



**Office of
Institutional
Research**

**National Community College Benchmark Project:
Peer Institution Comparison**

IR Report # 175

November 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. Subscribers provide benchmark data on a range of learning outcomes and institutional processes. Definitions of benchmarks are updated annually and current NCCBP benchmarks include the following:

- Certificate, degree completion and transfer rates
- Credit course persistence rates
- 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
- Success rates in core academic skill areas
- Institution-wide grade information
- Minority participation rates
- High school graduate enrollment rates
- Market penetration rates
- Average credit section size
- Student/faculty ratio
- 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 2007, over 175 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.

The 22 colleges that were identified as peers appear in Table 1, information that appears in the tables for each benchmark includes:

- 2007 CCP Benchmark Value
- 2006 CCP Benchmark Value
- Change in CCP Value between the 2006 and 2007 reporting period
- Median Peer College Benchmark Value
- Difference between CCP's Benchmark Value and Peer College Benchmark Value

This report provides a balance for the performance measures contained in IR Report #161, titled *2006 Institutional Effectiveness Report* (available at: http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_161.pdf), which assesses effectiveness based on historical internal benchmarks. Also, in IR Report #174 (available at: http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_174.pdf) CCP benchmarks are compared with other Pennsylvania community colleges.

In the present report, the reader can determine areas of institutional strength and weakness by noting CCP's benchmark value relative to last year's value and relative to the median peer benchmark 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. For ease of analysis positive change is highlighted in green and negative change in red.**

The following are several summary observations related to CCP's effectiveness over time or 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 increased at CCP over the two year comparison. Cost for both were higher at CCP than the median costs at the peer colleges.
- Short-term persistence rates (fall to spring and fall to fall persistence) at CCP are similar to the peer institutions however CCP students are less likely, than students at the peer institutions, to persist over the long-term (to graduation).

Table 1

List of Peer Institutions

1. Central New Mexico Community College (NM)
2. College of DuPage (IL)
3. Community College of Allegheny County (PA)
4. Des Moines Area Community College (IA)
5. Erie Community College (NY)
6. Harrisburg Area Community College (PA)
7. Hudson Valley Community College
8. Johnson County Community College (KS)
9. Macomb Community College (MI)
10. Maricopa Community College District (AZ)
11. Metropolitan Community College (NE)
12. Miami-Dade Community College (FL)
13. Monroe Community College (NY)
14. Nassau Community College (NY)
15. Phoenix Community College (AZ)
16. Richland College (TX)
17. Rio Salado College (AZ)
18. San Antonio College (TX)
19. Suffolk County Community College (NY)
20. Valencia Community College (FL)
21. Washtenaw Community College (MI)
22. Westchester Community College (NY)

Table Descriptions

- § **Benchmark Measures** are defined in accordance with the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP). Detailed descriptions for each indicator and the cohorts measured are available in the following reports for each benchmark year.
- For the 2006 CCP Benchmark values see IR Report # 163, available at: http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_163.pdf
 - For the 2007 CCP Benchmark values see IR Report # 174 available at: http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_174.pdf

§ **Color Coding**

Red: Denotes a lack of progress over the past year
Green: Indicates an improvement over the past year

Reporting Criteria: To provide accurate and comparable information there is a time lag between data collection, analyses, and reporting; participating institutions adhere to NCCBP data collection guidelines. The following table summaries the data collection periods reflected in this report's four primary Effectiveness Dimensions.

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Year	Data collection period
Access, Enrollment, and Short-term Persistence	§ 2006 § 2007	§ Fall 2004 § Fall 2005
Long-term Persistence	§ 2006 § 2007	§ First-time cohort fall 2002 § First-time cohort fall 2003
Financial Information	§ 2006 § 2007	§ Fiscal year 2005 § Fiscal year 2006
HR Statistics	§ 2006 § 2007	§ Academic Year 2004-05 § Academic Year 2005-06

