The Demographic Wave

• Rapid expansion and diversification of graduates

• Source: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), *Knocking at the College Door*, March 2008
The Demographic Wave

Between 1996 and 2022, the percent of US public high school graduates who are Hispanic grows from 10% to 28%.

20% → 40%
23% → 45%
20%

Regional and state variation in growth

Class of 2022 entered 3rd grade this fall

Sources: CDC National Center for Health Statistics Monthly Vital Statistics Reports (births); Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (high school graduates); NCES Digest of Educational Statistics 2010 (immediate college enrollees); College Board (SAT Examinees in US Cohort)
Trends in CBS Student Characteristics

- Increasingly diverse SAT examinees

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in CBS Student Characteristics

- Increasingly diverse SAT examinees

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in CBS Student Characteristics

- Steady % First Generation in past 10 years

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation - Rank

Percent of Cohort Ranked in Top Tenth of Graduating Class

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation - Rank

Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation - GPA

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation - GPA

• Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation – AP/Honors

Steady rise across disciplines

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2011 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation – AP/Honors

• Similar, troubling gaps were observed across disciplines

• The difference by race/ethnicity were most notable in:

  • Math
    • In the class of 2011, 48% of Asian examinees indicating taking AP/Honors Math compared to 24% of Black/African American and 30% of Hispanic examinees.

  • Science
    • In the class of 2011, 44% of Asian examinees indicating taking AP/Honors science compared to 23% of Black/African American and 27% of Hispanic examinees.
Trends in Academic Preparation – Calculus

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2007 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation – Calculus

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2007 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation – Physics

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2007 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Trends in Academic Preparation – Physics

• Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps

Source: College-Bound Seniors 1991-2007 Profile Report analyses of self-reported information from the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ)
Access to Rigorous Courses

- Steady rise across groups; persistent gaps
- Hispanic and white rates are identical
Performance in Rigorous Courses

- Equity & Excellence metric
  - Percent of graduates scoring 3 or higher on an AP exam during high school.
  - Found in APRN, OSR, etc.
  - Not equivalent to ‘pass rate’ which reflects the percent of examinees scoring 3 or higher.
Some thoughts on ‘Pass Rates’

• It’s not that we don’t want to talk about them or aren’t concerned about students who aren’t successful.

• The issue is about interpretation and potential behavior consequences.
  
  • On a state or national level, they reflect vastly different school/district policies as to who gets into AP, who takes the exam, and how well those students were prepared both prior to and during AP.
  
  • The easiest way to increase pass rates is to build barriers to entry, as opposed to doing the hard work of making sure that students and teachers have the tools to succeed.
    
    • It is more efficient/cheaper to decrease the denominator than it is to increase the numerator. Is that good for students?
Performance in Rigorous Courses

AP E&E Rate - US Public Schools

- Total Group
- American Indian
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic
- White

Graph showing the AP E&E rate for different groups from 2001 to 2011.
Who’s knocking at the college door?

- An increasingly diverse and academically prepared student body
  - Also motivated and confident
- This presents substantial challenges and incredible opportunities
Questions?

- Researchers are encouraged to freely express their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in College Board presentations do not necessarily represent official College Board position or policy.

- Please forward any questions, comments, and suggestions to:
  - Kelcey Edwards – kedwards@collegeboard.org
Landscape of Higher Education: Net Price

Greg Perfetto
Executive Director, College Connection & Success
October 26, 2012
Net Price Calculators -- Overview

- Early data from first year under mandate

- Broad Representation
  - 318 Colleges
  - Public, Private, Doctoral, Baccalaureate
  - Over 1 Million NPC “hits” since going live.
  - Almost 600K completed calculations over the just completed 12 month cycle, yielding detailed information on net cost, as well as family contribution estimates based on both IM and FM needs analysis.

