The National Association of Community College Teacher Education Programs (NACCTEP) promotes the community college role in the recruitment, preparation, retention, and renewal of diverse early childhood and K-12 teachers, and advances quality teacher education programs in the community college. The Association was conceived in partnership by the Maricopa Community Colleges, the League for Innovation in the Community College, and the American Association of Community Colleges in 2001.

In fall 2010, there were a total of 470 members from 188 institutions and educational partners from 45 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada.

NACCTEP is an organization comprised of
- community colleges;
- administrators, faculty, staff, and students involved in teacher education programs;
- universities with teacher education programs; and
- industry partners and professional associations that work as partners with community college teacher education programs.

NACCTEP serves as a voice for community colleges in national discussions about teacher education; supports institutions and individual members by enhancing current community college teacher education programs and serving as a resource for those looking to develop new programs; and facilitates connections between community college teacher education programs and faculty.

For more information, visit the NACCTEP website at www.nacctep.org.

“There can be no greater national priority than excellence in the preparation of our teachers. By serving as a learning community for community college teacher education programs, NACCTEP provides invaluable leadership to help achieve that priority.”

Walter G. Bumphus, President and CEO
American Association of Community Colleges
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Executive Summary

The recent and historic White House Summit on Community Colleges highlighted community colleges as essential to increasing the number of college graduates and preparing them to lead the 21st century workforce. Community colleges have always played a critical role in the preparation and professional development of individuals in a wide variety of careers. Accessible and affordable, with diverse student bodies that represent local populations, diverse programming, and established relationships with school districts and universities, community colleges are uniquely positioned to attract, prepare, and support students from all walks of life.

Community college teacher education programs have been crucial to the growth, development, and training of future teachers and current educators across America for many years. The poor economy and a renewed commitment to public service careers have led to more students and professionals considering teaching careers. Overall enrollment in community colleges has increased significantly. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2009), enrollment at community colleges increased by 16.9% from 2007 to 2009. Contributing to this increase is the fact that community college undergraduate students pay an average of 56% less in tuition and fees than those at a public four-year institution (College Board, 2010).

The important function of community colleges in teacher education is one that will continue to evolve with the changing needs of communities and states. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment of school teachers is expected to grow by 13% between 2008 and 2018 (2010). Job prospects are best for teachers in high demand fields, such as mathematics, science, and bilingual education, and in urban and rural school districts. For this reason, teaching has shown more stability than many other professions.

Dr. Jerry Pinsel, President of NACCTEP, states, “The profession of teaching gives rise to all other professions. It is imperative, then, that the preparation of every teacher is nothing less than world-class. Community college teacher preparation, the launching pad for so many of the nation’s classroom teachers, is uniquely positioned to open the profession to individuals who, in all likelihood, would never have considered college. Community college teacher education programs allow individuals, from all walks of life, to demonstrate to their own children that a college education is attainable . . . that education is truly a solid road to a better lifetime . . . that dreams can become realities.”

NACCTEP strives to provide resources for community college administrators and teacher education program administrators, faculty, and staff as they develop new and enhance existing programs and services. One way NACCTEP accomplishes this is by facilitating data collection through the NACCTEP Profile Survey. A total of 111 member institutions, equaling 60% of NACCTEP’s colleges and partner members at the time, responded to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey. Results of member submitted surveys have allowed NACCTEP to formulate some general conclusions about teacher education and early childhood programs at community colleges, including programs offered, trends in funding and student enrollment, and partnership efforts.

