	92.6	87.2	81.6
LaGuardia	91.5	92.6	91.5	94.7	94.6
Queensborough	85.0*	87.8	95.8*	97.3	95.4
Community College Average	88.1	89.2	88.5	90.0	92.0
University Average	91.8	91.1	91.1	92.1	92.1

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	69.0	58.2	67.6	62.4	49.4
Medgar Evers	65.4	54.9	58.7	59.4	59.6
NYCCT	64.6	63.2	72.6	71.3	75.3
Staten Island	61.0	52.5	55.8	60.0	57.8
Comprehensive College Average	64.7	58.3	65.4	64.5	63.6
Community					
BMCC	58.7	58.1	56.8	54.4	56.3
Bronx	66.1	60.1	66.1	61.0	62.3
Hostos	41.6	41.6	45.3	44.9	41.8
Kingsborough	60.3	58.1	65.6	60.4	57.0
LaGuardia	57.7	60.0	61.0	57.9	58.3
Queensborough	53.0	58.5	58.2	63.3	61.8
Community College Average	56.1	56.6	58.6	56.9	56.6
University Average	58.2	57.0	60.0	58.2	57.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

Pass rate in writing on exit from remediation

Associate Programs	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.1	65.7	65.6	59.1	50.3
Medgar Evers	49.4	52.6	43.8	57.0	44.9
NYCCT	46.5	42.8	50.9	44.1	58.5
Staten Island	56.7	58.3	52.9	54.7	63.3
Comprehensive College Average	53.5	53.5	53.1	52.3	55.6
Community					
BMCC	57.8	55.6	48.4	55.9	48.7
Bronx	65.7	67.6	61.8	62.4	57.7
Hostos	37.2	44.5	43.8	45.2	44.4
Kingsborough	49.6	58.2	51.3	45.2	57.6
LaGuardia	53.4	57.4	49.0	50.9	61.2
Queensborough	46.9	45.6	54.7	48.1	58.3
Community College Average	53.3	55.4	50.6	52.0	54.7
University Average	53.4	54.9	51.2	52.1	54.8

Note: Exit results are based on all scores reported to UAPC between October 1 and December 31.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

Pass rate in math on exit from remediation

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	51.6	42.2	41.1	53.6	51.5
Medgar Evers	63.7	50.7	27.1	45.7	50.4
NYCCT	88.0	79.4	74.1	78.2	73.8
Staten Island	57.3	32.5	44.6	52.8	55.1
Comprehensive College Average	62.2	48.3	46.6	57.1	57.9

Community

BMCC	60.8	51.9	75.7	74.3	76.1
Bronx	55.2	45.6	38.4	47.6	57.2
Hostos	51.6	44.6	52.7	64.3	58.4
Kingsborough	57.3	51.7	59.7	80.9	80.8
LaGuardia	77.9	68.7	68.4	79.1	76.2
Queensborough	56.7	48.9	63.8	62.5	62.9
Community College Average	60.4	52.3	62.0	68.5	70.7

University Average	60.9	51.2	57.4	65.1	67.6
---------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Note: Exit results for fall 2010 are preliminary. Final fall 2010 values will be available in July. The pass rates reflect basic skills proficiency on the COMPASS Math 2 (Algebra) test. Beginning in fall 2007, the passing score on the COMPASS math test was raised to 30 from 27. Beginning in October 2008, some colleges (senior and comprehensives) raised the passing score on the COMPASS to a higher cut off. Exit results reflect the passing score set by each college in use for the semester shown, and therefore rates over time are not comparable. Rates are based on all scores reported to UAPC between October 1 and December 31.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 fully skills proficient upon initial testing who have met basic skills proficiency in reading, writing and math by the 30th credit

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	67.5	72.5	71.5	74.9	78.5
Medgar Evers	66.5	64.2	64.5	66.6	69.3
NYCCT	91.3	91.7	92.0	90.6	91.4
Staten Island	90.9	91.4	89.2	88.9	85.4
Comprehensive College Average	82.3	83.3	82.3	82.8	83.8
Community					
BMCC	60.1	66.2	65.9	60.9	61.5
Bronx	54.5	56.1	52.7	45.5	45.8
Hostos	53.6	59.0	64.2	64.6	58.5
Kingsborough	59.1	62.1	57.1	52.3	46.1
LaGuardia	59.3	68.0	67.5	63.7	62.3
Queensborough	70.5	70.3	68.3	64.4	67.0
Community College Average	60.1	64.3	62.6	58.3	56.7
University Average	65.6	69.0	67.4	64.2	62.7

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. 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 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	84.5	77.5	86.6	92.0	95.0
Medgar Evers	86.3	82.6	82.2	82.2	87.0
NYCCT	97.7	96.0	94.5	94.5	96.6
Staten Island	91.4	95.4	93.8	92.9	94.2
Comprehensive College Average	91.9	90.0	90.5	91.0	93.9
Community					
BMCC	83.6	85.2	86.9	87.0	86.2
Bronx	76.1	80.4	81.0	81.8	81.4
Hostos	72.3	67.7	74.4	78.2	78.0
Kingsborough	76.2	78.5	76.8	77.0	76.3
LaGuardia	83.0	86.0	83.6	83.7	84.6
Queensborough	90.9	90.1	89.9	88.3	88.0
Community College Average	81.0	82.2	82.6	82.9	82.6
University Average	83.1	83.8	84.3	84.6	84.6

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	86.0	89.8	84.6	91.4	92.0
Medgar Evers	82.4	83.3	87.6	82.9	86.9
NYCCT	95.1	94.1	94.5	94.1	95.1
Staten Island	92.9	93.4	93.3	92.5	93.8
Comprehensive College Average	90.6	91.3	91.1	91.1	92.9
Community					
BMCC	78.3	80.8	82.2	82.9	82.5
Bronx	75.9	80.0	85.3	83.1	84.6
Hostos	72.6	75.1	81.3	83.8	81.4
Kingsborough	71.3	75.1	77.2	72.6	67.7
LaGuardia	71.6	77.3	80.8	78.9	79.3
Queensborough	81.3	84.8	84.9	84.5	88.3
Community College Average	75.6	79.2	81.9	80.5	79.9
University Average	78.9	81.9	83.8	82.7	82.3

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.9	71.1	71.3	69.1	77.5
Medgar Evers	66.8	64.5	62.8	63.4	68.8
NYCCT	90.5	92.6	92.8	90.7	92.2
Staten Island	92.6	92.2	89.9	89.5	84.6
Comprehensive College Average	80.6	82.5	81.2	80.2	82.7
Community					
BMCC	63.4	67.9	65.9	58.8	60.3
Bronx	56.1	53.7	48.5	40.0	40.9
Hostos	57.5	65.3	69.9	69.5	61.6
Kingsborough	58.7	59.9	55.2	49.7	43.9
LaGuardia	62.1	69.9	66.5	61.5	61.3
Queensborough	70.2	66.2	62.6	59.8	60.3
Community College Average	61.5	64.0	60.7	55.5	54.1
University Average	66.1	68.7	65.7	61.5	60.6

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	20.0*	17.5	16.6*	19.2*	12.7*
Brooklyn	21.4	11.2	13.5	13.9	12.0*
City	14.5	13.8	13.8	14.1*	13.2*
Hunter	22.3*	10.7*	13.9*	7.0*	7.4*
Lehman	14.0	7.5	14.9	17.5*	12.8*
Queens	14.1	13.5	14.3	17.7	19.3
York	17.6	12.8	13.8	12.6	13.4
Senior College Average	16.5	12.3	14.3	14.7	13.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14.6	14.9	15.8	17.1	16.2
Medgar Evers	16.1	9.0	14.8	13.6	14.8
NYCCT	12.4	10.6	11.2	10.4	12.9
Staten Island	15.0	15.1	17.3	15.8	17.8
Comprehensive College Average	14.0	13.1	14.5	14.3	15.1
Community					
BMCC	12.6	12.2	14.2	15.1	13.4
Bronx	11.4	11.4	7.5*	8.5	10.9
Hostos	- 1.9*	1.5*	14.4*	9.5*	18.2*
Kingsborough	13.8	13.4	11.8	12.8	10.6
LaGuardia	15.8*	11.8	11.6	13.7	15.7
Queensborough	15.4	10.1	13.8	11.6	13.7
Community College Average	13.0	11.7	12.7	12.8	12.9
University Average	14.7	12.5	14.1	13.8	13.8

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in reading with the initial attempt of the reading test and who re-tested during the summer. The college at which the student took the summer re-test is credited with the gain. The indicator reflects the 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 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.8	2.1*
Brooklyn	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.6	2.2*
City	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4
Hunter	1.3	0.9	1.5	0.9*	1.5*
Lehman	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Queens	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.1
York	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5
Senior College Average	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1.2	1.5	1.9	1.5	1.7
Medgar Evers	1.1	1.1	1.4*	1.2	1.1
NYCCT	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8
Staten Island	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5
Comprehensive College Average	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2
Community					
BMCC	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.0
Bronx	0.7	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.1
Hostos	1.4*	1.1*	1.2*	0.8*	0.8
Kingsborough	0.7	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9
LaGuardia	1.2*	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5
Queensborough	0.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4
Community College Average	0.9	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2
University Average	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	34.0*	23.0*	34.5*	29.0*	---
Brooklyn	19.1*	17.0	17.7	22.8	26.2
City	15.2	13.4	19.9	19.7	17.7
Hunter	16.8*	14.5*	20.0*	8.5*	---
Lehman	14.9	12.3	10.4	22.2	22.3
Queens	21.5*	15.1*	16.8*	30.4*	37.8*
York	15.2	12.5	14.7	16.5	15.0
Senior College Average	16.0	13.3	14.9	20.3	19.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	15.3	13.4	14.1	20.1	17.6
Medgar Evers	19.4	15.4	24.3	31.6	33.8
NYCCT	20.1	18.6	15.5	17.9	18.5
Staten Island	14.5	13.1	17.2	16.2	14.8
Comprehensive College Average	16.5	14.4	16.8	19.0	18.3
Community					
BMCC	19.3	17.2	15.3	19.7	19.4
Bronx	8.0*	3.4*	13.0*	7.9	7.4
Hostos	5.5*	8.4*	12.5*	11.8*	12.1*
Kingsborough	15.0	13.7	11.3	16.9	10.8
LaGuardia	13.2*	24.2	23.0	24.2	20.4
Queensborough	---	11.0*	12.5*	22.2	16.9
Community College Average	15.1	16.1	15.6	18.3	15.0
University Average	16.1	14.3	15.8	19.2	17.5

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 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>	<u>Summer 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	23.9*	8.0*	22.3*	15.6*	27.3*
Brooklyn	19.1	25.2	26.8	31.6	31.4
City	13.2	12.3	17.9	18.5	13.8
Hunter	16.3*	19.5*	18.6*	15.0*	27.4*
Lehman	12.2	11.0	12.3	22.5	25.5
Queens	23.2	19.8	22.4	30.5	36.9*
York	16.6	14.4	14.3	16.5	20.2
Senior College Average	15.6	14.7	16.8	22.0	23.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10.7	10.5	11.4	15.8	18.4
Medgar Evers	19.5*	20.8*	29.1	35.0	44.1
NYCCT	17.1	16.5	19.1	19.2	17.4
Staten Island	15.0	14.0	19.9	15.6	14.7
Comprehensive College Average	14.3	13.6	17.8	17.9	18.3
Community					
BMCC	21.0	17.1	19.7	25.8	27.1
Bronx	9.4*	8.5	9.4*	8.7	16.6*
Hostos	5.5*	9.9*	19.1*	22.8*	20.2*
Kingsborough	12.6	11.8	17.3	14.5	12.6
LaGuardia	16.7	21.5	22.4	20.4	23.2
Queensborough	20.2*	13.8	18.1*	20.1	18.7
Community College Average	16.1	14.9	19.0	19.3	20.4
University Average	15.1	14.3	17.6	19.4	20.0

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 instructional FTEs in lower division courses delivered by full-time faculty

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	51.8	58.4	55.5	53.0	51.1
Brooklyn	46.9	43.3	39.1	44.8	39.6
City	42.2	35.0	36.9	41.6	38.5
Hunter	36.9	35.7	34.8	39.6	36.8
Lehman	37.3	38.4	39.1	37.7	36.8
Queens	42.4	41.1	35.0	44.0	40.5
York	38.5	39.9	47.3	46.5	50.5
Senior College Average	42.9	42.0	40.7	43.6	41.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	35.1	38.7	39.3	41.9	35.3
Medgar Evers	39.2	42.6	51.7	49.7	43.7
NYCCT	46.4	48.0	49.0	46.9	47.3
Staten Island	33.6	32.8	33.6	27.8	24.9
Comprehensive College Average	39.1	40.8	42.9	41.0	37.9
University Average	41.1	41.5	41.7	42.5	39.9

