

A GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATION OF  
MASTER'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

JOHN CLINTON KINKEAD II

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the  
Department of Educational Leadership,  
Policy, and Technology Studies  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2009

Copyright John Clinton Kinkead, II 2009  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

This study had two primary objectives. First, this study sought to create a classification system to which publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities could be grouped according to geographical service (rural-serving, suburban-serving, or urban-serving). Second, once the classification system was developed and applied, the study, using descriptive statistics, sought to describe selected characteristics of these institutions. The variables chosen to describe these institutions included membership status in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), student unduplicated headcount enrollments, number of degrees awarded, student race/ethnicity, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness.

Using population data from the 2000 United States decennial census, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), this study had four major findings. First, most (94%) of publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities are participating members of AASCU. Second, publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities are approximately 61% rural-serving, 21% suburban-serving, and 17% urban-serving. Of the 2.5 million students enrolled during academic year 2006-07, 50% were enrolled in a rural-serving institution, while 25% and 24% were enrolled in suburban-serving and urban-serving institutions, respectively. Third, publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities enroll and graduate a very diverse student body. In total, students at public master's institutions are 61% White, 13% Black, and 11% Hispanic. While this is true in

total, significant minority enrollments were observed from the rural, suburban, and urban subclasses. Fourth and finally, student financial aid at public master's institutions has not kept pace with the need for student loans. In nearly every subclass, loans represent the single largest percentage of financial aid. Regretfully, the average loan taken out by a student at a public master's institution is nearly \$4,000. Moreover, the suburban-serving sector of public master's institutions posts the highest loan figure of \$4,474.

The study concludes with recommendations for policy, practice, and future studies. Discussions of the findings with an overall relevance to the future of higher education in the 21st century are offered.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife Amy and my children, Nora and Grant Kinhead, and the beautiful addition who will join our family in January.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people that have helped me reach this point in my life. First, I thank God that I was blessed with the ability and opportunity to pursue doctoral training. Beyond this, I wish to thank my parents, John and Mary Kinkead, for teaching the importance of education and to pursue my dreams with great tenacity. I also wish to thank my wife, Amy Kinkead, for being a constant source of encouragement for me. Amy, your many hours of proofreading were very much appreciated. My children, Nora, Grant, and Johnah Kinkead, are the shining jewels of my life. I love each of you more than words could ever describe. Nora, I especially appreciate your kind words and uplifting spirit concerning Daddy's big project.

I also wish to mention my in-laws, Larry and Karen York. Thank you for the many hours of prayers and support. Specifically, Larry York motivates me. I wish that Larry's health would have allowed him to finish his doctorate. Although he never formally finished, he will always be Dr. York to me.

I would also like to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Natalie Adams, Dr. David Hardy, Dr. Randall Schumacker, Allan Ostar, and Dr. Chun-Mei Zhao for their service. My chairman, Dr. Katsinas, has been a constant supporter and advocate for my work. I am so very thankful that I was fortunate enough to study under this great man.

Lastly, I would like to thank all of my fellow graduate students for their hard work and dedication. Know that I am truly inspired by each of your stories.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASCU- American Association of State Colleges and Universities

HBCU- Historically Black College or University

HSI- Hispanic Serving Institution

MCU- Master's Colleges and Universities

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	7
Significance of the Problem .....	10
Purpose of the Study .....	10
Research Questions .....	11
Definitions of Terms .....	11
Terms Related to the Carnegie Classifications .....	12
Terms Related to the United States Census .....	13
Terms Related to NCES/IPEDS .....	16
Geographical Region .....	18
Terms Related to Higher Education .....	19
Limitations .....	20
Delimitations.....	21



Assumptions .....	21
Summary .....	22
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Introduction .....	23
Colleges of the Forgotten Americans .....	23
The Distinctiveness of Master’s Colleges and Universities .....	26
The American Association of State Colleges and Universities .....	28
History and Growth of AASCU .....	28
Researching AASCU Institutions .....	32
Present-Day AASCU .....	34
Challenges for the Future .....	37
Understanding the Context of Place .....	42
Students at AASCU-Type Institutions .....	46
Characteristics of First-Generation College Students .....	48
Experiences of First-Generation College Students .....	51
Challenges of First-Generation College Students .....	53
The Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education .....	54
Summary .....	62
<b>3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>64</b>
Introduction .....	64
Description of the Population .....	64
Classification Methods .....	67
Selection of Variables .....	70

	Instrumentation .....	71
	Data Collection .....	72
	Research Questions.....	74
	Data Analysis .....	75
	Summary .....	76
4.	PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	77
	Introduction.....	77
	Research Question 1 .....	77
	Discussion.....	78
	Research Question 2 .....	86
	Discussion.....	86
	Summary .....	100
5.	CONCLUSION AND RECCOMENDATIONS .....	101
	Introduction.....	101
	A Comparison of the Current and Proposed Classification Schema .....	104
	Findings.....	108
	Conclusions.....	111
	Recommendations.....	115
	Recommendations for Policy.....	115
	Recommendations for Future Research.....	119
	Closing Thoughts .....	121
	REFERENCES .....	124
	APPENDICES:	

A. ALL MASTER’S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY TYPE, CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION AND HBCU STATUS .....	131
B. GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PUBLICLY-CONTROLLED CARNEGIE CLASSIFIED MASTER’S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES .....	153
C. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MEMBERSHIP AS OF SEPTEMBER 2008 .....	165
D. GRADUATE ENROLLMENT DATA AT PUBLIC MASTER’S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATION.....	184
E. IRB APPROVAL .....	186

## LIST OF TABLES

1. All Master's Colleges and Universities by Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments for Academic Year 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	9
2. Total Number of Institutions and Total Enrollments for Master's Colleges and Universities by Program Size and Control, Numbers and Percentages .....	41
3. The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Class and Subclasses, 1973 and 1976 .....	58
4. The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Class and Subclasses, 1987 and 1994 .....	59
5. The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Class and Subclasses, 2000 and 2005 .....	61
6. Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Enrollments, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	80
7. Number of Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments at Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities by Geographical Classification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers, Percentages, and Average Enrollments .....	80
8. Annual Unduplicated Headcount Undergraduate Enrollments at Public Master's Colleges and Universities by Race/Ethnicity: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages.....	82
9. Total Undergraduate Annual Unduplicated Headcount Enrollments at Public Master's Colleges and Universities by Race/Ethnicity and Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	84
10. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded at Public Master's Colleges and Universities in Academic Year 2006-07 for First and Second Major by Race/Ethnicity, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	88
11. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded at Public Master's Colleges and Universities for First and Second Major by Race/Ethnicity and Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	91

12. Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master’s Colleges and Universities 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	93
13. Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master’s Colleges and Universities by Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages .....	95
14. Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Master’s Colleges and Universities: Average Award Amounts 2006-07, Expressed in Dollars .....	97
15. Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master’s Colleges and Universities by Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Average Award Amounts Expressed in Dollars .....	99
16. Number of Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments at Publicly-Controlled Master’s Colleges and Universities by Modified Geographical Classification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers, Percentages, and Average Enrollments .....	113
17. Master’s Colleges and Universities by Modified Geographical Reclassification, Institutions and American Association of State Colleges and Universities Membership .....	116

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Introduction

In an effort to better understand the nature, roles, and resources of colleges and universities, classifications are offered to compare institutions of higher education. In 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education first developed a classification system describing both public and private institutions of higher education to support its research program (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a). The classification system was later published in 1973 for use by researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. The Carnegie Classifications, published by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, continues to offer its Basic Classification for all institutions of higher education in the United States. The most current version of the classification categories, released in February 2006, includes 33 Basic Classification categories. These 33 Basic Classification categories can be reduced to six broad categories: (1) Doctorate-granting Universities, (2) Master's Colleges and Universities, (3) Baccalaureate Colleges, (4) Associate's Colleges, (5) Special Focus Institutions, and (6) Tribal Colleges.