Highlights from the 2009-2010 NACCTEP Profile Survey

- Sixty percent of NACCTEP member institutions responded to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey.
- Ninety-eight percent of responding institutions collaborate with local PreK-12 schools.
- Ninety percent of responding institutions offer associate’s degrees in early childhood education; 86% percent offer associate’s degrees in elementary education.
- Early childhood and teacher education students continue to be largely Caucasian and female.
- Sixty-seven percent of responding institutions experienced an increase in teacher education program student enrollment.
- Sixty-five percent of responding institutions report having a statewide associate’s degree specific to early childhood or teacher education that transfers to four-year institutions.
- Forty-eight percent of responding institutions have seen decreases in program funding.
- Eleven percent of responding institutions had applied for National Science Foundation funding within the last five years; 50% percent of those who applied received funding.
Introduction

The NACCTEP Profile Survey was created to profile the numerous and diverse teacher education programs that exist at community colleges nationwide. The purpose of the survey is to showcase teacher education programs at member colleges; identify state and national issues and trends; provide a resource for community colleges to use in their efforts to create and/or improve their own teacher education programs; assist NACCTEP in its advocacy efforts; and serve as a national data source for community college teacher education program information.

This report includes an overview of respondents’ community college teacher education programs, as well as information about enrollment; funding; articulation with four-year institutions; collaboration and partnership efforts; grants; and teacher education and early childhood student demographics. NACCTEP uses Profile Survey results to guide Association advocacy and support efforts.

Most importantly, results of this survey demonstrate that in order to meet the need for highly qualified teachers throughout the nation, member colleges are offering a diversity of program options, and working hard to develop partnerships with PreK-12 school districts, other colleges and universities, and businesses in their states.

Methodology

The 2009-2010 Profile Survey is NACCTEP’s fourth comprehensive effort to gather and disseminate community college teacher education program data. Previous surveys were conducted in 2005, 2006, and 2008, and completed by an average of 51% of member institutions. In summer 2010, NACCTEP administrators revised survey questions in response to member suggestions. Throughout fall 2010, NACCTEP sent a series of emails to each member about the history, purpose, and importance of the NACCTEP Profile Survey. Emails included instructions on how to complete and submit the survey, and avoid duplication of data submission by collaborating with other NACCTEP members at their institution. Members were asked to submit their survey responses online using a web-based survey tool. In order to facilitate data collection, survey questions were attached to email requests in PDF format, and follow up included individualized emails about submission and completion.

Institutional Characteristics

One hundred and eleven member institutions from 35 states, or 60% of NACCTEP membership at the time, responded to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey. Ninety-nine percent were public institutions and 1% were tribal institutions. Ninety-five percent were two-year colleges, 4% were four-year institutions, and 1% were educational partner members. A range of institution representatives, from faculty to institutional research personnel to deans, completed the survey.

Enrollment

Sixty-seven percent of responding NACCTEP member institutions with teacher education programs indicated an increase in the number of students enrolled in the past two years. Of those indicating an enrollment increase, 17% increased up to 5%, 32% increased 6-10%, 14% increased 11-20%, 10% increased 21-30%, and 19% increased by more than 30%. Seventeen percent of responding institutions’ enrollment numbers decreased, and 16% stayed the same. Of those that indicated a decrease, 29% reported a decrease of up to 5%, but 23.5% reported a decrease of over 30%.

Fifty-seven percent of responding NACCTEP member institutions with early childhood programs indicated an increase in the number of students enrolled in the past two years. Of those indicating an enrollment increase for these programs, 17% increased up to 5%, 27% increased 6-10%, 19% increased 11-20%, 15% increased 21-30%, and 17% increased by more than 30%. Twenty percent of responding institutions’ enrollment numbers decreased, and 23% stayed the same. Of those that indicated a decrease, the majority reported a decrease of no more than to 10%.

Graphics 1 and 2 depict enrollment trends for 2009-2010.*
Profile of Programs

The 2009-2010 Profile Survey asked member colleges to indicate what types of teacher education programs they were currently offering. As a whole, statistics show that from the 2007-2008 survey to the 2009-2010 survey the percentage of colleges offering a wide range of program options remained relatively stable, with the highest percent of member colleges offering associates degrees in early childhood (90%) and elementary education (86%), and certificates of completion and/or workplace certificates in early childhood (71%). However, the percentage of responding institutions offering associate’s degrees in middle school and secondary education increased (from 34% to 45% and from 52% to 60%, respectively), as did those offering professional development/extended credentials in early childhood (from 22% to 31%).

