The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is the nation's core postsecondary education data collection program. It is a single, comprehensive system designed to encompass all institutions and educational organizations whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. For additional information see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds.
October, 2009

Dear Institutional Executive:

The National Center for Education Statistics is pleased to provide you with your institution’s annual IPEDS Data Feedback Report. The report compares data provided by your institution in 2008-09 through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to data for a similar group of institutions. Like last year, your institution was given the opportunity to select its own comparison group. We strongly encourage institutions to take advantage of the opportunity to select the other institutions to which they want to be compared in the report, as they generally find the report more informative. If your institution did not submit its own group, IPEDS identified a comparison group for you (see the list toward the back of this report for the institutions in your comparison group).

I also encourage you to visit the IPEDS Executive Peer Tool (ExPT) at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/. Not only can you download a PDF of this report as it was sent to you, you can also select a different comparison group and recreate the full report in PDF format. In addition, there are a number of extra figures available in the ExPT that are not included in your original report.

Thank you for supporting IPEDS throughout the data collection process. Without your support and the high quality data that your institution provides, these reports would not be possible. If you have any comments on how we can improve the Data Feedback Report or the ExPT, please send them to ipedsdatafeedback@ed.gov.

Best regards,

Elise S. Miller
IPEDS Program Director

What Is IPEDS?

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a system of survey components that collects data from nearly 6,700 institutions across the United States whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. IPEDS collects institution-level data on students (enrollment and graduation rates), student charges, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances.

These data are used at the federal and state level for policy analysis and development; at the institutional level for benchmarking and peer analysis; and by students and parents, through the College Navigator (http://collegenavigator.ed.gov), to aid in the college search process. For more information about IPEDS, see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds.

What is the Purpose of This Report?

The Data Feedback Report is intended to provide institutions a context for examining the data they submitted to IPEDS. Our goal is to produce a report that is useful to institutional executives and that may help improve the quality and comparability of IPEDS data.

What Is in This Report?

The figures provided in this report are those suggested by the IPEDS Technical Review Panel. They were developed to provide selected indicators and data elements for your institution and a comparison group of institutions. The figures are based on data collected during the 2008-09 IPEDS collection cycle and are the most recent data available. Additional information about these indicators is provided in the Methodological Notes at the end of the report. Following the figures is a list of the institutions in your comparison group and the criteria used for their selection. Please refer to "Comparison Group" in the Methodological Notes for more information.

How Can I Use This Report?

Upon receiving your Data Feedback Report (DFR), we strongly encourage you to discuss its contents with your institution’s IPEDS keyholder, or other institutional research professionals. Keyholders, appointed by institutional executives, coordinate the institution’s IPEDS data submission, frequently working with colleagues across the institution to ensure timely and accurate reporting. Your keyholder can answer questions about how IPEDS data are submitted, how individual indicators are defined, and how to interpret differences between your institution and the group to which it was compared. She or he can also assist you in identifying more appropriate comparison groups, if needed. After discussing the DFR with your keyholder, we encourage you to share it with your campus leadership team. With their assistance, other ways to make use of the DFR can be considered, including how to appropriately incorporate the DFR into existing strategic planning efforts and whether to share parts of the DFR with on- and off-campus stakeholders, including students, staff, faculty, governance board members, community leaders, media, and state and local officials. We are committed to ensuring the DFR is useful to campus executives. If after working with the DFR you have suggestions for future improvements, please send them to ipedsdatafeedback@ed.gov.

Where Can I Do More with IPEDS Data?

