2025 Peer Report: Nebraska Community Colleges







Approved by the Commission May 16, 2025



FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

COMMISSIONERS

Dr. Paul Von Behren, Chair *Fremont, District 3*

Timothy Daniels, Vice Chair *Omaha, Member-at-Large*

Dr. Deborah Frison *Omaha, District 2*

Dr. LeDonna Griffin *Omaha, Member-at-Large* **Dr. Dennis Headrick** *Lincoln, District 1*

Mary Lauritzen West Point, Member-at-Large

Dannika Nelson Oakland, Member-at-Large Molly O'Holleran North Platte, District 6

Tamara Weber Columbus, District 5

W. Scott Wilson *Plattsmouth, Member-at-Large*

STAFF

Dr. Michael Baumgartner *Executive Director*

Dr. Kathleen Fimple Academic Programs Officer

Jill Heese Research Director

Kadi Lukesh Bookkeeper, Budget Coordinator, & Office Manager J. Ritchie Morrow Financial Aid Officer

Helen Pope Executive Assistant

Matthew Roque Capital Project & Financial Analyst **Celeste Thompson** Excellence in Teaching Act (ETA) Specialist

Gary Timm Chief Finance & Administrative Officer

Joe Velasquez Database Manager

Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education 140 N. 8th Street, Suite 300 · P.O. Box 95005 · Lincoln, NE 68509-5005 Phone: (402) 471-2847

The Commission's reports are available online at ccpe.nebraska.gov/reports

The Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education is an equal opportunity employer. As such, the Coordinating Commission does not discriminate with regard to race, color, religion, age, sex, marital status, national origin, or mental or physical disability.

Table of Contents

Introduction1
Evaluation Process
Data Source2
Selection Criteria2
Screening Variables2
Evaluation Variables5
Rational for Selection Criteria and Evaluation Variables5
Peers and Alternates7
Central Community College9
Metropolitan Community College11
Mid-Plains Community College13
Northeast Community College15
Southeast Community College17
Western Nebraska Community College19
Suitability of Peers over Time21
Appendix A22

Introduction

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 85-1413(5)(g) requires that Nebraska's Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education (CCPE) establish peer groups for public institutions in Nebraska. *The Comprehensive Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education* further defines the Commission's purpose for establishing peer groups for Nebraska public colleges and universities as follows:

Peer Groups

A peer institution is one that is representative of the institution to which it is compared. The Commission is required by statute to identify peer institutions for each public postsecondary education institution in the state. The Commission reviews and compares several characteristics of institutions, such as enrollment and program offerings, in identifying peers. Peer groups are used for budget and program review, as well as for other comparisons that will aid in Commission decision making. The Commission's purpose for the use of peer groups does not include influencing the collective bargaining process.

Selection of peer groups for Nebraska's community colleges was last conducted in 2014. These peer groups were to remain in effect for 10 years, provided that the peers remained suitable over time. If at any time one of the community colleges felt that a peer was no longer viable, the institution was encouraged to contact the Commission to review the peer in question. Since peer groups have been in effect since 2014, the Commission deemed it necessary to develop updated peer groups for Nebraska's six community colleges.

For the Commission's purposes, <u>peer institutions</u> are defined as institutions sufficiently similar in mission, programs, size, students, wealth, etc., and are used to establish basic central tendencies. <u>Aspirational institutions</u> in some ways excel the target institution, which would like to emulate the aspirational institutions' accomplishments and set similar goals.¹ <u>Competitors</u> are rival institutions contesting for students, faculty, research dollars, etc.

The Commission staff identified peer institutions consistent with the definition above. As the peer groups are used for program reviews, budget analysis, tuition and fees comparisons, facilities analysis, and similar types of comparisons, aspirational and competitor institutions were not specifically included. Commission staff worked with the community colleges during the evaluation process to ensure selection of the most suitable peer institutions.

The following report describes the peer selection process utilized by the Commission for the community colleges. The Commission's updated peer groups for the community colleges are outlined in Table 8, Table 9, Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13.

¹ Halstead, K. (1991). *Higher Education Revenues and Expenditures: A Study of Institutional Costs.* Washington DC: Research Associates of Washington.



