

**Bronx Community College of the City University of New York
 Annual FY04 Performance Report
 President Carolyn G. Williams
 July, 2004**

Objectives	Outcomes/Assessment
<p>Goal 1: RAISE ACADEMIC QUALITY</p>	
<p>Objective 1: Promote CUNY Flagship Programs and strengthen premier campus programs, while ensuring that every college offers a sound general education program.</p>	
<p>1. Strengthen and promote premier liberal arts and science transfer programs, career programs in the <i>new technologies</i>, general education and excellence in teaching.</p> <p>1A. New faculty will be hired in the following departments:</p> <p>Fall 2003: Hire 12 new faculty in Liberal Arts & Sciences areas: Art & Music (1), Biology (1), Chemistry (1), Communication (1), English (2), History (1), Mathematics (2), Modern Languages (1), Physics (1), Social Sciences (1); Hire 2 new Librarians to focus on evening/weekend operations.</p> <p>Spring 2004: Hire 16 remaining faculty in Liberal Arts & Sciences areas: English (4), Math (4), Social Sciences (3), History (2), Communication (1), Biology (1), Modern Language (1); Hire 2 Librarians.</p>	<p>1. The recruitment and selection process of new faculty have been part of a deliberate effort to attract and retain outstanding faculty who have the potential and the determination to meet high standards of excellence all areas of scholarship, teaching and service.</p> <p>1A. New Faculty Hires exceeded numerical targets.</p> <p>Fall 2003 –Hired 11 faculty in Liberal Arts & Sciences areas: Art & Music (1), Biology (1), Communication (1), English (2), History (2), Mathematics (1), Modern Language (1), Physics (1), Social Sciences (1); and hired 2 Librarians.</p> <p>Spring 2004: Hired 20 faculty in Biology (3), Chemistry (2), Communication (1), English (4), History (1) Mathematics (5), Modern Language (1), Social Sciences (3); and hired 1 Librarian.</p>
<p>1B. Focused attention to the goals and organization of general education will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of a <i>General Education Vision</i>, which will be: developed by a faculty committee; discussed and evaluated across the campus among all constituencies; and approved by the College Senate. ▪ Assessment of academic offerings and practices, relative to the <i>General Education Vision</i>, will result in recommendations for changes and improvements in the College curriculum and programs. 	<p>1 B. General Education Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With input from campus constituencies at open college forums, in departmental faculty survey responses, student focus groups, and discussions at faculty and administrative governance and other committee meetings, consensus was reached on general education proficiencies for BCC students. Approved by BCC Senate on February 5, 2004.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integration of general education principles in existing initiatives (WAC, CPE preparation, Teaching with Technology, course and classroom assessment initiatives). ▪ Reexamination of the Freshmen Year Experience with respect to our new general education vision and goals. ▪ Faculty participation in a General Education Institute at the College. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty General Education Fellows met in two committees: one focused on developing assessment of general education proficiencies across the curricula; the other looked at developing teaching practices and coursework to strengthen student achievement of general education proficiencies. • Product of the faculty committees is a draft of <i>A Guide to Teaching General Education at BCC</i> incorporating best practices related to writing and Web-based research, including sample assignments and exercises, many of which relate to proficiencies tested on the CPE, such as accurate interpretation and critical thinking about graphic information. • Course assessment planning and tools are also featured in the <i>Guide</i> to help faculty evaluate general education student learning outcomes. • First year developmental courses emphasize critical thinking analytical skills in reading and writing exercises. • Thirty-six attended a two-day faculty BCC General Education Institute focused upon assessment planning and tools, teaching strategies for promoting active learning, and relating development of general education competencies to learning styles among diverse student populations.
<p>1C. New Technology offerings will be enhanced and expanded through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of the new Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Technology AAS Program. ▪ Curriculum redesign and renaming of Advertising Art & Computer Graphics (consistent with recommendations from industry professional and senior college colleagues at a recent Focus Group meeting. ▪ Transformation within the Media Technology curriculum from analog to digital technology. <p>Continuation and expansion of efforts to evaluate the currency of New Technology programs by engaging faculty in focus group discussions with industry professionals, senior college colleagues & alumni.</p>	<p>1C. New technology career programs strengthened:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning Fall 2003 new Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Technology AAS Program is in effect. • AAS Advertising Art & Computer Graphics renamed to Digital Design and Computer Graphics and curriculum updated with new and revised courses. • With Perkins support, upgrade of equipment, including cameras, editing station and software for integration into Media Technology course content. • Business and Paralegal advisory board and employer forum meetings assess student success in workforce and evaluate employer needs.
<p>1D. Seek funding for the development and implementation of a Pre-Freshmen Science & Technology Institute, which will provide basic, science and technology skill preparation for students in allied health, science and technology majors.</p>	<p>1D. Proposals for funding pre-freshmen science, technology and allied health initiatives have been developed. Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences developed jointly with Columbia University Teachers College's Community College Research Center submitted and awaiting a response. Proposal to National Institutes of Health to support pre-freshmen summer program was denied; proposal being re-developed for resubmission to prepare students in vocabulary and skills needed for success in college-level science courses.</p>

