2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Brooklyn College

Key Indicators

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of required test-takers passing the CUNY Proficiency Exam	91.4	92.7	90.7	93.5	95.4

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of instruction taught by full-time faculty	68.0	64.7	70.1	62.5	60.6

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Still Enrolled in the Same College After One Year (Baccalaureate Programs)	78.5	83.4	79.6	78.6	75.5

	Entering Class of Fall 1995	Entering Class of Fall 1996	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999
First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Graduated from the Same College Within 6 Years (Baccalaureate Programs)	34.8	37.3	36.2	43.7	39.4

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Percentage of non-ESL, regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in USIP who pass all required basic skills assessment tests by the completion of USIP or who enroll in Prelude to Success	85.2	90.6	95.0	92.0	93.7

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Total Enrollment	15,137	15,635	15,513	15,384	15,281

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs	1014	1021	1046	1059	1053

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Voluntary Support - Cash In	$7,976,451	$6,215,696	$7,603,910	$7,508,557	

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Grants and contracts awarded (administered by the Research Foundation)	$8,481,563	$9,750,917	$9,131,895	$10,680,318	$12,916,018

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity	11.6	17.2	18.8	9.1	13.1

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	
Institutional Support Services (administrative services) as a percentage of total tax levy budget	29.6	29.8	29.2	28.9	

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of Undergraduate FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends	31.2	32.6	36.5	37.1	37.4

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

Raise Academic Quality

Objective 1:   Promote CUNY flagship programs and strengthen premier campus programs while ensuring that every college offers a sound general education program

University Target: Outstanding faculty will be recruited to flagship/premier programs.

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: CUNY's most prominent programs will draw greater recognition.

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: Faculty research awards/scholarships will increase from previous year's level.

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: New resources will be shifted into flagship/premier programs.

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: All colleges will demonstrate a comprehensive approach to strengthening undergraduate education (CUE initiative).

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

Objective 2:   Use program reviews and assessment outcome efforts to enhance and update programs, pedagogy and use of instructional technology to improve instruction

University Target: Colleges will conduct external program reviews and implement action plans from external review recommendations.

> Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

---

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 2:   Use program reviews and assessment outcome efforts to enhance and update programs, pedagogy and use of instructional technology to improve instruction

University Target: More CUNY professional programs will be certified/accredited.

    Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: All colleges will show progress in implementing learning outcomes plans.

    Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

University Target: Use of technology to enhance instruction and student access to computer technology will increase.

	2002	2004	2006
Frequency of student use of computer technology	**2.05**	**2.27**	**2.28**

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Figures for 2002 and 2004 have been revised because some items available in the surveys conducted in those years were not included in the 2006 survey. Also, the 2004 figures now reflect final data (last year's PMP reported preliminary data). This measure reflects responses to 11 items that ask about the frequency of the use of computers, e-mail and the Internet. For each item, students were asked to report on their frequency of use (1=never, 2=occasionally, 3=often, 4=very often). Scores for each student were calculated by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses, and then college averages were computed. Items about using a computer during class, using e-mail to hand in an assignment, using e-mail to communicate with a professor, browsing a course's web page, and finding college-related information online were weighted twice as much, and items about participating in an online discussion and searching online for a class assignment were weighted three times as much as the other four items (used e-mail to communicate with a classmate about an assignment, used a computer in a computer lab, used a computer at school/home to do an assignment for class).

	2002	2004	2006
Context: **Student satisfaction with access to computer technology**	**2.85**	**3.20**	**3.24**

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Figures for 2002 and 2004 have been revised because some items available in the surveys conducted in those years were not included in the 2006 survey. This measure reflects responses to four items about satisfaction with access to computers on campus from the Student Experience Survey. 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 four items in this measure are weighted equally.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 2: **Use program reviews and assessment outcome efforts to enhance and update programs, pedagogy and use of instructional technology to improve instruction**

University Target: Show and pass rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE) will rise CUNY-wide.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of required invitees who took the CUNY Proficiency Exam	**74.9**	**81.2**	**84.1**	**80.4**	**82.1**

Note: The 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.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of required test-takers passing the CUNY Proficiency Exam	**91.4**	**92.7**	**90.7**	**93.5**	**95.4**

Note: The 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).