Evaluation Process

Data Source

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) served as the data source for the listing of potential peers. For all variables, the Commission used the most up-to-date data available. To obtain a more accurate snapshot of the program offerings at each institution, the Commission aggregated two-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes into seven discipline clusters. In addition, data regarding the institutions' multi/single campus classification was obtained from the American Association of Community Colleges and matched to the IPEDS list to form the original database of peers used in the Commission's evaluation.²

Selection Criteria

The Commission focused on key *input variables*—open admission policy, 12-month full-time equivalency (FTE), percent of students from historically underrepresented minorities, etc.—that are likely to affect outcome variables. *Outcome variables*, such as graduation and retention rates, were excluded from the Commission's analysis.

Focusing on these key variables, peers were selected through the use of screening variables as well as evaluation variables. Institutions not matching on identified important categorical criteria or falling outside Commission-established parameters for numeric variables were withdrawn, at least temporarily, from consideration.

Screening Variables

The listing of potential peers was narrowed by first applying selection criteria to screen in/out potential peer institutions. The use of screening variables ensures essential characteristics of each college are present in its respective peer group. For example, since it would be illogical to compare Nebraska's community colleges to four-year institutions, four-year institutions were screened completely out of the potential peer pools. (See <u>Rational for Selection Criteria</u> for more information on selection criteria.)

As outlined in Table 1, the following screening variables were utilized for the community colleges: location, sector, degree-granting status, open admission policy, and state and local appropriations. Through the implementation of these screening variables, the remaining peer pools for the community colleges were reduced to 754 institutions.

² Multi/single campus classification data from the American Association of Community Colleges is proprietary and was only authorized to be used by the Commission for community college peer group selection.



Table 1

Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
1. Data source	Institutions that reported to IPEDS in 2023	6,134
2. Location	U.S. only	5,994
3. Sector	Public, 2-year	875
4. Degree-granting status	Degree-granting	801
5. Open admission policy	Yes	776
6. State + local appropriations	> \$0	755
7. Removal of Central, Metro, Mid- Plains, Northeast, Southeast, or Western Nebraska from its own peer pool	Central, Metro, Mid-Plains, Northeast, Southeast, or Western Nebraska	754

Screening Variables Applicable to All Community Colleges

Note. Steps 1-5 were conducted for all of Nebraska's community colleges during the initial custom data file download in IPEDS. Steps 6-7 were conducted for all of Nebraska's community colleges after the initial data file was downloaded from IPEDS. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

For the next phase of the selection process, screening variables were individually tailored to each community college for CIP codes, 12-month FTE, percentage of students that are minorities, percentage of students that are dually enrolled, housing, athletics, and degree of urbanization (see Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7).

Table 2

Screening Variables Applicable to Central Community College

011				
Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N		
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	47, 52, 51, 48, 43	393		
9. 12-month FTE	1,700 - 6,800	203		
10. % of students who are minorities	< 50% minority	141		
 % of students who are dually enrolled 	> 20% dual enrollment	100		
12. Housing and athletics	Offers housing and athletics	30		
Note Others 0.40, and is it is all to have the Ochever of Ochever of the Ochever				

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Central Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Table 3

Screening Variables Applicable to Metropolitan Community College

Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	24, 47, 51, 52, 11	638
9. 12-month FTE	4,000 - 17,000	179
10. % of students who are minorities	< 60% minority	109
11. % of students who are dually enrolled	> 20% dual enrollment	45
12. Degree of urbanization	City: large, suburb: large	21
Mate. Otene 0.40 were individually tailed	and to Matrice aliters. Company with Callers	Data anuman

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Metropolitan Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Table 4

Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	24, 51, 47, 52, 46	630
9. 12-month FTE	800 - 3,000	309
10. % of students who are minorities	< 40% minority	197
 % of students who are dually enrolled 	> 20% dual enrollment	167
12. Housing and athletics	Offers housing and athletics	48

Screening Variables Applicable to Mid-Plains Community College

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Mid-Plains Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Table 5

Screening Variables Applicable to Northeast Community College

Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	51, 1, 52, 46, 11	260
9. 12-month FTE	1,100 - 4,500	143
10. % of students who are minorities	< 40% minority	91
11. % of students who are dually enrolled	> 20% dual enrollment	72
12. Housing and athletics	Offers housing and athletics	19

