Southeastern Community College
West Burlington, IA
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, 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=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated headcount - total</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>6,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE enrollment</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>3,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time fall enrollment</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>2,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time fall enrollment</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>2,546</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. Full-time enrollment by degree/certificate seeking status: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of full-time student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Figure 3. Part-time enrollment by degree/certificate seeking status: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of part-time student</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-in, degree/ certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree/certificate-seeking undergraduate</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Figure 4. Percent of students enrolled who are women: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All students</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Figure 5. Percent of all 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" 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.


Figure 6. 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 7. Academic year tuition and required fees for full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates: 2006-07–2008-09

NOTE: The tuition and required fees shown here are the lowest reported from the categories of in-district, in-state, and out-of-state. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 8. Percent of students receiving Pell Grants: 2007-08

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

Figure 9. 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

NOTE: Pell Grants and Other Federal Grants are included in Federal Grants above. 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 10. 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

NOTE: Pell Grants and Other Federal Grants are included in Federal Grants above. Average grant values were calculated by dividing the total grants awarded by the total number of recipients in each institution. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Figure 11. Percent of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students receiving loans, by type of loan: 2007-08

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 12. Average amounts of loans received by full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates, by type of loan: 2007-08

- **Any loan**: $3,800 (Your institution), $4,394 (Comparison Group Median)
- **Federal**: $3,678 (Your institution), $3,676 (Comparison Group Median)
- **Non-federal**: $3,622 (Your institution), $5,259 (Comparison Group Median)

**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 13. Retention rates of first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students, by enrollment status: Fall 2008

- **Full-time**: 55% (Your institution), 54% (Comparison Group Median)
- **Part-time**: 46% (Your institution), 36% (Comparison Group Median)

**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 14. 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 (2005 cohort)

- **Graduation rate cohort as a percent of all undergraduates (N=15)**: 20%
- **Graduation rate cohort as a percent of total entering students (N=14)**: 17%
- **Graduation rate, overall (N=15)**: 38%
- **Transfer-out rate (N=8)**: 20%

**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 15. Graduation rates of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 150% of normal time to program completion, by race/ethnicity: 2005 cohort

Graduation rates by race/ethnicity

Your institution | Comparison Group Median
--- | ---
American Indian or Alaska Native (N=13) | 27 38
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (N=14) | 0 17
Black or African American (N=14) | 20 18
Hispanic/Latino (N=15) | 11 8
White (N=15) | 13 20
Two or more races (N=0) | 28 41
Race/ethnicity unknown (N=13) | 45 30
Nonresident alien (N=10) | 25 27

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 16. Graduation rates of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within normal time, and 150% and 200% of normal time to completion: 2004 cohort

Time to program completion

Your institution | Comparison Group Median (N=15)
--- | ---
Normal time | 10 25
150% of normal time | 22 37
200% of normal time | 26 46

NOTE: The Normal time and 150% graduation rates are the Student Right-to-Know (SRK) rates; the 200% 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 17. Number of degrees or certificates awarded, by level: Academic year 2007-08

Level of award

Your institution | Comparison Group Median (N=15)
--- | ---
Associate's | 472 492
Certificates of at least 2 but less than 4 years | 0 0
Certificates of at least 1 but less than 2 years | 148 145
Certificates of less than 1 year | 0 0

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

Figure 18. Full-time equivalent staff, by assigned position: Fall 2008

Staff category

- Instruction/research/public service: 92
- Executive/administrative/managerial: 39
- Other professional: 61
- Non-professional: 53

Number of staff

- Your institution: 138
- Comparison Group Median (N=15): 89

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


Figure 19. Average salaries of full-time instructional staff equated to 9-month contracts, by academic rank: Academic year 2008-09

Academic rank

- All ranks (N=15): $58,963
- Professor (N=7): $58,963
- Associate professor (N=7): $48,756
- Assistant professor (N=6): $44,035
- Instructor (N=13): $48,167
- Lecturer (N=0): $48,167
- No academic rank (N=3): $39,696

Average salary

- Your institution: $45,519
- Comparison Group Median: $45,092

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. At least three values in the comparison group are required to calculate the median.


Figure 20. Percent distribution of core revenues, by source: Fiscal year 2008

Revenue source

- Tuition and fees: 13
- State appropriations: 12
- Local appropriations: 10
- Government grants and contracts: 26
- Other core revenues: 12

Percent

- Your institution: 100
- Comparison Group Median (N=15): 100

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 21. Core revenues per FTE enrollment, by source: Fiscal year 2008

Revenue source

- Tuition and fees: $1,616
- State appropriations: $1,187
- Local appropriations: $1,251
- Government grants and contracts: $3,592
- Other core revenues: $1,767

Dollars per FTE

- Your institution: $2,467
- Comparison Group Median (N=15): $2,467

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.