In addition to the courses of study outlined in Graphic 3, NACCTEP member colleges offered options such as individual education courses without a formalized program; teaching assistant/paraeducator degrees and certificates; ESL certification programs; transfer degrees in Physical Education, Art Education, and Music Education; continuing education/recertification courses for teachers; non-credit professional development opportunities for teachers; and therapeutic intervention coursework for educators.

Funding

Thirty-nine percent of member institutions responding to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey reported that their funding levels have remained the same for the past two years. Of those who saw program funding changes, 48% revealed that their funding had been decreased, while 13% noted funding increases. When asked about how funding changes had affected programs, members responded with a variety of positive and negative impacts. Those who experienced institutional or program funding decreases in the past two years indicated the following effects.

- Decreases in the number of course offerings or class sections
- Faculty and staff reduction
- Increased class sizes
- Limited opportunity for travel, professional development such as conferences or statewide meetings, and recruitment activities
- Decreased or no development of recruitment materials
- Limited faculty release time
- Projects that start and stop, providing students with less seamlessness
- Inability to grow programs and projects
- Reduction of supplies, tutoring programs, and student support services
- Negative impact on program quality, or “doing the same with less”
- More costs passed on to students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>CREDENTIAL/DEGREE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Certificate of Completion or Workplace Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Education</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphic 3: Courses of Study
Those member colleges that saw funding increases in the past two years noted the following effects. Many colleges enjoying funding increases seem to be doing so as a result of grant monies.

- Ability to hire more faculty and staff, and/or save positions
- Increase in student enrollment
- Opportunity to build new classrooms and facilities (such as a professional resource center, technology program, and library)
- Ability to extend program services, serve a greater population, and offer additional programs
- Increased funding for future teachers clubs and advertising
- Opportunity to revise curriculum
- Ability to move initiatives and partnerships forward

Grants

The 2009-2010 NACCTEP Profile Survey asked respondents about their participation in grant programs and activities. With the increase in funding opportunities specific to community colleges, NACCTEP was particularly interested in assessing the percentage of member colleges that had applied for National Science Foundation (NSF) grant funds in the past five years. Surprisingly, only 11% of responding institutions had applied for an NSF grant during that time period. Seventy-four percent had not attempted to secure NSF grant monies in the past five years, and 15% did not know. Of those who did apply for NSF funding, 50% were awarded funding. Member college NSF projects were funded through the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program, Advanced Technological Education Program, and EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement Program.

Thirty responding colleges reported participation in a variety of additional (non-NSF) teacher education and/or early childhood grants as follows.

- State grants including Career and Technical Education; early education and child care provider professional development; Great Start Readiness Program; Professional Career Pathway Project; Grow Your Own Teacher Scholarship Program; TEACH Early Childhood Arizona; Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund; Educational Aide Exemption; Special Education Tuition Reimbursement; First Things First; Connect 9 Math; Fast Packs; Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs; Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund; and California Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention Initiative.

- Federal grants including Title III; Early Reading First; Child and Adult Care Food Program; Office of Special Education Programs; Transition to Teaching; Special Education-Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities; Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program; Head Start; American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; and College Cost Reduction and Access Act.

- Grants through private foundations including Dow Community; Packard Foundation; American Association of Community Colleges; and Helios Education Foundation.

Student Profile

In comparison to 2005-2006, in which only 18% of survey respondents answered questions about the age, gender, and racial/ethnic makeup of their student population, and 60% in 2007-2008, 81% of 2009-2010 Profile Survey responses included at least some student demographic information. This increase may be the result of trends necessitating community colleges to quantify their efforts in order to demonstrate the key role they play in preparing future teachers, and the need to satisfy national and state requests. It may also be a result of a concerted effort by NACCTEP to simplify the Profile Survey and encourage the submission of this important data.