<p>1E. Continue to provide Presidential faculty development grants (\$50,000) to promote faculty research, publication and presentation.</p>	<p>1E. Presidential faculty development grants program continued with 18 grants awarded for research, presentation, training and cultural/enrichment activities.</p>
<p>1F. Continue to encourage, facilitate, support and promote faculty presentations, national conference attendance, leadership programs, awards and other recognition</p>	<p>1F. Faculty and staff presentations and attendance at national conferences continued and included: Association of American Colleges and Universities, American Association of Community Colleges, American Chemical Society, American Mathematical Society, Modern Language Association, Association for Equality and Excellence in Education, League for Innovation in Community Colleges, National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, National Institute of Health, Phi Theta Kappa, CUNY Enrollment Management Professional Development Conference, International conferences, National Academic Advisement Association, Internal Conferences (Canada, Finland, Germany, Greece, India, Israel, Poland, Puerto Rico Spain) and film festivals.</p>
<p>University Objective 2: Use program reviews and assessment outcomes to enhance and update programs, pedagogy and use of Instructional Technology.</p>	
<p>2A. In preparation for a Middle States Periodic Review Report (due in June, 2004) a Committee will: assess the extent to which previous Middle States Association recommendations have been implemented; assess the current status of the College relative to revised <i>Characteristics of Excellence</i>; and make recommendations for future College progress.</p>	<p>2A. As planned, a Middle States Periodic Review Report was submitted to the Middle States Association, reflecting the analysis of a campus-wide committee.</p>
<p>2B. The College will integrate (and regularly monitor) accreditation requirements for individual programs (Nursing, Paralegal, Business, Engineering) into the annual planning/assessment process for these departments.</p>	<p>2B. Assessment criterion established by accrediting entities for the Nursing, Radiologic Technology, Paralegal, and Business programs have been incorporated into the annual performance assessment reports for those departments. In addition, the Department of Business & Information Systems completed self-study Report for submission to ACBSP; ABA Interim Report completed; Nursing Report submitted to the NLNAC. An eight-year accreditation is being recommended.</p>
<p>2C. Continuous progress on outcomes assessment will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilizing SIMSMirror to create knowledge-based “real time” enrollment management reports and processes to increase retention and graduation rates. ▪ Expanding faculty access to and use of web-based <i>Interactive Assessment Tools</i> (Electronic Rosters, Grade Distributions, Pre and Post Course Performance Reports) with assistance from faculty 	<p>2C. Continuous progress on outcomes assessment included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilization of SIMSMirror to create greater numbers of reports, with more information, more quickly and in more user-friendly formats. ▪ Several workshops were conducted with faculty to demonstrate and practice use of existing web-based <i>Interactive Assessment Tools</i> (Electronic Rosters, Grade Distributions, Pre and Post Course Performance Reports). ▪ Additional “superusers” were trained in accessing data from the

