




Section 5

Contexts of Postsecondary Education





Section 5

Contexts of Postsecondary Education

Contents

Introduction	111
Characteristics of Postsecondary Students	
Indicator 39. Characteristics of Undergraduate Institutions	112
Programs and Courses	
Indicator 40. Undergraduate Fields of Study	114
Indicator 41. Graduate and First-Professional Fields of Study	116
Indicator 42. Degrees Conferred by Public and Private Institutions	118
Indicator 43. Distance Education in Higher Education.....	120
Faculty and Staff	
Indicator 44. Faculty Salaries, Benefits, and Total Compensation.....	122
Finance	
Indicator 45. College Student Employment.....	124
Indicator 46. Federal Grants and Loans to Undergraduates	126
Indicator 47. Price of Attending an Undergraduate Institution.....	128
Indicator 48. Price of Graduate and First-Professional Attendance	130
Indicator 49. Tuition and Fees, Student Loans, and Default Rates	132
Indicator 50. Postsecondary Revenues and Expenses	134

Introduction

The indicators in this section of *The Condition of Education* examine features of postsecondary education, many of which parallel those presented in the previous section on elementary and secondary education. Indicators prepared for this year's volume appear on the following pages, and all indicators in this section, including those from previous years, appear on the NCES website (see the "List of Indicators on *The Condition of Education* Website" on page xxii for a full listing of indicators).

Postsecondary education is characterized by diversity both in institutional level and control and in the characteristics of students. Postsecondary institutions vary by the level of degrees awarded, control (public or private), and whether they are operated on a not-for-profit or for-profit basis. Beyond these basic differences, postsecondary institutions have distinctly different missions and provide students with a wide range of learning environments. For example, some institutions are research universities with graduate programs, while others focus on undergraduate education; some have a religious affiliation, while others do not; and some have selective entrance policies, while others have more open admissions.

The first indicator in this section examines postsecondary enrollment by institution level and control. Indicators on the website focus on the racial and ethnic concentration in postsecondary institutions, the number and characteristics of U.S. students who study in foreign countries, and international students who study in U.S. postsecondary institutions.

Indicators in this volume highlight data on degree completion, showing trends in the fields of study that undergraduate and graduate students receive their degrees in; compare the distribution of degrees awarded by institutional control; and examine the percentage of postsecondary student participating in distance education courses.

Faculty members are another defining feature of postsecondary institutions: they teach students, conduct research, and serve their institutions and communities. An indicator in this volume highlights trends in faculty salaries and benefits at different postsecondary levels and across institutional control.

Finally, *The Condition of Education* examines financial support for postsecondary education. Indicators in this volume include the number and characteristics of college students who are employed and an examination of federal grants and loans to undergraduate students. Other indicators provide measures of the price of attending a postsecondary institution, as well as student loan amounts and default rates by institution level and control. The last indicator in this volume examines the levels and sources of postsecondary revenues and expenses. Indicators on the website look at the institutional aid available to students and public funding for postsecondary institutions.

Indicators of the contexts of postsecondary education from previous editions of *The Condition of Education* not included in this volume are available at <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe>.

Characteristics of Undergraduate Institutions

In fall 2009, some 11 percent of all full-time undergraduate students attended private for-profit institutions. About 38 percent of full-time students age 35 and over attended private for-profit institutions, compared with 5 percent of full-time students under the age of 25.

Of the 18 million undergraduate students at degree-granting institutions in the United States in fall 2009, some 76 percent attended public institutions, 15 percent attended private not-for-profit institutions, and 9 percent attended private for-profit institutions (see table A-39-1). Enrollment patterns by institution control varied by race/ethnicity. For example, 17 percent of Black undergraduate students attended private for-profit institutions in fall 2009, compared with 5 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander students. Fifty-two percent of Hispanic undergraduate students and 45 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native undergraduate students attended public 2-year institutions, compared with 38 percent of White students, 40 percent each of Black students, and 42 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander students.

Among undergraduate students who were enrolled full time in fall 2009, some 11 percent attended private for-profit institutions in fall 2009. About 38 percent of full-time students age 35 and over attended private for-profit institutions, compared with 5 percent of full-time students under the age of 25. For part-time undergraduate students under the age of 25, more than two-thirds (70 percent) attended public 2-year institutions in fall 2009.

Some 77 percent of full-time students and 46 percent of part-time students who entered 4-year institutions in 2008 returned the following year to continue their studies; this percentage is the retention rate (see table A-39-2). At 2-year institutions, the retention rates for

those who entered school in 2008 were 61 percent for full-time students and 40 percent for part-time students. Among 4-year institutions, retention rates varied based on the percentage of applicants who were accepted for admission. For 4-year institutions with open admissions policies, 57 percent of full-time students and 46 percent of part-time students who enrolled in fall 2008 returned the following year. Four-year institutions that accepted less than a fourth of applicants had retention rates of 95 percent for full-time students and 60 percent for part-time students.

At 4-year public institutions with open admissions policies, 31 percent of the students who began as first-year, full-time undergraduates in 2002 completed a bachelor's degree within 6 years (by fall 2009) (see table A-39-2). In contrast, at public 4-year institutions that accepted less than a fourth of applicants, 73 percent of students who began attending in 2002 completed a bachelor's degree within 6 years. At private not-for-profit and private for-profit institutions with open admissions, the 6-year graduation rates for the 2002 cohort for bachelor's degree recipients were 35 and 13 percent, respectively.




For more information: *Tables A-39-1 and A-39-2*
Glossary: *College, Four-year postsecondary institution, Full-time enrollment, Part-time enrollment, Private institution, Public institution, Tuition, Two-year postsecondary institution*

Technical Notes

Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. For 4-year institutions, the retention rate is the percentage of first-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students who return to the institution to continue their studies the following fall. For 2-year institutions, the retention rate is the percentage of first-time degree/certificate-seeking students enrolled in the fall who either returned to the institution or successfully completed their program by the following fall. The overall graduation rate is the percentage of full-time, first-time students who graduated or transferred out of the institution within 150 percent

of normal program completion time. For a bachelor's degree, this represents 6 years. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. For more information on race/ethnicity, see *supplemental note 1*. *Full time* refers to students who enrolled full time (as defined by the institution) in the fall. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*. Institutions in this indicator are classified based on the highest degree offered. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*.

Figure 39-1. Percentage distribution of fall undergraduate enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by student attendance status, age, and control and level of institution: Fall 2009




Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. For more information on IPEDS, see *supplemental note 3*. Institutions in this indicator are classified based on the highest degree offered. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Spring 2010.

Figure 39-2. Overall annual retention rates and graduation rates within 150 percent of normal time at degree-granting institutions, by level and control of institution and student attendance status: Fall 2009



NOTE: Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. The retention rate is the percentage of first-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students who return to the institution to continue their studies the following year, in this case fall 2009. The overall graduation rate is the percentage of full-time, first-time students who graduated within 150 percent of normal program completion time, in this case by fall 2008 for the cohort that enrolled in 4-year institutions in fall 2002 and for the students that enrolled in 2-year institutions in fall 2005. For more information on IPEDS, see *supplemental note 3*. Institutions in this indicator are based on the highest degree offered. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Spring 2010.

Undergraduate Fields of Study

In 2008–09, more than half of the 1.6 million bachelor's degrees awarded were in five fields: business (22 percent), social sciences and history (11 percent), health professions and related clinical sciences (8 percent), education (6 percent), and psychology (6 percent).

Of the 1.6 million bachelor's degrees awarded in 2008–09, over 50 percent were concentrated in five fields: business (22 percent), social sciences and history (11 percent), health professions and related clinical sciences (8 percent), education (6 percent), and psychology (6 percent) (see table A-40-1). The fields of visual and performing arts (6 percent), engineering and engineering technologies (5 percent), communication and communications technologies (5 percent), and biological and biomedical sciences (5 percent) represented an additional 21 percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded in 2008–09.