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 3:   Increase instruction by full-time faculty

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

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of instruction taught by full-time faculty	**68.0**	**64.7**	**70.1**	**62.5**	**60.6**

Note: This indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of undergraduate contact hours taught by full-time faculty members by the total of all undergraduate contact hours. Adjustments are made for hours spent on sponsored research and teaching at the doctoral level - both added to the numerator. Adjustments for doctoral teaching are made when reimbursement for this teaching is in the form of adjunct replacements. Full-time faculty members are defined as those of professorial rank, instructors and lecturers, as well as individuals on the Executive Compensation Plan who teach undergraduate courses.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context: **Undergraduate student-faculty ratio**	**16.7**	**17.6**	**17.3**	**17.6**	**17.5**

Note: Total undergraduate student FTEs divided by total faculty FTEs.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context: **Number of full-time faculty**	**537**	**519**	**528**	**525**	**537**

Note: Includes staff in all full-time faculty titles (professors, instructors, lecturers, counselors, and librarians). Individuals on unpaid leave are excluded. Graduate assistants are included as fractions (A=0.6, B=0.3, C=0.45).

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context: **Number of FTE part-time faculty**	**143**	**170**	**155**	**185**	**205**

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

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context: **Number of full-time professional and executive staff**	**207**	**238**	**240**	**243**	**242**

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

University Target: Efforts will be made to recruit under-represented groups to the profession.

Note: Documentation of indicator to be prepared by college.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Improve Student Success

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: Retention rates will increase incrementally.

One-Year (Fall-to-Fall) Retention Rates
Baccalaureate Programs

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Still Enrolled in the Same College	**78.5**	**83.4**	**79.6**	**78.6**	**75.5**

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

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
Context: **First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Still Enrolled in any CUNY College**	**82.9**	**86.4**	**83.8**	**82.4**	**80.8**

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

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
Transfers (full-time entrants) Still Enrolled in the Same College	**72.5**	**78.4**	**71.9**	**73.6**	**69.6**

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

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
Context: **Transfers (full-time entrants) Still Enrolled in any CUNY College**	**76.4**	**82.5**	**76.8**	**78.1**	**73.4**

Note: Students are counted as retained in the college of entry in the cohort year if they are still enrolled one year later at any CUNY college (or earn the degree pursued from any CUNY college within one year of transfer entry).

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: Graduation rates will improve incrementally.

Six-Year Graduation Rates

Baccalaureate Programs

	Entering Class of Fall 1995	Entering Class of Fall 1996	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999
First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Graduated from the Same College	**34.8**	**37.3**	**36.2**	**43.7**	**39.4**

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

	Entering Class of Fall 1995	Entering Class of Fall 1996	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999
Context: **First-time Freshmen (full-time entrants) Graduated from any CUNY College**	**36.5**	**39.7**	**39.1**	**46.0**	**41.8**

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

	Entering Class of Fall 1995	Entering Class of Fall 1996	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999
Transfers (full-time entrants) Graduated from the Same College	**40.4**	**42.6**	**44.8**	**50.9**	**47.1**

Note: Students are counted as graduates from the college of entry in the cohort year if they earn the degree pursued (or higher) within 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. For students who earn more than one CUNY degree, the highest degree earned within six years is counted.

	Entering Class of Fall 1995	Entering Class of Fall 1996	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999
Context: **Transfers (full-time entrants) Graduated from any CUNY College**	**43.1**	**45.7**	**47.9**	**54.2**	**50.6**

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 of transfer entry, 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.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 4:   Increase retention and graduation rates

University Target: Graduation rates will improve incrementally.

