



Performance Management Report

2009-10
Year-End University Report
Final

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
July 22, 2010

**CUNY Performance Management Process
University Year-End Report
2009-10**

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 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will increase.

Percentage of required invitees who took the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE show rate)	41
Percentage of required test-takers passing the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE pass rate)	42

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)..... 43

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in a baccalaureate program (full-time entrants) 46

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) 49

Gap in the one-year retention rate between male and female first-time freshmen enrolled in an associate program (full-time entrants)..... 52

Gap in the percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted between underrepresented minority and non-underrepresented minority undergraduates..... 55

Gap in the percentage of semester credit hours earned (or passed) of those attempted between male and female undergraduates..... 59

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

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 63

Percentage of baccalaureate students who have declared a major by the 70th credit 64

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) 65

All Undergraduate Programs

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in baccalaureate programs 66

Ratio of FTEs to Headcount in associate programs 67

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 68

Two-year Retention Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of entry two years later 69

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) 70

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) 71

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 72

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 73

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 74

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time first-time freshmen in baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years 75

Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years 76

Six-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years	77
Four-year Graduation Rate: Percentage of master's students who graduated within four years of entry into the master's program.....	78

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	79
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	80
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.....	81

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).....	82
Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification	83
Context: Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam	84
Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification.....	85
Context: Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam	86
Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)	87
Context: Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)	88
Percentage passing the NCLEX exam	89
Context: Number taking the NCLEX exam	90
Context: Number of graduates from programs leading to the RN license	91
Context: Number of graduates from baccalaureate-level nursing programs for licensed nurses.....	92
Percentage of test-takers without an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam.....	93
Percentage of test-takers with an advanced degree passing at least one segment of the Uniform CPA exam.....	94

5.2 Job and education placement rates for graduates will rise.

Six-month job placement rate in career and technical education programs.....	95
Context: Six-month education placement rate in career and technical education programs	96
Context: Six-month job and education placement rate in career and technical education programs.....	97
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	98
Student satisfaction with student services	99
Student satisfaction with access to computer technology	100

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	101
Total FTEs.....	102
First-time Freshmen.....	103
Transfers	104
Total Undergraduates	105
New Graduates	106
Total Graduates	107
Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses	108
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs	109
Context: Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students	110
Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate..	111

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).....	112
Context: Percentage of evaluated courses designated as non-transferable	113

Baccalaureate Programs

Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs	114
Context: Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs.....	115

Associate Programs

Context: Percentage of AA/AS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program	116
Context: Percentage of AAS recipients who transferred to a CUNY baccalaureate program.....	117
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AA/AS programs	118
Context: Average first term GPA of transfers from AAS programs.....	119
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AA/AS transfers to baccalaureate programs	120
Context: One-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rate of AAS transfers to baccalaureate programs	121

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).....	122
Context: College Now enrollment in college credit courses.....	123
Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now high school and college credit	124
Context: Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now college credit courses	125
Percentage of College Now participants with previous enrollment in College Now high school and college credit	126

8 Increase revenues and decrease expenses

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

Total Voluntary Support (weighted rolling average)	127
Context: Total Voluntary Support (annual amounts)	128

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.....	129
Context: Institutional Support Services (administrative services)	129
Context: General Administration as a percentage of total tax levy budget	130
Context: General Administration.....	130
Context: General Institutional Services as a percentage of total tax levy budget.....	131
Context: General Institutional Services	131
Context: Maintenance and Operations as a percentage of total tax levy budget.....	132
Context: Maintenance and Operations	132

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)	133
Context: Percentage of Total Award Dollars that are for Research	134

8.6 Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve.

Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity.....	135
---	-----

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	136
---	-----

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	137
---	-----

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 2009-10 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>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior				
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
Brooklyn	2.4	7.3	10.5	11.5
City	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0
Hunter	0.2	0.8	3.8	4.6
Lehman	3.8	4.6	6.6	8.0
Queens	0.1	12.6	10.8	1.5
York	0.6	1.0	0.9	1.1
Senior College Average	0.9	4.1	5.1	3.8
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.3	2.3	3.4	3.3
Medgar Evers	1.0	1.7	2.9	2.3
NYCCT	2.4	3.3	1.4	5.0
Staten Island	0.2	1.1	0.9	1.3
Comprehensive College Average	1.6	2.2	2.0	3.1
Community				
BMCC	1.1	1.0	15.0	21.7
Bronx	0.7	1.4	1.2	2.0
Hostos	6.8	5.3	4.3	2.5
Kingsborough	8.1	9.8	10.9	13.7
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4
Queensborough	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.8
Community College Average	2.6	2.8	6.8	8.9
University Average	1.6	3.3	5.1	5.4

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 2009-10 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>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior				
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Brooklyn	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.9
City	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0
Hunter	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Lehman	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.6
Queens	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.3
York	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5
Senior College Average	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.9
Comprehensive				
John Jay	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2
Medgar Evers	0.6	0.8	1.3	1.3
NYCCT	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.6
Staten Island	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.6
Comprehensive College Average	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.5
Community				
BMCC	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7
Bronx	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.0
Hostos	3.1	1.8	1.7	1.1
Kingsborough	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4
LaGuardia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5
Community College Average	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6
University Average	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9

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 2009-10 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>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior				
Baruch	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Brooklyn	1.6	6.1	9.2	9.5
City	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hunter	0.1	0.7	3.7	4.0
Lehman	1.4	2.1	3.6	4.4
Queens	0.0	12.6	10.5	1.2
York	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.6
Senior College Average	0.4	3.6	4.4	2.9
Comprehensive				
John Jay	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2
Medgar Evers	0.4	0.9	1.6	1.0
NYCCT	2.2	3.0	0.5	4.4
Staten Island	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.6
Comprehensive College Average	0.7	1.0	0.5	1.6
Community				
BMCC	0.0	0.0	14.2	21.1
Bronx	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.0
Hostos	3.7	3.5	2.6	1.4
Kingsborough	7.9	9.4	10.4	13.3
LaGuardia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4
Queensborough	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3
Community College Average	2.0	2.3	6.2	8.2
University Average	1.0	2.6	4.2	4.5

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	57.0	54.6	56.6	53.0	53.7
Brooklyn	53.4	48.9	47.1	43.5	49.5
City	52.9	49.6	44.6	44.9	47.3
Hunter	48.7	45.1	43.1	42.1	41.6
Lehman	45.1	48.4	50.3	49.3	50.4
Queens	47.9	46.9	46.6	42.1	48.0
York	41.3	41.8	42.5	50.3	50.0
Senior College Average	50.5	48.5	47.6	45.8	48.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	37.9	40.5	41.6	42.7	42.8
Medgar Evers	50.5	43.3	45.6	52.7	51.4
NYCCT	46.9	47.0	49.3	50.6	47.7
Staten Island	43.2	41.6	40.6	42.0	35.3
Comprehensive College Average	43.2	43.0	44.0	46.0	43.5
Community					
BMCC	51.0	51.5	52.1	46.2	49.1
Bronx	63.2	61.5	60.3	61.2	56.9
Hostos	57.3	60.1	64.1	62.0	62.4
Kingsborough	60.1	57.5	55.6	53.3	51.7
LaGuardia	44.7	46.5	45.8	44.1	41.2
Queensborough	54.1	52.9	53.1	51.0	50.9
Community College Average	53.9	53.6	53.3	50.5	50.0
University Average	50.2	49.0	48.8	47.4	47.8

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. 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 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	56.0	51.9	54.8	51.1	50.5
Brooklyn	53.3	48.6	46.1	42.1	48.4
City	48.4	44.6	39.6	40.0	43.9
Hunter	42.3	38.1	37.9	37.2	37.7
Lehman	42.1	44.5	46.7	46.4	46.9
Queens	44.5	43.5	42.9	38.6	44.6
York	41.0	41.4	42.1	50.0	49.9
Senior College Average	47.6	45.0	44.5	42.8	45.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	34.9	38.3	39.7	40.8	40.5
Medgar Evers	50.5	43.3	45.6	52.7	51.4
NYCCT	46.9	47.0	49.3	50.6	47.7
Staten Island	41.8	39.7	39.0	40.2	33.1
Comprehensive College Average	42.0	41.9	43.1	45.2	42.4
Community					
BMCC	51.0	51.5	52.1	46.2	49.1
Bronx	63.2	61.5	60.3	61.2	56.9
Hostos	57.3	60.1	64.1	62.0	62.4
Kingsborough	60.1	57.5	55.6	53.3	51.7
LaGuardia	44.7	46.5	45.8	44.1	41.2
Queensborough	54.1	52.9	53.1	51.0	50.9
Community College Average	53.9	53.6	53.3	50.5	50.0
University Average	48.8	47.5	47.4	46.2	46.6

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. 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 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	62.1	67.4	65.2	60.5	68.2
Brooklyn	53.9	50.5	52.1	50.9	54.5
City	71.4	71.8	67.8	68.9	65.0
Hunter	70.7	69.9	59.5	57.3	52.9
Lehman	62.2	72.1	69.4	63.3	69.3
Queens	61.5	62.2	65.3	59.1	66.6
York	100.0	83.6	100.0	100.0	67.0
Senior College Average	63.9	65.3	62.7	59.5	61.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.6	60.3	58.6	58.0	61.6
Staten Island	64.0	68.9	68.6	72.8	72.9
Comprehensive College Average	63.0	63.2	61.6	62.4	65.2
University Average	63.8	65.0	62.5	59.8	61.6

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. This indicator is expected to be updated in the final version of the PMP report due out in mid-July. 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 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	53.7	52.2	52.7	49.0	48.1
Brooklyn	55.5	50.6	48.6	45.3	50.7
City	54.4	54.8	47.2	48.1	50.3
Hunter	48.6	45.6	44.8	45.2	39.8
Lehman	49.5	52.8	54.1	52.4	51.2
Queens	48.8	49.8	49.5	44.6	46.5
York	40.6	52.0	50.4	54.1	56.0
Senior College Average	50.7	50.7	49.2	47.5	48.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	40.6	43.1	45.6	45.7	44.8
Medgar Evers	53.1	46.1	46.7	53.5	50.0
NYCCT	46.1	44.8	47.2	49.7	47.8
Staten Island	49.3	47.6	47.1	46.7	39.6
Comprehensive College Average	46.0	45.2	46.7	48.2	45.1
Community					
BMCC	51.9	52.2	52.7	47.2	47.7
Bronx	64.0	62.4	62.8	63.4	60.4
Hostos	59.6	61.8	66.4	62.7	62.0
Kingsborough	59.1	56.3	53.3	52.9	52.9
LaGuardia	46.2	47.0	47.0	45.5	42.3
Queensborough	55.4	54.2	54.2	51.8	52.9
Community College Average	54.9	54.3	54.1	51.7	51.1
University Average	51.2	50.8	50.5	49.2	48.5

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. The values shown here for prior years are revised from previous reports to reflect a correction in the way instructional hours for team taught courses are apportioned. 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	51.7	48.7	50.3	46.4	44.5
Brooklyn	56.6	51.1	47.9	43.8	49.1
City	49.1	48.7	41.4	42.2	45.8
Hunter	40.2	37.1	37.4	38.1	33.2
Lehman	46.6	48.4	50.1	49.1	47.1
Queens	44.7	45.9	45.0	40.5	41.3
York	40.0	50.5	48.6	53.4	55.9
Senior College Average	47.1	46.8	45.4	43.8	44.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	37.2	40.5	43.5	44.0	42.5
Medgar Evers	53.1	46.1	46.7	53.5	50.0
NYCCT	46.1	44.8	47.2	49.7	47.8
Staten Island	47.7	45.0	44.7	44.4	37.1
Comprehensive College Average	44.8	43.9	45.6	47.4	44.0
Community					
BMCC	51.9	52.2	52.7	47.2	47.7
Bronx	64.0	62.4	62.8	63.4	60.4
Hostos	59.6	61.8	66.4	62.7	62.0
Kingsborough	59.1	56.3	53.3	52.9	52.9
LaGuardia	46.2	47.0	47.0	45.5	42.3
Queensborough	55.4	54.2	54.2	51.8	52.9
Community College Average	54.9	54.3	54.1	51.7	51.1
University Average	49.8	49.2	48.9	47.8	46.9

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload data collection from CUNYfirst. The values shown here for prior years are revised from previous reports to reflect a correction in the way instructional hours for team taught courses are apportioned. 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	64.2	69.5	65.1	61.6	68.7
Brooklyn	52.5	49.2	51.4	50.7	56.7
City	73.5	74.9	70.9	71.6	71.4
Hunter	72.1	70.9	66.7	65.0	58.0
Lehman	63.6	75.1	71.2	65.8	69.9
Queens	62.9	63.6	66.8	61.2	70.1
York	100.0	96.1	100.0	100.0	69.2
Senior College Average	64.9	66.4	65.5	62.5	64.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65.6	61.2	60.4	56.7	61.2
Staten Island	68.3	76.4	78.7	79.2	74.0
Comprehensive College Average	66.6	66.9	66.5	63.8	65.6
University Average	65.1	66.5	65.6	62.6	64.6

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from the new faculty workload collection from CUNYfirst. This indicator is expected to be updated in the final version of the PMP report due out in mid-July. The values shown here for prior years are revised from previous reports to reflect a correction in the way instructional hours for team taught courses are apportioned. 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	7.6	8.0	7.6	7.8	7.4
Brooklyn	8.3	8.1	7.9	8.1	7.7
City	7.7	8.2	9.3	9.0	8.5
Hunter	7.7	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.2
Lehman	7.5	7.8	7.7	8.0	8.2
Queens	8.2	7.9	7.4	7.4	7.3
York	8.7	7.8	7.4	8.1	8.2
Senior College Average	7.9	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	7.7	6.9	6.9	7.2	9.0
Medgar Evers	6.8	7.2	7.2	6.4	9.4
NYCCT	10.4	9.5	9.2	9.2	9.1
Staten Island	8.1	8.4	8.1	8.5	7.2
Comprehensive College Average	8.5	8.2	8.0	8.1	8.5
Community					
BMCC	11.0	11.3	11.5	11.7	11.1
Bronx	10.6	10.4	10.2	10.7	10.8
Hostos	10.5	10.3	10.1	10.9	10.9
Kingsborough	10.4	10.3	10.4	10.4	10.2
LaGuardia	9.9	9.7	10.4	10.3	10.9
Queensborough	11.3	11.7	11.6	11.8	12.0
Community College Average	10.6	10.7	10.8	11.1	11.0
University Average	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.8	8.7

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 (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. Teaching hours are credited to the faculty member's appointment college.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	322	313	323	304	306
Brooklyn	332	320	314	294	313
City	321	342	312	320	321
Hunter	394	426	406	417	451
Lehman	198	206	201	203	196
Queens	357	349	346	321	343
York	102	107	106	104	97
Senior College Total	2,026	2,063	2,008	1,963	2,027
Comprehensive					
John Jay	164	192	194	176	185
Medgar Evers	84	84	76	79	77
NYCCT	187	199	207	209	205
Staten Island	201	215	191	206	228
Comprehensive College Total	636	690	668	670	695
Community					
BMCC	160	176	215	217	223
Bronx	127	131	132	140	147
Hostos	84	83	94	91	82
Kingsborough	145	146	159	160	170
LaGuardia	117	124	130	131	129
Queensborough	143	153	177	182	166
Community College Total	776	813	907	921	917
University Total	3,438	3,566	3,583	3,554	3,639

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from CUNYfirst Human Capital Management (HCM). Due to unforeseen challenges in identifying faculty hired under a contract allowing for contractual release time, OIRA is not able to report on this indicator at this time. The prior years' data reflects 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	7.4	6.2	6.7	6.1	5.9
Brooklyn	7.4	7.6	7.3	7.1	6.9
City	6.7	6.4	6.9	7.2	7.8
Hunter	6.8	6.7	6.3	6.0	6.6
Lehman	7.4	7.4	6.7	7.8	6.8
Queens	6.8	7.3	6.7	6.2	6.9
York	8.0	8.1	7.1	8.2	7.6
Senior College Average	7.1	7.0	6.8	6.8	6.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.0	7.2
Medgar Evers	7.7	7.9	6.2	7.4	7.9
NYCCT	10.3	10.5	9.7	9.7	8.4
Staten Island	7.9	7.9	7.2	7.3	7.6
Comprehensive College Average	8.2	8.0	7.7	8.0	7.8
Community					
BMCC	12.0	12.1	11.3	11.4	10.7
Bronx	10.4	10.9	10.3	9.8	11.6
Hostos	11.3	10.6	10.8	10.4	10.2
Kingsborough	11.1	9.9	10.7	10.3	9.9
LaGuardia	11.9	10.4	11.4	11.5	11.9
Queensborough	10.3	11.7	11.1	10.6	11.1
Community College Average	11.2	11.1	11.0	10.9	11.0
University Average	8.7	8.7	8.1	8.1	8.2

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 (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.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	50	45	63	78	81
Brooklyn	64	63	75	98	103
City	96	70	67	93	99
Hunter	94	71	84	89	109
Lehman	48	45	57	66	63
Queens	85	80	79	104	119
York	37	34	30	50	57
Senior College Total	474	408	455	578	631
Comprehensive					
John Jay	63	65	78	96	122
Medgar Evers	15	21	29	35	36
NYCCT	55	33	57	90	115
Staten Island	65	46	50	49	82
Comprehensive College Total	198	165	214	270	355
Community					
BMCC	95	80	59	77	88
Bronx	45	46	41	33	37
Hostos	31	31	23	29	33
Kingsborough	49	52	29	36	46
LaGuardia	51	40	42	55	73
Queensborough	73	67	51	47	59
Community College Total	344	316	245	277	336
University Total	1,016	889	914	1,125	1,322