All degree-granting accredited institutions in the United States are classified by the Carnegie Classification system. Each institution's classification is periodically reviewed and updated in order to more accurately reflect the changing scopes and missions of institutions. The most recent revision of the Carnegie Classifications was completed and published on the Carnegie website in 2006. The next scheduled update to the classifications will occur in 2010.

The wide acceptance of the Carnegie Classification system by policymakers, scholars, and practitioners alike is due to its utility as a tool to examine institutions of higher education, by separating institutions of similar interest.

Under the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification, four-year institutions are separated into three broad categories: (1) Doctoral, (2) Master's, and (3) Baccalaureate (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2009b). Each of these three broad categories are further subdivided into three subclasses. Doctorate-granting institutions are classified as either (a) Research Universities-Very High Research Activity, (b) Research Universities-High Research Activity, or (c) Doctoral/Research Universities. Institutions belonging to the Master's sector are classified as (a) Master's Colleges and Universities-Larger Programs, (b) Master's Colleges and Universities-Medium Programs, or (c) Master's Colleges and Universities-Smaller Programs. Finally, Baccalaureate institutions are classified as (a) Baccalaureate Colleges-Arts and Sciences, (b) Baccalaureate Colleges-Diverse Fields, or (c) Baccalaureate Colleges-Associates. Thus, there are a total of 9 subcategories into which all four year institutions of higher education may be placed based on the Carnegie universe. These 9 subcategories are then further categorized based upon level of control (public, private-not-for-profit, private-for-profit). This study has as its primary interest the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities sector.

While the most current version, the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification, refers to the institutions under investigation in this study as "Master's Colleges and Universities," the 1973, 1976, and 1987 editions of the classification system referred to them as "Comprehensive Universities and Colleges." For the purposes of this study, these two terms are deemed to be equivalent, as they are describing the similar institutions.

As noted above, master's institutions are currently divided into three categories (large,

medium, small) based on the number of master's degree conferred (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b). An institution is defined by the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification as a master's institution if that institution is not identified as a Special Focus Institution or Tribal College, and awards a minimum of 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees. A Special Focus institution is an institution that awards at least 75% of its degrees in one discipline or is only accredited by a special focus accrediting agency, while a Tribal College is an institution recognized as a member of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

The 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification system classifies the Master's Colleges and Universities based upon the number of master's degrees awarded during the 2003-2004 academic year (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a). A master's institution is defined as, "Institutions awarding at least 200 master's degrees were included among larger programs; those awarding 100–199 were included among medium programs; and those awarding 50–99 were included among smaller programs" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b, n. p.).

It is both necessary and important, however, to note that the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification categories are offered only as limited timeframe snapshots of institutions. Due to the ever-changing nature of higher education institutions, Carnegie recognizes that no college or university is permanently bound by a single classification. For example, some previously classified Master's Colleges and Universities are now classified as Baccalaureate Colleges. Moreover, any institution, with respect to a specified timeframe, institutional mission, and degrees awarded, may be subject to classification change (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b, n. p.).



While the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification system sub-divides the Master's Colleges and Universities sector into three subclasses (large, medium, and small), this study seeks to further sub-divide the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities geographically using city population data from the 2000 United States Decennial Census. Dividing the institutions geographically would create nine potential possibilities for the master's institutional classification. Since the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification systems characterizes the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities as either large, medium, or small, the proposed system would create rural-serving large, medium, and small; suburban-serving large, medium, and small; and urban-serving large, medium, and small.

The rationale for this additional geographically-based division is four-fold. First, the Associate's Colleges sector has already been classified geographically by Carnegie, thus there is precedent for sub-classifying institutions geographically. Based upon the work of Katsinas, Hardy, and Lacey (2005), Carnegie's 2005 Basic Classification categories for the first time classified the Associate's Colleges sector geographically, by rural-serving, urban-serving, and suburban-serving, which allows separation and institutional comparison based upon geography. Using the appropriate Carnegie classification, community college researchers may now access the appropriate federal data sets via the U.S. Department of Education's/National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). These data sets are included in the NCES/IPEDS dataset cutting tool.

Second, it is clear that major differences exist among the basic sectors of institutional classifications. A careful analysis of the publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities performed by this researcher reveals that 250 of the 266 total institutions or 94% are also members of the American Association of State Colleges and

Universities (AASCU). Perhaps the most important book-length treatment of this understudied sector was Alden Dunham's *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities*, published in 1969 as part of the book series edited by the late Clark Kerr. Dunham (1969) suggested that AASCU member institutions more closely parallel the Associate's Colleges sector than any other institutional type; therefore, the task of classifying the master's sector in a similar fashion to the associate's sector is justified. Moreover, Ostar (1991) echoed the views of Dunham, by proclaiming that community colleges and AASCU institutions "share a similar philosophy, and serve a similar clientele" (p. 23) that often includes first-generation, minority, low-income, and working students.

Third, the additional sub-classification of the Master's Colleges and Universities sector assists in the greater understanding of place. The geographic subclasses for the Associate's Colleges are characterized as rural-serving, urban-serving, or suburban-serving. These geographic characterizations enable scholars and practitioners to more accurately compare institutions and offer a more complete analysis for accreditation, benchmarking, and other purposes. Can a similar geographically-based classification scheme of Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities bring enhanced precision to what we know about these institutions?

"Stewardship of place" is a core value of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, which acknowledges and celebrates regional distinction and community involvement (AASCU, 2002). Just as Associate's Colleges are institutions that exist to provide access, so too do Master's Colleges and Universities (Katsinas, 2009). A common classification scheme between the Associate's Colleges and Master's Colleges and Universities will allow a more precise examination of transfer, which long has been associated with geography.

The “stewards of place” initiative strives to bring America’s promise of higher education to all who seek it, as AASCU institutions are places of access and student-centeredness. Moreover, access and use of institutional resources are not limited to students. Rather, the larger surrounding community benefits from the work of the college or university, and thus projects an atmosphere that generally is both appreciative and understanding of the culture in which the institution operates. Therefore, the geographical (rural-serving, urban-serving, or suburban-serving) sub-classification of these institutions is justified and necessary for a more comprehensive understanding of the larger communities and contexts in which these institutions operate (AASCU, 2002).

Fourth and finally, as approximately 94% of all publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master’s Colleges and Universities are member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, further exploration into the relationship between Carnegie classification and AASCU membership is needed. Nearly 56% of all public four-year higher education enrollments are found at AASCU institutions (AASCU, 2009b). With a plurality of all publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master’s Colleges and Universities belonging to AASCU, it would seem appropriate to sub-classify them geographically, to explore both geographic and functional differences that flow from those geographic differences.

Dunham (1969) suggested that many students at AASCU institutions were first-generation college students. President Barack Obama recently spoke to the need of dramatically expanding bachelor’s degree attainment among U. S. adults (Obama, 2009). Katsinas (2009) has recently argued that enrollment caps at large public flagship institutions are forcing minority and first-generation populations to seek access from other types of institutions. Simply put, to significantly expand access to higher education in the four year sector for the underserved low

income, minority, and first-generation students will likely not occur without the active, if not increased participation, of America's 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities.