Four-year Graduation Rates
Master's Programs

	Entering Class of Fall 1997	Entering Class of Fall 1998	Entering Class of Fall 1999	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001
Master's Students (full- and part-time entrants)	**54.1**	**57.7**	**60.6**	**61.9**	**60.3**

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.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

Objective 5:   Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: All teacher education, nursing and accounting programs will maintain or improve performance on certification/licensing exams.

	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Percentage passing the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) for teacher certification	**88**	**89**	**90**	**91**	**95**

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

	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Context: **Number taking the LAST teacher certification exam**	**478**	**427**	**452**	**310**	**202**

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

	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Percentage passing the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W) for teacher certification	**91**	**92**	**92**	**95**	**95**

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

	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Context: **Number taking the ATS-W teacher certification exam**	**461**	**421**	**456**	**302**	**200**

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

	2003-2004	2004-2005
Percentage passing a Content Specialty Test (CST)	**97**	**92**

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

	2003-2004	2004-2005
Context: **Number taking a Content Specialty Test (CST)**	**39**	**157**

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

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

Objective 5:   Improve post-graduate outcomes

University Target: All teacher education, nursing and accounting programs will maintain or improve performance on certification/licensing exams.

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Percentage of first-time test-takers without an advanced degree passing all segments of the CPA exam that they attempted	**15.8**	**17.6**	**14.8**	**16.4**

Note: The Uniform CPA Exam changed from a paper-and-pencil test to a computer-administered test beginning in 2004. Though the exam is still comprised of four subtests, these subtests are not exactly the same as those that comprised the paper-and-pencil test. New baseline indicators are currently being developed for the 2006-07 PMP report.

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Percentage of repeat test-takers without an advanced degree passing all segments of the CPA exam that they attempted	**40.3**	**35.3**	**30.1**	**31.0**

Note: The Uniform CPA Exam changed from a paper-and-pencil test to a computer-administered test beginning in 2004. Though the exam is still comprised of four subtests, these subtests are not exactly the same as those that comprised the paper-and-pencil test. New baseline indicators are currently being developed for the 2006-07 PMP report.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 6:   Improve college readiness

University Target: Senior colleges will improve the percentage of immersion students who pass basic skills tests or enter Prelude to Success, and improve the percentage of SEEK/ESL students who pass skills tests in the allowed time.

Baccalaureate Programs

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Percentage of non-ESL, regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in USIP who pass all required basic skills assessment tests by the completion of USIP or who enroll in Prelude to Success	**85.2**	**90.6**	**95.0**	**92.0**	**93.7**

Note: Based on first-time freshmen allocated to one of the seven senior colleges who enrolled in USIP. Rates are reported by USIP college. City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Context: **Number of regularly-admitted, non-ESL first-time freshmen enrolled in USIP**	**115**	**138**	**120**	**113**	**143**

Note: City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

Baccalaureate Programs

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Percentage of non-ESL, SEEK first-time freshmen enrolled in USIP who demonstrate progress towards basic skills proficiency by the end of summer immersion	**93.9**	**83.6**	**90.0**	**96.0**	**97.3**

Note: Based on first-time freshmen allocated to one of the seven senior colleges who enrolled in USIP. Rates reflect students who passed one or more basic skills test during USIP, and are reported by USIP college. SEEK freshmen are identified by the college on the USIP data file submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Context: **Number of SEEK, non-ESL first-time freshmen enrolled in USIP**	**49**	**61**	**60**	**125**	**150**

Note: City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

Baccalaureate Programs

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Percentage of ESL first-time freshmen (SEEK and regular) enrolled in USIP who demonstrate progress towards basic skills proficiency by the end of summer immersion	**80.9**	**68.5**	**65.9**	**83.5**	**86.0**

Note: Based on first-time freshmen allocated to one of the seven senior colleges who enrolled in USIP. Rates reflect students who passed one or more basic skills test during USIP, and are reported by USIP college. ESL freshmen are identified by the college on the USIP data file submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

Baccalaureate Programs

	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	Summer 2004	Summer 2005
Context: **Number of ESL first-time freshmen (SEEK and regular) enrolled in USIP**	**110**	**108**	**91**	**91**	**129**

Note: City College did not submit USIP data for summer 2005.

