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This publication contains a sample of the indicators in *The Condition of Education 2011*. To order the entire printed edition of *The Condition* free of charge, call ED Pubs (1-877-4ED-PUBS).

The indicators in this publication are numbered sequentially, rather than according to their numbers in the complete edition. The Contents page offers a cross-reference between the two publications.

Since 1870, the federal government has gathered data about students, teachers, schools, and education funding. As mandated by Congress, the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the Institute of Education Sciences annually publishes a statistical report on the status and progress of education in the United States. *The Condition of Education* includes data and analysis on a wide variety of issues. These data are taken from government and private sources. The 2011 edition of *The Condition* contains indicators that are divided into five sections:

- Participation in Education
- Learner Outcomes
- Student Effort and Educational Progress
- Contexts of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Contexts of Postsecondary Education

The publication also contains additional tables and notes related to each indicator.
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Indicator 1

Enrollment Trends by Age

Between 2000 and 2009, enrollment rates increased for young adults ages 18–19 and adults ages 20–24, 25–29, and 30–34; students in these age groups are typically enrolled in college or graduate school.

Between 1970 and 2009, the school enrollment rate for children ages 3–4 (typically in nursery or preschool) increased from 20 to 52 percent. More recently, from 2000 through 2009, the enrollment rate for children ages 3–4 remained stable between 52 and 56 percent. The enrollment rate for children ages 5–6, who are typically enrolled in kindergarten or first grade, rose from 90 percent in 1970 to 96 percent in 1976 and has since remained stable. For youth ages 7–13 and 14–15, enrollment rates have remained at nearly 100 percent over the past 39 years, reflecting states’ compulsory age requirements for school attendance. The enrollment rate for 16- to 17-year-olds increased from 90 percent in 1970 to 95 percent in 2009.

For young adults ages 18–19, the overall school enrollment rate increased from 48 to 69 percent between 1970 and 2009, with enrollment at the secondary level increasing from 10 to 19 percent and enrollment at the college level increasing from 37 to 50 percent. Between 2000 and 2009, the college enrollment rate for young adults ages 18–19 increased from 45 to 50 percent. During the same period, the enrollment rate for adults ages 20–24 increased from 32 to 39 percent; for adults ages 25–29, from 11 to 13 percent; and for adults ages 30–34, from 7 to 8 percent.

Technical Notes

Estimates include enrollment in any type of graded public, parochial, or other private school. This includes nursery schools, kindergartens, elementary schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and professional schools. Estimates include only enrollments in regular schooling; that is, schools or classes that advance a person toward a high school diploma, or a college, university, or professional school degree.
Figure 1. Percentage of the population ages 3–34 enrolled in school, by age group: October 1970–2009

NOTE: Includes enrollment in any type of graded public, parochial, or other private schools. Includes nursery schools, kindergartens, elementary schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and professional schools. Attendance may be on either a full-time or part-time basis and during the day or night. Excluded are enrollments in schools or classes that do not advance students to regular school degrees, such as trade schools, business colleges, or vocational schools.


1 Beginning in 1994, new procedures were used to collect enrollment data on children ages 3–4. As a result, pre-1994 data may not be comparable to data from 1994 or later.
Between 2007 and 2009, the average grade 4 reading score showed no measurable change and the average grade 8 reading score increased by 1 point. At grade 12, the average reading score increased by 2 points between 2005 and 2009.

In 2009, the average National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) reading scale score for 4th-graders (221) was not measurably different from the 2007 score, but was higher than the scores on all assessments between 1992 (217) and 2005 (219). For 8th-graders, the average score in 2009 (264) was 1 point higher than in 2007 and 4 points higher than in 1992. The average reading score for 12th-graders was 2 points higher in 2009 (288) than in 2005, the year of the immediately preceding assessment, but was 4 points lower than the score in 1992.

At grade 4, the average reading scores in 2009 for White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native students were not measurably different from their scores in 2007. However, the 2009 reading scores for White, Black, and Hispanic students were higher than the scores from assessment years prior to 2007. In 2009, the average reading score of Black 4th-grade students was less than that of White 4th-grade students by 26 points. This gap was not measurably different from the gap in 2007 but was smaller than the gaps in all other assessment years prior to 2007. In 2009, Hispanic 4th-grade students scored 25 points lower than their White peers; this gap was not measurably different from the gaps in 2007 or 1992.