- Preliminary look at affordability landscape
## NPC Data Overview: 2011-12

### Total NPC Accesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11,272</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>733,436</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>277,078</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,021,786</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>203,953</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175,899</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidWest</td>
<td>149,163</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western States</td>
<td>104,713</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>84,047</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>32,813</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>30,596</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>781,184</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost, Price and Family Contribution (FM) by College Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Type</th>
<th>NPC Completion Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
<th>NP/Cost</th>
<th>EFC</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36,918</td>
<td>32,711</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>12,424</td>
<td>7,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17,970</td>
<td>13,767</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>11,230</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13,522</td>
<td>16,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>32,592</td>
<td>22,246</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20,122</td>
<td>105,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27,335</td>
<td>17,644</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14,405</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>41,048</td>
<td>26,076</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18,469</td>
<td>13,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>43,249</td>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20,296</td>
<td>62,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>49,572</td>
<td>27,813</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23,246</td>
<td>21,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>57,028</td>
<td>28,888</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25,951</td>
<td>204,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50,827</td>
<td>25,611</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>159,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>47,470</td>
<td>26,155</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22,791</td>
<td>597,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall, Net Price is about 60 to 80% cost for Publics, 50 to 65% for Privates
- Completion rates (hits to full info) generally runs in the 70-80% range for typical Public and Private 4-yr colleges

Eliminate incomplete records and those with insufficient data to generate family contribution estimates.
Net Price and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Band</th>
<th>Net Price (Mean)</th>
<th>Percent in Income Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 10000</td>
<td>12,814</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 - 20000</td>
<td>15,640</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001 - 30000</td>
<td>15,777</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001 - 50000</td>
<td>16,666</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50001 - 75000</td>
<td>20,607</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75001 - 100000</td>
<td>23,694</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100001 - 125000</td>
<td>25,748</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125001 - 150000</td>
<td>27,383</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150001 - 200000</td>
<td>29,283</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200001+</td>
<td>31,895</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 21,422

- Below $100,000 Public and Private are very similar on Net Price
- Above $100,000 Net Price diverges with Private > Public
- Similar distribution of NPC users across income levels for Public and Private, with slight shift towards higher income for users at Private Colleges

### NPC Users by Income Band (Percent of Total)

- Public NPC Users
- Private NPC Users
Who is using NPC Calculators

Relative to the overall population, NPC usage tends to be over-representative of students from upper-income and very low income families.

Students from Middle-to-lower income families are under-represented.

Summary – Mandate vs. Opportunity

• Net Price Calculators are in widespread use and provide a pre-application window on families who are concerned about affordability.

• Preliminary information suggests that there is general consensus between public and private colleges on expected family contribution across income levels.

• Current aid policies appear to cancel out public vs. private prices differences for middle to lower income families, however net prices diverge for families making more than $75,000 with private education becoming significantly more expensive.

• Within our restricted sample, IM and FM methodologies yield similar average family contribution estimates, with major difference being the IM option for a Student Contribution regardless of income level.

• NPC Calculators are an important tool for communicating more realistic information about net price – versus “sticker price”. However, the early data suggest that while the message appears to be reaching students from very low income families, additional opportunities may exist to reach prospective students from families in the $10k-$50k income range.
Net Price Calculator Requirement

- In accordance with the *Higher Education Opportunity Act* of 2008 (HEOA), by October 29, 2011, each postsecondary institution that participates in Title IV federal student aid programs must post a net price calculator on its website that uses institutional data to provide estimated net price information to current and prospective students and their families based on a student’s individual circumstances. This calculator should allow students to calculate an estimated net price of attendance at an institution (defined as cost (price) of attendance minus grant and scholarship aid) based on what similar students paid in a previous year. The net price calculator is required for all Title IV institutions that enroll full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking undergraduate students.
Questions?

Greg Perfetto
Enrollment Research
The College Board
gperfetto@collegeboard.org
The Changing Landscape of How We Understand Postsecondary Pathways – With a Focus on Transfer Students and Persistence Anywhere

The College Board Annual Forum
Miami, FL
October 26, 2012

Don Hossler
Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Indiana University &
Senior Consultant, National Student Clearinghouse Research Center
My Goals Today

• Expand thinking beyond what we typically think we know from IPEDS, SLDS systems, or institutional views of enrollment patterns.

• Better understand the actual enrollment patterns of many students

• Encourage you to start playing “what if” with your own data by linking it with data held by the Clearinghouse.