Overall, there were 33 percent more bachelor's degrees awarded in 2008–09 than in 1998–99 (an increase of 401,100 bachelor's degrees awarded). Bachelor's degrees awarded in the field of parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies had the largest percent change of all fields (from 16,500 to 31,700 degrees, a 92 percent change). The next largest percent change was in the field of security and protective services (from 24,600 to 41,800 degrees, a 70 percent change). Education was the only field in which fewer bachelor's degrees were awarded in 2008–09 than in 1998–99 (a negative percent change of 5 percent).

About 57 percent of all bachelor's degrees conferred in 2008–09 were awarded to females, which was about the same as the percentage awarded to females in 1998–99. Looking at the five most prevalent bachelor's degree fields, females earned between 49 and 85 percent of the degrees awarded in those fields. In 2008–09, females earned the smallest percentages of bachelor's degrees relative to males in the fields of engineering and engineering technologies (16 percent of these degrees were awarded to females) and computer and information sciences and support services (18 percent female), both of which are considered STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields. From 1998–99 to 2008–09, there were changes in the percentages of bachelor's degrees conferred to females in several fields of study. For example, of all the bachelor's degrees conferred in the field of security and protective

services, the percentage that were conferred to females was 50 percent in 2008–09, compared with 43 percent in 1998–99. In contrast, of all the bachelor's degrees conferred in the field of computer and information sciences and support services, the percentage conferred to females was 18 percent in 2008–09, compared with 27 percent in 1998–99.

Of the 787,300 associate's degrees earned in 2008–09, about 54 percent were awarded in two broad areas of study: liberal arts and sciences, general studies, and humanities (34 percent) and health professions and related clinical sciences (21 percent). Overall, there was a 41 percent change in the number of associate's degrees awarded from 1998–99 to 2008–09 (an increase of 227,400 associate's degrees awarded). The field experiencing the largest percent change in the number of associate's degrees awarded over this time period was psychology (143 percent, from 1,600 to 3,900 degrees). Several fields experienced a decline in the number of associate's degrees awarded; for example, 4,400 fewer associate's degrees were awarded in engineering and engineering technologies in 2008–09 than in 1998–99 (a negative percent change of 8 percent).

In 2008–09, females earned 62 percent of all associate's degrees awarded. Females earned the majority of associate's degrees awarded in the fields of family and consumer sciences (96 percent were awarded to females) and legal professions and studies (90 percent female). Females earned fewer associate's degrees than males in fields such as precision production (6 percent female) and engineering and engineering technologies (11 percent female).



For more information: *Table A-40-1*


Glossary: *Associate's degree, Bachelor's degree, Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), STEM fields*

Technical Notes

The percent increases discussed in this indicator refer to aggregate fields of study. For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. The 2000 *Classification of Instructional Programs* was initiated in 2002–03. Estimates for 1998–99 have been reclassified when necessary to conform to the new

taxonomy. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.


Figure 40-1. Number of bachelor's degrees awarded by degree-granting institutions in selected fields of study: Academic years 1998–99 and 2008–09



NOTE: For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. The 2000 *Classification of Instructional Programs* was initiated in 2002–03. Estimates for 1998–99 have been reclassified when necessary to conform to the new taxonomy. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1998–99 and 2008–09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:99) and Fall 2009.

Figure 40-2. Percentage of bachelor's degrees awarded to females by degree-granting institutions in selected fields of study: Academic year 2008–09



¹ Of the 20 fields of study in which the most bachelor's degrees were awarded in 2008–09.

NOTE: For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2008–09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, "Completions Survey," Fall 2009.

Graduate and First-Professional Fields of Study

Overall, 656,800 master's degrees and 67,700 doctoral degrees were awarded in 2008–09; these numbers represent increases of 49 and 54 percent, respectively, over the numbers awarded in 1998–99. In 2008–09, females earned 60 percent of master's degrees and 52 percent of doctoral degrees awarded.

Of the 656,800 master's degrees awarded in 2008–09, over 50 percent were concentrated in two fields: education (27 percent) and business (26 percent) (see table A-41-1). During that same academic year, an additional 10 percent of all master's degrees were awarded in the field of health professions and related clinical sciences.

Overall, there were 49 percent more master's degrees awarded in 2008–09 than in 1998–99 (an increase of 216,800 master's degrees awarded). During this period, the two fields awarding the most master's degrees, education and business, saw percent changes of 51 and 57 percent, respectively, in the number of degrees awarded. In each of the 20 most popular fields of study, the number of master's degrees awarded was higher in 2008–09 than in 1998–99. The field of security and protective services had the largest percent change in the number of master's degrees awarded (from 2,200 to 6,100 degrees, a 172 percent increase). The field of physical sciences and science technologies saw the smallest percent change in the number of master's degrees awarded over this period (from 5,100 to 5,700 degrees, a 10 percent increase).

Females earned 60 percent of all master's degrees awarded in 2008–09. In the two fields awarding the most master's degrees, education and business, females earned 77 and 45 percent, respectively, of all master's degrees awarded. In addition, females earned 81 percent of all master's degrees awarded in the field of health professions and related clinical sciences. In fields such as engineering and engineering technologies and computer and information sciences and support services, however, females earned fewer master's degrees than males in 2008–09: females earned 23 percent of the master's degrees awarded in engineering and engineering technologies and 27 percent of master's degrees awarded in computer and information sciences and support services. These fields are part of a larger grouping known as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields.

Over 50 percent of the 67,700 doctoral degrees awarded in 2008–09 were awarded in four fields: health professions and related clinical sciences (18 percent),

education (13 percent), engineering and engineering technologies (12 percent), and biological and biomedical sciences (10 percent). Overall, there were 54 percent more doctoral degrees in 2008–09 than in 1998–99 (an increase of 23,600 doctoral degrees awarded). In 2008–09, more doctoral degrees were awarded in the field of health professions and related clinical sciences than in any other field, and from 1998–99 to 2008–09 the number of degrees awarded in this field increased by more than 500 percent.

Females earned about 35,400 doctoral degrees (or 52 percent of all doctoral degrees awarded) in 2008–09, an 87 percent increase over the number awarded in 1998–99. Among the top 20 fields of study, females earned the smallest percentages of doctoral degrees relative to males in 2008–09 in the fields engineering and engineering technologies and computer and information sciences and support services (22 percent female each). In contrast, females earned the greatest percentages of doctoral degrees relative to males in family and consumer sciences/human sciences (80 percent female) and health professions and related clinical sciences (74 percent female).

In 2008–09, of the 92,000 first-professional degrees awarded, 48 percent were awarded in the field of law. An additional 17 percent of first-professional degrees were conferred in medicine, and 12 percent were conferred in pharmacy. In 2008–09, 17 percent more first-professional degrees were awarded than were in 1998–99. During this period, the field of pharmacy saw the greatest percentage increase in the number of degrees awarded (183 percent), and the field of chiropractic medicine saw the greatest decrease (31 percent). Females earned 45,100 first-professional degrees in 2008–09 (49 percent of all first-professional degrees awarded in that year), representing a 32 percent increase over the number of degrees awarded to females in 1998–99.



For more information: Table A-41-1


Glossary: *Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), Doctoral degree, First-professional degree, Master's degree, STEM fields*

Technical Notes

The percent increases discussed in this indicator refer to aggregate fields of study. For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. The 2000 edition of *Classification of Instructional Programs* was initiated in 2002–03. Estimates for 1998–99 have been reclassified when necessary to conform to the new

taxonomy. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.