Note: Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator is based on data from CUNYfirst Human Capital Management (HCM). Figures reflect 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	21.8	21.5	20.4	19.8	
Brooklyn	17.5	17.8	17.2	17.0	
City	15.0	16.3	15.4	15.4	
Hunter	19.7	18.9	19.1	18.4	
Lehman	14.5	15.3	14.8	15.3	
Queens	16.9	17.4	18.1	18.2	
York	16.4	16.9	16.9	17.6	
Senior College Average	17.7	17.9	17.7	17.5	
Comprehensive					
John Jay	21.0	20.3	19.5	19.2	
Medgar Evers	17.5	17.1	15.9	17.8	
NYCCT	15.6	15.8	15.4	16.0	
Staten Island	18.2	18.8	18.6	18.2	
Comprehensive College Average	18.1	18.0	17.4	17.7	
Community					
BMCC	20.2	20.3	20.8	21.2	
Bronx	17.3	17.6	16.8	17.2	
Hostos	16.7	16.7	16.3	16.9	
Kingsborough	19.3	18.4	18.9	19.6	
LaGuardia	20.0	20.3	19.7	19.7	
Queensborough	17.4	17.2	17.5	18.4	
Community College Average	18.9	18.8	18.8	19.4	
University Average	18.2	18.3	18.0	18.2	

Note: This indicator is calculated by summing the student FTEs in undergraduate sections and dividing by the sum of faculty FTEs in undergraduate sections. Fall 2009 figures will be included in next year's PMP report. Beginning with fall 2009, this indicator will be 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	439	448	468	470	458
Brooklyn	494	488	511	512	500
City	502	491	498	541	535
Hunter	610	607	645	661	654
Lehman	306	327	349	358	349
Queens	559	566	609	620	610
York	164	160	167	188	199
Senior College Total	3,074	3,087	3,247	3,350	3,305
Comprehensive					
John Jay	323	359	382	400	414
Medgar Evers	132	136	148	156	170
NYCCT	289	297	327	366	393
Staten Island	306	306	322	329	339
Comprehensive College Total	1,050	1,098	1,179	1,251	1,316
Community					
BMCC	352	348	364	361	392
Bronx	251	245	255	256	247
Hostos	137	146	155	148	157
Kingsborough	295	292	282	296	315
LaGuardia	244	248	257	265	266
Queensborough	275	270	284	284	305
Community College Total	1,554	1,549	1,597	1,610	1,682
University Total	5,678	5,734	6,023	6,211	6,303

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. Fall 2009 figures are revised from the preliminary PMP report to reflect the exclusion of counselors, librarians and EOC faculty.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	183	193	186	208	256
Brooklyn	205	231	247	295	355
City	202	212	123	318	449
Hunter	286	313	339	372	549
Lehman	209	196	192	202	279
Queens	275	285	284	323	311
York	115	109	115	110	116
Senior College Total	1,475	1,539	1,486	1,828	2,315
Comprehensive					
John Jay	274	289	268	278	364
Medgar Evers	84	98	113	101	180
NYCCT	284	298	294	285	367
Staten Island	206	215	234	247	286
Comprehensive College Total	848	900	909	911	1,198
Community					
BMCC	311	304	311	378	401
Bronx	121	121	118	117	177
Hostos	72	72	71	73	86
Kingsborough	187	192	202	212	251
LaGuardia	220	227	269	283	306
Queensborough	198	208	216	227	274
Community College Total	1,109	1,124	1,187	1,290	1,496
University Total	3,432	3,563	3,582	4,029	5,009

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	240	257	266	267	281
Brooklyn	242	245	261	284	283
City	308	318	333	359	367
Hunter	329	322	352	383	395
Lehman	195	199	214	222	242
Queens	283	289	321	348	313
York	118	118	134	158	180
Senior College Total	1,715	1,748	1,881	2,021	2,061
Comprehensive					
John Jay	161	181	207	239	250
Medgar Evers	130	157	174	180	180
NYCCT	172	172	181	189	222
Staten Island	172	178	188	186	201
Comprehensive College Total	635	688	750	794	853
Community					
BMCC	182	195	203	207	212
Bronx	152	155	159	166	177
Hostos	114	119	126	133	141
Kingsborough	169	182	201	204	223
LaGuardia	234	245	266	291	301
Queensborough	167	168	176	190	203
Community College Total	1,018	1,064	1,131	1,191	1,257
University Total	3,368	3,500	3,762	4,006	4,171

Note: Includes individuals on the executive compensation plan and personnel in full-time professional titles. Figures for Hunter College, Senior College Subtotal and University Total have been revised slightly from prior reports to exclude employees of Hunter College High School.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	97.0	91.3	98.8	96.3	97.8
Brooklyn	91.4	90.2	85.1	91.2	85.2
City	90.6	86.5	85.2	87.0	86.8
Hunter	91.1	88.5	96.5	92.0	93.9
Lehman	81.8	87.2	74.6	83.3	79.0
Queens	92.7	91.4	92.1	85.9	93.0
York	76.5	86.3	76.6	62.2	72.3
Senior College Average	88.3	88.4	84.6	83.6	85.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	71.2	80.1	66.3	75.5	72.5
Medgar Evers	100.0*	0.0*	89.1	90.7	92.7
NYCCT	86.3	94.4*	89.5*	94.1*	95.0*
Staten Island	100.0*	100.0*	---	---	100.0*
Comprehensive College Average	76.6	81.8	72.8	79.9	78.5
University Average	86.6	87.5	82.7	83.1	84.3

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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	200	46	85	82	93
Brooklyn	174	225	195	239	203
City	255	281	277	193	219
Hunter	169	52	115	100	114
Lehman	325	218	280	210	214
Queens	232	175	214	220	258
York	187	139	205	225	195
Senior College Total	1,542	1,136	1,371	1,269	1,296
Comprehensive					
John Jay	177	141	187	159	229
Medgar Evers	5	1	55	43	41
NYCCT	80	18	19	17	20
Staten Island	3	5	0	0	21
Comprehensive College Total	265	165	261	219	311
University Total	1,807	1,301	1,632	1,488	1,607

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	89.4	89.4	90.5	96.5	92.0
Brooklyn	68.2	83.7	76.9	89.3	71.4
City	79.2	86.0	84.1	75.2	77.2
Hunter	86.7	81.0	81.8	89.7	78.0
Lehman	78.6	68.9	39.1*	79.5	78.4
Queens	77.5	67.3	76.9	69.2	77.9
York	62.0	59.6	56.9	49.1	46.2
Senior College Average	78.3	77.5	76.3	80.6	77.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	33.3*	33.3*	60.0*	60.0*	42.9*
Medgar Evers	---	---	---	---	--
NYCCT	50.0*	61.5*	60.0*	100.0*	0.0*
Staten Island	100.0*	---	---	100.0*	--
Comprehensive College Average	45.5*	46.4	60.0*	71.4*	33.3*
University Average	77.4	75.4	75.9	80.5	77.1

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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	66	47	84	144	137
Brooklyn	44	43	52	28	35
City	72	86	44	101	79
Hunter	60	58	66	58	41
Lehman	28	45	23	44	51
Queens	71	52	65	65	68
York	50	47	58	55	52
Senior College Total	391	378	392	495	463
Comprehensive					
John Jay	6	15	5	5	7
Medgar Evers	0	0	0	0	0
NYCCT	4	13	5	1	2
Staten Island	1	0	0	1	0
Comprehensive College Total	11	28	10	7	9
University Total	402	406	402	502	472

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	91.7*	91.7*	86.7	92.0*	100.0*
Brooklyn	89.7	100.0	74.4	91.4	90.3
City	81.6	85.3	87.9	91.7	75.0*
Hunter	77.3*	100.0*	90.0*	81.3*	66.7*
Lehman	100.0	83.8	76.5	90.6	100.0*
Queens	84.6	90.0	85.7	89.7	93.2
York	93.1	94.1	85.4	89.3	84.5
Senior College Average	89.4	90.4	83.3	90.0	88.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	87.5	83.3	90.5	93.1	96.0
Medgar Evers	92.9*	84.8	81.3	90.5	89.4
NYCCT	88.9	85.7	77.3	84.1	79.5
Staten Island	83.3	85.3	89.3	96.4	92.9
Comprehensive College Average	87.1	85.0	85.1	90.7	89.2
Community					
BMCC	88.6	72.1	80.3	84.4	92.3
Bronx	76.2*	80.6	76.7	64.7*	68.8
Hostos	62.5*	57.1*	50.0*	80.0*	76.9*
Kingsborough	81.0	80.6	87.2	82.5	86.2
LaGuardia	75.7	95.7*	97.4	84.2	86.9
Queensborough	78.1	96.0*	76.4	94.9	84.6
Community College Average	78.7	81.6	82.5	84.1	85.4
University Average	85.9	86.2	83.9	89.2	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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	95.9	94.0	87.3	83.9	85.7
Brooklyn	71.5	64.6	80.4	87.3	87.5
City	78.4	70.7	80.8	74.6	77.6
Hunter	66.7	71.4	55.2	75.9	53.8*
Lehman	84.9	71.1	77.2	79.1	76.2
Queens	88.8	75.3	82.0	82.2	76.3
York	76.1	60.4	74.8	76.6	71.9
Senior College Average	79.9	70.0	78.4	79.8	76.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	75.9	65.4	75.6	86.1	71.0
Medgar Evers	71.8	63.6	62.8	70.0*	69.4
NYCCT	58.7	61.4	58.6	59.8	65.5
Staten Island	67.9	76.5	70.2	72.5	72.0
Comprehensive College Average	66.8	66.8	66.2	70.2	69.0
Community					
BMCC	56.1	61.9	60.3	67.4	70.2
Bronx	64.3	46.0	69.4	78.1	67.2
Hostos	18.8*	72.7*	66.7*	75.0*	56.0*
Kingsborough	60.5	50.7	73.1	71.6	63.2
LaGuardia	54.3	60.9*	73.5	66.7	77.0
Queensborough	43.9	53.8	71.9	65.3	67.2
Community College Average	51.6	55.2	69.9	68.8	67.4
University Average	69.6	65.8	71.9	73.8	69.9

Note: This indicator is based on admitted first-time freshmen who did not meet the basic skills requirement in writing with the initial attempt of the 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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Brooklyn	94.7*	100.0*	100.0	89.6	94.8
City	88.3	88.0	83.8	91.4	87.2
Hunter	100.0*	75.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*
Lehman	88.0	90.3	87.7	88.7	93.1
Queens	89.5*	95.5*	95.8*	88.2*	100.0*
York	97.2	92.1	90.7	96.2	95.8
Senior College Average	92.2	91.2	89.7	91.8	93.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	87.0	89.2	91.0	90.8	96.2
Medgar Evers	80.0	96.3	89.3	89.5	100.0
NYCCT	92.6	96.1	98.0	96.2	99.1
Staten Island	83.5	87.8	88.3	95.6	88.2
Comprehensive College Average	86.3	90.9	91.0	93.5	93.4
Community					
BMCC	84.3	93.5	92.2	91.1	95.5
Bronx	62.5*	57.1*	66.7*	100.0*	83.1
Hostos	78.6*	45.5*	90.0*	87.0*	78.9*
Kingsborough	92.7	84.6	88.5	79.2	92.6
LaGuardia	82.8	90.5*	97.6	93.3	93.0
Queensborough	100.0*	---	50.0*	100.0*	93.2
Community College Average	84.6	83.8	90.3	88.8	91.3
University Average	88.2	89.8	90.3	91.6	92.8

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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	87.5*	100.0*
Brooklyn	96.9	92.2	96.5	93.5	98.7
City	86.5	93.3	89.7	92.5	90.1
Hunter	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	100.0*	83.3*
Lehman	89.2	87.3	86.2	87.0	92.8
Queens	97.4	96.5	96.4	97.7	100.0
York	95.6	89.8	93.6	91.0	93.0
Senior College Average	93.0	91.1	91.5	91.0	93.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	90.3	89.5	88.9	87.2	90.2
Medgar Evers	100.0*	94.7*	100.0*	91.4	94.2
NYCCT	99.1	100.0	100.0	97.8	99.4
Staten Island	92.3	94.2	89.4	93.0	89.0
Comprehensive College Average	93.1	94.0	91.6	92.3	92.1
Community					
BMCC	84.9	90.9	94.5	83.9	91.5
Bronx	88.4	88.9*	79.3	84.6*	72.7
Hostos	92.3*	62.5*	80.0*	90.9*	91.7*
Kingsborough	91.8	87.1	89.2	92.6	87.2
LaGuardia	85.7	91.5	92.6	91.5	94.7
Queensborough	94.2	85.0*	87.8	95.8*	97.3
Community College Average	88.8	88.1	89.2	88.5	90.0
University Average	92.1	91.8	91.1	91.1	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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	56.1	69.0	58.2	67.6	62.4
Medgar Evers	50.9	65.4	54.9	58.7	59.4
NYCCT	54.2	64.6	63.2	72.6	71.3
Staten Island	58.5	61.0	52.5	55.8	60.0
Comprehensive College Average	55.7	64.7	58.3	65.4	64.5
Community					
BMCC	53.0	58.7	58.1	56.8	54.4
Bronx	54.6	66.1	60.1	66.1	61.0
Hostos	38.6	41.6	41.6	45.3	44.9
Kingsborough	56.3	60.3	58.1	65.6	60.4
LaGuardia	53.6	57.7	60.0	61.0	57.9
Queensborough	57.2	53.0	58.5	58.2	63.3
Community College Average	53.1	56.1	56.6	58.6	56.9
University Average	53.6	58.2	57.0	60.0	58.2

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	65.4	62.1	65.7	65.6	59.1
Medgar Evers	55.2	49.4	52.6	43.8	57.0
NYCCT	57.3	46.5	42.8	50.9	44.1
Staten Island	55.3	56.7	58.3	52.9	54.7
Comprehensive College Average	58.5	53.5	53.5	53.1	52.3
Community					
BMCC	59.9	57.8	55.6	48.4	55.9
Bronx	55.7	65.7	67.6	61.8	62.4
Hostos	35.1	37.2	44.5	43.8	45.2
Kingsborough	56.3	49.6	58.2	51.3	45.2
LaGuardia	58.4	53.4	57.4	49.0	50.9
Queensborough	53.7	46.9	45.6	54.7	48.1
Community College Average	55.5	53.3	55.4	50.6	52.0
University Average	56.3	53.4	54.9	51.2	52.1

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	68.4	51.6	42.2	41.1	53.6
Medgar Evers	60.3	63.7	50.7	27.1	45.7
NYCCT	90.5	88.0	79.4	74.1	78.2
Staten Island	62.2	57.3	32.5	44.6	52.8
Comprehensive College Average	69.5	62.2	48.3	46.6	57.1
Community					
BMCC	57.8	60.8	51.9	75.7	74.3
Bronx	64.3	55.2	45.6	38.4	47.6
Hostos	48.8	51.6	44.6	52.7	64.3
Kingsborough	55.9	57.3	51.7	59.7	80.9
LaGuardia	76.2	77.9	68.7	68.4	79.1
Queensborough	61.3	56.7	48.9	63.8	62.5
Community College Average	60.3	60.4	52.3	62.0	68.5
University Average	62.7	60.9	51.2	57.4	65.1

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	53.4	67.5	72.5	71.5	74.9
Medgar Evers	68.8	66.5	64.2	64.5	66.6
NYCCT	87.9	91.3	91.7	92.0	90.6
Staten Island	89.2	90.9	91.4	89.2	88.9
Comprehensive College Average	77.2	82.3	83.3	82.3	82.8
Community					
BMCC	57.0	60.1	66.2	65.9	60.9
Bronx	57.3	54.5	56.1	52.7	45.5
Hostos	49.1	53.6	59.0	64.2	64.6
Kingsborough	59.8	59.1	62.1	57.1	52.3
LaGuardia	62.9	59.3	68.0	67.5	63.7
Queensborough	68.0	70.5	70.3	68.3	64.4
Community College Average	59.7	60.1	64.3	62.6	58.3
University Average	63.9	65.6	69.0	67.4	64.2

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	80.2	84.5	77.5	86.6	92.0
Medgar Evers	85.3	86.3	82.6	82.2	82.2
NYCCT	92.5	97.7	96.0	94.5	94.5
Staten Island	94.6	91.4	95.4	93.8	92.9
Comprehensive College Average	89.4	91.9	90.0	90.5	91.0
Community					
BMCC	85.9	83.6	85.2	86.9	87.0
Bronx	76.3	76.1	80.4	81.0	81.8
Hostos	66.2	72.3	67.7	74.4	78.2
Kingsborough	75.7	76.2	78.5	76.8	77.0
LaGuardia	85.0	83.0	86.0	83.6	83.7
Queensborough	89.8	90.9	90.1	89.9	88.3
Community College Average	81.4	81.0	82.2	82.6	82.9
University Average	82.8	83.1	83.8	84.3	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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.9	86.0	89.8	84.6	91.4
Medgar Evers	83.6	82.4	83.3	87.6	82.9
NYCCT	91.7	95.1	94.1	94.5	94.1
Staten Island	92.2	92.9	93.4	93.3	92.5
Comprehensive College Average	87.3	90.6	91.3	91.1	91.1
Community					
BMCC	72.7	78.3	80.8	82.2	82.9
Bronx	74.0	75.9	80.0	85.3	83.1
Hostos	69.6	72.6	75.1	81.3	83.8
Kingsborough	66.4	71.3	75.1	77.2	72.6
LaGuardia	73.1	71.6	77.3	80.8	78.9
Queensborough	78.3	81.3	84.8	84.9	84.5
Community College Average	72.4	75.6	79.2	81.9	80.5
University Average	75.7	78.9	81.9	83.8	82.7

Note: This indicator is based on students who have earned between 25 and 35 credits by the start of the fall term and who were not initially proficient in 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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	45.0	62.9	71.1	71.3	69.1
Medgar Evers	71.9	66.8	64.5	62.8	63.4
NYCCT	91.1	90.5	92.6	92.8	90.7
Staten Island	90.1	92.6	92.2	89.9	89.5
Comprehensive College Average	76.0	80.6	82.5	81.2	80.2
Community					
BMCC	59.5	63.4	67.9	65.9	58.8
Bronx	61.7	56.1	53.7	48.5	40.0
Hostos	51.1	57.5	65.3	69.9	69.5
Kingsborough	65.0	58.7	59.9	55.2	49.7
LaGuardia	64.0	62.1	69.9	66.5	61.5
Queensborough	71.6	70.2	66.2	62.6	59.8
Community College Average	62.6	61.5	64.0	60.7	55.5
University Average	65.7	66.1	68.7	65.7	61.5