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Northeast Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Table 6

Screening Variables Applicable to Southeast Community College

V 11	, <u>,</u>	
Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	51, 52, 1, 24, 47	621
9. 12-month FTE	4,000 - 8,000	123
10. % of students who are minorities	< 50% minority	63
11. % of students who are dually enrolled	> 15% dual enrollment	47
12. Housing and athletics	Offers housing or athletics	34

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Southeast Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Table 7

Screening Variables Applicable to Western Nebraska Community College

Variable Description	Screen In Responses	Remaining N
8. Top 3 out of 5 CIP codes	51, 24, 46, 52, 13	551
9. 12-month FTE	500 - 1,500	147
10. % of students who are minorities	< 50% minority	111
 % of students who are dually enrolled 	> 20% dual enrollment	94
12. Housing and athletics	Offers housing and athletics	32

Note. Steps 8-12 were individually tailored to Western Nebraska Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Evaluation Variables

After the peer pools were each reduced to between 19 and 48 institutions through screening variables, each remaining peer was evaluated on an individual basis. Variables examined during this step included completions by discipline cluster and by award level, degree of urbanization, percent of students full time, percent of students receiving Pell Grants, single/multiple campuses, location, degree of urbanization, Carnegie classifications, CCPE's 2014 peer lists, IPEDS 2024 peer lists, and institutional peer list(s) submitted to CCPE by Nebraska's community colleges (if applicable). This process further reduced the peer pools to between 15 and 19 institutions.

Rational for Selection Criteria and Evaluation Variables

The selection criteria and evaluation variables used focused on the size of the institution (via 12month FTE and the percent of students who are full-time), rather than the location of the institution. Therefore, the listing of peers had the potential to include institutions from any of the 50 states as well as Washington, D.C. Attention was paid to the location of the institution to ensure the final peer groups included institutions from an assortment of different areas.

The sector of the institution was used to restrict the control and level of the peer pools to those classified as public two-year institutions. The degree-granting status further restricted the listing to institutions that offer degrees (e.g., associate's degrees).

An institution's degree of selectivity and rigor of admission requirements influence the type of students who enroll, often serving as strong predictors of retention and graduation rates. As schools with open admission policies accept any student who applies, these institutions are more likely to experience diminished achievement rates. All of Nebraska's community colleges have open admission policies. Therefore, the selection criteria ensured the admission policy of the institution was classified as "open admission" in IPEDS.

Since Nebraska's community colleges receive local and state funding, selection criteria ensured the funding control of the institution included at least some level of local or state funding.

Selection criteria also ensured potential peers were comparable to each community college in terms of the program mix in awards granted. The top five Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes were identified for each institution. Peers that did not match the community college on at least three out of five of the top CIP codes were screened out of the pool of potential peers. Additionally, the Commission aggregated two-digit CIP codes into seven discipline clusters and analyzed the proportion of completions within each cluster. (See <u>Appendix A</u> for CIP code descriptions and discipline cluster groupings.) The proportion of completions at each award level was further examined to ensure potential peers were suitable matches.

An institution's enrollment size invariably affects countless important institutional characteristics, including facility usage, tuition income, student-to-faculty ratios, and program offerings. At the community colleges, 12-month FTE ranged from 1,011 at Western Nebraska to 8,572 at Metropolitan.



Stemming from higher incidence of poverty and lower parental educational attainment, many historically underrepresented minority students require additional academic, financial, and social supports to be successful in postsecondary education. At the community colleges, between 15% (Mid-Plains) and 42% (Metropolitan) of students are from minority racial or ethnic groups.³

Dual enrollment programs allow students to take college courses and earn credit while still in high school, and these enrollments have increased in recent years, particularly at Nebraska's community colleges. At the community colleges, between 26% (Southeast) and 44% (Mid-Plains) of 12-month enrollments are classified as dual enrollments. Most dually enrolled students do not take their college courses at a college campus, and this impacts the need for facilities, equipment, and faculty. At the national level, approximately 80% of dually enrolled students take their college courses at their high school.⁴

The number of campuses (single campus vs. multi-campus) was taken into consideration due to the impact it can have on finances. Variables related to housing and athletics were also examined due to their impact on finances and student engagement.