Figure 41-1. Number of master's degrees awarded by degree-granting institutions in selected fields of study: Academic years 1998-99 and 2008-09



NOTE: For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. The 2000 edition of *Classification of Instructional Programs* was initiated in 2002-03. Estimates for 1998-99 have been reclassified when necessary to conform to the new taxonomy. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1998-99 and 2008-09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:99) and Fall 2009.

Figure 41-2. Percentage of master's degrees awarded to females by degree-granting institutions in selected fields of study: Academic year 2008-09



¹ Of the 20 fields of study in which the most master's degrees were awarded in 2008-09.

NOTE: For more information on fields of study for postsecondary degrees, see *supplemental note 9*. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2008-09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Fall 2009.

Degrees Conferred by Public and Private Institutions

Between 1998–99 and 2008–09, the number of degrees conferred by private for-profit institutions increased by a larger percentage than the number conferred by public institutions and private not-for-profit institutions; this was true for all levels of degrees.

Between 1998–99 and 2008–09, the number of postsecondary degrees conferred by public and private for-profit and private not-for-profit institutions generally increased for each level of degree. From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of associate's degrees awarded increased by 41 percent, bachelor's degrees by 33 percent, master's degrees by 49 percent, first-professional degrees by 17 percent, and doctoral degrees by 54 percent (see table A-42-1). For all degree levels, the percentage increases were smaller for public and private not-for-profit institutions than for private for-profit institutions.

The number of associate's degrees awarded from 1998–99 to 2008–09 increased by 33 percent for public institutions (from 448,300 to 596,100 degrees) and more than doubled for private for-profit institutions (from 64,000 to 144,300 degrees), but decreased by 1 percent for private not-for-profit institutions (from 47,600 to 46,900 degrees). Due to these changes, the percentage of all associate's degrees that were conferred by private for-profit institutions increased from 11 percent in 1998–99 to 18 percent in 2008–09, while the percentage that were conferred by public and private not-for-profit institutions decreased during this period (from 80 to 76 percent and from 9 to 6 percent, respectively).

From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of bachelor's degrees awarded by public institutions increased by 29 percent (from 790,300 to 1,020,400 degrees), the number awarded by private not-for-profit institutions increased by 26 percent (from 393,700 to 496,300 degrees), and the number awarded by private for-profit institutions more than quadrupled (from 16,300 to 84,700 degrees). Despite the large gains made by private for-profit institutions, they awarded 5 percent of all bachelor's degrees conferred in 2008–09, while public institutions awarded 64 percent and private not-for-profit institutions awarded 31 percent of all bachelor's degrees.

The number of master's degrees awarded by private not-for-profit institutions increased 48 percent from 1998–99 to 2008–09, yet the percentage of master's degrees conferred by these institutions remained about the same. For public institutions, however, the number of master's degrees conferred increased at a lower rate (29 percent), resulting in a decrease in their share of all

master's degrees: public institutions conferred 54 percent of all master's degrees in 1998–99 and 47 percent in 2008–09. The number of master's degrees conferred by private for-profit institutions, on the other hand, increased by 580 percent, resulting in an increase in their share of total master's degrees conferred. Private for-profit institutions conferred 2 percent of all master's degrees in 1998–99 and 10 percent in 2008–09.

From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the percentage increases in the number of first-professional degrees awarded by public institutions and private not-for-profit institutions (18 and 16 percent, respectively) were similar to the overall 17 percent increase in first-professional degree awards. The number of first-professional degrees awarded by private for-profit institutions in 2008–09 was more than twice the number of degrees awarded in 1998–99. In 2008–09, public institutions conferred 41 percent of all first-professional degrees; private not-for-profit institutions, 58 percent; and private for-profit institutions, 1 percent. From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of doctoral degrees conferred increased by 42 percent for public institutions (from 28,100 to 39,900 degrees), by 62 percent for private not-for-profit institutions (from 15,500 to 25,200 degrees), and by almost 500 percent for private for-profit institutions (from 440 to 2,600 degrees).

Although enrollment size is not reported here, the growing number of private for-profit institutions provides context for the percentage increases in the number of degrees conferred by level and control of institution. For example, the number of private for-profit 4-year institutions increased from 190 to 530 from 1998–99 to 2008–09, accounting for most of the increase in the total number of 4-year institutions (from 2,340 to 2,720 institutions) (see table A-42-2). In addition, the number of private for-profit 2-year institutions increased from 480 to 570 during this time, while the total number of all 2-year institutions decreased from 1,710 to 1,690.



For more information: Tables A-42-1 and A-42-2

Glossary: Associate's degree, Bachelor's degree, Doctoral degree, First-professional degree, Private institution, Public institution

Technical Notes

This indicator includes only degree-granting institutions that participated in Title IV federal financial aid programs. For more information on the Integrated


Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes* 3 and 8.

Table 42-1. Number of degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions and percent change, by control of institution and level of degree: Academic years 1998–99 and 2008–09

Level of degree and academic year	Total	Public	Private		
			Total	Not-for-profit	For-profit
Number of degrees					
Associate's					
1998–99	559,954	448,334	111,620	47,611	64,009
2008–09	787,325	596,098	191,227	46,929	144,298
Percent change	40.6	33.0	71.3	-1.4	125.4
Bachelor's					
1998–99	1,200,303	790,287	410,016	393,680	16,336
2008–09	1,601,368	1,020,435	580,933	496,260	84,673
Percent change	33.4	29.1	41.7	26.1	418.3
Master's					
1998–99	439,986	238,501	201,485	192,152	9,333
2008–09	656,784	308,206	348,578	285,098	63,480
Percent change	49.3	29.2	73.0	48.4	580.2
First-professional					
1998–99	78,439	31,693	46,746	46,315	431
2008–09	92,004	37,357	54,647	53,572	1,075
Percent change	17.3	17.9	16.9	15.7	149.4
Doctoral					
1998–99	44,077	28,134	15,943	15,501	442
2008–09	67,716	39,911	27,805	25,169	2,636
Percent change	53.6	41.9	74.4	62.4	496.4

NOTE: Includes only institutions that participated in Title IV federal financial aid programs. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. See the glossary for definitions of first-professional degree and doctoral degree.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1998–99 and 2008–09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:99) and Fall 2009.

Figure 42-1. Number of degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by level of degree and control of institution: Academic years 1998–99 and 2008–09

NOTE: Includes only institutions that participated in Title IV federal financial aid programs. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. See the glossary for definitions of first-professional degree and doctoral degree.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1998–99 and 2008–09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:99) and Fall 2009.

Distance Education in Higher Education

In 2007–08, about 4.3 million undergraduate students, or 20 percent of all undergraduates, took at least one distance education course. About 0.8 million, or 4 percent of all undergraduates, took their entire program through distance education.

Distance education courses and programs provide flexible learning opportunities to both undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students. In this indicator, distance education courses include live, interactive audio- or videoconferencing; prerecorded instructional videos; webcasts; CD-ROMs or DVDs; or computer-based systems accessed over the Internet. Distance education does not include correspondence courses. In 2007–08, about 4.3 million undergraduate students, or 20 percent of all undergraduates, took at least one distance education course (see table A-43-1). About 0.8 million, or 4 percent of all undergraduates, took their entire program through distance education. The percentage of undergraduates who took any distance education courses rose from 16 percent in 2003–04 to 20 percent in 2007–08; over the same period, however, the percentage who took their entire program through distance education decreased from 5 to 4 percent. In addition to these undergraduate students, about 0.8 million, or 22 percent, of all postbaccalaureate students took distance education courses in 2007–08 (see table A-43-2). The percentage of postbaccalaureate students who took their entire program through distance education (9 percent) was higher than the percentage at the undergraduate level.