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	Benchmark Value					2007 Median Peer Value	Difference Between CCP and Peer College Value ¹
		2007 CCP Benchmark Value	2006 CCP Benchmark Value	Change in CCP Values from 2006 to 2007	2007 Median Peer Value	Difference Between CCP and Peer College Value ¹		
Market Penetration ¹	Percent of Credit Students	2%	2%	0%	3%	1%		
Market Penetration ¹	Percent of Non-Credit Students	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%		
Access	Minority Student Percentage of Credit Enrollment	64%	68%	4%	27%	37%		
Access	Minority Employees Percentage of Total Employees	40%	40%	0%	19%	21.0%		
Access	Spring High School Graduates Who Enrolled as Credit Students	5.3%	10%	5%	19%	13.7%		
Faculty Related Resources	Average Credit Course Section Size	23.5	23.2	0.3	21.3	2.2		
Faculty Related Resources	Student FTE/Faculty FTE Ratio	20.8	20.9	0.1	19.8	1.0		
Faculty Related Resources	Percent of Credit Hours Taught by Full Time Faculty	70%	51%	19%	52%	18%		
Faculty Related Resources	Percent of Credit Hours Taught by Part Time Faculty	30%	49%	19%	48%	18%		
Other Human Resources	Percent of Full Time, non-Temporary Employees who Retired by End of the Academic Year	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%		
Fiscal Year Costs ²	Direct Instructional Cost per FTE Student	\$3,893.68	\$3,553.93	\$339.75	\$3,455.97	\$437.71		
Fiscal Year Costs ²	Direct Instructional Cost per Credit Hour	\$129.79	\$118.46	\$11.33	\$115.20	\$14.59		
Course Persistence	Percent of Withdraw Grades in all College Level Courses	14%	14%	0%	14%	0%		
Course Persistence	Percent of Withdraw Grades in College Algebra Courses	16%	17%	1%	23%	7%		

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.

Red: Denotes a lack of progress over the past year
Green: Indicates an improvement over the past year

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures	2007 CCP Benchmark Value		2006 CCP Benchmark Value		Change in CCP Values from 2006 to 2007	2007 Median Peer Value	Difference Between CCP and Peer College Value*
		2007 CCP Benchmark Value	2006 CCP Benchmark Value	2007 CCP Benchmark Value	2006 CCP Benchmark Value			
Course Persistence	Percent of Withdraw Grades in First Level Composition Courses	14%	17%	3%	14%	0%		
Course Persistence	Percent of Withdraw Grades in Second Level Composition Courses	19%	16%	3%	18%	1%		
Course Persistence	Percent of Withdraw Grades in Developmental Math Courses	13%	13%	0%	17%	4%		
Course Persistence	Percent of Former Developmental Writing Students Who Withdrew from their First College-Level Writing Courses	10%	7%	3%	14.5%	4.5%		
Course Persistence	Percent of Former Developmental Math Students Who Withdrew from their First College-Level Math Courses	21%	20%	1%	18%	3%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	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)	81%	81%	0%	83%	2%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in College Algebra Courses by Students Who Completed Algebra Courses (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	65%	63%	2%	70%	5%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	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)	83%	84%	1%	82%	1%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Second Level Compositions by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	76%	75%	1%	81%	5%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Developmental Math Courses by Students Who Completed the Course (Excludes W Grades from the Base)	62%	62%	0%	64%	2%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	Percent of A, B, and C Grades Earned in Developmental Math Courses (Includes W Grades in the Base)	54%	54%	0%	51%	3%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	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%	57%	0%	65%	8%		
Course Success at the End of the Term	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%	71%	0%	79%	8%		

Red: Denotes a lack of progress over the past year
Green: Indicates an improvement over the past year

Effectiveness Dimension	Benchmark Measures					Difference Between CCP and Peer Value*
	2007 CCP Benchmark Value	2006 CCP Benchmark Value	Change in CCP Values from 2006 to 2007	2007 Median Peer Value	Difference Between CCP and Peer Value*	
Course Success at the End of the Term	76%	79%	3%	70%	6%	
Course Success at the End of the Term	84%	86%	2%	84%	0%	
Distance Learning	3%	3%	0%	7%	4%	
Distance Learning	45%	42%	3%	51%	6%	
Distance Learning	17%	20%	3%	21%	4%	
Short-Term Persistence	69%	70%	1%	68%	1%	
Short-Term Persistence	46%	42%	4%	47%	-1%	
Long-Term Persistence	5%	5%	0%	13%	8%	
Long-Term Persistence	7%	9%	2%	18%	11%	
Long-Term Persistence	2%	2%	0%	7%	5%	
Post-Community College Outcomes	16%	18%	2%	16%	0%	
Post-Community College Outcomes	15%	20%	5%	17%	2%	
Post-Community College Outcomes	17%	16%	1%	10%	7%	
Post-Community College Outcomes	65%	65%	0%	61%	4%	
Post-Community College Outcomes	42%	42%	0%	27%	15%	

Red: Denotes a lack of progress over the past year
Green: Indicates an improvement over the past year
 * Reflects absolute value