

**Bronx Community College of the City University of New York  
Annual FY03 Performance Report  
President Carolyn G. Williams**

**Goal 1: RAISE ACADEMIC QUALITY**

Objectives/Targets	Outcomes/Assessment
<p><b>University Objective 1: Promote CUNY Flagship Programs and strengthen premier campus programs [Outstanding faculty hired, Recognition/Validation from external sources, Research Awards &amp; Faculty Publications, Documented efforts to move flagship programs to the next level].</b></p>	
<p>1. Strengthen and promote premiere liberal arts transfer programs, career programs in the new technologies and excellence in teaching (with Perkins/Title V funding, other external funding , new faculty positions, support for faculty research and publications, and support for internal program assessment).</p>	
<p>1A. New faculty will be hired in the following departments: Biology (2); Communications/Media Technology (2); English (4); History (1); Math &amp; Computer Science (1); Modern Languages (1); Nursing (1);</p>	<p>1A. Ten teaching faculty were hired in: Biology &amp; MLT (2); Communication Arts and Sciences (2); English (1); Health, Physical Education &amp; Wellness (1); History (1); Mathematics and Computer Science (1) Modern Languages (1); Nursing (1). [ Representative of the newly hired faculty are Martha Aguilar, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages, who has B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. from the Sorbonne University in France and Sharon Persinger, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, who has a Bachelor's Degree from Princeton University and a Ph.D. from the CUNY Graduate Center.]</p>
<p>1B. <i>New Technology</i> offerings will be enhanced and developed through new curriculum development in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Technology AAS (letter of intent 2002-03).</p>	<p>1B. <i>New Technology</i> Offerings were enhanced and expanded through curriculum development in: Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Technology AAS (supported by NSF funding; approved by CUNY and SED).</p>

<p>1C. The currency of <i>New Technology</i> programmatic offerings will be assessed in formal discussion sessions (sponsored with Perkins funding) among faculty, students, alumni, and partners in business and industry. These discussions will foster ongoing relationships among faculty and business partners and will support the development of employer satisfaction surveys for these career programs.</p>	<p>1C. Three FOCUS sessions were conducted for the Business , Computer Art and Graphics and Radiologic Technology Programs – each specially designed to foster interaction between faculty, alumni, students and industry professionals. As one example, the Computer Arts and Graphics Session included a portfolio review (with formal assessments completed) in the Art Gallery by graphic designers and design faculty at senior colleges &amp; premier art institutes; a presentation by the BCC Faculty regarding potential future curriculum directions; and a luncheon discussion among all parties about the current status and future direction of the program. Additional focus sessions are being planning for FY04.</p>
<p>1D. <i>Liberal Arts</i> offerings will be enhanced and expanded through new curriculum development in Earth Science and Liberal Arts and Sciences (BCC Senate approval 2002-03)</p>	<p>1D. Curriculum development in Earth Science and Liberal Arts and Sciences continues.</p>
<p>1E. Liberal Arts transfer outcomes will improve through activities supported by Title V funding for the BCC Transfer Center, which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increasing transfer rate within CUNY to 44% for AA/AS graduates;</li> <li>▪ Increasing the number of top-tier (non-CUNY) transfer colleges from seven to ten.</li> <li>▪ Establishing at least one new (and updating existing) articulation agreements with Lehman College).</li> </ul>	<p>1E. Liberal Arts transfer outcomes improved, with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An increase in the transfer rate within CUNY from 42.2% to 49.5 % for AA/AS graduates;</li> <li>▪ An increase in the 1-year retention rate of AA/AS transfers from 75.7% to 81.7%;</li> <li>▪ The establishment of a Transfer Center (with Title V Funding);</li> <li>▪ Increased collaboration with Lehman College through our Collaborative Title V grant (designed to increase transfer numbers and rate with Lehman College);</li> <li>▪ Development of articulation agreements with Lehman College for Human Services and new Business Program (at LC).</li> </ul>
<p>1F. BCC will establish itself as a borough center for teaching excellence with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Operations initiated in temporary space, while the permanent facility continues to be renovated;</li> <li>▪ Staffing in place, including Faculty Director, Education Technology Directors and Instructional Design Specialist;</li> <li>▪ Activities planning, including: Idea Salons, Roundtables, Faculty Development Workshops, a CTE Website, a Newsletter, Orientation sessions, seminars, Faculty Assessment Fellows Project – all designed to encourage and disseminate best teaching practices resulting in improved student learning outcomes. (A baseline survey assessing current teaching practice among faculty will be conducted).</li> </ul>	<p>1F. The BCC <i>Center for Teaching Excellence</i> clearly established and institutionalized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Operations initiated in a temporary space, with renovations continuing on a permanent facility;</li> <li>▪ Staffing has been institutionalized (now supported by tax-levy funding) to include a Faculty Director, Educational Technology Director and Instructional Design Specialist;</li> <li>▪ An advisory board has been established and had regular meetings;</li> <li>▪ Institutional Products (newsletter, entitled <i>Learning about Learning</i> , web-page, regular announcements and activities) have been developed;</li> <li>▪ Workshops included semester-long programs (with reassigned time for faculty to develop and share effective teaching practices, including the utilization of technology) as well as single session workshops in Blackboard, Integrated Skills Reinforcement, Web-enhanced teaching, Writing Across the Curriculum, among others).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BCC “Assessment Fellows” attended a conference on Assessment sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education, and met as part of the Center for Teaching Excellence during the semester regarding a variety of assessment topics;</li> <li>▪ Assessment-related presentations were made by BCC faculty &amp; staff at the American Association of Community Colleges national convention (including: “Begging for Baselines: Engaging Faculty in Assessment Contributes to Successful Students” and “Engaging the Elephant: A Center for Teaching Excellence That Promotes Deep Learning at Bronx Community College;</li> <li>▪ The BCC Center for Teaching Excellence expanded its scope of service to include ten faculty from Lehman College, who participated with BCC faculty in a Summer Institute for Action Research. The Action Researchers will be guided during Fall 2003 to conduct action-research projects, which involves systematic investigation related to student learning.</li> </ul>
<p>1G. Presidential faculty development grants (\$50,000 allocated for FY03) will continue to promote faculty research, publication and presentation.</p>	<p>1G. The Presidential faculty grant program continues to promote faculty research, publication and presentation with the Senate Committee on Instruction and Professional Development reviewing and making recommendations regarding faculty proposals.</p>
<p>1H. With a focus on quality, faculty accomplishments (including research, publications, presentations and recognition from external sources) will be highlighted on the upcoming <i>Center for Teaching Excellence</i> Web Page.</p>	<p>1H. Two new Web Pages/Newsletters now highlight faculty accomplishments -- the <i>Center for Teaching Excellence</i> and <i>GATEWAY</i> (designed for alumni, retirees, and friends of the College)/</p>
<p>1I. Assessment activities will continue to foster continuous improvement in all academic programs (both flagship &amp; support), will guide resource allocation, and will suggest strategies for moving premier programs to their next level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A subcommittee of the Academic Program Planning Committee has been charged to redesign the Internal Academic Program Review Process, with a particular focus on integrating assessment into the ongoing self-study process;</li> </ul>	<p>1I. The Academic Program Planning Committee focused the entire year on Assessment activities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment in each academic department of a Course Assessment Committee, with the APPC member as liaison/resource person;</li> <li>▪ Establishment of standard approach to initiate course assessment activity;</li> <li>▪ Participation in a workshop conducted by colleagues from Nassau Community College regarding course assessment.</li> </ul>