Based on a school's physical address and proximity to urban areas, the degree of urbanization codes found in IPEDS utilize a methodology developed by the U.S. Census Bureau's Population Division. This variable is important since an institution's surrounding area has a tremendous influence on its current and potential enrollment.

The percentage of students receiving Pell Grants was analyzed to further condense potential peers. And Carnegie classifications were evaluated to match the type of institution and the city size.

In addition, Commission staff considered the 2014 CCPE peer groups, 2024 IPEDS peer groups, and peer groups submitted to the Commission by community colleges (if applicable).

⁴ NACEP Fast Facts, National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), retrieved April 4, 2025, from <u>https://www.nacep.org/resource-center/nacep-fast-facts/</u>.



³ Excludes U.S. Nonresident students and students whose race is unknown.

Peers and Alternates

The Commission's objective was to identify distinct peer groups for the community colleges, consisting of 10 peers and two alternate peers for each community college.⁵ While the screening variables were applied across the board for the peer groups, evaluation variables allowed for closer examination of fit for institutions within each state college's peer group.

As previously stated, Commission staff worked with each community college during the evaluation process to identify updated peer groups. Each community college was given the opportunity to submit their internal peer group listings to the Commission to consider when selecting peer institutions. Central Community College and Metropolitan Community College submitted peer groups for consideration while the remaining institutions (Mid-Plains, Northeast, Southeast, and Western Nebraska) did not.

Following the application of screening variables, the Commission sent the peer pools, consisting of 15 to 19 institutions, to each community college president for their review and suggestions. Summary reports and customized datafiles were provided to each community college.

Commission staff requested that each community college review the listing of potential peers and identify 10 institutions they prefer to be classified as peers and two institutions they prefer to be classified as alternatives.

If a community college had concerns about the potential peer pool and did not feel they could identify 10 suitable peers and two alternates, the Commission requested that they suggest a replacement, along with their rationale, to be considered by the Commission as a replacement.

Central Community College initially selected seven peers and two alternates from the Commission's listing and suggested three peers that had initially been screened out of Central's peer pool. Commission staff agreed with two of these changes and asked the college to reconsider one of their recommendations. Central Community College agreed and selected a peer from the original listing.

Northeast Community College selected five peers and one alternate from the Commission's listing and suggested five peers and one alternate that were initially screened out of Northeast's peer pool because they do not offer housing. Commission staff agreed with Northeast's suggestions.

Metropolitan Community College, Mid-Plains Community College, and Southeast Community College all selected 10 peers and two alternates from the potential peer pool listings provided by the Commission. Western Nebraska Community College also selected 12 institutions from the potential peer pool listing, but the college did not state a preference for which institutions were

⁵ Alternate peers are available for permanent substitution if an institution from the peer group becomes a nonviable peer. For example, if a peer merges with another institution and increases enrollments or if a peer begins conferring a large number of bachelor's degrees, it may be prudent to exchange an alternate in place of the original peer.



peers versus alternates. Therefore, Commission staff decided which of the 12 institutions would be classified as peers and alternates.

The Commission appreciates the cooperation from the community colleges to ensure representative peer groups were selected.

The final peer groups for the community colleges are itemized in Table 8, Table 9, Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13. Additionally, maps detailing the location of each peer are included in Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, Figure 7, Figure 9, and Figure 11, and discipline cluster comparisons are provided in Figure 2, Figure 4, Figure 6, Figure 8, Figure 10, and Figure 12.



