The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is the core postsecondary education data collection program for the NCES. 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 17, 2007

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 2006-07 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. 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/ipedspas/expt/. This year the ExPT offers several new features. 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 the PDF format. In addition, there are a number of additional figures available in the ExPT that are not included in your original report such as enrollments by student level, admissions and test scores, and more finance figures.

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

Best regards,

Elise S. Miller
IPEDS Program Director

What is the Purpose of this Report?

The IPEDS Data Feedback Report is intended to provide institutions a context for examining the data they submitted to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (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 2006-07 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.

What is IPEDS?

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a system of survey components that collects data from all institutions in the United States and other jurisdictions, such as Puerto Rico, 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. Each year nearly 6,700 postsecondary institutions provide information to the U.S. Department of Education through IPEDS. 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.

Would You Like to Do More Analysis of Your IPEDS Data?

The information in this report can be produced for a different comparison group using the IPEDS Executive Peer Tool (ExPT) at http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/expt. If you would like to make comparisons on a wider range of IPEDS variables, the more comprehensive IPEDS Peer Analysis System (PAS) is available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas. In both systems, you may select your own comparison group by institution name or by using selected variables. Through the ExPT, you may also print additional copies of this report.

Selected Figures

These figures are based on 2006-07 IPEDS data submitted by your institution, University of Oregon, and the comparison group listed later in this report. The number of institutions in the comparison group from which the median is derived is shown as "(N = x)" in the labels or in the legend at the bottom of the figure.

University of Oregon
Figure 1. Unduplicated 12-month headcount of all students and of undergraduate students, total FTE enrollment (academic year 2005-06), and full- and part-time fall enrollment (Fall 2006)

Enrollment measure

- Unduplicated headcount - total: 24,024
- Unduplicated headcount - undergraduates: 18,701
- Total FTE enrollment: 20,090
- Full-time fall enrollment: 17,900
- Part-time fall enrollment: 2,448

Number of students
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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. Percent of all students enrolled, by race/ethnicity, and percent women: Fall 2006

Race/ethnicity or gender

- White, non-Hispanic: 74
- Black, non-Hispanic: 4
- Hispanic: 3
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 7
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 6
- Race/ethnicity unknown: 4
- Nonresident alien: 5
- Women: 53
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NOTE: 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 3. Academic year tuition and required fees for full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates: 2004-05—2006-07

Academic year

2006-07
- Tuition and fees: $5,838
- Institutional grants: $6,144
2005-06
- Tuition and fees: $5,613
- Institutional grants: $5,540
2004-06
- Tuition and fees: $5,490
- Institutional grants: $5,681

Tuition and fees
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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 4. Percent of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students receiving financial aid, by type of aid: 2005-06

Type of aid

- Federal grants: 17
- State and local grants: 8
- Institutional grants: 39
- Loans: 40

Percent
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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 5. Types and average amounts of financial aid received by full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates: 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants</td>
<td>$3,267</td>
<td>$3,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local</td>
<td>$1,563</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional grants</td>
<td>$1,717</td>
<td>$4,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>$4,459</td>
<td>$1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,244</td>
<td>$3,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,393</td>
<td>$1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,267</td>
<td>$3,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollars

NOTE: Average grant (or loan) values were calculated by dividing the total grants (or loans) awarded by the total number of recipients in each institution. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 6. Graduation rates of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 150% of normal time to program completion, by race/ethnicity: 2000 cohort

NOTE: 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.


Figure 7. Graduation rate cohort as a percent of all undergraduates and as a percent of total entering students (Fall 2006); graduation rate and transfer-out rate (2000 cohort); and retention rates (Fall 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate cohort as % of undergraduates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate cohort as % of entering class</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate, overall (N=10)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-out rate (N=7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time retention rate (N=10)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time retention rate (N=10)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent

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. 4-year schools report retention rates for students seeking a bachelor's degree. For more information, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 8. Number of degrees awarded, by level: Academic year 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of degree</th>
<th>Your institution</th>
<th>Comparison Group Median (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-professional</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's degrees</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degrees</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degrees</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>4,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of degrees

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


University of Oregon
Figure 9. Percent distribution of core revenues, by source: Fiscal year 2006

Your institution
Comparison Group Median (N=10)

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 10. Core expenses per FTE enrollment, by function: Fiscal year 2006

Your institution
Comparison Group Median (N=10)

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. Expenses per full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, particularly instruction, may be inflated because finance data includes all core expenses while FTE reflects credit activity only. For details on calculating FTE enrollment and a detailed definition of core expenses, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.


Figure 11. Full-time equivalent staff by assigned position: Fall 2006

Your institution
Comparison Group Median (N=10)

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


Figure 12. Average salaries of full-time instructional staff equated to 9-month contracts, by academic rank: Academic year 2006-07

Your institution
Comparison Group Median (N=10)

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.

This custom comparison group for University of Oregon includes the following 10 institutions:

- Indiana University-Bloomington (Bloomington, IN)
- SUNY at Buffalo (Buffalo, NY)
- University of California-Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara, CA)
- University of Colorado at Boulder (Boulder, CO)
- University of Iowa (Iowa City, IA)
- University of Kansas (Lawrence, KS)
- University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (Ann Arbor, MI)
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, NC)
- University of Virginia-Main Campus (Charlottesville, VA)
- University of Washington-Seattle Campus (Seattle, WA)
METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

Overview

The statistics and indicators in this report are based on data supplied by institutions to IPEDS during the 2006-07 survey year. Once the data submissions were locked by the institution’s keyholder (and others), they were reviewed by the Help Desk and migrated to the IPEDS Peer Analysis System. Response rates for 2006-07 exceeded 99 percent for most surveys. Detailed response tables are included in the appendices to the IPEDS First Looks. See http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds under "publications."

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 June 30, 2007, 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 multiple groups of institutions. The Executive Peer Tool (ExPT) (see http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/expt) can be used to produce the figures in this report for different groups of institutions.

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 percent 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.

Use of Imputed Data

All IPEDS data are subject to imputation for nonresponse—both total (institutional) nonresponse and partial (item) nonresponse. Imputed values are included for both your institution and any institutions in your comparison group. For example, if an institution in your comparison group did not complete the Enrollment component, NCES imputed the data for that institution AND the imputed data were used in determining the median values for each comparison group statistic.

Data Perturbation and Confidentiality

Four laws cover protection of the confidentiality of individually identifiable information collected by NCES—the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended; the E-Government Act of 2002; the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002; and the USA Patriot Act of 2001. Under law, public use data collected and distributed by NCES may be used only for statistical purposes. Any effort to determine the identity of any reported case is prohibited by law. In order to preserve individuals’ confidentiality, data in the Graduation Rates, Student Financial Aid, and Human Resources components of IPEDS are perturbed. Only perturbed data are available in the Peer Analysis System and the ExPT; the perturbed data were used in creating this report.

Descriptions of Statistics Used in the Figures

Calculating FTE Enrollment

The full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment used in this report is the sum of the institutions’ FTE undergraduate enrollment and FTE graduate enrollment (as calculated from or reported on the 2006 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). First-professional FTE is estimated by calculating the ratio of full-time to part-time first-professional students from the fall counts (Part A) and applying this ratio to the 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/.

Calculating 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.

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.

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
Graduation Rates and Transfer-out Rate

Graduation rates are those developed to satisfy the requirements of the Student Right-to-Know (SRK) Act 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 150 percent of normal time (for the degree or certificate) before the ending status date of August 31, 2006, 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 to transfer are required to report transfers out.