Based on responses by 405 public two-year colleges in the United States to 2 surveys, this report provides comparative financial information for fiscal year 1994-95. The report provides space for colleges to compare their institutional statistics with national sample medians, quartile data for the national sample, and tables and graphs of findings. The first section presents background information on the annual study of two-year college finances, discussing objectives of the study and the potential uses of findings. The second section reviews limitations of the study and explains the study methodology, including a section attempting to dispel the myth of the "typical" institution and sections on calculations; interpretation of proportions, medians, and quartiles; means; and definitions of terms. Following a table showing participation by state and region, the next sections present national data on revenues per credit full-time equivalent (FTE) student and expenditures per credit FTE student, including selected expenditure ratios. Finally, data are provided on the numbers of credit FTE students per FTE staff and part-time FTE staff; student characteristics (i.e., credit units enrolled, hours attended, and class level); and mean class size. Appendix includes a list of participating colleges and their peer group classification. (HAA)
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PREFACE

This report is the 18th in an annual series of comparative data studies of public two-year colleges. It is the result of an intensive six-month study involving three national education associations—the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), and the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)—as well as the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and 405 community colleges. The study is intended to provide information to community college administrators, representatives of state and local agencies, and federal policy makers.

This report provides comparative information derived from a national sample of 405 public two-year colleges. It contains financial statistics for fiscal year 1994-95 and explanations derived from two surveys of public two-year colleges from across the nation. For the purpose of this study, colleges are defined at the highest district level. Included are multi-college districts and single-college districts. A single-college district may be multi-campus. (For example, Yosemite Community College is a multi-college district comprising Columbia College and Modesto College. Miami-Dade Community College, which is made up of multiple campuses, is treated as a single entity, a multi-campus single-college district.) This report includes:

- space for colleges to compare their institutional statistics with national sample medians,
- quartile data for the national sample, and
- statistics presented in a variety of formats, such as tables, bar graphs, and pie charts.
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INTRODUCTION

Background. In 1977, members of NACUBO's Two-Year Colleges Committee decided to undertake a comparative data study of public community colleges. (The term "community colleges" includes all postsecondary institutions offering up to the first two years of higher education.) Members of the committee were frustrated by the lack of information available to governing boards, presidents, and taxpayers who requested comparative data. The committee members thought that these data could be an important part of the information necessary for decisions, such as appropriation requests, salary increases, and proposed expenditures by function (instruction, institutional support, plant operation and maintenance). Further, "current" information, rather than historical summary, was needed. Because the committee members were also concerned about potential problems involved in trying to establish comparative data for community colleges, they approached the task cautiously.

Throughout the first 17 years of the project, comments from community college presidents and business officers were used to determine the usefulness of the data and the additional information needed, as well as to make necessary changes. Sample size doubled steadily throughout the first three years, from 97 to 184 to 403; leveled off at 420 and 442 the next two years; and increased to more than 500 since then. This year, the number of participants fell to 405.

This report reflects the project assessment that occurred in 1991. A task force was formed to assess the study and to consider its restructuring to improve its utility. This group comprised business officers, an accrediting agency official, a state agency administrator, a representative from private industry, a former community college president, and higher education consultants. Through the guidance of these people, several surveys were conducted and analyzed. This report is one result of that process, which included input from more than 300 business officers and representatives of state agencies.

The following summary of important financial characteristics is based on the financial data section of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), conducted by NCES, and a supplemental survey, conducted by NACUBO. Analysis performed by NACUBO, Laura Faulk Willson, and K. Scott Hughes in 1992 provided the foundation for the FY 1991, 1992, and 1993 reports, as well as the current one.

Objectives. One of the study's primary objectives is to learn how comparative information can be used to improve community college decision making. The project also seeks to shed light on the financial and operational aspects of community colleges. The report format is designed to facilitate comparing the operational and financial statistics of an individual community college to national medians.