Central Community College

Table 8

Peer Group for Central Community College and Select Screening Variables

Description & Unit ID	Institution Name	State	12-Month FTE	% Minority	% Dual Enrollment
Target Instit	ution:				
180902	Central Community College	Nebraska	3,401	29%	37%
Peer Institut	tions:				
154697	Barton County Community College	Kansas	3,063	36%	8%
101161	Coastal Alabama Community College	Alabama	4,891	35%	27%
155195	Hutchinson Community College	Kansas	3,238	26%	30%
153472	Indian Hills Community College	Iowa	2,353	20%	35%
153524	Iowa Central Community College	Iowa	3,393	33%	39%
193283	Mohawk Valley Community College	New York	3,785	28%	48%
181491	Northeast Community College	Nebraska	3,007	17%	32%
176169	Northeast Mississippi Community College	Mississippi	2,720	27%	22%
181640	Southeast Community College Area	Nebraska	5,622	25%	26%
154572	Western Iowa Tech Community College	Iowa	2,935	33%	47%
Alternates:					
153630	Iowa Western Community College	Iowa	3,743	27%	31%
227401	Paris Junior College	Texas	3,002	39%	32%

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 1 Central Community College Peer Locations





Figure 2 Central Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. CCC = Central Community College; BCCC = Barton County Community College; CACC = Coastal Alabama Community College; HCC = Hutchinson Community College; IHCC = Indian Hills Community College; ICCC = Iowa Central Community College; MVCC = Mohawk Valley Community College; NECC = Northeast Community College; NEMCC = Northeast Mississippi Community College; SCC = Southeast Community College Area; WITCC = Western Iowa Tech Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Metropolitan Community College

Table 9

Peer Group for Metropolitan Community College and Select Screening Variables

Description & Unit ID	Institution Name	State	12-Month FTE	% Minority	% Dual Enrollment
Target Instit	ution:				
181303	Metropolitan Community College Area	Nebraska	8,572	42%	36%
Peer Institut	tions:				
156202	Bluegrass Community and Technical	Kontucky	6 562	20%	240/
130392	Brightneint Community College	Virginio	0,303	25/0	2470
232430	Brightpoint Community College	virginia	4,700	43%	20%
364025	Chandler-Gilbert Community College	Arizona	6,945	48%	29%
202222	Columbus State Community College	Ohio	16,740	44%	24%
153214	Des Moines Area Community College	Iowa	13,146	25%	52%
191083	Erie Community College	New York	5,854	39%	25%
145682	Illinois Central College	Illinois	4,119	27%	23%
	Jefferson Community and Technical				
156921	College	Kentucky	5,940	42%	39%
147378	Moraine Valley Community College	Illinois	7,014	46%	25%
230746	Salt Lake Community College	Utah	14,345	35%	31%
Alternates:					
183938	Camden County College	New Jersey	6,084	52%	28%
146296	Joliet Junior College	Illinois	7,742	47%	27%

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 3 Metropolitan Community College Peer Locations





Figure 4 Metropolitan Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. MCC = Metropolitan Community College Area; BCTC = Bluegrass Community and Technical College; BCC = Brightpoint Community College; CGCC = Chandler-Gilbert Community College; CSCC = Columbus State Community College; DMACC = Des Moines Area Community College; ECC = Erie Community College; ICC = Illinois Central College; JCTC = Jefferson Community and Technical College; MVCC = Moraine Valley Community College; SLCC = Salt Lake Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Mid-Plains Community College

Table 10

Peer Group for Mid-Plains Community College and Select Screening Variables

Description & Unit ID	Institution Name	State	12-Month FTE	% Minority	% Dual Enrollment
Target Instit	tution:				
181312	Mid-Plains Community College	Nebraska	1,270	15%	44%
Peer Institut	tions:				
154642	Allen County Community College	Kansas	1,140	22%	40%
168883	Bay de Noc Community College	Michigan	946	13%	38%
154907	Cloud County Community College	Kansas	987	25%	45%
155186	Highland Community College	Kansas	1,499	23%	44%
153533	Iowa Lakes Community College	Iowa	1,356	15%	42%
153922	Marshalltown Community College	Iowa	1,076	35%	55%
107460	North Arkansas College	Arkansas	1,258	17%	34%
154396	Southwestern Community College	Iowa	1,080	12%	46%
172307	Southwestern Michigan College	Michigan	1,250	25%	23%
181817	Western Nebraska Community College	Nebraska	1,011	34%	34%
Alternates:					
200192	Lake Region State College	North Dakota	854	18%	40%
240666	District	Wyoming	1,903	16%	41%

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 5 Mid-Plains Community College Peer Locations