Institutional support
Endowment per FTE

Endowment assets (year end) per FTE enrollment: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 25. Endowment assets (year end) per FTE enrollment: Fiscal year 2008

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 more information, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


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 more information, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 24. Expenses for salaries, wages, and benefits as a percent of total expenses, by function: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 22. Percent distribution of core expenses, by function: Fiscal year 2008

Figure 23. Core expenses per FTE enrollment, by function: Fiscal year 2008

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 expenses, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


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 expenses, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

COMPARISON GROUP

The custom comparison group chosen by Southeastern Community College includes the following 15 institutions:

- Des Moines Area Community College (Ankeny, IA)
- Eastern Iowa Community College District (Davenport, IA)
- Ellsworth Community College (Iowa Falls, IA)
- Hawkeye Community College (Waterloo, IA)
- Indian Hills Community College (Ottumwa, IA)
- Iowa Central Community College (Fort Dodge, IA)
- Iowa Lakes Community College (Estherville, IA)
- Iowa Western Community College (Council Bluffs, IA)
- Kirkwood Community College (Cedar Rapids, IA)
- Marshalltown Community College (Marshalltown, IA)
- North Iowa Area Community College (Mason City, IA)
- Northeast Iowa Community College-Calmar (Calmar, IA)
- Northwest Iowa Community College ( Sheldon, IA)
- Southwestern Community College (Creston, IA)
- Western Iowa Tech Community College (Sioux City, IA)
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/pubsearch/getpubcats.asp?sid=010.

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.

Postbaccalaureate Degree Categories

In 2008-09 IPEDS, new postbaccalaureate degree categories were introduced as optional. The new categories are Doctor’s degree, Research/scholarship, Doctor’s degree-Professional practice, and Doctor’s degree-Other. In addition, the First-professional degree and certificate categories and the single Doctor’s degree category are being phased out. During the transition period, all First-professional students are reflected as graduate students, all First-professional degrees awarded are reflected as Doctor’s degrees, and all Doctor’s degrees reported under the new categories are aggregated under a single Doctor’s degree category, so that data reported by all institutions are comparable.

Cohort Determination for Reporting Student Financial Aid and Graduation Rates

Student cohorts for reporting Student Financial Aid and Graduation Rates data are based on the reporting type of the institution. For institutions that report based on an academic year (those operating on standard academic terms), student counts and cohorts are based on fall term data. Student counts and cohorts for program reporters (those that do not operate on standard academic terms) are based on unduplicated counts of students enrolled during a full 12-month period.

Description of Statistics Used in the Figures

Core Expenses

Core expenses for public institutions using the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards include expenses for instruction, research, public service, academic support, institutional support, student services, operation and maintenance of plant, depreciation, scholarships and fellowships, other expenses, and nonoperating expenses. Core expenses for private, not-for-profit and public institutions reporting under the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) standards include expenses for instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, net grant aid to students, and other expenses. For all institutions, core expenses exclude expenses for auxiliary enterprises (e.g., bookstores, dormitories), hospitals, and independent operations. Expenses for operation and maintenance of plant for GASB institutions are included in other core expenses, but are allocated to each of the other functions for FASB institutions.

Core Revenues

Core revenues for public institutions reporting under GASB standards include tuition and fees; government appropriations (federal, state, and local); government grants and contracts; private gifts, grants, and contracts; investment income; other operating and nonoperating sources; and other revenues and additions. Core revenues for private, not-for-profit institutions (and a small number of public institutions) reporting under FASB include tuition and fees; government appropriations (federal, state, and local); government grants and contracts; private gifts, grants, and contracts; investment return; sales and services of educational activities; and other sources. Core revenues for private, for-profit institutions reporting under FASB standards include tuition and fees; government appropriations (federal, state, and local); government grants and contracts; private gifts and contracts; net investment income; sales and services of educational activities; and other sources. In general, core revenues exclude revenues from auxiliary enterprises (e.g., bookstores, dormitories), hospitals, and independent operations.
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 individuals from a given cohort of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates who completed a degree or certificate within a given percent of normal time (for the degree or certificate) before the ending status date of August 31, 2008, divided by the entire cohort of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates minus any allowable exclusions. Institutions are permitted to exclude from the initial cohort students who died or were totally and permanently disabled; those who left school to serve in the armed forces or were called to active duty; those who left to serve with a foreign aid service of the federal government, such as the Peace Corps; and those who left to serve on an official church mission. Transfer-out rate is the total number of students from the cohort who are known to have transferred out of the reporting institution within the same time period, divided by the same adjusted cohort. Only institutions with a mission that includes preparing students from the cohort who are known to have transferred out of the 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.

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.

ADDITIONAL METHODOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Additional methodological information on the IPEDS components can be found in the publications available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/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/.