<p><b>University Objective 2: Enhance and update programs, pedagogy and use of instructional technology [programs reviewed externally and jointly agreed upon recommendations implemented; accreditations, licensures, certifications; extent outcomes assessment process instituted; use of technology in instruction and student use of technology as measured by student survey; show and pass rates on CUNY proficiency exam].</b></p>	
<p>2A. Nursing curriculum reform (in response to NYSED) will modify the nursing course formats by splitting two nursing courses offered each semester into two seven week intensive modules (improving course/program retention by 5%).</p>	<p>2A. Nursing curriculum reform has included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ formalized and coordinated annual assessment and planning procedures;</li> <li>▪ coordination to assure consistent reporting of admissions criteria and policies;</li> <li>▪ assuring the auditing and maintenance of student records;</li> <li>▪ course assessment and continued development and redesign</li> </ul>
<p>2B. The College will initiate a self-study process and a new cycle of strategic planning in Fall 2002 in preparation for the upcoming Periodic Review for the Middle States Association.</p>	<p>2B. The College continued to assess and renew the strategic planning and assessment program for the College:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Coordinating Planning Council (CPC) updated strategic plan for the College;</li> <li>▪ A Committee (with two faculty leaders as co-chairs) has been established with a design and plan for the Middle States Periodic Review process in place for FY04;</li> <li>▪ Faculty Co-chairs and members of College Administration attended Middle States Workshop on Preparing for the Periodic Review.</li> <li>▪ An Ad Hoc IT Strategic Planning Committee has completed an IT Strategic Plan for BCC.</li> </ul>
<p>2C. Self-study preparation for the Association of Collegiate Business Schools (ACBS) will be completed.</p>	<p>2C. Business and Information Systems Department submitted two-year ACBSP Quality Assurance Report, with approval for reaccredited granted through Spring 2004. Assessment and Analysis for ten-year evaluation report in progress.</p>
<p>2D. Outcomes Assessment Activities will include (but won't be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continued refinement of the "Assessment" section of the <i>Annual Departmental/Divisional Assessment and Plan</i> to encourage meaningful and measurable departmental assessment;</li> <li>▪ A redesign of the Assessment Guidelines for Departmental/Program Review and Planning will be completed by a subcommittee of the Academic Program Planning Committee;</li> <li>▪ Assessment of remediation pedagogy at BCC will continue to be addressed by a subcommittee of the Academic Program Planning Committee – resulting in redesigned remedial courses/sequences in Math, Reading, and ESL;</li> <li>▪ The College will pilot TRACDAT, a software package designed to manage the academic assessment process (including the management of assessment impact and feedback loop, and the storage retrieval of student</li> </ul>	<p>2D. Outcomes Assessment remained a major campus priority with the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Academic Program Planning Committee initiated a campus-wide course assessment initiative with each academic department engaged in course assessment;</li> <li>▪ The College obtained TRACDAT software and is testing and evaluating its utility as an assessment tool;</li> <li>▪ The College provided standardized annual performance reports for each academic department to use as part of the annual departmental assessment &amp; planning process;</li> <li>▪ Assessment of remediation pedagogy continued;</li> <li>▪ Assessment Fellows met as part of both <i>the Center for Teaching Excellence</i> and as part of the Academic Program Planning Committee</li> </ul>