There were differences in the percentage of students participating in distance education programs by institutional control in 2007–08. A lower percentage of students at private not-for-profit institutions (14 percent) took distance education courses than students at public institutions (22 percent) or students at private for-profit institutions (21 percent) (see table A-43-1). Also, a higher percentage of students at private for-profit institutions (12 percent) took their entire program through distance education than students at either public institutions or private not-for-profit institutions (both 3 percent). Within the specific institutional controls and levels, a higher percentage of students at private for-profit 4-year institutions (30 percent) took distance education courses than students at any other control and level of institution, ranging from 6 percent at private for-profit less-than-2-year institutions to 24 percent at public 2-year institutions. Similarly, a higher percentage of students at private for-profit 4-year institutions took their entire

program through distance education (19 percent) than students at any other control and level of institution, ranging from 2 percent at public less-than-2-year, public 4-year, and private for-profit less-than-2-year institutions to 8 percent at private for-profit 2-year institutions.

Participation in distance education programs also varied by student characteristics. A higher percentage of older than younger undergraduate students took distance education courses. In 2007–08, for example, 30 percent of students 30 years old and over took distance education courses, compared to 26 percent of students 24 to 29 years of age and 15 percent of students 15 to 23 years of age (see table A-43-1). A higher percentage of undergraduates who had a job took distance education courses (22 percent) than those who had no job (16 percent) and a higher percentage of students attending classes exclusively part time took distance education courses (25 percent) than those attending classes exclusively full time (17 percent).

There also were differences in distance education participation by student dependency status. In 2007–08, a lower percentage of undergraduates who were financially dependent (14 percent) took distance education courses than undergraduates who were financially independent (see table A-43-1). A higher percentage of independent undergraduates who were married and had dependents took distance education courses (33 percent) than did other types of independent undergraduates, including those who were unmarried, with or without dependents, as well as those who were married and without dependents (percentages for these three groups ranged from 24 to 29 percent). Similarly, a higher percentage of married postbaccalaureate students with dependents took distance education courses (33 percent) and took their entire program through distance education (16 percent) than did unmarried postbaccalaureate students with no dependents (5 percent) (see table A-43-2).




For more information: Tables A-43-1 and A-43-2
Glossary: College, Four-year postsecondary institution, Public institution, Private institution, Two-year postsecondary institution, Undergraduate student

Technical Notes

Estimates pertain to all postsecondary students who enrolled at any time during the school year at an institution participating in Title IV programs. Distance education participation includes participation at any institution for students attending more than one


institution during the school year. For more information on the National Postsecondary Student Financial Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*.

Figure 43-1. Percentage of undergraduate students in postsecondary institutions taking distance education courses, by control and level of institution: 2003-04 and 2007-08



NOTE: Estimates pertain to all postsecondary students who enrolled at any time during the school year at an institution participating in Title IV programs. Distance education participation includes participation at any institution for students attending more than one institution during the school year. Data include Puerto Rico. For more information on the National Postsecondary Student Financial Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003-04 and 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:04 and NPSAS:08).

Figure 43-2. Percentage of undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students in postsecondary institutions taking distance education courses, by dependency status: 2007-08



† Not applicable.

¹ Includes separated.

NOTE: Estimates pertain to all postsecondary students who enrolled at any time during the school year at an institution participating in Title IV programs. Distance education participation includes participation at any institution for students attending more than one institution during the school year. Data include Puerto Rico. For more information on the National Postsecondary Student Financial Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*. For more information on the classification of postsecondary education institutions, see *supplemental note 8*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:08).

Faculty Salaries, Benefits, and Total Compensation

After increasing by 14 percent during the 1980s and by 5 percent during the 1990s, average salaries for full-time faculty were 4 percent higher in 2009–10 than they were in 1999–2000, after adjusting for inflation.

In 2009–10, the average salary for full-time instructional faculty at degree-granting postsecondary institutions was \$74,600, with a range of \$55,600 for instructors, lecturers, and other faculty with no academic rank to \$103,700 for professors (see table A-44-1). Faculty categories are defined by the institution. Salaries at the various levels and controls of institutions ranged from \$44,700 at private 2-year colleges to \$97,700 at private doctoral universities. Institutions are categorized by the number of highest degrees awarded: doctoral, master's, bachelor's, or associate's.

The average faculty salary increased by 25 percent from 1979–80 to 2009–10, after adjusting for inflation (see table A-44-2). Average salaries increased for each type of faculty during this period as follows: professors (30 percent), assistant professors (28 percent), associate professors (24 percent), and faculty with no academic rank (17 percent). Average salaries were also higher in 2009–10 than they were in 1979–80 at each institution level and control, with increases ranging from 9 percent at public 2-year colleges to 40 percent at private doctoral universities.

Compared with earlier years, growth in average faculty salaries slowed in the recent decade. After increasing by 14 percent during the 1980s and by 5 percent during the 1990s, average faculty salaries were 4 percent higher in 2009–10 than they were in 1999–2000, after adjusting for inflation (data not shown). This pattern differed by institution level and control. Average salaries at public and private master's degree institutions and public and private doctoral universities were between 1 and 4 percent higher in 2009–10 than they were in 1999–2000. Salaries at public other 4-year colleges did not measurably change during this period. In contrast, average faculty salaries

increased by 9 percent at private other 4-year colleges and were 3 percent lower at private 2-year colleges.

Average fringe benefits (adjusted for inflation) increased by a higher percentage than did average faculty salaries (82 vs. 25 percent) between 1979–80 and 2009–10. As a result, fringe benefits accounted for a higher share of total compensation for faculty in 2009–10 than it did in 1979–80 (22 vs. 16 percent). Compared with faculty salaries between 1999–2000 and 2009–10, fringe benefits for faculty increased by larger percentages at most levels and controls of institutions. From 1999–2000 to 2009–10, average fringe benefits for faculty increased by 24 percent, while average faculty salaries increased by 4 percent. In particular, fringe benefits for faculty increased by higher percentages at public institutions than at private institutions. For example, average benefits for faculty at public master's degree institutions increased by 28 percent, compared with an increase of 19 percent for faculty at private master's degree institutions. From 1999–2000 to 2009–10, benefits for faculty at public 2-year colleges increased by 29 percent, while benefits at private 2-year colleges decreased by 2 percent.

Combining salary with benefits, faculty received an average total compensation package in 2009–10 that was about 8 percent higher than the package they received in 1999–2000. In 2009–10, the average compensation package for faculty was about \$95,600, including \$74,600 in salaries and \$21,000 in benefits.



For more information: Tables A-44-1 and A-44-2


Glossary: Consumer Price Index (CPI), Faculty, Four-year postsecondary institution, Private institution, Public institution, Salary, Two-year postsecondary institution

Technical Notes

Average total compensation is the sum of salary (which excludes outside income) and fringe benefits (which may include benefits such as retirement plans, medical/dental plans, group life insurance, or other benefits). Private institutions include private not-for-profit and private for-profit institutions. Institutions are classified by the number of highest degrees awarded. For example, institutions that award 20 or more doctoral degrees per year are classified as doctoral universities. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. Data do not include institutions at which all faculty were part time, contributed their services, were in the military, or taught

preclinical or clinical medicine. Salaries reflect an average of all faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts rather than a weighted average based on contract length that appears in some other National Center for Education Statistics reports. Data exclude faculty on 11- and 12-month contracts (17 percent of faculty in 2009–10) and are reported for the 50 states and D.C. and exclude Puerto Rico and the territories. Data are adjusted by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI, see *supplemental note 10*. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

Figure 44-1. Average salary for full-time instructional faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts at degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level and control of institution: Academic year 2009–10




NOTE: Institutions are classified based on the number of highest degrees awarded. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. Data are reported for the 50 states and D.C. and exclude Puerto Rico and the territories. Salaries exclude outside income and reflect an average of all faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts rather than a weighted average based on contract length that appears in some other reports of the National Center for Education Statistics. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009–10 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2009 and Winter 2009–10.