At grade 8, average reading scores were higher in 2009 than in 2007 for all racial/ethnic groups. Black and Hispanic 8th-grade students scored lower than their White counterparts in 2009, by 26 and 24 points, respectively; neither of these gaps was measurably different from the corresponding gaps in 2007 and 1992.

The average scores for White and Asian/Pacific Islander 12th-graders were higher in 2009 than in 2005 by 3 and 11 points, respectively, while scores for Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians/Alaska Natives did not measurably change. In 2009, White 12th-grade students scored 27 points higher in reading than Black students and 22 points higher than Hispanic students. Neither score gap was measurably different from the respective score gaps in previous assessment years.

Technical Notes

NAEP reading scores range from 0 to 500. Score gaps are calculated based on differences between unrounded scores. The 12th-grade reading assessment was not administered in 2003 or 2007. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.
Figure 2. Average reading scale scores of 4th-, 8th-, and 12th-grade students: Selected years, 1992–2009

NOTE: The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Student assessments are not designed to permit comparisons across subjects or grades. Testing accommodations (e.g., extended time, small group testing) for children with disabilities and English language learners were not permitted in 1992 and 1994; students were tested with and without accommodations in 1998. The 12th-grade NAEP reading assessment was not administered in 2003 or 2007.

Indicator 3
Mathematics Performance and Achievement Gaps

From 1990 to 2009, average grade 4 mathematics scores increased by 27 points and average grade 8 scores increased by 20 points. At grade 12, average scores increased by 3 points between 2005 and 2009.

In 2009, the average National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics scale score for 4th-grade students (240) was not measurably different from the 2007 score, but was higher than the scores on all of the assessments given between 1990 and 2005. The average score for 8th-grade students in 2009 (283) was higher than the average scores in all previous assessment years. From 1990 to 2009, average grade 4 and grade 8 mathematics scores increased by 27 and 20 points, respectively. The average 12th-grade mathematics score was 3 points higher in 2009 (153) than it was in 2005, the year the assessment was first given.

At grade 4, the average mathematics scores in 2009 for White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native students were not measurably different from their scores in 2007. However, the 2009 scores for White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander 4th-grade students were higher than their scores from assessment years prior to 2007. Black 4th-grade students scored 26 points lower than their White peers in 2009. This gap was not measurably different from that in 2007 but was smaller than the gap in 1990, when the average score of Black 4th-grade students was 32 points lower than that of their White peers. The 21-point achievement gap between White and Hispanic 4th-grade students in 2009 was not measurably different from the gap in 2007 or the gap in 1990.

At grade 8, average mathematics scores were higher in 2009 than in 2007 for all racial/ethnic groups except American Indians/Alaska Natives. Black and Hispanic 8th-grade students scored lower than their White counterparts in 2009, by 32 and 26 points, respectively; neither of these gaps was measurably different from the corresponding gaps in 2007 and 1990.

At grade 12, average mathematics scores were higher in 2009 than in 2005 for all racial/ethnic groups. In 2009, White 12th-grade students scored 30 points higher in mathematics than Black students and 23 points higher than Hispanic students. Neither gap was measurably different from the corresponding gaps in 2005.

Technical Notes

NAEP mathematics scores range from 0 to 500 for grades 4 and 8. The framework for the 12th-grade mathematics assessment was revised in 2005; as a result, the 2005 and 2009 results cannot be compared with those from previous years. At grade 12, mathematics scores on the revised assessment range from 0 to 300. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.
Figure 3. Average mathematics scale scores of 4th- and 8th-grade students: Selected years, 1990–2009

NOTE: At grades 4 and 8, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. Testing accommodations (e.g., extended time, small group testing) for children with disabilities and limited-English proficient students were not permitted in 1990 and 1992; students were tested with and without accommodations in 1996.

In 2009, the average U.S. combined reading literacy score and the combined science literacy score for 15-year-old students were not measurably different from the average score of the 34 OECD member countries, while the average U.S. mathematics literacy score was below the OECD average.

The 2009 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) reports the performance of 15-year-old students in reading, mathematics, and science literacy in 65 countries and other education systems, including the 34 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, 26 non-OECD countries, and 5 other education systems. The OECD countries are a group of the world’s most advanced economies. Other education systems refer to non-national entities, such as Shanghai-China.