<p>assessment data for analytical purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nineteen newly identified Faculty Assessment Fellows will explore topics in classroom assessment and will write articles or offer workshops &amp; seminars on these topics as part of the activities of the Center for Teaching Excellence. Members of the group will be encouraged to apply for grants that support scholarship relating to classroom research.</li> <li>▪ The College will provide doctoral research opportunities for selected graduate students, who are working with the Teachers College Center for Community College Research (CCRC). Interaction and collaboration with our faculty will also be encouraged;</li> <li>▪ The campus-wide Committee on Risk Assessment and Internal Control will continue efforts to heighten awareness of risk management and internal controls, through training sessions for mid-level managers, and through the development of feedback and reporting mechanisms (as part of the annual planning and assessment program).</li> <li>▪ The Division of Student Development will implement a Customer Service Satisfaction Assessment form for each student service department in the division;</li> <li>▪ A recently completed BCC Marketing Analysis and Assessment will be utilized to further the College's Marketing Program;</li> <li>▪ The Offices of Institutional Research, Planning &amp; Assessment, Computer Services and Enrollment Management are collaborating to develop web-based information and analytical user-friendly systems that can be used by faculty and administrators to access information and make inquiries that will facilitate ongoing analysis and assessment of progress, problems and accomplishments. During FY03, systems will be developed/piloted and access will be provided to all Chairpersons and at least one other faculty member for each academic department.</li> </ul>	<p>(APPC). Several members presented experiences and results for the CTE and at national conferences (AACCC among others)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The College engaged in collaborative research and assessment activities with both doctoral students and faculty from the Teachers College Center for Community College Research (CCRC), including: the creation of at least two collaborative grants (awaiting responses); TC faculty member offering workshop as part of the CTE Summer Institute on Action Research, and several collaborative research projects underway.</li> <li>▪ A customer service satisfaction survey was created for implementation in student services department..</li> <li>▪ Recommendations from the BCC Marketing analysis and assessment were implemented, including the creation of a new position in the College Relations Department of a Graphic Designer;</li> <li>▪ Reporting the assessment of risk and planned controls has been incorporated as part of the annual departmental/divisional assessment &amp; planning process.</li> <li>▪ The College completed the first phase of its SIMS Mirror project (which included the creation of a relational data base "mirror" of the SIMS registration data base, which (1) provided systems and research staff more accessible and usable data for reporting and analysis, and (2) provided the framework for the creation of interactive assessment tools, which include descriptive rosters, grade distributions, and prerequisite and post completion course performance data. The analytical tools have been demonstrated to Chairs and selected faculty groups, and are currently being piloted and used.</li> </ul>
<p>2E. The College will continue to invest more than \$1 million in Perkins funding toward the transformation and modernization of vocational curricula, ensuring the currency of technology, curriculum, and teaching methodologies, with the goals of increasing retention, graduation and job placement rates,</p>	<p>2E. The College continued to invest Perkins funding toward the transformation and modernization of vocational curricula, ensuring the currency of technology, curriculum and teaching methodologies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the Library has responded to external review recommendations by: removing obsolete items from collections; improving appearance of library, increasing seating; increased number of periodical subscriptions; improving and increasing Nursing Department collections; increasing number of electronic resources; updating collections; increasing hours on weekends.</li> </ul>
<p>2F. The College will continue to promote the utilization of technology across the curriculum to improve teaching and learning through the following efforts:</p>	<p>2F. The College continues to promote utilization of technology across the curriculum to improve teaching and learning, with investment of Title V funds,</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Investing Title V funds to support activities of the Instructional Technology Lab (which will be housed in the Center for Teaching Excellence). Although the facilities itself is not yet completed, three professional full-time staff members will commence both group and individualized training in Fall 2002;</li> <li>▪ Offering five additional distance learning/on-line courses in collaboration with the University and the Sloan Foundation;</li> <li>▪ A baseline survey will be used to collect information about teaching practice and the extent to which faculty currently use technology and innovative practice in their courses.</li> </ul>	<p>use of technology fee and support for faculty development and training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Teaching Learning Technology Roundtable (TLTR) conducted an assessment of current teaching practices on campus.</li> </ul> <p>Faculty development in use of technology will increase &amp; campus baselines will be established for student use of technology:</p> <p><u>BCC Baseline Measurement of Use of Technology</u>  Frequency of student use of computer technology = 1.76 [scale: 1=never...4=very often]</p> <p><u>Context:</u> CUNY Student satisfaction with access to computer technology – 2.93 [scale: 1=very dissatisfied...4=very satisfied]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The BCC Center for Teaching Excellence has developed a series of Faculty Development Workshops and individualized training opportunities to encourage the effective use of technology in the classroom. The Center is staffed by a Faculty Director, Educational Technology Director and an Instructional Technology Developer.</li> <li>▪ The Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable initiated a discussion and academic departmental survey about minimum student and faculty technology competencies.</li> </ul> <p><u>Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Average BCC student use of computer technology shows less than occasional usage, which is below the community college (1.81) and university average (1.88)</li> <li>▪ BCC students express greater satisfaction than the community college average (2.79) and the University average (2.79) with access to computer technology</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>2G. Show rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will increase from 43% to 75% and passing rates on the CUNY Proficiency Exam will increase from 66.7% to 75%.</p>	<p><u>BCC Measurement</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BCC CPE Results</th> <th>2001-2002</th> <th>2002—2003</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% of required invitees taking the CPE</td> <td>63.5</td> <td>73.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of required test-takers passing CPE</td> <td>75.8</td> <td>57.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BCC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002—2003	% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.5	73.2	% of required test-takers passing CPE	75.8	57.0
BCC CPE Results	2001-2002	2002—2003								
% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.5	73.2								
% of required test-takers passing CPE	75.8	57.0								

	<u>Context</u>		
	CUNY CC Results	2001-2002	2002—2003
	% of required invitees taking the CPE	63.6	69.6
	% of required test-takers passing CPE	74.2	65.3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The calculations of passing/failing rates do not take into account students who fail because they do not take the test. When the calculation takes these failures into account, BCC pass rate of 49% is fourth among all CUNY schools, with the highest 54% at Baruch and the lowest 25% at CSI.</li> <li>Most recent CPE test results (6/10/03) reflect a 60% pass rate.</li> </ul>		
	<u>Assessment</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good progress was made on increasing the CPE show rate by 10 percentage points and closely approaching the University target , while passing rates (which appear to be inversely related to show rates) declined substantially .</li> <li>Most recent increase is hopefully reflective of focused attention on improving student success on the CPE.</li> </ul>		

<b>Objective 3: Increase instruction by full-time faculty</b>				
<p>Target 3.1: Instruction by full-time faculty will increase incrementally.</p> <p>BCC Target: Maintain % of nonremedial instructional hours taught by FT faculty at 65.7%.</p>	<b>BCC Measurement</b>			
	<b>% of instruction</b>	<b>Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>
	<b>By ft faculty</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>63.2</b>
	<u>Context</u>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CUNY CC average = 51.02 and University average = 54.04.</li> <li>Fall '02 student faculty ratio – at BCC (17.9) for CUNY CC's (20.0)</li> </ul>			
	<u>Assessment</u>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relatively high rate of instruction taught by FT faculty at BCC (12 % points higher than the CC average) reflects the College's recent commitment to the promotion of teaching excellence and scholarship with effective recruitment, retention, training, policies, recognition, and opportunities for faculty support.</li> </ul>			