<p>technology and assessment leadership (Action Researchers, Assessment Fellows and Teaching Learning Technology Roundtable members)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expanding access to and providing training in SIMS Mirror relational student information data base to enrollment management staff (registrar, financial aid, admissions). ▪ Piloting electronic Individual Academic Plan (developed from collaborative Title V grant with Lehman College) for incoming freshmen in OCD (Freshmen Seminar Course) ▪ Building upon learning's from departmental course assessment activities, expand course assessment activity and develop appropriate assessments at the course and college level for general education requirements. 	<p>SIMSMirror relational information data base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Purchase of application software, which will further facilitate the development of additional reports and interactive web-based applications for all campus users. ▪ Installation and pilot testing of the electronic Individual Academic Plan is complete. ▪ College Assessment Plan developed. ▪ Consensus on use of goals-based assessment matrix for course assessment planning, concomitant increase in number of courses for which faculty have developed matrices, and inclusion of general education proficiencies in course matrix development. ▪ Early integration of general education proficiencies in learning objectives, for example in BIO 11 & 12; and EDU 10 and 12, (courses taken by liberal arts students who transfer into teacher preparation programs). 						
<p>2D. Consistent with the University target to increase faculty development in use of technology and establish campus baselines for student use of technology, and consistent with the College's IT Strategic Plan, the College plans the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop plans and procedures to protect the integrity of the network ▪ Establish and charge a Technology Oversight Committee. ▪ Establish minimum student and faculty technology competencies ▪ Increase the average frequency of student use of computer technology from 1.76 to 1.80. (with scale of 1= never and 4=very often) 	<p>2D. Implementation of the BCC Information Technology Strategic Plan, included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Bronx Community College Network Security Assessment was completed in June 2003 by IBM Corporation and the majority of their recommendations were implemented in FY04. The College is committed to an evaluation by an outside recognized IT vendor annually to continue to improve the stability and security of our computer network. ▪ Creation of a Technology Oversight Committee, with responsibility for: overseeing progress of IT Strategic Plan objectives; ongoing assessment & planning; review & recommend operational policy and procedures; review and disseminate policies, plans and procedures for critical IT functions. ▪ Technology competencies have been identified for students by the TLTR (Teaching Learning Technology Roundtable) and are being developed for faculty and staff by the TOC subcommittees. <p>Frequency of student use of technology increased, although BCC frequency is less than the CUNY community college average.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1060 1226 1774 1282"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>2002</th> <th>2004</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Frequency of use</td> <td>1.76</td> <td>1.83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	2002	2004	Frequency of use	1.76	1.83
BCC	2002	2004					
Frequency of use	1.76	1.83					

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Frequency of use</td> <td>1.81</td> <td>1.94</td> </tr> </table> <p>Student satisfaction with access to technology increased and continues to be above the CUNY Community College average.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>BCC</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction with access</td> <td>2.93</td> <td>2.97</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction with access</td> <td>2.79</td> <td>2.89</td> </tr> </table>	CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004	Frequency of use	1.81	1.94	BCC	2002	2004	Satisfaction with access	2.93	2.97	CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004	Satisfaction with access	2.79	2.89						
CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004																							
Frequency of use	1.81	1.94																							
BCC	2002	2004																							
Satisfaction with access	2.93	2.97																							
CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004																							
Satisfaction with access	2.79	2.89																							
<p>2E. Show rates on the CPE will increase from 73.2% to 75% and passing rates on the CPE will increase from 57% to 63%.</p>	<p>2E. Show rates on the CPE decreased to 67.4%, which is still above the community college average of 59.5%. CPE passing rate increased to 61.6%.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>BCC CPE Results</td> <td>2001-2002</td> <td>2002-03</td> <td>2003-04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of required invitees taking the CPE</td> <td>63.5</td> <td>73.2</td> <td>67.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of required test-takers passing CPE</td> <td>75.8</td> <td>57.0</td> <td>61.6</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC CPE Results</td> <td>2001-2002</td> <td>2002-03</td> <td>2003-04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of required invitees taking the CPE</td> <td>63.6</td> <td>69.6</td> <td>59.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of required test-takers passing CPE</td> <td>74.2</td> <td>65.3</td> <td>67.4</td> </tr> </table>	BCC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002-03	2003-04	% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.5	73.2	67.4	% of required test-takers passing CPE	75.8	57.0	61.6	CUNY CC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002-03	2003-04	% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.6	69.6	59.5	% of required test-takers passing CPE	74.2	65.3	67.4
BCC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002-03	2003-04																						
% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.5	73.2	67.4																						
% of required test-takers passing CPE	75.8	57.0	61.6																						
CUNY CC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002-03	2003-04																						
% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.6	69.6	59.5																						
% of required test-takers passing CPE	74.2	65.3	67.4																						
<p>Objective 3: Increase instruction by full-time faculty.</p>																									
<p>3A: The percent of nonremedial instructional hours taught by FT faculty will increase to 65%.</p>	<p>3A. The percent of instruction by FT faculty decreased slightly to 61.3%, which is well above the community college average of 53.5%. (Thirty new faculty hires could not completely offset the dramatic increase in enrollment)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>BCC</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> <td>Fall 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Instruction by FT Faculty</td> <td>62.2</td> <td>63.2</td> <td>61.3</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> <td>Fall 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Instruction by FT Faculty</td> <td>51.9</td> <td>50.7</td> <td>53.5</td> </tr> </table>	BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Instruction by FT Faculty	62.2	63.2	61.3	CUNY CC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Instruction by FT Faculty	51.9	50.7	53.5								
BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																						
Instruction by FT Faculty	62.2	63.2	61.3																						
CUNY CC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																						
Instruction by FT Faculty	51.9	50.7	53.5																						