### Statement of the Problem

The 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification system does not classify the 658 (public, private, and private-for-profit) Master's Colleges and Universities according to geographical service region (rural-serving, urban-serving, and suburban-serving). This makes research on this important sector of higher education much more difficult. A researcher interested in Master's Colleges and Universities and the 3.8 million students they serve would have to develop his or her own classification scheme in order to make geographical comparisons between institutions within this sector. With no set classification system in place, there is no manner in which to ensure that research reports concerning geographic diversity among Master's Colleges and Universities can be captured. Additionally, a growing body of literature suggests that many of the nation's community colleges are serving students that ultimately transfer to nearby "regional" universities, which would likely be classified as Master's Colleges and Universities and within the membership purview of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The Master's Colleges and Universities classified by Carnegie are likely serving as the front-line transfer institutions for many of the nation's community college students. Over the years, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities has partnered with the American Association of Community Colleges to identify salient issues in regard to student transfer including cooperative agreements, common course numberings, and statewide common core curricula (AACC & AASCU, 2003).

Identifying and classifying Master's Colleges and Universities in a similar manner to that

of the Associate's College sector would bring potentially much greater precision to the study of transfer for both sets of these access oriented institutions. Given President Barack Obama's (2009) recently stated education goals that seek to increase the nation's college-going rate, it seems likely that a more seamless and consistent approach to the study of both the Associate's Colleges and Master's Colleges and Universities sectors is called for.

This study had as its primary interest publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities. As revealed in Table 1, the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities represent approximately 40% of the entire master's institutional universe, while privately-controlled institutions represent 53% and private-for-profit institutions account for 7%. While the publicly-controlled institutions represent 40% of the institutional universe, they enroll 2.5 million, or 65% of the 3.8 million total students enrolled in a Master's College or University.

Table 1

*All Master's Colleges and Universities by Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments for Academic Year 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers*

*and Percentages*

	Number of Institutions								Undergraduate Enrollments							
	Public		Private		For Profit		Total		Public		Private		For Profit		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Smaller Programs	31	12	82	24	13	30	126	19	169,643	7	208,925	18	24,644	13	403,212	10
Medium Programs	69	26	107	31	13	30	189	29	443,570	18	308,379	27	46,345	24	798,294	21
Larger Programs	166	62	159	46	18	41	343	52	1,894,666	76	626,879	55	120,120	63	2,641,665	69
Total	266	100	348	100	44	100	658	100	2,507,879	100	1,144,183	100	191,109	100	3,843,171	100
Smaller Programs	25%		65%		10%		100%		42%		55%		6%		100%	
Medium Programs	37%		57%		7%		100%		56%		39%		6%		100%	
Larger Programs	48%		46%		5%		100%		72%		24%		5%		100%	
Total	40%		53%		7%		100%		65%		30%		5%		100%	

Source:

NCES/IPEDS

Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Data Source: Carnegie Foundation for the

Advancement of Teaching, 2009

## Significance of the Problem

A major purpose of colleges and universities is to provide service and outreach to the regions and communities they serve. In an effort to provide the highest quality service, institutions of higher education need to better understand their students. As Dunham (1969) suggested, state colleges and universities serve a significantly diverse set of students, many of whom are first-generation college students, more often than do other institutions. These institutions often develop targeted and highly specialized programs to assist in the successful transition of their students.

With no existing research scheme that geographically classifies Master's Colleges and Universities, and little research on the relationship between Master's Colleges and Universities and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, we know much less about these institutions and they serve the unique student populations attracted to their institutions.

Thus, the present study has potential for shaping future policy and research. The Master's Colleges and Universities sector, particularly those in rural-serving areas, are in great need of research-based policy solutions. As for research, the current study addresses the void in the existing literature concerning publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to create and test a classification system that places public Master's Colleges and Universities into a geographically-based classification scheme, and to examine the selected characteristics of the institutions belonging to this sector. Using city and population data from the 2000 United States Decennial Census, a geographical subclass can be created to more accurately describe institutions currently classified as Master's Colleges and

Universities. The geographical terminology includes rural-serving, urban-serving, and suburban-serving. Creating subclass categories for Master's Colleges and Universities makes for a much more accurate and sophisticated method by which to study this sector of higher education.

### Research Questions

1. In a manner consistent with existing Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching nomenclature, can a more precise classification scheme be developed for the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities?
2. What are the characteristics of a publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities institution with regard to:
  - Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded
  - Student Race and Ethnicity
  - Student Financial Aid
  - Student Loan Indebtedness

### Definitions of Terms

A major purpose of this study was to develop a classification system by which Master's Colleges and Universities may be classified geographically. The geographic classifications (rural-serving, urban-serving, suburban-serving) closely follow the classifications outlined by Hardy (2005) in his classification of the Associate's Colleges sector. Because this study employs a methodology consistent with that of Hardy (2005), the definitions of terms closely follow the pattern in which Hardy described them. This study used terminology drawn from four major sources that include the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the 2000 United States Decennial Census, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities



(AASCU), and the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The following section provides definitions that were used for the purposes of this study.

### *Terms Related to the Carnegie Classifications*

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification- The Basic Classification is an update of the traditional classification framework developed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in 1970 to support its research program, and later published in 1973 for use by other researchers.

Although this classification has undergone many changes over the years, the current release involves some significant changes from previous editions. For a complete description and technical details, these can be found at the Carnegie Foundation Website at

<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications>. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Associate's Colleges- Includes institutions where all degrees are at the associate's level, or where bachelor's degrees account for less than 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees. This classification excludes institutions eligible for classification as Tribal Colleges or Special Focus Institutions (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

Doctorate-granting Universities- Includes institutions that award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year (excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.). This classification excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

Master's Colleges and Universities- Generally includes institutions that award at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year. This classification excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of

Teaching, 2009c).

Baccalaureate Colleges- Includes institutions where baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10 percent of all undergraduate degrees and that award fewer than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees per year (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

Special Focus Institutions- Institutions awarding baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where a high concentration of degrees is in a single field or set of related fields. This classification excludes Tribal Colleges (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

Tribal Colleges- Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, as identified in IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c).

#### *Terms Related to the United States Census*

Census- A complete enumeration of a population or the business and commercial establishments, factories, farms, or governments in an area (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Census 2000- The 22nd decennial census, taken as of April 1, 2000, for the United States, Puerto Rico, and several island areas under U.S. jurisdiction, officially called the 2000 Census of Population and Housing (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Central City- In a metropolitan area (MA), the largest place and, in some areas, one or more additional places that meet official standards issued by the federal Office of Management and Budget. If a place extends beyond an MA, only the portion within the MA is a central city. A few primary metropolitan statistical areas do not have a central city (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

City- A type of incorporated place in all states and the District of Columbia. In Virginia, all cities are not part of any county, and the Census Bureau treats them as county equivalents as well as

places for purposes of data presentation; there also is one such independent city in each of three states: Maryland, Missouri, and Nevada. In 23 states and the District of Columbia, some or all cities are not part of any minor civil division, and the Census Bureau treats them as county subdivisions as well as places for purposes of data presentation. In agreement with the State of Hawaii, the Census Bureau does not recognize the city of Honolulu for presentation of decennial census data. See consolidated city, county equivalent, county subdivision, governmental unit, incorporated place, independent city, and independent place (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA)- A geographic entity designated by the federal Office of Management and Budget for use by federal statistical agencies. An area becomes a CMSA if it qualifies as a metropolitan area, has a census population of one million or more, has component parts that qualify as primary metropolitan statistical areas based on official standards, and local opinion favors the designation. CMSAs consist of whole counties except for the New England states, where they consist of county subdivisions (primarily cities and towns) (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

County- The primary legal division of every state except Alaska and Louisiana. A number of geographic entities are not legally designated as a county, but are recognized by the Census Bureau as equivalent to a county for data presentation purposes. These include the boroughs, city and boroughs, municipality, and census areas in Alaska; parishes in Louisiana; and cities that are independent of any county (independent cities) in Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, and Virginia. They also include the municipios in Puerto Rico, districts and islands in American Samoa, municipalities in the Northern Mariana Islands, and islands in the Virgin Islands of the United States. Because they contain no primary legal divisions, the Census Bureau treats the District of