Peer Groups. A more detailed report, Comparative Financial Statistics for Public Two-Year Colleges: FY 1995 Peer Groups Sample, is also available. It contains national medians as well as peer group medians for multi-college districts and for five single-college peer groups on the basis of credit FTE enrollment. FY 1995 Peer Groups Sample also contains explanations of the statistics, definitions of terms, and clarification as to what is included in and what is excluded from each calculation. Possible interpretations derived from institutional and peer group statistical comparisons, which may be useful for management reports based on this analysis, are also included. The breakdowns included in the peer groups' report are:

National
Multi-college districts
Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment less than 1,000
Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 1,000 through 2,499
Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 2,500 through 4,999
Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 5,000 through 9,999
Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment of 10,000 or more
How to Order. Complimentary copies of this report have been distributed to the chief business officers of the participating colleges. Additional copies of this report, or copies of the FY 1995 Peer Groups Sample report, may be obtained by calling the NACUBO Order Desk at (202) 861-2560. FY 1995 National Sample (NC1175) is $25 for members; $30 for nonmembers. FY 1995 Peer Groups Sample (NC1180) is $40 for members; $50 for nonmembers. Information from the Peer Groups Sample is also available on disk in a menu-driven, Lotus spreadsheet format (NC1185, 3 1/2" disk format; NC1190, 5 1/4" disk) and is $30 for members; $45 for nonmembers.

Special Analysis Service. A service providing analyses of special groupings of the database is available for a modest fee ($80 members; $110 nonmembers). Selections available include groupings on the basis of credit FTE enrollment, current fund expenditures, state, region, or special group as specified by purchaser (for example, California colleges with credit FTE enrollment greater than 10,000). Call the NACUBO Center for Institutional Accounting, Finance, and Management at (202) 861-2535 for more information.

Potential Uses. The primary purpose of this report is to assist an institution in preparing a meaningful analysis of how its financial and operational performance relates to peer group norms. Accreditation agencies have also found this study to be a useful tool in assessing institutional effectiveness, and increased application of the study by these agencies for reaccreditation purposes is anticipated.

Unlike internal institutional analysis, where performance in terms of revenue and expenditure patterns is related to goals, this analysis compares certain data from one institution with data from other institutions. Comparison is useful only to the extent that the comparison group is similar, and that data on revenue and expenditure performance are based on common understandings. Comparative data may be used to define high standards for assessing institutional financial success or to justify average performance, depending on the aspirations of an institution with respect to the norms of the comparison group. Both types of comparison can lead to meaningful analysis of an institution's financial data; such analysis could, in turn, affect the institution's financial policies in cases where an institution appears significantly out of line with its peers.

In addition to its primary purpose of providing meaningful comparisons, this report may serve as an internal management document for self-review and self-analysis. Comparisons provide a starting point for discovering institutional strengths and weaknesses. For example, costs per student that are far above the median, as well as staff-to-faculty ratios that appear high when compared with others, may indicate problems in institutional management.
LIMITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

The results of a comparative data study of this nature must be used with care. Discussion of some of the more obvious concerns follows.

Extrapolation. The 405 public community colleges in this study may not reflect the financial and operational patterns of their 369 sister institutions (counting systems of branch campuses as single institutions). Care was taken to include institutions that are geographically representative, as well as representative of enrollment levels. However, because of the need to use data only from those cooperating institutions that filed both timely and complete reports, the sample is not random.

No great significance is attached to any changes that occurred from year to year for any of the statistics: the survey populations differed and most changes are smaller than the confidence limits for the statistics.

Original Data. Lack of well-established definitions for such terms as "full-time-equivalent student" and lack of consistency in reporting such expenditure functions as "academic support," "institutional support," and "student services" create difficulties in generating accurate comparative data. Moreover, some survey responses are estimates because some institutions do not keep precise data in all the areas surveyed. All these factors affect the quality of the results.

Institutional Comparability. There is no way to establish truly homogeneous peer groups for community colleges. Major factors, such as mission, location, academic preparation of entering students, local area salary levels, local nonsalary costs, and methods of financing, create unique financial and operating patterns. Peer group comparisons that lead to administrative financial policy changes require sensitivity to the many factors not readily apparent from the statistics.

The Myth of the "Typical" Institution. There is no typical institution, and institutions should use this report only to find what makes them unique—not to pressure an institution toward some nonexistent "median" performance. This study has found a great diversity of expenditure, revenue, and staffing patterns. Diversity is clearly a characteristic—and a great strength—of community and junior colleges.