Goal 2: IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS																																																									
Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates.																																																									
<p>4A. Consistent with the University Target to increase retention rates by an average of 2 percentage points, BCC will strive to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase one-year retention rate for first-time (full-time) freshmen from 63.5% for the F'01 cohort to 65.5% for the F'02 cohort; and ▪ Increase one-year retention rate for transfer students from 59.4% for the F'01 cohort to 61.4% for the F'02 cohort. ▪ Increase six year graduation rate for Freshmen from 20.7% for the F'96 cohort to 22.7% for the F'97 cohort; ▪ Increase six-year graduation rate for Transfers from 20.3% for the F'96 cohort to 22.3% for the F'97 cohort. 	<p>4A. All retention and graduation targets were met or exceeded as follows: freshmen retention rates reflect steady 3-yr increase to 65.7% (which is at the community college average); transfer one-year retention rate increased to 65%, which is above the community college average of 63.3%); the six-year graduation rate for freshmen reflects a steady 3-year increase to 24.8%; and the six-year graduation rate for transfers increased to 26.2%.</p> <p>One-year (fall-to-fall) retention rates</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>F'00 Cohort</th> <th>F' 01 Cohort</th> <th>F'02 Cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Freshmen</td> <td>62.7</td> <td>63.5</td> <td>65.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>60.6</td> <td>59.4</td> <td>65.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sophomores</td> <td>68.5</td> <td>71.5</td> <td>71.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>F'00 Cohort</th> <th>F' 01 Cohort</th> <th>F'02 Cohort</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Freshmen</td> <td>64.3</td> <td>65.5</td> <td>65.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>64.2</td> <td>63.7</td> <td>63.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sophomores</td> <td>72.4</td> <td>72.4</td> <td>72.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Six-year Graduation Rates</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>First-time Freshmen</td> <td>21.7</td> <td>20.7</td> <td>24.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>28.8</td> <td>20.3</td> <td>26.2</td> </tr> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> <tr> <td>First-time Freshmen</td> <td>28.5</td> <td>25.9</td> <td>29.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>34.9</td> <td>34.7</td> <td>36.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	F'00 Cohort	F' 01 Cohort	F'02 Cohort	Freshmen	62.7	63.5	65.7	Transfers	60.6	59.4	65.0	Sophomores	68.5	71.5	71.0	CUNY CC Avg	F'00 Cohort	F' 01 Cohort	F'02 Cohort	Freshmen	64.3	65.5	65.7	Transfers	64.2	63.7	63.3	Sophomores	72.4	72.4	72.2	BCC	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	First-time Freshmen	21.7	20.7	24.8	Transfers	28.8	20.3	26.2	CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	First-time Freshmen	28.5	25.9	29.4	Transfers	34.9	34.7	36.2
BCC	F'00 Cohort	F' 01 Cohort	F'02 Cohort																																																						
Freshmen	62.7	63.5	65.7																																																						
Transfers	60.6	59.4	65.0																																																						
Sophomores	68.5	71.5	71.0																																																						
CUNY CC Avg	F'00 Cohort	F' 01 Cohort	F'02 Cohort																																																						
Freshmen	64.3	65.5	65.7																																																						
Transfers	64.2	63.7	63.3																																																						
Sophomores	72.4	72.4	72.2																																																						
BCC	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																																																						
First-time Freshmen	21.7	20.7	24.8																																																						
Transfers	28.8	20.3	26.2																																																						
CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																																																						
First-time Freshmen	28.5	25.9	29.4																																																						
Transfers	34.9	34.7	36.2																																																						