## Goal 2: IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS

<p><b>Objective 4: increase retention and graduation rates.</b></p>																																	
<p>University Target: 4.1: Retention rates will increase by an average of 2 percentage points.</p> <p>BCC Target: Increase one-year retention rate for first-time (full-time) freshmen from 62.7% for the F'00 cohort to 65% for the F'01 cohort and for transfer students from 60.6% for the F'00 cohort to 63%.</p>	<p><b><u>BCC Measurement</u></b></p> <p><b>One-year (fall-to-fall) retention rates</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 513 1906 630"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall '99 cohort</th> <th>Fall '00 cohort</th> <th>Fall '01 cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Freshmen</b></td> <td><b>66.4</b></td> <td><b>62.7</b></td> <td><b>63.5</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Transfers</b></td> <td><b>60.9</b></td> <td><b>60.6</b></td> <td><b>59.4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Sophomores</b></td> <td><b>71.9</b></td> <td><b>68.5</b></td> <td><b>71.5</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Context:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National one-year retention rate (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) News-May 2003) for % Freshmen at 2-yr colleges returning for their sophomore year = 62.6% (NYS){ nad 54.1% (US):.</li> </ul> <p><b>CUNY CC Averages</b></p> <p><b>One-year (fall-to-fall) retention rates are just above the BCC average</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 878 1906 992"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall '99 cohort</th> <th>Fall '00 cohort</th> <th>Fall '01 cohort</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Freshmen</td> <td>64.0</td> <td>64.3</td> <td>65.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>62.1</td> <td>64.2</td> <td>63.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sophomores</td> <td>72.0</td> <td>72.4</td> <td>72.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fall '99 cohort	Fall '00 cohort	Fall '01 cohort	<b>Freshmen</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>62.7</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>Transfers</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>Sophomores</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>71.5</b>		Fall '99 cohort	Fall '00 cohort	Fall '01 cohort	Freshmen	64.0	64.3	65.5	Transfers	62.1	64.2	63.7	Sophomores	72.0	72.4	72.4
	Fall '99 cohort	Fall '00 cohort	Fall '01 cohort																														
<b>Freshmen</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>62.7</b>	<b>63.5</b>																														
<b>Transfers</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>59.4</b>																														
<b>Sophomores</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>71.5</b>																														
	Fall '99 cohort	Fall '00 cohort	Fall '01 cohort																														
Freshmen	64.0	64.3	65.5																														
Transfers	62.1	64.2	63.7																														
Sophomores	72.0	72.4	72.4																														
	<p><b><u>BCC course passing rates are increasing &amp; withdrawal rates are declining</u></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1078 1906 1162"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall 2000</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Passing Rates</td> <td>67.8</td> <td>70.1</td> <td>70.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Withdrawal Rates</td> <td>18.1</td> <td>16.4</td> <td>14.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><u>BCC Increase in Transfer Student Admissions Is Substantial</u></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1247 1906 1305"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall 2000</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Transfer Admits</td> <td>392</td> <td>493</td> <td>624</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Passing Rates	67.8	70.1	70.3	Withdrawal Rates	18.1	16.4	14.6		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Transfer Admits	392	493	624												
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																														
Passing Rates	67.8	70.1	70.3																														
Withdrawal Rates	18.1	16.4	14.6																														
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																														
Transfer Admits	392	493	624																														

**Comparative Demographics Represent BCC students disproportionately “at risk” compared to even the average CUNY community college student**

Demographics	BCC students	Total CC Students
Household Income < \$15,000	46%	38%
Single Parent	31%	16%
Ethnicity: Minority	96%	77%
Age: 25 & under	54%	65%

Source: CUNY 2002 Students Experience Survey

Assessment

- The 1-year Freshmen retention rate of 63.5% reflects an increase of 1% point . It is higher than the NYS (62.6%) and US (54.1%) averages and approaches the CUNY CC average of 65.5.
- The 1-year Transfer retention rate declined 1.5% points. The dramatic increase in transfer admissions should be analyzed relative to this decline in retention.
- The 1-year Sophomore retention rate increased 3 % points to 71.5, which is just below the CUNY CC average of 72.4.

University Target 4.2: Graduation rates will rise by an average of 1 percentage point in associate programs.

BCC Target: Increase first-time freshmen six-year graduation rate from 21.7% for the Fall '95 entering cohort to 23% for the Fall '96 entering cohort.

BCC Target: Increase six-year graduation rate for transfers from 28.8% for the Fall '95 entering transfers to 31% for the Fall '96 entering transfers.

**BCC Six-year Graduation Rates:**

Full-time	F'94 cohort	F'95 cohort	F'96 cohort
Freshmen	24.4	21.7	20.7
Transfers	31.0	28.8	20.3

Context:

- National Graduation Rate at 2-yr colleges after 3 years (NCHEMS News-May 2003) – US rate = 30%
- BCC recently ranked in the top 30 (#29) along with BMCC (#2), LAG (#10), KCC (#27) of Minority Associate Degree Producers for 2001-02 (according to Black Issues in Higher Ed, 6/03)

**CUNY CC six-year Graduation Rates are above the BCC rates:**

Full-time	F'94 cohort	F'95 cohort	F'96 cohort
Freshmen	26.0	28.5	25.9
Transfers	36.3	34.9	34.7

**BCC Four-year Graduation Rates are incrementally increasing:**

First-time, FT	F'97 cohort	F'98 cohort	F'99 cohort
Freshmen	13.3	14.8	18.6

**BCC Enrollment Trend declines from F'94 to F'96:**

	Freshmen Admits	Transfer Admits	Total Population
Fall 1994	1605	433	8357
Fall 1995	1584	375	8370
Fall 1996	1341	266	7884

Assessment

- Six-year graduation rates are below the CUNY community college average and the BCC rates declined for cohorts between F'94 and F'96 (during which time enrollment decline began and transfer enrollment decline was substantial).
- College efforts to increase student attainment and increase graduation rates have focused on more current student populations (note 4-year graduation rate increases from 13.3% for the F'97 cohort to 18.6% for the F'99 cohort).
- Corresponding with increases in the 4-year graduation rates, the six year rates should begin to increase with the F'97 cohort.