The Executive Peer Tool (ExPT), available through the IPEDS Data Center (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter), is designed to provide campus executives easy access to institutional and comparison group data. Using the ExPT, you can produce reports using different comparison groups and access a wider range of IPEDS variables.
Figure 1. Unduplicated 12-month headcount of all students and of undergraduate students, total FTE enrollment (academic year 2007-08), and full- and part-time fall enrollment (Fall 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment measure</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated headcount - total</td>
<td>12,398</td>
<td>11,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated headcount - undergraduates</td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>10,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE enrollment</td>
<td>8,808</td>
<td>8,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time fall enrollment</td>
<td>7,493</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time fall enrollment</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For details on calculating full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, see Calculating FTE in the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. Total headcount, FTE, and full- and part-time fall enrollment include both undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students, when applicable. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 2. Enrollment, by student level: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,014</td>
<td>10,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>8,171</td>
<td>8,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>6,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 3. Full-time enrollment, by student level: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of full-time student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total full-time</td>
<td>7,493</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>6,804</td>
<td>7,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>4,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 4. Part-time enrollment, by student level: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of part-time student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total part-time</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 5. Percent of students enrolled who are women, by level of student: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTE: N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 6. Percent of all students enrolled, by race/ethnicity: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For this survey year, institutions could report race and ethnicity using both 1977 (old) and 1997 (new) Office of Management and Budget categories. Categories shown in this figure are derived by adding comparable categories from both old and new; however, the "Two or more races" category appears only in the 1997 version. For more information about disaggregation of data by race and ethnicity, please see the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. Median values for the comparison group may not add to 100 percent. See "Use of Median Values for Comparison Group" in the Methodological Notes at the end of this report for how median values are determined. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Murray State University
Figure 7. Percent of all undergraduate students enrolled, by race/ethnicity: Fall 2008

NOTE: For this survey year, institutions could report race and ethnicity using both 1977 (old) and 1997 (new) Office of Management and Budget categories. Categories shown in this figure are derived by adding comparable categories from both old and new; however, the "Two or more races" category appears only in the 1997 version. For more information about disaggregation of data by race and ethnicity, please see the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. Median values for the comparison group may not add to 100 percent. See "Use of Median Values for Comparison Group" for how median values are determined. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 8. Percent of all graduate students enrolled, by race/ethnicity: Fall 2008

NOTE: For this survey year, institutions could report race and ethnicity using both 1977 (old) and 1997 (new) Office of Management and Budget categories. Categories shown in this figure are derived by adding comparable categories from both old and new; however, the "Two or more races" category appears only in the 1997 version. For more information about disaggregation of data by race and ethnicity, please see the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. Median values for the comparison group may not add to 100 percent. See "Use of Median Values for Comparison Group" for how median values are determined. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 9. Student-to-faculty ratio: Fall 2008

NOTE: Student-to-faculty ratio data is presented only for institutions that have undergraduate students; graduate only institutions are not included. For details on how the ratio is calculated, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 10. Number of applicants, admissions, and students enrolled full and part time: Fall 2008

NOTE: Admissions data are presented only for institutions that do not have an open admission policy, and apply to first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students only. For more information, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 11. Percent of applicants admitted, and percent of admissions enrolled by full- and part-time status: Fall 2008

NOTE: Admissions data are presented only for institutions that do not have an open admission policy, and apply to first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students only. For more information, see the Methodological Notes. Median values for the comparison group may not add to 100 percent. See "Use of Median Values for Comparison Group" for how median values are determined. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 12. Percentile ACT scores of first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students: Fall 2008

NOTE: Test score data are presented only for institutions that do not have an open admission policy, and apply to first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students only. Institutions report test scores only if they are required for admission. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 13. Academic year tuition and required fees for full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates: 2006-07–2008-09

Figure 14. Percent of students receiving Pell Grants: 2007-08

Figure 15. Percent of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students receiving Federal, State/local, and Institutional grant aid, by type of grant: 2007-08