Figure 44-2. Average total compensation (salary and benefits) for full-time instructional faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts at degree-granting postsecondary institutions: Selected academic years, 1979–80 through 2009–10

[In constant 2009–10 dollars]



NOTE: Average total compensation is the sum of salary (which excludes outside income) and fringe benefits (which may include benefits such as retirement plans, medical/dental plans, group life insurance, or other benefits). Data are reported for the 50 states and D.C. and exclude Puerto Rico and the territories. Salaries reflect an average of all faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts rather than a weighted average based on contract length that appears in some other reports of the National Center for Education Statistics. Salaries, benefits, and compensation adjusted by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI, see *supplemental note 10*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1979–80 Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), "Faculty Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits Survey"; and 1989–90, 1999–2000, and 2009–10 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty Survey" (IPEDS-SA:89–99), "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:89–99), Fall 2009 and Winter 2009–10.

College Student Employment

In 2009, about 41 percent of full-time and 76 percent of part-time college students ages 16–24 were employed.

The percentage of full-time college students ages 16–24 who were employed increased from 34 to 52 percent between 1970 and 2000 and then decreased to 47 percent in 2001, where it remained relatively stable until 2008 before declining to 41 percent in 2009 (see table A-45-1). The percentage of full-time students who worked 20–34 hours per week increased from 10 to 22 percent from 1970 to 2000 and then remained relatively stable (between 20 and 22 percent) through 2008 before declining to 18 percent in 2009. The percentage of these students who worked 35 or more hours per week increased from 4 percent in 1970 to 9 percent in 2000, fluctuated between 8 and 9 percent through 2008, and declined to 6 percent in 2009.

In 2009, about 76 percent of part-time college students ages 16–24 were employed. In contrast to the increase among full-time college students, there was no overall trend between 1970 and 2009 in the percentage of part-time college students who were employed. The percentage of part-time college students working 35 or more hours per week, however, decreased from 60 to 37 percent between 1970 and 2009.

The employment rate of full-time college students at public 4-year institutions fluctuated between 1990 and 2009; it increased between 1990 and 2000, decreased in 2001, and then remained relatively stable until it decreased again in 2009. The employment rate for full-time students at private 4-year institutions also increased between 1990 and 2000 and decreased in 2001, but showed no measurable change between 2001 and 2009. The percentage of full-time students at public 2-year institutions who were employed did not measurably change between 1990 and 2000 but decreased between 2000 and 2009. The percentage of part-time students in public and private 4-year institutions who were employed did not show an overall trend between 1990 and 2009. The employment rate of part-time students in public 2-year institutions in 1990 was not measurably different from the rate in 2007, but from 2007 to 2009, it decreased from 83 to 72 percent.

The percentages of students who were employed differed by level and control of institution. In general, the employment rates of full-time students were higher at public 2-year institutions than at 4-year institutions for nearly all years of data shown between 1990 and 2009. In addition, the employment rate of full-time students at public 4-year institutions was higher than the rate at private 4-year institutions for all years of data shown. In 2009, for example, about 45 percent of full-time students at public 2-year institutions were employed, compared with 41 percent of full-time students at public 4-year institutions and 35 percent at private 4-year institutions. The employment rates for part-time students generally did not differ by level and control of institution between 1990 and 2007, though in 2008 and 2009, a higher percentage of part-time students at public 4-year institutions worked than did those at public 2-year institutions. In 2009, a higher percentage of part-time students at 4-year private institutions were employed than were students at 2- and 4-year public institutions.

In 2009, the percentage of full-time college students ages 16–24 who were employed differed by sex and race/ethnicity. A higher percentage of female full-time students were employed than were male full-time students (45 vs. 36 percent) (see table A-45-2). Also, the employment rates of full-time students were higher among White and Hispanic students and students of two or more races (45, 39, and 44 percent, respectively) than among Black and Asian students (29 and 26 percent, respectively).

The percentage of students who were employed in 2009 also differed by student enrollment level. The percentage of part-time graduate students who were employed was higher than the percentage of part-time undergraduate students who were employed (88 vs. 74 percent). At both the part-time and full-time level, higher percentages of graduate than undergraduate students worked 35 or more hours per week.




For more information: Tables A-45-1 and A-45-2
Glossary: Four-year postsecondary institution, Full-time enrollment, Part-time enrollment, Private institution, Public institution, Two-year postsecondary institution

Technical Notes

College includes both 2- and 4-year institutions. College students were classified as *full time* if they were taking at least 12 hours of classes (or at least 9 hours of graduate classes) during an average school week and as *part time* if they were taking fewer hours. *Hours worked per week* refers to the number of hours that the respondent worked


at all jobs during the survey week. For more information on the Current Population Survey (CPS), see *supplemental note 2*. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. For more information on race/ethnicity, see *supplemental note 1*.

Figure 45-1. Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old college students who were employed, by attendance status and hours worked per week: October 1970 through October 2009



NOTE: College includes both 2- and 4-year institutions. College students were classified as *full time* if they were taking at least 12 hours of classes (or at least 9 hours of graduate classes) during an average school week and as *part time* if they were taking fewer hours. Percent employed estimates include those who were employed but not at work during the survey week. *Hours worked per week* refers to the number of hours the respondent worked at all jobs during the survey week—these estimates exclude those who were employed but not at work during the survey week; therefore, detail may not sum to total percentage employed. For more information on the Current Population Survey (CPS), see *supplemental note 2*.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October Supplement, 1970–2009.

Figure 45-2. Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old full-time college students who were employed, by sex and institution level and control: October 2009



NOTE: College includes both 2- and 4-year institutions. College students were classified as *full time* if they were taking at least 12 hours of classes (or at least 9 hours of graduate classes) during an average school week. Percent employed estimates include those who were employed but not at work during the survey week. For more information on the Current Population Survey (CPS), see *supplemental note 2*.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Current Population Survey (CPS), October Supplement, 2009.

Federal Grants and Loans to Undergraduates

From 1999–2000 to 2007–08, the percentage of full-time, full-year undergraduates receiving federal loans increased from 43 to 49 percent. Over the same time period, the average federal grant increased from \$3,300 to \$3,800 (in constant 2009–10 dollars).

Grants and loans are the major forms of federal financial support for postsecondary students. Federal grants, which do not need to be repaid, are available to undergraduates who qualify by economic need, whereas loans are available to all students. In addition to federal financial aid, there are also grants from state and local governments, institutions, and private sources, as well as private loans.

In 2007–08, about 65 percent of full-time, full-year undergraduates received a grant from any source, compared with 59 percent in 1999–2000 (see table A-46-1). From 1999–2000 to 2007–08, the average grant amount received from all sources by these recipients increased from \$6,500 to \$7,400 (in constant 2009–10 dollars). During this period, the average federal grant per recipient also increased from \$3,300 to \$3,800. The percentage of low-income dependent undergraduate students who received federal grants increased from 73 percent in 1999–2000 to 80 percent in 2007–08. In 2007–08, about 15 percent of middle-income and less than 1 percent of high-income students received federal grants.

In 2007–08, while some 29 percent of full-time, full-year undergraduates at public 4-year institutions and 28 percent of full-time full-year undergraduates at private not-for-profit 4-year institutions received federal grants, 56 percent of full-time full-year undergraduates at private for-profit 4-year institutions received federal grants. From 1999–2000 to 2007–08, the percentage of students at private for-profit 4-year institutions receiving federal grants increased from 36 to 56 percent. At public 4-year and private not-for-profit 4-year institutions, however, there were no measurable changes during this period in the percentages of students receiving federal grants.