---

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 6: Improve college readiness

University Target: *Senior colleges will improve the percentage of immersion students who pass basic skills tests or enter Prelude to Success, and improve the percentage of SEEK/ESL students who pass skills tests in the allowed time.*

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
Percentage of non-ESL SEEK students who pass all basic skills tests within one year	**82.3**	**91.6**	**91.9**	**89.3**	**91.4**

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.

	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003	Entering Class of Fall 2004
Context: **Number of non-ESL SEEK students**	**362**	**107**	**160**	**178**	**174**

Baccalaureate Programs

	Entering Class of Fall 1999	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003
Percentage of ESL students (SEEK and regular) who pass all basic skills tests within two years	**75.8**	**77.4**	**72.5**	**86.4**	**68.2**

Note: ESL students are identified as those students enrolled in at least one ESL course in their first term at CUNY.

	Entering Class of Fall 1999	Entering Class of Fall 2000	Entering Class of Fall 2001	Entering Class of Fall 2002	Entering Class of Fall 2003
Context: **Number of ESL students (SEEK and regular)**	**66**	**53**	**40**	**59**	**44**

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 6:   Improve college readiness

University Target: Colleges will meet College Now enrollment targets and 70% of participants will complete courses and earn grades of A, B or C.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06 (estimated)
College Now registrations	**1,968**	**2,474**	**228**	**322**	**573**

Note: College Now registrations are from the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Registrations for 2004-05 have been revised to reflect final numbers for summer 2004, fall 2004 and spring 2005. The University Total for 2004-05 includes 13 students who participated in College Now through the School of Professional Studies. Registrations for 2005-06 are estimates because Spring 2006 registrations are not final at this time. Final data for 2005-06 will be provided in next year's report.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	Summer and Fall 2005
Percentage of College Now participants who earn an A, B, or C in College Now courses or demonstrate mastery of material in workshops	**96**	**93**	**86**	**80**	**75**

Note: College Now success rates are based on data in the registration database maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Last year's summer and fall 2004 success rates have been revised to reflect final 2004-05 success rates (including spring 2005). The total rate excludes the 13 students at the School for Professional Studies. For the current year, spring 2006 performance data are not yet available so current year success rates are based on summer and fall 2005 only. The comprehensive subtotal and university total exclude the College of Staten Island for 2004-05 and 2005-06 because data are not yet available.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 7:   **Improve quality of student support services**

University Target: *Student satisfaction with academic support services and student services will rise at all colleges.*

	2002	2004	2006
Student satisfaction with academic support services	**2.49**	**3.02**	**2.90**

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Figures for 2002 and 2004 have been revised because one item from the surveys administered in those years was not asked the same way in the 2006 survey. Also, the 2004 figures now reflect final data (last year's PMP reported preliminary data). This measure reflects responses to three items about satisfaction with library services, science labs and learning labs. For each item, students were asked to report their satisfaction level (1=very dissatisfied, 2=dissatisfied, 3=satisfied, 4=very satisfied). Scores were calculated for each student by combining items with valid (non-missing) responses (a response of "no opinion" was considered missing), and then college averages were computed. All items in this measure are weighted equally.

	2002	2004	2006
Student satisfaction with student services	**2.60**	**2.65**	**2.65**

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 three items in this measure are weighted equally.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 8: Meet enrollment goals

University Target: CUNY's enrollment will rise incrementally while mean SAT scores and College Admissions Averages (CAA) of senior college baccalaureate entrants continue to improve.