Figure 6 Mid-Plains Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. MPCC = Mid-Plains Community College; ACCC = Allen County Community College; BNCC = Bay de Noc Community College; CCCC = Cloud County Community College; HCC = Highland Community College; ILCC = Iowa Lakes Community College; MCC = Marshalltown Community College; NAC = North Arkansas College; SWCC = Southwestern Community College; SWMC = Southwestern Michigan College; WNCC = Western Nebraska Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Northeast Community College

Table 11

Peer Group for Northeast Community College and Select Screening Variables

Description & Unit ID	Institution Name	State	12-Month FTE	% Minority	% Dual Enrollment
Target Instit	ution:				
181491	Northeast Community College	Nebraska	3,007	17%	32%
Peer Institut	ions:				
240505	Casper College	Wyoming North	2,178	17%	25%
198376	Davidson-Davie Community College Minnesota State Community and Technical	Carolina	3,277	32%	34%
173559	College	Minnesota	3,171	23%	37%
200305	North Dakota State College of Science	North Dakota	2,089	15%	41%
239460	Northcentral Technical College	Wisconsin	2,707	18%	37%
175236	Ridgewater College Rochester Community and Technical	Minnesota	2,140	21%	20%
174738	College	Minnesota	2,981	33%	24%
161545	Southern Maine Community College	Maine	3,818	21%	21%
189547	SUNY Broome Community College	New York	3,114	34%	34%
222062	Walters State Community College	Tennessee	3,397	15%	33%
Alternates:					
153533	Iowa Lakes Community College	Iowa	1,356	15%	42%
193946	Niagara County Community College	New York	2,558	25%	25%

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 7
Northeast Community College Peer Locations





Figure 8
Northeast Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. NECC = Northeast Community College; CC = Casper College; DDCC = Davidson-Davie Community College; MSCTC = Minnesota State Community and Technical College; NDSCS = North Dakota State College of Science; NCTC = Northcentral Technical College; RC = Ridgewater College; RCTC = Rochester Community and Technical College; SMCC = Southern Maine Community College; SUNYB = SUNY Broome Community College; WSCC = Walters State Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Southeast Community College

Table 12

Peer Group for Southeast Community College and Select Screening Variables

	, <u> </u>	U U						
Description		a	12-Month	%	% Dual			
& Unit ID	Institution Name	State	FTE	Minority	Enrollment			
Target Institution:								
181640	Southeast Community College Area	Nebraska	5,622	25%	26%			
Peer Institut	tions:							
364025	Chandler-Gilbert Community College	Arizona	6,945	48%	29%			
101161	Coastal Alabama Community College	Alabama	4,891	35%	27%			
153311	Eastern Iowa Community College District	Iowa	4,357	30%	42%			
191083	Erie Community College	New York	5,854	39%	25%			
198570	Gaston College	North Carolina	4,337	36%	38%			
145682	Illinois Central College	Illinois	4,119	27%	23%			
146296	Joliet Junior College	Illinois	7,742	47%	27%			
153737	Kirkwood Community College	Iowa	7,656	25%	34%			
176178	Northwest Mississippi Community College	Mississippi	5,667	45%	28%			
204945	Owens Community College	Ohio	4,454	24%	20%			
Alternates:								
212878	Harrisburg Area Community College	Pennsylvania	7,518	33%	20%			
101505	Jefferson State Community College	Alabama	5,028	36%	25%			
Note, Perce	nt minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and st	udents whose race	e is unknown	Data source	ce:			

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 9





Figure 10 Southeast Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. SCC = Southeast Community College Area; CGCC = Chandler-Gilbert Community College; CACC = Coastal Alabama Community College; EICCD = Eastern Iowa Community College District; ECC = Erie Community College; GC = Gaston College; ICC = Illinois Central College; JJC = Joliet Junior College; KCC = Kirkwood Community College; NWMCC = Northwest Mississippi Community College; OCC = Owens Community College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Western Nebraska Community College

