



Performance Management Report

2008-09
Year-End University Report
Final

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
July 30, 2009

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

Table of Contents

1 Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

Colleges will provide evidence of recognition/validation from external sources

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

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

1.4 Colleges will use technology to enrich courses and teaching.

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

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

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

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

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

Colleges will report on faculty scholarship and creative activity

2.3 Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.

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

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

Colleges will report on efforts to diversify faculty and staff

2 Improve Student Success

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

Associate Programs

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

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

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

4 Increase retention and graduation rates**4.1 Retention rates will progressively increase.*****Baccalaureate Programs***

One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later	48
Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later	49
One-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry one year later (or earned degree pursued).....	50
Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry two years later (or earned degree pursued)	51

Associate Programs

One-year Retention Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in the college of entry one year later	52
<i>Context:</i> One-year Retention Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs still enrolled in any CUNY college one year later	53

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

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within four years	54
Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years	55
Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years	56
Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years	57

Master's Programs

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

Associate Programs

Six-year Graduation Rate (institution rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years	59
<i>Context:</i> Six-year Graduation Rate (system rate): Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who graduated from any CUNY college within six years of entry	60
<i>Context:</i> Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in associate programs who transferred outside of CUNY within six years of entry without having earned a degree from the college of entry.....	61

5 Improve post-graduate outcomes**5.1 Professional preparation programs will improve or maintain high numbers of successful graduates.**

Number of credentialed teachers (from traditional and alternative certification programs).....	62
Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification	63
<i>Context:</i> Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam.....	64
Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification.....	65
<i>Context:</i> Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam	66
Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)	67
<i>Context:</i> Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)	68
Percentage passing the NCLEX exam	69
<i>Context:</i> Number taking the NCLEX exam	70
Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license	71
Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses	72
Percentage of test-takers without an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam	73
Percentage of test-takers with an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam	74

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

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

Supplement: New Indicators for 2009-10

2 Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

9 *Improve administrative services*

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

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

Percentage of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

New Methodology

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Mean teaching hours of veteran full-time faculty

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of veteran full-time faculty

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Undergraduate student-faculty ratio

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of full-time faculty

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of FTE part-time faculty

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Raise Academic Quality

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

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

Context: Number of full-time executive and professional staff

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Percentage of students passing freshman composition with C or better

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Percentage of students passing gateway mathematics courses with C or better

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

New Methodology

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

New Indicator

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

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

New Indicator

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

New Indicator

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

New Indicator

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Context: Number of non-ESL SEEK students

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Context: Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)

Baccalaureate Programs

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

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

University Performance Management Process 2008-09 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

Pass rate in reading on exit from remediation

Associate Programs

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

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