Calculations. Pell Grants are excluded from both the revenue and expenditure bases, including federal restricted grants and restricted scholarships. All revenue and expenditure figures exclude auxiliaries unless specifically noted.

Interpretation of Proportions. Careful interpretation of expenditure and revenue proportions is urged. High costs in any area, such as utilities, will naturally push the expenditure proportion for other areas, such as instruction, below the sample median—even if the budget support for instruction is adequate.

Medians and Quartiles. The median represents the number that will split the group of colleges in half for a given statistic: one-half the colleges will be above the median, while one-half will be below. For that reason, the "median institution" is different for each statistic, thus, the proportions may not add up to 100 percent.

The first quartile is the value for a statistic that separates the lowest 25 percent of the institutional values from the top 75 percent of the institutional values. The median is the value that separates the lowest 50 percent of the values from the top 50 percent of the values for each statistic. The third quartile is the value that separates the lowest 75 percent of the values from the top 25 percent of the values for each statistic.

N is the number of institutions that provided the data necessary to calculate the statistic. Hence, N is the number of values to find the quartiles and median. N varies with each statistic.
**Important Note.** Because each statistic has a different institution at its median and quartile values, proportions will not add up to 100 percent. This is especially true of the first and third quartiles. An institution that has a low instructional budget proportion, has a high administrative budget proportion. Thus, the quartiles are formed from very different institutions. As a result, the sum of the first quartile proportions will generally be less than 100 percent, while the sum of the third quartile proportions will tend to exceed 100 percent.

**Means.** The values in the pie charts and bar graphs depicting student population characteristics are means rather than medians.

**Definitions.** For the purposes of this study, the relevant terms are defined as follows:

**Single-college district:** A community/junior college district organized as a single college with one or more campuses and/or satellite locations.

**Multi-college district:** A community/junior college district organized as two or more separate colleges, each of which may have one or more campuses and/or satellite locations.

**Full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment:** Survey respondents were urged to report figures that accurately represent their institutions. For those colleges that required a formula, the following were recommended.

*Credit FTE enrollment* is annual credit hours divided by 30 if a college is on a semester basis; divided by 45 if a college is on a quarter basis.

*Noncredit FTE enrollment* is annual noncredit course hours divided by 60.

**Instructional expenditures:** Expenditures for credit and noncredit courses; academic, occupational, and technical instruction; remedial and tutorial instruction; and regular, special, and extension sessions.

**Service area population:** The population included in the area the district is mandated to serve (i.e., as designated by ZIP codes, county boundaries, political boundaries).

**Staffing:** Includes regular, temporary, and part-time staff. Excludes student assistants, both regular and work study. See *Financial Accounting and Reporting Manual for Higher Education* [¶332-338] (NACUBO) for definitions of categories.

**Total educational and general expenditures:** Excludes E&G mandatory transfers, E&G nonmandatory transfers, auxiliary enterprises, hospitals, and independent operations.

**Total revenues:** Excludes sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, sales and services of hospitals, and independent operations.

**Other income:** Includes endowment income, sales and services of educational activities, and other sources.

**Academic expenditures:** Includes instruction (and research), public service, and academic support.

**Support expenditures:** Includes student services, institutional support, and plant operation and maintenance.
# FY 1995 Participation by State and Region

**N = 405**

T = Total in Region or State  
R = Responses

### Regional Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eastern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Southern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Western

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVENUES

Total revenues per credit student were $5,515 at the median college. Almost two-thirds (59 percent) of revenues were received from total appropriations (all) at the median college, and 50 percent of the colleges reported receiving 51 percent to 67 percent of their total funds from this source.

Tuition and fees made up 24 percent of total revenue at the median college; one-half of the colleges reported that tuition and fees represented from 17 percent to 30 percent of their revenues. Students paid $1,286 in tuition and fees at the median college.
Expenditures per Credit FTE Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures as a Percentage of Total E&amp;G Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures by Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (incl. research, public serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant operation and maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES

Almost two-thirds (60 percent) of all expenditures at the median college were directed to academic programs and approximately 49 percent of expenditures to instruction. Fifty percent of the colleges reported spending 39 percent to 51 percent on credit instruction.