<p><b>Objective 5: Improve post-graduate outcomes</b></p> <p>University Target: All teacher education and nursing programs will maintain or improve performance on certification/licensing exams: those having below an 80% pass rate will achieve that rate in 2002-03.</p> <p>BCC Target: Consistent with the University Master Plan target of 80%, sustain improvements on the NCLEX exam with maintaining at least an 85% passing rate</p>	<p><b>Measurement</b>  <b>BCC NCLEX Passing Rates</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NCLEX</th> <th>2000</th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% Passing</td> <td>70.0</td> <td>90.5</td> <td>87.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N Taking</td> <td>30</td> <td>19</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Registry of Rad Tech % Passing Exam</td> <td>83%</td> <td>88%</td> <td>100%*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* unofficial rate</p> <p>Context:  <b>CUNY NCLEX Results</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2000</th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% CC Passing</td> <td>73.6</td> <td>78.3</td> <td>82.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Univ Passing</td> <td>72.0</td> <td>74.5</td> <td>79.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BCC exceeded target of maintaining at least an 85% NCLEX passing rate , while almost doubling the number of test takers .</li> <li>▪ The BCC NCLEX passing rate of 87.5% continues to be above the CC (82%) and University (79%) rates.</li> <li>▪ Rad Tech graduates continue to excel and have increased passing rate to 100%.</li> </ul>	NCLEX	2000	2001	2002	% Passing	70.0	90.5	87.5	N Taking	30	19	35	American Registry of Rad Tech % Passing Exam	83%	88%	100%*		2000	2001	2002	% CC Passing	73.6	78.3	82.0	% Univ Passing	72.0	74.5	79.0
NCLEX	2000	2001	2002																										
% Passing	70.0	90.5	87.5																										
N Taking	30	19	35																										
American Registry of Rad Tech % Passing Exam	83%	88%	100%*																										
	2000	2001	2002																										
% CC Passing	73.6	78.3	82.0																										
% Univ Passing	72.0	74.5	79.0																										

<p>University Target 5.2: VTEA job placement rates fill rise by 2 percentage points.</p> <p>BCC Target: Continue positive trend in increasing job placement rates from 80.8 to 83%.</p>	<p><b>Measurement</b>  <b>BCC Six month job placement rates in vocational programs</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1998-99 Grads</th> <th>1999-00 Grads</th> <th>2000-01 Grads</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Job placement</td> <td>77.6</td> <td>80.8</td> <td>79.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education Rate</td> <td>59.2</td> <td>46.0</td> <td>59.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job &amp; Ed Rate</td> <td>95.9</td> <td>92.8</td> <td>94.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1998-99 Grads	1999-00 Grads	2000-01 Grads	Job placement	77.6	80.8	79.1	Education Rate	59.2	46.0	59.0	Job & Ed Rate	95.9	92.8	94.1
	1998-99 Grads	1999-00 Grads	2000-01 Grads														
Job placement	77.6	80.8	79.1														
Education Rate	59.2	46.0	59.0														
Job & Ed Rate	95.9	92.8	94.1														

	<p><u>Context</u>  <b>CUNY community college job placement rates in vocational programs</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1998-99 Grads</th> <th>1999-00 Grads</th> <th>2000-01 Grads</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Job placement</td> <td>78.3</td> <td>80.8</td> <td>81.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education Rate</td> <td>54.2</td> <td>49.5</td> <td>58.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job &amp; Ed Rate</td> <td>95.0</td> <td>93.1</td> <td>93.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After several years of increases, BCC job placement rate remains stable at 79%, which is just under the CC rate of 81%.</li> <li>The job and ed rate for BCC increased to 94.1%, which is just above the CC rate of 93.9%.</li> </ul>		1998-99 Grads	1999-00 Grads	2000-01 Grads	Job placement	78.3	80.8	81.0	Education Rate	54.2	49.5	58.4	Job & Ed Rate	95.0	93.1	93.9						
	1998-99 Grads	1999-00 Grads	2000-01 Grads																				
Job placement	78.3	80.8	81.0																				
Education Rate	54.2	49.5	58.4																				
Job & Ed Rate	95.0	93.1	93.9																				
<p><b>Objective 6: Improve College Readiness</b></p>																							
<p>University Target 6.1: Increase the percentage on non-exempt freshmen in immersion, the percentage of immersion students who progress a level, and the pass rates on skills tests at the end of remediation/ESL sequences.</p> <p>BCC Target: The percentage of USIP participants whose placement level improves as a result of USIP will increase.</p> <p>BCC Target: Passing Rates on the Exit from Remediation Exams will increase to: 53% in Reading; 64% in Writing; 68% in Math</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u>  <b>Percentage of BCC USIP participants whose placement level improves (by passing 1 or more CUNY exams)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Summer 2001</th> <th>Summer 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Percentage</b></td> <td><b>18.2</b></td> <td><b>27.4</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>BCC Pass Rates on Exit from Remediation (Univ calculated 10/1-12/31)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall 2000</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>49.7</td> <td>50.1</td> <td>61.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>31.5</td> <td>61.2</td> <td>47.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>60.6</td> <td>65.2</td> <td>63.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Context</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many USIP students are not in the highest level of remediation and may not take CUNY exams at the completion of their courses (even though they may improve a course level).</li> </ul>		Summer 2001	Summer 2002	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>27.4</b>		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Reading	49.7	50.1	61.3	Writing	31.5	61.2	47.5	Math	60.6	65.2	63.7
	Summer 2001	Summer 2002																					
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>27.4</b>																					
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																				
Reading	49.7	50.1	61.3																				
Writing	31.5	61.2	47.5																				
Math	60.6	65.2	63.7																				

**CUNY Community College Pass Rates on Exit from Remediation (Univ calculated 10/1-12/31)**

	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002
Reading	58.0	57.8	63.6
Writing	48.7	50.2	42.4
Math	66.1	66.0	69.1