• A more complex look at transfer students.
A Tale of Two Students

Traditional Student

Retention at Institution of Origin

Mobile Student

Persistence Anywhere
Entering cohort of fall 2006

- 2.8 million unique students reported to NSC (full- and part-time)
Analysis

• Tracked each student for up to five years or first degree

• Identified mobility and transfer:
  – Any change of institution prior to first degree completion

• All enrollment terms counted, including summer

• Origin institution

• Destination institution
45 Percent of Four-Year Degrees Go to Students with Previous Enrollment in a Two-Year Institution

2010/11 degrees awarded

U.S. Overall = 45%

*Students were considered enrolled at two-year institutions if they had at least one full-time or part-time enrollment at a two-year institution prior to the four-year completion date.
27% of 4-to-2 Mobility/Reverse Transfer Students Enroll at the Two-Year Institution Only During Summer Months

- 27% Summer Only
- 73% Regular Term
The Pathways for Reverse Transfers - Summer

- Did not return to 4-yr
- Returned to other 4-yr
- Returned to origin institution
27 Percent of All Students Who Changed Institutions Also Crossed a State Line

Institutional Origins of Transfer Students

- **Public**
  - Two-Year: 330,948
  - Four-Year: 242,042
- **Private Nonprofit**
  - Two-Year: 1,699
  - Four-Year: 73,010
- **Private For-Profit**
  - Two-Year: 5,377
  - Four-Year: 1,427

- **Transferred Out of State**
  - Public: 91,104
  - Private Nonprofit: 1,861
  - Private For-Profit: 1,427
- **Transferred Within State**
  - Public: 322,844
  - Private Nonprofit: 60,546
  - Private For-Profit: 2,949
Bottom Line:
One-Third of Students Enroll in a Different Institution within Five Years of Their First Enrollment Term or by the Time they Earn a Degree (whichever comes first)

| Prevalence of Transfer and Mobility Among All Students in Entry Cohort, Fall 2006 |
|---------------------------------|--------|------|
| N                               | %      |      |
| Transfers                       | 923,196| 33.1%|
| Non-Transfers                   | 1,869,765| 67.0%|
| Total                           | 2,792,961| 100.0%|
That's *Half* of Each Institution’s Students (on average)
Within the Mobile Students group, One-Quarter Moved More Than Once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Transfer &amp; Mobility, 2006–11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Once</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three Times or More</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Mobile Students</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mobility & Transfer Rates by Level of Origin and Destination Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Transferred</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Four-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destination Institution
- Two-Year
- Four-Year
Transfer & Mobility Rates by Enrollment Intensity

% of Fall 2006 Entering Cohort by Enrollment Intensity

- Full-Time: 32.6%
- Part-Time: 33.9%
Some Key Takeaways

• One-third of all students transferred at least once within five years

• Transfer and mobility rates were similar for part- and full-time students, public, and private nonprofit students

• Of those who transfer:
  – Most prevalent destination was a public two-year (43 percent)
  – One-quarter of mobile students transfer or move more than once
  – More than one-quarter move across state lines (27 percent)
Traditional View

- 1/2 is hard to forget
- Education as time, place
- Institutional home
- Graduation rate
- How many students complete vs. dropout
- Fear the data

Mobile View

- 1/2 is hard to ignore
- Education as career, path
- Institutional stepping stone
- Network path efficiency
- How do institutions bend student trajectories
- Free the data
Final Comments

• For public policy makers
  – Without clear and accurate information on student enrollment patterns it is impossible to develop public policy incentives that will lead to desired outcomes.

• For Institutional Policy Makers
  – You cannot develop sound enrollment management plans if you lack a clear understanding of the enrollment patterns of your students.
Thank You

Research Center Snapshots and Reports:
http://research.studentclearinghouse.org/

Don Hossler
hossler@indiana.edu
The College Completion Agenda

From “Education for Education’s Sake” to Return on Investment and Gainful Employment

Patrick J. Kelly

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Why ROI and Gainful Employment?

• State policymakers are realizing they can’t afford to reach the postsecondary goals they are targeting under “business as usual” scenarios.