	<p>Six-year Outcomes for 1st-time, Full-time Freshmen</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CUNY Grads</td> <td>21.7</td> <td>20.7</td> <td>24.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Still Enrolled in CUNY</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>6.1</td> <td>6.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-CUNY Transfers</td> <td>11.5</td> <td>12.1</td> <td>12.5</td> </tr> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> <tr> <td>CUNY Grads</td> <td>28.5</td> <td>25.9</td> <td>29.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Still Enrolled in CUNY</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>7.1</td> <td>6.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-CUNY Transfers</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>12.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	CUNY Grads	21.7	20.7	24.8	Still Enrolled in CUNY	5.8	6.1	6.2	Non-CUNY Transfers	11.5	12.1	12.5	CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	CUNY Grads	28.5	25.9	29.4	Still Enrolled in CUNY	5.8	7.1	6.7	Non-CUNY Transfers	11.8	12.9	12.8
BCC	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																														
CUNY Grads	21.7	20.7	24.8																														
Still Enrolled in CUNY	5.8	6.1	6.2																														
Non-CUNY Transfers	11.5	12.1	12.5																														
CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																														
CUNY Grads	28.5	25.9	29.4																														
Still Enrolled in CUNY	5.8	7.1	6.7																														
Non-CUNY Transfers	11.8	12.9	12.8																														
<p>Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes.</p>																																	
<p>5A. Consistent with the University Master Plan target of 85%, sustain improvements on the NCLEX exam with maintaining at least an 85% pass rate on the NCLEX and on the Radiologic Technology Registry Exam.</p>	<p>5A. NCLEX passing rates fell below 85% target to 81%, which is below the community college average of 84.3%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> <th>2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% Passing NCLEX</td> <td>90.5</td> <td>87.5</td> <td>81.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Taking NCLEX</td> <td>21</td> <td>40</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% Passing NCLEX</td> <td>78.3</td> <td>82.0</td> <td>84.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Taking NCLEX</td> <td>299</td> <td>300</td> <td>343</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	2001	2002	2003	% Passing NCLEX	90.5	87.5	81.0	N Taking NCLEX	21	40	42	CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	% Passing NCLEX	78.3	82.0	84.3	N Taking NCLEX	299	300	343								
BCC	2001	2002	2003																														
% Passing NCLEX	90.5	87.5	81.0																														
N Taking NCLEX	21	40	42																														
CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																														
% Passing NCLEX	78.3	82.0	84.3																														
N Taking NCLEX	299	300	343																														
<p>5B. Sustain high job placement rates of 80%. (with combined job and education rates of at least 90%)</p>	<p>5B. Job placement rate declined to 73.9%, which was below College target, but was consistent with community college average. The education placement rate increased slightly to 59.8%, which is substantially above the community college average of 55.7%.</p> <p>Six-Month Job Placement rate in Vocational Programs</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>99-00 Grads</th> <th>00-01 Grads</th> <th>01-02 Grads</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Job Placement Rate</td> <td>80.8</td> <td>79.1</td> <td>73.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ed Placement Rate</td> <td>46.0</td> <td>59.0</td> <td>59.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job+Ed Placement</td> <td>92.8</td> <td>94.1</td> <td>89.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>99-00 Grads</th> <th>00-01 Grads</th> <th>01-02 Grads</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Placement Rate</td> <td>80.8</td> <td>81.0</td> <td>73.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ed Placement Rate</td> <td>49.5</td> <td>58.4</td> <td>55.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job+Ed Placement</td> <td>93.1</td> <td>93.9</td> <td>92.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	99-00 Grads	00-01 Grads	01-02 Grads	Job Placement Rate	80.8	79.1	73.9	Ed Placement Rate	46.0	59.0	59.8	Job+Ed Placement	92.8	94.1	89.1	CUNY CC Avg	99-00 Grads	00-01 Grads	01-02 Grads	Placement Rate	80.8	81.0	73.5	Ed Placement Rate	49.5	58.4	55.7	Job+Ed Placement	93.1	93.9	92.4
BCC	99-00 Grads	00-01 Grads	01-02 Grads																														
Job Placement Rate	80.8	79.1	73.9																														
Ed Placement Rate	46.0	59.0	59.8																														
Job+Ed Placement	92.8	94.1	89.1																														
CUNY CC Avg	99-00 Grads	00-01 Grads	01-02 Grads																														
Placement Rate	80.8	81.0	73.5																														
Ed Placement Rate	49.5	58.4	55.7																														
Job+Ed Placement	93.1	93.9	92.4																														