Figure 16. Average amounts of Federal, State/local, and Institutional grant aid received by full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates, by type of grant: 2007-08
Figure 17. Percent of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students receiving loans, by type of loan: 2007-08
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NOTE: For details on how students are counted for financial aid reporting, see Cohort Determination for Reporting Student Financial Aid and Graduation Rates in the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 18. Average amounts of loans received by full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates, by type of loan: 2007-08
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NOTE: Average loan values were calculated by dividing the total loans awarded by the total number of recipients in each institution. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 19. Retention rates of first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students, by enrollment status: Fall 2008
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NOTE: Retention rates are measured from the fall of first enrollment to the following fall. 4-yr institutions report retention rates for students seeking a bachelor's degree. For more information, see the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 20. Graduation rate cohort as a percent of all undergraduates and as a percent of total entering students (Fall 2008); graduation rate and transfer-out rate (2002 cohort)

Measure

Graduation rate cohort as a percent of undergraduates (N=13)
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Percent
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NOTE: Graduation rate cohort includes all full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students. Entering class includes all students coming to the institution for the first time. Only institutions with a mission to prepare students to transfer are required to report transfers out. Graduation and transfer-out rates are the Student Right-to-Know rates. For more information, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 21. Graduation rates of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 150% of normal time to program completion, by race/ethnicity: 2002 cohort

Graduation rates by race/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overall (N=13)</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native (N=11)</th>
<th>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (N=13)</th>
<th>Black or African American (N=13)</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino (N=13)</th>
<th>White (N=13)</th>
<th>Two or more races (N=0)</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity unknown (N=8)</th>
<th>Nonresident alien (N=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For this survey year, institutions could report race and ethnicity using both 1977 (old) and 1997 (new) Office of Management and Budget categories. Categories shown in this figure are derived by adding comparable categories from both old and new; however, the "Two or more races" category appears only in the 1997 version. For more information about disaggregation of data by race and ethnicity, please see the Methodological Notes at the end of this report. The graduation rates are the Student Right-to-Know (SRK) rates. For more information see the Methodological Notes at the end of the report. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group. At least three values in the comparison group are required to calculate the median.


Figure 22. Bachelor's degree graduation rates of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 4 years, 6 years, and 8 years: 2000 cohort

Time to program completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Program Completion</th>
<th>Your institution (N=13)</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The 4-year and 6-year graduation rates are the Student Right-to-Know (SRK) rates; the 8-year rate is calculated using the same methodology. For more information see the Methodological Notes at the end of the report. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 23. Number of degrees awarded, by level: Academic year 2007-08

Number of degrees awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Degree</th>
<th>Your institution (N=13)</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

**Figure 24.** Full-time equivalent staff, by assigned position: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff category</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/research/public service</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/administrative/managerial</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your institution                                    | Comparison Group Median (N=13)

NOTE: Graduate assistants are not included in this figure. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


**Figure 25.** Average salaries of full-time instructional staff equated to 9-month contracts, by academic rank: Academic year 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic rank</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranks (N=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,506 ($59,379, $79,768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (N=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,201 ($63,464, $77,163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,740 ($50,097, $64,115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,619 ($40,703, $53,097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (N=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,415 ($39,145, $42,885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (N=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,959 ($39,777, $42,885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No academic rank (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,359 ($39,097, $42,885)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your institution                                    | Comparison Group Median

NOTE: Average full-time instructional staff salaries for 11/12-month contracts were adjusted to 9-month average salaries by multiplying the 11/12-month salary by .8182. Salaries based on less than 9-month contracts are not included. Medical school staff salaries are not included. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


**Figure 26.** Percent distribution of core revenues, by source: Fiscal year 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local appropriations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and contracts</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other core revenues</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your institution                                    | Comparison Group Median (N=13)

NOTE: The comparison group median is based on those members of the comparison group that report finance data using the same accounting standards as the focus institution. For a detailed definition of core revenues, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


**Figure 27.** Core revenues per FTE enrollment, by source: Fiscal year 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue source</th>
<th>Dollars per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$4,949 ($5,309, $6,175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>$6,175 ($5,628, $6,770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local appropriations</td>
<td>$0 ($0, $0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and contracts</td>
<td>$2,791 ($3,549, $4,194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other core revenues</td>
<td>$1,894 ($2,607, $3,419)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your institution                                    | Comparison Group Median (N=13)