• Beyond the Federal concern about Pell grants and loan repayment, the economic recession has led many state policymakers to heightened awareness of the mismatch between the graduates being produced (and their skills) and employer demand.
Return on Investment
The Personal and State Returns if Each State Produced an Additional 100 Undergraduate Certificates, 100 Associate Degrees, and 100 Bachelor’s Degrees

Additional Annual State Revenues Generated

Additional Annual Personal Income Generated

High Personal Gain, Low State Revenues Gain

Low Personal Gain, Low State Revenues Gain

High Personal Gain, High State Revenues Gain

Low Personal Gain, High State Revenues Gain
Calculating the Economic Value of Increasing College Credentials by 2025
United States

Set Postsecondary Performance Goals for Year 2025

Increase College Access

- High School Graduation Rate: 87.0%
- College-Going Rate Directly from High School: 75.0%
- 2020-2025 39-Year-Olds Enrolled in College: 2.40%

Increase Number of College Credentials

- Public Research: 26.0
- Public Bachelor's and Master's: 24.4
- Public Two-Year: 42.7
- Private Colleges: 37.2

Undergraduate Credentials Awarded per 100 Students

Optional: Set 2025 College Attainment Goal (%)

- Goal: 60.0%
- Current College Attainment of 25 to 64 Year Olds is 36.3%
- Gap: Additional Degrees Needed to Meet: 24,305,885

Results: Additional Undergraduate Credentials Awarded by 2025

- Associate's: 12,412,476
- Bachelor's: 12,002,697
- Total Additional Undergraduate Credentials: 32,266,610

Additional Undergraduate Credentials Awarded Annually

Note: The default positions reflect current rates and values. The results in 2025 assume linear progress toward goals.

Created by NCHEMS and CLASP
Calculating the Economic Value of Increasing College Credentials by 2025
United States

Change in Personal Income per Capita
In Current $

Additional State Revenues Generated
In Current $

Additional Revenues Generated
In Current $

State and Federal Costs vs Revenues Generated
In Current $

Note: The default positions reflect current rates and values. The results in 2025 assume linear progress toward goals.
Gainful Employment
Environmental Pressures

• Federal Gainful Employment

• Effective utilization of federal SLDS grants

• College attainment/completion goals – state retention of graduates and economic returns

• Increased focus on “credentials of value” – the attainment of credentials of less than two-years in length (primarily) that yield living/competitive wages

• Meeting employment demand in key areas – e.g. health, education, STEM, trades

• Increasing need for employment outcomes data to make the case for continued investment (state and federal policymaking environments)
The Data are Simple

**Institution Records**
- Completions
- Level of Award (Certificate, Associates, Bachelor’s Masters, Doctorate, Professional)
- CIP Code of Award – Field of Study
- Origin of Student
- Continued Enrollment

**Employment/Wage Records**
- Employed – record in the database (excludes self employed, military, and employed out-of-state)
- Earnings
- Industry of Employment
- Region of Employment

**Data Available by Term**
- SSN

**Data Available Quarterly**
Major Questions Answered

• What percentage of the graduates are employed in-state – by level and type of award?

• Are the graduates employed in the region in which they graduate?

• What are their quarterly earnings?

• What industries are the employed in? (only relevant in a few fields)

• What percentage continue to enroll/persist in postsecondary education?
Most Effective Uses of the Data

• **State brain drain.** Is the state retaining the graduates it produces? How is it changing over time? (the impact on the degree and attainment goals of the state).

• **State-level supply and demand.** What is the employment status of graduates in key areas of demand for the state? E.g. health and STEM fields, certain trades. Don’t fall into the trap of overly detailed program-to-occupation supply and demand studies.

• **Regional supply and demand.** Are institutions producing graduates that meet local employer needs? What are the employment status and wages of the graduates they produce?

• **Information for students and families.** What programs provide the highest wages in the short-run? What programs are more likely to require continued education upon completion?
Institutional Accountability (Difficult)

• Small numbers of graduates for many programs

• It is very difficult to calculate the “value added” by institution – i.e. the likely employment and wages of students had they not completed their college credentials

• The state economy treats graduates from some institutions better than graduates from others (with the same credentials) – the “prestige” factor

• Institutions serving large numbers of place-bound students are victims of their local economy (e.g. a part of the state that has low wages relative to other parts of the state)

• The difficult balance between directing students into programs with competitive wages and providing student choice
Median Annual Wages by General Field of Study and Age (United States)
(Includes Only Bachelor’s Degree Holders, Not Residents Who Earned Graduate/ Professional Degrees)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey (Public Use Microdata Sample)
How Can We Tell a Story with the Data?
Many Students Re-Enrolled Following Completion