According to survey respondents who provided student demographic information, early childhood and teacher education students continue to be largely female (92% in early childhood programs and 80% in teacher education programs). The majority of students are Caucasian (non-Hispanic), with a higher distribution in teacher education courses of study (60%) than in early childhood pathways (53%). The rate of Hispanic and African American students follow that of
Caucasian students in both early childhood and teacher education programs, with a much smaller percentage of Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander, and those of “two or more races.” The highest percentage of students in both early childhood and teacher education programs are 20 to 40 years old (60% and 59%, respectively). Twenty-seven percent of students in all programs are under the age of 20, and 14% are over 40. Graphics 4 and 5 represent student demographic information submitted for early childhood and teacher education courses of study.

The teacher education and early childhood courses of study of responding institutions vary in size and capacity. The majority of early childhood programs, for instance, report over 100 students enrolled. However, 7% are as small as 25 students or less. Similarly, 81% of teacher education programs have over 100 students enrolled, but 3% have 25 or less. Graphic 6 depicts teacher education and early childhood program sizes.

### Articulation

Sixty-five percent of survey respondents, representing 29 states, reported having a statewide associate’s degree specific to early childhood and/or teacher education that transferred to all state funded universities in their state. Eighty-four percent of respondents in 33 states reported having associate’s degrees specific to teacher education and/or early childhood that transferred to one or some of the four-year institutions in their state. All 29 states reporting a statewide associate’s degree pathway also reported associate’s degrees specifically designed to meet the requirements for individual state universities and colleges.

Examples of statewide associate’s degree articulation agreements included an Associate in Arts in Elementary Education, Associate of Arts in Teacher Education, Associate of Science in Teaching, Associate of Arts in Secondary Math, Associate of Science in General Studies with Teacher Education Specialization, and state approved Paraeducator Certificate. Those with pathways specific to individual state universities included a variety of associate’s degrees in teacher education and child development options, including associate’s degrees (AA) and associate’s in applied sciences (AAS).

NACCTEP member colleges identified numerous statewide, regional, or local policies or practices that support articulation and transfer efforts, including
• statewide articulation agreements;
• statewide articulation task forces and/or oversight committees;
• state legislative mandates;
• state Boards of Regents or Departments of Higher Education policies or guidelines;
• common course guidelines and/or numbering systems;
• dual enrollment agreements with four-year institutions;
• specialized community college departments facilitating articulation and transfer agreements;
• collaboration with PreK-12 schools;
• university programs offered on community college campuses;
• regular meetings between community college and four-year institutions’ teacher education and/or early childhood programs;
• web-based course equivalency guides; and
• agreements supported and maintained by individual colleges and universities, some of which allow for a larger number of transferable credits.

Collaboration

Ninety-eight percent of NACCTEP member colleges who responded to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey reported collaboration with local PreK-12 schools, 10% more than did so for the 2007-2008 Profile Survey. Collaboration took place for the purposes listed below, in order of prevalence.

• Field placement agreements (83%)
• Recruitment efforts (64%)
• Collaborative committee/group efforts (61%)
• Dual enrollment efforts (60%)  
• Teacher education/early childhood course provision (59%)  
• Grant activities (39%)  
• General education course provision (33%)

Collaboration also occurred to facilitate joint high school diplomas as in the case of a middle or early college, for non-credit bearing professional development purposes (e.g., seminars), and in joint ventures such as a college-based early learning lab operated by a local school district.

Ninety-six percent of respondents also collaborated with four-year institutions. These efforts took place as a result of articulation efforts (94%), transfer efforts (91%), collaborative committee/group efforts (67%), recruitment efforts (59%), grant activities (41%), and state/institutions of higher education boards (32%).

In addition, 95% of respondents collaborated with at least one of the following entities.