Columbia and Guam each as equivalent to a county (as well as equivalent to a state) for data presentation purposes. In American Samoa, a county is a minor civil division (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) - A large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. This collective term was established by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 1990 to refer to metropolitan statistical areas, consolidated metropolitan areas, primary metropolitan statistical areas, and New England County Metropolitan Areas. The OMB establishes MAs based on census data related to a set of published official standards (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Place- A concentration of population either legally bounded as an incorporated place or delineated for statistical purposes as a census designated place (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Population- All people living in a geographic area (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA)- A geographic entity designated by the federal Office of Management and Budget for use by federal statistical agencies. If an area that qualifies as a metropolitan statistical area has a census population of 1 million or more, two or more PMSAs may be designated within it if they meet published official standards and local opinion favors the designation. When PMSAs are established within a metropolitan area, that metropolitan area is designated a consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA) (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

State- The primary governmental division of the United States. The Census Bureau treats the

District of Columbia as the equivalent of a state for data presentation purposes. It also treats a number of entities that are not legal divisions of the United States (Puerto Rico and the Island Areas) as equivalent to a state for data presentation purposes (Decennial Management Division Glossary, 2009).

#### *Terms Related to NCES/IPEDS*

Financial Aid- Grants, loans, assistantships, scholarships, fellowships, tuition waivers, tuition discounts, veteran's benefits, employer aid (tuition reimbursement) and other monies (other than from relatives/friends) provided to students to meet expenses. This includes Title IV subsidized and unsubsidized loans made directly to students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)- The full-time equivalent (FTE) of students is a single value providing a meaningful combination of full time and part time students. IPEDS data products currently have two calculations of FTE students, one using fall student headcounts and the other using 12-month instructional activity (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

First-Time/Full-time student (undergraduate)- A student who has no prior postsecondary experience attending any institution at the undergraduate level. Includes students enrolled in academic or occupational programs. Also includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term, and students who entered with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Graduate student- A student who holds a bachelor's or first-professional degree, or equivalent, and is taking courses at the post-baccalaureate level. These students may or may not be enrolled in graduate programs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Integrated Post Secondary Data System (IPEDS)- The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), conducted by the NCES, began in 1986 and involves annual institution-level data collections. All postsecondary institutions that have a Program Participation Agreement with the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE), U.S. Department of Education (throughout IPEDS referred to as “Title IV”) are required to report data using a web-based data collection system. IPEDS currently consists of the following components: Institutional Characteristics (IC); 12-month Enrollment (E12); Completions (C); Human Resources (HR) composed of Employees by Assigned Position (EAP), Fall Staff (S), and Salaries (SA); Fall Enrollment (EF); Graduation Rates (GRS); Finance (F); and Student Financial Aid (SFA) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)- The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Part-time student- Undergraduate—A student enrolled for either 11 semester credits or less, or 11 quarter credits or less, or less than 24 contact hours a week each term. Graduate—A student enrolled for either 8 semester credits or less, or 8 quarter credits or less (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Race/ethnicity- Categories developed in 1997 by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that are used to describe groups to which individuals belong, identify with, or belong in the eyes of the community. The categories do not denote scientific definitions of anthropological origins. The designations are used to categorize U.S. citizens, resident aliens, and other eligible non-citizens (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Individuals are asked to first designate ethnicity as:

Hispanic or Latino or

Not Hispanic or Latino

Second, individuals are asked to indicate all races that apply among the following:

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Black or African American

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

White

Student Financial Aid Survey - This annual component of IPEDS began with a pilot test in 1999, and collected both institution price and student financial aid data. The 2000-01 data collection included questions regarding the total number of full-time first-time degree/certificate-students receiving financial assistance for the previous year, and the number of them who received financial assistance by type of aid and the average amount. The tuition and other price items are now part of the Institutional Characteristics (IC) component; the student financial aid questions remain part of SFA (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Unduplicated headcount- The sum of students enrolled for credit with each student counted only once during the reporting period, regardless of when the student enrolled (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Undergraduate student- A student enrolled in a 4- or 5-year bachelor's degree program, an associate's degree program, or a vocational or technical program below the baccalaureate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

*Geographical Region*

Far West- AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Great Lakes- IL, IN, MI, OH, WI (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Mid East- DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

New England- CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Plains- IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Rocky Mountains- CO, ID, MT, UT, WY (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Southeast- AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Southwest- AZ, NM, OK, TX (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

### *Terms Related to Higher Education*

Bachelor's Degree- An award (baccalaureate or equivalent degree, as determined by the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education) that normally requires at least 4 but not more than 5 years of full-time equivalent college-level work. This includes all bachelor's degrees conferred in a 5-year cooperative (work-study) program. A cooperative plan provides for alternate class attendance and employment in business, industry, or government; thus, it allows students to combine actual work experience with their college studies. Also includes bachelor's degrees in which the normal 4 years of work are completed in 3 years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Master's Degree- An award that requires the successful completion of a program of study of at least the full-time equivalent of 1 but not more than 2 academic years of work beyond the bachelor's degree. Some of these degrees, such as those in Theology (M.Div., M.H.L./Rav) that were formerly classified as "first-professional," may require more than two full-time equivalent academic years of work (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Postsecondary Education- The provision of a formal instructional program whose curriculum is



designed primarily for students who are beyond the compulsory age for high school. This includes programs whose purpose is academic, vocational, and continuing professional education, and excludes avocational and adult basic education programs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Postsecondary Education Institution- An institution which has as its sole purpose, or one of its primary missions, the provision of postsecondary education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Public Institution- An educational institution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials and which is supported by public funds (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

#### *Classification Methods*

Classification- The general process of grouping entities by similarity (Bailey, 1994).

Taxonomy- A classification of empirical entities (Bailey, 1994).

Taxa- Multiple cells of a taxonomy (Bailey, 1994).

Taxon- A single cell of a taxonomy (Bailey, 1994).

Typology- A multidimensional and conceptual classification (Bailey, 1994).

Empirical Classification- Taxonomic method that generally begins with a data set of empirical objects measured on a number of variables (Bailey, 1994).

Subtypes- The subdivisions of types, taxa, or other classes (Bailey, 1994).

#### Limitations

This study has limitations. They are as follows:

1. The data and the subsequent analysis for this study are limited to the 266 publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities; therefore, the findings

of this study are limited to institutions fitting into this classification.

2. In some cases the institutional data reported to NCES/IPEDS are inaccurate, unreported, or incomplete. In these cases the findings are limited to only the data that are available.
3. The current Carnegie Basic Classification categories, as well as the proposed subclasses in this study, are retrospective time sensitive snapshots of institutions. The classifications, much like the institutions that attempt to describe, are subject to change.
4. The data describing student financial aid and student loan indebtedness are for first-time/full-time degree/certificate seeking students only.

#### Delimitations

The delimitations for this study are as follows:

1. This study only examines publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities.
2. With respect to the intended outputs, this study primarily focuses on undergraduate education at Master's Colleges and Universities.
3. This study focuses on institutions located within the 50 states of the United States of America, the District of Columbia, and United States territories.

#### Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions were developed:

1. It is assumed that the data reported in NCES/IPEDS concerning publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities are the best and most accurate sources of data available.
2. It is assumed that the publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities sector is a special and unique set of institutions worthy of additional

exploration.

3. It is assumed that the findings of this study will serve as betterment to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector of higher education.

