



# Office of Institutional Research

## National Community College Benchmark Project: Peer Institution Comparison

IR Report #164

March 2007

Community  
College  
*of* Philadelphia

## History of the National Community College Benchmark Project

Responding to the needs for accessible, inter-institutional effectiveness data, Johnson County Community College, working with other colleges, developed a benchmark reporting process tailored to the needs of community colleges. The National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) provides community colleges with opportunities to report outcome and effectiveness data, receive reports of benchmarks, and compare their data with those of peer institutions. Initial benchmarks and data collection and reporting processes were pilot tested successfully by 20 colleges in summer 2003. Revisions and full implementation of NCCBP began in March 2004. Subscribers provide benchmark data on a range of learning outcomes and institutional processes. Definitions of benchmarks are updated annually. Current NCCBP benchmarks include the following:

- Certificate, degree completion and transfer rates
- Credit course persistence rates
- Performance in transfer institutions
- Student satisfaction and engagement ratings
- Student goal attainment
- College-level course retention and success rates
- Developmental course retention and success rates
- Developmental student success in first college-level courses
- Career program completers' employment status and employer ratings
- Success rates in core academic skill areas
- Institution-wide grade information
- Minority participation rates
- High school graduate enrollment rates
- Market penetration rates
- Business and Industry productivity
- Average credit section size
- Student/faculty ratio
- Distance learning outcomes
- Instructional faculty load
- Cost per credit hour and FTE student
- Distance learning sections and grade distributions
- Student/student services staff ratio
- Human resources statistics
- Cost per credit hour
- Training expenditures per employee

## Current Application of the National Community College Benchmark Project

In 2006, approximately 150 community colleges across the country participated in the NCCBP by providing benchmark information. Each college has the flexibility to select peer institutions from the list of participants and to generate aggregated comparative peer information. CCP peer institutions that were selected for this report were chosen because they resembled CCP along a number of dimensions: size of student enrollment; size of service area population; campus environment; size of budget; and institutional control.

While 27 colleges, including CCP, were identified as peers (Table 1), the number of colleges that provided information varies across benchmarks. This information is provided in the ensuing tables. Other information that appears in the tables for each benchmark includes:

- CCP value
- Median Peer Value
- Minimum Reported Peer Value
- Maximum Reported Peer Value
- CCP's Value Relative to Median Peer Value

This report provides a balance for the performance measures contained in IR Report #161, titled *2006 Institutional Effectiveness Report* [http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir\\_reports/ir\\_report\\_161.pdf](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_161.pdf), which assesses effectiveness based on historical internal benchmarks. In the present report, the reader can determine areas of institutional strength and weakness by noting CCP's benchmark value relative to the peer institutions' value. **Each benchmark should be reviewed carefully since a value below the peer median may be a sign of institutional strength or weakness, depending upon the particular benchmark measure.**

The following are several summary observations related to CCP's effectiveness relative to its peers.

- CCP enjoys a smaller market share of its local service area than is the case at the peer institutions. This is true for credit students and students enrolling immediately after graduation from high school.
- Direct instructional costs per FTE student and per credit hour were both higher at CCP than the median costs at the peer colleges.
- CCP students were less likely than their peers to persist.
- The transfer and career outcomes experienced by CCP students were extremely positive, exceeding those experienced by community college students elsewhere.

**Table 1**

List of Peer Institutions

1. Broward Community College (FL)
2. Central New Mexico Community College (NM)
3. Central Piedmont Community College (NC)
4. College of DuPage (IL)
5. Community College of Allegheny County (PA)
6. Community College of Philadelphia (PA)
7. Cuyahoga Community College (OH)
8. Daytona Beach Community College (FL)
9. Des Moines Area Community College (IA)
10. Erie Community College (NY)
11. Harrisburg Area Community College (PA)
12. Hillsborough Community College (FL)
13. Hudson Valley Community College (NY)
14. Johnson County Community College (KS)
15. Macomb Community College (MI)
16. Metropolitan Community College (NE)
17. Monroe Community College (NY)
18. Nassau Community College (NY)
19. Palm Beach Community College (FL)
20. Phoenix College (AZ)
21. Richland College (TX)
22. Rio Salado College (AZ)
23. San Antonio College (TX)
24. Suffolk County Community College (NY)
25. Valencia Community College (FL)
26. Washtenaw Community College (MI)
27. Westchester Community College (NY)