• Community agencies/councils/child advocacy groups
• Professional associations and organizations
• Early childhood/child development/child care programs
• (Other) two-year colleges
• State/regional departments of education
• Higher education councils/commissions
• Local businesses

Collaborative efforts with the partners listed above took place primarily for the purposes of professional development; program support and advocacy; solicitation of grant partners, scholarship funds, and service learning experiences; networking with local businesses and agencies; and connecting with communities through tutoring services, volunteer opportunities, and parent classes.

Graphic 7 represents the types of agencies with which responding member colleges partnered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILE OF PARTNERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools/Districts</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Institutions</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agencies/Councils/Child Advocacy Groups</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations/Organizations</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood/Child Development/Child Care Programs</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Colleges</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Regional Departments of Education</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Commissions/Councils</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Businesses</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphic 7: Profile of Partners
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Implications

The 2009-2010 Profile Survey results allow NACCTEP to make some general statements regarding the provision and development of community college teacher education and early childhood programs.

Enrollment and Funding

The majority of member college teacher education and early childhood programs continue to see an increase in enrollment numbers. As students and their families seek a less expensive alternative to four-year institutions and laid-off workers return to school for retraining, many community colleges can expect to see additional enrollment increases due to tough economic times. However, as demand is rising, almost half of member colleges are losing resources as federal, state, and local governments cut back on budgets. Budget cuts, resulting in inadequate staffing, reduced class sections, and larger class sizes, threaten not only opportunities for students but the ability of community colleges to meet the needs of their communities, and the ability of the American workforce to react to current market trends.

Regardless of the economic downturn, the nation as a whole will always need qualified teachers and paraprofessionals. NACCTEP member colleges continue to provide innovative and diverse programming and develop partnerships with local schools, agencies, and businesses. In this way, community colleges are actively demonstrating their ability to address the educational needs of their communities and the country.

Grants

The current emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) has allowed for more funding opportunities for community colleges through NSF. This is a trend that will continue for the foreseeable future. Specific areas of interest for teacher education include teacher preparation, teacher quality, and the development of more STEM educators. With declining resources and limited budgets at nearly 50% of our community colleges, these funding opportunities provide forums for expanding partnerships and cultivating innovative programs.

NACCTEP member institutions continue to seek teacher education and early childhood grant opportunities through state and national programs, private foundations, and partnerships with local schools and businesses. However, despite the high priority placed on STEM education in the national arena, the percentage of member colleges seeking NSF funds is at only 11%. Projects that promote and increase STEM expertise at member colleges can only improve the visibility of community colleges as viable options for those interested in the STEM areas.

Articulation

Helping community college students to move seamlessly to public four-year institutions to complete their degrees has long been an area of concern of states and higher education professionals. Community colleges are the primary access point to higher education for traditionally underrepresented students, such as low-income, minority, and nontraditional students. Obtaining an associate’s degree en route to a bachelor’s degree program is the lower cost option, but the transition from two-year to four-year program is often fraught with barriers.

Despite the barriers, efforts are being made in many states to clear the pathway from community colleges to four-year colleges and universities. NACCTEP members continue to work diligently to develop articulation agreements with four-year institutions. With each iteration of the NACCTEP Profile Survey, a higher percentage of survey respondents report the existence of articulation agreements specific to teacher education and early childhood. By serving on statewide articulation boards and encouraging ongoing discussions between two- and four-year institutions, member colleges are leading the way in the development of new pathways.
Student Data Collection

The Commission on Access, Admissions and Success in Higher Education, formed by the College Board, was created to study the educational pipeline as a single continuum and identify solutions to increase the number of students who graduate from college and are prepared to succeed in the 21st century (2010). The commission established 10 interdependent recommendations to reach its goal of ensuring that at least 55% of Americans hold a postsecondary degree by 2025. One recommendation, to dramatically increase college completion rates, calls for improving retention, easing transfer among institutions, and implementing data-based strategies to identify retention and dropout challenges.