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	18.3*	20.0*	17.5	16.6*	19.2*
Brooklyn	18.0	21.4	11.2	13.5	13.9
City	20.4	14.5	13.8	13.8	14.1*
Hunter	14.3*	22.3*	10.7*	13.9*	7.0*
Lehman	19.4	14.0	7.5	14.9	17.5*
Queens	16.1	14.1	13.5	14.3	17.7
York	18.9	17.6	12.8	13.8	12.6
Senior College Average	18.2	16.5	12.3	14.3	14.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14.8	14.6	14.9	15.8	17.1
Medgar Evers	14.5*	16.1	9.0	14.8	13.6
NYCCT	16.3	12.4	10.6	11.2	10.4
Staten Island	16.9	15.0	15.1	17.3	15.8
Comprehensive College Average	16.1	14.0	13.1	14.5	14.3
Community					
BMCC	17.2	12.6	12.2	14.2	15.1
Bronx	13.7*	11.4	11.4	7.5*	8.5
Hostos	13.9*	- 1.9*	1.5*	14.4*	9.5*
Kingsborough	13.7	13.8	13.4	11.8	12.8
LaGuardia	12.9	15.8*	11.8	11.6	13.7
Queensborough	13.2	15.4	10.1	13.8	11.6
Community College Average	14.2	13.0	11.7	12.7	12.8
University Average	16.4	14.7	12.5	14.1	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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.8
Brooklyn	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.6
City	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4
Hunter	1.1	1.3	0.9	1.5	0.9*
Lehman	2.0	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6
Queens	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.8
York	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.5
Senior College Average	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1.6	1.2	1.5	1.9	1.5
Medgar Evers	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.4*	1.2
NYCCT	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
Staten Island	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Comprehensive College Average	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
Community					
BMCC	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3
Bronx	1.1	0.7	1.1	1.3	1.3
Hostos	0.0*	1.4*	1.1*	1.2*	0.8*
Kingsborough	1.0	0.7	1.3	1.1	1.1
LaGuardia	1.1	1.2*	1.7	1.3	1.5
Queensborough	0.7	0.8	1.4	1.3	1.3
Community College Average	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.2	1.3
University Average	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.4	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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	13.0*	34.0*	23.0*	34.5*	29.0*
Brooklyn	17.0*	19.1*	17.0	17.7	22.8
City	17.2	15.2	13.4	19.9	19.7
Hunter	20.0*	16.8*	14.5*	20.0*	8.5*
Lehman	14.1	14.9	12.3	10.4	22.2
Queens	17.4*	21.5*	15.1*	16.8*	30.4*
York	16.8	15.2	12.5	14.7	16.5
Senior College Average	16.2	16.0	13.3	14.9	20.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	13.1	15.3	13.4	14.1	20.1
Medgar Evers	11.6	19.4	15.4	24.3	31.6
NYCCT	21.0	20.1	18.6	15.5	17.9
Staten Island	13.6	14.5	13.1	17.2	16.2
Comprehensive College Average	14.7	16.5	14.4	16.8	19.0
Community					
BMCC	19.0	19.3	17.2	15.3	19.7
Bronx	6.6*	8.0*	3.4*	13.0*	7.9
Hostos	6.5*	5.5*	8.4*	12.5*	11.8*
Kingsborough	15.7	15.0	13.7	11.3	16.9
LaGuardia	14.0	13.2*	24.2	23.0	24.2
Queensborough	20.0*	---	11.0*	12.5*	22.2
Community College Average	15.0	15.1	16.1	15.6	18.3
University Average	15.4	16.1	14.3	15.8	19.2

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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Summer 2006</u>	<u>Summer 2007</u>	<u>Summer 2008</u>	<u>Summer 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	15.2*	23.9*	8.0*	22.3*	15.6*
Brooklyn	19.9	19.1	25.2	26.8	31.6
City	9.6	13.2	12.3	17.9	18.5
Hunter	18.3*	16.3*	19.5*	18.6*	15.0*
Lehman	13.8	12.2	11.0	12.3	22.5
Queens	26.1	23.2	19.8	22.4	30.5
York	14.8	16.6	14.4	14.3	16.5
Senior College Average	15.2	15.6	14.7	16.8	22.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	12.2	10.7	10.5	11.4	15.8
Medgar Evers	16.3*	19.5*	20.8*	29.1	35.0
NYCCT	17.8	17.1	16.5	19.1	19.2
Staten Island	15.4	15.0	14.0	19.9	15.6
Comprehensive College Average	14.7	14.3	13.6	17.8	17.9
Community					
BMCC	15.7	21.0	17.1	19.7	25.8
Bronx	8.9	9.4*	8.5	9.4*	8.7
Hostos	13.5*	5.5*	9.9*	19.1*	22.8*
Kingsborough	11.9	12.6	11.8	17.3	14.5
LaGuardia	15.1	16.7	21.5	22.4	20.4
Queensborough	17.5	20.2*	13.8	18.1*	20.1
Community College Average	14.1	16.1	14.9	19.0	19.3
University Average	14.8	15.1	14.3	17.6	19.4

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. Summer 2008 figures are revised from last year's PMP report to reflect more complete skills test data.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	55.0	51.8	58.4	55.5	
Brooklyn	53.1	46.9	43.3	39.1	
City	45.9	42.2	35.0	36.9	
Hunter	40.5	36.9	35.7	34.8	
Lehman	34.5	37.3	38.4	39.1	
Queens	41.8	42.4	41.1	35.0	
York	39.8	38.5	39.9	47.3	
Senior College Average	45.4	42.9	42.0	40.7	
Comprehensive					
John Jay	32.3	35.1	38.7	39.3	
Medgar Evers	47.8	39.2	42.6	51.7	
NYCCT	45.9	46.4	48.0	49.0	
Staten Island	36.5	33.6	32.8	33.6	
Comprehensive College Average	39.7	39.1	40.8	42.9	
University Average	42.9	41.1	41.5	41.7	

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	73.8	74.6	79.5	80.2	76.8
Brooklyn	79.4	76.6	78.2	78.2	79.6
City	83.2	83.3	82.0	83.2	82.9
Hunter	85.0	85.3	87.5	81.6	87.9
Lehman	84.3	82.8	82.1	78.9	80.3
Queens	86.6	87.0	85.3	87.9	84.8
York	76.4	72.0	72.9	76.4	77.7
Senior College Average	80.6	80.3	81.5	80.9	81.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	69.7	70.0	69.0	72.0	71.0
Medgar Evers	69.1	75.8	70.1	70.5	72.6
NYCCT	69.1	68.2	68.6	68.7	72.2
Staten Island	85.5	84.9	85.8	84.8	82.7
Comprehensive College Average	73.0	73.4	72.6	73.6	74.2
Community					
BMCC	79.6	78.1	79.1	76.7	77.4
Bronx	74.9	73.5	75.4	78.7	73.0
Hostos	76.0	78.6	75.8	80.1	78.3
Kingsborough	83.8	82.4	83.3	84.7	84.8
LaGuardia	72.6	75.5	73.7	74.2	72.2
Queensborough	77.6	74.8	79.2	78.3	76.7
Community College Average	78.2	77.5	78.2	78.2	77.2
University Average	77.2	77.0	77.3	77.5	77.3

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	93.0	93.9	94.9	94.9	95.9
Brooklyn	82.6	78.5	80.9	79.5	82.8
City	92.7	90.5	92.1	91.5	92.5
Hunter	91.1	91.4	93.4	93.3	95.4
Lehman	90.1	91.6	90.4	87.7	90.1
Queens	91.0	93.0	90.7	93.1	91.8
York	74.2	72.1	73.9	81.3	80.9
Senior College Average	88.8	88.5	89.0	89.2	90.7
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.9	76.7	77.5	82.2	82.1
Medgar Evers	69.1	75.9	68.0	71.8	70.4
NYCCT	82.1	82.1	83.3	84.2	84.6
Staten Island	93.1	91.6	92.0	91.5	91.1
Comprehensive College Average	82.1	82.3	81.9	84.0	83.6
Community					
BMCC	82.7	79.8	81.5	80.7	80.4
Bronx	77.9	80.7	78.4	84.1	78.4
Hostos	77.4	81.7	80.3	82.9	80.5
Kingsborough	89.0	87.8	88.0	86.7	88.1
LaGuardia	73.3	77.3	75.5	78.1	75.6
Queensborough	86.9	83.3	87.4	87.0	86.6
Community College Average	81.7	81.5	82.0	82.8	81.8
University Average	83.9	83.8	83.9	84.8	84.4

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	43.1	49.9	59.8	61.4	50.6
Brooklyn	63.1	70.2	69.6	74.2	70.5
City	63.1	69.6	62.9	67.0	65.3
Hunter	69.2	70.7	74.3	58.0	72.8
Lehman	66.7	60.8	62.7	63.7	67.6
Queens	69.8	66.8	69.7	73.4	64.2
York	87.7	71.6	68.9	59.3	69.9
Senior College Average	59.2	62.4	65.5	64.3	64.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	61.4	63.0	60.1	61.6	59.8
Medgar Evers	69.2	75.7	73.1	68.7	76.0
NYCCT	54.8	53.6	55.4	55.5	61.5
Staten Island	68.8	71.0	72.7	70.8	66.1
Comprehensive College Average	61.3	62.4	61.6	61.4	63.3
Community					
BMCC	74.8	75.1	73.2	69.1	71.3
Bronx	60.9	44.1	61.5	56.8	45.8
Hostos	72.1	69.6	59.2	67.6	68.1
Kingsborough	64.0	59.7	59.1	74.4	67.8
LaGuardia	63.8	67.0	65.1	59.5	59.6
Queensborough	54.9	55.2	57.8	56.3	57.1
Community College Average	67.8	66.3	65.2	64.9	63.8
University Average	62.9	63.6	63.7	63.2	63.7

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 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will increase.

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	83.8	82.2	86.1	87.6	91.0
Brooklyn	84.3	79.4	85.3	84.3	87.3
City	76.5	87.8	88.2	86.3	89.1
Hunter	81.3	80.1	87.3	90.8	88.5
Lehman	69.2	69.1	71.3	77.3	85.0
Queens	72.7	71.9	76.6	79.7	77.4
York	76.7	67.2	72.3	85.5	80.8
Senior College Average	77.9	77.3	81.7	84.4	85.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	70.9	82.8	85.3	86.4	83.6
Medgar Evers	68.3	70.7	76.4	83.6	87.0
NYCCT	81.5	82.3	82.3	78.2	83.0
Staten Island	73.8	74.3	73.5	78.0	76.1
Comprehensive College Average	74.3	79.6	80.1	81.5	81.7
Community					
BMCC	77.1	78.2	77.5	82.4	85.9
Bronx	64.4	75.8	73.1	77.7	76.6
Hostos	81.0	81.1	85.5	86.0	84.4
Kingsborough	74.6	75.5	83.5	83.1	77.8
LaGuardia	75.7	80.3	86.1	84.8	79.1
Queensborough	78.4	80.7	81.9	78.1	84.5
Community College Average	75.3	78.2	81.2	82.1	81.8
University Average	76.4	78.1	81.2	83.1	83.2

Note: This indicator reflects the percentage of students required to take the CPE for the first time in the fall semester, who took it either that fall or in the subsequent winter or spring administrations. Beginning with the 2009-10 year-end PMP report, the methodology for producing this indicator changed slightly; students who were not enrolled in the fall term are excluded from the base, even if they take the CPE in a subsequent administration. Students who were deferred in the fall and did not enroll in the subsequent spring term are also excluded from the base. The methodological change is reflected in the data for all years included in this report.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.4 Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will increase.

New Methodology

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	95.8	94.3	95.8	94.4	95.7
Brooklyn	95.5	92.8	93.4	94.4	95.5
City	91.2	92.2	90.8	93.2	92.7
Hunter	96.7	96.1	96.2	96.1	97.4
Lehman	90.5	91.6	89.9	88.8	93.3
Queens	93.9	93.9	94.5	93.4	94.2
York	88.7	87.2	87.1	85.3	90.7
Senior College Average	94.0	93.4	93.4	93.1	94.6
Comprehensive					
John Jay	93.7	91.8	89.9	91.8	89.7
Medgar Evers	87.7	83.4	85.5	91.5	91.7
NYCCT	89.3	88.5	88.8	85.6	88.3
Staten Island	92.5	91.2	86.9	89.1	90.5
Comprehensive College Average	91.5	90.2	88.4	89.4	89.8
Community					
BMCC	91.2	87.5	85.3	93.3	90.1
Bronx	90.3	90.0	85.1	86.3	90.1
Hostos	93.6	91.0	87.3	90.8	95.1
Kingsborough	87.7	84.7	88.4	87.7	88.8
LaGuardia	91.1	94.6	92.7	91.5	96.4
Queensborough	94.2	90.7	92.2	90.4	91.6
Community College Average	91.0	89.2	88.8	90.5	91.5
University Average	92.7	91.5	91.1	91.5	92.5

Note: This indicator reflects the percentage of students who passed the CPE based on the students counted as test-takers for the CPE show rate. The pass rate reflects the best outcome for tests taken that fall or in the subsequent winter or spring administrations (longitudinal pass rate). Beginning with the 2009-10 year-end PMP report, the methodology for producing this indicator changed slightly; students who were not enrolled in the fall term are excluded from the base, even if they take the CPE in a subsequent administration. Students who were deferred in the fall and did not enroll in the subsequent spring term are also excluded from the base. The methodological change is reflected in the data for all years included in this report.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Senior					
Baruch					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	83.7	87.8	85.2	89.0	86.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	89.2	88.3	89.5	89.8	88.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.5	-0.5	-4.3	-0.8	-2.3
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.5	77.0	80.9	74.7	71.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.5	79.2	79.9	78.5	81.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.1	-2.1	1.0	-3.8	-10.1
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.9	78.2	79.3	81.9	79.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.7	82.3	79.6	80.6	78.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.8	-4.2	-0.3	1.3	1.0
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	80.6	76.5	79.0	82.9	82.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.2	82.0	83.1	83.9	84.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-2.5	-5.5	-4.1	-1.0	-2.1
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	74.3	77.3	73.5	71.9	76.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.5	73.7	72.5	72.5	78.2
URM-non-URM Gap	4.8	3.6	1.0	-0.6	-1.2
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	83.1	77.4	83.3	84.2	84.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	84.1	82.9	84.1	85.0	86.3
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.0	-5.5	-0.8	-0.8	-1.7
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	67.0	65.4	71.9	70.2	75.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	75.0	75.3	67.9	67.3	75.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.0	-10.0	4.1	2.8	-0.6
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.4	76.7	78.5	78.3	79.1
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.2	82.8	82.9	83.3	84.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.7	-6.1	-4.4	-5.0	-5.0

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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</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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.1	76.7	75.8	73.6	75.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	73.5	69.9	71.7	70.1	74.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.4	6.8	4.1	3.5	1.2
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	51.7	61.1*	61.2	56.6	68.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	0.0*	---	66.7*	33.3*	100.0*
URM-non-URM Gap	51.7*	---	-5.5*	23.3*	-31.3*
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.3	79.0	76.7	78.8	79.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.7	74.2	71.7	79.4	82.0
URM-non-URM Gap	1.6	4.7	5.0	-0.6	-2.5
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.0	73.5	80.6	74.4	74.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.0	80.2	82.1	83.2	80.8
URM-non-URM Gap	-22.0	-6.7	-1.5	-8.8	-6.1
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.8	76.6	73.6	70.9	74.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	77.1	73.2	76.2	75.6	77.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.3	3.4	-2.6	-4.7	-3.0

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.7	76.7	77.6	76.7	78.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	82.3	81.6	81.9	82.2	83.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.6	-4.9	-4.4	-5.5	-5.1

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Senior					
Baruch					
Males	86.1	87.2	87.2	87.9	87.6
Females	89.2	89.3	89.5	91.5	89.2
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	-2.1	-2.3	-3.6	-1.6
Brooklyn					
Males	72.1	75.3	79.2	76.2	77.3
Females	78.2	81.0	81.0	77.9	78.3
Male-Female Gap	-6.1	-5.7	-1.8	-1.7	-1.0
City					
Males	78.0	78.7	79.2	78.9	79.6
Females	79.3	81.1	79.7	83.5	79.3
Male-Female Gap	-1.3	-2.4	-0.5	-4.6	0.3
Hunter					
Males	80.8	79.9	77.7	80.1	81.8
Females	83.0	80.3	83.7	85.4	85.5
Male-Female Gap	-2.2	-0.4	-6.0	-5.3	-3.6
Lehman					
Males	71.5	78.1	71.3	70.5	76.0
Females	74.6	76.2	74.0	72.6	77.7
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	1.8	-2.7	-2.2	-1.7
Queens					
Males	81.6	76.3	81.3	80.5	84.0
Females	85.3	85.0	85.5	87.6	87.1
Male-Female Gap	-3.7	-8.7	-4.2	-7.1	-3.1
York					
Males	65.3	63.6	68.8	66.4	76.2
Females	70.9	69.4	72.1	71.3	74.6
Male-Female Gap	-5.5	-5.8	-3.4	-4.9	1.7
Senior College Average					
Males	78.6	78.8	79.9	79.1	81.4
Females	81.4	81.2	81.7	82.5	82.2
Male-Female Gap	-2.9	-2.4	-1.8	-3.3	-0.8

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	70.9	70.6	73.7	70.8	71.6
Females	73.8	76.5	74.4	73.2	77.2
Male-Female Gap	-2.9	-5.9	-0.7	-2.4	-5.7
Medgar Evers					
Males	40.0	57.1	61.4	58.8	76.9
Females	60.0	63.6	61.3	54.5	66.0
Male-Female Gap	-20.0	-6.5	0.1	4.3	10.9
NYCCT					
Males	76.6	74.8	74.8	80.2	81.4
Females	80.8	84.9	75.9	75.0	77.3
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-10.1	-1.1	5.2	4.1
Staten Island					
Males	79.0	81.9	80.3	81.6	77.7
Females	85.2	76.5	82.8	81.6	81.4
Male-Female Gap	-6.1	5.4	-2.5	0.0	-3.6
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	73.1	73.1	74.5	73.1	74.5
Females	76.2	76.9	75.1	72.8	76.8
Male-Female Gap	-3.1	-3.7	-0.7	0.4	-2.3