Fifty-three percent of full-time, full-year undergraduates received a loan, including federal loans, in 2007–08, up from 45 percent in 1999–2000. In 2007–08, some

49 percent of all full-time, full-year undergraduates received federal loans, compared with the 43 percent who received federal loans in 1999–2000. Of those undergraduates receiving a loan, the average loan amount from all sources was \$8,200 in 2007–08, higher than the average amount in 1999–2000 (\$6,500, in constant 2009–10 dollars). From 1999–2000 to 2007–08, the percentage of low-income dependent undergraduates who received federal loans increased from 47 to 51 percent. In 2007–08, there was no measurable difference between low-income and middle-income dependent undergraduates in the percentage who received federal loans (51 and 49 percent, respectively), but the percentages for both groups were higher than the percentage of high-income dependent undergraduates who received federal loans that year (35 percent). Sixty-one percent of independent undergraduates received a federal loan in 2007–08.

In 2007–08, approximately 49 percent of full-time, full-year undergraduates at public 4-year institutions received federal loans, compared with 61 percent of students at private not-for-profit 4-year institutions and 92 percent of students at private-for-profit 4-year institutions. Comparing the percentage of students receiving federal loans at private for-profit 4-year institutions in 1999–2000 with the percentage receiving federal loans at those institutions in 2007–08 shows that the percentage increased from 73 to 92 percent, respectively. However, there were no measurable changes from 1999–2000 to 2007–08 in the percentages of students receiving federal loans at 4-year public institutions and private not-for-profit 4-year institutions.



For more information: Table A-46-1


Glossary: Four-year postsecondary institution, Private institution, Public institution, Two-year postsecondary institution

Technical Notes

Federal loans include Perkins loans, subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans, and Supplemental Loans to Students (SLS); federal grants are primarily Pell Grants and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), but also include Byrd scholarships. Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS), veterans' benefits, and tax credits are not included in any of the totals. The weights used for the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 2000 calculations were revised and produce estimates that differ from those reported in *The Condition of Education 2010*. Income for dependent

students is based on parents' annual income in the prior year. The cutoff points for low, middle, and high income were obtained by identifying the incomes below the 25th percentile (low-income), between the 25th and 75th percentiles (middle-income), and at the 75th percentile and above (high-income). Data were adjusted to 2009–10 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*. For more information on NPSAS, see *supplemental note 3*.


Figure 46-1. Percentage of full-time, full-year dependent undergraduates who had federal loans and grants, by income level: Academic year 2007–08



NOTE: Federal loans include Perkins loans, subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans, and Supplemental Loans to Students (SLS). Federal grants are primarily Pell Grants and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), but also include Byrd scholarships. Income for dependent students is based on parents' annual income in the prior year. The cutoff points for low, middle, and high income were obtained by identifying the incomes below the 25th percentile (low-income), between the 25th and 75th percentiles (middle-income), and at the 75th percentile and above (high-income).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007–08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:08).

Figure 46-2. Average grants and loans to full-time, full-year dependent undergraduates who had federal loans and grants, by income level: Academic year 2007–08



NOTE: Federal loans include Perkins loans, subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans, and Supplemental Loans to Students (SLS). Federal grants are primarily Pell Grants and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), but also include Byrd scholarships. Income for dependent students is based on parents' annual income in the prior year. The cutoff points for low, middle, and high income were obtained by identifying the incomes below the 25th percentile (low-income), between the 25th and 75th percentiles (middle-income), and at the 75th percentile and above (high-income). Data adjusted to 2009–10 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). For more information about the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007–08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:08).

Price of Attending an Undergraduate Institution

The net price of education was higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000 for full-time, full-year, dependent undergraduates at all family income levels.

The total price of attending a postsecondary institution (also called “the student budget”) includes tuition and fees, books and materials, and an allowance for living expenses. In 2007–08, the average total price of attendance, in constant 2009–10 dollars, for full-time, full-year, dependent undergraduates was \$12,100 at public 2-year institutions and \$19,300 at public 4-year institutions (see table A-47-1). At private institutions, the total price was \$23,800 at not-for-profit 2-year institutions, \$37,400 at not-for-profit 4-year institutions, \$27,900 at for-profit 2-year institutions, and \$33,500 at for-profit 4-year institutions. The average total price of attendance for students at each of the six major combinations of institution level and control was higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000, with the exception of private not-for-profit 2-year institutions, for which there was no measurable difference.

Many students and their families do not pay the full price of attendance because they receive financial aid to help cover their expenses. The primary types of financial aid are grants, which do not have to be repaid, and loans, which must be repaid. Grants, including scholarships, may be awarded on the basis of financial need, merit, or both, and may include tuition aid from employers. The average grant amounts for students at public 2- and 4-year institutions and private not-for-profit 4-year institutions were higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000 (see table A-47-1). However, there was no measurable change in the average grant amount for students at private not-for-profit 2-year institutions, private for-profit 2-year institutions, or private for-profit 4-year institutions. The loan amounts reported in this indicator include student borrowing through federal, state, institutional, and alternative (private) loan programs, as well as loans taken out by parents through the federal Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students (PLUS) program. When adjusted for inflation to 2009–10 dollars, the average amount borrowed by students at each of the six major

combinations of institution level and control was higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000. Financial aid amounts and percentages exclude tax credits and deductions.

The net price is an estimate of the cash outlay, including loans, that students and their families need to pay in a given year to cover educational expenses. It is calculated here as the total price of attendance minus grants (which decrease the price). Tax credits and deductions are excluded from the calculation of net price. Reflecting the higher total costs, the net price for full-time, full-year, dependent undergraduates was higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000 at four of the six major combinations of institution level and control (public 2-year, public 4-year, private not-for-profit 4-year, and private for-profit 4-year). From 2003–04 to 2007–08, the net price of attendance increased for all institutions, with the exception of private not-for-profit 2-year institutions.

Overall, the net price of sending a student to a postsecondary institution was higher in 2007–08 than in 1999–2000 for families at all income levels. For low-income, middle-income and high-income families, the net price increased, respectively by \$1,400, \$2,200, and \$3,600. During this period, net price also increased for students from all racial/ethnic groups, with the exception of American Indian/Alaska Natives (see table A-47-2). For example, the net price for White students increased from \$16,000 in 1999–2000 to \$18,700 in 2007–08. For Black, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian students, and students of two or more races, the net price increased, respectively, by \$2,600, \$2,600, \$3,100, \$5,000, and \$3,100.



For more information: Tables A-47-1 and A-47-2
Glossary: Consumer Price Index (CPI), Four-year postsecondary institution, Private institution, Public institution, Two-year postsecondary institution


Technical Notes

Full time refers to students who attended full time (as defined by the institution) for the full year (at least 9 months). Information on the use of tax credits by individual families is not available and therefore could not be taken into account in calculating net price. Averages were computed for all students, including those who did not receive financial aid. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Data were adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*. Estimates exclude

students who were not U.S. citizens or permanent residents and therefore ineligible for federal student aid and students who attended more than one institution in a year, due to the difficulty matching information on price and aid. For more information on race/ethnicity, see *supplemental note 1*. The weights used for the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 2000 calculations were revised and produce estimates that differ from those reported in *The Condition of Education 2010*. For more information on NPSAS, see *supplemental note 3*.

Figure 47-1. Average total price, grants, and net price for full-time, full-year, dependent undergraduates at 2-year institutions, by institution control: Academic years 1999–2000, 2003–04, and 2007–08


[In constant 2009–10 dollars]



NOTE: *Full time* refers to students who attended full time (as defined by the institution) for the full year (at least 9 months). *Net price* is an estimate of the cash outlay that students and their families need to make in a given year to cover educational expenses. Averages were computed for all students, including those who did not receive financial aid. Data were adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999–2000, 2003–04, and 2007–08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Studies (NPSAS:2000, NPSAS:04, and NPSAS:08).