The U.S. students’ average score on the combined reading literacy scale (500) was not measurably different from the average score of OECD countries (493). Compared with the other 64 countries and other education systems, the U.S. average was lower than the average in 9 countries and other education systems (6 OECD countries, 1 non-OECD country, and 2 other education systems) and higher than the average in 39 countries and other education systems (13 OECD countries, 24 non-OECD countries, and 2 other education systems).

The average U.S. mathematics literacy score (487) in 2009 was lower than the average score of the 34 OECD countries (496). In comparison with students in all 64 other countries and education systems, students in the United States on average scored lower than students in 23 (17 OECD countries, 2 non-OECD countries, and 4 other education systems) and higher than students in 29 (5 OECD countries, 23 non-OECD countries, and 1 other education system).

The average U.S. science literacy score (502) in 2009 was not measurably different from the average score of the 34 OECD countries (501). In comparison with students in all 64 other countries and education systems, students in the United States on average scored lower than students in 18 (12 OECD countries, 2 non-OECD countries, and 4 other education systems) and higher than students in 33 (9 OECD countries, 23 non-OECD countries, and 1 other education system).

Technical Notes

Since PISA is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries and other education systems are displayed separately and are not included in the OECD average. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the 34 OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000.
Figure 4. Average scores of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on reading, mathematics, and science literacy scales: 2009
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy subject area</th>
<th>OECD average</th>
<th>United States average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>487*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, U.S. average is significantly different from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Scores are reported on a scale of 0 to 1,000.

In 2009, young adults ages 25–34 with a bachelor’s degree earned more than twice as much as those without a high school diploma or its equivalent, 50 percent more than high school completers, and 25 percent more than those with an associate’s degree.

For young adults ages 25–34 who worked full time throughout a full year, higher educational attainment was associated with higher median earnings. This pattern was consistent for each year examined between 1995 and 2009. For example, young adults with a bachelor’s degree consistently had higher median earnings than those with less education. This relationship of higher median earnings corresponding with higher educational attainment also held across sex and race/ethnicity subgroups.

In 2009, the median of the earnings for young adults with a bachelor’s degree was $45,000, while the median was $21,000 for those without a high school diploma or its equivalent, $30,000 for those with a high school diploma or its equivalent, and $36,000 for those with an associate’s degree. In other words, young adults with a bachelor’s degree earned more than twice as much as young adults without a high school diploma or its equivalent, 50 percent more than young adult high school completers, and 25 percent more than young adults with an associate’s degree.

Earnings differences were also observed by sex and by race/ethnicity. In 2009, the median of the earnings for young adult males was higher than the median for young adult females at every education level. For example, in 2009 young adult males with a bachelor’s degree earned $51,000, while their female counterparts earned $40,100. In the same year, the median of the earnings of White young adults was higher than that of Black and Hispanic young adults at most education levels. Asian young adults with a bachelor’s degree or master’s degree or higher had higher median earnings than did their White, Black, and Hispanic counterparts in 2009.

Technical Notes

High school completers are those who earned a high school diploma or equivalent (e.g., a General Educational Development [GED] certificate). Full-year worker refers to those who were employed 50 or more weeks during the previous year; full-time worker refers to those who were usually employed 35 or more hours per week. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.
Figure 5. Median annual earnings of full-time, full-year wage and salary workers ages 25–34, by educational attainment and sex: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, Less than high school completion¹</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>$32,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$29,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$40,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Young adults in this category did not earn a high school diploma or receive alternative credentials, such as a General Educational Development (GED) certificate.
² Total represents median annual earnings of young adults with a bachelor’s degree or higher.

NOTE: Full-year worker refers to those who were employed 50 or more weeks during the previous year; full-time worker refers to those who were usually employed 35 or more hours per week.

In 2007–08, about three-quarters of public high school students graduated on time with a regular diploma.

Among public high school students in the class of 2007–08, the averaged freshman graduation rate—an estimate of the percentage of an incoming freshman class that graduates with a regular diploma 4 years later—was 74.7 percent; that is, about 3 million students graduated on time. Wisconsin had the highest graduation rate at 89.6 percent. Sixteen other states had rates of 80 percent or more (ordered from high to low): Vermont, Minnesota, Iowa, New Jersey, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Connecticut, Montana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Illinois, and Idaho. The District of Columbia had the lowest rate, at 56.0 percent. Nine other states had graduation rates below 70 percent (ordered from high to low): Alaska, Alabama, Florida, New Mexico, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Nevada.