Note: The values shown here for prior years are revised from previous reports to reflect a correction in the way FTEs for team taught courses are apportioned. This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of student FTEs in lower division courses taught by full-time faculty members by the total of all lower division student FTEs. For fall 2006 and later, instruction in winter session sections is included only for full-time faculty whose teaching is part of their contractual workload (instruction is added to both the numerator and the denominator). Other winter session sections are excluded. Full-time faculty members are those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers. Instruction is credited to the faculty member's appointment college except for those appointed to the Graduate Center; their teaching is credited to the college where instruction took place. College Now sections are excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	74.6	79.5	80.2	76.8	76.8
Brooklyn	76.6	78.2	78.2	79.6	81.6
City	83.3	82.0	83.2	82.9	81.6
Hunter	85.3	87.5	81.6	87.9	89.0
Lehman	82.8	82.1	78.9	80.3	80.3
Queens	87.0	85.3	87.9	84.8	88.3
York	72.0	72.9	76.4	77.7	80.1
Senior College Average	80.3	81.5	80.9	81.6	82.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	70.0	69.0	72.0	71.0	73.0
Medgar Evers	75.8	70.1	70.5	72.6	70.1
NYCCT	68.2	68.6	68.7	72.2	69.1
Staten Island	84.9	85.8	84.8	82.7	84.8
Comprehensive College Average	73.4	72.6	73.6	74.2	73.8
Community					
BMCC	78.1	79.1	76.7	77.4	79.3
Bronx	73.5	75.4	78.7	73.0	75.4
Hostos	78.6	75.8	80.1	78.3	78.7
Kingsborough	82.4	83.3	84.7	84.8	83.1
LaGuardia	75.5	73.7	74.2	72.2	73.2
Queensborough	74.8	79.2	78.3	76.7	77.0
Community College Average	77.5	78.2	78.2	77.2	77.9
University Average	77.0	77.3	77.5	77.3	77.7

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	93.9	94.9	94.9	95.9	94.2
Brooklyn	78.5	80.9	79.5	82.8	83.1
City	90.5	92.1	91.5	92.5	92.8
Hunter	91.4	93.4	93.3	95.4	95.2
Lehman	91.6	90.4	87.7	90.1	88.3
Queens	93.0	90.7	93.1	91.8	92.8
York	72.1	73.9	81.3	80.9	84.7
Senior College Average	88.5	89.0	89.2	90.7	91.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	76.7	77.5	82.2	82.1	83.6
Medgar Evers	75.9	68.0	71.8	70.4	73.2
NYCCT	82.1	83.3	84.2	84.6	84.4
Staten Island	91.6	92.0	91.5	91.1	92.0
Comprehensive College Average	82.3	81.9	84.0	83.6	84.7
Community					
BMCC	79.8	81.5	80.7	80.4	81.1
Bronx	80.7	78.4	84.1	78.4	78.4
Hostos	81.7	80.3	82.9	80.5	81.1
Kingsborough	87.8	88.0	86.7	88.1	85.4
LaGuardia	77.3	75.5	78.1	75.6	76.4
Queensborough	83.3	87.4	87.0	86.6	85.1
Community College Average	81.5	82.0	82.8	81.8	81.4
University Average	83.8	83.9	84.8	84.4	84.3

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	49.9	59.8	61.4	50.6	54.9
Brooklyn	70.2	69.6	74.2	70.5	76.7
City	69.6	62.9	67.0	65.3	64.0
Hunter	70.7	74.3	58.0	72.8	78.3
Lehman	60.8	62.7	63.7	67.6	69.8
Queens	66.8	69.7	73.4	64.2	75.8
York	71.6	68.9	59.3	69.9	63.9
Senior College Average	62.4	65.5	64.3	64.2	66.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	63.0	60.1	61.6	59.8	62.9
Medgar Evers	75.7	73.1	68.7	76.0	66.3
NYCCT	53.6	55.4	55.5	61.5	56.1
Staten Island	71.0	72.7	70.8	66.1	70.1
Comprehensive College Average	62.4	61.6	61.4	63.3	61.7
Community					
BMCC	75.1	73.2	69.1	71.3	74.9
Bronx	44.1	61.5	56.8	45.8	55.6
Hostos	69.6	59.2	67.6	68.1	66.1
Kingsborough	59.7	59.1	74.4	67.8	71.2
LaGuardia	67.0	65.1	59.5	59.6	62.5
Queensborough	55.2	57.8	56.3	57.1	60.3
Community College Average	66.3	65.2	64.9	63.8	67.0
University Average	63.6	63.7	63.2	63.7	64.6

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 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Methodology

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

	<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					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	87.8	85.2	89.0	86.6	89.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	88.3	89.5	89.8	88.9	91.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-0.5	-4.3	-0.8	-2.3	-1.7
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.0	80.9	74.7	71.4	80.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.2	79.9	78.5	81.6	82.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.1	1.0	-3.8	-10.1	-2.0
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.2	79.3	81.9	79.9	82.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.3	79.6	80.6	78.9	83.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.2	-0.3	1.3	1.0	-1.0
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.5	79.0	82.9	82.7	82.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.0	83.1	83.9	84.8	85.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.5	-4.1	-1.0	-2.1	-2.8
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.3	73.5	71.9	76.9	80.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	73.7	72.5	72.5	78.2	81.3
URM-non-URM Gap	3.6	1.0	-0.6	-1.2	-1.2
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.4	83.3	84.2	84.5	85.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.9	84.1	85.0	86.3	88.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.5	-0.8	-0.8	-1.7	-3.1
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	65.4	71.9	70.2	75.0	73.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	75.3	67.9	67.3	75.6	77.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.0	4.1	2.8	-0.6	-3.8
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.7	78.5	78.3	79.1	81.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.8	82.9	83.3	84.1	86.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.1	-4.4	-5.0	-5.0	-4.8

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Methodology

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

	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.7	75.8	73.6	75.3	76.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.9	71.7	70.1	74.1	77.4
URM-non-URM Gap	6.8	4.1	3.5	1.2	-1.1
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	61.1*	61.2	56.6	68.7	63.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	---	66.7*	33.3*	100.0*	63.6*
URM-non-URM Gap	---	-5.5*	23.3*	-31.3*	0.3*
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.0	76.7	78.8	79.5	73.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	74.2	71.7	79.4	82.0	76.1
URM-non-URM Gap	4.7	5.0	-0.6	-2.5	-2.7
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.5	80.6	74.4	74.7	78.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.2	82.1	83.2	80.8	84.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.7	-1.5	-8.8	-6.1	-5.4
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.6	73.6	70.9	74.5	74.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	73.2	76.2	75.6	77.6	80.3
URM-non-URM Gap	3.4	-2.6	-4.7	-3.0	-5.5

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

New Methodology

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

	<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>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.7	77.6	76.7	78.0	79.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM-non-URM Gap)	81.6	81.9	82.2	83.1	85.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.9	-4.4	-5.5	-5.1	-5.6

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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					
Males	87.2	87.2	87.9	87.6	89.1
Females	89.3	89.5	91.5	89.2	92.7
Male-Female Gap	-2.1	-2.3	-3.6	-1.6	-3.6
Brooklyn					
Males	75.3	79.2	76.2	77.3	80.8
Females	81.0	81.0	77.9	78.3	82.8
Male-Female Gap	-5.7	-1.8	-1.7	-1.0	-2.0
City					
Males	78.7	79.2	78.9	79.6	83.4
Females	81.1	79.7	83.5	79.3	83.3
Male-Female Gap	-2.4	-0.5	-4.6	0.3	0.1
Hunter					
Males	79.9	77.7	80.1	81.8	80.6
Females	80.3	83.7	85.4	85.5	87.1
Male-Female Gap	-0.4	-6.0	-5.3	-3.6	-6.5
Lehman					
Males	78.1	71.3	70.5	76.0	75.1
Females	76.2	74.0	72.6	77.7	83.7
Male-Female Gap	1.8	-2.7	-2.2	-1.7	-8.6
Queens					
Males	76.3	81.3	80.5	84.0	86.5
Females	85.0	85.5	87.6	87.1	88.8
Male-Female Gap	-8.7	-4.2	-7.1	-3.1	-2.3
York					
Males	63.6	68.8	66.4	76.2	77.6
Females	69.4	72.1	71.3	74.6	73.2
Male-Female Gap	-5.8	-3.4	-4.9	1.7	4.3
Senior College Average					
Males	78.8	79.9	79.1	81.4	83.2
Females	81.2	81.7	82.5	82.2	85.1
Male-Female Gap	-2.4	-1.8	-3.3	-0.8	-1.9

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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	70.6	73.7	70.8	71.6	76.2
Females	76.5	74.4	73.2	77.2	77.1
Male-Female Gap	-5.9	-0.7	-2.4	-5.7	-1.0
Medgar Evers					
Males	57.1	61.4	58.8	76.9	65.7
Females	63.6*	61.3	54.5	66.0	62.7
Male-Female Gap	-6.5	0.1	4.3	10.9	3.0
NYCCT					
Males	74.8	74.8	80.2	81.4	73.0
Females	84.9	75.9	75.0	77.3	77.0
Male-Female Gap	-10.1	-1.1	5.2	4.1	-4.0
Staten Island					
Males	81.9	80.3	81.6	77.7	79.9
Females	76.5	82.8	81.6	81.4	87.1
Male-Female Gap	5.4	-2.5	0.0	-3.6	-7.1
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	73.1	74.5	73.1	74.5	76.3
Females	76.9	75.1	72.8	76.8	78.3
Male-Female Gap	-3.7	-0.7	0.4	-2.3	-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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
University Average					
Males	77.8	79.0	78.1	80.0	81.6
Females	80.6	80.7	80.8	81.2	83.7
Male-Female Gap	-2.8	-1.7	-2.8	-1.2	-2.1

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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	62.0	61.5	61.5	66.8	69.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	63.9	67.5	67.5	69.2	69.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.0	-6.0	-6.0	-2.4	0.2
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	54.1	49.3	52.8	55.6	55.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	55.6*	80.0*	55.6*	50.0*	52.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.5*	-30.7*	-2.8*	5.6*	3.8
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.0	58.3	58.3	56.7	61.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.8	69.3	69.1	70.0	72.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.8	-11.0	-10.8	-13.4	-11.6
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	64.1	59.5	58.7	57.9	59.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.1	64.3	65.4	66.2	70.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.1	-4.8	-6.8	-8.3	-11.4
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.3	58.1	58.5	58.6	61.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.0	66.5	66.8	67.7	71.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.7	-8.4	-8.3	-9.1	-9.8

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
Community					
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	55.9	55.9	59.9	58.9	63.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.0	66.0	65.6	65.6	72.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.1	-10.2	-5.7	-6.7	-8.7
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.1	61.6	61.1	64.9	60.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	62.0	58.0	62.9	72.1	60.2
URM-non-URM Gap	1.1	3.6	-1.8	-7.3	0.7
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.1	57.7	60.5	56.7	62.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	62.9	60.9*	58.8	61.0	66.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.8	-3.1*	1.7	-4.2	-4.0
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	60.1	58.8	61.5	66.2	63.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.4	70.8	70.9	74.5	75.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.2	-12.0	-9.4	-8.3	-11.5
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.1	61.0	59.7	60.5	65.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.6	71.7	74.1	74.9	75.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-10.5	-10.8	-14.4	-14.4	-9.8
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.3	57.5	59.9	65.1	68.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.9	69.3	71.1	73.6	76.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-11.6	-11.8	-11.2	-8.5	-8.2
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.5	58.5	60.3	61.6	64.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.5	69.2	70.2	71.9	74.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.9	-10.7	-9.9	-10.4	-10.3

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.8	58.4	59.7	60.7	63.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM-non-URM Gap)	68.3	68.1	68.9	70.5	73.3
	-9.5	-9.7	-9.1	-9.8	-10.0

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	60.2	60.1	62.6	68.5	67.3
Females	64.2	65.3	63.5	66.5	70.6
Male-Female Gap	-4.0	-5.2	-0.9	2.0	-3.3
Medgar Evers					
Males	52.4	42.2	50.3	54.6	49.8
Females	54.8	52.5	53.9	55.8	58.0
Male-Female Gap	-2.4	-10.3	-3.6	-1.2	-8.2
NYCCT					
Males	58.2	59.9	59.2	60.0	63.5
Females	64.3	63.0	63.7	60.9	66.3
Male-Female Gap	-6.1	-3.1	-4.5	-0.8	-2.8
Staten Island					
Males	65.8	56.1	61.6	59.6	64.6
Females	69.1	69.0	64.9	66.9	69.1
Male-Female Gap	-3.3	-12.9	-3.2	-7.3	-4.5
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	60.4	58.0	60.1	60.7	63.2
Females	64.3	63.8	62.8	62.8	66.0
Male-Female Gap	-3.9	-5.7	-2.7	-2.1	-2.8

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
Community					
BMCC					
Males	55.8	54.5	59.1	56.6	63.0
Females	60.0	61.5	63.0	63.4	67.6
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-7.1	-4.0	-6.8	-4.6
Bronx					
Males	59.7	60.7	57.9	62.5	58.2
Females	65.9	61.9	63.7	67.5	63.0
Male-Female Gap	-6.2	-1.2	-5.8	-5.1	-4.8
Hostos					
Males	53.2	52.4	61.8	53.6	64.5
Females	61.3	60.6	59.8	58.7	62.5
Male-Female Gap	-8.1	-8.2	2.0	-5.1	2.0
Kingsborough					
Males	59.2	60.1	62.6	69.1	65.5
Females	69.5	68.5	69.4	71.4	72.1
Male-Female Gap	-10.3	-8.4	-6.7	-2.3	-6.6
LaGuardia					
Males	61.1	61.9	63.8	62.4	67.9
Females	61.6	66.1	64.7	67.4	69.2
Male-Female Gap	-0.5	-4.2	-0.8	-5.0	-1.3
Queensborough					
Males	61.2	60.3	63.5	68.0	68.9
Females	65.9	65.1	66.5	69.6	74.0
Male-Female Gap	-4.7	-4.8	-3.0	-1.6	-5.2
Community College Average					
Males	58.8	58.7	61.5	62.5	65.2
Females	63.8	64.2	64.8	66.5	69.0
Male-Female Gap	-5.0	-5.5	-3.4	-4.1	-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 2010-11 Goals and Targets 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 (race/ethnicity and gender).