Academic support (i.e., libraries, media services, academic administration) received the smallest proportion of funds, with about 8 percent of total expenditures going to this category at the median college. Ten percent of expenditures were dedicated to student services (i.e., counseling and career guidance, financial aid, admissions and records, health service and administration) and plant operation and maintenance, respectively, at the median college.
## Selected Expenditure Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Your College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G salaries and wages</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building gross square feet</td>
<td>$0.94</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant O&amp;M without utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building gross square feet</td>
<td>$2.51</td>
<td>$3.47</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G salaries &amp; wages</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional salaries (without benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G expenditures</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand transfers for debt + CF interest paymts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted CF revenues</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of these ratios is their usefulness when one is examining figures that show changes over time.

The median college reported that 60 percent of its E&G expenditures were paid in salaries and wages (exclusive of benefits), with half of the colleges between 56 percent and 63 percent.

Utilities averaged $1.23 per gross square foot at the median college, with 50 percent of the colleges reporting a range of $0.94 to $1.54.

Plant operation and maintenance--excluding utilities--averaged $3.47 per gross square foot at the median college, with 50 percent of the colleges reporting between $2.51 and $4.72.

As a proportion of total E&G salaries, benefits were 24 percent at the median college, with a range of 19 percent to 29 percent at half the colleges.

The median college dedicated 35 percent of expenditures to instructional salaries (without benefits), with half the colleges reporting between 32 percent and 39 percent.

Another measure of flexibility, debt service is usually regarded as a fixed cost. The amount of budget used to support debt service reduces funds for academic purposes. The higher the proportion of budget dedicated to debt service, the less flexibility the college may have to respond to financial changes. At least 50 percent of the colleges reporting had a debt service ratio of 0. Debt service ratios are seldom above 5 percent.
STAFFING

The median college employed one FTE staff member for every nine credit FTE students.

The median college employed one credit instruction FTE faculty member for every 19 credit FTE students. However, the median college employed only one FTE staff member in counseling and career guidance areas for every 390 credit FTE students.

### Credit FTE Students per FTE Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff by Function</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Your College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit instruction faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other (nonfac, noncredit instruc)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic administration</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other (faculty, nonfaculty)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services administration</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; career guidance</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant operation and maintenance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 21 credit headcount students for each FTE employee at the median college. The ratio of credit FTE students to FTE staff is much smaller (9). Unduplicated credit student headcount includes all students enrolled for a credit course.

One out of 32 residents of the median college's service area attended the college as a credit student. Fifty percent of the colleges reported a participation rate in their service areas of between 21 and 48, indicating relatively disparate attendance rates.

The median college had 124 gross square feet per credit FTE student. The range for one-half of the colleges was between 92 and 155 gross square feet.

The median value of scholarships and grants—including Pell Grants—per credit FTE student was $761. However, one-half of the colleges reported scholarships per student ranging from $533 to $1,033.

The median college employed 2.7 credit faculty and counseling FTE staff for every one FTE academic and student services administrator and institutional support employee. This figure ranged from 2.0 to 3.7 at half of the colleges. The median college had a 1.2 to 1 relationship between nonfaculty employees and FTE faculty.

More than a third (40 percent) of credit instructional faculty were part-time employees at the median college. In contrast, approximately one-quarter (29 percent) of all FTE staff (both faculty and nonfaculty staff) were employed part-time at the median college.
Credit Units Enrolled (N=238) (Mean)

- Under 6 credits: 34.4%
- 6-11.9 credits: 30.9%
- 12 or more credits: 34.6%

Class Level (N=256) (Mean)

- Freshman: 61.7%
- Sophomore: 32.8%
- AA/AS or higher degree: 5.5%

Hours Attended (N=240) (Mean)

- Day: 57.5%
- Evening: 28.7%
- Day/Evening/Weekend: 12.9%
- Weekend: 0.9%

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

About one-third (35 percent) of students were enrolled on a full-time basis. Thirty-four percent of students were enrolled for fewer than six credit units; it is significant that this group did not qualify for financial aid.

If one assumes that community college enrollment would be approximately evenly split between first- and second-year students, it is noteworthy that only half of the entering freshmen appeared to remain in school long enough to attain sophomore status.