Table 13

Peer Group for Western Nebraska Community College and Select Screening Variables

Description & Unit ID	Institution Name	State	12-Month FTE	% Minority	% Dual Enrollment				
Target Institution:									
181817	Western Nebraska Community College	Nebraska	1,011	34%	34%				
Poor Institutions									
	Bay de Nee Community College	Michigan	040	400/	200/				
168883	Bay de Noc Community College	Michigan	946	13%	38%				
154925	Coffeyville Community College	Kansas	1,119	43%	22%				
153922	Marshalltown Community College	Iowa	1,076	35%	55%				
181312	Mid-Plains Community College	Nebraska	1,270	15%	44%				
155566	Neosho County Community College	Kansas	988	19%	44%				
154129	Northwest Iowa Community College	Iowa	1,112	18%	44%				
155715	Pratt Community College	Kansas	882	24%	27%				
154396	Southwestern Community College	Iowa	1,080	12%	46%				
210155	Southwestern Oregon Community College	Oregon	1,077	29%	22%				
200341	Williston State College	North Dakota	668	26%	40%				
Alternates:									
200192	Lake Region State College	North Dakota	854	18%	40%				
194028	North Country Community College	New York	895	14%	48%				

Note. Percent minority excludes U.S. Nonresidents and students whose race is unknown. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Figure 11





Figure 12 Western Nebraska Community College Discipline Cluster Comparison

Note. WNCC = Western Nebraska Community College; BNCC = Bay de Noc Community College; CCC = Coffeyville Community College; MCC = Marshalltown Community College; MPCC = Mid-Plains Community College; NCCC = Neosho County Community College; NWICC = Northwest Iowa Community College; PCC = Pratt Community College; SWCC = Southwestern Community College; SWOCC = Southwestern Oregon Community College; WSC = Williston State College. Data source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.



Suitability of Peers over Time

Since institutions are subject to change over time, the Commission has built in a five-year evaluation process to ensure the peer groups for the community colleges remain suitable. In 2030, the Commission will verify the suitability of the peer groups and make modifications if warranted. Before any changes are finalized, the Commission will distribute the modified list to each community college for their review and suggestions. Additionally, if any community college determines at any point in time that a peer is no longer viable, it may contact the Commission to request a review of the peer group.

If no changes to the peer groups are identified by the community colleges or by Commission staff, the peer groups will remain valid until 2035, when the Commission generates new peer groups for the community colleges.



Appendix A

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Codes Discipline Clusters

Arts and Humanities

- 5 Area, ethnic, cultural, gender, and group studies
- 16 Foreign languages, literatures, and linguistics
- 23 English language and literature/letters
- 24 Liberal arts and sciences, general studies and humanities
- 30 Multi/interdisciplinary studies
- 38 Philosophy and religious studies
- 39 Theology and religious vocations
- 50 Visual and performing arts
- 54 History

Business and Communication

- 9 Communication, journalism, and related programs
- 10 Communications technologies/technicians and support services
- 22 Legal professions and studies
- 52 Business, management, marketing, and related support services

Education

13 Education

<u>Health</u>

51 Health professions and related clinical sciences

Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services

- 19 Family and consumer sciences/human sciences
- 25 Library science
- 31 Parks, recreation, leisure, fitness, and kinesiology
- 42 Psychology
- 44 Public administration and social service professions
- 45 Social sciences

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)

- 1 Agricultural/animal/plant/veterinary science and related fields
- 3 Natural resources and conservation
- 4 Architecture and related services
- 11 Computer and information sciences and support services
- 14 Engineering
- 15 Engineering/engineering-related technologies/technicians
- 26 Biological and biomedical sciences
- 27 Mathematics and statistics
- 29 Military technologies and applied sciences
- 40 Physical sciences
- 41 Science technologies/technicians

<u>Trades</u>

- 12 Culinary, entertainment, and personal services
- 43 Homeland security, law enforcement, firefighting and related protective services
- 46 Construction trades
- 47 Mechanic and repair technologies/technicians
- 48 Precision production
- 49 Transportation and materials moving



Nebraska's Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education

P.O. Box 95005, Lincoln, NE 68509-5005 • 140 N. 8th St., Suite 300, Lincoln, NE 68508 Phone: (402) 471-2847

The Commission's reports are available online at ccpe.nebraska.gov/reports

Promoting high quality, ready access, and efficient use of resources in Nebraska higher education.