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
University Average					
Males	77.5	77.8	79.0	78.1	80.0
Females	80.6	80.6	80.7	80.8	81.2
Male-Female Gap	-3.0	-2.8	-1.7	-2.8	-1.2

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.1	62.0	61.5	61.5	66.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.3	63.9	67.5	67.5	69.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.1	-2.0	-6.0	-6.0	-2.4
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	55.9	54.1	49.3	52.8	55.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	26.7*	55.6*	80.0*	55.6*	50.0*
URM-non-URM Gap	29.2*	-1.5*	-30.7*	-2.8*	5.6
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	55.5	58.0	58.3	58.3	56.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	64.7	68.8	69.3	69.1	70.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.2	-10.8	-11.0	-10.8	-13.4
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	57.4	64.1	59.5	58.7	57.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	64.8	69.1	64.3	65.4	66.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.4	-5.1	-4.8	-6.8	-8.3
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	58.2	59.3	58.1	58.5	58.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	64.8	68.0	66.5	66.8	67.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.5	-8.7	-8.4	-8.3	-9.1

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Community					
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	56.2	55.9	55.9	59.9	58.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	61.1	66.0	66.0	65.6	65.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.9	-10.1	-10.2	-5.7	-6.7
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.0	63.1	61.6	61.1	64.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	61.2	62.0	58.0	62.9	72.1
URM-non-URM Gap	1.8	1.1	3.6	-1.8	-7.3
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	60.9	58.1	57.7	60.5	56.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	50.0	62.9	60.9*	58.8	61.0
URM-non-URM Gap	10.9	-4.8	-3.1*	1.7	-4.2
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	63.6	60.1	58.8	61.5	66.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	70.1	69.4	70.8	70.9	74.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.4	-9.2	-12.0	-9.4	-8.3
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.5	58.1	61.0	59.7	60.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	69.0	68.6	71.7	74.1	74.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-9.5	-10.5	-10.8	-14.4	-14.4
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.7	58.3	57.5	59.9	65.1
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	68.4	69.9	69.3	71.1	73.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.7	-11.6	-11.8	-11.2	-8.5
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.7	58.5	58.5	60.3	61.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	67.2	68.5	69.2	70.2	71.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.5	-9.9	-10.7	-9.9	-10.4

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	59.2	58.8	58.4	59.7	60.7
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	66.2	68.3	68.1	68.9	70.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.9	-9.5	-9.7	-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 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	63.1	60.2	60.1	62.6	68.5
Females	64.8	64.2	65.3	63.5	66.5
Male-Female Gap	-1.7	-4.0	-5.2	-0.9	2.0
Medgar Evers					
Males	48.5	52.4	42.2	50.3	54.6
Females	57.8	54.8	52.5	53.9	55.8
Male-Female Gap	-9.3	-2.4	-10.3	-3.6	-1.2
NYCCT					
Males	55.1	58.2	59.9	59.2	60.0
Females	61.8	64.3	63.0	63.7	60.9
Male-Female Gap	-6.7	-6.1	-3.1	-4.5	-0.8
Staten Island					
Males	60.3	65.8	56.1	61.6	59.6
Females	64.4	69.1	69.0	64.9	66.9
Male-Female Gap	-4.1	-3.3	-12.9	-3.2	-7.3
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	58.3	60.4	58.0	60.1	60.7
Females	62.9	64.3	63.8	62.8	62.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.7	-3.9	-5.7	-2.7	-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.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
Community					
BMCC					
Males	54.3	55.8	54.5	59.1	56.6
Females	59.4	60.0	61.5	63.0	63.4
Male-Female Gap	-5.1	-4.2	-7.1	-4.0	-6.8
Bronx					
Males	61.7	59.7	60.7	57.9	62.5
Females	63.8	65.9	61.9	63.7	67.5
Male-Female Gap	-2.0	-6.2	-1.2	-5.8	-5.1
Hostos					
Males	52.5	53.2	52.4	61.8	53.6
Females	64.0	61.3	60.6	59.8	58.7
Male-Female Gap	-11.5	-8.1	-8.2	2.0	-5.1
Kingsborough					
Males	63.8	59.2	60.1	62.6	69.1
Females	69.2	69.5	68.5	69.4	71.4
Male-Female Gap	-5.4	-10.3	-8.4	-6.7	-2.3
LaGuardia					
Males	60.4	61.1	61.9	63.8	62.4
Females	63.9	61.6	66.1	64.7	67.4
Male-Female Gap	-3.5	-0.5	-4.2	-0.8	-5.0
Queensborough					
Males	62.2	61.2	60.3	63.5	68.0
Females	64.7	65.9	65.1	66.5	69.6
Male-Female Gap	-2.5	-4.7	-4.8	-3.0	-1.6
Community College Average					
Males	59.6	58.8	58.7	61.5	62.5
Females	63.7	63.8	64.2	64.8	66.5
Male-Female Gap	-4.1	-5.0	-5.5	-3.4	-4.1

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.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

University Target: 3.5 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 2004</u>	<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>
University Average					
Males	59.1	59.4	58.4	61.0	61.9
Females	63.4	64.0	64.1	64.2	65.4
Male-Female Gap	-4.3	-4.6	-5.6	-3.2	-3.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	81.6	82.9	82.8	84.3	85.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.1	87.1	87.7	89.1	88.9
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.5	-4.2	-4.9	-4.7	-3.7
Brooklyn					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.4	80.0	79.9	81.5	82.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.3	84.7	84.8	85.4	86.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.9	-4.7	-5.0	-3.9	-3.6
City					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	77.7	81.1	81.3	82.2	83.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.3	84.7	84.0	85.6	86.6
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.6	-3.5	-2.7	-3.4	-3.4
Hunter					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.5	79.9	81.8	83.3	83.9
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.7	84.6	86.2	87.0	86.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.1	-4.7	-4.4	-3.7	-2.8
Lehman					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	80.6	82.5	82.6	84.3	84.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.8	86.7	85.6	87.5	88.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-3.1	-4.1	-3.0	-3.2	-3.7
Queens					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.5	79.8	79.7	81.9	83.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	85.1	85.6	85.4	86.7	87.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.6	-5.9	-5.7	-4.8	-4.0
York					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	78.9	80.6	83.1	82.8	82.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.0	82.2	83.5	85.5	85.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-1.1	-1.7	-0.4	-2.7	-2.3
Senior College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	79.3	81.1	81.6	82.9	83.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	83.6	85.4	85.8	86.9	87.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.3	-4.3	-4.2	-4.0	-3.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	76.0	77.5	78.4	81.2	81.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.4	82.5	83.2	85.8	85.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-4.4	-5.0	-4.7	-4.7	-3.7
Medgar Evers					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	68.3	67.2	68.0	70.6	69.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	75.1	75.1	70.6	81.1	78.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.8	-8.0	-2.7	-10.5	-9.0
NYCCT					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	72.1	71.0	71.3	71.2	74.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.5	79.2	81.2	80.5	82.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.4	-8.2	-9.8	-9.3	-8.5
Staten Island					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	75.8	74.9	73.7	74.6	75.2
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.7	79.9	80.9	80.1	81.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-5.0	-5.1	-7.1	-5.5	-5.8
Comprehensive College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.1	72.9	73.4	74.8	75.4
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	80.3	80.4	81.5	81.6	82.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.2	-7.5	-8.1	-6.8	-7.0

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Community					
BMCC					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	67.4	68.6	66.1	64.7	65.1
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	75.0	76.8	75.7	75.1	76.1
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.7	-8.3	-9.6	-10.4	-11.0
Bronx					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	67.4	68.6	67.9	71.2	67.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	74.2	75.0	74.0	79.3	75.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.8	-6.4	-6.1	-8.2	-7.9
Hostos					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	66.7	70.0	70.3	69.6	67.6
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	78.9	83.9	79.8	80.1	74.2
URM-non-URM Gap	-12.3	-14.0	-9.5	-10.5	-6.7
Kingsborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	71.7	72.8	74.4	74.6	74.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	78.4	79.5	80.2	79.9	79.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-6.6	-6.7	-5.8	-5.2	-5.4
LaGuardia					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	71.4	72.0	70.4	70.4	70.0
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	79.1	81.0	80.1	80.5	80.5
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.8	-9.0	-9.7	-10.1	-10.5
Queensborough					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	68.4	69.0	68.4	71.7	68.3
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	76.1	75.1	74.7	77.0	75.7
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.6	-6.0	-6.3	-5.3	-7.3
Community College Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	68.9	70.0	69.1	69.5	68.5
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	77.2	78.3	77.8	78.3	78.0
URM-non-URM Gap	-8.4	-8.2	-8.7	-8.7	-9.5

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
University Average					
Underrepresented Minorities (URM)	73.4	74.5	74.4	75.2	74.8
Non-Underrepresented Minorities (non-URM)	81.2	82.4	82.7	83.3	83.4
URM-non-URM Gap	-7.8	-7.9	-8.3	-8.1	-8.6

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch					
Males	82.3	84.8	85.3	86.7	87.0
Females	85.5	86.8	87.3	88.8	88.9
Male-Female Gap	-3.2	-1.9	-2.0	-2.0	-1.9
Brooklyn					
Males	77.2	80.9	81.2	81.9	82.7
Females	81.4	84.1	83.9	85.2	86.0
Male-Female Gap	-4.2	-3.2	-2.6	-3.3	-3.3
City					
Males	77.5	81.2	80.6	82.5	83.5
Females	80.8	84.0	84.3	84.6	85.6
Male-Female Gap	-3.3	-2.8	-3.7	-2.1	-2.1
Hunter					
Males	79.2	80.5	82.8	83.6	83.7
Females	83.6	84.1	85.6	86.8	86.9
Male-Female Gap	-4.4	-3.6	-2.8	-3.2	-3.2
Lehman					
Males	79.7	82.7	82.3	83.3	83.6
Females	81.7	83.4	83.4	85.4	85.8
Male-Female Gap	-2.0	-0.6	-1.0	-2.2	-2.2
Queens					
Males	80.1	81.0	80.7	82.5	83.4
Females	85.9	86.0	85.9	87.3	87.7
Male-Female Gap	-5.8	-4.9	-5.2	-4.8	-4.3
York					
Males	77.1	78.4	81.0	83.0	82.2
Females	80.1	82.2	84.3	83.7	84.0
Male-Female Gap	-3.0	-3.8	-3.2	-0.7	-1.8
Senior College Average					
Males	79.3	81.7	82.2	83.5	84.0
Females	83.2	84.6	85.1	86.2	86.6
Male-Female Gap	-3.9	-2.9	-3.0	-2.7	-2.7

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay					
Males	76.0	78.1	80.0	82.6	82.5
Females	78.5	80.0	80.1	82.8	82.9
Male-Female Gap	-2.5	-1.9	-0.1	-0.2	-0.4
Medgar Evers					
Males	65.6	65.7	66.0	69.7	68.3
Females	69.3	67.9	68.7	71.3	69.9
Male-Female Gap	-3.8	-2.2	-2.7	-1.6	-1.5
NYCCT					
Males	71.9	71.4	71.7	72.0	74.6
Females	76.9	75.9	77.5	76.6	79.5
Male-Female Gap	-5.0	-4.5	-5.8	-4.6	-4.9
Staten Island					
Males	76.7	75.3	76.1	75.2	77.0
Females	81.7	81.2	81.3	81.3	81.6
Male-Female Gap	-5.0	-5.9	-5.3	-6.1	-4.5
Comprehensive College Average					
Males	74.0	74.1	74.9	75.7	76.9
Females	77.6	77.4	78.0	79.0	79.2
Male-Female Gap	-3.5	-3.3	-3.1	-3.3	-2.3

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Community					
BMCC					
Males	66.9	69.2	67.3	65.9	67.0
Females	71.2	72.2	70.2	69.1	69.3
Male-Female Gap	-4.4	-3.0	-3.0	-3.2	-2.2
Bronx					
Males	66.1	67.4	66.5	70.4	67.0
Females	68.9	70.0	69.4	72.4	68.8
Male-Female Gap	-2.8	-2.6	-2.8	-2.0	-1.8
Hostos					
Males	66.1	69.8	70.6	69.1	65.7
Females	68.0	71.2	71.1	71.0	69.4
Male-Female Gap	-1.9	-1.4	-0.5	-1.9	-3.7
Kingsborough					
Males	71.8	73.3	75.0	75.1	74.8
Females	77.5	78.6	79.2	79.2	78.2
Male-Female Gap	-5.8	-5.3	-4.2	-4.1	-3.4
LaGuardia					
Males	72.2	73.6	72.8	72.5	72.8
Females	75.6	76.8	75.3	76.0	75.3
Male-Female Gap	-3.4	-3.2	-2.5	-3.5	-2.5
Queensborough					
Males	69.5	68.8	69.0	72.2	69.5
Females	74.2	74.6	73.7	76.0	73.8
Male-Female Gap	-4.7	-5.9	-4.7	-3.7	-4.3
Community College Average					
Males	69.3	70.7	70.4	70.8	70.3
Females	73.3	74.4	73.5	73.9	72.9
Male-Female Gap	-4.0	-3.7	-3.1	-3.1	-2.7

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Goals and Targets Report

Goal: Improve Student Success

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
University Average					
Males	74.5	76.0	76.3	77.0	77.1
Females	78.3	79.4	79.4	80.2	79.8
Male-Female Gap	-3.8	-3.3	-3.1	-3.1	-2.7

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	44.0	40.7	42.0	46.8	45.3
Brooklyn	33.7	33.8	30.8	31.7	34.0
City	33.5	28.0	29.6	27.3	26.8
Hunter	31.6	28.7	31.5	34.4	31.0
Lehman	32.1	28.4	27.2	27.1	28.3
Queens	34.0	31.4	32.4	32.6	33.9
York	21.7	16.3	18.2	19.9	23.1
Senior College Average	34.1	30.9	31.6	32.6	32.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	19.5	20.3	16.6	16.7	18.6
Medgar Evers	21.7	22.2	29.0	27.9	30.3
NYCCT	27.7	25.8	24.9	25.6	24.0
Staten Island	16.0	17.2	17.3	24.0	20.4
Comprehensive College Average	21.0	21.3	20.7	22.6	22.1
Community					
BMCC	19.6	18.3	18.7	18.4	16.9
Bronx	25.6	22.7	24.4	22.0	20.2
Hostos	18.3	19.5	14.4	16.3	12.7
Kingsborough	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
LaGuardia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Queensborough	19.3	22.3	17.7	23.5	21.8
Community College Average	20.6	20.4	19.0	20.3	18.3
University Average	26.8	25.6	25.3	26.5	25.6

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.9	84.5	90.4	90.0	88.8
Brooklyn	84.6	87.0	90.1	83.8	86.6
City	57.8	80.4	80.0	77.6	84.9
Hunter	68.8	61.4	60.5	65.1	69.0
Lehman	84.7	79.6	82.3	82.6	85.7
Queens	68.5	66.5	60.6	62.5	64.3
York	96.2	96.4	98.0	97.4	78.3
Senior College Average	76.7	77.0	77.0	77.6	78.1
Comprehensive					
John Jay	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Medgar Evers	97.1	99.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
NYCCT	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0
Staten Island	96.0	96.5	96.3	95.8	96.1
Comprehensive College Average	98.8	99.1	99.1	99.0	99.0
University Average	81.5	81.8	81.9	82.2	83.0

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 2009-10 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 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	26.4	26.1	27.0	28.2	28.6
Brooklyn	22.7	22.9	24.5	24.3	24.5
City	23.2	22.1	22.8	23.0	23.2
Hunter	24.3	24.6	24.9	25.5	25.8
Lehman	23.0	23.2	23.1	23.8	24.4
Queens	25.5	25.1	25.9	25.6	25.8
York	20.0	19.8	21.7	22.2	22.8
Senior College Average	24.1	23.8	24.6	24.9	25.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	22.8	22.7	23.5	23.4	23.8
Medgar Evers	16.7	17.9*	19.2	19.1	18.9
NYCCT	21.1	20.7	21.4	20.1	20.6
Staten Island	25.9	25.9	25.8	26.3	25.3
Comprehensive College Average	22.8	22.9	23.5	23.5	23.5
University Average	23.9	23.7	24.4	24.7	24.9

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	0.827	0.826	0.825	0.830	0.842
Brooklyn	0.789	0.799	0.804	0.808	0.820
City	0.784	0.793	0.797	0.806	0.808
Hunter	0.775	0.776	0.784	0.791	0.796
Lehman	0.751	0.765	0.769	0.774	0.773
Queens	0.801	0.801	0.808	0.812	0.825
York	0.759	0.760	0.772	0.772	0.772
Senior College Average	0.788	0.792	0.797	0.802	0.809
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.811	0.804	0.811	0.807	0.817
Medgar Evers	0.727	0.724	0.730	0.707	0.740
NYCCT	0.743	0.743	0.735	0.739	0.745
Staten Island	0.803	0.823	0.822	0.831	0.817
Comprehensive College Average	0.787	0.786	0.787	0.789	0.796
University Average	0.788	0.791	0.795	0.799	0.806

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	0.801	0.830	0.814	0.786	0.822
Medgar Evers	0.740	0.752	0.792	0.785	0.810
NYCCT	0.742	0.751	0.747	0.752	0.756
Staten Island	0.746	0.775	0.772	0.739	0.762
Comprehensive College Average	0.753	0.772	0.770	0.757	0.774
Community					
BMCC	0.725	0.721	0.732	0.748	0.774
Bronx	0.755	0.733	0.725	0.720	0.739
Hostos	0.794	0.777	0.747	0.750	0.760
Kingsborough	0.906	0.889	0.893	0.890	0.910
LaGuardia	0.837	0.820	0.829	0.839	0.834
Queensborough	0.696	0.699	0.707	0.716	0.747
Community College Average	0.779	0.769	0.773	0.780	0.800
University Average	0.773	0.770	0.772	0.775	0.794