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	CCP			CCP Value	Median Peer Value	Minimum	Maximum	# of Peer Institutions
		CCP Above Median	CCP Equal to Median	CCP Below Median					
Market Penetration <sup>1</sup>	Percent of Credit Students in 2004-2005 Academic Year			X	2%	3%	1%	6%	25
Market Penetration <sup>1</sup>	Percent of Non-Credit Students in 2004-2005 Academic Year		X		1%	1%	0%	5%	25
Access in Fall 2004	Minority Student Percentage of Credit Enrollment in Fall 2004	X			68%	37%	11%	68%	27
Access in Fall 2004	Minority Employees Percentage of Total Employees in Fall 2004	X			40%	25%	7%	44%	26
Access in Fall 2004	Spring 2004 High School Graduates Who Enrolled as Credit Students			X	10%	16%	2%	27%	16
Access in Fall 2004	Spring 2004 Private High School Graduate Who Enrolled as Credit Students			X	1%	11%	1%	20%	10
Access in Fall 2004	Spring 2004 Public High School Graduate Who Enrolled as Credit Students			X	9%	19%	9%	33%	16
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Average Credit Course Section Size	X			23.23	21.30	8.10	27.49	25
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Student FTE/Faculty FTE Ratio	X			20.86	20.04	12.40	43.79	27
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Percent of Credit Hours Taught by Full Time Faculty		X		51%	52%	1%	71%	26
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Percent of Credit Hours Taught by Part Time Faculty		X		49%	49%	29%	99%	26
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Percent of Sections taught by Full Time Faculty	X			58%	50%	1%	71%	25
Faculty Related Resources in Fall 2004	Percent of Sections taught by Part Time Faculty			X	42%	50%	29%	99%	25
Other Human Resources	Percent of Full Time, non-Temporary Employees who Departed by End of 2004-2005 Academic Year			X	3%	5%	1%	69%	22
Other Human Resources	Percent of Full Time, non-Temporary Employees who Retired by End of 2004-2005 Academic Year		X		2%	2%	0%	5%	22
Other Human Resources	Development and Training Expenditures per FTE Employees in Fiscal Year 2005			X	\$292.74	\$366.00	\$14.17	\$731.64	12

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	CCP			CCP Value	Median Peer Value	Minimum	Maximum	# of Peer Institutions
		CCP Above Median	CCP Equal to Median	CCP Below Median					
Costs in Fiscal Year 2005 <sup>2</sup>	Direct Instructional Cost per FTE Student	X			\$3,553.93	\$3,260.64	\$1,841.02	\$22,265.00	23
Costs in Fiscal Year 2005 <sup>2</sup>	Direct Instructional Cost per Credit Hour	X			\$118.46	\$108.69	\$61.37	\$742.17	23
Course Persistence in Fall 2004	Percent of Withdraw Grades in all College Level Courses		X		14%	14%	5%	22%	27
Course Persistence in Fall 2004	Percent of Withdraw Grades in College Algebra Courses	X			17%	23%	0%	45%	27
Course Persistence in Fall 2004	Percent of Withdraw Grades in First Level Composition Courses	X			17%	13%	0%	28%	27
Course Persistence in Fall 2004	Percent of Withdraw Grades in Second Level Composition Courses			X	16%	19%	1%	32%	27
Course Persistence in Fall 2004	Percent of Withdraw Grades in Developmental Math Courses			X	13%	17%	0%	48%	27
Course Persistence in Fall 2003	Percent of Former Developmental Writing Students Who Withdrew from their First College-Level Writing Courses			X	7%	14%	2%	33%	22
Course Persistence in Fall 2003	Percent of Former Developmental Math Students Who Withdrew from their First College-Level Math Courses	X			20%	15%	0%	43%	23
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in all Credit, College-Level Courses by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)			X	81%	84%	79%	92%	27
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in College Algebra Courses by Students Who Completed Algebra Courses (Excludes W Grades from the Base)			X	63%	71%	59%	92%	27
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in First Level Composition Courses by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	X			84%	81%	69%	95%	27
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Second Level Compositions by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	X			75%	67%	59%	81%	27
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Developmental Math Courses by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)			X	62%	64%	46%	93%	27