One hundred and eleven colleges, college systems, and partners, representing 60% of NACCTEP member institutions, felt it was important to assist NACCTEP in its effort to collect data and provide a summary of teacher education trends by responding to the 2009-2010 Profile Survey. More encouraging, though, was the number of institutions that responded to questions regarding student demographics. Unlike in years past, when only 18% to 60% of members included student data, 81% responded in 2009-2010 with at least some basic student statistics.

The need to collect up-to-date and accurate student data has become more and more critical, as the numbers of students enrolling in community colleges continues to rise and the role of community college teacher preparation programs continues to gain national recognition, and NACCTEP member institutions are increasingly doing their part to contribute to a culture of evidence at American community colleges.
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NACCTEP NEXT STEPS

The leadership of NACCTEP is committed to supporting member institutions in their efforts to provide quality teacher education and early childhood programs and services to the communities they serve. Data and information gathered from our colleges will be utilized in the following ways.

• Future publications, reports, and policy briefs will be developed based on report findings.

• Data will be used to assist NACCTEP in applying for possible funding opportunities.

• The report will be shared with external partners and legislators.

• Models of success from member colleges will be identified and shared with the membership and Association partners.

• The NACCTEP Executive Board will begin to formulate strategic goals for 2011-2012.
Institutions that responded to the 2009-2010 Survey