**BCC Comparative Pass Rates on Exit from Writing Remediation After Course Completion & After January Immersion – show substantial increases in passing rates after the intersession**

Course	'01 Pass Rate as of 12/31/01	'01 Pass Rate as of 1/31/01	'02 Pass Rate as of 12/31/02	'02 Pass Rate as of 1/31/02
ENG 02	54.9%	63.1%	34.8%	49.7%
ENG 09	52.4%	61.9%	39.8%	51.2%
ENG 10	80.8%	85.8%	69.4%	77.2%
Total	59.8%	64.2%	47.3%	56.6%

Assessment

- The percent of USIP participants whose placement level improves (by passing CUNY test) increased substantially (9.2 percentage points) from 18.2% to 27.4%.
- Exit pass rates increased for Reading by 11.2 percentage points to 61.3% (which is just under the CC average of 63.6% in F01). The Reading Department made a great deal of effort to improve student performance
- Exit pass rates (after course completion and prior to intersession workshops) in writing (which had dramatically increased to 61.2% in F01) decreased to 47.5% (which is still higher than the CC average of 42.2% and is higher than the F'00 BCC rate of 31.5%).
- Exit pass rates (in writing) are substantially higher (9.3 percentage points) after students participate in January Intersession workshops [47.3% after the course and 56.6% after the course and workshop].
- Math pass rates declined 1.5 percentage points.

University Target 6.2: Colleges will meet their College Now enrollment targets and 70% of participants will complete courses and earn grades of A,B or C.

Measurement

BCC College Now:	2001-02	2002-03
Registrations	579	844
% earning A,B,C	60%	68%

BCC Target: The College will meet College Now credit-bearing course enrollment target of 500, with overall course completion rate of 70%.	<u>Context: for Community Colleges</u>	
	College Now:	2001-02
	Registrations	15673
	% earning A,B,C	68%
		2002-03
		17122
		70%
<u>Assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>College Now registrations of 844 far exceeded the College target of 500.</li> <li>Course passing rates (with A,B, &amp; C grades) increased 8 percentage points to 68%, just under the University target of 70% and the CC average of 70%.</li> </ul>		

<b>Objective 7: Improve quality of student support services.</b>									
University Target 7.1: Student satisfaction with support services will rise.	<p><b><u>Baseline Measurement</u></b></p> <p><b>BCC Student Satisfaction:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Mean</b></span></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>With support services</b></td> <td><b>2.91</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>With student services</b></td> <td><b>2.71</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>[ scale –1=very dissatisfied ...4=very satisfied]</p> <p><u>Context:</u> <b>Community College</b></p> <p><b>Student Satisfaction:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Mean</b></span></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>With support services</td> <td>2.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>With student services</td> <td>2.71</td> </tr> </table> <p>[ scale –1=very dissatisfied ...4=very satisfied]</p> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student satisfaction with support services (2.91) approaches an overall satisfactory average (3.0) and is higher than the CC average of 2.86.</li> <li>Students satisfaction with student services is lower (at 2.71) and equal to the CC average.</li> </ul>	<b>With support services</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>With student services</b>	<b>2.71</b>	With support services	2.86	With student services	2.71
<b>With support services</b>	<b>2.91</b>								
<b>With student services</b>	<b>2.71</b>								
With support services	2.86								
With student services	2.71								

### Goal 3: ENHANCE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

<p><b>Objective 8: Meet Enrollment Goals.</b></p>																																									
<p>University Target 8.1: Colleges will meet enrollment targets.</p> <p>BCC Target: Meet enrollment targets in the Master Plan of 7239 (Fall 2002) and 7290 (Spring 2003)</p>	<p><b>Measurement</b></p> <p><b>BCC Enrollment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 467 1906 548"> <thead> <tr> <th>Mast Plan F02 Target</th> <th>F02 Actual Enrollment</th> <th>% diff</th> <th>Mast Plan S03 Target</th> <th>S03 Actual Enrollment</th> <th>% diff</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7239</td> <td>7304</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>7290</td> <td>7780</td> <td>6.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 630 1906 743"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall 2000</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FT Freshmen</td> <td>1148</td> <td>1121</td> <td>1203</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer</td> <td>392</td> <td>496</td> <td>625</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>6928</td> <td>6942</td> <td>7304</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Context:</b></p> <p>Comparative Percentage Increase in Enrollment for Fall '01 and Fall '02</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 857 1906 1003"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>CUNY CC % change from F'01 to F'02</th> <th>BCC % change from F'01 to F'02</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FT Freshmen</td> <td>7.1%</td> <td>7.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfers</td> <td>21.1%</td> <td>26.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Enrollment</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>5.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BCC exceeded enrollment targets for Fall 02 (by 65 students or .8%) and for Spring '03 by 490 students or 6.7%)</li> <li>▪ BCC enrollment increases in FT Freshmen (7.1%) and Transfers (26%) are above the CC rates.</li> <li>▪ Total BCC enrollment grew by 5.3% from F01 to F02.</li> </ul>	Mast Plan F02 Target	F02 Actual Enrollment	% diff	Mast Plan S03 Target	S03 Actual Enrollment	% diff	7239	7304	0.8%	7290	7780	6.7%		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	FT Freshmen	1148	1121	1203	Transfer	392	496	625	Total	6928	6942	7304		CUNY CC % change from F'01 to F'02	BCC % change from F'01 to F'02	FT Freshmen	7.1%	7.3%	Transfers	21.1%	26.0%	Total Enrollment	7.6%	5.2%
Mast Plan F02 Target	F02 Actual Enrollment	% diff	Mast Plan S03 Target	S03 Actual Enrollment	% diff																																				
7239	7304	0.8%	7290	7780	6.7%																																				
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																																						
FT Freshmen	1148	1121	1203																																						
Transfer	392	496	625																																						
Total	6928	6942	7304																																						
	CUNY CC % change from F'01 to F'02	BCC % change from F'01 to F'02																																							
FT Freshmen	7.1%	7.3%																																							
Transfers	21.1%	26.0%																																							
Total Enrollment	7.6%	5.2%																																							
<p>University Target 8.2: Show rates for all accepted students will rise at all levels.</p> <p>BCC Target: Increase show rate for accepted students.</p>	<p><b>Measurement</b></p> <p><b>BCC Show Rate</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 1279 1906 1344"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Fall 2000</th> <th>Fall 2001</th> <th>Fall 2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Show Rate</td> <td>52.3</td> <td>53.8</td> <td>54.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Show Rate	52.3	53.8	54.7																																
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																																						
Show Rate	52.3	53.8	54.7																																						