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>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	87.7	88.2	88.2	89.6	88.3
Brooklyn	75.5	78.4	80.2	77.2	77.9
City	78.6	79.8	79.5	81.3	79.5
Hunter	82.3	80.2	81.7	83.6	84.2
Lehman	73.6	76.8	73.3	72.0	77.1
Queens	83.8	81.5	83.8	84.8	85.8
York	68.8	67.4	70.9	69.6	75.1
Senior College Average	80.2	80.2	80.9	81.1	81.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	72.7	74.0	74.1	72.3	74.9
Medgar Evers	50.0	61.1*	61.4	56.0	69.2
NYCCT	77.8	77.5	75.0	79.0	80.2
Staten Island	82.7	79.3	81.8	81.6	79.7
Comprehensive College Average	74.7	75.1	74.8	72.9	75.8
University Average	79.3	79.4	80.0	79.7	80.7

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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>
Senior					
Baruch	77.1	75.0	75.5	77.4	76.3
Brooklyn	61.3	64.9	67.4	68.0	65.4
City	61.4	62.2	63.1	66.9	67.7
Hunter	66.5	66.7	65.5	65.6	69.2
Lehman	57.5	59.6	61.4	59.1	57.9
Queens	69.4	69.4	70.3	73.5	72.6
York	47.3	44.4	45.0	52.0	52.7
Senior College Average	65.4	65.4	66.0	67.8	67.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.8	57.2	56.3	58.7	59.6
Medgar Evers	26.3*	50.0	61.1*	42.0	38.2
NYCCT	51.8	56.3	53.4	56.4	57.1
Staten Island	65.4	69.2	69.5	69.7	71.6
Comprehensive College Average	60.7	58.6	58.0	59.6	59.8
University Average	64.7	64.2	64.8	66.5	66.2

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled in the college of entry (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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>
Senior					
Baruch	87.5	85.6	88.5	86.9	88.2
Brooklyn	69.6	70.3	70.8	72.7	75.3
City	69.6	71.3	71.4	72.9	74.0
Hunter	72.3	70.6	74.6	74.9	74.5
Lehman	75.9	73.2	73.9	74.7	75.9
Queens	73.8	76.2	77.1	77.2	78.9
York	66.3	62.2	67.4	65.2	65.8
Senior College Average	74.1	73.6	75.5	75.8	77.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	74.4	77.9	74.5	74.1	77.4
Medgar Evers	62.8	59.0	51.6	60.8	56.8
NYCCT	74.7	75.3	71.2	76.4	75.5
Staten Island	80.4	75.0	76.6	78.9	80.1
Comprehensive College Average	74.5	75.6	72.4	74.3	76.0
University Average	74.2	73.9	75.0	75.5	76.8

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 2009-10 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>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	77.4	81.0	78.0	81.0	78.6
Brooklyn	60.9	61.6	63.2	63.2	64.3
City	55.4	58.2	58.1	62.2	62.3
Hunter	56.6	60.6	59.6	63.3	67.1
Lehman	61.3	65.1	63.2	60.9	68.1
Queens	66.3	65.7	68.0	68.0	67.7
York	56.7	56.4	52.1	56.8	60.7
Senior College Average	62.5	64.8	64.4	66.0	67.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	64.7	62.7	66.9	67.3	63.1
Medgar Evers	63.8	43.6	49.4	33.3	43.7
NYCCT	59.4	60.0	58.8	63.3	64.4
Staten Island	75.3	66.3	66.7	70.5	71.7
Comprehensive College Average	66.0	61.5	63.9	64.4	63.6
University Average	63.2	64.3	64.3	65.7	66.8

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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	64.0	62.5	63.0	63.1	67.3
Medgar Evers	55.1	54.1	49.8	52.8	55.5
NYCCT	58.2	61.0	61.3	61.2	60.4
Staten Island	62.6	67.7	62.9	63.4	63.5
Comprehensive College Average	60.8	62.5	61.1	61.5	61.8
Community					
BMCC	58.3	59.0	59.1	61.2	60.5
Bronx	63.0	63.1	61.4	61.2	65.2
Hostos	60.4	58.4	57.8	60.5	57.0
Kingsborough	67.3	64.9	64.6	66.2	70.3
LaGuardia	63.1	62.1	64.4	64.3	65.2
Queensborough	68.3	68.5	65.8	69.5	70.7
Community College Average	63.3	62.9	62.6	64.1	65.0
 University Average	 62.4	 62.7	 62.0	 63.2	 64.0

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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2006</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2007</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2008</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	68.7	66.6	68.2	68.2	71.5
Medgar Evers	59.5	59.5	53.7	55.6	59.4
NYCCT	64.9	67.4	67.7	66.7	66.9
Staten Island	71.2	75.1	70.4	70.7	71.5
Comprehensive College Average	67.3	68.5	67.2	67.2	68.1
Community					
BMCC	61.0	62.8	61.9	63.4	63.3
Bronx	65.0	65.6	63.8	62.9	66.6
Hostos	62.4	60.5	60.2	62.9	58.4
Kingsborough	69.9	68.9	68.2	69.1	73.1
LaGuardia	65.2	64.5	66.9	66.8	67.4
Queensborough	71.7	71.0	68.3	72.2	73.5
Community College Average	65.9	65.9	65.3	66.5	67.5
University Average	66.4	66.9	66.0	66.8	67.7

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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2004</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2005</u>
Senior					
Baruch	32.8	33.5	32.8	33.6	35.5
Brooklyn	20.7	19.9	17.3	23.2	21.7
City	7.7	6.9	5.5	9.1	6.1
Hunter	12.5	17.7	16.9	17.1	20.0
Lehman	12.0	10.0	10.8	11.7	14.0
Queens	27.0	27.6	25.3	26.0	25.9
York	7.5	6.0	5.3	3.7	3.6
Senior College Average	19.6	20.0	18.5	19.8	20.2
Comprehensive					
John Jay	19.4	20.7	23.1	21.2	19.0
Medgar Evers	5.2	12.5	0.0*	0.0	11.1*
NYCCT	0.0	5.1	5.9	5.2	2.9
Staten Island	20.9	23.3	22.9	25.8	25.2
Comprehensive College Average	18.0	18.8	19.4	18.4	17.8
University Average	19.4	19.8	18.7	19.5	19.8

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>
Senior					
Baruch	58.7	56.8	59.8	57.6	60.3
Brooklyn	39.4	44.3	46.9	43.7	43.3
City	34.8	30.3	36.2	37.0	35.0
Hunter	36.7	37.5	35.9	41.9	43.7
Lehman	33.9	30.4	33.6	33.6	30.8
Queens	50.5	52.6	52.7	55.3	51.8
York	29.9	23.8	27.6	23.4	23.9
Senior College Average	41.8	42.2	44.7	44.8	44.5
Comprehensive					
John Jay	35.7	42.3	42.1	42.7	41.7
Medgar Evers	17.6*	20.0*	10.3	21.9	5.3*
NYCCT	6.1	9.1*	11.1	18.2	17.3
Staten Island	50.8	51.4	44.3	45.6	45.2
Comprehensive College Average	38.3	43.5	39.3	39.2	37.1
University Average	41.2	42.3	43.9	44.0	43.3

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within 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 2009-10 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>Entering</u>	<u>Entering</u>	<u>Entering</u>	<u>Entering</u>
	<u>Class of Fall</u>	<u>Class of Fall</u>	<u>Class of Fall</u>	<u>Class of Fall</u>	<u>Class of Fall</u>
	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
Senior					
Baruch	69.3	68.9	63.9	65.1	65.5
Brooklyn	43.3	44.0	43.0	44.8	48.7
City	37.9	34.1	33.0	37.9	37.5
Hunter	39.5	43.6	41.0	46.5	47.2
Lehman	52.9	50.1	45.2	48.7	45.7
Queens	57.0	53.7	52.3	50.6	52.3
York	37.2	40.0	38.7	38.6	33.3
Senior College Average	48.9	48.4	45.9	48.5	48.9
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.4	50.0	49.8	48.8	52.8
Medgar Evers	14.1	20.0	36.2	30.8	20.5
NYCCT	38.8	43.4	31.0	35.1	32.0
Staten Island	62.0	61.4	61.2	57.1	59.7
Comprehensive College Average	50.8	50.1	48.7	46.2	46.6
University Average	49.2	48.7	46.4	48.1	48.6

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>
Senior					
Baruch	65.0	70.9	73.5	74.9	70.5
Brooklyn	47.1	50.6	52.8	54.0	52.0
City	46.7	48.3	50.4	46.1	45.0
Hunter	47.6	51.0	47.7	50.1	48.6
Lehman	55.3	54.9	59.2	57.0	53.9
Queens	62.5	67.4	63.5	61.8	59.1
York	57.1	48.6	45.7	48.6	48.4
Senior College Average	55.2	58.2	56.7	56.7	54.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	50.0	50.5	58.6	57.3	56.0
Medgar Evers	23.8*	28.0	18.3	36.4	40.4
NYCCT	59.5	46.2	45.6	50.7	39.3
Staten Island	67.1	64.2	66.7	67.1	66.9
Comprehensive College Average	54.9	54.3	57.4	57.5	55.1
University Average	55.1	57.6	56.8	56.8	54.5

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2001</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2004</u>	<u>Entering</u> <u>Class of Fall</u> <u>2005</u>
Senior					
Baruch	76.6	77.0	75.2	74.4	77.9
Brooklyn	60.3	67.6	70.0	69.6	71.0
City	58.0	53.2	60.4	65.1	65.8
Hunter	65.5	68.0	67.7	71.9	72.9
Lehman	67.9	68.5	73.9	71.4	65.0
Queens	67.9	70.0	70.6	73.0	69.7
Senior College Average	67.2	68.7	69.4	71.2	71.3
Comprehensive					
John Jay	60.2	61.5	54.6	65.5	61.9
Staten Island	62.6	62.9	56.0	62.8	61.0
Comprehensive College Average	61.0	61.9	55.0	64.5	61.7
University Average	66.4	67.7	67.3	70.2	69.9

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 2009-10 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 freshmen in associate programs who graduated from the college of entry within six years

Associate Programs

	<u>Entering Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	24.7	25.2	26.0	24.3	26.6
Medgar Evers	13.0	16.9	17.8	16.9	21.8
NYCCT	18.7	19.8	19.8	19.7	22.1
Staten Island	21.0	24.2	26.5	24.9	22.7
Comprehensive College Average	19.2	21.6	22.6	22.1	23.4
Community					
BMCC	21.9	23.5	24.2	23.7	22.9
Bronx	23.7	20.8	20.4	22.1	20.3
Hostos	22.6	18.2	20.3	18.9	22.5
Kingsborough	24.9	27.1	28.7	34.9	34.5
LaGuardia	27.6	27.4	27.6	24.8	24.7
Queensborough	22.2	27.1	24.5	26.1	25.1
Community College Average	23.9	25.0	25.1	26.0	25.3
University Average	22.4	23.9	24.2	24.6	24.6

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	27.3	29.5	30.5	28.9	30.8
Medgar Evers	14.8	21.0	20.7	20.0	24.9
NYCCT	24.3	25.5	25.8	26.0	29.8
Staten Island	25.7	29.3	31.7	30.5	27.9
Comprehensive College Average	23.7	26.7	27.8	27.5	28.9
Community					
BMCC	25.7	27.3	27.6	26.6	27.5
Bronx	25.7	22.3	22.3	23.7	22.7
Hostos	23.3	19.9	22.2	20.9	24.1
Kingsborough	27.8	30.1	32.0	38.8	38.7
LaGuardia	30.8	30.2	30.2	28.2	27.7
Queensborough	26.6	31.8	29.0	30.7	28.8
Community College Average	27.2	28.2	28.4	29.2	28.9
University Average	26.1	27.7	28.2	28.6	28.9

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 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 2009-10 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 Class of Fall 1999</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2000</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2001</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2002</u>	<u>Entering Class of Fall 2003</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14.8	11.0	13.5	12.7	15.8
Medgar Evers	13.4	13.7	10.8	14.6	11.9
NYCCT	14.5	13.2	12.4	12.7	10.9
Staten Island	16.1	13.8	13.3	14.5	12.5
Comprehensive College Average	14.8	13.1	12.7	13.4	12.8
Community					
BMCC	15.0	13.6	11.9	14.2	12.5
Bronx	13.6	15.3	14.3	13.2	13.1
Hostos	12.1	9.7	8.9	11.9	8.7
Kingsborough	12.9	12.9	12.1	10.4	10.6
LaGuardia	12.1	11.7	9.6	10.1	11.1
Queensborough	17.0	14.8	14.3	14.2	14.2
Community College Average	14.1	13.3	12.1	12.5	12.1
University Average	14.3	13.2	12.3	12.8	12.3

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	211	430	519	475	491
City	661	588	544	481	618
Hunter	359	383	426	419	436
Lehman	455	454	536	521	495
Queens	602	583	526	807	890
York	17	13	15	22	26
Senior College Total	2,305	2,451	2,566	2,725	2,956
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	7	4	8	12	15
NYCCT	11	13	5	0	0
Staten Island	136	216	304	236	223
Comprehensive College Total	154	233	317	248	238
University Total	2,459	2,684	2,883	2,973	3,194

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 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	95	95	93	94	95
City	99	98	99	98	100
Hunter	100	99	100	100	100
Lehman	98	99	96	98	98
Queens	98	98	97	98	99
York	100*	93*	94*	100*	96
Senior College Average	98	98	97	98	98
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	69*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	98	99	99	96	98
Comprehensive College Average	95	99	99	95	98
University Average	98	98	97	97	98

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	202	299	406	398	405
City	438	376	345	295	355
Hunter	310	332	394	361	335
Lehman	338	312	397	373	341
Queens	559	451	392	698	789
York	17	14	16	22	27
Senior College Total	1,864	1,784	1,950	2,147	2,252
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	7	4	8	12	15
NYCCT	16	13	5	2	9
Staten Island	136	178	259	225	213
Comprehensive College Total	159	195	272	239	237
University Total	2,023	1,979	2,222	2,386	2,489

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	95	98	98	97	97
City	100	100	99	100	100
Hunter	100	100	100	100	100
Lehman	98	98	99	100	99
Queens	99	99	98	99	99
York	100*	93*	100*	100*	100
Senior College Average	99	99	99	99	99
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*
NYCCT	76*	100*	100*	100*	100*
Staten Island	99	100	100	97	99
Comprehensive College Average	96	100	100	98	99
University Average	99	99	99	99	99

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	200	308	409	402	403
City	416	330	315	266	330
Hunter	310	343	399	383	351
Lehman	319	305	411	374	332
Queens	552	454	392	704	805
York	18	15	15	23	26
Senior College Total	1,815	1,755	1,941	2,152	2,247
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	7	4	8	12	16
NYCCT	17	15	15	15	23
Staten Island	138	179	264	223	221
Comprehensive College Total	162	198	287	250	260
University Total	1,977	1,953	2,228	2,402	2,507

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	92	89	88	87	82
City	96	94	95	95	98
Hunter	95	96	98	96	96
Lehman	97	96	94	94	93
Queens	91	93	95	95	94
York	82*	90*	80*	86*	85
Senior College Average	94	94	94	93	93
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	100*	100*	100*	82*	93
NYCCT	67*	100*	80*	100*	100*
Staten Island	89	93	96	87	88
Comprehensive College Average	89	93	96	86	89
University Average	94	94	95	93	92

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Brooklyn	157	238	320	402	433
City	384	318	288	330	425
Hunter	299	326	382	451	416
Lehman	284	289	342	434	412
Queens	407	416	347	837	945
York	11	10	10	22	27
Senior College Total	1,542	1,597	1,689	2,476	2,658
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	7	4	9	22	28
NYCCT	6	15	5	2	9
Staten Island	151	189	298	240	254
Comprehensive College Total	164	208	312	264	291
University Total	1,706	1,805	2,001	2,740	2,949

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior					
Hunter	84.9	86.7	88.2	91.9	89.2
Lehman	63.5	70.1	73.0	84.4	81.5
Senior College Average	76.0	77.8	79.5	87.6	86.2
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	82.4*	84.2*	94.4*	100.0*	100.0
NYCCT	93.7	90.3	88.2	90.7	82.1
Staten Island	84.8	90.5	88.6	80.3	84.7
Comprehensive College Average	88.3	90.0	88.9	85.3	85.2
Community					
BMCC	80.7	83.2	88.5	82.9	82.7
Bronx	75.4	87.3	74.1	86.0	81.4
Hostos	78.6*	86.7*	88.0	84.6	81.1
Kingsborough	88.6	77.9	86.9	89.9	91.7
LaGuardia	97.9	93.2	97.5	87.6	85.7
Queensborough	91.5	93.0	89.9	89.4	85.0
Community College Average	85.2	86.5	87.2	86.7	85.3
University Average	84.5	86.0	86.3	86.5	85.4

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Senior					
Hunter	73	75	76	74	102
Lehman	52	87	100	96	65
Senior College Total	125	162	176	170	167
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	17	19	18	14	27
NYCCT	79	93	85	107	106
Staten Island	92	137	132	152	124
Comprehensive College Total	188	249	235	273	257
Community					
BMCC	197	191	200	205	173
Bronx	61	55	108	50	59
Hostos	14	15	25	26	37
Kingsborough	70	86	122	119	132
LaGuardia	47	74	79	129	126
Queensborough	117	129	138	142	133
Community College Total	506	550	672	671	660
University Total	819	961	1,083	1,114	1,084

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>
Senior					
Hunter	76	79	73	76	102
Lehman	97	116	109	105	67
Senior College Total	173	195	182	181	169
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	14	15	18	14	28
NYCCT	74	92	84	108	107
Staten Island	97	133	135	151	127
Comprehensive College Total	185	240	237	273	262
Community					
BMCC	197	192	201	211	175
Bronx	64	52	112	44	55
Hostos	13	12	26	31	39
Kingsborough	72	85	119	120	138
LaGuardia	44	77	80	125	132
Queensborough	123	116	142	139	137
Community College Total	513	534	680	670	676
University Total	871	969	1,099	1,124	1,107

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>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>
Senior					
Hunter	37	22	26	38	34
Lehman	0	12	21	48	79
York	18	16	21	24	26
Senior College Total	55	50	68	110	139
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	8	16	17	33	22
NYCCT	0	0	0	15	15
Staten Island	25	22	36	36	40
Comprehensive College Total	33	38	53	84	77
University Total	88	88	121	194	216