Fall Enrollment

		Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
	Total Enrollment	**15,137**	**15,635**	**15,513**	**15,384**	**15,281**
Context:	**Total FTEs**	**9,902**	**10,529**	**10,768**	**10,979**	**11,000**
Context:	**First-time Freshmen**	**1,080**	**1,224**	**1,349**	**1,215**	**1,413**
Context:	**Transfers from Within CUNY**	**547**	**624**	**751**	**811**	**826**
Context:	**Transfers from Outside CUNY**	**543**	**624**	**728**	**679**	**695**
Context:	**New Non-degree Undergraduates**	**243**	**367**	**270**	**286**	**221**
Context:	**Continuing Undergraduates**	**7,152**	**7,383**	**7,453**	**7,603**	**7,593**
Context:	**Undergraduate Re-admits**	**547**	**545**	**409**	**578**	**616**
Context:	**Total Undergraduates**	**10,112**	**10,767**	**10,960**	**11,172**	**11,364**
Context:	**New Graduates**	**765**	**732**	**1,132**	**1,045**	**982**
Context:	**New Non-degree Graduates**	**731**	**697**	**343**	**248**	**142**
Context:	**Continuing Graduates**	**3,352**	**3,286**	**2,935**	**2,790**	**2,682**
Context:	**Graduate Re-admits**	**177**	**153**	**143**	**129**	**111**
Context:	**Total Graduates**	**5,025**	**4,868**	**4,553**	**4,212**	**3,917**

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 8:   Meet enrollment goals

University Target: CUNY's enrollment will rise incrementally while mean SAT scores and College Admissions Averages (CAA) of senior college baccalaureate entrants continue to improve.

Academic Preparation of First-time Freshmen

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs	**1014**	**1021**	**1046**	**1059**	**1053**

Note: Based on current graduates of domestic high schools.

		Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context:	**Mean SAT Score of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs, excluding ESL students**	**1028**	**1033**	**1054**	**1067**	**1061**

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

Academic Preparation of First-time Freshmen

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Mean College Admissions Average (CAA) of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled in baccalaureate programs.	**84.0**	**82.8**	**82.8**	**84.5**	**84.3**

University Target: All colleges will take actions to better coordinate and facilitate movement from the associate to baccalaureate level.

Note: Colleges will provide documentation of demonstrated actions to better coordinate student transfers from CUNY associate to CUNY baccalaureate institutions.

Baccalaureate Programs

		Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context:	**Number of transfers from CUNY AA/AS programs**	**271**	**271**	**351**	**393**	**438**

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

		Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context:	**Number of transfers from CUNY AAS programs**	**132**	**188**	**192**	**204**	**213**

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

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 9: Increase revenues from external sources

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

	FY 2005	FY 2006
Total Voluntary Support (Cash In and Testamentary Gifts)	**$9,374,292**	**$15,563,038**

Note: Total Voluntary Contributions is the sum of Cash In and Testamentary Gifts. This is a change from the preliminary version of the PMP report. Preliminary data are marked by a "^".

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Voluntary Support - Cash In	**$7,976,451**	**$6,215,696**	**$7,603,910**	**$7,508,557**	

Note: Last year's report showed preliminary figures for FY 2005. The figures are revised here to reflect final values for FY 2005. FY 2006 data are preliminary.

	FY 2005	FY 2006
Context: **Voluntary Support - Testamentary Gifts**	**$1,865,735**	

	FY 2005	FY 2006
Context: **Voluntary Support - Outstanding Pledges**	**$16,057,729**	

University Target: Contract/grant awards will rise 10% CUNY-wide.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Grants and contracts awarded (administered by the Research Foundation)	**$8,481,563**	**$9,750,917**	**$9,131,895**	**$10,680,318**	**$12,916,018**

Note: This indicator reflects total awards of both grants and contracts for the fiscal year. Student Financial Aid, PSC-CUNY grants, and grants and contracts generated by the Central Office are not included. Last year's report showed preliminary figures for FY 2005. The figures are revised here to reflect final values for FY 2005. FY 2006 data are preliminary.