	<p><u>Context</u> <b>Community College average Show Rate</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 293 1902 354"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Fall 2000</td> <td>Fall 2001</td> <td>Fall 2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Show Rate</td> <td>56.7</td> <td>56.1</td> <td>59.4</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BCC show rate continues increasing trend.</li> </ul>		Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Show Rate	56.7	56.1	59.4																																																
	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002																																																						
Show Rate	56.7	56.1	59.4																																																						
<p>University Target 8.3: All colleges will take actions to better coordinate and facilitate movement from the associate to the baccalaureate level.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u></p> <p><b>BCC Transfers</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 574 1902 805"> <tr> <td></td> <td>'99-00 Grads</td> <td>'00-01 Grads</td> <td>'01-02 Grads</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of AA/AS transfers</td> <td>46.0</td> <td>42.2</td> <td>49.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% AAS transfers</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>24.9</td> <td>19.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers</td> <td>81.8</td> <td>75.7</td> <td>81.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers</td> <td>75.2</td> <td>67.0</td> <td>71.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avg 1<sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers</td> <td></td> <td>2.42</td> <td>2.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avg 1<sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers</td> <td></td> <td>2.39</td> <td>2.40</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Context</u> <b>CUNY Community College Transfers</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1062 915 1902 1146"> <tr> <td></td> <td>'99-00 Grads</td> <td>'00-01 Grads</td> <td>'01-02 Grads</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of AA/AS transfers</td> <td>44.2</td> <td>42.6</td> <td>44.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% AAS transfers</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>28.3</td> <td>29.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers</td> <td>79.2</td> <td>78.7</td> <td>79.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers</td> <td>76.4</td> <td>74.6</td> <td>73.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avg 1<sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers</td> <td></td> <td>2.44</td> <td>2.47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avg 1<sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers</td> <td></td> <td>2.47</td> <td>2.54</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transfer rate of AA/AS students increased by 7.3 percentage points to 49.5 (above the CC average of 44.4%).</li> <li>The transfer rate of AAS transfers decreased to 19.4% (which is well below the CC average of 29.6%). Students in BCC AAS programs are prepared for immediate entry to the workplace with high salaries and often do not enroll in BA/BS programs directly after AAS degree completion.</li> </ul>		'99-00 Grads	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads	% of AA/AS transfers	46.0	42.2	49.5	% AAS transfers	22.5	24.9	19.4	1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers	81.8	75.7	81.7	1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers	75.2	67.0	71.4	Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers		2.42	2.48	Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers		2.39	2.40		'99-00 Grads	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads	% of AA/AS transfers	44.2	42.6	44.4	% AAS transfers	25.1	28.3	29.6	1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers	79.2	78.7	79.3	1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers	76.4	74.6	73.9	Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers		2.44	2.47	Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers		2.47	2.54
	'99-00 Grads	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads																																																						
% of AA/AS transfers	46.0	42.2	49.5																																																						
% AAS transfers	22.5	24.9	19.4																																																						
1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers	81.8	75.7	81.7																																																						
1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers	75.2	67.0	71.4																																																						
Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers		2.42	2.48																																																						
Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers		2.39	2.40																																																						
	'99-00 Grads	'00-01 Grads	'01-02 Grads																																																						
% of AA/AS transfers	44.2	42.6	44.4																																																						
% AAS transfers	25.1	28.3	29.6																																																						
1-yr retention rate of AA/AS transfers	79.2	78.7	79.3																																																						
1-yr retention rate of AAS transfers	76.4	74.6	73.9																																																						
Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AA/AS transfers		2.44	2.47																																																						
Avg 1 <sup>st</sup> term GPA of AAS transfers		2.47	2.54																																																						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BCC 1-year retention rates of AA/AS transfers increased 6 percentage points to 81.7% (which is above the CC average of 79.3). First-term GPA of 2.48 is also just above the CC average of 2.47.</li> <li>▪ The 1-year retention rate of AAS transfers increased 4.4 percentage points to 71.4 (which is less than the CC average of 73.9), with an average GPA of but the 1<sup>st</sup> term GPA of 2.4, which represents a 1 percentage point increase.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Objective 9: Increase revenues from external sources</b></p>										
<p>University Target 9.1: Alumni-corporate fundraising will increase 10% CUNY-wide.</p> <p>BCC Target: Alumni and Corporate Fundraising (as reported on the CAE) will increase 10% to \$297,000.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u>  <b>Alumni/Corporate Fundraising as reported on CAE</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="894 626 1543 716"> <thead> <tr> <th>Fy01</th> <th>Fy02</th> <th>Fy03 estimate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>\$570,000</td> <td>\$271,000</td> <td>\$514,174</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Context</u>  The College focused attention on several efforts to support a development infrastructure, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Updating alumni data base with 30,000+ records</li> <li>▪ Updating retiree/emeriti data base and reestablishing contact with this group</li> <li>▪ Supporting alumni group efforts in selected areas (paralegal, radiologic technology)</li> <li>▪ In collaboration with Public Relations launched a new publication (Gateway) with an emphasis on alumni outreach.</li> <li>▪ Developed web-based opportunities for alumni/emeriti contacts</li> <li>▪ Recruited new directors to the BCC Foundation Board</li> <li>▪ Increased earnings resulting from approximately \$125,000 earned from fundraising gala and another \$200,000 from Ford Foundation grant for collaborative articulation work with South Africa.</li> </ul> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant progress made with respect to infrastructure development, actual fundraising and earnings, and foundation grant acquisition.</li> </ul>	Fy01	Fy02	Fy03 estimate	\$570,000	\$271,000	\$514,174			
Fy01	Fy02	Fy03 estimate								
\$570,000	\$271,000	\$514,174								