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>
Senior				
Baruch	36.5	44.1	47.6	51.1
Brooklyn	34.7	42.9	45.3	55.8
Hunter	33.9	46.8	34.6	32.1
Lehman	25.0	22.7*	14.7	20.3
Queens	44.2	37.8	40.9	41.1
York	35.5	32.0	16.0	33.3*
Senior College Average	37.3	42.0	42.8	45.7
Comprehensive				
Medgar Evers	44.4*	8.3*	14.3*	15.0*
Staten Island	21.4	37.2	32.6	29.2
Comprehensive College Average	27.0	30.9	28.3	26.1
University Average	36.8	41.2	42.1	44.5

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>
Senior				
Baruch	72.2*	65.9*	75.5	80.7
Lehman	---	40.0*	---	0.0
Queens	---	---	---	71.4*
Senior College Average	72.2*	63.0	75.5	80.0

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 2009-10 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>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	71.4	80.0	81.4	90.2	93.9
Medgar Evers	90.7	95.2	97.1	86.0	86.7
NYCCT	86.1	85.3	81.6	93.2	87.3
Staten Island	93.5	88.2	93.2	84.1	92.8
Comprehensive College Average	86.6	86.6	85.5	89.5	89.3
Community					
BMCC	84.5	86.6	89.1	84.6	82.1
Bronx	74.8	90.1	86.3	89.3	79.1
Hostos	88.7	92.3	92.6	94.7	88.9
Kingsborough	85.4	85.4	80.7	87.2	82.6
LaGuardia	83.3	86.4	92.0	88.9	88.5
Queensborough	86.2	84.5	89.0	88.3	79.9
Community College Average	84.6	86.4	88.3	88.2	83.1
University Average	84.9	86.4	87.8	88.4	84.4

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 2009-10 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>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	79.2*	58.3*	69.8	65.9	65.4
Medgar Evers	66.7*	59.3*	56.8*	63.9	63.3
NYCCT	70.5	60.2	53.1	58.1	51.5
Staten Island	50.0*	48.3*	40.8	38.5	46.8
Comprehensive College Average	66.7	58.1	53.7	56.2	53.6
Community					
BMCC	70.2	63.8	52.6	61.0	62.8
Bronx	63.9	56.5	44.6	53.2	51.2
Hostos	56.4*	70.0	37.3	51.3	42.2
Kingsborough	72.2	59.6	52.1	55.9	62.8
LaGuardia	65.0	62.7	43.7	62.2	57.0
Queensborough	51.6	42.4	44.8	58.9	60.0
Community College Average	61.2	54.9	46.7	57.8	57.6
University Average	61.9	55.4	48.0	57.5	56.8

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.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2003-04</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2004-05</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Graduates</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Graduates</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	93.9	97.4	96.8	97.6	98.1
Medgar Evers	95.5	100.0	97.3	100.0	95.8
NYCCT	96.9	97.4	94.1	98.6	94.6
Staten Island	95.2	100.0	94.7	92.4	98.8
Comprehensive College Average	96.0	98.3	95.0	97.4	96.2
Community					
BMCC	95.8	96.5	94.7	95.4	93.9
Bronx	91.8	96.5	92.5	96.7	90.7
Hostos	94.5	100.0	95.8	98.7	91.6
Kingsborough	96.4	94.3	90.7	95.2	95.5
LaGuardia	95.0	95.2	96.4	97.0	95.8
Queensborough	94.5	93.0	95.2	97.7	93.8
Community College Average	95.0	95.0	94.3	96.6	93.8
University Average	95.1	95.6	94.5	96.8	94.2

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 2009-10 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 academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction.

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 2009-10 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 academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction.

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 2009-10 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 academic support services, academic advising, and use of technology to strengthen instruction.

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 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Total Enrollment

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	15,756	15,730	16,097	16,321	16,195
Brooklyn	15,281	15,947	16,087	16,689	17,094
City	12,360	13,155	14,392	15,306	16,212
Hunter	20,843	20,899	20,845	21,258	22,168
Lehman	10,615	10,814	10,922	11,860	12,195
Queens	17,638	18,107	18,728	19,572	20,711
York	5,899	6,236	6,727	7,157	7,780
Senior College Total	98,392	100,888	103,798	108,163	112,355
Comprehensive					
John Jay	14,295	14,645	14,841	14,844	15,330
Medgar Evers	5,211	5,561	5,550	6,036	7,080
NYCCT	12,439	13,368	13,502	14,268	15,399
Staten Island	12,083	12,313	12,517	13,092	13,858
Comprehensive College Total	44,028	45,887	46,410	48,240	51,667
Community					
BMCC	18,776	18,457	19,259	21,858	21,424
Bronx	8,470	8,717	9,003	9,117	10,420
Hostos	4,477	4,697	5,112	5,532	6,187
Kingsborough	15,265	14,687	14,962	15,739	18,204
LaGuardia	13,489	14,185	15,169	15,540	17,028
Queensborough	12,838	13,150	13,359	13,752	15,507
Community College Total	73,315	73,893	76,864	81,538	88,770
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,313	4,445	4,543	4,620	4,625
School of Journalism	---	57	99	111	144
School of Professional Studies	241	367	826	1,213	1,547
Law School	438	425	420	388	407
University Total	220,727	225,962	232,960	244,273	259,515

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Total FTEs

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,527	12,601	12,726	12,969	12,784
Brooklyn	11,000	11,530	11,867	12,243	12,549
City	8,749	9,355	10,278	11,047	11,868
Hunter	14,668	14,646	14,899	15,182	16,115
Lehman	7,126	7,485	7,653	8,195	8,423
Queens	12,431	12,873	13,578	14,288	15,410
York	4,425	4,415	4,762	5,053	5,561
Senior College Total	70,925	72,904	75,762	78,975	82,710
Comprehensive					
John Jay	11,076	11,385	11,468	11,348	12,042
Medgar Evers	3,677	3,947	4,042	4,318	5,355
NYCCT	8,892	9,583	9,619	10,316	11,146
Staten Island	8,868	9,266	9,474	9,975	10,648
Comprehensive College Total	32,514	34,181	34,603	35,957	39,191
Community					
BMCC	13,311	13,029	13,808	16,088	16,350
Bronx	6,242	6,300	6,402	6,411	7,539
Hostos	3,289	3,369	3,447	3,732	4,356
Kingsborough	10,855	10,522	10,783	11,555	13,910
LaGuardia	10,127	10,447	11,250	11,743	13,064
Queensborough	8,024	8,241	8,644	8,991	10,804
Community College Total	51,847	51,908	54,334	58,521	66,022
Graduate					
Graduate School	3,287	3,446	3,555	3,592	3,667
School of Journalism	---	72	122	139	180
School of Professional Studies	76	178	335	523	645
Law School	544	526	515	487	512
University Total	159,193	163,216	169,225	178,194	192,928

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

First-time Freshmen

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,641	1,508	1,479	1,512	1,442
Brooklyn	1,413	1,379	1,322	1,358	977
City	1,326	1,565	1,831	1,776	1,773
Hunter	1,837	1,864	1,906	2,042	2,028
Lehman	804	932	886	1,001	773
Queens	1,509	1,662	1,778	1,675	1,712
York	780	693	1,017	1,057	1,045
Senior College Total	9,310	9,603	10,219	10,421	9,750
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2,704	2,783	2,813	2,442	2,872
Medgar Evers	787	943	891	1,048	1,378
NYCCT	2,499	2,883	2,844	3,158	3,251
Staten Island	2,198	2,281	2,479	2,515	2,688
Comprehensive College Total	8,188	8,890	9,027	9,163	10,189
Community					
BMCC	3,198	3,337	3,904	4,949	4,301
Bronx	1,457	1,611	1,697	1,568	2,056
Hostos	721	786	813	905	1,178
Kingsborough	1,970	1,977	2,136	2,386	3,111
LaGuardia	2,080	2,419	2,573	2,613	2,871
Queensborough	2,464	2,615	2,812	2,849	3,705
Community College Total	11,890	12,745	13,935	15,270	17,222
University Total	29,388	31,238	33,231	34,872	37,241

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Transfers

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1,282	1,337	1,397	1,254	1,260
Brooklyn	1,521	1,590	1,694	1,699	1,759
City	1,115	1,129	1,196	1,212	1,517
Hunter	1,490	1,616	1,542	1,470	1,540
Lehman	1,090	1,184	1,061	1,209	1,255
Queens	1,812	1,938	1,951	2,081	2,305
York	727	590	694	697	833
Senior College Total	9,037	9,384	9,535	9,622	10,469
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,022	1,080	997	1,207	1,193
Medgar Evers	488	631	561	643	779
NYCCT	848	1,022	942	1,093	1,045
Staten Island	651	1,007	1,175	1,653	1,489
Comprehensive College Total	3,009	3,740	3,675	4,596	4,506
Community					
BMCC	1,791	1,542	1,688	1,956	1,013
Bronx	738	753	697	694	975
Hostos	410	497	522	492	620
Kingsborough	1,316	1,359	1,416	1,558	2,129
LaGuardia	1,136	1,453	1,399	1,416	1,473
Queensborough	962	959	907	853	1,102
Community College Total	6,353	6,563	6,629	6,969	7,312
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies		239	218	274	243
University Total	18,399	19,926	20,057	21,461	22,530

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Total Undergraduates

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	12,844	12,796	12,863	12,731	12,332
Brooklyn	11,364	12,111	12,495	13,011	13,069
City	9,418	10,231	11,181	11,977	12,878
Hunter	15,631	15,805	15,718	15,698	15,884
Lehman	8,442	8,747	8,864	9,569	9,720
Queens	13,018	13,662	14,618	15,262	16,059
York	5,882	6,197	6,682	7,111	7,732
Senior College Total	76,599	79,549	82,421	85,359	87,674
Comprehensive					
John Jay	12,436	12,784	12,896	12,943	13,346
Medgar Evers	5,211	5,561	5,550	6,036	7,080
NYCCT	12,439	13,368	13,502	14,268	15,399
Staten Island	10,920	11,263	11,588	12,183	12,886
Comprehensive College Total	41,006	42,976	43,536	45,430	48,711
Community					
BMCC	18,776	18,457	19,259	21,858	21,424
Bronx	8,470	8,717	9,003	9,117	10,420
Hostos	4,477	4,697	5,112	5,532	6,187
Kingsborough	15,265	14,687	14,962	15,739	18,204
LaGuardia	13,489	14,185	15,169	15,540	17,028
Queensborough	12,838	13,150	13,359	13,752	15,507
Community College Total	73,315	73,893	76,864	81,538	88,770
Graduate					
School of Professional Studies	8	255	694	966	1,117
University Total	190,928	196,673	203,515	213,293	226,272

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

New Graduates

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	961	991	1,064	1,159	1,245
Brooklyn	982	901	1,010	1,174	1,249
City	708	847	940	885	838
Hunter	955	909	950	1,092	1,406
Lehman	265	358	383	641	613
Queens	1,108	1,215	1,062	1,278	1,437
Senior College Total	4,979	5,221	5,409	6,229	6,788
Comprehensive					
John Jay	585	506	567	573	582
Staten Island	217	219	203	211	302
Comprehensive College Total	802	725	770	784	884
Graduate					
Graduate School	753	713	725	655	698
School of Journalism	---	57	50	64	83
School of Professional Studies	65	41	58	129	210
Law School	168	143	146	130	161
University Total	6,767	6,900	7,158	7,991	8,824

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Total Graduates

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	2,912	2,934	3,234	3,590	3,863
Brooklyn	3,917	3,836	3,592	3,678	4,025
City	2,942	2,924	3,211	3,329	3,334
Hunter	5,212	5,094	5,127	5,560	6,284
Lehman	2,173	2,067	2,058	2,291	2,475
Queens	4,620	4,445	4,110	4,310	4,652
York	17	39	45	46	48
Senior College Total	21,793	21,339	21,377	22,804	24,681
Comprehensive					
John Jay	1,859	1,861	1,945	1,901	1,984
Staten Island	1,163	1,050	929	909	972
Comprehensive College Total	3,022	2,911	2,874	2,810	2,956
Graduate					
Graduate School	4,313	4,445	4,543	4,620	4,625
School of Journalism		57	99	111	144
School of Professional Studies	233	112	132	247	430
Law School	438	425	420	388	407
University Total	29,799	29,289	29,445	30,980	33,243

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Senior					
Baruch	9,864	9,023	8,643	9,336	11,527
Brooklyn	5,201	3,322	4,375	5,171	4,516
City	5,181	6,529	5,788	4,835	6,371
Hunter	14,936	14,673	14,521	11,629	8,987
Lehman	10,139	9,175	8,904	9,562	10,175
Queens	16,898	17,776	15,220	14,282	12,093
York	9,685	7,428	12,586	14,809	18,043
Senior College Total	71,904	67,926	70,037	69,624	71,712
Comprehensive					
John Jay	8,707	11,208	9,098	16,613	9,380
Medgar Evers	3,719	3,216	12,856	12,561	2,120
NYCCT	15,381	15,503	13,885	14,359	16,358
Staten Island	4,723	5,159	5,464	4,783	4,446
Comprehensive College Total	32,530	35,086	41,303	48,316	32,304
Community					
BMCC	12,057	9,852	12,153	8,499	11,153
Bronx	16,929	15,457	13,474	12,949	13,588
Hostos	9,189	8,136	9,717	9,540	10,802
Kingsborough	20,041	20,423	23,476	24,590	23,806
LaGuardia	48,772	55,190	66,624	76,755	77,178
Queensborough	9,213	8,694	8,809	9,630	8,872
Community College Total	116,201	117,752	134,253	141,963	145,399
Graduate					
Graduate School	23,405	10,326	12,674	9,905	
School of Professional Studies			14,642	5,755	7,773
University Total	244,040	231,090	272,909	275,563	257,188

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 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1107	1120	1136	1153	1182
Brooklyn	1053	1050	1050	1040	1098
City	1027	1005	1000	1026	1044
Hunter	1073	1088	1095	1104	1137
Lehman	913	907	899	921	989
Queens	1036	1034	1033	1061	1083
York	835	849	845	864	900
Senior College Average	1041	1041	1036	1050	1084
Comprehensive					
John Jay	958	941	931	943	942
Medgar Evers	853*	872	853	875	887
NYCCT	939	920	918	908	905
Staten Island	1054	982	1015	1008	1004
Comprehensive College Average	972	949	949	956	957
University Average	1029	1026	1021	1032	1057

Note: Based on recent graduates of domestic high schools.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	1113	1123	1139	1156	1183
Brooklyn	1061	1058	1058	1053	1106
City	1043	1016	1009	1032	1049
Hunter	1078	1089	1096	1106	1138
Lehman	918	914	906	925	989
Queens	1042	1039	1039	1067	1089
York	844	856	852	867	901
Senior College Average	1049	1047	1043	1055	1087
Comprehensive					
John Jay	960	943	934	944	943
Medgar Evers	840*	873	855	875	889
NYCCT	947	922	921	909	906
Staten Island	1055	985	1016	1009	1007
Comprehensive College Average	974	951	951	957	959
University Average	1036	1031	1027	1037	1060

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.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

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

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

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

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	85.8	85.8	87.4	87.2	86.6
Brooklyn	84.3	84.4	85.1	85.9	87.0
City	84.6	84.8	85.2	85.2	85.8
Hunter	84.7	85.3	84.8	85.9	86.5
Lehman	82.2	83.1	83.5	81.9	83.7
Queens	85.0	85.6	86.0	86.2	86.5
York	76.8	79.8	79.3	80.4	81.5
Senior College Average	84.2	84.8	85.0	85.2	85.8
Comprehensive					
John Jay	79.9	80.5	81.6	81.1	81.2
Medgar Evers	74.7*	75.1	75.2	74.7	77.6
NYCCT	76.7	77.5	78.0	77.8	79.9
Staten Island	85.3	84.4	84.5	83.6	83.9
Comprehensive College Average	80.4	81.1	81.7	81.1	81.8
University Average	83.6	84.2	84.5	84.5	84.9

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>
Senior				
Baruch	81.9	83.2	91.4	97.3
Brooklyn	94.5	92.7	90.6	91.4
City	74.1	95.0	95.2	93.9
Hunter	83.2	92.6	94.8	95.4
Lehman	65.8	98.8	98.8	98.0
Queens	76.0	88.8	94.3	94.9
York	82.5	98.2	98.6	99.5
Senior College Average	78.9	92.8	94.8	95.8
Comprehensive				
John Jay	61.5	98.2	100.0	99.8
Medgar Evers	81.9	81.7	99.9	99.8
NYCCT	67.3	92.1	90.8	97.4
Staten Island	66.5	74.4	100.0	97.8
Comprehensive College Average	68.9	86.7	97.7	98.7
Community				
BMCC	84.9	96.1	99.9	99.4
Bronx	80.5	99.9	100.0	99.5
Hostos	82.1	99.3	99.9	99.8
Kingsborough	79.1	96.0	99.9	100.0
LaGuardia	46.6	78.9	98.3	99.6
Queensborough	99.9	98.0	99.3	93.5
Community College Average	78.8	94.7	99.6	98.6
University Average	76.5	92.0	97.2	97.5

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 2009-10 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>
Senior				
Baruch	32.3	30.1	30.8	32.2
Brooklyn	30.1	23.6	21.6	22.2
City	25.3	22.3	21.8	22.1
Hunter	23.4	23.4	24.6	25.0
Lehman	5.9	18.3	18.8	15.3
Queens	13.5	11.5	10.3	9.1
York	23.8	23.3	23.3	23.1
Senior College Average	22.3	21.8	21.6	21.4
Comprehensive				
John Jay	6.6	4.2	3.9	3.9
Medgar Evers	39.7	39.6	33.0	31.6
NYCCT	30.2	45.6	45.9	43.7
Staten Island	19.3	22.7	16.7	16.6
Comprehensive College Average	24.8	27.5	24.4	23.9
Community				
BMCC	52.2	51.9	52.5	46.7
Bronx	29.0	25.2	24.0	24.6
Hostos	35.8	36.7	36.7	35.7
Kingsborough	66.7	57.0	55.2	38.8
LaGuardia	66.5	75.0	41.3	21.1
Queensborough	80.5	80.4	19.6	73.5
Community College Average	55.1	53.5	38.2	39.6
University Average	35.2	35.0	28.5	28.7