### Summary

The Master's Colleges and Universities sector of higher education is a unique, interesting, and often overlooked area of American higher education. This study aims to illuminate the critically important characteristics of these institutions while offering a description of the institutions and the students served by them. With the high percentage of publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the strong similarities between AASCU institutions and Associate's Colleges, it seems only appropriate that the means by which the two institutional types are to be classified might also be similar. The creation of such a classification provides a much more accurate means to study these institutions. Finally, this study hopes to create a useful tool to be used by scholars, policy-makers, and practitioners by which voice can be brought to those institutions bringing and delivering America's promise of higher education to areas that have been neglected in the research and forgotten by policy-makers.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

A relevant review of existing literature is presented in this chapter. The literature on Master's Colleges and Universities sector of higher education is very limited. The one seminal work written on the subject, *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities*, was written by Alden Dunham and published 40 years ago in 1969. Given the importance of this work, it is presented first in this review. This is followed by sections on The Distinctiveness of Master's Colleges and Universities, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Understanding the Context of Place, Students at AASCU-Type Institutions, and The Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education.

#### Colleges of the Forgotten Americans

The most comprehensive scholarly treatment of American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) institutions, with extensive support from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, was written by Alden Dunham in 1969. *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities* provides voice to a grouping of students and institutions that provide the backbone for the American higher education system. As Dunham (1969) calls them, the “forgotten students” numbered 1,568,891 students as of the fall semester of 1967 who attended one of the 279 state colleges and universities. These students sought, as Dunham argued, to develop marketable skills and to advance their economic outlook.

It is worth noting that Dunham used the term “regional” in his description of state colleges and universities. The term “regional” is but another term used to describe state colleges and universities, and in no way suggests another type of institution. It does, however, suggest a geographical differential in regard to primary service area. Moreover, the term “regional” was used by Dunham to indicate that the institutions about which he was writing were not large-scale national universities (A. W. Ostar, personal communication, May 5, 2009). This view of the term “regional” is consistent with the manner in which the term is used by most scholars today. For the purposes of this review, the term “regional” will only be used in the context suggested by Dunham.

Dunham (1969) suggested that many state colleges and community colleges have similar student profiles, and that both have more in common with each other than either does with national or what we might today call flagship universities. This point is evidenced by his assertion that “upper-division enrollments in large numbers of state colleges consist increasingly of junior college transfer students” (p. 94). In fact, many state colleges graduate almost as many transfer students as they do their own freshmen, a point re-affirmed by Ostar (1991) who noted the strong connection and similarities between AASCU institutions and community colleges.

Dunham (1969) observed that many students attending state colleges and universities are “first-generation collegians” (p. 94). This has tremendous implications for economic development within the geographic service region of the institution—rural, urban, or suburban. More specifically, state colleges and universities greatly impact their service regions by providing educational services to students, many of whom would/could not attend other institutions. In fact, as Dunham says, “One finds the sons and daughters of very few professional people in state colleges” (p. 92). Due to the relatively large diversity and low socio-economic

populations served by state colleges and universities, such institutions are attractive due to the relatively low cost of attendance, he argues.

State colleges and universities typically have less alumni engagement. Dunham (1969) points out that few alumni (27%) consider themselves strongly attached to their alma mater. Moreover, few state college alumni give monetary gifts to their colleges. Additionally, he asserted that few state college alumni attempt to persuade others to attend their alma mater. State college students are not typically enrolled for the traditional college experience, and thus may not have the loyalty and sense of ownership toward the college that students at large public flagship universities or elite private colleges enjoy.

Dunham (1969) argues that state colleges and universities should not focus on copying the great research universities. This argument, in more recent years, has been echoed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. A small, yet significant, rationale for the expanded and updated 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification categories of institutions by the Carnegie Foundation is to assist institutions *in becoming distinctive based upon mission* rather than creating a system by which institutions attempt to “move up” to become large-scale research universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005).

State colleges and universities would be wise, as Dunham (1969) suggested, to focus institutional resources on quality baccalaureate and master’s level programs. As Dunham explains, “Few of the institutions about which I am writing will ever become first-rate research universities” (p. 157). This point is critical, in that Dunham calls upon state colleges and universities to be and remain teaching/student-focused institutions. This teaching, student-centered focus is ideologically consistent with the historical focus of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. This commitment to quality teaching is heavily supported by

Ostar's (1991) proclamation that "the primary concern of state colleges and universities is high-quality instruction for their students" (p. 22).

### The Distinctiveness of Master's Colleges and Universities

The first version of the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was published in 1973, and used the language of "Comprehensive Universities and Colleges" to classify what are now known as Master's Colleges and Universities. It was Fred Harclerod who coined the phrase "Comprehensive Universities and Colleges" and suggested to Clark Kerr that the term be used to describe these institutions (F. F. Harclerod, personal communication, March 11, 2009). Harclerod felt that the term "comprehensive" accurately captured the vast diversity of these institutions. The terms "Master's Colleges and Universities" used in the 1994, 2000, and 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification categories, and "Comprehensive Universities and Colleges" used in the 1973, 1976, and 1987 editions of the Carnegie Basic Classification categories, are deemed to be equivalent, as they are describing the same type of institution (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a).

While the terms AASCU-type institution, comprehensive colleges, master's colleges and universities, and regional university are not always or officially interchangeable, the vast majority (94%) of the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities under the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification categories are members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and have missions consistent with a teaching and service agenda designed to serve the geographic region in which they are located. The significance of this explanation is two-fold. First, Finnegan (1992) examined Comprehensive Colleges and Universities (master's colleges) with regard to faculty career lines, and discovered that the

majority of faculty members at Comprehensive Colleges and Universities<sup>1</sup> “have chosen to teach in these institutions” (p. 310). Although Finnegan acknowledges that some faculty came to this type of institution due to a tightening labor market, her work speaks to the critical importance of faculty and the primary teaching mission at these institutions.

Finnegan’s 1992 work illuminates, as did Dunham’s (1969), that these institutions are not the same as research universities in terms of focus, resources, faculty, or student populations. Second, and perhaps most importantly, AASCU institutions simply should not be compared to research universities (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987).

The Master’s Colleges and Universities sector of higher education may well be the most important sector concerning the future growth of American higher education. Katsinas (2009), as well as Lewin (2009) and Hurley (2008), have noted the undergraduate enrollment caps that exist at many public flagship institutions. Dan Hurley, Director of State Relations and Policy Analysis at AASCU, in an interview on C-Span’s *Washington Journal*, explained that many flagship institutions, particularly those in California, have announced enrollment caps that will ultimately force community colleges enrollments to soar (Lamb, 2009). Given the enrollment caps, the expansion of higher education (access) falls to either master’s colleges or community colleges. Within the context of publicly-controlled master’s colleges, this means examining these institutions and their students in a manner consistent with the geographic regions that they serve. Hurley (2008) suggests that local distinctiveness of AASCU institutions was a critical role in the future economic development of the areas in which these institutions serve.

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the phrase Comprehensive Colleges and Universities here, because at the time of Finnegan’s writing, this was the appropriate term. Of course, these institutions are now known as Master’s Colleges and Universities.



## The American Association of State Colleges and Universities

### *History and Growth of AASCU*

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) was formally established on February 23, 1961 as the Association of State Colleges and Universities (ASCU) (Hager, 1970). The major aim of the association was to bring together institutions that were partially or fully state supported and state controlled, to examine the vast diversity among them (Harclerod, 1983). The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, as it was later renamed in 1967, grew out of the Association of Teacher Education Institutions (ATEI) (Hager). A significant number of present-day AASCU member institutions were founded as single-focus institutions, primarily functioning as normal schools in the decades prior to World War II (American Association of State Colleges, 2009b; Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976; Harclerod & Ostar, 1987).