Although the community colleges enrolled on average 58 percent of students in the day, a significantly large percentage of students attended evening classes or a combination of day, evening, and weekend classes.
The most popular class sizes were 10-19 and 20-29 (36 percent and 30 percent respectively). While 20 percent of classes enrolled fewer than 10 students, 1 percent enrolled 50 or more students.
APPENDIX
PARTICIPATING COLLEGES AND PEER GROUP COMPOSITION

Group 1: Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment less than 1,000
Group 2: Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 1,000 through 2,499
Group 3: Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 2,500 through 4,999
Group 4: Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment from 5,000 through 9,999
Group 5: Single-college district with credit FTE enrollment of 10,000 or more
Group 6: Multi-college district

ALABAMA
- Alabama Aviation & Technical College (1)
- Alabama Southern Community College (2)
- Athens State College (2)
- Bessemer State Technical College (2)
- Bevill State Community College (3)
- Bishop State Community College (3)
- CA Fredd State Technical College (1)
- Chattahoochee Valley Community College (2)
- Chauncey Sparks State Technical College (1)
- Douglas MacArthur State Technical College (1)
- Enterprise State Junior College (2)
- Gadsden State Community College (4)
- George C. Wallace State Community College (3)
- Harry M. Ayers State Technical College (1)
- J.F. Drake State Technical College (1)
- J.F. Ingram State Community College (2)
- J.M. Patterson State Technical College (2)
- James H. Faulkner State Community College (3)
- Jefferson Davis Community College (4)
- Jefferson State Community College (3)
- John C. Calhoun State Community College (4)
- Lawson State Community College (2)
- Lurleen B. Wallace State Junior College (2)
- Northeast Alabama State Community College (2)
- Northwest Shoals Community College (2)
- Reid State Technical College (1)
- Shelton State Community College (4)
- Snead State Community College (2)
- Southern Union State Community College (3)
- Trenholm State Technical College (1)
- Wallace State Community College, Selma (2)
- Wallace State Community College, Hanceville (3)

ARKANSAS
- Mississippi County Community College (1)
- Phillips County Community College (1)
- Pulaski Technical College (1)
- Westark Community College (3)

CALIFORNIA
- College of the Siskiyous (2)
- Crafton Hills College (3)
- Imperial Valley College (3)
- Long Beach Community College (5)
- Los Angeles Community College District (6)
- Mount San Antonio College (5)
- Napa Valley Community College (4)
- Palomar Community College (5)
- San Bernardino Community College (6)
- San Joaquin Delta College (5)
- State Center Community College District (6)
- Yosemite Community College District (6)

COLORADO
- Aims Community College (3)
- Arapahoe Community College (3)
- Colorado Mountain College (3)
- Community College of Aurora (3)
- Front Range Community College (4)
- Pikes Peak Community College (3)
- Pueblo Community College (3)

CONNECTICUT
- Three Rivers Community Technical College (2)

FLORIDA
- Brevard Community College (4)
- Broward Community College (5)
- Central Florida Community College (4)

FLORIDA (cont.)
- Daytona Beach Community College (4)
- Edison Community College (4)
- Florida Community College of Jacksonville (5)
- Hillsborough Community College (5)
- Indian River Community College (3)
- Lake Sumter Community College (2)
- Miami-Dade Community College (5)
- Okaloosa-Walton Community College (3)
- Palm Beach Community College (4)
- Polk Community College (3)
- South Florida Community College (2)
- Taliahhassee Community College (4)

GEORGIA
- Atlanta Metropolitan College (2)
- Bainbridge College (1)
- Dalton College (2)
- DeKalb College (5)
- DeKalb Technical Institute (2)
- Macon College (3)
- Middle Georgia College (2)
- South Georgia College (1)
- Waycross College (1)