Percentage of 2005-06 Completers Who Continued to Enroll the Following Year

- **Business and Com:** 51.7% (Certificates), 25.2% (Certificates 1 Year), 16.7% (Certificates 2 Years), 29.4% (Associate Degrees)
- **Health:** 56.6% (Certificates), 33.6% (Certificates 1 Year), 24.0% (Certificates 2 Years), 11.0% (Associate Degrees)
- **Soc and Beh Sciences:** 62.2% (Certificates), 45.2% (Certificates 1 Year), 33.7% (Certificates 2 Years), 31.4% (Associate Degrees)
- **STEM:** 44.8% (Certificates), 33.7% (Certificates 1 Year), 41.8% (Certificates 2 Years), 33.6% (Associate Degrees)
- **Trades:** 41.8% (Certificates), 24.0% (Certificates 1 Year), 16.7% (Certificates 2 Years), 29.4% (Associate Degrees)

---

Certifications (Less than 1 Year) | Certifications (1 Year, Less than 2 Years) | Associate Degrees
---|---|---
Business and Com | 51.7% | 25.2% | 16.7% | 29.4%
Health | 56.6% | 33.6% | 24.0% | 11.0%
Soc and Beh Sciences | 62.2% | 45.2% | 33.7% | 31.4%
STEM | 44.8% | 33.7% | 41.8% | 33.6%
Trades | 41.8% | 24.0% | 16.7% | 29.4%
Arts and Humanities | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
Business and Com | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
Health | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
Soc and Beh Sciences | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
STEM | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
Trades | 56.8% | 29.4% | 11.0% | 11.0%
Of Those Who Didn’t Re-Enroll, How Many are Employed in State?

Percentage of 2005-06 Completers Who Employed the Following Year

- **Business and Com**: 74.1%
- **Health**: 82.1%
- **Soc and Beh Sciences**: 77.1%
- **STEM**: 77.3%
- **Trades**: 73.7%
- **Business and Com**: 61.6%
- **Health**: 87.4%
- **STEM**: 60.0%
- **Trades**: 68.0%
- **Arts and Humanities**: 78.3%
- **Business and Com**: 80.2%
- **Health**: 87.8%
- **Soc and Beh Sciences**: 82.6%
- **STEM**: 77.8%
- **Trades**: 82.8%
What are Their Median Annual Wages One Year After Completion?

Median Annual Wages of 2005-06 Completers the Following Year

- Business and Com: $23,726
- Health: $20,316
- Soc and Beh Sciences: $16,808
- STEM: $39,154
- Trades: $26,396
- Business and Com: $20,126
- Health: $32,305
- STEM: $17,013
- Trades: $30,307
- Arts and Humanities: $27,132
- Business and Com: $24,184
- Health: $34,478
- Soc and Beh Sciences: $20,963
- STEM: $35,000
- Trades: $34,478

Median Annual Wages of Working Adults with Just a High School Diploma ($16,122)
### Median Annual Wages of Working Adults with Just a High School Diploma ($16,122)

#### Median Annual Wages of 2005-06 Completers Five Years After Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Certificates (Less than 1 Year)</th>
<th>Certificates (1 Year, Less than 2 Years)</th>
<th>Associate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc and Beh Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>$33,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td>$21,386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$35,956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>$26,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>$39,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>$34,484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td>$29,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc and Beh Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>$24,276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$46,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Completion</th>
<th>Employed Five Years Following Graduation</th>
<th>Median Annual Earnings</th>
<th>Total Personal Income Generated Above the High School Median Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc and Beh Sciences</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Com</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc and Beh Sciences</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employed Over the Five Year Period

Median Earnings Over Five Years

Total Personal Earnings Above a High School Wage ($16,122)

Total Additional Earnings Generated Over the Five Years = $438,756,988

**NCHEMS**
Making the Case for the Graduating Cohort of 2005-06

Total Additional Earnings Over Last Five Years = $438,756,988

Additional State Tax Revenues Generated = $68,536,366
- Income Tax $37,818,493
- Property Tax $8,471,451
- Sales Tax $22,246,422

Savings to the State = $25,707,910
- Medicaid $20,078,941
- Corrections $5,628,969

Total Revenues and Savings to the State = $94,244,276