The overall averaged freshman graduation rate was higher for the graduating class of 2007–08 (74.7 percent) than it was for the graduating class of 2001–02 (72.6 percent). However, from 2004–05 to 2005–06, the overall averaged freshman graduation rate decreased from 74.7 percent to 73.4 percent. Looking at changes by state, there was an increase in the graduation rate in 40 states from school year 2001–02 to 2007–08; in 8 of these states rates increased by more than 5 percentage points. The graduation rate decreased in 11 states and the District of Columbia; 3 of these experienced a decline of more than 5 percentage points.

Technical Notes

The averaged freshman enrollment count is the sum of the number of 8th-graders 5 years earlier, the number of 9th-graders 4 years earlier (when current-year seniors were freshmen), and the number of 10th-graders 3 years earlier, divided by 3. The intent of this averaging is to account for the high rate of grade retention in the freshman year, which adds 9th-grade repeaters from the previous year to the number of students in the incoming freshman class each year. Ungraded students were allocated to individual grades proportional to each state’s enrollment in those grades. The 2005–06 national estimates include imputed data for the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. The 2007–08 national estimates excludes graduates of semi-private schools in Maine.
Figure 6. Averaged freshman graduation rate for public high school students, by state or jurisdiction: School year 2007–08

NOTE: The rate is the number of graduates divided by the estimated freshman enrollment count 4 years earlier. This count is the sum of the number of 8th-graders 5 years earlier, the number of 9th-graders 4 years earlier, and the number of 10th-graders 3 years earlier, divided by 3. Ungraded students were allocated to individual grades proportional to each state’s enrollment in those grades. The estimate for Maine excludes graduates of semi-private schools. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), “NCES Common Core of Data State Dropout and Completion Data File,” school year 2007–08, version 1b.
Indicator 7
Status Dropout Rates

In general, the status dropout rates for Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics each declined between 1980 and 2009. However, in each year during that period, the status dropout rate was lower for Whites and Blacks than for Hispanics.

The status dropout rate represents the percentage of 16-through 24-year-olds who are not enrolled in school and have not earned a high school credential (either a diploma or an equivalency credential such as a General Educational Development [GED] certificate). In this indicator, status dropout rates are estimated using both the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the American Community Survey (ACS). While the CPS has longer time trends, the 2009 ACS has larger sample sizes than the CPS, thus allowing for more detailed comparisons of status dropout rates by race/ethnicity, nativity, and sex.

Based on the CPS, the status dropout rate declined from 14 percent in 1980 to 8 percent in 2009. In general, the status dropout rates for Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics each declined between 1980 and 2009. However, in each year during that period, the status dropout rate was lower for Whites and Blacks than for Hispanics. In addition, the rate for Asians/Pacific Islanders was lower than that for Hispanics and Blacks every year between 1989 and 2009.

Data from the 2009 ACS show that the status dropout rate for Hispanics born in the United States was higher than the rates for Asians, Whites, Blacks, and persons of two or more races born in the United States. Overall, the status dropout rate for U.S.-born 16- through 24-year-olds was lower than the rate for their peers born outside of the United States (7 vs. 20 percent). Hispanics and Asians born in the United States had lower status dropout rates than did their counterparts born outside of the United States, whereas U.S.-born Blacks had higher status dropout rates than did their counterparts born outside of the United States.

Technical Notes

CPS estimates include civilian, noninstitutionalized 16-through 24-year-olds. Young adults in the military or those who are incarcerated are not included in this measure. However, the 2009 ACS includes noninstitutionalized and institutionalized group quarters. Therefore, due to this and other methodological differences between the CPS and ACS, status dropout estimates from the two surveys are not directly comparable.
Figure 7. Status dropout rates of 16- through 24-year-olds in the civilian, noninstitutionalized population, by race/ethnicity: October Current Population Survey (CPS) 1995–2009

NOTE: The status dropout rate is the percentage of 16- through 24-year-olds who are not enrolled in high school and have not earned a high school credential (either a diploma or an equivalency credential such as a General Educational Development [GED] certificate). The status dropout rate includes all dropouts regardless of when they last attended school. Data for American Indians/Alaska Natives in 1999 have been suppressed due to unstable estimates. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.