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

	<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>
University Average					
Males	59.4	58.4	61.0	61.9	64.5
Females	64.0	64.1	64.2	65.4	68.1
Male-Female Gap	-4.6	-5.6	-3.2	-3.5	-3.6

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 2010-11 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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	40.7	42.0	46.8	45.3	40.8
Brooklyn	33.8	30.8	31.7	34.0	33.9
City	28.0	29.6	27.3	26.8	27.7
Hunter	28.7	31.5	34.4	31.0	32.6
Lehman	28.4	27.2	27.1	28.3	28.8
Queens	31.4	32.4	32.6	33.9	30.4
York	16.3	18.2	19.9	23.1	22.7
Senior College Average	30.9	31.6	32.6	32.5	31.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	20.3	16.6	16.7	18.6	22.7
Medgar Evers	22.2	29.0	27.9	30.3	24.2
NYCCT	25.8	24.9	25.6	24.0	24.5
Staten Island	17.2	17.3	24.0	20.4	20.3
Comprehensive College Average	21.3	20.7	22.6	22.1	22.7
Community					
BMCC	18.3	18.7	18.4	16.9	17.1
Bronx	22.7	24.4	22.0	20.2	19.2
Hostos	19.5	14.4	16.3	12.7	14.6
Kingsborough	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LaGuardia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Queensborough	22.3	17.7	23.5	21.8	24.7
Community College Average	20.4	19.0	20.3	18.3	19.7
University Average	25.6	25.3	26.5	25.6	25.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	84.5	90.4	90.0	88.8	84.2
Brooklyn	87.0	90.1	83.8	86.6	90.9
City	80.4	80.0	77.6	84.9	83.6
Hunter	61.4	60.5	65.1	69.0	69.6
Lehman	79.6	82.3	82.6	85.7	84.9
Queens	66.5	60.6	62.5	64.3	62.6
York	96.4	98.0	97.4	78.3	70.0
Senior College Average	77.0	77.0	77.6	78.1	76.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
Medgar Evers	99.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NYCCT	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0	99.7
Staten Island	96.5	96.3	95.8	96.1	90.2
Comprehensive College Average	99.1	99.1	99.0	99.0	97.4
University Average	81.8	81.9	82.2	83.0	81.6

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 2010-11 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	26.1	27.0	28.2	28.6	28.9
Brooklyn	22.9	24.5	24.3	24.5	25.6
City	22.1	22.8	23.0	23.2	24.1
Hunter	24.6	24.9	25.5	25.8	25.7
Lehman	23.2	23.1	23.8	24.4	25.3
Queens	25.1	25.9	25.6	25.8	26.7
York	19.8	21.7	22.2	22.8	23.5
Senior College Average	23.8	24.6	24.9	25.2	25.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	22.7	23.5	23.4	23.8	23.1
Medgar Evers	17.9*	19.2	19.1	18.9	19.5
NYCCT	20.7	21.4	20.1	20.6	22.1
Staten Island	25.9	25.8	26.3	25.3	25.4
Comprehensive College Average	22.9	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.4
University Average	23.7	24.4	24.7	24.9	25.3

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.826	0.825	0.830	0.842	0.837
Brooklyn	0.799	0.804	0.808	0.820	0.827
City	0.793	0.797	0.806	0.808	0.822
Hunter	0.776	0.784	0.791	0.796	0.799
Lehman	0.765	0.769	0.774	0.773	0.767
Queens	0.801	0.808	0.812	0.825	0.832
York	0.760	0.772	0.772	0.772	0.771
Senior College Average	0.792	0.797	0.802	0.809	0.812
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.804	0.811	0.807	0.817	0.822
Medgar Evers	0.724	0.730	0.707	0.740	0.771
NYCCT	0.743	0.735	0.739	0.745	0.745
Staten Island	0.823	0.822	0.831	0.817	0.824
Comprehensive College Average	0.786	0.787	0.789	0.796	0.805
University Average	0.791	0.795	0.799	0.806	0.810

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.830	0.814	0.786	0.822	0.708
Medgar Evers	0.752	0.792	0.785	0.810	0.807
NYCCT	0.751	0.747	0.752	0.756	0.762
Staten Island	0.775	0.772	0.739	0.762	0.787
Comprehensive College Average	0.772	0.770	0.757	0.774	0.772
Community					
BMCC	0.721	0.732	0.748	0.774	0.763
Bronx	0.733	0.725	0.720	0.739	0.745
Hostos	0.777	0.747	0.750	0.760	0.765
Kingsborough	0.889	0.893	0.890	0.910	0.905
LaGuardia	0.820	0.829	0.839	0.834	0.850
Queensborough	0.699	0.707	0.716	0.747	0.768
Community College Average	0.769	0.773	0.780	0.800	0.804
University Average	0.770	0.772	0.775	0.794	0.798

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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>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	88.2	88.2	89.6	88.3	90.7
Brooklyn	78.4	80.2	77.2	77.9	81.9
City	79.8	79.5	81.3	79.5	83.3
Hunter	80.2	81.7	83.6	84.2	84.7
Lehman	76.8	73.3	72.0	77.1	80.4
Queens	81.5	83.8	84.8	85.8	87.8
York	67.4	70.9	69.6	75.1	74.9
Senior College Average	80.2	80.9	81.1	81.8	84.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74.0	74.1	72.3	74.9	76.7
Medgar Evers	61.1*	61.4	56.0	69.2	63.9
NYCCT	77.5	75.0	79.0	80.2	74.4
Staten Island	79.3	81.8	81.6	79.7	83.4
Comprehensive College Average	75.1	74.8	72.9	75.8	77.3
University Average	79.4	80.0	79.7	80.7	82.7

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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>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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	75.0	75.5	77.4	76.3	78.8
Brooklyn	64.9	67.4	68.0	65.4	66.5
City	62.2	63.1	66.9	67.7	65.5
Hunter	66.7	65.5	65.6	69.2	70.9
Lehman	59.6	61.4	59.1	57.9	65.0
Queens	69.4	70.3	73.5	72.6	73.9
York	44.4	45.0	52.0	52.7	52.2
Senior College Average	65.4	66.0	67.8	67.5	68.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	57.2	56.3	58.7	59.6	61.9
Medgar Evers	50.0	61.1*	42.0	38.2	45.7
NYCCT	56.3	53.4	56.4	57.1	55.6
Staten Island	69.2	69.5	69.7	71.6	68.8
Comprehensive College Average	58.6	58.0	59.6	59.8	61.5
University Average	64.2	64.8	66.5	66.2	67.3

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 2010-11 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>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	85.6	88.5	86.9	88.2	88.9
Brooklyn	70.3	70.8	72.7	75.3	76.5
City	71.3	71.4	72.9	74.0	71.5
Hunter	70.6	74.6	74.9	74.5	78.6
Lehman	73.2	73.9	74.7	75.9	76.2
Queens	76.2	77.1	77.2	78.9	79.0
York	62.2	67.4	65.2	65.8	65.7
Senior College Average	73.6	75.5	75.8	77.0	77.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.9	74.5	74.1	77.4	81.7
Medgar Evers	59.0	51.6	60.8	56.8	72.4
NYCCT	75.3	71.2	76.4	75.5	79.2
Staten Island	75.0	76.6	78.9	80.1	75.9
Comprehensive College Average	75.6	72.4	74.3	76.0	78.4
University Average	73.9	75.0	75.5	76.8	77.6

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 2010-11 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</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>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	81.0	78.0	81.0	78.6	81.9
Brooklyn	61.6	63.2	63.2	64.3	66.6
City	58.2	58.1	62.2	62.3	64.5
Hunter	60.6	59.6	63.3	67.1	65.5
Lehman	65.1	63.2	60.9	68.1	68.3
Queens	65.7	68.0	68.0	67.7	70.7
York	56.4	52.1	56.8	60.7	52.5
Senior College Average	64.8	64.4	66.0	67.5	68.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.7	66.9	67.3	63.1	69.6
Medgar Evers	43.6	49.4	33.3	43.7	46.4
NYCCT	60.0	58.8	63.3	64.4	62.9
Staten Island	66.3	66.7	70.5	71.7	68.5
Comprehensive College Average	61.5	63.9	64.4	63.6	65.9
University Average	64.3	64.3	65.7	66.8	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 2010-11 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>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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.5	63.0	63.1	67.3	69.1
Medgar Evers	54.1	49.8	52.8	55.5	55.7
NYCCT	61.0	61.3	61.2	60.4	64.7
Staten Island	67.7	62.9	63.4	63.5	67.0
Comprehensive College Average	62.5	61.1	61.5	61.8	64.6
Community					
BMCC	59.0	59.1	61.2	60.5	65.6
Bronx	63.1	61.4	61.2	65.2	60.9
Hostos	58.4	57.8	60.5	57.0	63.2
Kingsborough	64.9	64.6	66.2	70.3	69.1
LaGuardia	62.1	64.4	64.3	65.2	68.6
Queensborough	68.5	65.8	69.5	70.7	71.5
Community College Average	62.9	62.6	64.1	65.0	67.3
University Average	62.7	62.0	63.2	64.0	66.4

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 2010-11 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.

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	66.6	68.2	68.2	71.5	71.7
Medgar Evers	59.5	53.7	55.6	59.4	58.1
NYCCT	67.4	67.7	66.7	66.9	68.3
Staten Island	75.1	70.4	70.7	71.5	70.8
Comprehensive College Average	68.5	67.2	67.2	68.1	67.9
Community					
BMCC	62.8	61.9	63.4	63.3	67.0
Bronx	65.6	63.8	62.9	66.6	61.5
Hostos	60.5	60.2	62.9	58.4	64.2
Kingsborough	68.9	68.2	69.1	73.1	71.2
LaGuardia	64.5	66.9	66.8	67.4	70.0
Queensborough	71.0	68.3	72.2	73.5	72.9
Community College Average	65.9	65.3	66.5	67.5	68.7
University Average	66.9	66.0	66.8	67.7	68.4

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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's 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>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	33.5	32.8	33.6	35.5	33.3
Brooklyn	19.9	17.3	23.2	21.7	26.7
City	6.9	5.5	9.1	6.1	7.5
Hunter	17.7	16.9	17.1	20.0	19.2
Lehman	10.0	10.8	11.7	14.0	14.4
Queens	27.6	25.3	26.0	25.9	25.7
York	6.0	5.3	3.7	3.6	4.0
Senior College Average	20.0	18.5	19.8	20.2	20.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	20.7	23.1	21.2	19.0	21.0
Medgar Evers	12.5	0.0*	0.0	11.1*	5.1
NYCCT	5.1	5.9	5.2	2.9	5.1
Staten Island	23.3	22.9	25.8	25.2	24.2
Comprehensive College Average	18.8	19.4	18.4	17.8	18.9
University Average	19.8	18.7	19.5	19.8	20.0

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 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.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's programs.

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

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>
Senior					
Baruch	56.8	59.8	57.6	60.3	60.5
Brooklyn	44.3	46.9	43.7	43.3	48.5
City	30.3	36.2	37.0	35.0	38.9
Hunter	37.5	35.9	41.9	43.7	46.2
Lehman	30.4	33.6	33.6	30.8	34.5
Queens	52.6	52.7	55.3	51.8	51.0
York	23.8	27.6	23.4	23.9	19.5
Senior College Average	42.2	44.7	44.8	44.5	45.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	42.3	42.1	42.7	41.7	40.1
Medgar Evers	20.0*	10.3	21.9	5.3*	23.3
NYCCT	9.1*	11.1	18.2	17.3	24.5
Staten Island	51.4	44.3	45.6	45.2	48.1
Comprehensive College Average	43.5	39.3	39.2	37.1	38.0
University Average	42.3	43.9	44.0	43.3	44.4

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 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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's 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>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	68.9	63.9	65.1	65.5	67.4
Brooklyn	44.0	43.0	44.8	48.7	46.0
City	34.1	33.0	37.9	37.5	37.8
Hunter	43.6	41.0	46.5	47.2	47.0
Lehman	50.1	45.2	48.7	45.7	45.5
Queens	53.7	52.3	50.6	52.3	54.8
York	40.0	38.7	38.6	33.3	38.7
Senior College Average	48.4	45.9	48.5	48.9	49.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.0	49.8	48.8	52.8	53.7
Medgar Evers	20.0	36.2	30.8	20.5	18.3
NYCCT	43.4	31.0	35.1	32.0	33.6
Staten Island	61.4	61.2	57.1	59.7	55.3
Comprehensive College Average	50.1	48.7	46.2	46.6	47.7
University Average	48.7	46.4	48.1	48.6	49.3

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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's 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>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>
Senior					
Baruch	70.9	73.5	74.9	70.5	73.3
Brooklyn	50.6	52.8	54.0	52.0	53.9
City	48.3	50.4	46.1	45.0	47.6
Hunter	51.0	47.7	50.1	48.6	54.4
Lehman	54.9	59.2	57.0	53.9	57.5
Queens	67.4	63.5	61.8	59.1	57.6
York	48.6	45.7	48.6	48.4	47.5
Senior College Average	58.2	56.7	56.7	54.3	56.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.5	58.6	57.3	56.0	56.0
Medgar Evers	28.0	18.3	36.4	40.4	39.7
NYCCT	46.2	45.6	50.7	39.3	41.8
Staten Island	64.2	66.7	67.1	66.9	60.1
Comprehensive College Average	54.3	57.4	57.5	55.1	52.9
University Average	57.6	56.8	56.8	54.5	56.2

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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's 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>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2006</u>
Senior					
Baruch	77.0	75.2	74.4	77.9	79.3
Brooklyn	67.6	70.0	69.6	71.0	73.1
City	53.2	60.4	65.1	65.8	65.2
Hunter	68.0	67.7	71.9	72.9	73.5
Lehman	68.5	73.9	71.4	65.0	72.3
Queens	70.0	70.6	73.0	69.7	65.0
Senior College Average	68.7	69.4	71.2	71.3	71.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	61.5	54.6	65.5	61.9	60.7
Staten Island	62.9	56.0	62.8	61.0	52.5
Comprehensive College Average	61.9	55.0	64.5	61.7	58.3
University Average	67.7	67.3	70.2	69.9	69.7

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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's 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 Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	25.2	26.0	24.3	26.6	24.7
Medgar Evers	16.9	17.8	16.9	21.8	16.9
NYCCT	19.8	19.8	19.7	22.1	20.6
Staten Island	24.2	26.5	24.9	22.7	24.4
Comprehensive College Average	21.6	22.6	22.1	23.4	22.5
Community					
BMCC	23.5	24.2	23.7	22.9	21.6
Bronx	20.8	20.4	22.1	20.3	19.7
Hostos	18.2	20.3	18.9	22.5	23.9
Kingsborough	27.1	28.7	34.9	34.5	32.7
LaGuardia	27.4	27.6	24.8	24.7	25.6
Queensborough	27.1	24.5	26.1	25.1	24.0
Community College Average	25.0	25.1	26.0	25.3	24.7
University Average	23.9	24.2	24.6	24.6	23.9

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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's programs.