University Target: Indirect cost recovery ratios will improve CUNY-wide.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Indirect cost recovery as a percentage of overall activity	**11.6**	**17.2**	**18.8**	**9.1**	**13.1**

Note: FY 2005 figures have been revised to reflect final data. FY 2006 data are preliminary.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 10:   Improve productivity, service to students, and environmental health and safety

University Target: Student satisfaction with administrative services will rise at all CUNY colleges.

	2002	2004	2006
Student satisfaction with administrative services	**2.71**	**2.90**	**2.78**

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The 2004 figures now reflect final data (last year's PMP reported preliminary data). This measure reflects responses to the 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 four items in this measure are weighted equally.

	2002	2004	2006
Student satisfaction with facilities	**2.58**	**3.14**	**3.03**

Note: This indicator is based on responses to the Student Experience Survey administered every two years by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The 2004 figures now reflect final data (last year's PMP reported preliminary data). This measure reflects responses to items about satisfaction with campus facilities: library, computer facilities, athletic facilities, study areas and conditions of buildings and grounds. 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 six items in this measure are weighted equally.

University Target: Each college will achieve its productivity savings target and apply funds to student instruction-related activities; the savings will total $10 million CUNY-wide.

Note: Data on savings and redeployment to be provided by colleges

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

2005-06 University Performance Management Report

Objective 10: Improve productivity, service to students, and environmental health and safety

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

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Institutional Support Services (administrative services)	$24,045,696	$25,115,055	$24,898,486	$25,392,500

Note: Includes general administration, general institutional services, and maintenance and operations (everything except instructional activities). FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Institutional Support Services (administrative services) as a percentage of total tax levy budget	29.6	29.8	29.2	28.9

Note: FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **General Administration**	$5,567,797	$6,121,035	$5,855,968	$6,078,353

Note: Includes president and provost offices, legal services, fiscal operations, campus development, and grants office. FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **General Administration as a percentage of total tax levy budget**	6.9	7.3	6.9	6.9

Note: FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **General Institutional Services**	$11,266,385	$11,313,269	$10,647,097	$9,698,404

Note: Includes mail and printing, institutional research, public relations, computing and telephone services, and security. FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **General Institutional Services as a percentage of total tax levy budget**	13.9	13.4	12.5	11.0

Note: FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **Maintenance and Operations**	$7,211,515	$7,680,751	$8,395,421	$9,615,743

Note: Includes administrative, maintenance and custodial activities associated with the college's physical plant. FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.

Objective 10:   Improve productivity, service to students, and environmental health and safety

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

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Context: **Maintenance and Operations as a percentage of total tax levy budget**	**8.9**	**9.1**	**9.8**	**10.9**

Note: FY 2004 and 2005 data have been adjusted to include expenses that were offset with non-tax levy funds. As a result, FY 2004 figures have been revised from last year.

University Target: The University will increase the percentage of instruction delivered on Fridays, evenings and weekends, to better serve students and make fuller use of facilities.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Percentage of Undergraduate FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends	**31.2**	**32.6**	**36.5**	**37.1**	**37.4**

Note: Courses meeting any time on Friday, Saturday or Sunday, or starting at 4:00 PM or later are counted in this category.

	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005
Context: **Percentage of Graduate FTEs offered on Fridays, evenings or weekends**	**95.0**	**92.0**	**91.1**	**92.7**	**90.7**

Note: Courses meeting any time on Friday, Saturday or Sunday, or starting at 4:00 PM or later are counted in this category.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06 (Preliminary)
Number of seats filled in Adult and Continuing Education courses	**4,581**	**4,968**	**5,041**	**4,186**	**4,279**

Note: 2004-05 counts have been revised to reflect changes submitted by some colleges.

*Throughout this report, an asterisk next to an indicator value denotes that the indicator was computed on a base of fewer than 25 students.