Objective 6: Improve College Readiness.																																	
<p>6A. The percentage of USIP participants whose placement level improves as a result of USIP will increase from 27.4% in summer 2002 to 30% in summer 2003.</p>	<p>6A. Rate of USIP students with improved placement increased well above college target to 60.3%. (The CUNY and BCC Offices of Institutional Research are investigating the data accuracy of this indicator)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 404 1845 508"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>Summer 2001</th> <th>Summer 2002</th> <th>Summer 2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% USIP students w/improved placement</td> <td>18.2</td> <td>27.4</td> <td>60.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N in USIP</td> <td>198</td> <td>164</td> <td>224</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 534 1845 638"> <thead> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>F '95 Cohort</th> <th>F '96 Cohort</th> <th>F '97 Cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% USIP students w/improved placement</td> <td>43.8</td> <td>48.4</td> <td>52.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N in USIP</td> <td>1494</td> <td>1364</td> <td>1798</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003	% USIP students w/improved placement	18.2	27.4	60.3	N in USIP	198	164	224	CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort	% USIP students w/improved placement	43.8	48.4	52.3	N in USIP	1494	1364	1798								
BCC	Summer 2001	Summer 2002	Summer 2003																														
% USIP students w/improved placement	18.2	27.4	60.3																														
N in USIP	198	164	224																														
CUNY CC Avg	F '95 Cohort	F '96 Cohort	F '97 Cohort																														
% USIP students w/improved placement	43.8	48.4	52.3																														
N in USIP	1494	1364	1798																														
<p>6B. Passing Rates on the Exit from Remediation Exams will increase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ from 61.3% to 64% in Reading ▪ from 47.5% to 51.5% in Writing ▪ from 63.7 to 66% in Math 	<p>6B. Pass rates on exit from remediation exams exceeded college target for Reading, which was 67.5% (equal to the community college average). English pass rates increased to 50.5%, which was just under the college target, but well above the community college average of 43.4%. Math rates declined to 56.7%, which is substantially lower than the community college average of 68%.</p> <p>Exit from Remediation Pass Rates:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 883 1845 987"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> <th>Fall 2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>50.5</td> <td>61.4</td> <td>67.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>59.8</td> <td>47.4</td> <td>50.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>65.3</td> <td>63.8</td> <td>56.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1013 1845 1117"> <thead> <tr> <th>CUNY CC Avg</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> <th>Fall 2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>58.2</td> <td>63.7</td> <td>67.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>51.0</td> <td>42.5</td> <td>43.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>66.3</td> <td>69.1</td> <td>68.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Reading	50.5	61.4	67.5	Writing	59.8	47.4	50.5	Math	65.3	63.8	56.7	CUNY CC Avg	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Reading	58.2	63.7	67.7	Writing	51.0	42.5	43.4	Math	66.3	69.1	68.0
BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																														
Reading	50.5	61.4	67.5																														
Writing	59.8	47.4	50.5																														
Math	65.3	63.8	56.7																														
CUNY CC Avg	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																														
Reading	58.2	63.7	67.7																														
Writing	51.0	42.5	43.4																														
Math	66.3	69.1	68.0																														
<p>6C. College Now enrollment target of 795 will be met and 70% of participants will complete courses and earn grades of A, B or C.</p>	<p>6C. College Now enrollments exceeded target. Student performance improved.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1229 1845 1307"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>2001-02</th> <th>2002-03</th> <th>2003-04</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>College Now – Registr</td> <td>579</td> <td>801</td> <td>1108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% earning A-C</td> <td>60</td> <td>63</td> <td>68</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	College Now – Registr	579	801	1108	% earning A-C	60	63	68																				
BCC	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04																														
College Now – Registr	579	801	1108																														
% earning A-C	60	63	68																														