Significant demand for teachers and rapid expansion of secondary education throughout the United States during the later part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw many normal schools change their names to teachers colleges (Harclerod, 1983). The transition from normal schools to teachers colleges, among other factors, brought about changes in admissions practices. As Harclerod explains, teachers colleges had higher standards of admission than the normal schools, requiring high-school graduation as a condition of admission, and teachers colleges by the 1920s had gained favor with the developing accreditation agencies. This, as Harclerod noted, “made teachers colleges truly collegiate-level institutions” (p. 10).

In the years immediately following World War II, the United States experienced tremendous enrollment growth in higher education. Teachers colleges, some of which had already changed their names to state colleges or universities, surged in enrollments (Harclerod,

1983). The enrollments during this time period were so vast and extraordinary that institutions of this type became the fastest growing degree-granting sector of higher education (Hager, 1970). This rapid expansion created institutional challenges and difficulties specific to these institutions. Thus, the concept behind the founding of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in the 1960's was in the desire of similar institutions to collaborate in an effort to address the unique problems and challenges they faced, due to tremendous growth and expansion to serve the "Baby Boom" of the 1960's and early 1970's.

While AASCU was not formed until the early 1960's, much of the history of present-day AASCU institutions can be traced to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. Many present-day AASCU institutions were founded as state-controlled normal schools with a singular focus, teacher education (Finnegan, 1992; Hager, 1970; Harclerod, 1983). While publicly-controlled normal schools would be an accurate description of the history and founding of the vast majority of current AASCU institutions, a few present-day AASCU institutions were founded as private institutions. While no longer a member of AASCU, the College of William and Mary stands out as a prominent example of an institution's transition from private to public control. As Harclerod (1983) explains, due to financial hardship, the College of William and Mary was forced to close in 1881. The college reopened in 1888 as a state-supported institution only after agreeing to develop a program in teacher education that would assist the State of Virginia in meeting its demand for teachers. Although this conversion took place some 73 years before the formal establishment of AASCU, the conversion marks a significant moment in history. The focus on teacher education, as evidenced by the large number of present-day AASCU members that are converted to normal schools and teachers colleges, is still one of the most significant programs of study at AASCU institutions.

During the 1979-1980 academic year, AASCU institutions accounted for 67% of all bachelor's degrees conferred and 63% of all master's degrees conferred within publicly-controlled institutions of higher education (Harclerod, 1983). Moreover, during this same time period, AASCU institutions accounted for approximately 50% of all students graduating in the field of teacher education. This commitment to teacher education continues today, as AASCU institutions graduate 58% of all the nation's newly licensed teachers annually (D. Hurley, personal communication, February 5, 2009).

The initial development period of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities covered a 9 year period from 1961-1970 (Harclerod, 1983). This period saw the election of the first AASCU officers-- Lloyd Young of Keene Teachers College, now Keene State College in New Hampshire, was the first elected president. Other elected officials included president-elect John Emens of Ball State Teachers College, now known as Ball State University in Indiana, and Secretary-Treasurer C. R. Sattgast of Bemidji State College, now known as Bemidji State University in Minnesota. Within its first year of operation, AASCU had a membership of 160 institutions, and had opened its national office in Washington D.C. with Walter Hager serving as executive secretary. At this point in its history, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities had four main purposes, as Hager detailed:

To enable the members to make their influence felt in connection with national affairs. With their greatly increased enrollments and expanded curricula, the presidents of the state colleges and universities were conscious of the growing significance of these institutions in the national scene. The officers of the Association were admonished from the outset that the members wanted it to be heard in national activities affecting higher education – as a voice, and not merely an echo.

To present the strengths and services of state colleges and universities effectively to the public and to agencies and individuals from which grants and funds might be available. Throughout most of their history, the state colleges and universities had done little to publicize the importance and the effectiveness of their programs. Many of them had not considered it necessary. Now the situation had changed. The presidents and faculties of

the state colleges and universities were confident that the new Association could help demonstrate to all agencies – both private and governmental – that when grants of funds were being made, these institutions merited favorable consideration.

To represent members of the Association in the National Commission on Accrediting. When that Commission was activated, the state teachers colleges were the only institutions of higher education not represented in it. The gap was filled when ATEI (Association of Teacher Education Institutions) was organized and made a constituent member. The Commission readily accepted AASCU as a replacement to ATEI.

To conduct studies of educational problems of common interest to the members. Immediately upon establishing the new Association, its members voted to help finance the activities and services of what was then called the Joint Office of Institutional Research which had been established by the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities Association. These two associations later merged and the Joint Office became the Office of Institutional Research of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The reports and publications from this Office proved to be of considerable value. However, the members of ASCU foresaw it would be desirable for them collectively, through their new Association, to conduct studies tailored to their own particular needs and the Association's Office of Information and Research was created. (Hager, 1970, p. 2-3)

These four major purposes helped guide the growth and development of AASCU. An important factor in the growth of AASCU was the leadership of Allan Ostar, who served as president from 1965-1991. During Ostar's presidency, AASCU grew from 160 to nearly 400 institutional members. Ostar remained a passionate advocate for AASCU throughout his presidency, proclaiming in 1991 that "it is our institutions that make the American dream of higher education a reality for millions of American men and women from all walks of life" (Ostar, 1991, p. 22).

It is worth noting here the work of the Morse Commission. Formed in January of 1971 and officially known as the National Commission on the Future of State Colleges and Universities, the Morse Commission consistently met from 1971-1973 with the primary goal of improving the AASCU institutions (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987). The Morse Commission developed Campus Action Teams that charged each institution with identifying and capitalizing on unique strengths. The major outcome of the Morse commission—with respect to AASCU

institutional development—was best described, as Harclerod and Ostar noted, as “a period of maturity” (p. 106). This period of maturity saw these institutions take on identities such as “the people’s colleges” or “colleges of the forgotten Americans” (p. 106).

### *Researching AASCU Institutions*

It is essential to examine state colleges and universities for several reasons. First, state colleges and universities provide services to students who are often unable to attend other institutions due to financial or distance concerns (Ostar, 1975; 1991). Second, state colleges and universities have largely accepted the challenge of educating first-time, often first-generation students (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987).

There are two major factors that separate AASCU institutions from other institutions—*access* and *affordability* (A. W. Ostar, personal communication, March 9, 2009). One method by which AASCU institutions maintained their commitment to access and affordability was through a model of low-tuition (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987). This commitment to low-tuition was significant in that “low-tuition is the key to overcoming the economic barriers that stand in the way of the educational aspirations of many American families” (p. 124). Given the current economic conditions of the United States, low-tuition is as important an issue as ever before (A. W. Ostar, personal communication, March 9, 2009).

As noted above, the financing of state colleges and universities has traditionally revolved around a policy of low-tuition (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987; Ostar, 1975). The low-tuition model helps state colleges and universities promote access. AASCU institutions are deeply committed to access. As access provides opportunity, a major vehicle is low tuition. Within the context of access the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971), in their report *New students and new places*, called for the development of additional accessible colleges. While calling for the

development of additional accessible colleges, the report de-emphasized the need for more doctoral-granting institutions. While this report did not specifically comment on the tuition policies of Comprehensive Colleges and Universities, as they were called at the time, now known as Master's Colleges and Universities, the report did suggest that other access institutions (community colleges) "should follow policies of no tuition or very low tuition" (The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971, p. 38). Given the well-documented connection between these two institutional types (Dunham, 1969; Harclerod & Ostar, 1987; Ostar, 1975; Ostar, 1991), it is entirely reasonable to conclude that Master's Colleges and Universities should also be institutions of low tuition.