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 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	343	351	400	373	412
Brooklyn	438	478	473	501	516
City	268	286	309	355	403
Hunter	358	360	374	349	369
Lehman	261	325	301	312	305
Queens	437	454	451	492	615
York	224	172	185	178	210
Senior College Total	2,329	2,426	2,493	2,560	2,830
Comprehensive					
John Jay	276	306	155	337	338
Medgar Evers	17	32	32	56	42
NYCCT	48	42	57	69	62
Staten Island	43	234	377	538	584
Comprehensive College Total	384	614	621	1,000	1,026
University Total	2,713	3,040	3,114	3,560	3,856

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	240	206	189	168	183
Brooklyn	213	227	231	201	247
City	100	79	92	72	111
Hunter	71	96	82	97	92
Lehman	127	140	121	142	138
Queens	101	119	111	129	157
York	60	53	50	51	79
Senior College Total	912	920	876	860	1,007
Comprehensive					
John Jay	53	50	66	66	86
Medgar Evers	6	22	33	25	20
NYCCT	84	105	76	100	110
Staten Island	15	97	178	399	252
Comprehensive College Total	158	274	353	590	468
University Total	1,070	1,194	1,229	1,450	1,475

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

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	62.4	72.8	60.7	62.9	58.7
Medgar Evers	58.0	58.7	58.9	54.5	59.1
NYCCT	51.6	45.2	38.7	41.0	47.3
Staten Island	53.1	50.4	61.0	56.4	60.2
Comprehensive College Average	55.7	56.7	58.5	55.7	58.2
Community					
BMCC	48.5	49.1	46.6	47.5	51.2
Bronx	52.8	52.0	49.6	45.9	49.2
Hostos	44.7	37.2	46.6	41.6	46.3
Kingsborough	46.0	47.7	45.0	48.5	45.8
LaGuardia	42.0	46.5	46.3	47.5	50.7
Queensborough	54.3	53.0	51.8	56.5	58.0
Community College Average	48.0	48.7	47.3	48.8	50.5
University Average	49.2	50.0	49.2	50.1	51.8

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program by the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2008-09 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program by fall 2008.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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>2004-05</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2005-06</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2006-07</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2007-08</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>	<u>2008-09</u> <u>Associate</u> <u>Degree</u> <u>Recipients</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	25.0*	15.0*	16.7*	56.5*	43.8
NYCCT	43.7	45.0	39.3	39.4	44.0
Staten Island	37.0	38.8	41.3	49.0	49.1
Comprehensive College Average	41.7	42.7	39.4	42.6	45.2
Community					
BMCC	29.3	29.1	28.1	25.4	30.5
Bronx	23.4	22.5	22.3	23.8	25.0
Hostos	24.1	18.3	20.8	19.4	26.5
Kingsborough	36.4	35.1	30.6	32.5	35.5
LaGuardia	25.4	25.0	27.7	25.5	28.6
Queensborough	20.4	20.0	17.9	20.6	21.5
Community College Average	28.1	27.2	26.1	26.0	29.4
University Average	31.5	31.4	29.7	30.5	33.4

Note: Transfers are those who enrolled in a baccalaureate program by the fall following graduation. For example, to be counted as a transfer, a 2008-09 graduate must enroll in a baccalaureate program by fall 2008.

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	2.37	2.44	2.41	2.40	2.55
Medgar Evers	2.27	2.34	2.70	1.97	2.14*
NYCCT	2.62*	2.46	2.30	2.43*	2.12*
Staten Island	2.63	2.75	2.72	2.52	2.47
Comprehensive College Average	2.43	2.60	2.64	2.46	2.47
Community					
BMCC	2.60	2.59	2.56	2.61	2.62
Bronx	2.49	2.67	2.54	2.73	2.66
Hostos	2.41	2.67	2.69	2.48	2.55
Kingsborough	2.52	2.35	2.49	2.59	2.64
LaGuardia	2.61	2.69	2.57	2.70	2.72
Queensborough	2.40	2.44	2.45	2.55	2.49
Community College Average	2.53	2.54	2.53	2.61	2.61
University Average	2.52	2.55	2.55	2.58	2.58

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

*Based on fewer than 25 students.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	2.56*	2.26*	2.43*	2.67*	3.41*
NYCCT	2.33	2.38	2.52	2.49	2.51
Staten Island	2.76	2.68	2.83	2.60	2.62
Comprehensive College Average	2.53	2.57	2.74	2.59	2.61
Community					
BMCC	2.59	2.58	2.68	2.78	2.79
Bronx	2.55	2.57	2.68	2.76	2.79
Hostos	2.49	2.59	2.45	2.81	2.77
Kingsborough	2.34	2.46	2.32	2.56	2.54
LaGuardia	2.50	2.58	2.65	2.74	2.68
Queensborough	2.43	2.32	2.59	2.53	2.57
Community College Average	2.48	2.52	2.55	2.69	2.67
University Average	2.48	2.53	2.59	2.66	2.66

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 2009-10 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 2004</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
John Jay	77.4	83.3	79.8	82.5	81.7
Medgar Evers	73.5	70.7	77.8	88.9	78.6
NYCCT	81.0*	64.3*	77.8	73.3	79.2*
Staten Island	81.9	80.5	77.1	80.2	76.3
Comprehensive College Average	78.8	80.2	78.1	80.7	78.0
Community					
BMCC	78.2	77.6	78.4	76.8	79.2
Bronx	78.7	77.4	78.9	76.6	81.3
Hostos	77.5	76.8	78.2	71.9	64.8
Kingsborough	72.7	74.3	71.0	73.4	75.7
LaGuardia	80.9	76.5	81.4	80.2	79.7
Queensborough	76.0	74.9	79.5	77.9	79.1
Community College Average	77.2	76.1	77.7	76.8	78.3
University Average	77.5	76.6	77.8	77.6	78.2

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 2009-10 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 2004</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u> <u>Transfers</u>
Comprehensive					
Medgar Evers	57.1*	81.8*	45.5*	41.7*	60.0*
NYCCT	79.2	54.8*	64.9	72.2	76.9
Staten Island	83.7	86.1	80.0	79.9	81.4
Comprehensive College Average	79.8	70.8	73.6	76.3	80.7
Community					
BMCC	75.3	76.0	78.2	77.4	77.5
Bronx	72.6	74.1	75.9	73.5	72.2
Hostos	72.7	74.5	63.2*	64.3	76.5
Kingsborough	77.1	69.3	71.6	72.5	80.3
LaGuardia	72.4	71.8	80.8	77.8	81.3
Queensborough	75.0	72.2	70.3	73.7	76.5
Community College Average	74.9	72.6	75.1	74.5	78.2
University Average	75.3	72.4	74.9	74.9	79.0

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 2009-10 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>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	890	908	751	694	903
Brooklyn	344	481	484	759	879
City	894	1,021	1,014	852	639
Hunter	677	792	733	902	864
Lehman	958	1,083	1,188	1,162	1,234
Queens	834	987	1,127	1,070	1,083
York	3,205	2,615	2,816	2,000	2,044
Senior College Total	7,802	7,887	8,113	7,439	7,646
Comprehensive					
John Jay	595	579	586	789	929
Medgar Evers	682	419	735	658	598
NYCCT	764	881	1,036	956	941
Staten Island	617	738	536	465	565
Comprehensive College Total	2,658	2,617	2,893	2,868	3,033
Community					
BMCC	718	821	742	546	724
Bronx	1,465	465	447	513	747
Hostos	711	1,165	1,574	1,332	1,371
Kingsborough	9,329	9,026	9,900	9,383	9,051
LaGuardia	3,366	3,001	3,139	2,719	3,167
Queensborough	3,121	2,956	2,571	2,391	2,278
Community College Total	18,710	17,434	18,373	16,884	17,338
University Total	29,170	27,938	29,379	27,191	28,017

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Enrollment figures for 2008-09 have been revised to reflect final figures. 2009-10 figures are estimates because spring 2010 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2009-10 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 2009-10 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>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10 (estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	353	419	392	453	485
Brooklyn	169	247	193	268	273
City	789	799	696	742	530
Hunter	599	792	703	700	690
Lehman	687	805	1,080	1,098	1,112
Queens	464	542	618	631	610
York	1,241	961	1,332	1,785	1,804
Senior College Total	4,302	4,565	5,014	5,677	5,504
Comprehensive					
John Jay	295	352	428	532	685
Medgar Evers	408	324	425	365	457
NYCCT	568	629	755	651	706
Staten Island	370	370	420	427	565
Comprehensive College Total	1,641	1,675	2,028	1,975	2,413
Community					
BMCC	690	776	689	508	577
Bronx	535	230	259	309	475
Hostos	633	809	1,118	1,074	858
Kingsborough	9,198	8,763	9,715	9,232	8,831
LaGuardia	3,015	2,859	2,765	2,419	2,860
Queensborough	2,108	2,258	1,966	1,883	1,778
Community College Total	16,179	15,695	16,512	15,425	15,379
University Total	22,122	21,935	23,554	23,077	23,296

Note: College Now enrollment data are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Enrollment figures for 2008-09 have been revised to reflect final figures. 2009-10 figures are estimates because spring 2010 data are not final at this time. Final data for 2009-10 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 2009-10 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>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	91	94	93	94	99
Brooklyn	77	84	83	81	84
City	93	93	85	87	89
Hunter	84	85	87	92	89
Lehman	90	91	93	95	92
Queens	86	84	85	83	90
York	79	81	85	90	90
Senior College Average	85	86	87	89	91
Comprehensive					
John Jay	76	76	77	83	92
Medgar Evers	79	80	85	89	78
NYCCT	85	80	84	66	70
Staten Island	97	95	93	88	94
Comprehensive College Average	84	83	85	79	84
Community					
BMCC	82	87	60	76	75
Bronx	91	77	60	88	80
Hostos	89	88	86	88	84
Kingsborough	91	91	92	93	94
LaGuardia	77	82	82	83	84
Queensborough	90	88	93	90	94
Community College Average	88	88	88	90	90
University Average	87	87	87	88	89

Note: College Now success rates are based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Students who withdrew from a College Now college credit course are excluded from the computation of this indicator. 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>Summer & Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	96	96	93	95	98
Brooklyn	80	89	87	78	91
City	92	92	85	87	90
Hunter	86	85	87	89	85
Lehman	92	95	96	96	96
Queens	86	87	92	89	89
York	87	85	89	91	90
Senior College Average	89	89	90	91	91
Comprehensive					
John Jay	76	74	73	80	91
Medgar Evers	72	77	78	84	85
NYCCT	86	81	83	64	70
Staten Island	95	89	91	89	94
Comprehensive College Average	83	81	82	77	85
Community					
BMCC	81	87	58	76	75
Bronx	96	67	68	89	84
Hostos	89	88	87	87	87
Kingsborough	91	91	92	93	94
LaGuardia	76	81	82	82	84
Queensborough	91	88	93	91	94
Community College Average	88	88	88	90	91
University Average	88	88	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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u> <u>(estimated)</u>
Senior					
Baruch	17	17	21	19	26
Brooklyn	24	29	24	27	36
City	25	21	30	38	26
Hunter	23	31	21	25	26
Lehman	28	33	30	42	36
Queens	28	26	31	30	24
York	45	42	42	47	42
Senior College Average	32	31	31	35	32
Comprehensive					
John Jay	28	19	16	21	21
Medgar Evers	19	20	16	23	37
NYCCT	25	24	29	28	31
Staten Island	38	24	44	36	25
Comprehensive College Average	27	22	26	26	28
Community					
BMCC	18	29	26	24	20
Bronx	40	43	28	34	32
Hostos	32	28	35	41	30
Kingsborough	38	34	35	34	38
LaGuardia	37	40	36	37	34
Queensborough	38	40	36	35	32
Community College Average	37	36	35	35	35
University Average	34	33	33	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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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>
Senior				
Baruch	\$37,275,990	\$43,316,099	\$30,661,651	\$19,194,623
Brooklyn	\$10,777,893	\$11,798,827	\$8,928,984	\$11,726,044
City	\$53,405,587	\$62,752,168	\$63,585,449	\$46,703,422
Hunter	\$16,076,117	\$16,981,140	\$32,369,753	\$25,699,325
Lehman	\$2,989,776	\$3,067,791	\$3,563,530	\$4,074,265
Queens	\$16,658,809	\$17,525,510	\$17,456,623	\$16,895,511
York	\$176,915	\$408,352	\$680,555	\$639,960
Senior College Total	\$137,361,087	\$155,849,886	\$157,246,544	\$124,933,151
Comprehensive				
John Jay	\$986,184 [^]	\$2,227,428	\$3,597,305	\$6,364,597
Medgar Evers	\$924,336	\$1,895,108	\$3,077,974	\$1,993,971
NYCCT	\$1,035,375	\$1,268,449	\$1,175,077	\$1,116,864
Staten Island	\$1,403,142	\$1,416,752	\$1,433,696	\$1,989,687
Comprehensive College Total	\$4,166,992	\$6,807,738	\$9,284,052	\$11,465,119
Community				
BMCC	\$5,086,954	\$3,897,142	\$3,540,068	\$2,230,483
Bronx	\$1,177,605	\$1,508,550	\$1,705,253	\$1,694,148
Hostos	\$521,228	\$714,649	\$827,707	\$868,071
Kingsborough	\$753,675	\$1,120,921	\$1,410,179	\$1,628,689
LaGuardia	\$761,303	\$689,618	\$891,006	\$1,586,190
Queensborough	\$2,052,999	\$2,407,599	\$2,676,452	\$2,867,673
Community College Total	\$10,353,765	\$10,338,479	\$11,050,665	\$10,875,254
Graduate				
Graduate School	\$10,675,684	\$13,004,015	\$9,983,052	\$9,408,088
School of Journalism	\$2,850,000	\$4,357,633	\$3,081,728	\$2,454,933
Law School	\$840,995 [^]	\$904,921	\$1,009,391	\$1,136,125
University Total	\$181,849,300[^]	\$201,223,094[^]	\$198,614,807[^]	\$161,131,341[^]

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 2009 have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect averages based on final values for that year.

[^]FY 2007 figures for John Jay and the CUNY Law School reflect a 40/60 weighted average because FY 2005 figures were not available for these colleges. The university total rolling averages include contributions to the Macaulay Honors College; \$3.5 million for FY 2007, \$1 million for FY 2008, \$704 thousand for FY2009, and \$894 thousand for FY 2010.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$25,092,157	\$50,296,685	\$46,417,325	\$13,354,232	\$11,809,778
Brooklyn	\$15,563,038	\$8,468,247	\$12,291,490	\$7,095,776	\$14,278,026
City	\$63,000,000	\$62,913,263	\$62,556,378	\$64,471,766	\$29,701,234
Hunter	\$13,177,707	\$18,787,308	\$17,418,812	\$46,773,295	\$16,367,149
Lehman	\$3,370,579	\$3,060,289	\$2,951,176	\$4,132,238	\$4,488,716
Queens	\$15,468,764	\$19,004,497	\$17,460,816	\$16,834,958	\$16,705,721
York	\$108,897	\$250,000	\$623,145	\$887,222	\$498,329
Senior College Total	\$135,781,142	\$162,780,289	\$159,719,142	\$153,549,487	\$93,848,953
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$530,428	\$1,290,022	\$3,468,672	\$4,597,398	\$8,583,287
Medgar Evers	\$260,160	\$1,414,433	\$2,837,493	\$3,887,678	\$520,338
NYCCT	\$834,519	\$1,135,505	\$1,521,788	\$982,879	\$1,035,285
Staten Island	\$1,280,944	\$1,567,147	\$1,380,839	\$1,412,030	\$2,579,820
Comprehensive College Total	\$2,906,051	\$5,407,107	\$9,208,792	\$10,879,985	\$12,718,730
Community					
BMCC	\$923,654	\$9,019,102	\$2,013,362	\$2,264,478	\$2,296,934
Bronx	\$1,317,594	\$1,402,104	\$1,648,799	\$1,860,384	\$1,612,546
Hostos	\$335,715	\$623,934	\$920,651	\$853,450	\$855,811
Kingsborough	\$793,552	\$974,215	\$1,339,893	\$1,626,737	\$1,745,379
LaGuardia	\$268,771	\$905,089	\$728,674	\$982,772	\$2,291,248
Queensborough	\$2,043,110	\$2,295,233	\$2,620,815	\$2,862,322	\$2,969,627
Community College Total	\$5,682,396	\$15,219,677	\$9,272,194	\$10,450,143	\$11,771,545
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$6,822,588	\$15,383,997	\$14,048,597	\$5,383,347	\$9,966,729
School of Journalism	\$4,800,000	\$2,800,000	\$5,115,266	\$1,974,297	\$1,679,181
Law School	\$792,789	\$873,132	\$968,847	\$1,088,221	\$1,231,778
University Total	\$156,784,966	\$233,998,940	\$199,332,838	\$184,030,336	\$132,111,346

Note: This indicator reflects a sum of Cash In, New Pledges and Testamentary Gifts. Figures for FY 2009 have been updated from last year's PMP report to reflect 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, and \$894 thousand for FY 2010.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

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

Administrative Costs (Institutional Support Services)