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	CCP Above Median		CCP Equal to Median	CCP Below Median	CCP Value	Median Peer Value	Minimum	Maximum	# of Peer Institutions
		✓	✗	✗	✗					
Course Success at End of Fall 2004	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Developmental Math Courses (Includes W Grades in the Base)	✗				54%	53%	35%	77%	27
Course Success at End of Fall 2003 Cohort	Percent of Passing Grades in First College Level Math Course Taken by Students Who Passed Highest Level Developmental Math Course (Includes W Grades in the Base)			✗		57%	69%	41%	88%	23
Course Success at End of Fall 2003 Cohort	Percent of Passing Grades in First College Level Math Course Taken by Students who Passed Highest Level Developmental Math Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)			✗		71%	79%	59%	91%	23
Course Success at End of Fall 2003 Cohort	Percent of Passing Grades in First College Level Writing Course Taken by Students who Passed Highest Level Developmental Writing Course (Includes W Grades in the Base)	✗				86%	85%	73%	100%	22
Course Success at End of Fall 2003 Cohort	Percent of Passing Grades in First College Level Writing Courses Taken by Students who Passed Highest Level Developmental Writing Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	✗				79%	74%	53%	88%	22
Distance Learning in Fall 2004	Percent of Credit Hours That Were Distance Learning Courses			✗		3%	4%	0%	71%	25
Distance Learning in Fall 2004	Percent of Course Sections That Were Distance Learning Courses			✗		3%	5%	1%	37%	25
Distance Learning in Fall 2004	Percent of A and B Grades Awarded in Distance Learning Courses			✗		42%	50%	42%	61%	26
Distance Learning in Fall 2004	Percent of Course Withdrawals In Distance Learning Courses			✗		20%	21%	0%	32%	26
Short-Term Persistence	Students at End of Fall 2004 Semester Who Returned in Spring 2005 Semester	✗				70%	69%	34%	79%	26
Short-Term Persistence	Students at End of Fall 2004 Semester Who Returned in Fall 2005			✗		42%	48%	20%	58%	26
Long-Term Persistence	All Fall 2002 Students Who Earned a Degree or Certificate by Spring 2005			✗		5%	12%	5%	27%	19
Long-Term Persistence	Full Time Fall 2002 Students Who Earned a Degree or Certificate by Spring 2005			✗		9%	22%	3%	35%	26
Long-Term Persistence	Part Time Fall 2002 Students Who Earned a Degree or Certificate by Spring 2005			✗		2%	6%	2%	13%	19
Persistence to Goal Completion	Recent Graduates Who Completed Their Higher Education Goals at Their Community College			✗		79%	96%	78%	100%	13

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	CCP Above Median	CCP Equal to Median	CCP Below Median	CCP Value	Median Peer Value	Minimum	Maximum	# of Peer Institutions
Post-Community College Outcomes	All New Students in Fall 2002 Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred by Spring 2005	X			18%	14%	3%	60%	17
Post-Community College Outcomes	New Full Time Students in Fall 2002 Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred by Spring 2005	X			20%	16%	5%	65%	24
Post-Community College Outcomes	New Part Time Students in Fall 2002 Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred by Spring 2005	X			16%	9%	1%	55%	17
Post-Community College Outcomes	2005 Career Program Graduates Who Were Employed in a Field Related to Their Studies	X			65%	62%	32%	88%	20
Post-Community College Outcomes	2005 Career Program Graduates Who Were Enrolled in Higher Education	X			42%	25%	0%	86%	20

1. Credit and non-credit headcounts were compared with service area population counts to yield market penetration rates.
2. Costs include only direct credit instructional expenditures.