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	29.5	30.5	28.9	30.8	29.6
Medgar Evers	21.0	20.7	20.0	24.9	21.6
NYCCT	25.5	25.8	26.0	29.8	28.6
Staten Island	29.3	31.7	30.5	27.9	31.4
Comprehensive College Average	26.7	27.8	27.5	28.9	29.0
Community					
BMCC	27.3	27.6	26.6	27.5	25.7
Bronx	22.3	22.3	23.7	22.7	22.2
Hostos	19.9	22.2	20.9	24.1	25.5
Kingsborough	30.1	32.0	38.8	38.7	36.3
LaGuardia	30.2	30.2	28.2	27.7	28.2
Queensborough	31.8	29.0	30.7	28.8	28.1
Community College Average	28.2	28.4	29.2	28.9	28.0
University Average	27.7	28.2	28.6	28.9	28.4

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 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 2010-11 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 progressively increase in associate, baccalaureate and master's programs.

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	11.0	13.5	12.7	15.8	13.1
Medgar Evers	13.7	10.8	14.6	11.9	14.6
NYCCT	13.2	12.4	12.7	10.9	10.1
Staten Island	13.8	13.3	14.5	12.5	12.0
Comprehensive College Average	13.1	12.7	13.4	12.8	11.9
Community					
BMCC	13.6	11.9	14.2	12.5	13.9
Bronx	15.3	14.3	13.2	13.1	13.4
Hostos	9.7	8.9	11.9	8.7	9.7
Kingsborough	12.9	12.1	10.4	10.6	9.9
LaGuardia	11.7	9.6	10.1	11.1	10.1
Queensborough	14.8	14.3	14.2	14.2	11.8
Community College Average	13.3	12.1	12.5	12.1	11.8
University Average	13.2	12.3	12.8	12.3	11.8

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	430	519	475	491	483
City	588	544	481	618	476
Hunter	383	426	419	436	528
Lehman	454	536	521	495	521
Queens	583	526	807	890	746
York	13	15	22	26	22
Senior College Total	2,451	2,566	2,725	2,956	2,776
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	4	8	12	15	14
NYCCT	13	5	0	0	5
Staten Island	216	304	236	223	217
Comprehensive College Total	233	317	248	238	236
University Total	2,684	2,883	2,973	3,194	3,012

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	95	93	94	95	95
City	98	99	98	100	98
Hunter	99	100	100	100	100
Lehman	99	96	98	98	91
Queens	98	97	98	99	98
York	93*	94*	100*	96	96*
Senior College Average	98	97	98	98	97
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	99	99	96	98	98
Comprehensive College Average	99	99	95	98	98
University Average	98	97	97	98	97

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	299	406	398	405	392
City	376	345	295	355	184
Hunter	332	394	361	335	396
Lehman	312	397	373	341	298
Queens	451	392	698	789	680
York	14	16	22	27	23
Senior College Total	1,784	1,950	2,147	2,252	1,973
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	4	8	12	15	14
NYCCT	13	5	2	9	5
Staten Island	178	259	225	213	215
Comprehensive College Total	195	272	239	237	234
University Total	1,979	2,222	2,386	2,489	2,207

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	98	98	97	97	98
City	100	99	100	100	100
Hunter	100	100	100	100	100
Lehman	98	99	100	99	96
Queens	99	98	99	99	99
York	93*	100*	100*	100	100*
Senior College Average	99	99	99	99	99
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	100	100	97	99	100
Comprehensive College Average	100	100	98	99	100
University Average	99	99	99	99	99

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	308	409	402	403	397
City	330	315	266	330	180
Hunter	343	399	383	351	428
Lehman	305	411	374	332	299
Queens	454	392	704	805	712
York	15	15	23	26	24
Senior College Total	1,755	1,941	2,152	2,247	2,040
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	4	8	12	16	13
NYCCT	15	15	15	23	18
Staten Island	179	264	223	221	214
Comprehensive College Total	198	287	250	260	245
University Total	1,953	2,228	2,402	2,507	2,285

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	89	88	87	82	89
City	94	95	95	98	95
Hunter	96	98	96	96	97
Lehman	96	94	94	93	85
Queens	93	95	95	94	93
York	90*	80*	86*	85	100*
Senior College Average	94	94	93	93	92
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	82*	93	64
NYCCT	100*	80*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	93	96	87	88	90
Comprehensive College Average	93	96	86	89	87
University Average	94	95	93	92	92

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	238	320	402	433	451
City	318	288	330	425	251
Hunter	326	382	451	416	530
Lehman	289	342	434	412	400
Queens	416	347	837	945	829
York	10	10	22	27	23
Senior College Total	1,597	1,689	2,476	2,658	2,484
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	4	9	22	28	28
NYCCT	15	5	2	9	5
Staten Island	189	298	240	254	218
Comprehensive College Total	208	312	264	291	251
University Total	1,805	2,001	2,740	2,949	2,735

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Percentage passing the NCLEX exam

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Hunter	86.7	88.2	91.9	89.2	90.1
Lehman	70.1	73.0	84.4	81.5	87.8
Senior College Average	77.8	79.5	87.6	86.2	89.4
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	84.2*	94.4*	100.0*	100.0	82.9
NYCCT	90.3	88.2	90.7	82.1	95.2
Staten Island	90.5	88.6	80.3	84.7	90.8
Comprehensive College Average	90.0	88.9	85.3	85.2	91.2
Community					
BMCC	83.2	88.5	82.9	82.7	84.0
Bronx	87.3	74.1	86.0	81.4	90.6
Hostos	86.7*	88.0	84.6	81.1	68.4
Kingsborough	77.9	86.9	89.9	91.7	91.7
LaGuardia	93.2	97.5	87.6	85.7	79.1
Queensborough	93.0	89.9	89.4	85.0	79.8
Community College Average	86.5	87.2	86.7	85.3	82.7
University Average	86.0	86.3	86.5	85.4	85.5

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Hunter	75	76	74	102	101
Lehman	87	100	96	65	41
Senior College Total	162	176	170	167	142
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	19	18	14	27	35
NYCCT	93	85	107	106	83
Staten Island	137	132	152	124	98
Comprehensive College Total	249	235	273	257	216
Community					
BMCC	191	200	205	173	162
Bronx	55	108	50	59	32
Hostos	15	25	26	37	57
Kingsborough	86	122	119	132	132
LaGuardia	74	79	129	126	134
Queensborough	129	138	142	133	129
Community College Total	550	672	671	660	646
University Total	961	1,083	1,114	1,084	1,004

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Hunter	79	73	76	102	89
Lehman	116	109	105	67	34
Senior College Total	195	182	181	169	123
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	15	18	14	28	34
NYCCT	92	84	108	107	80
Staten Island	133	135	151	127	101
Comprehensive College Total	240	237	273	262	215
Community					
BMCC	192	201	211	175	169
Bronx	52	112	44	55	35
Hostos	12	26	31	39	58
Kingsborough	85	119	120	138	131
LaGuardia	77	80	125	132	143
Queensborough	116	142	139	137	132
Community College Total	534	680	670	676	668
University Total	969	1,099	1,124	1,107	1,006

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>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>
Senior					
Hunter	22	26	38	34	60
Lehman	12	21	48	79	104
York	16	21	24	26	34
Senior College Total	50	68	110	139	198
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	16	17	33	22	31
NYCCT	0	0	15	15	45
Staten Island	22	36	36	40	37
Comprehensive College Total	38	53	84	77	113
University Total	88	121	194	216	311

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	36.5	44.1	47.6	51.1	53.3
Brooklyn	34.7	42.9	45.3	55.8	45.4
Hunter	33.9	46.8	34.6	32.1	23.7
Lehman	25.0	22.7*	14.7	20.3	26.6
Queens	44.2	37.8	40.9	41.1	37.4
York	35.5	32.0	16.0	33.3*	29.0
Senior College Average	37.3	42.0	42.8	45.7	44.1
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	44.4*	8.3*	14.3*	15.0*	11.5
Staten Island	21.4	37.2	32.6	29.2	37.1
Comprehensive College Average	27.0	30.9	28.3	26.1	31.3
University Average	36.8	41.2	42.1	44.5	43.4

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	72.2*	65.9	75.5	80.7	77.2
Lehman	---	40.0*	---	0.0	---
Queens	---	---	---	71.4*	80.0*
Senior College Average	72.2*	63.0	75.5	80.0	77.4

Note: Pass rates are computed as the number of events passed divided by the total number of events taken, where each attempt at a subtest is counted as a separate event.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	80.0	81.4	90.2	93.9	69.6
Medgar Evers	95.2	97.1	86.0	86.7	72.3
NYCCT	85.3	81.6	93.2	87.3	78.7
Staten Island	88.2	93.2	84.1	92.8	70.8
Comprehensive College Average	86.6	85.5	89.5	89.3	74.8
Community					
BMCC	86.6	89.1	84.6	82.1	76.3
Bronx	90.1	86.3	89.3	79.1	76.5
Hostos	92.3	92.6	94.7	88.9	75.3
Kingsborough	85.4	80.7	87.2	82.6	71.0
LaGuardia	86.4	92.0	88.9	88.5	75.4
Queensborough	84.5	89.0	88.3	79.9	74.0
Community College Average	86.4	88.3	88.2	83.1	74.9
University Average	86.4	87.8	88.4	84.4	74.9

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	58.3*	69.8	65.9	65.4	68.4
Medgar Evers	59.3*	56.8*	63.9	63.3	76.1
NYCCT	60.2	53.1	58.1	51.5	62.3
Staten Island	48.3*	40.8	38.5	46.8	38.5
Comprehensive College Average	58.1	53.7	56.2	53.6	62.5
Community					
BMCC	63.8	52.6	61.0	62.8	66.8
Bronx	56.5	44.6	53.2	51.2	52.4
Hostos	70.0	37.3	51.3	42.2	61.8
Kingsborough	59.6	52.1	55.9	62.8	70.1
LaGuardia	62.7	43.7	62.2	57.0	56.5
Queensborough	42.4	44.8	58.9	60.0	46.3
Community College Average	54.9	46.7	57.8	57.6	58.0
University Average	55.4	48.0	57.5	56.8	58.8

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes

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

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

	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	97.4	96.8	97.6	98.1	92.9
Medgar Evers	100.0	97.3	100.0	95.8	94.4
NYCCT	97.4	94.1	98.6	94.6	92.7
Staten Island	100.0	94.7	92.4	98.8	77.6
Comprehensive College Average	98.3	95.0	97.4	96.2	90.9
Community					
BMCC	96.5	94.7	95.4	93.9	92.0
Bronx	96.5	92.5	96.7	90.7	88.5
Hostos	100.0	95.8	98.7	91.6	95.4
Kingsborough	94.3	90.7	95.2	95.5	94.1
LaGuardia	95.2	96.4	97.0	95.8	90.4
Queensborough	93.0	95.2	97.7	93.8	87.8
Community College Average	95.0	94.3	96.6	93.8	90.6
University Average	95.6	94.5	96.8	94.2	90.7

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

2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of 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>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.89	3.04	3.02	2.93	2.92
Brooklyn	2.49	3.02	2.90	2.93	2.93
City	2.72	2.79	2.83	2.88	2.97
Hunter	2.75	2.83	2.78	2.82	2.84
Lehman	2.93	3.10	3.01	3.02	3.00
Queens	2.87	2.91	3.03	2.85	3.00
York	2.71	2.81	2.86	2.88	2.82
Senior College Average	2.77	2.93	2.92	2.89	2.93
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.84	3.01	2.99	2.96	2.99
Medgar Evers	2.75	2.84	2.82	2.93	2.78
NYCCT	2.95	2.93	2.94	2.94	2.91
Staten Island	2.80	2.94	2.89	3.00	2.80
Comprehensive College Average	2.85	2.94	2.93	2.96	2.88
Community					
BMCC	2.84	2.84	2.93	3.02	2.91
Bronx	2.92	2.82	2.92	2.91	2.91
Hostos	2.80	2.91	3.00	2.99	3.00
Kingsborough	2.92	3.03	3.03	3.05	3.00
LaGuardia	2.89	2.97	2.95	2.97	2.88
Queensborough	2.92	2.93	3.09	3.04	3.08
Community College Average	2.88	2.91	2.98	3.00	2.95
University Average	2.83	2.93	2.94	2.95	2.93

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, learning labs. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores were calculated for each student by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process