Figure 47-2. Average total price, grants, and net price for full-time, full-year, dependent undergraduates at 4-year institutions, by institution control: Academic years 1999–2000, 2003–04, and 2007–08

[In constant 2009–10 dollars]



NOTE: *Full time* refers to students who attended full time (as defined by the institution) for the full year (at least 9 months). *Net price* is an estimate of the cash outlay that students and their families need to make in a given year to cover educational expenses. Averages were computed for all students, including those who did not receive financial aid. Data were adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*. Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999–2000, 2003–04, and 2007–08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Studies (NPSAS:2000, NPSAS:04, and NPSAS:08).

Price of Graduate and First-Professional Attendance

About 9 out of 10 full-time graduate students received financial aid in 2007–08. The average total price of attending was greater in 2007–08 than in 2003–04 for students in master’s or first-professional degree programs at public universities, as well as for students in first-professional degree programs at private not-for-profit universities.

In 2007–08, the average total price (tuition and fees, books and materials, and living expenses) for 1 year of full-time graduate education was \$34,600 for a master’s degree program; \$39,700 for a doctoral program; and \$46,500 for a first-professional degree program. Prices are in constant 2009–10 dollars (see table A-48-1). The average total price differed depending on degree level and institution control, ranging from \$29,000 for a master’s degree program at a public institution to \$53,700 for a first-professional degree program at a private not-for-profit institution.

About one-fourth (26 percent) of master’s degree students were enrolled full time in 2007–08, compared to 53 percent of doctoral degree students and 78 percent of first-professional degree students. Among the full-time master’s degree students, the adjusted average net price (total price minus grants) was \$23,900 at public institutions and \$35,000 at private not-for-profit institutions. Compared with their peers at private not-for-profit institutions, on average, full-time master’s students at public institutions received more in assistantships and borrowed less in student loans.

In 2007–08, some 85 percent of full-time students at the master’s level, 88 percent at the first-professional level, and 93 percent at the doctoral level received some type of financial aid (see table A-48-2). Grants and assistantships are usually awarded on a discretionary basis and are not related to financial need. Financial need must be demonstrated by students in order to obtain Perkins or subsidized Stafford loans, but not to take out unsubsidized Stafford loans, or private loans. Graduate students may receive tuition assistance from their employers (also considered grant aid). For example, in 2007–08, some 48 percent of part-time students in master of business administration programs received this type of financial aid (see table A-48-3).

The average annual net price in 2007–08 for full-time doctoral students was \$24,700 at public institutions and \$36,300 at private not-for-profit institutions (see table A-49-1). Although full-time doctoral students faced higher average total prices compared with their counterparts at the master’s level, they did receive larger average amounts in grants and assistantships and borrowed less in student loans.

In 2007–08, the annual net price paid by first-professional students was higher than that paid by doctoral students in both public and private not-for-profit institutions. Also, first-professional students relied more heavily on loans to pay for their education: in 2007–08 their per annum loan amounts averaged \$23,400 at public institutions and \$30,500 at private not-for-profit institutions, while doctoral students’ per annum loans averaged \$4,700 and \$9,800, respectively.

The average total price of attending a graduate program was greater in 2007–08 than in 2003–04 (after adjusting for inflation) for master’s degree students at public institutions and for first-professional students at both public and private not-for-profit institutions. Tuition and fees were greater in 2007–08 than in 2003–04 for master’s degree students at public institutions and for first-professional students at public and private not-for-profit institutions. The 2007–08 tuition and fees associated with obtaining a doctoral degree at both public and private not-for-profit institutions were not measurably different from the 2003–04 tuition and fees; the same was true for net price. For students enrolled in first-professional degree programs at private not-for-profit institutions, the total annual price of attendance (in constant 2009–10 dollars) rose from approximately \$47,600 in 2003–04 to \$53,700 in 2007–08.



For more information: Tables A-48-1 through A-48-3
Glossary: Classification of Instructional Program (CIP), Consumer Price Index (CPI), Doctoral degree, First-professional degree, Master’s degree


Technical Notes

First-professional programs include chiropractic, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, law, podiatry, medicine, theology, optometry, and veterinary medicine. The category labeled “Assistantships and other aid” consists primarily of assistantships but also includes a small amount of other types of aid such as work study, state vocational, rehabilitation and job training grants, federal veterans benefits, and military tuition aid. Analysis is limited to students who attended for the full year at only one institution in 2003–04 and 2007–08 to keep financial aid and prices comparable. Totals include data for private

for-profit institutions, which are not shown separately. *Full time* means enrolled full time (according to the institution’s definition) for at least 9 months during the academic year; full-time enrollment does not preclude working. For more information on the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*. Data were adjusted to constant 2009–10 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Figure 48-1. Average annual total price, financial aid, and net price for full-time graduate and first-professional students attending public institutions: Academic years 2003-04 and 2007-08

[In constant 2009-10 dollars]




NOTE: Data presented are limited to students who attended for the full year at only one institution to keep financial aid and price data comparable. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. For more information on the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003-04 and 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:04 and NPSAS:08).

Figure 48-2. Average annual total price, financial aid, and net price for full-time graduate and first-professional students attending private not-for-profit institutions: Academic years 2003-04 and 2007-08

[In constant 2009-10 dollars]



NOTE: Data presented are limited to students who attended for the full year at only one institution to keep financial aid and price data comparable. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. For more information on National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), see *supplemental note 3*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003-04 and 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:04 and NPSAS:08).

Tuition and Fees, Student Loans, and Default Rates

In 2008–09, average tuition and fees, in constant 2009–10 dollars, at 4-year postsecondary institutions were \$12,100. At public 4-year institutions, average tuition and fees were \$6,400, compared with \$15,300 at private for-profit institutions and \$24,900 at private not-for-profit institutions.

In 2008–09, average tuition and fees, in constant 2009–10 dollars, at 4-year postsecondary degree-granting institutions were \$12,100. At public 4-year institutions, average tuition and fees were \$6,400, compared with \$15,300 at private for-profit institutions and \$24,900 at private not-for-profit institutions (see table A-49-1). Among first-time, full-time students attending 4-year institutions in 2008–09, the percentage who had student loans differed by institution control: 56 percent of all students had student loans, compared with 47 percent of students at public institutions, 61 percent of students at private not-for-profit institutions, and 81 percent of students at private for-profit institutions. In 2008–09, average per annum loan amounts, in constant dollars, were highest at private for-profit institutions (\$9,800), followed by private not-for-profit institutions (\$7,700) and public institutions (\$6,000).

At 2-year postsecondary degree-granting institutions, average tuition and fees (in constant 2009–10 dollars) were \$2,600 in 2008–09. At public 2-year institutions, average tuition and fees were \$2,200; at private not-for-profit 2-year institutions, average tuition and fees were \$12,700; and at private for-profit 2-year institutions, average tuition and fees were \$13,900. Some 21 percent of first-time, full-time students attending public 2-year institutions had student loans, with an average loan amount of \$4,200. At private not-for-profit 2-year institutions, 58 percent of students had student loans, with an average loan amount of \$6,100. At private for-profit 2-year institutions, 78 percent of students had student loans, with an average loan amount of \$7,800.

Approximately 3.2 million students entered the repayment phase of their student loans in fiscal year (FY) 2008, meaning their student loans became due between October 1, 2007, and September 30, 2008 (see table A-49-2). Of those students, 7 percent had defaulted on the payments on their student loans within 2 years (before FY 2009 ended on September 30, 2009). The percentage of students who enter repayment on their loans in a particular fiscal year and default prior to the end of the next fiscal year is the 2-year cohort default rate. The default rate for students in the FY 2008 cohort was 5 percent at 4-year degree-granting institutions and 11 percent at 2-year degree-granting institutions. Default rates for the FY 2008 cohort were highest at private for-profit 2-year institutions (12 percent) and private for-profit 4-year institutions (11 percent). The lowest default rates were for students at private not-for-profit and public 4-year institutions (4 percent each).