Immediate Transition to College

The immediate college enrollment rate after high school increased from 1975 to 1997 (51 to 67 percent), declined from 1997 to 2001 (to 62 percent), then increased from 2001 to 2009 (70 percent). Gaps in immediate enrollment rates by family income, race/ethnicity, and sex have persisted over time.

The rate at which high school completers enrolled in college in the fall immediately after high school ranged from 49 to 70 percent between 1975 and 2009. This rate increased from 51 percent in 1975 to 67 percent in 1997 and then declined to 62 percent in 2001 before increasing to 70 percent in 2009.

In every year between 1975 and 2009, the immediate college enrollment rates of high school completers from low- and middle-income families were lower than those of high school completers from high-income families. In 2009, the difference in enrollment rates between students from low- and high-income families was 29 percentage points (55 percent vs. 84 percent). The difference in rates between students from middle- and high-income families was 17 percentage points (67 percent vs. 84 percent).

Differences in enrollment rates by race/ethnicity have also persisted over time. In every year between 2003 and 2009, the immediate college enrollment rate of Asian high school completers was higher than the rates of White, Black, and Hispanic high school completers. In 2009, the immediate college enrollment rate of Asian high school completers (90 percent) was 19 percentage points higher than that of White high school completers (71 percent). These immediate college enrollment rates of White and Asian high school completers were higher than the rates of Black (63 percent) and Hispanic (62 percent) high school completers.

Technical Notes

Low income refers to the bottom 20 percent of all family incomes, high income refers to the top 20 percent of all family incomes, and middle income refers to the 60 percent in between. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. This indicator provides data on high school completers ages 16–24, who account for about 98 percent of all high school completers in a given year. Before 1992, high school completer referred to those who had completed 12 years of schooling. As of 1992, high school completer refers to those who have received a high school diploma or equivalency certificate.
Figure 8. Percentage of high school completers who were enrolled in 2- or 4-year colleges the October immediately following high school completion, by family income: 1975–2009

1 Due to the small sample size for the low-income category, data are subject to relatively large sampling errors. Therefore, moving averages are used to produce more stable estimates. The 3-year moving average is an arithmetic average of the year indicated, the year immediately preceding, and the year immediately following. For 1975 and 2009, a 2-year moving average is used: data for 1975 reflect an average of 1975 and 1976, and data for 2009 reflect an average of 2008 and 2009.

NOTE: Includes high school completers ages 16–24, who account for about 98 percent of all high school completers in a given year. Low income refers to the bottom 20 percent of all family incomes, high income refers to the top 20 percent of all family incomes, and middle income refers to the 60 percent in between.

Indicator 9
Postsecondary Graduation Rates

About 54 percent of male and 60 percent of female first-time students who sought a bachelor’s degree and enrolled at a 4-year institution full time in fall 2002 completed a bachelor’s degree at that institution within 6 years.

Approximately 57 percent of first-time students who sought a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent and enrolled at a 4-year institution full time in fall 2002 completed a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent at that institution within 6 years. Six-year graduation rates were highest at private not-for-profit institutions (65 percent), followed by public institutions (55 percent) and private for-profit institutions (22 percent).

Among students who enrolled in 4-year institutions in fall 2002, Asian/Pacific Islander students had the highest 6-year graduation rate (67 percent), followed by Whites (60 percent), Hispanics (49 percent), Blacks (40 percent), and American Indians/Alaska Natives (38 percent). At both public and private not-for-profit 4-year institutions, the 6-year graduation rates for females were higher than the rates for males. About 54 percent of male and 60 percent of female first-time students who sought a bachelor’s degree completed a bachelor’s degree at that institution with 6 years. At public institutions, about 58 percent of females seeking a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent graduated within 6 years, compared with 52 percent of males.

At 2-year institutions, about 27 percent of first-time, full-time students who enrolled in fall 2005 completed a certificate or associate’s degree within 150 percent of the normal time required to complete such a degree. Fifty-eight percent of students graduated within 150 percent of the normal time at private for-profit 2-year institutions, 48 percent did so at private not-for-profit institutions, and 21 percent did so at public institutions.