To further illustrate the power of the low tuition model, in strongly advocating for a continued policy of low tuition, Ostar in 1975 proclaimed:

AASCU has always supported student aid for low income students who cannot otherwise afford college. We have never believed that student aid can be a substitute for low tuition. Indeed, we have expressed our fear that an emphasis on student aid alone, without adequate institutional aid, can force a general increase in tuition which will disadvantage all students—working-class and middle-class as well as the poor (p. 3).

In the many years that have passed since Ostar's comments, much focus still remains on low tuition. More recent data indicates that the average tuition charges at AASCU institutions remain slightly under that of the other sectors of public four-year higher education (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2000). Katsinas (2009) has recently pointed out the prevalence of enrollments caps at public flagship/research universities. Moreover, Lewin (2009) has documented the enrollment caps placed in effect at Arizona State University and Lamb (2009) has explained that similar enrollment caps are in place throughout the California system of higher education. With such enrollment caps in place, access to higher education falls

to other sectors. The dominant access sectors are community colleges and AASCU-type institutions (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987).

One of the major driving factors of accessibility is affordability. Given that many students attending AASCU institutions are the first in their families to attend college (Harclerod & Ostar, 1987; Dunham, 1969) and that more recent conditions have seen dramatic increases in tuition much faster by percentages than the rates of inflation and wages (Toutkoushian, 2001), it should be of little surprise that a low tuition policy has guided the work of AASCU.

### *Present-Day AASCU*

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities has a rich history spanning nearly five decades. While tremendous enrollment growth and membership expansion has changed AASCU, the aim of the association continues to bring voice and advocacy to America's most unique and interesting institutions. Today AASCU supports a four-fold mission:

- (1) To promote appreciation and support for public higher education and the distinctive contributions of our member colleges and universities;
- (2) To analyze public policy, and to advocate for member institutions and the students they serve;
- (3) To provide policy leadership and program support to strengthen academic quality, promote access and inclusion, and facilitate educational innovation; and
- (4) To create professional development opportunities for institutional leaders, especially presidents, chancellors and their spouses (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2009b).

In addition to these purposes, AASCU member institutions are committed to initiatives that include access, student-centeredness, and stewardship of place (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2009b). An access orientation helps bring the promise of higher education to student populations that are often underserved. Student centeredness focuses on a commitment to students. Stewards of place reveal a deep understanding of the environment in

which these institutions operate. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002) describes it as:

While the demands of the economy and society have forced institutions to be nationally and globally aware, the fact remains that state colleges and universities are inextricably linked with the communities and regions in which they are located. Exercising “stewardship of place” does not mean limiting the institution’s worldview; rather, it means pursuing that worldview in a way that has meaning to the institution’s neighbors, who can be its most consistent and reliable advocates. (p. 10)

In short, a steward of place recognizes the impact that an institution has on both student and surrounding community. This engagement initiative puts forth the historical commitments of AASCU to serve students and the geographic areas in which they are located.

With a strong understanding of the historical context in which these institutions came to be, the present day American Association of State Colleges and Universities seeks to bring America’s promise of higher education to all who seek it. According to the AASCU membership directory, as of September 2008, 430 institutions were listed as members. These 430 member institutions enroll approximately 3 million students, accounting for 56% of the total enrollment in all of public four-year higher education (AASCU, 2009b).

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities has several committees that are charged with examining significant issues related to higher education. With respect to regional distinctiveness and the stewardship of place initiative, the Rural Coalition is an AASCU initiative designed to examine rural institutions and the roles of such institutions in education and economic development. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities describes, “The coalition engages the presidents and chancellors of AASCU campuses located in rural areas in supporting initiatives to strengthen education and economic development in rural America” (AASCU, 2009c, n. p.). The very existence of a rural coalition suggests the importance of



geography, and underscores the need for a geographical system by which institutions of this type can be more easily and widely studied and benchmarked.

Given the current economic recession, many states have cut funding for higher education as a means to balance budgets (Hurley, 2008; Katsinas & Tollefson, 2009). In the face of fluid and somewhat turbulent economic conditions, higher education, particularly institutions within the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, have experienced tremendous growth. More specifically, AASCU institutions have seen significant increases in minority students (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006; American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2009a). As more access opportunities are made available, more students are using the services of state colleges and universities. It is, however, important to note that growth is not evenly distributed throughout the country. As the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2009a) points out, institutions in the Western and Southeastern sections of the United States have experienced tremendous enrollment growth while institutions in the Northeast and Midwest have slower growth rates. As researchers and policy-makers continue to examine expanding access and evaluating AASCU member's role in access, the distinctiveness of geographic location becomes an increasingly important area of examination. This is particularly important for the many areas that have institutions of this type serving large numbers of first-generation students.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2009a) suggested tuition at state colleges and universities will most likely increase to offset the serious budget deficits faced by many states and institutions in the wake of the current economic crisis (Katsinas & Tollefson, 2009). Given the crisis, "It is certain that elevating public higher education as a state priority will be all the more challenging" (AASCU, 2009a p. 6). Moreover, as previously noted, the

enrollment surges in the Western and Southeastern sections of the country suggest that enrollment capacity may begin to reduce the historically access-focused mission of state colleges and universities. In short, many more people are in need of higher education services in the current economy.

### *Challenges for the Future*

With much rhetoric being focused on the importance of higher education, it appears that little in the way of research-based policy decisions are being made with respect to baccalaureate education. As noted throughout this review, Dunham (1969) and Ostar (1991) strongly argued in favor of a relationship between community colleges and state colleges and universities. Much progress has been made, yet there are still many concerns to include reluctance on the part of four year institutions to accept credits earned at community colleges, lack of convenient course offerings, and lack of financial aid resources (AACC & AASCU, 2003). Moreover, Doyle (2006) argued that one of the major reasons that community college students were not achieving the baccalaureate education at optimal percentages related to an overall lack of seamless transfer policies between the community college and four year sectors of higher education. While both the American Association of Community Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities have worked on this issue, much work remains.

Today's access challenge is another area of consideration for the future. While access and affordability have been the guiding forces for much of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities history, the tremendous economic difficulties that the United States is enduring will undoubtedly cause this problem to expand. Immerwahr, Johnson, Gasbarra, Ott, and Rochkind (2009) noted that many Americans feel that a college education is important but yet many feel that the cost of attendance has risen to the point of extremes. In addition, nearly

62% of the public believed that “many qualified people did not have the opportunity to attend college” (p. 3).

In further examination of access, Reed and Alexander (2009) feel that in order for the United States to again be the world’s leader in higher education, “We need much higher levels of educational attainment for lower-income and underrepresented students” (n. p.). This view has led Reed and Alexander to suggest that a new kind of institutional aid be made available to institutions educating lower-income and underrepresented students. “Cost of Education Allowances,” a program that was included in the early discussion of the legislation that created the Pell Grant in 1972, has never been funded (Reed & Alexander). This program would provide direct grant aid to institutions willingly accepting the challenge of educating lower-income and underrepresented students. Such a program would, as Reed and Alexander note, “encourage states to maintain their commitment to financing widespread access and completion in higher education” (n. p.).

Within the context of public higher education, for member institutions of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, access and low-tuition are cornerstones. Allan Ostar, former president of AASCU, has never wavered on his commitment to low tuition. Low-tuition is a catalyst for both access and affordability, he argues (A. W. Ostar, personal communication March 16, 2009). Beyond this, leadership within the AASCU institution is of vital importance to student achievement and success. In the 2005 American Association of State Colleges and Universities publication, *A matter of culture and leadership: Student success in state colleges and universities*, AASCU leaders noted:

University leaders have a fundamental choice to make in they want to increase graduation rates. On the one hand, they can take the traditional path of increasing selectivity. . . But it does not embody exemplary leadership for an AASCU institution. On the contrary, it represents an abrogation of the fundamental social

responsibility these institutions were created to meet. . . The more courageous and difficult choice, which study institutions illustrate (though some have increased selectivity as well), is to succeed with the students we have. (AASCU, 2005b, p. 3)

The Lumina Foundation for Education has recently expressed a desire to have 60% of adults between the ages of 25 and 64 with high quality two-year and four-year degrees by 2025 (Lumina Foundation, 2009). Achieving this goal will no doubt bring about considerable challenges at both the national, local, and campus levels, and Master's Colleges and Universities will play a leading role.