The 7 percent rate of default across all institutions for the FY 2008 cohort was higher than the rates for the FY 2007 (6 percent) and FY 2006 (5 percent) cohorts. The percentage increase in default rates from FY 2006 to FY 2008 was greatest at private for-profit 4-year institutions (from 8 percent to 11 percent). The smallest increases in default rates from FY 2006 to FY 2008 were at public 4-year institutions (from 3 to 4 percent) and private not-for-profit 2-year institutions (from 7 to 8 percent).



For more information: *Tables A-49-1 and A-49-2*
Glossary: *College, Four-year postsecondary institution, Private institution, Public institution, Tuition, Two-year postsecondary institution*


Technical Notes

Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Tuition and fees amounts for public institutions are the averages for in-state students. The repayment phase is the period when student loans must be repaid and generally begins 6 months after a student leaves an institution. The 2-year cohort default rate is the percentage of borrowers who enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program loans during a particular federal fiscal year (a fiscal year runs from October 1 to September 30) and default or meet other specified conditions within the cohort default period. The cohort default period is the two-year period that begins on October 1 of the fiscal

year when the borrower enters repayment and ends on September 30 of the following fiscal year. Default rates were calculated using student counts by institution from the Federal Student Aid Cohort Default Rate Database and the IPEDS classification of institution level and control. For more information on the Federal Student Aid (FSA) cohort default rate database or the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), see *supplemental note 3*. Institutions in this indicator are classified based on the highest degrees awarded. For more information on the classification of postsecondary institutions, see *supplemental note 8*. Data were adjusted to 2009–10 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*.

Figure 49-1. Average tuition and fees and average loan amounts at degree-granting institutions, by level and control of institution: 2008–09


[In constant 2009–10 dollars]



NOTE: Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Tuition and fees amounts for public institutions are the averages for in-state students. Tuition and fee data are collected in the fall and loan data are collected in the spring. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. Data were adjusted to constant 2009–10 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). For more information on the CPI-U, see *supplemental note 10*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009–10 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Spring 2009.

Figure 49-2. Two-year student loan cohort default rates at degree-granting institutions, by level and control of institution: Fiscal years 2006–08



NOTE: Includes undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students. Degree-granting institutions grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. The 2-year cohort default rate is the percentage of borrowers who enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program loans during a particular federal fiscal year and default or meet other specified conditions within the cohort default period, which is the two-year period that begins on October 1 of the fiscal year when the borrower enters repayment and ends on September 30 of the following fiscal year. Default rates were calculated using student counts by institution from the Federal Student Aid Cohort Default Rate Database and the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) classification of institution level and control. For more information on IPEDS and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Federal Student Aid, Direct Loan and Federal Family Education Loan Programs, Cohort Default Rate Database, retrieved November 5, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/offices/QSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>.

Postsecondary Revenues and Expenses

In 2008–09, instruction was the largest per-student expense at public (\$7,534) and private not-for-profit institutions (\$15,215). At private for-profit institutions, instruction was the second largest expense category, with \$3,069 spent per student.

About 19 million undergraduate and graduate students were enrolled in postsecondary degree-granting institutions in 2008–09 (see *indicators 8 and 9*). This indicator examines general patterns in the revenues and expenses of postsecondary degree-granting institutions. Only some financial data may be comparable across institutional control (public, private not-for-profit, and private for-profit) because of differences in accounting procedures for certain categories. In addition, comparisons between institutional levels (2-year vs. 4-year) may also be limited because of different institutional missions.

In 2008–09, total revenue was \$267 billion at public institutions, \$69 billion at private not-for-profit institutions, and \$19 billion at private for-profit institutions (see table A-50-1). The category of student tuition and fees typically accounts for a large percentage of total revenue and was the largest revenue source at both private not-for-profit and for-profit institutions in 2008–09 (78 and 86 percent, respectively). At public institutions, the share of revenue from tuition and fees (19 percent) was second to that from state appropriations (24 percent). Tuition and fees constituted the largest revenue category for private not-for-profit and private for-profit 2- and 4-year institutions, the second largest category for public 4-year institutions, and the third largest category for public 2-year institutions. Across all sectors, the shares for tuition and fees were generally larger for 4-year institutions than they were for 2-year institutions (see table A-50-2).

Historically, investment return has generally been among the largest revenue sources for private not-for-profit institutions. In contrast, private for-profit institutions typically receive little revenue from this source, while public institutions receive a moderate amount. Changes in the value of endowment funds from investments affect total revenue and can fluctuate from year to year. For example, in 2008–09, private not-for-profit institutions saw a loss in investment return of \$64 billion, which decreased total revenue and caused other revenue sources to account for larger shares of the total (see table A-50-1). Investment

income at public institutions was affected to a lesser degree (a loss of \$9 billion).

In 2008–09, total expenses were \$273 billion at public institutions, \$141 billion at private not-for-profit institutions, and \$16 billion at private for-profit institutions (see table A-50-3). At public and private not-for-profit institutions, instruction was the largest expense category (27 and 33 percent, respectively). At private for-profit institutions, instruction constituted 24 percent of total expenses but student services and academic and institutional support (a category which covers a wide range of administrative costs) was the largest category at 67 percent. Other relatively large categories at public institutions (those accounting for 8–10 percent of expenses) were research, institutional support, auxiliary enterprises, and hospitals. At private not-for-profit institutions, some of the other larger categories (those accounting for 10–14 percent of expenses) were research, institutional support, and auxiliary enterprises.

Public and private not-for-profit institutions spent the most per student on instruction in 2008–09 (\$7,534 and 15,215, respectively); private for-profit institutions spent \$3,069 per student.

Variations were found when comparing expenses at 2- and 4-year institutions in 2008–09. For example, public 2-year and private for-profit 2-year institutions spent a greater share of their budgets on instruction than their 4-year counterparts did (37 vs. 25 percent at public institutions and 33 vs. 21 percent at private for-profit institutions) (see table A-50-4). Private not-for-profit 2- and 4-year institutions each spent 33 percent of their budgets on instruction.



For more information: Tables A-50-1 through A-50-4
Glossary: Consumer Price Index (CPI), Full-time Equivalent (FTE) enrollment, Private institution, Public institution, Revenues, Tuition


Technical Notes

Auxiliary enterprises are essentially self-supporting operations, such as residence halls, that exist to provide a service to students, faculty, or staff, and that charge a fee that is directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the cost of the service. Academic support includes services that directly support an institution's primary missions of instruction, research, or public service. Institutional support includes general administrative services, executive direction and planning, legal and fiscal operations, and community relations. Student services includes expenses associated with

admissions, registrar activities, and activities whose primary purpose is to contribute to students' emotional and physical well-being and to their intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. Data are adjusted by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to constant 2009–10 dollars. For more information on the CPI, see *supplemental note 10*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*.

Figure 50-1. Revenue per student from tuition and fees for degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by institutional control and level: Academic year 2008-09


[In constant 2009-10 dollars]



NOTE: Full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment includes full-time students plus the full-time equivalent of part-time students. Data are adjusted by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to constant 2009-10 dollars. For more information on the CPI, see *supplemental note 10*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2008-09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Spring 2010.

Figure 50-2. Expenses per student at 4-year degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by institutional control and purpose: Academic year 2008-09

[In constant 2009-10 dollars]



NOTE: Full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment includes full-time students plus the full-time equivalent of part-time students. Data are adjusted by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to constant 2009-10 dollars. For more information on the CPI, see *supplemental note 10*. For more information on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and IPEDS classification of institutions, see *supplemental notes 3 and 8*. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2008-09 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Spring 2010.