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2001-02</td> <td>2002-03</td> <td>2003-04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>College Now – Registr</td> <td>7577</td> <td>14375</td> <td>Na</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% earning A-C</td> <td>68</td> <td>79</td> <td>80</td> </tr> </table>	CUNY CC Avg	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	College Now – Registr	7577	14375	Na	% earning A-C	68	79	80																				
CUNY CC Avg	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04																														
College Now – Registr	7577	14375	Na																														
% earning A-C	68	79	80																														
Objective 7: Improve quality of student support services.																																	
<p>7A. Student satisfaction with support services will increase from 2.91 to 2.96 [scale: 1=very dissatisfied...4=very satisfied]</p> <p>7B. Student satisfaction with student services will increase from 2.71 to 2.76.</p>	<p>7A. Student satisfaction with academic support services declined to 2.85, which is below the community college average of 2.93.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>BCC</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ acad services</td> <td>2.91</td> <td>2.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ student services</td> <td>2.71</td> <td>2.65</td> </tr> </table> <p>7.B Student satisfaction with student services also declined to 2.65, which is also below the community college average of 2.74.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ acad services</td> <td>2.86</td> <td>2.93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ student services</td> <td>2.71</td> <td>2.74</td> </tr> </table>	BCC	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ acad services	2.91	2.85	Satisfaction w/ student services	2.71	2.65	CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ acad services	2.86	2.93	Satisfaction w/ student services	2.71	2.74														
BCC	2002	2004																															
Satisfaction w/ acad services	2.91	2.85																															
Satisfaction w/ student services	2.71	2.65																															
CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004																															
Satisfaction w/ acad services	2.86	2.93																															
Satisfaction w/ student services	2.71	2.74																															
Goal 3: ENHANCE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS																																	
Objective 8: Meet enrollment goals.																																	
<p>8A. Meet enrollment targets in the Master Plan of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall 2003 - 7342; Spring 2004 -7356 	<p>8A. Enrollment targets were exceeded in every category, resulting in a 15% total enrollment increase over a two year period.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>BCC Totals</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> <td>Fall 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Enrollment</td> <td>6922</td> <td>7277</td> <td>7937</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Freshmen</td> <td>1104</td> <td>1177</td> <td>1399</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer</td> <td>493</td> <td>624</td> <td>769</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Totals</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> <td>Fall 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Enrollment</td> <td>63078</td> <td>67674</td> <td>69945</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Freshmen</td> <td>10463</td> <td>11210</td> <td>11221</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer</td> <td>4679</td> <td>5667</td> <td>6110</td> </tr> </table>	BCC Totals	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Total Enrollment	6922	7277	7937	Freshmen	1104	1177	1399	Transfer	493	624	769	CUNY CC Totals	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Total Enrollment	63078	67674	69945	Freshmen	10463	11210	11221	Transfer	4679	5667	6110
BCC Totals	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																														
Total Enrollment	6922	7277	7937																														
Freshmen	1104	1177	1399																														
Transfer	493	624	769																														
CUNY CC Totals	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003																														
Total Enrollment	63078	67674	69945																														
Freshmen	10463	11210	11221																														
Transfer	4679	5667	6110																														

8B. Increase show rate for accepted students from 54.7% to 55.7%.

8B. Show rate declined slightly to 54%.

BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003
Show Rate	54.8	54.7	54.0

CUNY CC Avg	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003
Show Rate	56.9	59.7	55.7

8C: BCC will take the following actions to better coordinate and facilitate movement from the associate to the baccalaureate level:

- Strategically link curriculum design and redesign to articulation
- Create transfer center and hire transfer coordinator (Title V funded) and inform students of transfer requirements/conditions in the first semester
- Support and develop 'transfer to Lehman activities' that are part of the collaborative Title V grant.

8C. Better coordination and facilitation of movement from the associate to baccalaureate level reflected by:

- Development of new options with articulation agreements for liberal arts and sciences students to transfer to John Jay College in either Criminal Justice or Security Management; and to Lehman in Earth Systems and Environmental Science.
- Title V collaborative grant funded efforts with Lehman College (including Transfer Center & Retention software) are in progress.

BCC	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads	'02-03 Grads
% AA/AS transfers to CUNY BA/BS	42.2	49.5	50.3
% AAS transfers to CUNY BA/BS	24.9	19.4	20.8
1-yr Retention rates AA/AS transfers	75.7	81.7	74.8
1-Yr Retention rates of AAS transfers	67.0	71.4	78.6
Avg 1 st Term GPA- AA/AS transfers	2.42	2.48	2.52
Avg 1 st Term GPA – AAS transfers	2.39	2.40	2.38

CUNY CC Avg	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads	'02-03 Grads
% AA/AS transfers to CUNY BA/BS	42.6	44.4	45.6
% AAS transfers to CUNY BA/BS	28.3	29.6	28.0
1-yr Retention rates AA/AS transfers	78.7	79.3	78.4
1-Yr Retention rates of AAS transfers	74.6	73.9	77.1
Avg 1 st Term GPA- AA/AS transfers	2.44	2.47	2.49
Avg 1 st Term GPA – AAS transfers	2.47	2.54	2.48