ILLINOIS
- Belleville Area College (4)
- Black Hawk College (4)
- City Colleges of Chicago (6)
- College of DuPage (5)
- College of Lake County (4)
- Danville Area Community College (2)
- Elgin Community College (4)
- Heartland Community College (1)
- Highland Community College (2)
- Illinois Central College (4)
- Illinois Eastern Community Colleges (6)
- Illinois Valley Community College (2)
- John A. Logan College (3)
- John Wood Community College (2)
### ILLINOIS (cont.)
- Joliet Junior College (4)
- Kankakee Community College (3)
- Kishwaukee College (2)
- Lake Land College (3)
- Lewis and Clark Community College (3)
- Lincoln Land Community College (3)
- Moraine Valley Community College (4)
- Morton College (2)
- Oakton Community College (4)
- Parkland College (4)
- Prairie State College (3)
- Rend Lake College (2)
- Richland Community College (2)
- Rock Valley College (3)
- Sauk Valley Community College (2)
- Shawnee Community College (2)
- South Suburban College (3)
- Southeastern Illinois College (2)
- Spoon River College (2)
- State Community College (1)
- Triton College (4)
- Waubonsee Community College (3)
- William Rainey Harper College (4)

### IOWA
- Des Moines Area Community College (4)
- Hawkeye Community College (4)
- Iowa Valley Community College District (6)
- Iowa Western Community College (3)
- Southeastern Community College (2)
- Western Iowa Tech Community College (2)

### KANSAS
- Allen County Community College (2)
- Barton County Community College (3)
- Butler County Community College (3)
- Cowley County Community College (2)
- Hutchinson Community College (2)
- Johnson County Community College (4)
- Kansas City Kansas Community College (3)

### MAINE
- Eastern Maine Technical College (1)
- Kennebec Valley Technical College (1)
- Northern Maine Technical College (1)

### MARYLAND
- Allegany Community College (2)
- Anne Arundel Community College (4)
- Baltimore City Community College (3)
- Catonsville Community College (4)
- Cecil Community College (1)
- Chesapeake College (1)
- Essex Community College (4)
- Frederick Community College (2)
- Garrett Community College (1)
- Harford Community College (2)
- Howard Community College (3)
- Montgomery Community College (5)
- Prince George's Community College (4)

### MASSACHUSETTS
- Berkshire Community College (2)
- Holyoke Community College (3)
- Massasoit Community College (3)
- Middlesex Community College (3)
- Mount Wachusett Community College (2)
- North Shore Community College (3)

### MICHIGAN (cont.)
- North Central Michigan College (2)
- Northwestern Michigan College (3)
- Oakland Community College (5)
- Schoolcraft College (4)
- St. Clair County Community College (3)

### MINNESOTA
- Anoka Ramsey Community College (3)
- Hibbing Community College (2)
- Minnesota Community Colleges (6)
- St. Cloud Technical College (2)

### MISSISSIPPI
- Coahoma Community College (1)
- East Central Community College (2)
- Hinds Community College (6)
- Jones County Junior College (3)
- Meridian Community College (2)
- Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College (2)
- Northeast Mississippi Community College (4)
- Northwest Mississippi Community College (3)

### MISSOURI
- East Central College (2)
- Jefferson College (3)
- Metropolitan Community Colleges (6)
- Ozarks Technical Community College (2)
- St. Charles County Community College (3)
- Three Rivers Community College (2)

### MONTANA
- College of Technology, University of Montana - Missoula (1)
- College of Technology of Montana Tech (1)
- Dawson Community College (1)
- Flathead Valley Community College (2)
- Montana State University - Great Falls Coll. of Technology (1)
- Montana State University - Billings Coll. of Technology (1)

### NEBRASKA
- Central Community College (3)
- Metropolitan Community College (4)
- Mid-Plains Community College Area (2)
- Southeast Community College (4)
- Western Nebraska Community College (2)
NEVADA
Great Basin College (2)
Truckee Meadows Community College (3)

NEW JERSEY
Atlantic Community College (3)
Brookdale Community College (4)
Burlington County College (3)
County College of Morris (4)
Cumberland County College (2)
Mercer County Community College (3)
Ocean County College (4)

NEW MEXICO
Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute (5)
Clovis Community College (2)
Santa Fe Community College (2)