2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of 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>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.55	2.82	2.92	2.82	2.75
Brooklyn	2.60	2.65	2.65	2.78	2.76
City	2.63	2.60	2.60	2.81	2.80
Hunter	2.53	2.62	2.59	2.59	2.53
Lehman	2.92	3.11	2.96	2.93	3.04
Queens	2.66	2.76	2.87	2.67	2.86
York	2.71	2.82	2.69	2.45	2.60
Senior College Average	2.63	2.74	2.75	2.73	2.76
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.65	2.77	2.85	2.76	2.77
Medgar Evers	2.72	2.86	2.87	2.94	2.85
NYCCT	2.79	2.75	2.75	2.74	2.77
Staten Island	2.69	2.73	2.77	2.94	2.90
Comprehensive College Average	2.71	2.77	2.80	2.83	2.82
Community					
BMCC	2.64	2.65	2.58	2.89	2.83
Bronx	2.71	2.65	2.80	2.81	2.76
Hostos	2.68	2.76	2.85	2.82	2.93
Kingsborough	2.74	2.94	2.94	2.86	2.94
LaGuardia	2.69	2.75	2.77	2.84	2.88
Queensborough	2.80	2.76	2.88	2.94	3.09
Community College Average	2.71	2.74	2.77	2.87	2.89
University Average	2.68	2.75	2.77	2.80	2.83

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 combines items about satisfaction with personal counseling, career planning and placement, and student health services. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores were calculated for each student by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process

2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

Objective 6: Improve quality of 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>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.96	3.16	3.29	3.09	3.03
Brooklyn	2.85	3.20	3.24	3.23	3.11
City	2.62	2.64	2.67	2.76	2.96
Hunter	2.78	2.82	2.81	2.79	2.76
Lehman	2.88	2.95	3.01	2.92	2.98
Queens	2.70	2.82	2.95	2.88	2.86
York	2.52	2.71	2.83	2.82	2.77
Senior College Average	2.79	2.92	2.99	2.94	2.93
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.85	2.90	3.13	2.98	3.09
Medgar Evers	2.79	2.90	2.81	2.89	2.70
NYCCT	2.74	2.90	2.95	2.91	3.01
Staten Island	2.93	2.96	3.01	3.08	2.79
Comprehensive College Average	2.83	2.91	3.00	2.97	2.93
Community					
BMCC	2.71	2.70	3.01	3.15	2.95
Bronx	2.94	2.98	3.08	3.12	3.11
Hostos	2.91	3.00	3.04	3.19	3.04
Kingsborough	2.61	2.97	2.92	2.98	2.87
LaGuardia	2.83	2.87	2.89	2.95	2.92
Queensborough	2.91	2.99	3.02	3.04	3.10
Community College Average	2.79	2.88	2.99	3.07	2.98
University Average	2.80	2.90	2.99	2.99	2.95

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

University Performance Management Process

2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	15,730	16,097	16,321	16,195	17,063
Brooklyn	15,947	16,087	16,689	17,094	16,912
City	13,155	14,392	15,306	16,212	15,416
Hunter	20,899	20,845	21,258	22,168	22,407
Lehman	10,814	10,922	11,860	12,195	12,115
Queens	18,107	18,728	19,572	20,711	20,906
York	6,236	6,727	7,157	7,780	7,821
Senior College Total	100,888	103,798	108,163	112,355	112,640
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14,645	14,841	14,844	15,330	15,206
Medgar Evers	5,561	5,550	6,036	7,080	6,920
NYCCT	13,368	13,502	14,268	15,399	15,366
Staten Island	12,313	12,517	13,092	13,858	13,894
Comprehensive College Total	45,887	46,410	48,240	51,667	51,386
Community					
BMCC	18,457	19,259	21,858	21,424	22,534
Bronx	8,717	9,003	9,117	10,420	10,740
Hostos	4,697	5,112	5,532	6,187	6,499
Kingsborough	14,687	14,962	15,739	18,204	18,606
LaGuardia	14,185	15,169	15,540	17,028	17,569
Queensborough	13,150	13,359	13,752	15,507	15,316
Community College Total	73,893	76,864	81,538	88,770	91,264
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,445	4,543	4,620	4,625	4,642
School of Journalism	57	99	111	144	169
School of Professional Studies	367	826	1,213	1,547	1,779
Law School	425	420	388	407	441
University Total	225,962	232,960	244,273	259,515	262,321

University Performance Management Process

2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,601	12,726	12,969	12,784	13,489
Brooklyn	11,530	11,867	12,243	12,549	12,385
City	9,355	10,278	11,047	11,868	11,639
Hunter	14,646	14,899	15,182	16,115	16,120
Lehman	7,485	7,653	8,195	8,423	8,357
Queens	12,873	13,578	14,288	15,410	15,639
York	4,415	4,762	5,053	5,561	5,604
Senior College Total	72,904	75,762	78,975	82,710	83,233
Comprehensive					
John Jay	11,385	11,468	11,348	12,042	11,686
Medgar Evers	3,947	4,042	4,318	5,355	5,279
NYCCT	9,583	9,619	10,316	11,146	11,218
Staten Island	9,266	9,474	9,975	10,648	10,829
Comprehensive College Total	34,181	34,603	35,957	39,191	39,012
Community					
BMCC	13,029	13,808	16,088	16,350	16,955
Bronx	6,300	6,402	6,411	7,539	7,794
Hostos	3,369	3,447	3,732	4,356	4,653
Kingsborough	10,522	10,783	11,555	13,910	14,366
LaGuardia	10,447	11,250	11,743	13,064	13,829
Queensborough	8,241	8,644	8,991	10,804	11,007
Community College Total	51,908	54,334	58,521	66,022	68,604
Graduate					
Graduate School	3,446	3,555	3,592	3,667	3,671
School of Journalism	72	122	139	180	208
School of Professional Studies	178	335	523	645	790
Law School	526	515	487	512	533
University Total	163,216	169,225	178,194	192,928	196,051

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,508	1,479	1,512	1,442	1,260
Brooklyn	1,379	1,322	1,358	977	1,157
City	1,565	1,831	1,776	1,773	1,389
Hunter	1,864	1,906	2,042	2,028	1,788
Lehman	932	886	1,001	773	641
Queens	1,662	1,778	1,675	1,712	1,491
York	693	1,017	1,057	1,045	1,103
Senior College Total	9,603	10,219	10,421	9,750	8,829
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2,783	2,813	2,442	2,872	2,015
Medgar Evers	943	891	1,048	1,378	1,188
NYCCT	2,883	2,844	3,158	3,251	2,930
Staten Island	2,281	2,479	2,515	2,688	2,342
Comprehensive College Total	8,890	9,027	9,163	10,189	8,475
Community					
BMCC	3,337	3,904	4,949	4,301	5,176
Bronx	1,611	1,697	1,568	2,056	1,911
Hostos	786	813	905	1,178	1,073
Kingsborough	1,977	2,136	2,386	3,111	2,933
LaGuardia	2,419	2,573	2,613	2,871	3,205
Queensborough	2,615	2,812	2,849	3,705	3,209
Community College Total	12,745	13,935	15,270	17,222	17,507
University Total	31,238	33,231	34,872	37,241	34,829

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,337	1,397	1,254	1,260	1,595
Brooklyn	1,590	1,694	1,699	1,759	1,449
City	1,129	1,196	1,212	1,517	970
Hunter	1,616	1,542	1,470	1,540	1,663
Lehman	1,184	1,061	1,209	1,255	1,169
Queens	1,938	1,951	2,081	2,305	1,896
York	590	694	697	833	633
Senior College Total	9,384	9,535	9,622	10,469	9,375
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,080	997	1,207	1,193	1,167
Medgar Evers	631	561	643	779	389
NYCCT	1,022	942	1,093	1,045	1,055
Staten Island	1,007	1,175	1,653	1,489	1,537
Comprehensive College Total	3,740	3,675	4,596	4,506	4,148
Community					
BMCC	1,542	1,688	1,956	1,013	621
Bronx	753	697	694	975	586
Hostos	497	522	492	620	374
Kingsborough	1,359	1,416	1,558	2,129	1,563
LaGuardia	1,453	1,399	1,416	1,473	1,062
Queensborough	959	907	853	1,102	610
Community College Total	6,563	6,629	6,969	7,312	4,816
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	239	218	274	243	330
University Total	19,926	20,057	21,461	22,530	18,669

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,796	12,863	12,731	12,332	13,120
Brooklyn	12,111	12,495	13,011	13,069	12,804
City	10,231	11,181	11,977	12,878	12,263
Hunter	15,805	15,718	15,698	15,884	15,684
Lehman	8,747	8,864	9,569	9,720	9,841
Queens	13,662	14,618	15,262	16,059	16,195
York	6,197	6,682	7,111	7,732	7,784
Senior College Total	79,549	82,421	85,359	87,674	87,691
Comprehensive					
John Jay	12,784	12,896	12,943	13,346	13,278
Medgar Evers	5,561	5,550	6,036	7,080	6,920
NYCCT	13,368	13,502	14,268	15,399	15,366
Staten Island	11,263	11,588	12,183	12,886	12,829
Comprehensive College Total	42,976	43,536	45,430	48,711	48,393
Community					
BMCC	18,457	19,259	21,858	21,424	22,534
Bronx	8,717	9,003	9,117	10,420	10,740
Hostos	4,697	5,112	5,532	6,187	6,499
Kingsborough	14,687	14,962	15,739	18,204	18,606
LaGuardia	14,185	15,169	15,540	17,028	17,569
Queensborough	13,150	13,359	13,752	15,507	15,316
Community College Total	73,893	76,864	81,538	88,770	91,264
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	255	694	966	1,117	1,136
University Total	196,673	203,515	213,293	226,272	228,484

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	991	1,064	1,159	1,245	1,229
Brooklyn	901	1,010	1,174	1,249	1,155
City	847	940	885	838	806
Hunter	909	950	1,092	1,406	1,548
Lehman	358	383	641	613	624
Queens	1,215	1,062	1,278	1,437	1,440
Senior College Total	5,221	5,409	6,229	6,788	6,802
Comprehensive					
John Jay	506	567	573	582	495
Staten Island	219	203	211	302	309
Comprehensive College Total	725	770	784	884	804
Graduate					
Graduate School	713	725	655	698	721
School of Journalism	57	50	64	83	90
School of Professional Studies	41	58	129	210	264
Law School	143	146	130	161	164
University Total	6,900	7,158	7,991	8,824	8,845

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2,934	3,234	3,590	3,863	3,943
Brooklyn	3,836	3,592	3,678	4,025	4,108
City	2,924	3,211	3,329	3,334	3,153
Hunter	5,094	5,127	5,560	6,284	6,723
Lehman	2,067	2,058	2,291	2,475	2,274
Queens	4,445	4,110	4,310	4,652	4,711
York	39	45	46	48	37
Senior College Total	21,339	21,377	22,804	24,681	24,949
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,861	1,945	1,901	1,984	1,928
Staten Island	1,050	929	909	972	1,065
Comprehensive College Total	2,911	2,874	2,810	2,956	2,993
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,445	4,543	4,620	4,625	4,642
School of Journalism	57	99	111	144	169
School of Professional Studies	112	132	247	430	643
Law School	425	420	388	407	441
University Total	29,289	29,445	30,980	33,243	33,837

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>
Senior					
Baruch	9,023	8,643	9,336	11,527	10,814
Brooklyn	3,322	4,375	5,171	4,516	3,562
City	6,529	5,788	4,835	6,371	3,482
Hunter	14,673	14,521	11,629	8,987	9,142
Lehman	9,175	8,904	9,562	10,175	10,708
Queens	17,776	15,220	14,282	12,093	8,775
York	7,428	12,586	14,809	18,043	14,611
Senior College Total	67,926	70,037	69,624	71,712	61,094
Comprehensive					
John Jay	11,208	9,098	16,613	9,380	347
Medgar Evers	3,216	12,856	12,561	2,120	2,377
NYCCT	15,503	13,885	14,359	16,358	14,612
Staten Island	5,159	5,464	4,783	4,446	4,225
Comprehensive College Total	35,086	41,303	48,316	32,304	21,214
Community					
BMCC	9,852	12,153	8,499	11,153	8,242
Bronx	15,457	13,474	12,949	13,588	15,597
Hostos	8,136	9,717	9,540	10,802	9,880
Kingsborough	20,423	23,476	24,590	23,806	24,029
LaGuardia	55,190	66,624	76,755	77,178	58,434
Queensborough	8,694	8,809	9,630	8,872	9,264
Community College Total	117,752	134,253	141,963	145,399	125,446
Graduate					
Graduate School	10,326	12,674	9,905		
School of Professional Studies		14,642	5,755	7,773	9,640
University Total	231,090	272,909	275,563	257,188	217,394

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1120	1136	1153	1182	1217
Brooklyn	1050	1050	1040	1098	1110
City	1005	1000	1026	1044	1072
Hunter	1088	1095	1104	1137	1155
Lehman	907	899	921	989	1016
Queens	1034	1033	1061	1083	1113
York	849	845	864	900	904
Senior College Average	1041	1036	1050	1084	1100
Comprehensive					
John Jay	941	931	943	942	939
Medgar Evers	872	853	875	887	852
NYCCT	920	918	908	905	929
Staten Island	982	1015	1008	1004	1008
Comprehensive College Average	949	949	956	957	955
University Average	1026	1021	1032	1057	1062

Note: Based on recent graduates of domestic high schools.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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.