NOTE: The comparison group median is based on those members of the comparison group that report finance data using the same accounting standards as the focus institution. For details on calculating FTE enrollment and a detailed definition of core revenues, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 28. Percent distribution of core expenses, by function: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 29. Core expenses per FTE enrollment, by function: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 30. Expenses for salaries, wages, and benefits as a percent of total expenses, by function: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 31. Endowment assets (year end) per FTE enrollment: Fiscal year 2008
The custom comparison group chosen by Murray State University includes the following 13 institutions:

- Eastern Kentucky University (Richmond, KY)
- Western Kentucky University (Bowling Green, KY)
- Northern Kentucky University (Highland Heights, KY)
- Morehead State University (Morehead, KY)
- Kentucky State University (Frankfort, KY)
- Austin Peay State University (Clarksville, TN)
- Eastern Illinois University (Charleston, IL)
- Jacksonville State University (Jacksonville, AL)
- Southeast Missouri State University (Cape Girardeau, MO)
- Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (Edwardsville, IL)
- Tennessee State University (Nashville, TN)
- Tennessee Technological University (Cookeville, TN)
- The University of Tennessee-Martin (Martin, TN)
METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

Overview

This report is based on data supplied by institutions to IPEDS during the 2008-09 survey year. Response rates exceeded 99 percent for most surveys. Detailed response tables are included in IPEDS First Look reports, which can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/

Comparison Groups

Comparison group data are included to provide a context for interpreting your institution’s statistics. If your institution did not define a Custom Comparison Group for this report by July 14, NCES selected a comparison group for you based on the institutional characteristics detailed immediately above the listing of the comparison group institutions. (If the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was used as an institutional characteristic in the definition of a comparison group, the 2005 Basic version was used.) The comparison group used in this report may not reflect your institution’s peer group, or you may wish to compare your institution to other groups. The Executive Peer Tool (ExPT) (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/) can be used to reproduce the figures in this report using different peer groups.

Use of Median Values for Comparison Group

The value for the focus institution is compared to the median value for the comparison group for each statistic included in the figure. If more than one statistic is presented in a figure, the median values are determined separately for each indicator or statistic. Where percentage distributions are presented, median values may not add to 100 percent. Through the ExPT, users have access to all of the data used to create the figures included in this report.

Missing Statistics

If a statistic is not reported for your institution, the omission indicates that the statistic is not relevant to your institution and the data were not collected. As such, not all notes listed below may be applicable to your report.

Use of Imputed Data

All IPEDS data are subject to imputation for total (institutional) and partial (item) nonresponse. If necessary, imputed values were used to prepare your report.

Data Confidentiality

IPEDS data are not collected under a pledge of confidentiality.

Disaggregation of Data by Race/Ethnicity

When applicable, some statistics are disaggregated by race/ethnicity. Between survey years 2008-09 and 2010-11, the categories used for the collection and reporting of race/ethnicity data in IPEDS are transitioning to those developed in 1997 by the Office of Management and Budget, and institutions may report using either those categories, the older (1977) categories, or a mixture of both. Therefore, during the transition, only derived categories that present comparable data will be displayed. Detailed information about these changes can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/reic/resource.asp.
Endowment Assets

Endowment assets, for public institutions under GASB standards, and private, not-for-profit institutions under FASB standards, include gross investments of endowment funds, term endowment funds, and funds functioning as endowment for the institution and any of its foundations and other affiliated organizations. Private, for-profit institutions under FASB do not hold or report endowment assets.

Equated Instructional Staff Salaries

Total salary outlays for full-time instructional staff on 11/12-month contracts were equated to 9/10-month outlays by multiplying the outlay for 11/12-month contracted instructional staff by 0.8182. The equated outlays were then added to the outlays for 9/10-month instructional staff to determine an average salary for each rank. Salaries for staff on less-than-9-month contracts are not included.