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$23,998,853	\$24,410,444	\$26,323,749	\$24,956,811	26.8	26.2	25.4	23.9
Brooklyn	\$25,949,492	\$27,411,261	\$31,729,887	\$29,565,427	27.9	27.6	28.3	25.6
City	\$23,054,182	\$26,035,361	\$35,199,080	\$34,590,883	24.9	23.9	27.5	26.1
Hunter	\$31,710,090	\$33,534,966	\$36,838,001	\$35,840,429	28.2	27.8	27.6	26.2
Lehman	\$15,790,609	\$18,937,436	\$20,420,936	\$19,684,135	25.5	27.7	26.5	24.7
Queens	\$25,069,950	\$27,641,948	\$34,994,532	\$31,462,198	26.1	26.9	29.4	26.4
York	\$11,616,128	\$14,112,427	\$15,814,468	\$15,533,006	29.9	33.3	33.8	32.1
Senior College Total/Avg	\$157,189,304	\$172,083,843	\$201,320,653	\$191,632,889	26.9	27.1	28.0	26.0
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$16,101,922	\$18,249,110	\$19,017,776	\$19,768,296	25.1	25.3	24.4	23.9
Medgar Evers	\$9,720,576	\$13,819,907	\$13,419,905	\$12,779,806	27.1	32.6	29.7	28.0
NYCCT	\$14,871,060	\$14,943,596	\$16,136,997	\$16,198,315	24.6	22.5	21.8	21.2
Staten Island	\$20,957,563	\$21,656,768	\$22,986,279	\$23,700,757	31.1	30.4	29.1	28.3
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$61,651,120	\$68,669,381	\$71,560,957	\$72,447,174	27.1	27.2	25.9	25.1
Community								
BMCC	\$30,831,293	\$31,950,140	\$33,276,974	\$36,267,448	37.0	36.5	36.0	34.1
Bronx	\$16,782,857	\$17,257,002	\$18,842,827	\$19,758,660	33.0	32.2	32.7	32.4
Hostos	\$11,927,950	\$12,814,591	\$14,245,535	\$15,521,500	33.7	34.1	34.7	35.3
Kingsborough	\$18,117,377	\$19,545,414	\$21,844,679	\$21,764,103	27.4	27.8	29.1	27.9
LaGuardia	\$20,053,286	\$21,270,696	\$23,343,946	\$25,097,692	29.0	29.4	28.6	29.0
Queensborough	\$13,742,877	\$14,869,417	\$15,673,587	\$17,436,889	24.8	24.6	24.3	24.3
Community College Total/Avg	\$111,455,638	\$117,707,260	\$127,227,548	\$135,846,292	30.9	30.8	30.9	30.4
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$14,064,514	\$15,380,065	\$19,898,164	\$22,364,968	17.6	17.2	19.0	17.0
University Total/Avg	\$344,360,575	\$373,840,549	\$420,007,322	\$422,291,323	27.5	27.5	27.8	26.3

Note: Data for FY 2010 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). FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

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

Context: General Administration Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 6</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$6,400,329	\$6,952,629	\$7,677,759	\$7,243,226	7.2	7.5	7.4	6.9
Brooklyn	\$6,287,448	\$6,561,956	\$7,055,560	\$7,281,612	6.8	6.6	6.3	6.3
City	\$5,282,903	\$6,567,898	\$6,976,236	\$7,495,839	5.7	6.0	5.4	5.7
Hunter	\$8,167,200	\$8,535,126	\$9,169,877	\$9,431,240	7.3	7.1	6.9	6.9
Lehman	\$3,610,309	\$4,125,839	\$4,170,532	\$3,868,044	5.8	6.0	5.4	4.9
Queens	\$5,425,100	\$6,462,265	\$7,242,914	\$6,474,324	5.7	6.3	6.1	5.4
York	\$3,511,781	\$4,896,963	\$5,147,699	\$4,349,905	9.0	11.6	11.0	9.0
Senior College Total/Avg	\$38,685,070	\$44,102,676	\$47,440,578	\$46,144,190	6.6	6.9	6.6	6.3
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$4,448,661	\$5,978,681	\$6,533,244	\$6,411,860	6.9	8.3	8.4	7.7
Medgar Evers	\$3,728,647	\$7,017,087	\$6,675,574	\$5,629,224	10.4	16.5	14.8	12.3
NYCCT	\$4,625,335	\$4,582,811	\$4,959,967	\$5,190,483	7.7	6.9	6.7	6.8
Staten Island	\$4,712,817	\$4,850,762	\$4,969,216	\$5,228,326	7.0	6.8	6.3	6.2
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$17,515,459	\$22,429,341	\$23,138,000	\$22,459,893	7.7	8.9	8.4	7.8
Community								
BMCC	\$16,582,859	\$14,086,099	\$13,785,038	\$15,631,736	19.9	16.1	14.9	14.7
Bronx	\$4,865,166	\$5,025,520	\$5,588,380	\$5,686,690	9.6	9.4	9.7	9.3
Hostos	\$3,592,715	\$3,835,116	\$3,974,827	\$4,195,948	10.2	10.2	9.7	9.5
Kingsborough	\$4,641,150	\$5,298,602	\$4,974,770	\$4,971,085	7.0	7.5	6.6	6.4
LaGuardia	\$4,610,449	\$5,124,367	\$5,665,386	\$6,444,486	6.7	7.1	6.9	7.5
Queensborough	\$3,579,292	\$3,785,854	\$3,917,933	\$4,154,289	6.5	6.3	6.1	5.8
Community College Total/Avg	\$37,871,631	\$37,155,558	\$37,906,334	\$41,084,234	10.5	9.7	9.2	9.2
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$2,838,593	\$3,106,833	\$3,354,976	\$4,767,649	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.6
University Total/Avg	\$96,910,753	\$106,794,408	\$111,839,888	\$114,455,967	7.7	7.9	7.4	7.1

Note: Data for FY 2010 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. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

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

Context: General Institutional Services Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$10,229,781	\$10,773,613	\$10,933,931	\$10,191,530	11.4	11.6	10.6	9.8
Brooklyn	\$10,950,671	\$11,567,547	\$12,505,208	\$11,344,262	11.8	11.7	11.2	9.8
City	\$7,797,703	\$8,551,872	\$10,911,540	\$13,170,849	8.4	7.9	8.5	9.9
Hunter	\$9,767,649	\$10,401,077	\$11,282,248	\$10,909,586	8.7	8.6	8.4	8.0
Lehman	\$5,357,676	\$6,629,658	\$7,379,239	\$6,926,287	8.6	9.7	9.6	8.7
Queens	\$9,294,448	\$10,025,216	\$12,814,363	\$11,788,245	9.7	9.8	10.8	9.9
York	\$3,447,990	\$4,153,781	\$5,197,739	\$5,624,407	8.9	9.8	11.1	11.6
Senior College Total/Avg	\$56,845,918	\$62,102,764	\$71,024,267	\$69,955,165	9.7	9.8	9.9	9.5
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$6,432,926	\$7,461,730	\$7,281,030	\$7,566,881	10.0	10.3	9.3	9.1
Medgar Evers	\$2,682,657	\$3,003,858	\$2,699,319	\$3,126,774	7.5	7.1	6.0	6.9
NYCCT	\$6,009,360	\$6,129,738	\$6,588,042	\$6,632,557	10.0	9.2	8.9	8.7
Staten Island	\$7,144,646	\$7,421,927	\$7,929,913	\$8,165,614	10.6	10.4	10.0	9.7
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$22,269,588	\$24,017,253	\$24,498,304	\$25,491,826	9.8	9.5	8.9	8.8
Community								
BMCC	\$6,030,633	\$8,367,095	\$9,133,409	\$10,696,504	7.2	9.6	9.9	10.1
Bronx	\$5,141,849	\$5,340,383	\$5,594,525	\$6,522,122	10.1	10.0	9.7	10.7
Hostos	\$4,284,077	\$4,571,401	\$5,571,989	\$5,894,444	12.1	12.2	13.6	13.4
Kingsborough	\$5,893,201	\$6,803,935	\$6,992,720	\$7,036,379	8.9	9.7	9.3	9.0
LaGuardia	\$7,830,248	\$8,240,062	\$8,855,132	\$9,725,163	11.3	11.4	10.8	11.3
Queensborough	\$4,791,436	\$4,960,859	\$5,098,196	\$6,441,296	8.7	8.2	7.9	9.0
Community College Total/Avg	\$33,971,445	\$38,283,735	\$41,245,971	\$46,315,907	9.4	10.0	10.0	10.3
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$6,036,411	\$6,803,054	\$8,454,266	\$9,917,077	7.6	7.6	8.1	7.5
University Total/Avg	\$119,123,361	\$131,206,806	\$145,222,808	\$151,679,975	9.5	9.7	9.6	9.5

Note: Data for FY 2010 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. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

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

Context: Maintenance and Operations Costs

	Amount				Percent of Total			
	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
Senior								
Baruch	\$7,368,742	\$6,684,202	\$7,712,059	\$7,522,056	8.2	7.2	7.4	7.2
Brooklyn	\$8,711,373	\$9,281,758	\$12,169,119	\$10,939,553	9.4	9.4	10.9	9.5
City	\$9,973,577	\$10,915,591	\$17,311,304	\$13,924,194	10.8	10.0	13.5	10.5
Hunter	\$13,775,241	\$14,598,763	\$16,385,876	\$15,499,603	12.2	12.1	12.3	11.3
Lehman	\$6,822,624	\$8,181,939	\$8,871,165	\$8,889,803	11.0	12.0	11.5	11.2
Queens	\$10,350,402	\$11,154,467	\$14,937,255	\$13,199,630	10.8	10.8	12.6	11.1
York	\$4,656,357	\$5,061,683	\$5,469,031	\$5,558,695	12.0	12.0	11.7	11.5
Senior College Total/Avg	\$61,658,316	\$65,878,403	\$82,855,808	\$75,533,534	10.6	10.4	11.5	10.3
Comprehensive								
John Jay	\$5,220,335	\$4,808,699	\$5,203,502	\$5,789,555	8.1	6.7	6.7	7.0
Medgar Evers	\$3,309,272	\$3,798,962	\$4,045,013	\$4,023,807	9.2	9.0	8.9	8.8
NYCCT	\$4,236,365	\$4,231,047	\$4,588,988	\$4,375,275	7.0	6.4	6.2	5.7
Staten Island	\$9,100,101	\$9,384,079	\$10,087,150	\$10,306,817	13.5	13.2	12.8	12.3
Comprehensive College Total/Avg	\$21,866,073	\$22,222,787	\$23,924,653	\$24,495,454	9.6	8.8	8.7	8.5
Community								
BMCC	\$8,217,801	\$9,496,946	\$10,358,527	\$9,939,208	9.9	10.8	11.2	9.3
Bronx	\$6,775,842	\$6,891,099	\$7,659,922	\$7,549,849	13.3	12.9	13.3	12.4
Hostos	\$4,051,158	\$4,408,074	\$4,698,719	\$5,431,108	11.4	11.7	11.4	12.3
Kingsborough	\$7,583,025	\$7,442,877	\$9,877,189	\$9,756,639	11.5	10.6	13.2	12.5
LaGuardia	\$7,612,588	\$7,906,267	\$8,823,428	\$8,928,043	11.0	10.9	10.8	10.3
Queensborough	\$5,372,149	\$6,122,704	\$6,657,458	\$6,841,304	9.7	10.1	10.3	9.5
Community College Total/Avg	\$39,612,562	\$42,267,967	\$48,075,243	\$48,446,151	11.0	11.1	11.7	10.8
Graduate								
Graduate School	\$5,189,510	\$5,470,178	\$8,088,922	\$7,680,242	6.5	6.1	7.7	5.8
University Total/Avg	\$128,326,461	\$135,839,335	\$162,944,627	\$156,155,381	10.2	10.0	10.8	9.7

Note: Data for FY 2010 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. FY 2004, 2005 and 2006 data reflect adjustments to salaries paid as a result of union contract settlements. Percentages for community colleges have been adjusted to add Ledger 3 amounts to the base tax-levy budget. In prior PMP reports, these amounts had been excluded.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	\$4,512,675	\$4,763,520	\$5,424,298	\$5,417,250	\$6,106,267
Brooklyn	\$11,488,483	\$12,618,228	\$11,853,929	\$12,215,159	\$13,576,134
City	\$38,586,123	\$40,279,622	\$43,122,499	\$48,802,709	\$59,384,188
Hunter	\$39,864,685	\$37,361,993	\$37,113,200	\$42,244,156	\$47,001,342
Lehman	\$16,210,917	\$16,951,744	\$16,041,390	\$17,387,991	\$21,669,114
Queens	\$18,430,264	\$18,634,893	\$21,576,884	\$21,667,450	\$28,933,290
York	\$6,041,668	\$5,184,664	\$6,014,578	\$6,341,443	\$7,495,168
Senior College Total	\$135,134,815	\$135,794,664	\$141,146,778	154,076,158	\$184,165,502
Comprehensive					
John Jay	\$6,583,688	\$9,705,446	\$12,896,015	\$15,275,879	\$18,277,464
Medgar Evers	\$7,758,782	\$8,057,150	\$8,581,458	\$8,835,698	\$9,308,249
NYCCT	\$5,790,224	\$6,271,530	\$6,208,149	\$6,128,546	\$7,179,020
Staten Island	\$9,546,013	\$8,990,931	\$9,107,818	\$9,039,801	\$9,445,850
Comprehensive College Total	\$29,678,706	\$33,025,057	\$36,793,441	\$39,279,924	\$44,210,582
Community					
BMCC	\$7,665,563	\$6,231,737	\$6,591,445	\$6,735,194	\$7,867,265
Bronx	\$7,677,016	\$7,244,448	\$6,148,425	\$5,700,917	\$6,159,851
Hostos	\$2,830,744	\$3,351,333	\$3,777,250	\$3,932,899	\$3,588,387
Kingsborough	\$3,529,371	\$4,566,973	\$5,002,278	\$5,168,318	\$5,052,288
LaGuardia	\$14,634,607	\$12,984,479	\$13,193,066	\$14,638,288	\$16,902,509
Queensborough	\$2,656,446	\$3,464,844	\$3,836,512	\$4,131,033	\$3,672,917
Community College Total	\$38,993,747	\$37,843,814	\$38,548,977	\$40,306,648	\$43,243,217
Graduate					
Graduate School	\$13,365,270	\$14,208,620	\$13,386,035	\$12,970,438	\$13,115,331
School of Journalism	---	\$225,735^	\$232,964^	\$190,590	\$349,445
Law School	\$215,200	\$240,798	\$330,229	\$438,848	\$575,891
University Total	\$217,387,738	\$221,225,820	\$230,389,662	\$247,262,606	\$285,659,968

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 2009 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data.

^Not a weighted, rolling average.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	53.7	52.5	57.0	33.1	42.4
Brooklyn	39.9	43.7	50.2	34.2	55.9
City	75.6	80.2	74.2	79.4	83.5
Hunter	58.0	54.8	56.2	51.2	61.5
Lehman	24.2	27.7	22.1	11.6	14.7
Queens	53.9	51.0	62.2	50.6	67.6
York	43.4	15.0	33.8	16.8	24.0
Senior College Total	55.4	56.3	58.1	52.3	61.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	30.9	39.0	39.9	31.2	34.6
Medgar Evers	6.8	4.7	6.8	5.1	15.9
NYCCT	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.4
Staten Island	46.6	22.5	28.7	27.3	34.6
Comprehensive College Total	23.4	21.0	24.2	20.1	25.4
Community					
BMCC	2.9	1.2	0.8	0.8	2.6
Bronx	7.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1
Hostos	8.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	3.8
Kingsborough	10.7	5.0	9.9	8.9	11.6
LaGuardia	7.9	3.0	4.6	7.2	6.3
Queensborough	1.6	5.6	5.1	9.5	20.0
Community College Total	6.5	2.6	3.6	4.9	6.1
Graduate					
Graduate School	45.8	43.4	46.1	46.7	46.6
School of Journalism		77.9	3.2	3.8	0.0
Law School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
University Total	41.4	40.9	42.7	39.2	47.2

Note: This indicator is calculated as research dollars divided by total awards for a given fiscal year. FY 2009 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Senior					
Baruch	8.2	7.6	6.9	7.2	8.8
Brooklyn	13.1	20.9	23.6	15.1	15.4
City	17.4	21.8	20.4	18.2	18.9
Hunter	14.5	16.7	17.1	15.4	16.2
Lehman	13.9	17.0	13.5	11.8	12.4
Queens	7.9	11.1	11.4	9.1	12.2
York	13.0	13.0	13.3	7.6	8.7
Senior College Average	14.0	17.3	16.8	14.2	15.4
Comprehensive					
John Jay	8.3	10.7	10.1	10.5	9.4
Medgar Evers	7.7	7.7	7.3	7.6	7.4
NYCCT	4.3	7.2	7.0	6.5	7.0
Staten Island	10.0	9.3	13.2	10.5	16.6
Comprehensive College Average	7.7	7.2	9.7	9.2	10.1
Community					
BMCC	5.8	8.3	6.6	5.6	5.3
Bronx	7.2	10.1	7.8	8.0	6.7
Hostos	5.5	6.2	5.3	6.0	7.4
Kingsborough	5.8	6.4	5.7	5.8	6.1
LaGuardia	6.7	7.1	5.9	4.9	4.4
Queensborough	7.1	6.0	7.4	7.5	6.2
Community College Average	6.4	7.6	6.4	6.0	5.6
Graduate					
Graduate School	12.3	12.3	10.3	10.3	8.7
School of Journalism	12.3	0.0	3.7	13.3	2.8
Law School	3.4	2.4	0.6	3.9	8.4
University Average	11.6	14.8	13.4	11.8	12.6

Note: FY 2009 figures have been revised from last year's PMP report to reflect final data.

University Performance Management Process 2009-10 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 2009-10 Year-End Report

Goal: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

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

Percentage of FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends

	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>
Senior					
Baruch	46.9	45.9	48.1	49.3	47.6
Brooklyn	46.8	46.3	45.0	42.7	41.0
City	41.3	40.5	41.4	42.2	42.4
Hunter	54.7	55.0	54.9	55.6	54.4
Lehman	50.6	49.5	49.5	49.7	49.8
Queens	47.9	46.3	45.2	45.7	44.7
York	50.4	52.1	51.8	50.1	50.7
Senior College Average	48.6	47.9	47.9	47.9	47.0
Comprehensive					
John Jay	35.9	37.4	38.9	37.3	40.3
Medgar Evers	52.4	50.9	52.3	50.7	51.1
NYCCT	45.0	44.9	44.4	44.5	44.0
Staten Island	53.9	54.3	53.7	53.4	53.7
Comprehensive College Average	45.2	45.7	46.1	45.5	46.5
Community					
BMCC	48.8	44.7	44.7	47.6	39.0
Bronx	41.9	41.1	38.6	40.2	41.5
Hostos	35.2	32.1	36.8	33.2	33.0
Kingsborough	24.3	25.4	24.4	25.3	27.5
LaGuardia	39.4	38.3	38.2	36.6	36.7
Queensborough	33.1	32.3	33.2	34.1	37.5
Community College Average	38.2	36.7	36.7	37.6	36.1
University Average	44.5	43.8	43.8	44.0	43.1