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

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1123	1139	1156	1183	1218
Brooklyn	1058	1058	1053	1106	1113
City	1016	1009	1032	1049	1076
Hunter	1089	1096	1106	1138	1155
Lehman	914	906	925	989	1017
Queens	1039	1039	1067	1089	1117
York	856	852	867	901	908
Senior College Average	1047	1043	1055	1087	1103
Comprehensive					
John Jay	943	934	944	943	942
Medgar Evers	873	855	875	889	856
NYCCT	922	921	909	906	928
Staten Island	985	1016	1009	1007	1010
Comprehensive College Average	951	951	957	959	958
University Average	1031	1027	1037	1060	1066

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 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.8	87.4	87.2	86.6	86.7
Brooklyn	84.4	85.1	85.9	87.0	86.3
City	84.8	85.2	85.2	85.8	86.9
Hunter	85.3	84.8	85.9	86.5	87.2
Lehman	83.1	83.5	81.9	83.7	84.5
Queens	85.6	86.0	86.2	86.5	86.7
York	79.8	79.3	80.4	81.5	81.9
Senior College Average	84.8	85.0	85.2	85.8	86.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	80.5	81.6	81.1	81.2	82.2
Medgar Evers	75.1	75.2	74.7	77.6	77.1
NYCCT	77.5	78.0	77.8	79.9	79.8
Staten Island	84.4	84.5	83.6	83.9	84.3
Comprehensive College Average	81.1	81.7	81.1	81.8	82.4
University Average	84.2	84.5	84.5	84.9	85.1

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	81.9	83.2	91.4	97.3	98.3
Brooklyn	94.5	92.7	90.6	91.4	98.0
City	74.1	95.0	95.2	93.9	93.7
Hunter	83.2	92.6	94.8	95.4	93.1
Lehman	65.8	98.8	98.8	98.0	96.3
Queens	76.0	88.8	94.3	94.9	93.2
York	82.5	98.2	98.6	99.5	98.0
Senior College Average	78.9	92.8	94.8	95.8	95.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	61.5	98.2	100.0	99.8	100.0
Medgar Evers	81.9	81.7	99.9	99.8	100.0
NYCCT	67.3	92.1	90.8	97.4	97.5
Staten Island	66.5	74.4	100.0	97.8	99.9
Comprehensive College Average	68.9	86.7	97.7	98.7	99.3
Community					
BMCC	84.9	96.1	99.9	99.4	99.9
Bronx	80.5	99.9	100.0	99.5	100.0
Hostos	82.1	99.3	99.9	99.8	100.0
Kingsborough	79.1	96.0	99.9	100.0	100.0
LaGuardia	46.6	78.9	98.3	99.6	100.0
Queensborough	99.9	98.0	99.3	93.5	93.6
Community College Average	78.8	94.7	99.6	98.6	98.9
University Average	76.5	92.0	97.2	97.5	97.8

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Context: Percentage of evaluated courses designated as non-transferable

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	32.3	30.1	30.8	32.2	31.3
Brooklyn	30.1	23.6	21.6	22.2	23.1
City	25.3	22.3	21.8	22.1	22.1
Hunter	23.4	23.4	24.6	25.0	25.1
Lehman	5.9	18.3	18.8	15.3	15.3
Queens	13.5	11.5	10.3	9.1	8.8
York	23.8	23.3	23.3	23.1	22.9
Senior College Average	22.3	21.8	21.6	21.4	21.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	6.6	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9
Medgar Evers	39.7	39.6	33.0	31.6	2.2
NYCCT	30.2	45.6	45.9	43.7	42.5
Staten Island	19.3	22.7	16.7	16.6	15.8
Comprehensive College Average	24.8	27.5	24.4	23.9	15.9
Community					
BMCC	52.2	51.9	52.5	46.7	46.3
Bronx	29.0	25.2	24.0	24.6	24.8
Hostos	35.8	36.7	36.7	35.7	34.9
Kingsborough	66.7	57.0	55.2	38.8	38.6
LaGuardia	66.5	75.0	41.3	21.1	19.9
Queensborough	80.5	80.4	19.6	73.5	14.7
Community College Average	55.1	53.5	38.2	39.6	30.0
University Average	35.2	35.0	28.5	28.7	23.2

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	351	400	373	412	495
Brooklyn	478	473	501	516	470
City	286	309	355	403	343
Hunter	360	374	349	369	391
Lehman	325	301	312	305	317
Queens	454	451	492	615	535
York	172	185	178	210	200
Senior College Total	2,426	2,493	2,560	2,830	2,751
Comprehensive					
John Jay	306	155	337	338	500
Medgar Evers	32	32	56	42	30
NYCCT	42	57	69	62	96
Staten Island	234	377	538	584	643
Comprehensive College Total	614	621	1,000	1,026	1,269
University Total	3,040	3,114	3,560	3,856	4,020

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs

Baccalaureate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	206	189	168	183	218
Brooklyn	227	231	201	247	183
City	79	92	72	111	102
Hunter	96	82	97	92	127
Lehman	140	121	142	138	146
Queens	119	111	129	157	116
York	53	50	51	79	58
Senior College Total	920	876	860	1,007	950
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50	66	66	86	75
Medgar Evers	22	33	25	20	10
NYCCT	105	76	100	110	118
Staten Island	97	178	399	252	352
Comprehensive College Total	274	353	590	468	555
University Total	1,194	1,229	1,450	1,475	1,505

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

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

Associate Programs

	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	72.8	60.7	62.9	58.7	65.9
Medgar Evers	58.7	58.9	54.5	59.1	62.5
NYCCT	45.2	38.7	41.0	47.3	51.8
Staten Island	50.4	61.0	56.4	60.2	66.8
Comprehensive College Average	56.7	58.5	55.7	58.2	63.6
Community					
BMCC	49.1	46.6	47.5	51.2	51.0
Bronx	52.0	49.6	45.9	49.2	50.3
Hostos	37.2	46.6	41.6	46.3	46.3
Kingsborough	47.7	45.0	48.5	45.8	46.4
LaGuardia	46.5	46.3	47.5	50.7	50.1
Queensborough	53.0	51.8	56.5	58.0	57.4
Community College Average	48.7	47.3	48.8	50.5	50.6
University Average	50.0	49.2	50.1	51.8	52.7

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.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

Associate Programs

	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	15.0*	16.7*	56.5*	43.8	34.0
NYCCT	45.0	39.3	39.4	44.0	44.5
Staten Island	38.8	41.3	49.0	49.1	54.2
Comprehensive College Average	42.7	39.4	42.6	45.2	45.9
Community					
BMCC	29.1	28.1	25.4	30.5	35.5
Bronx	22.5	22.3	23.8	25.0	24.9
Hostos	18.3	20.8	19.4	26.5	29.8
Kingsborough	35.1	30.6	32.5	35.5	36.8
LaGuardia	25.0	27.7	25.5	28.6	23.8
Queensborough	20.0	17.9	20.6	21.5	23.6
Community College Average	27.2	26.1	26.0	29.4	30.3
University Average	31.4	29.7	30.5	33.4	34.1

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.44	2.41	2.40	2.55	2.52
Medgar Evers	2.34	2.70	1.97	2.14*	2.35
NYCCT	2.46	2.30	2.43*	2.12*	2.86
Staten Island	2.75	2.72	2.52	2.47	2.54
Comprehensive College Average	2.60	2.64	2.46	2.47	2.54
Community					
BMCC	2.59	2.56	2.61	2.62	2.70
Bronx	2.67	2.54	2.73	2.66	2.72
Hostos	2.67	2.69	2.48	2.55	2.61
Kingsborough	2.35	2.49	2.59	2.64	2.69
LaGuardia	2.69	2.57	2.70	2.72	2.64
Queensborough	2.44	2.45	2.55	2.49	2.59
Community College Average	2.54	2.53	2.61	2.61	2.66
University Average	2.55	2.55	2.58	2.58	2.63

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	2.26*	2.43*	2.67*	3.41*	3.02*
NYCCT	2.38	2.52	2.49	2.51	2.54
Staten Island	2.68	2.83	2.60	2.62	2.64
Comprehensive College Average	2.57	2.74	2.59	2.61	2.63
Community					
BMCC	2.58	2.68	2.78	2.79	2.69
Bronx	2.57	2.68	2.76	2.79	2.85
Hostos	2.59	2.45	2.81	2.77	2.95
Kingsborough	2.46	2.32	2.56	2.54	2.75
LaGuardia	2.58	2.65	2.74	2.68	2.72
Queensborough	2.32	2.59	2.53	2.57	2.60
Community College Average	2.52	2.55	2.69	2.67	2.74
University Average	2.53	2.59	2.66	2.66	2.71

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2005 Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2006 Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007 Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2008 Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2009 Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	83.3	79.8	82.5	81.7	86.9
Medgar Evers	70.7	77.8	88.9	78.6	58.8*
NYCCT	64.3*	77.8	73.3	79.2*	78.9*
Staten Island	80.5	77.1	80.2	76.3	71.5
Comprehensive College Average	80.2	78.1	80.7	78.0	75.2
Community					
BMCC	77.6	78.4	76.8	79.2	78.3
Bronx	77.4	78.9	76.6	81.3	79.4
Hostos	76.8	78.2	71.9	64.8	75.0
Kingsborough	74.3	71.0	73.4	75.7	79.0
LaGuardia	76.5	81.4	80.2	79.7	82.9
Queensborough	74.9	79.5	77.9	79.1	82.8
Community College Average	76.1	77.7	76.8	78.3	80.2
University Average	76.6	77.8	77.6	78.2	79.1

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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

Associate Programs

	<u>Fall 2005</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	81.8*	45.5*	41.7*	60.0*	50.0*
NYCCT	54.8*	64.9	72.2	76.9	89.7
Staten Island	86.1	80.0	79.9	81.4	78.2
Comprehensive College Average	70.8	73.6	76.3	80.7	79.8
Community					
BMCC	76.0	78.2	77.4	77.5	79.3
Bronx	74.1	75.9	73.5	72.2	79.3
Hostos	74.5	63.2*	64.3	76.5	73.2
Kingsborough	69.3	71.6	72.5	80.3	80.9
LaGuardia	71.8	80.8	77.8	81.3	71.6
Queensborough	72.2	70.3	73.7	76.5	74.3
Community College Average	72.6	75.1	74.5	78.2	77.1
University Average	72.4	74.9	74.9	79.0	77.7

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 2010-11 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 number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	908	751	694	903	688
Brooklyn	481	484	759	876	944
City	1,021	1,014	852	529	531
Hunter	792	733	902	863	768
Lehman	1,083	1,188	1,162	1,233	1,356
Queens	987	1,127	1,070	1,073	1,038
York	2,615	2,816	2,000	2,015	1,867
Senior College Total	7,887	8,113	7,439	7,492	7,192
Comprehensive					
John Jay	579	586	789	953	663
Medgar Evers	419	735	658	598	490
NYCCT	881	1,036	956	941	1,055
Staten Island	738	536	465	705	858
Comprehensive College Total	2,617	2,893	2,868	3,197	3,066
Community					
BMCC	821	742	546	723	785
Bronx	465	447	513	747	848
Hostos	1,165	1,574	1,332	1,370	1,080
Kingsborough	9,026	9,900	9,383	9,453	8,759
LaGuardia	3,001	3,139	2,719	3,139	3,046
Queensborough	2,956	2,571	2,391	2,419	2,346
Community College Total	17,434	18,373	16,884	17,851	16,864
University Total	27,938	29,379	27,191	28,540	27,122

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Enrollment figures for 2009-10 have been revised to reflect final figures. 2010-11 figures are estimates because spring 2011 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2010-11 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 2010-11 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 number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

Context: College Now enrollment in college credit courses

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	419	392	453	485	393
Brooklyn	247	193	268	272	313
City	799	696	742	469	470
Hunter	792	703	700	689	710
Lehman	805	1,080	1,098	1,112	1,248
Queens	542	618	631	604	611
York	961	1,332	1,785	1,775	1,631
Senior College Total	4,565	5,014	5,677	5,406	5,376
Comprehensive					
John Jay	352	428	532	652	532
Medgar Evers	324	425	365	457	490
NYCCT	629	755	651	706	739
Staten Island	370	420	427	565	698
Comprehensive College Total	1,675	2,028	1,975	2,380	2,459
Community					
BMCC	776	689	508	529	615
Bronx	230	259	309	370	588
Hostos	809	1,118	1,074	858	843
Kingsborough	8,763	9,715	9,232	7,906	7,560
LaGuardia	2,859	2,765	2,419	2,063	2,166
Queensborough	2,258	1,966	1,883	1,602	1,457
Community College Total	15,695	16,512	15,425	13,328	13,229
University Total	21,935	23,554	23,077	21,114	21,064

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 2010-11 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 number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	94	93	94	95	96
Brooklyn	84	83	81	82	85
City	93	85	87	77	79
Hunter	85	87	92	87	91
Lehman	91	93	95	94	93
Queens	84	85	83	87	95
York	81	85	90	88	88
Senior College Average	86	87	89	88	90
Comprehensive					
John Jay	76	77	83	91	94
Medgar Evers	80	85	89	78	85
NYCCT	80	84	66	70	79
Staten Island	95	93	88	93	95
Comprehensive College Average	83	85	79	83	89
Community					
BMCC	87	60	76	82	81
Bronx	77	60	88	80	85
Hostos	88	86	88	82	94
Kingsborough	91	92	93	94	94
LaGuardia	82	82	83	83	83
Queensborough	88	93	90	95	94
Community College Average	88	88	90	90	90
University Average	87	87	88	89	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 2010-11 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 number of students who participate in more than one college credit course and/or precollege activity.