Anne Arundel Community College (Arnold, MD)
Blue Mountain Community College (Pendleton, OR)
Borough of Manhattan Community College (New York, NY)
Bristol Community College – Fall River Campus (Fall River, MA)
Brookdale Community College (Lincroft, NJ)
Butler Community College – El Dorado Campus (El Dorado, KS)
Butler County Community College (Butler, PA)
California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (Sacramento, CA)
Capital Community College (Hartford, CT)
Central Arizona College (Coolidge, AZ)
Century College (White Bear Lake, MN)
Cerritos College (Norwalk, CA)
Chandler-Gilbert Community College (Chandler, AZ)
City College of San Francisco (San Francisco, CA)
Cochece Community College – Sierra Vista Campus (Sierra Vista, AZ)
College of Alameda (Alameda, CA)
College of Lake County (Grayslake, IL)
College of Southern Idaho (Twin Falls, ID)
College of the Mainland (Texas City, TX)
Collin College (Allen, TX)
County College of Morris (Randolph, NJ)
Cuyahoga Community College District (Cleveland, OH)
Delaware Technical and Community College – Georgetown Campus (Georgetown, DE)
Dutchess Community College (Poughkeepsie, NY)
Erie Community College – City Campus (Buffalo, NY)
Estrella Mountain Community College (Avondale, AZ)
Florida Gateway College (Lake City, FL)
Garrett College (McHenry, MD)
Georgia Military College (Warner Robins, GA)
Glendale Community College (Glendale, AZ)
Grand Rapids Community College (Grand Rapids, MI)
Grayson County College (Denison, TX)
Gulf Coast Community College (Panama City, FL)
Harper College (Palatine, IL)
Hinds Community College – Utica Campus (Utica, MS)
Houston Community College (Houston, TX)
Howard Community College (Columbia, MD)
Illinois Valley Community College (Oglesby, IL)
Ivy Tech Community College - Columbus Campus (Columbus, IN)
Ivy Tech Community College – Northwest Campus (Michigan City, IN)
Jackson Community College (Jackson, MI)
Jamestown Community College (Jamestown, NY)
Jefferson College – Hillsboro Campus (Hillsboro, MO)
John A. Logan College (Carterville, IL)
John Tyler Community College (Chester, VA)
Johnson County Community College (Overland Park, KS)
Kapiolani Community College (Honolulu, HI)
Kirkwood Community College (Cedar Rapids, IA)
Lansing Community College (Lansing, MI)
Leeward Community College (Pearl City, HI)
Lehigh Carbon Community College (Schnecksville, PA)
Lone Star College – Cy Fair (Cypress, TX)
Lone Star College – Kingwood (Kingwood, TX)
Lone Star College – Tomball (Tomball, TX)
Lorain County Community College (Elyria, OH)
Macomb Community College (Clinton Township, MI)
Massachusetts Bay Community College – Wellesley Hills Campus (Wellesley Hills, MA)
Massasoit Community College – Brockton Campus (Brockton, MA)
McLennan Community College (Waco, TX)
Mesa Community College (Mesa, AZ)
Metropolitan Community College (Omaha, NE)
Midland College (Midland, TX)
Milwaukee Area Technical College (Milwaukee, WI)
Monroe Community College (Rochester, NY)
Montgomery College (Rockville, MD)
Moraine Valley Community College (Palos Hills, IL)
Nassau Community College (Garden City, NY)
Niagara County Community College (Sanborn, NY)
Normandale Community College (Bloomington, MN)
North Shore Community College (Danvers, MA)
Northampton Community College (Bethlehem, PA)
Northwest Florida State College (Niceville, FL)
Nunez Community College (Chalmette, LA)
Onondaga Community College (Syracuse, NY)
Palm Beach State College (Lake Worth, FL)
Palo Alto College (San Antonio, TX)
Paradise Valley Community College (Phoenix, AZ)
Pearson Teacher Education and Development (Boston, MA)
Pellissippi State Technical Community College (Knoxville, TN)
Phoenix College (Phoenix, AZ)
Pikes Peak Community College (Colorado Springs, CO)
Polk State College (Winter Haven, FL)
Portland Community College (Portland, OR)
Pulaski Technical College (North Little Rock, AR)
Queensborough Community College, CUNY (New York, NY)
Rappahannock Community College (Warsaw, VA)
Red Rocks Community College (Lakewood, CO)
Richland College (Richland, TX)
Rio Salado College (Tempe, AZ)
St. Charles Community College (Cottleville, MO)
St. Louis Community College – Meramec Campus (St. Louis, MO)
Salt Lake Community College (Salt Lake City, UT)
San Diego Mesa College (San Diego, CA)
Santa Ana College (Santa Ana, CA)
Santa Fe College (Gainesville, FL)
Santa Rosa Junior College (Santa Rosa, CA)
Scottsdale Community College (Scottsdale, AZ)
South Arkansas Community College (El Dorado, AR)
South Georgia College (Douglas, GA)
South Louisiana Community College (Lafayette, LA)
South Mountain Community College (Phoenix, AZ)
South Texas College (McAllen, TX)
Southern Arkansas University Tech (Camden, AR)
Spokane Falls Community College (Spokane, WA)
Suffolk County Community College (Selden, NY)
Tarrant County College – Northeast Campus (Hurst, TX)
Three Rivers Community College (Poplar Bluff, MO)
Treasure Valley Community College (Ontario, OR)
United Tribes Technical College (Bismarck, ND)
West Virginia University at Parkersburg (Parkersburg, WV)
Yavapai College (Prescott, AZ)
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Disclaimer
The information contained within this report is based entirely on information provided to NACCTEP by the NACCTEP membership to which the Profile Survey relates. Further, this information has been collected by NACCTEP for the exclusive use and benefit of NACCTEP and NACCTEP’s members, but is being made available to the general public. While certain efforts are made to validate the information, NACCTEP undertakes no obligation to confirm or investigate the completeness or accuracy of any of the content of this report, now or at any time in the future. Persons accessing this report assume full responsibility for their use of the information set forth herein. NACCTEP does not make any representations whatsoever as to any information provided through this report, including, without limitation, that the information contained herein will be error-free. NACCTEP shall not be liable for any damages, including, without limitation, direct, indirect, incidental, special, punitive, or consequential damages, that result in any way from your use or reliance on information provided in this report. If you need to rely on the information set forth herein for any purpose, you are urged to confirm the information set forth herein with other sources.