FTE for Enrollment

The full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment used in this report is the sum of the institution’s FTE undergraduate enrollment and FTE graduate enrollment (as calculated from or reported on the 2007-08 12-month Enrollment component) plus the estimated FTE of first-professional students. Undergraduate and graduate FTE are estimated using 12-month instructional activity (credit and/or contact hours). If applicable, first-professional FTE is estimated by calculating the ratio of full-time to part-time first-professional students from the 2007 fall counts and applying this ratio to the 2007-08 12-month unduplicated headcount of first-professional students. The estimated number of full-time students is added to one-third of the estimated number of part-time students. See “Calculation of FTE Students (using instructional activity)” in the IPEDS Glossary at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/.

FTE for Staff

The full-time equivalent (FTE) of staff is calculated by summing the total number of full-time staff from the Employees by Assigned Position (EAP) section of the Human Resources component and adding one-third of the total number of part-time staff.

Graduation Rates and Transfer-out Rate

Graduation rates are those developed to satisfy the requirements of the Student Right-to-Know and Higher Education Opportunity Acts and are defined as the total number of students entering in the fall term (or the prior summer term who returned again in the fall). This includes all first-time undergraduate students, students transferring into the institution at the undergraduate level, and non-degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates entering in the fall. Only degree-granting institutions report total entering students.

Tuition and Required Fees

Tuition is defined as the amount of money charged to students for instructional services; required fees are those fixed sum charges to students for items not covered by tuition that are required of such a large proportion of all students that the student who does not pay the charge is an exception. The amounts used in this report are for full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates and are those used by the financial aid office to determine need. For institutions that have differential tuition rates for in-district or in-state students, the lowest tuition rate is used in the figure. Only institutions that operate on standard academic terms will have tuition figures included in their report.

Retention Rates

Full-time retention rates are defined as the number of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students who enter the institution for the first time in the fall and who return to the same institution the following fall (as either full- or part-time), divided by the total number of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates in the fall of first entrance. Part-time retention rates are similarly defined. For 4-year institutions offering a bachelor’s degree, this rate is reported only for those students seeking a bachelor’s degree. For less than 4-year institutions, the rate is calculated for all degree/certificate-seeking students.

Salaries, Wages, and Benefits

Salaries, wages, and benefits, for public institutions under GASB standards, and private, not-for-profit institutions under FASB standards, include amounts paid as compensation for services to all employees regardless of the duration of service, and amounts made to or on behalf of an individual over and above that received in the form of a salary or wage. Frequently, benefits are associated with an insurance payment. Private, for-profit institutions under FASB standards do not report salaries.

Student-to-Faculty Ratio

An institution’s student-to-faculty ratio is calculated by determining the number of FTE students (using Fall Enrollment data) divided by the total FTE instructional staff (using the total Primarily instruction + Instruction/research/public service staff reported on the EAP section of the Human Resources component). For this calculation, FTE for students is equal to the number of full-time students plus one-third the number of part-time students; FTE for instructional staff is similarly calculated. Students enrolled in “stand-alone” graduate or professional programs and instructional staff teaching in these programs are excluded from the FTE calculations. "Stand-alone" graduate or professional programs are those programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, or public health, in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students (also referred to as “independent” programs).

Total Entering (Undergraduate-Level) Students

Total entering students are students at the undergraduate level, both full- and part-time, coming into the institution for the first time in the fall term (or the prior summer term who returned again in the fall). This includes all first-time undergraduate students, students transferring into the institution at the undergraduate level, and non-degree/certificate seeking undergraduates entering in the fall. Only degree-granting institutions report total entering students.

Additional Methodological Information

Additional methodological information on the IPEDS components can be found in the publications available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubssearch/getpubcats.asp?sid=010. Additional definitions of variables used in this report can be found in the IPEDS online glossary available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/.