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

	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	96	93	95	82	97
Brooklyn	89	87	78	84	92
City	92	85	87	78	84
Hunter	85	87	89	86	92
Lehman	95	96	96	96	95
Queens	87	92	89	89	95
York	85	89	91	88	88
Senior College Average	89	90	91	89	92
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74	73	80	90	95
Medgar Evers	77	78	84	85	85
NYCCT	81	83	64	69	77
Staten Island	89	91	89	92	94
Comprehensive College Average	81	82	77	83	88
Community					
BMCC	87	58	76	77	79
Bronx	67	68	89	88	88
Hostos	88	87	87	85	97
Kingsborough	91	92	93	93	91
LaGuardia	81	82	82	86	85
Queensborough	88	93	91	96	92
Community College Average	88	88	90	91	90
University Average	88	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 2010-11 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 number 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>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	17	21	19	27	40
Brooklyn	29	24	27	37	33
City	21	30	38	31	22
Hunter	31	21	25	27	25
Lehman	33	30	42	37	41
Queens	26	31	30	25	24
York	42	42	47	44	39
Senior College Average	31	31	35	34	33
Comprehensive					
John Jay	19	16	21	21	23
Medgar Evers	20	16	23	40	30
NYCCT	24	29	28	31	24
Staten Island	24	44	36	27	25
Comprehensive College Average	22	26	26	29	25
Community					
BMCC	29	26	24	21	18
Bronx	43	28	34	35	32
Hostos	28	35	41	31	33
Kingsborough	34	35	34	37	38
LaGuardia	40	36	37	34	35
Queensborough	40	36	35	34	31
Community College Average	36	35	35	35	34
University Average	33	33	34	34	33

Note: College Now re-enrollment is based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. The rate reflects students enrolled in the academic year who enrolled in College Now in any prior semester over the previous two years and including the current year. 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 2010-11 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 or maintain current levels.

Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average)

	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$37,275,990	\$43,316,099	\$30,661,651	\$19,194,623	\$12,654,005
Brooklyn	\$10,777,893	\$11,798,827	\$8,928,984	\$11,726,044	\$18,704,317
City	\$53,405,587	\$62,752,168	\$63,585,449	\$46,703,422	\$40,358,974
Hunter	\$16,076,117	\$16,981,140	\$32,369,753	\$25,699,325	\$25,597,994
Lehman	\$2,989,776	\$3,067,791	\$3,563,530	\$4,074,265	\$4,517,771
Queens	\$16,658,809	\$17,525,510	\$17,456,623	\$16,895,511	\$20,625,790
York	\$176,915	\$408,352	\$680,555	\$639,960	\$886,737
Senior College Total	\$137,361,087	\$155,849,886	\$157,246,544	\$124,933,151	\$123,345,589
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$986,184 [^]	\$2,227,428	\$3,597,305	\$6,364,597	\$5,951,446
Medgar Evers	\$924,336	\$1,895,108	\$3,077,974	\$1,993,971	\$1,233,637
NYCCT	\$1,035,375	\$1,268,449	\$1,175,077	\$1,116,864	\$1,063,346
Staten Island	\$1,403,142	\$1,416,752	\$1,433,696	\$1,989,687	\$2,798,980
Comprehensive College Total	\$4,166,992	\$6,807,738	\$9,284,052	\$11,465,119	\$11,047,409
Community					
BMCC	\$5,086,954	\$3,897,142	\$3,540,068	\$2,230,483	\$2,322,602
Bronx	\$1,177,605	\$1,508,550	\$1,705,253	\$1,694,148	\$1,681,549
Hostos	\$521,228	\$714,649	\$827,707	\$868,071	\$933,259
Kingsborough	\$753,675	\$1,120,921	\$1,410,179	\$1,628,689	\$2,763,789
LaGuardia	\$761,303	\$689,618	\$891,006	\$1,586,190	\$1,602,483
Queensborough	\$2,052,999	\$2,407,599	\$2,676,452	\$2,867,673	\$3,122,865
Community College Total	\$10,353,765	\$10,338,479	\$11,050,665	\$10,875,254	\$12,426,546
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$10,675,684	\$13,004,015	\$9,983,052	\$9,408,088	\$6,016,688
School of Journalism	\$2,850,000	\$4,357,633	\$3,081,728	\$2,454,933	\$4,498,614
Law School	\$840,995 [^]	\$904,921	\$1,009,391	\$1,136,125	\$1,265,187
University Total	\$181,849,300	\$201,223,094	\$198,614,807	\$161,131,341	\$160,385,321

Note: This indicator reflects a weighted, rolling, three-year average (50-30-20) of the sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts, rather than the total for a given fiscal year as had been reported in previous PMP reports. Figures for FY 2010 have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect averages based on final values. The university total rolling averages include contributions to the Macaulay Honors College; \$3.5 million for FY 2007, \$1 million for FY 2008, \$704 thousand for FY2009, \$894 thousand for FY 2010 and \$2.8 million for FY 2011.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 or maintain current levels.

Context: Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts)

	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$50,296,685	\$46,417,325	\$13,354,232	\$11,809,778	\$12,880,451
Brooklyn	\$8,468,247	\$12,291,490	\$7,095,776	\$14,278,026	\$26,003,508
City	\$62,913,263	\$62,556,378	\$64,471,766	\$29,701,234	\$37,108,502
Hunter	\$18,787,308	\$17,418,812	\$46,773,295	\$16,367,149	\$22,666,381
Lehman	\$3,060,289	\$2,951,176	\$4,132,238	\$4,488,716	\$4,689,417
Queens	\$19,004,497	\$17,460,816	\$16,834,958	\$16,705,721	\$24,494,165
York	\$250,000	\$623,145	\$887,222	\$498,329	\$1,119,588
Senior College Total	\$162,780,289	\$159,719,142	\$153,549,487	\$93,848,953	\$128,962,012
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$1,290,022	\$3,468,672	\$4,597,398	\$8,583,287	\$4,913,961
Medgar Evers	\$1,414,433	\$2,837,493	\$3,887,678	\$520,338	\$600,000
NYCCT	\$1,135,505	\$1,521,788	\$982,879	\$1,035,285	\$1,112,370
Staten Island	\$1,567,147	\$1,380,839	\$1,412,030	\$2,579,820	\$3,485,255
Comprehensive College Total	\$5,407,107	\$9,208,792	\$10,879,985	\$12,718,730	\$10,111,586
Community					
BMCC	\$9,019,102	\$2,013,362	\$2,264,478	\$2,296,934	\$2,361,252
Bronx	\$1,402,104	\$1,648,799	\$1,860,384	\$1,612,546	\$1,651,416
Hostos	\$623,934	\$920,651	\$853,450	\$855,811	\$1,011,651
Kingsborough	\$974,215	\$1,339,893	\$1,626,737	\$1,745,379	\$3,829,656
LaGuardia	\$905,089	\$728,674	\$982,772	\$2,291,248	\$1,437,108
Queensborough	\$2,295,233	\$2,620,815	\$2,862,322	\$2,969,627	\$3,319,024
Community College Total	\$15,219,677	\$9,272,194	\$10,450,143	\$11,771,545	\$13,610,107
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$15,383,997	\$14,048,597	\$5,383,347	\$9,966,729	\$3,900,000
School of Journalism	\$2,800,000	\$5,115,266	\$1,974,297	\$1,679,181	\$7,200,000
Law School	\$873,132	\$968,847	\$1,088,221	\$1,231,778	\$1,356,019
University Total	\$233,998,940	\$199,332,838	\$184,030,336	\$132,111,346	\$167,891,701

Note: This indicator reflects a sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts. Figures for FY 2010 have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect final values. The university total includes contributions to the Macaulay Honors College; \$3.5 million for FY 2007, \$1 million for FY 2008, \$704 thousand for FY2009, \$894 thousand for FY 2010 and \$2.8 million for FY 2011.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$24,410,444	\$26,323,749	\$24,956,811	\$26,088,992	26.2	25.4	23.9	23.8
Brooklyn	\$27,411,261	\$31,729,887	\$29,565,427	\$29,788,281	27.6	28.3	25.6	25.0
City	\$26,035,361	\$35,199,080	\$34,590,883	\$32,224,028	23.9	27.5	26.1	23.4
Hunter	\$33,534,966	\$36,838,001	\$35,840,429	\$35,856,711	27.8	27.6	26.2	24.6
Lehman	\$18,937,436	\$20,420,936	\$19,684,135	\$21,260,254	27.7	26.5	24.7	24.7
Queens	\$27,641,948	\$34,994,532	\$31,462,198	\$35,104,214	26.9	29.4	26.4	27.0
York	\$14,112,427	\$15,814,468	\$15,533,006	\$16,893,097	33.3	33.8	32.1	32.0
Senior College Total/Avg	\$172,083,843	\$201,320,653	\$191,632,889	\$197,215,577	27.1	28.0	26.0	25.2
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$18,249,110	\$19,017,776	\$19,768,296	\$19,289,921	25.3	24.4	23.9	22.2
Medgar Evers	\$13,819,907	\$13,419,905	\$12,779,806	\$13,235,855	32.6	29.7	28.0	27.0
NYCCT	\$14,943,596	\$16,136,997	\$16,198,315	\$17,933,514	22.5	21.8	21.2	21.3
Staten Island	\$21,656,768	\$22,986,279	\$23,700,757	\$23,867,134	30.4	29.1	28.3	26.8
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$68,669,381	\$71,560,957	\$72,447,174	\$74,326,424	27.2	25.9	25.1	24.0
Community								
BMCC	\$31,950,140	\$33,276,974	\$36,267,448	\$40,299,198	36.5	36.0	34.1	34.1
Bronx	\$17,257,002	\$18,842,827	\$19,758,660	\$20,014,026	32.2	32.7	32.4	29.2
Hostos	\$12,814,591	\$14,245,535	\$15,521,500	\$16,250,206	34.1	34.7	35.3	33.0
Kingsborough	\$19,545,414	\$21,844,679	\$21,764,103	\$23,378,269	27.8	29.1	27.9	25.9
LaGuardia	\$21,270,696	\$23,343,946	\$25,097,692	\$27,823,426	29.4	28.6	29.0	29.7
Queensborough	\$14,869,417	\$15,673,587	\$17,436,889	\$17,285,581	24.6	24.3	24.3	20.5
Community College Total/Avg	\$117,707,260	\$127,227,548	\$135,846,292	\$145,050,706	30.8	30.9	30.4	28.8
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$15,380,065	\$19,898,164	\$22,364,968	\$19,331,205	17.2	19.0	17.0	17.9
University Total/Avg	\$373,840,549	\$420,007,322	\$422,291,323	\$435,923,912	27.5	27.8	26.3	25.6

Note: Data for FY 2011 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 2010-11 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.

Context: General Administration Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$6,952,629	\$7,677,759	\$7,243,226	\$7,524,534	7.5	7.4	6.9	6.9
Brooklyn	\$6,561,956	\$7,055,560	\$7,281,612	\$7,282,097	6.6	6.3	6.3	6.1
City	\$6,567,898	\$6,976,236	\$7,495,839	\$7,862,564	6.0	5.4	5.7	5.7
Hunter	\$8,535,126	\$9,169,877	\$9,431,240	\$9,472,225	7.1	6.9	6.9	6.5
Lehman	\$4,125,839	\$4,170,532	\$3,868,044	\$4,335,890	6.0	5.4	4.9	5.0
Queens	\$6,462,265	\$7,242,914	\$6,474,324	\$8,086,647	6.3	6.1	5.4	6.2
York	\$4,896,963	\$5,147,699	\$4,349,905	\$4,995,713	11.6	11.0	9.0	9.4
Senior College Total/Avg	\$44,102,676	\$47,440,578	\$46,144,190	\$49,559,670	6.9	6.6	6.3	6.3
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$5,978,681	\$6,533,244	\$6,411,860	\$6,860,722	8.3	8.4	7.7	7.9
Medgar Evers	\$7,017,087	\$6,675,574	\$5,629,224	\$5,305,255	16.5	14.8	12.3	10.8
NYCCT	\$4,582,811	\$4,959,967	\$5,190,483	\$5,615,103	6.9	6.7	6.8	6.7
Staten Island	\$4,850,762	\$4,969,216	\$5,228,326	\$5,709,361	6.8	6.3	6.2	6.4
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$22,429,341	\$23,138,000	\$22,459,893	\$23,490,441	8.9	8.4	7.8	7.6
Community								
BMCC	\$14,086,099	\$13,785,038	\$15,631,736	\$5,494,607	16.1	14.9	14.7	4.6
Bronx	\$5,025,520	\$5,588,380	\$5,686,690	\$5,826,634	9.4	9.7	9.3	8.5
Hostos	\$3,835,116	\$3,974,827	\$4,195,948	\$4,862,246	10.2	9.7	9.5	9.9
Kingsborough	\$5,298,602	\$4,974,770	\$4,971,085	\$5,901,487	7.5	6.6	6.4	6.5
LaGuardia	\$5,124,367	\$5,665,386	\$6,444,486	\$7,088,432	7.1	6.9	7.5	7.6
Queensborough	\$3,785,854	\$3,917,933	\$4,154,289	\$4,097,631	6.3	6.1	5.8	4.9
Community College Total/Avg	\$37,155,558	\$37,906,334	\$41,084,234	\$33,271,037	9.7	9.2	9.2	6.6
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$3,106,833	\$3,354,976	\$4,767,649	\$3,665,178	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.4
University Total/Avg	\$106,794,408	\$111,839,888	\$114,455,967	\$109,986,326	7.9	7.4	7.1	6.5

Note: Data for FY 2011 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 2010-11 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.