Technical Notes

The graduation rate was calculated as the total number of students who completed a degree at the institution first entered (i.e., did not transfer) within the specified time to degree attainment (for bachelor’s degrees, 6 years; for less than 4-year degrees, 150 percent of the normal time required to attain such a degree) divided by the revised cohort, meaning the cohort minus any allowable exclusions. For this indicator, the revised cohorts are the spring 2009 estimates of the number of students who entered a 4-year institution in fall 2002 as first-time, full-time undergraduates seeking a bachelor’s or equivalent degree and the number of students who entered a 2-year institution in fall 2005 as first-time, full-time undergraduates seeking a certificate or associate’s degree. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.
Figure 9. Percentage of students seeking a bachelor’s degree at 4-year institutions who completed a bachelor’s degree within 6 years, by control of institution and race/ethnicity: Cohort year 2002

NOTE: The rate was calculated as the total number of students who completed a degree within the specified time to degree attainment (6 years) divided by the revised cohort, meaning the cohort minus any allowable exclusions. The revised cohort is the spring 2009 estimate of the number of students who entered the institution in 2002 as first-time, full-time undergraduates seeking a bachelor’s or equivalent degree. Students who transferred to another institution and graduated from the other institution are not counted as completers at their initial institution. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Spring 2009, Graduation Rates component.
Indicator 10

Concentration of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch

In 2008–09, greater percentages of Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native students attended high-poverty elementary and secondary public schools than did White or Asian/Pacific Islander students.

The percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) provides a proxy measure for the concentration of low-income students within a school. High-poverty schools are defined as public schools where more than 75 percent of the students are eligible for FRPL. In 2008–09, approximately 22 percent of elementary and 8 percent of secondary school students attended high-poverty schools, up from the 20 percent of elementary and 6 percent of secondary school students in 2007–08.

In 2008–09, greater percentages of Hispanic, Black, and American Indian/Alaska Native students attended high-poverty public elementary and secondary schools than did White or Asian/Pacific Islander students. In addition, greater percentages of Asian/Pacific Islander students attended these schools than did White students. For example, at the elementary level, 45 percent of Hispanic, 44 percent of Black, and 31 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native students were enrolled in high-poverty schools, compared with 17 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander and 6 percent of White students.

Examining the racial/ethnic distributions within schools of a given poverty level provides a more detailed snapshot of the extent to which students of various races/ethnicities are concentrated in certain schools. White students were underrepresented in high-poverty schools in 2008–09, while Black and Hispanic students were overrepresented. While over half (54 percent) of public school students were White, 14 percent of students attending high-poverty schools were White. Blacks made up 17 percent of students overall and 34 percent of students in high-poverty schools, and Hispanics made up 21 percent of students overall and 45 percent of students in high-poverty schools.

Technical Notes

Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.
Figure 10. Percentage of public school students in high-poverty schools, by race/ethnicity and school level: School year 2008–09

1 Includes students whose racial/ethnic group was not reported.

NOTE: The National School Lunch Program is a federally assisted meal program. To be eligible, a student must be from a household with an income at or below 130 percent of the poverty threshold for free lunch, or between 130 percent and 185 percent of the poverty threshold for reduced-price lunch. High-poverty schools are public schools where more than 75 percent of the students are eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity.

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

Of the 18 million undergraduate students enrolled full or part time 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.

Among undergraduate students who were enrolled full time in fall 2009, some 11 percent 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. 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. 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. At 4-year institutions with open admissions policies, retention rates were 57 percent for full-time and 46 percent for part-time students. 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.

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. Full time refers to students who enrolled full time (as defined by the institution) in the fall.
Figure 11. Percentage distribution of fall undergraduate enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by student attendance status, age, and control and level of institution: Fall 2009

NOTE: Degree-granting institutions grant associate’s or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Institutions in this indicator are classified based on the highest degree offered.

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.

From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of degrees conferred by public, private for-profit, and private not-for-profit institutions generally increased for each level of degree: 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.

