

INDEX

- Academic advising, 41–42
- Academic Quality Improvement Program, 71
- Access, college: growing demand for, 25; and National Community College Benchmarking Project, 68; and tuition, 6
- Accountability: and Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 52–53; growing demand for, 25; and withdrawal, 76
- Accreditation: and Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 52–53; and Student Satisfaction Inventory results, 33; and uses of Kansas Study data, 17–18, 22–23
- Achievement, measuring, 87–88, 89
- Achieving the Dream initiative, 89
- Active learning, 50
- Admissions, 42
- African American students, 42
- Alstete, J. W., 84, 93
- American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC), 52
- Ammentorp, W., 91
- Arizona, 70
- Assessment: of achievement, 87–88; and Quality Enhancement model, 63f; and uses of Kansas Study data, 20
- Astin, A. W., 40, 48, 50, 76, 77
- Atkins, S., 61
- Attendance policies, 78
- Attinasi, L. C., 91, 95
- Attitude, 75–76
- Attrition, 25, 44. *See also* Withdrawal
- Audits, 21
- Bailey, B. L., 26
- Baldwin, A., 76
- Balog, S. E., 57
- Bandura, A., 77
- Banning, J., 44
- Barak, R. J., 96
- Bauman, C., 26
- Benchmarking: versus benchmarks, 84–85; cautions about, 53; definition of, 84, 91; demand for, 83, 90; design of, 92–94; drivers of, 83; factors of success for, 91–92; importance of, 98; key components of, 91–92; limitations of, 88–89; literature on, 91; in pursuit of excellence, 53–55; for quality improvement, 52; resources for, 92–98; and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), 26–27, 28; uses of, 91
- Benchmarks: versus benchmarking, 84–85; creation of, 49; definition of, 84; of instructional effectiveness, 48–52; and Kansas Study data collection, 7–8; Kansas Study results regarding, 9; limitations of, 83–90; of National Community College Benchmarking Project, 68; of student engagement, 48–52; and use of Kansas Study data, 19–20; uses of, 84
- Bender, B. E., 92–93
- Bers, T. H., 83
- Bostian, B., 73
- Brawer, F. B., 98
- Brewer, R. G., 5
- Bryant, J. L., 25
- Budgets, 88
- Burrill, D., 96–97
- Campus Climate scale (SSI scale), 29
- Campus Support Services scale (SSI scale), 29
- Career preparation, 68
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 53
- CCSSE. *See* Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
- Central Piedmont Community College, 73–80
- Centralized budgeting, 88
- Chickering, A., 44, 62
- Classification of Instructional Programs code, 7
- Cluster sampling, 48
- Cohen, A. M., 98
- Collaborative learning, 50, 64
- Collective-bargaining agreements, 87
- College consumer profiles, 5
- Colleges: challenges of, 34; principles of, 62; rankings of, 53, 89–90; strengths of, 33–34

- Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 22–23
- Community College Benchmark Task Force, 67–68
- Community College Leadership Program (University of Texas at Austin), 47
- Community College Student Report, 48
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE): and accountability, 52–53; and accreditation, 52–53; benchmarks of educational practices in, 48–52; cautions about, 53; customized reports of, 49; overview of, 47–48; in pursuit of excellence, 53–55; Quality Enhancement Plan's integration with, 64–65; and retention, 62–64; and Tallahassee Community College, 58–65; Web site of, 53
- Community, sense of, 77
- Commuter students, 44
- Cooper, M. M., 77
- Copa, G. H., 91
- Cost comparisons, 16–23
- Cost containment, 5
- Cost-model data, 16–20
- Counseling, 41–42
- Course schedules, 43–44
- Crawford, L., 76
- Critical thinking, 63f
- Culture, college, 45, 63f, 77, 88–90
- Cureton, J., 37, 40
- Dale, P. M., 76
- Data definitions, 85–86
- Data-sharing consortium, 6
- Decision making, 17, 20
- Delaware Study, 16
- Demographic profile templates, 7
- Derby, D., 76
- Developmental math, 20
- Dewalt, M. W., 76
- Diversity, 25
- Dockery, E. R., 76
- Donsky, A. P., 94
- Dowd, A. C., 93
- Drotning, L., 5
- Durdella, N. R., 91
- EagleEYE (Enhance Your Education) initiative, 58–59
- Educational effectiveness. *See* Instructional effectiveness
- Efficiency, 17–18, 20
- Elsner, P. A., 61
- English as a Second Language programs, 23
- Enrollment: current statistics related to, 47; National Community College Benchmarking Project results regarding, 70; patterns of, 76; and Student Satisfaction Inventory, 30, 34; and uses of Kansas Study data, 21
- Environmental barriers, 77
- Epper, R. M., 92
- Ethnicity, 76, 89
- Ewell, P. T., 94
- Faculty: and Kansas Study data collection, 7–8; Kansas Study results regarding, 9; salaries of, 86–87; scholarly research of, 6; statewide contracts for, 86; student interactions with, 50–51, 54; student relationships with, 59, 61–62; and use of Kansas Study data, 16–23; workshops for, 60
- Faculty workload. *See* Instructional workload
- Financial aid: at Santa Fe Community College, 42; and withdrawal, 76
- Flexibility, institutional, 87
- Flexterms, 44
- Florida A&M, 57
- Florida State University, 57
- Foundation of Excellence, 88
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 6, 12
- Funding: and benchmark limitations, 86; of new programs, 6; and use of Kansas Study data, 19–20
- Gamson, Z. F., 62
- Goel, M., 76
- Graduation, 45
- Groff, B. H., 76
- Hanushek, E. A., 76
- Heacock, R., 96–97
- Higher Education Act, 5
- Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, 71
- Hispanic students, 42–43
- Hodum, R. L., 76
- Inger, M., 91, 97
- Institutional Priorities Survey™ (IPS), 27
- Institutional reports, 10

- Instructional costs: Kansas Study of, 6–12; and uses of Kansas Study data, 17–18
- Instructional effectiveness: benchmarks of, 48–52; benefits of, 48; and Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 47–48; at Santa Fe Community College, 43
- Instructional Effectiveness scale (SSI scale), 29–30, 43
- Instructional workload: and Kansas Study data collection, 7–8; Kansas Study results regarding, 10, 11*t*; and use of Kansas Study data, 16–23
- Jackson, D. K., 76
- Johnson County Community College Office of Instructional Research (JCCC OIR), 6, 67
- Johnson, M. M., 76
- Juhnke, R., 67
- Kansas Study of Institutional Costs and Productivity: benefits of, 23; data collection instrument of, 6–8; future of, 12–13; history of, 6; institutional perspective of, 20–23; purpose of, 6; results of, 9–12; system perspective of, 15–20; and Tennessee Board of Regents, 15–20; uses of data from, 15–23; Web site for, 8–9
- Kempner, D. E., 84
- Kniker, C. R., 96
- Kress, A. M., 37
- Kuh, G. D., 48, 49, 50, 77
- Kytle, J., 44
- Labor contracts, 86–87
- Labs, 8
- Lata, K. A., 26
- Lau, L. K., 76, 77
- League for Innovation in the Community College, 67
- Learner support, 51
- Learning communities, 63*f*, 64
- Learning outcomes, 61, 62–64, 68
- Leff, B., 96–97
- Lemeshow, S., 48
- Levine, A., 37, 40
- Levy, P. S., 48
- Malo, G., 15
- Manning, T. M., 73
- Marti, C. N., 48
- Martin, O. L., 76
- McClenney, K. M., 47, 53
- McGregor, E. N., 91, 95
- Middaugh, M. F., 6
- Miller, R., 25, 26
- Minkler, J. E., 61
- Nashville State Technical Community College (NSTCC), 20–23
- National averages, 53–54, 73
- National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education, 5
- National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP), 67; annual reports of, 70, 71*e*; and Central Piedmont Community College, 74–80; data collection in, 69–70; development of, 67–68; and enrollment, 70; participation in, 69; and project enhancement, 71; and retention, 74–75; uses of, 71–72; Web site of, 69, 70; and withdrawal, 74–75
- National Postsecondary Education Cooperative, 88
- National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report (Noel-Levitz), 33–35
- Noel-Levitz, 28, 33, 38, 40
- Nolan, K. J., 95
- O'Banion, T., 62
- Organizational performance, 68
- Orientation, 78
- Pace, C. R., 50, 77
- Part-time faculty, 6, 22
- Pascarella, E., 48, 49, 50, 77
- Peer analyses, 10, 12; and National Community College Benchmarking Project, 70, 71*e*; and uses of Kansas Study data, 17
- Peer support, 63*f*
- Performance funding. *See* Funding
- Planning and assessment cycle, 63*f*
- Pomalaza-Raez, C., 76
- Prioritization, 31, 32*f*
- Productivity: Kansas Study of, 6–12; and use of Kansas Study data, 16–23
- Program reviews, 21
- Programs: funding of, 6; and uses of Kansas Study data, 21–22
- Psychology, 22
- Quality: benchmarking for improvement of, 52; and use of Kansas Study data, 19

- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), 71;
Community College Survey of Student Engagement's integration with, 64–65;
conceptual framework of, 61–62;
factors informing, 58–61; overview
of, 58; and retention, 62–64; uses of,
62–64
- Raymond, M. E., 76
- Recruitment: and college rankings,
89–90; and Student Satisfaction Inventory
results, 33
- Registration, 43–44
- Research, 60–61
- Resnick, D. P., 95
- Resnick, L. B., 95
- Retention: at Central Piedmont Commu-
nity College, 74–80; and college cul-
ture, 77–78; and Community College
Survey of Student Engagement, 62–64;
definition of, 73–74; and National
Community College Benchmark Proj-
ect, 74–80; and Quality Enhancement
Plan, 62–64; at Santa Fe Community
College, 45
- Richardson, D., 97–98
- Salaries, 86–87
- Sandiford, J. R., 76
- Santa Fe Community College (Florida),
37–45
- Satisfaction: and attrition, 25; effects of,
26; importance of, 38; and National
Community College Benchmarking
Project, 68
- Satisfaction assessment: benefits of, 35;
methods of, 26–27; rationale for, 26;
selecting survey for, 38; and Student
Satisfaction Inventory results, 33. *See
also specific instruments*
- Schroeder, C., 25
- Search, S. P., 57
- Self-reviews, 5
- Sheldon, C. Q., 91
- Singell, L. D., 76
- Smith, T., 76
- Southern Association of Colleges and
Schools, 18, 22–23, 58, 71
- Southern Regional Education Board, 60
- Staffing problems, 20–21
- Standards, 85–86
- Statewide faculty contracts, 86
- Strange, C., 44
- Strategic planning: and Student Satisfac-
tion Inventory results, 33; and use of
Kansas Study data, 19
- Student credit hours, 10, 11t; and bench-
mark limitations, 85–86; and uses of
Kansas Study data, 17–18, 21
- Student effort, 50
- Student engagement: barriers to, 55;
benchmarks of, 48–52; definition of,
47; and initiatives for student success,
62–64; measurement of, 47–48; and
National Community College Bench-
marking Project, 68; in pursuit of
excellence, 53–55; scholarly research
in, 60–61; and teacher-learner contin-
uum, 61–62
- Student perceptions: importance of, 38;
and Student Satisfaction Inventory, 33;
survey of, 38–45
- Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI):
administration of, 28; and enrollment,
30, 34; methodology of, 26–27; over-
view of, 26, 38; reliability of, 27–28;
reviewing results of, 30–32; Santa Fe
Community College's use of, 38–45;
2005 report from, 33–35; use of data
from, 32–33; validity of, 27–28
- Student support, 51, 63f
- Student-faculty interactions, 50–51, 54
- Student-to-faculty ratios, 21, 22, 23
- Success measurement, 87–88
- Sumner, K. P., 5
- Tallahassee Community College, 57–65
- Target-group reporting, 31
- Teacher-learner continuum, 59, 61–62
- Technology: for academic advising and
counseling, 41–42; for financial aid ser-
vices, 42; for registration effectiveness,
44; to show concern to individuals, 43
- Terenzini, P., 48, 49, 50, 77
- Tinto, V., 48, 50, 61, 62, 64, 77
- Title III-A Strengthening Institutions pro-
gram, 37, 39
- Transitions, 76
- Tuition: annual reporting of, 5; and col-
lege access, 6; and withdrawal, 75
- U.S. Department of Education, 6, 28, 37
- Vanguard Learning College Project, 60
- Vare, J. W., 76
- Vesper, N., 77

- Walk-aways, 74
- Walters, E., 76
- Web administration, 28
- Weed, E., 15
- Withdrawal: at Central Piedmont Community College, 74–80; and college culture, 77–78; definition of, 73–74; factors contributing to, 75–78
- Within-term retention, 73
- Wolfe, C., 61
- Year-to-year comparison reports, 31–32