Context: General Institutional Services Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$10,773,613	\$10,933,931	\$10,191,530	\$11,495,562	11.6	10.6	9.8	10.5
Brooklyn	\$11,567,547	\$12,505,208	\$11,344,262	\$11,905,467	11.7	11.2	9.8	10.0
City	\$8,551,872	\$10,911,540	\$13,170,849	\$11,767,383	7.9	8.5	9.9	8.6
Hunter	\$10,401,077	\$11,282,248	\$10,909,586	\$11,486,059	8.6	8.4	8.0	7.9
Lehman	\$6,629,658	\$7,379,239	\$6,926,287	\$7,782,152	9.7	9.6	8.7	9.1
Queens	\$10,025,216	\$12,814,363	\$11,788,245	\$12,902,159	9.8	10.8	9.9	9.9
York	\$4,153,781	\$5,197,739	\$5,624,407	\$6,288,783	9.8	11.1	11.6	11.9
Senior College Total/Avg	\$62,102,764	\$71,024,267	\$69,955,165	\$73,627,565	9.8	9.9	9.5	9.4
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$7,461,730	\$7,281,030	\$7,566,881	\$7,041,246	10.3	9.3	9.1	8.1
Medgar Evers	\$3,003,858	\$2,699,319	\$3,126,774	\$3,473,936	7.1	6.0	6.9	7.1
NYCCT	\$6,129,738	\$6,588,042	\$6,632,557	\$7,456,819	9.2	8.9	8.7	8.8
Staten Island	\$7,421,927	\$7,929,913	\$8,165,614	\$9,113,880	10.4	10.0	9.7	10.2
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$24,017,253	\$24,498,304	\$25,491,826	\$27,085,881	9.5	8.9	8.8	8.8
Community								
BMCC	\$8,367,095	\$9,133,409	\$10,696,504	\$12,502,521	9.6	9.9	10.1	10.6
Bronx	\$5,340,383	\$5,594,525	\$6,522,122	\$6,113,370	10.0	9.7	10.7	8.9
Hostos	\$4,571,401	\$5,571,989	\$5,894,444	\$5,672,175	12.2	13.6	13.4	11.5
Kingsborough	\$6,803,935	\$6,992,720	\$7,036,379	\$7,473,643	9.7	9.3	9.0	8.3
LaGuardia	\$8,240,062	\$8,855,132	\$9,725,163	\$10,381,857	11.4	10.8	11.3	11.1
Queensborough	\$4,960,859	\$5,098,196	\$6,441,296	\$6,175,037	8.2	7.9	9.0	7.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$38,283,735	\$41,245,971	\$46,315,907	\$48,318,603	10.0	10.0	10.3	9.6
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$6,803,054	\$8,454,266	\$9,917,077	\$8,711,025	7.6	8.1	7.5	8.1
University Total/Avg	\$131,206,806	\$145,222,808	\$151,679,975	\$157,743,073	9.7	9.6	9.5	9.3

Note: Data for FY 2011 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 2010-11 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.

Context: Maintenance and Operations Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$6,684,202	\$7,712,059	\$7,522,056	\$7,068,896	7.2	7.4	7.2	6.4
Brooklyn	\$9,281,758	\$12,169,119	\$10,939,553	\$10,600,717	9.4	10.9	9.5	8.9
City	\$10,915,591	\$17,311,304	\$13,924,194	\$12,594,081	10.0	13.5	10.5	9.2
Hunter	\$14,598,763	\$16,385,876	\$15,499,603	\$14,898,427	12.1	12.3	11.3	10.2
Lehman	\$8,181,939	\$8,871,165	\$8,889,803	\$9,142,212	12.0	11.5	11.2	10.6
Queens	\$11,154,467	\$14,937,255	\$13,199,630	\$14,115,408	10.8	12.6	11.1	10.8
York	\$5,061,683	\$5,469,031	\$5,558,695	\$5,608,601	12.0	11.7	11.5	10.6
Senior College Total/Avg	\$65,878,403	\$82,855,808	\$75,533,534	\$74,028,342	10.4	11.5	10.3	9.5
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$4,808,699	\$5,203,502	\$5,789,555	\$5,387,953	6.7	6.7	7.0	6.2
Medgar Evers	\$3,798,962	\$4,045,013	\$4,023,807	\$4,456,664	9.0	8.9	8.8	9.1
NYCCT	\$4,231,047	\$4,588,988	\$4,375,275	\$4,861,592	6.4	6.2	5.7	5.8
Staten Island	\$9,384,079	\$10,087,150	\$10,306,817	\$9,043,893	13.2	12.8	12.3	10.1
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$22,222,787	\$23,924,653	\$24,495,454	\$23,750,102	8.8	8.7	8.5	7.7
Community								
BMCC	\$9,496,946	\$10,358,527	\$9,939,208	\$22,302,070	10.8	11.2	9.3	18.9
Bronx	\$6,891,099	\$7,659,922	\$7,549,849	\$8,074,022	12.9	13.3	12.4	11.8
Hostos	\$4,408,074	\$4,698,719	\$5,431,108	\$5,715,785	11.7	11.4	12.3	11.6
Kingsborough	\$7,442,877	\$9,877,189	\$9,756,639	\$10,003,139	10.6	13.2	12.5	11.1
LaGuardia	\$7,906,267	\$8,823,428	\$8,928,043	\$10,353,137	10.9	10.8	10.3	11.0
Queensborough	\$6,122,704	\$6,657,458	\$6,841,304	\$7,012,913	10.1	10.3	9.5	8.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$42,267,967	\$48,075,243	\$48,446,151	\$63,461,066	11.1	11.7	10.8	12.6
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$5,470,178	\$8,088,922	\$7,680,242	\$6,955,002	6.1	7.7	5.8	6.4
University Total/Avg	\$135,839,335	\$162,944,627	\$156,155,381	\$168,194,512	10.0	10.8	9.7	9.9

Note: Data for FY 2011 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 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.

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

	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$4,763,520	\$5,424,298	\$5,417,250	\$6,106,267	\$6,721,694
Brooklyn	\$12,618,228	\$11,853,929	\$12,215,159	\$13,576,134	\$13,571,224
City	\$40,279,622	\$43,122,499	\$48,802,709	\$59,303,054	\$64,031,763
Hunter	\$37,361,993	\$37,113,200	\$42,244,156	\$46,999,342	\$48,027,876
Lehman	\$16,951,744	\$16,041,390	\$17,387,991	\$21,669,114	\$20,935,606
Queens	\$18,634,893	\$21,576,884	\$21,667,450	\$28,933,290	\$25,622,011
York	\$5,184,664	\$6,014,578	\$6,341,443	\$7,495,168	\$6,888,864
Senior College Total	\$135,794,664	\$141,146,778	154,076,158	\$184,082,368	\$185,799,038
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$9,705,446	\$12,896,015	\$15,275,879	\$18,128,219	\$16,903,472
Medgar Evers	\$8,057,150	\$8,581,458	\$8,835,698	\$9,308,249	\$9,197,374
NYCCT	\$6,271,530	\$6,208,149	\$6,128,546	\$7,179,020	\$7,463,674
Staten Island	\$8,990,931	\$9,107,818	\$9,039,801	\$9,445,850	\$8,525,387
Comprehensive College Total	\$33,025,057	\$36,793,441	\$39,279,924	\$44,061,337	\$42,089,907
Community					
BMCC	\$6,231,737	\$6,591,445	\$6,735,194	\$7,867,265	\$8,722,004
Bronx	\$7,244,448	\$6,148,425	\$5,700,917	\$6,159,851	\$6,722,830
Hostos	\$3,351,333	\$3,777,250	\$3,932,899	\$3,588,387	\$4,452,458
Kingsborough	\$4,566,973	\$5,002,278	\$5,168,318	\$5,052,288	\$5,072,036
LaGuardia	\$12,984,479	\$13,193,066	\$14,638,288	\$16,902,509	\$16,975,518
Queensborough	\$3,464,844	\$3,836,512	\$4,131,033	\$3,672,917	\$4,371,047
Community College Total	\$37,843,814	\$38,548,977	\$40,306,648	\$43,243,217	\$46,315,892
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$14,208,620	\$13,386,035	\$12,970,438	\$13,115,331	\$11,796,016
School of Journalism	\$225,735^	\$232,964^	\$190,590	\$349,445	\$775,735
Law School	\$240,798	\$330,229	\$438,848	\$575,891	\$399,792
University Total	\$221,225,820	\$230,389,662	\$247,262,606	\$285,427,588	\$287,176,380

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. FY 2010 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data and FY2011 figures are preliminary.

^Not a weighted, rolling average.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

University Target: 8.5 Contract/grant awards will rise.

Context: Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research

	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	52.5	57.0	33.1	42.4	34.9
Brooklyn	43.7	50.2	34.2	55.9	51.9
City	80.2	74.2	79.4	83.4	81.5
Hunter	54.8	56.2	51.2	61.5	58.9
Lehman	27.7	22.1	11.6	14.7	20.1
Queens	51.0	62.2	50.6	67.6	57.0
York	15.0	33.8	16.8	24.0	28.5
Senior College Total	56.3	58.1	52.3	61.4	60.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	39.0	39.9	31.2	33.7	37.8
Medgar Evers	4.7	6.8	5.1	15.9	12.3
NYCCT	2.1	2.4	2.5	1.6	5.2
Staten Island	22.5	28.7	27.3	34.6	31.6
Comprehensive College Total	21.0	24.2	20.1	24.8	24.5
Community					
BMCC	1.2	0.8	0.8	2.6	0.9
Bronx	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.7
Hostos	0.5	0.3	0.2	3.6	1.9
Kingsborough	5.0	9.9	8.9	11.6	9.0
LaGuardia	3.0	4.6	7.2	6.3	5.4
Queensborough	5.6	5.1	9.5	20.0	8.1
Community College Total	2.6	3.6	4.9	6.0	4.3
Graduate					
Graduate School	43.4	46.1	46.7	46.6	37.6
School of Journalism	77.9	3.2	3.8	0.0	0.0
Law School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
University Total	40.9	42.7	39.2	42.9	44.5

Note: This indicator is calculated as research dollars divided by total awards for a given fiscal year. FY 2010 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data and FY2011 figures are preliminary.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>
Senior					
Baruch	7.6	6.9	7.2	8.8	8.4
Brooklyn	20.9	23.6	15.1	15.4	16.0
City	21.8	20.4	18.2	18.9	19.3
Hunter	16.7	17.1	15.4	16.2	15.8
Lehman	17.0	13.5	11.8	12.4	11.7
Queens	11.1	11.4	9.1	12.2	12.6
York	13.0	13.3	7.6	8.7	9.4
Senior College Average	17.3	16.8	14.2	15.4	15.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	10.7	10.1	10.5	9.4	12.5
Medgar Evers	7.7	7.3	7.6	7.4	7.2
NYCCT	7.2	7.0	6.5	7.0	8.5
Staten Island	9.3	13.2	10.5	16.6	10.5
Comprehensive College Average	7.2	9.7	9.2	10.1	10.1
Community					
BMCC	8.3	6.6	5.6	5.3	4.2
Bronx	10.1	7.8	8.0	6.7	6.2
Hostos	6.2	5.3	6.0	7.4	8.4
Kingsborough	6.4	5.7	5.8	6.1	7.1
LaGuardia	7.1	5.9	4.9	4.4	5.6
Queensborough	6.0	7.4	7.5	6.2	5.3
Community College Average	7.6	6.4	6.0	5.6	5.9
Graduate					
Graduate School	12.3	10.3	10.3	8.7	8.8
School of Journalism	0.0	3.7	13.3	2.8	4.6
Law School	2.4	0.6	3.9	8.4	43.4
University Average	14.8	13.4	11.8	12.6	12.6

Note: FY 2010 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

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

Student satisfaction with administrative services

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.61	2.77	2.85	2.68	2.79
Brooklyn	2.71	2.90	2.78	2.76	2.72
City	2.77	2.84	2.93	2.80	2.76
Hunter	2.70	2.71	2.64	2.56	2.70
Lehman	2.88	3.05	2.98	2.84	2.89
Queens	2.95	3.04	2.97	2.80	2.84
York	2.76	2.77	2.89	2.67	2.74
Senior College Average	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.72	2.78
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.80	2.95	3.01	2.89	2.90
Medgar Evers	2.73	2.87	2.91	2.93	2.94
NYCCT	2.81	2.75	2.97	2.82	2.87
Staten Island	2.66	2.91	2.90	2.94	2.87
Comprehensive College Average	2.76	2.87	2.95	2.89	2.89
Community					
BMCC	2.73	2.90	2.94	2.87	2.99
Bronx	2.74	2.65	2.82	2.82	2.87
Hostos	2.63	2.91	2.96	2.95	2.99
Kingsborough	2.20	2.70	2.97	2.94	2.94
LaGuardia	2.68	2.80	2.78	2.81	2.79
Queensborough	2.82	2.90	2.99	2.84	2.96
Community College Average	2.63	2.81	2.91	2.87	2.93
University Average	2.71	2.84	2.89	2.81	2.86

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 items about satisfaction with administrative services: registration procedures, testing office, financial aid services, and billing and payment procedures. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores for each student were calculated by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Performance Management Process 2010-11 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 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	45.9	48.1	49.3	47.6	48.6
Brooklyn	46.3	45.0	42.7	41.0	40.2
City	40.5	41.4	42.2	42.4	41.9
Hunter	55.0	54.9	55.6	54.4	54.0
Lehman	49.5	49.5	49.7	49.8	50.2
Queens	46.3	45.2	45.7	44.7	44.8
York	52.1	51.8	50.1	50.7	50.6
Senior College Average	47.9	47.9	47.9	47.0	47.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	37.4	38.9	37.3	40.3	40.5
Medgar Evers	50.9	52.3	50.7	51.1	51.8
NYCCT	44.9	44.4	44.5	44.0	43.0
Staten Island	54.3	53.7	53.4	53.7	52.7
Comprehensive College Average	45.7	46.1	45.5	46.5	46.2
Community					
BMCC	44.7	44.7	47.6	39.0	37.0
Bronx	41.1	38.6	40.2	41.5	42.3
Hostos	32.1	36.8	33.2	33.0	32.9
Kingsborough	25.4	24.4	25.3	27.5	27.2
LaGuardia	38.3	38.2	36.6	36.7	36.8
Queensborough	32.3	33.2	34.1	37.5	35.2
Community College Average	36.7	36.7	37.6	36.1	34.9
University Average	43.8	43.8	44.0	43.1	42.5