The number of associate’s degrees awarded from 1998–99 to 2008–09 increased by 33 percent for public institutions and more than doubled for private for-profit institutions but decreased by 1 percent for private not-for-profit institutions. From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded by public institutions increased by 29 percent, the number awarded by private not-for-profit institutions increased by 26 percent, and the number awarded by private for-profit institutions more than quadrupled. Despite the large percentage increase for 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 conferred by private not-for-profit institutions increased by 48 percent from 1998–99 to 2008–09, yet the percentage of master’s degrees conferred by these institutions remained about the same. The number of master’s degrees conferred by public institutions increased at a lower rate (29 percent), resulting in a decrease in their share of master’s degrees. Private for-profit institutions conferred 2 percent of master’s degrees in 1998–99 and 10 percent in 2008–09.

From 1998–99 to 2008–09, the number of first-professional degrees awarded by public institutions increased by 18 percent, the number awarded by private not-for-profit institutions increased by 16 percent, and the number awarded by private for-profit institutions more than doubled. During the same period, the number of doctoral degrees conferred increased by 42 percent for public institutions, by 62 percent for private not-for-profit institutions, and by almost 500 percent for private for-profit institutions.

**Technical Notes**

This indicator includes only degree-granting institutions that participated in Title IV federal financial aid programs.
Table 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of degree and academic year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>559,954</td>
<td>448,334</td>
<td>111,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>787,325</td>
<td>596,098</td>
<td>191,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>1,200,303</td>
<td>790,287</td>
<td>410,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>1,601,368</td>
<td>1,020,435</td>
<td>580,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>439,986</td>
<td>238,501</td>
<td>201,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>656,784</td>
<td>308,206</td>
<td>348,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–99</td>
<td>78,439</td>
<td>31,693</td>
<td>46,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>92,004</td>
<td>37,357</td>
<td>54,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>67,716</td>
<td>39,911</td>
<td>27,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Includes only institutions that participated in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

The List of Indicators includes all of the indicators that appear on The Condition of Education website (http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe), drawn from the 2003–2011 print volumes. Since indicators are cumulative over the years, the same indicator appearing in multiple years is listed here only for the most recent year. The list is organized first by section then by subject area. Thus, the indicator numbers and the years in which the indicators were published are not sequential.

**Topics in Focus**

Reading—Young Children’s Achievement and Classroom Experiences ................................................................. 2003
Paying for College: Changes Between 1990 and 2000 for Full-Time Dependent Undergraduates ................................. 2004
Mobility in the Teacher Workforce ....................................................................................................................... 2005
U.S. Student and Adult Performance on International Assessments of Educational Achievement ........................... 2006
High School Coursetaking ................................................................................................................................ 2007
Community Colleges ............................................................................................................................................ 2008
U.S. Performance Across International Assessments of Student Achievement ......................................................... 2009
High-Poverty Schools ......................................................................................................................................... 2010
A Closer Look at Postsecondary Education by Institution Level and Control ............................................................. 2011

**Section 1—Participation in Education**

**All Ages**
Enrollment Trends by Age ........................................................................................................................................ 1–2011

**Preprimary Education**
Early Education and Child Care Arrangements of Young Children ........................................................................ 2–2008
Knowledge and Skills of Young Children .............................................................................................................. 3–2009
## Indicators on the Website

### Elementary/Secondary Education
- **Public School Enrollment**: 2–2011
- **Charter School Enrollment**: 3–2011
- **Private School Enrollment**: 4–2011
- **Homeschooled Students**: 6–2009
- **Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools**: 5–2011
- **Family Characteristics of 5- to 17-Year-Olds**: 6–2008
- **Children Who Spoke a Language Other Than English at Home**: 6–2011
- **Children and Youth With Disabilities**: 7–2011