<p>University Target 9.2: Contract/Grant awards will rise 10%.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u> <b>Contract/Grant Awards Distributed Through the RF</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 321 1528 381"> <tr> <td><b>Fy01</b></td> <td><b>Fy02</b></td> <td><b>Fy03 **</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>\$9,862,401</b></td> <td><b>\$9,301,442</b></td> <td><b>\$9,501,644</b></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Context</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In FY02, BCC's \$9,301,442 accounted for 26% of the total Community College Contracts/Grants distributed through the RF (\$35,239,447)</li> </ul> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BCC substantially increased in FY03, what was already a significantly high percentage of the community college CUNY-wide contracts and grants distributed through the RF/</li> </ul>	<b>Fy01</b>	<b>Fy02</b>	<b>Fy03 **</b>	<b>\$9,862,401</b>	<b>\$9,301,442</b>	<b>\$9,501,644</b>
<b>Fy01</b>	<b>Fy02</b>	<b>Fy03 **</b>					
<b>\$9,862,401</b>	<b>\$9,301,442</b>	<b>\$9,501,644</b>					
<p>University Target 9.3: Indirect cost recovery will increase.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u> <b>Indirect Cost Recovery</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 764 1583 824"> <tr> <td><b>FY 2002</b></td> <td><b>FY 2003</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>7.1</b></td> <td><b>7.36</b></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Context</u> BCC indirect cost recovery exceeds the CUNY community college average of 6.6</p>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.36</b>		
<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>						
<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.36</b>						

<p><b>Objective 10: Make administrative services more efficient and increase entrepreneurial efforts, and apply revenues to student instruction-related activities.</b></p>					
<p>University Target 10.1: Student satisfaction with administrative services will rise.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u></p> <p><b>BCC Student Satisfaction: Mean</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1060 1268 1906 1328"> <tr> <td><b>With administrative services</b></td> <td><b>2.74</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>With facilities</b></td> <td><b>2.84</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>[ scale -1=very dissatisfied ...4=very satisfied]</p>	<b>With administrative services</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>With facilities</b>	<b>2.84</b>
<b>With administrative services</b>	<b>2.74</b>				
<b>With facilities</b>	<b>2.84</b>				

	<p><u>Context:</u>  <b>Community College Student Satisfaction:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>With administrative services</td> <td>2.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>With facilities</td> <td>2.87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>[ scale –1=very dissatisfied ...4=very satisfied]</p> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Student satisfaction with administrative services is less than satisfied at 2.74 (but is greater than the average CC rate of 2.63)</li> <li>▪ Student satisfaction with facilities at 2.84 is less than the CC average of 2.87.</li> </ul>		Mean	With administrative services	2.63	With facilities	2.87																								
	Mean																														
With administrative services	2.63																														
With facilities	2.87																														
<p>University Target 10.3: CUNY will achieve \$10 million in productivity savings that will be applied to student instruction-related activities.</p>	<p><u>Measurement</u></p> <p><b>Percent of Tax Levy Budget Spent on:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY2001</th> <th>FY2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy</b></td> <td><b>34.5</b></td> <td><b>34.6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>General Administration as % of total</b></td> <td><b>8.1</b></td> <td><b>8.9</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>General Institutional Services as % of total</b></td> <td><b>12.5</b></td> <td><b>12.5</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Maintenance and Operations as % of total</b></td> <td><b>14.0</b></td> <td><b>13.2</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Context</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least \$200,000 of BCC administrative budget supports non BCC-related administrative functions.</li> <li>▪ Increase in the FY02 administrative BCC budget can be accounted for by the hiring of a new Business Manager and the ECP increases.</li> <li>▪ Percentage changes in the smaller CUNY budgets (BCC has the 2<sup>nd</sup> smallest) represent much smaller dollar amounts than percentage changes in the larger CUNY budgets.</li> <li>▪ Targets are below the University budget model.</li> </ul> <p><b>Percent of CC Tax Levy Budget Spent on:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY2001</th> <th>FY2002</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy</td> <td>32.1</td> <td>31.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Administration as % of total</td> <td>10.0</td> <td>9.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Institutional Services as % of total</td> <td>10.4</td> <td>10.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maintenance and Operations as % of total</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>11.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY2001	FY2002	<b>Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>General Administration as % of total</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>General Institutional Services as % of total</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>Maintenance and Operations as % of total</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>		FY2001	FY2002	Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy	32.1	31.6	General Administration as % of total	10.0	9.7	General Institutional Services as % of total	10.4	10.5	Maintenance and Operations as % of total	11.8	11.4
	FY2001	FY2002																													
<b>Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>34.6</b>																													
<b>General Administration as % of total</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>8.9</b>																													
<b>General Institutional Services as % of total</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.5</b>																													
<b>Maintenance and Operations as % of total</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>																													
	FY2001	FY2002																													
Institutional Support Services as % of total tax levy	32.1	31.6																													
General Administration as % of total	10.0	9.7																													
General Institutional Services as % of total	10.4	10.5																													
Maintenance and Operations as % of total	11.8	11.4																													

<p>University Target 10.4: Percentage of instruction offered on Fridays and weekends will increase.</p>	<b>Baseline BCC Measurement</b>		
		<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>
	% FTEs on Fridays,		
	<b>Weekends, evenings</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>38.3</b>
	<u>Context</u> Baseline CUNY CC		
		Fall 2001	Fall 2002
% FTEs on Fridays,			
Weekends, evenings	47.0	45.1	
<u>Assessment</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BCC made a conscious decision not to expand weekend services until resources could be make available to accommodate student supports and services during these times.</li> </ul>			

\*\* College & University figures differ and this measure is currently under review and possible revision

BCC FY03 Performance Assessment Final Copy  
9/8/03