NEW YORK
Adirondack Community College (2)
Corning Community College (3)
CUNY Borough of Manhattan Community College (6)
CUNY Queensborough Community College (4)
Dutchess Community College (3)
Fashion Institute of Technology (4)
Finger Lakes Community College (3)
Geneseo Community College (3)
Hudson Valley Community College (4)
Jefferson Community College (2)
Monroe Community College (4)
Nassau Community College (5)
North Country Community College (2)
Onondaga Community College (4)
Orange County Community College (3)
Schenectady County Community College (2)
Suffolk Community College (5)
Sullivan County Community College (2)
Westchester Community College (4)

NORTH CAROLINA
Alamance Community College (2)
Beaufort County Community College (1)
Cape Fear Community College (3)
Catawba Valley Community College (2)
Central Piedmont Community College (5)
Coastal Carolina Community College (2)

NORTH CAROLINA (cont.)
Durham Technical Community College (3)
Gaston College (3)
Haywood Community College (2)
James Sprunt Community College (1)
Johnston Community College (2)
Lenoir Community College (2)
Mayland Community College (1)
Rockingham Community College (2)
Southeastern Community College (2)
Surry Community College (2)
Vance-Granville Community College (2)
Wayne Community College (2)
Wilkes Community College (2)

NORTH DAKOTA
North Dakota State College of Science (2)

OHIO
Central Ohio Technical College (2)
Cincinnati State Technical and Community College (3)
Clark State Community College (3)
Columbus State Community College (5)
Cuyahoga Community College (5)
Hocking College (3)
Lakeland Community College (3)
Lorain County Community College (5)
North Central Technical College (2)
Owens Community College (4)
Sinclair Community College (5)
Southern State Community College (2)
Stark Technical College (2)

OKLAHOMA
Carl Albert State College (2)
Connors State College (2)
Northeastern Oklahoma A&I College (2)
Oklahoma City Community College (4)
Rose State College (4)
Western Oklahoma State College (1)

OREGON
Clackamas Community College (2)
Columbus Community College (1)
Lane Community College (4)
Linn-Benton Community College (3)
Rogue Community College (2)

OREGON (cont.)
Umpqua Community College (2)

PENNSYLVANIA
Community College of Allegheny County (5)
Community College of Philadelphia (5)
Delaware County Community College (4)
Harrisburg Area Community College (4)
Northampton County Area Community College (3)
Westmoreland County Community College (3)

RHODE ISLAND
Community College of Rhode Island (4)

SOUTH CAROLINA
Aiken Technical College (2)
Central Carolina Technical College (2)
Chesterfield-Marlboro Technical College (1)
Florence-Darlington Technical College (2)
Greenville Technical College (4)
Horry-Georgetown Technical College (2)
Midlands Technical College (4)
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College (2)
Spartanburg Technical College (3)
Technical College of the Lowcountry (2)
Tri-County Technical College (2)
Trident Technical College (4)
Williamsburg Technical College (1)
York Technical College (2)

TENNESSEE
Chattanooga State Technical Community College (3)
Dyersburg State Community College (2)
Jackson State Community College (2)
Motlow State Community College (2)
Northeast State Technical Community College (2)
Pellissippi State Technical Community College (4)
Roane State Community College (3)
State Technical Institute at Memphis (4)
Walters State Community College (4)

TEXAS
Alamo Community College District (6)
Amarillo College (3)
Angelina College (2)
Blinn College (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Borger Junior College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazosport College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Texas College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cisco Junior College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarendon College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of the Mainland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collin County Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas County Community College District</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Del Mar College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Paso County Community College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grayson County College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston Community College System</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilgore College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laredo Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McLennan Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navarro College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Central Texas College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Harris Montgomery Community College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odessa College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest Texas Junior College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarrant County Junior College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple Junior College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texarkana College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Southmost College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas State Technical College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity Valley Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vernon Regional Junior College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weatherford College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Texas College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>John Tyler Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Empire Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New River Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Henry Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul D. Camp Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rappahannock Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Bland College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest Virginia Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Nelson Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidewater Community College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Highlands Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Western Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wytheville Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Bellevue Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centralia College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Colleges of Spokane</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everett Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olympic College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renton Technical College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoreline Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacoma Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Blackhawk Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fox Valley Technical College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gateway Technical College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeshore Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Area Technical College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-State Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukee Area Technical College</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Casper College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laramie County Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Wyoming Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Wyoming Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The colleges listed are community colleges in each state.
- The count beside each college name indicates the prominence or significance of the college within the respective state.
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