<p>Objective 9: Increase revenues from external sources.</p>													
<p>9A. Alumni and Corporate Fundraising (as reported on the CAE) will increase 90% to \$514,174 for FY03 and will increase another 20% to \$ 617,000 in FY04.</p> <p>9B. Contract/Grant awards will increase to \$9,501,644 for FY03 and to \$10,261,175 for FY04.</p> <p>9C. Indirect cost recovery will increase to 7.36% for FY03.</p>	<p>9A. Alumni and Corporate Fundraising (as reported on the CAE) increased from \$514,174 for FY03 to \$733,130 for FY04. This figure represents a 43% increase over last year's figure and a 19% increase over the projected target for FY04, which was \$617,000.</p> <p>9B. Grants and Contracts increased from \$9,493,680 for FY03 to \$9,697,734 for FY04. The College also received more than 2.5 million dollars in grants and contracts which were administered by the College as subcontracts or Research Foundation sub accounts from other CUNY colleges or the Central Office</p> <p>9C. Indirect cost recovery increased from 7.1% to 7.3%, which is above the community college average of 6.3.</p>												
<p>Objective 10: Make administrative services more efficient and increase entrepreneurial efforts, and apply revenues to student instruction-related activities.</p>													
<p>10A. Student satisfaction with administrative services will increase to 2.81. [1=very dissatisfied 4=very satisfied]</p>	<p>10A. Student satisfaction with administrative services declined to 2.65, which is below the community college average of 2.81.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 885 1770 938"> <tr> <td>BCC</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ admin services</td> <td>2.74</td> <td>2.65</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 966 1770 1019"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ admin services</td> <td>2.63</td> <td>2.81</td> </tr> </table>	BCC	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ admin services	2.74	2.65	CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ admin services	2.63	2.81
BCC	2002	2004											
Satisfaction w/ admin services	2.74	2.65											
CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004											
Satisfaction w/ admin services	2.63	2.81											
<p>10B. Student satisfaction with facilities will increase to 2.90. [1=very dissatisfied ... 4=very satisfied]</p>	<p>10B. Student satisfaction with facilities increased to 2.86, which is below the community college average of 2.93.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1221 1770 1274"> <tr> <td>BCC</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ facilities</td> <td>2.84</td> <td>2.86</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1302 1770 1356"> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>2002</td> <td>2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfaction w/ facilities</td> <td>2.87</td> <td>2.93</td> </tr> </table>	BCC	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ facilities	2.84	2.86	CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004	Satisfaction w/ facilities	2.87	2.93
BCC	2002	2004											
Satisfaction w/ facilities	2.84	2.86											
CUNY CC Avg	2002	2004											
Satisfaction w/ facilities	2.87	2.93											

<p>10C. BCC will increase expectations for productivity savings that will be applied to student instruction-related activities.</p>	<p>10C. Productivity target of \$423,200 was met and funds were invested into Academic and Student Support Services.</p>																
<p>10D. The percentage of tax levy budget spent on institutional support services (administrative services) will decrease to 32%.</p>	<p>10D. The percentage of tax levy budget spent on institutional services (administrative services) increased slightly to 36.2%. [Explanation: Tuition revenues exceeding the target enabled purchases for departments across the campus, while only one major order purpose code (for administrative services) was used to expedite the process.].</p>																
<p>10E. The percentage of instruction offered on Fridays and weekends will increase from 38.3% to 43.3%.</p>	<p>10E. Although enrollments and sections increased on the weekends and evenings, the % of instruction offered on Fridays, weekends and evenings declined slightly to 38%, which is below the community college average of 44.6%.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 683 1850 813"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> <th>Fall 2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% weekend/evening</td> <td>40.2</td> <td>38.3</td> <td>38.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CUNY CC Avg</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> <td>Fall 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% weekend/evening</td> <td>44.9</td> <td>43.7</td> <td>44.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	% weekend/evening	40.2	38.3	38.0	CUNY CC Avg	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	% weekend/evening	44.9	43.7	44.6
BCC	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003														
% weekend/evening	40.2	38.3	38.0														
CUNY CC Avg	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003														
% weekend/evening	44.9	43.7	44.6														
<p>10F. Consistent with CUNY/EPA Audit agreement, review documents and initiate compliance activities</p>	<p>10F. In conjunction with O'Brien and Gere & Bowman Consultants the College has reviewed documents and begun to initiate compliance activities in anticipation of the federal EPA audit.</p>																

BCC FY04 Annual Performance Report – FINAL
August 24, 2004
[Updated as of: 8/24/2004 1:29 PM]