### Undergraduate Education
- **Undergraduate Enrollment**: 8–2011
- **Mobility of College Students**: 10–2008

### Graduate and Professional Education
- **Postbaccalaureate Enrollment**: 9–2011

### Adult Learning
- **Participation in Adult Education**: 10–2007

## Section 2—Learner Outcomes

### Early Childhood Outcomes
- **Children’s Skills and Proficiency in Reading and Mathematics Through Grade 3**: 8–2005
## Academic Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Performance</td>
<td>10–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Achievement Gaps</td>
<td>11–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Performance</td>
<td>12–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Achievement Gaps</td>
<td>13–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Performance</td>
<td>14–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Performance of Students in Grades 8 and 12</td>
<td>14–2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Performance of Students in Grade 12</td>
<td>15–2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Student Mathematics Achievement</td>
<td>15–2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Mathematics Score Trends</td>
<td>13–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement in the Arts</td>
<td>14–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Reading Literacy</td>
<td>15–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Mathematics and Science Literacy</td>
<td>16–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Mathematics Achievement at 5th Grade</td>
<td>16–2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Comparisons of Reading Literacy in Grade 4</td>
<td>18–2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trends in Mathematics Performance</td>
<td>15–2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Mathematics Content</td>
<td>15–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Science Content</td>
<td>16–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History Performance of Students in Grades 4, 8, and 12</td>
<td>14–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography Performance of Students in Grades 4, 8, and 12</td>
<td>13–2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Trends in Adult Literacy ................................................................................................................... 18–2007
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Adult Reading Habits ..................................................................................................................... 20–2006
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Time Spent on Homework .................................................................................................................. 21–2007
Student Preparedness .......................................................................................................................... 22–2007
Postsecondary Expectations of 12th-Graders ...................................................................................... 23–2006

Student Effort
Student Absenteeism .......................................................................................................................... 24–2006

Elementary/Secondary Persistence and Progress
Grade Retention of 16- to 19-Year-Olds ............................................................................................. 25–2006
Grade Retention ..................................................................................................................................... 18–2009
List of Indicators on The Condition of Education Website (2003–2011)
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Public High School Graduation Rates ................................................................................................. 19–2011
Event Dropout Rates by Family Income ............................................................................................. 16–2004
Status Dropout Rates ......................................................................................................................... 20–2011

Transition to College
Immediate Transition to College ........................................................................................................... 21–2011
Remedial Coursedaking ......................................................................................................................... 22–2011

Postsecondary Persistence and Progress
Postsecondary Graduation Rates .......................................................................................................... 23–2011

Completions
Educational Attainment ......................................................................................................................... 24–2011
International Comparison of Educational Attainment .......................................................................... 25–2011
Degrees Earned .................................................................................................................................... 26–2011
Advanced Degree Completion Among Bachelor’s Degree Recipients .................................................. 32–2006

Section 4—Contexts of Elementary and Secondary Education

School Characteristics and Climate
Characteristics of Public Schools .......................................................................................................... 27–2011
Parents’ Attitudes Toward Schools ....................................................................................................... 38–2006
Concentration of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch .................................................. 28–2006

The Condition of Education 2011 in Brief
School-Age Children Living in Poverty ................................................................. 29–2011
Concentration of Public School Enrollment by Locale and Race/Ethnicity ................................................................. 26–2009
Rates of School Crime .................................................................................................................. 30–2011
School Crime and Safety ........................................................................................................... 26–2010
School Suspension and Expulsions ...................................................................................... 28–2009

**Teachers and Staff**

Newly Hired Teachers ............................................................................................................ 28–2010
Elementary/Secondary School Teaching Among Recent College Graduates .................. 37–2006
Characteristics of Full-Time Teachers .................................................................................. 31–2006
Teacher Turnover: Stayers, Leavers, and Movers ............................................................. 32–2011
Characteristics of School Principals ..................................................................................... 33–2011
Principal Turnover: Stayers, Leavers, and Movers ............................................................. 34–2011
Public School Staff ............................................................................................................. 30–2010
Student Support Staff in Public Schools ............................................................................. 35–2007
International Teacher Comparisons ..................................................................................... 29–2009

**Learning Opportunities**

Parent and Family Involvement in Education ........................................................................ 30–2009
Early Development of Children ............................................................................................. 35–2005
Early Literacy Activities ......................................................................................................... 33–2006
Afterschool Activities ............................................................................................................. 29–2007
Student/Teacher Ratios in Public Schools ............................................................................. 31–2010
List of Indicators on *The Condition of Education* Website (2003–2011)

Out-of-Field Teaching in Middle and High School Grades ......................................................... 28–2003
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**School Choice**
Parental Choice of Schools ........................................................................................................... 32–2009
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Public School Revenue Sources .................................................................................................... 35–2011
Public School Expenditures ........................................................................................................... 36–2011
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Education Expenditures by Country .................................................................................................. 38–2011
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U.S. Students Studying Abroad ........................................................................................................ 40–2010
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Undergraduate Fields of Study ............................................................................................................. 40–2011
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College Student Employment .............................................................................................................. 45–2011
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