On Tuesday, February 24, 2009, in an address to a joint session of Congress, President Barack Obama called for all Americans to “commit to at least one year of higher education” (Obama, 2009 n.p.). While much of the details about the Obama plan are still unfolding, it does, however, appear clear that higher education in America has once again returned to “center stage” (Lumina Foundation, 2009, n. p.).

Another challenge for the future is institutional control (public vs. private). With strong national support and presidential rhetoric, public higher education may well stand at a moral crossroads. Public higher education seeks to renew America's promise of widespread access, delivery, and degree completion. Public institutions of higher education serve 80% of all students enrolled in higher education. Perhaps in no area is this more important than within the context of Master's Colleges and Universities. Table 2 shows the total enrollments within the Master's Colleges and Universities sector by program size and control. As revealed in Table 2, the public institutions belonging to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector have, in total, significantly higher student enrollments. Moreover, Table 2 also shows the number of institutions within the Master's Colleges and Universities sector by control. Private not-for-profit institutions outnumber the public institutions within this sector. Although the private not-for-

profit institutions outnumber the public institutions, the public institutions have nearly double the enrollments.

Table 2

*Total Number of Institutions and Total Enrollments for Master's Colleges and Universities by Program Size and Control, Numbers and*

*Percentages*

	Number of Institutions			Enrollments			Total by Type
	Public	Private Not-for-Profit	Private For-Profit	Public	Private Not-for-Profit	Private For-Profit	
Larger programs	166	159	18	1,871,665	790,113	136,501	2,798,279
Medium programs	69	107	13	400,732	313,349	25,567	739,648
Smaller programs	31	82	13	138,908	187,254	23,697	349,859
Total	266	348	44	2,411,305	1,290,716	185,765	3,887,786
Larger programs	62%	46%	41%	78%	61%	73%	72%
Medium programs	26%	31%	30%	17%	24%	14%	19%
Smaller programs	12%	24%	30%	6%	15%	13%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009  
Undergraduate Enrollments as  
of Fall 2004

## Understanding the Context of Place

The missions and visions of colleges and universities are unquestionably tied to place or geographic location. In fact, in order to fully understand public engagement, one must recognize that place or geographic location matters. As the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002) argued, *public engagement is inherently place-related*. Place or geographic location, with respect to colleges and universities, can be described as rural-serving, urban-serving, or suburban-serving. Each of these geographic locales suggests differences in how each institutional type connects with and serves the larger communities to which they belong. For example, Warner (2001) noted the urban institution “has traditionally attracted a richly diverse student population” (p. 34). Moreover, due to the “geographic centrality” (p. 28) of the urban institution, certain types of programs are more likely to be found on urban campuses. As Dengerink (2001) suggested, appropriate geographical context is a major factor in determining program offerings at urban institutions. Dengerink notes, “A medical or law school may be more feasible in a large urban area than near a rural residential campus” (p. 20). Moreover, Treadway (1984) said that “geography and access to educational opportunity are closely related” (p. 9). While Treadway’s comments were directed to isolated rural communities, the principle remains the same: proximity to a campus impacts the decision to attend. While there has been little work that specifically addresses the fundamental differences between rural students, urban students, and suburban students, much work addresses the beliefs about such students. It is worth noting that much more work has been devoted to the study of students attending rural and urban than suburban institutions.

The college environment often stands in direct opposition or contradiction to the value systems of rural America, particularly of rural Appalachia (Dees, 2006). Specifically, the college

environment violates the typical rural teaching that devalues the need for intellectual development. In short, rural values teach a strong distrust for formalized education.

Haaga (2004) found that educational attainment in the Appalachian region was less than the national average. Specifically, as of the 2000 Census, 24.4% of the United States population were college graduates while just 17.7% of Appalachian residents were college graduates. When these numbers are examined on a state-by-state basis, the results are even more troubling. While college completion rates are lower in Appalachian regions than they are in the rest of the country, the States of Mississippi and West Virginia post the lowest college completion rates of 16.9% and 14.8%, respectively (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2009).

There is perhaps no sector of students as vulnerable as students that are first-time in college first-generation students. This vulnerability is compounded when those students come from poor areas with underdeveloped academic skills. Dees (2006) observed that first-time college students often suffer significant difficulty adjusting to the college environment. With regard to background characteristics, students from rural backgrounds often endure considerably more challenging circumstances than their non-rural counterparts (Carter & Robinson, 2002). In support of this, Carter and Robinson argued:

Knowledge gaps are likely to be much greater in poor rural communities and in families where adults have not attended college. Our own experience in working with parents of rural, low-income potential first-generation college students indicates that few are aware of the widespread availability of scholarships, grants, and loans for college or the importance of their children taking appropriate mathematics, science, and language courses in order to do well on college admissions tests such as the SAT and ACT (p. 4).

Another challenge that is of importance particularly to rural and urban students is poverty.

McNeese (2000) found that students growing up in urban poverty have the poorest performance on reading, science, and math exams during their K-12 education. This, of course, leads to a far less incidence of these students being able to attend college. Unfortunately, this pattern has



existed for some time. For example, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971) reported that:

Young people who live in suburban areas are more likely to attend college than those living in inner cities or in nonmetropolitan areas, and those living in the poverty portions of large metropolitan areas are especially unlikely to attend college” (p. 97).

Adelman (2002), however, found that urban high school graduates attend college at similar rates to their suburban counterparts, while rural students have the lowest postsecondary participation rates. It is important to understand that there is great diversity within rural, urban, and suburban areas. As Adelman further noted:

We know that urban populations in one location look and behave very differently from urban populations in another location. Somehow these commonsense observations seem to escape analysts of educational phenomena, who like to have their populations neatly packaged: urban means poor and minority; suburban means middle class and white; rural is a mystery, and most analysts would prefer to leave it all that way (p. 41).

The problem brought about by these “neatly packaged” stereotypes comes in that we often assume outcomes for individuals based upon their initial circumstances. There also is a tendency to view organizations, with respect to their geographic location or place, in manners consistent with common stereotypes. Nevertheless, Adelman’s work teaches us that place matters. While it is difficult to correctly and accurately predict outcomes based upon rural, urban, or suburban locale, documenting differences among institutions based upon locale is worthy of more examination. Moreover, Frey (2001) found that minority groups accounted for the vast majority of growth among suburban populations. This is of particular interest given that the common stereotype of suburban America is associated with being white.

Another area of consideration with respect to the context of place involves the manner in which students view their home. Nunez and Cuccaro-Alamin (1998) explained that 56% of first-generation college students selected their college based upon their ability to live at home.

Moreover, Orbe (2004) observed that among first-generation students, status was an important identity factor when students returned home to visit family. It appears that home connection is a significant factor in relation to transitional efforts to the college environment. As such, Dees (2006) compares this strong home connection felt by students to immigrant groups struggling to assimilate into a new culture. This strong sense of home identity is not unique to rural students. In fact, many students from urban and suburban areas feel a strong connection to home that causes a resistance to the assimilation process on college campuses.

With respect to location and geography, the tendency for the urban metropolis to “sprawl” has aided in the creation of the suburban institution. As urban areas continue to grow and consume more and more cities and counties adjacent to them, the rise of the suburban university begins to take shape. Take, for example, Kennesaw State University in Kennesaw, Georgia. Kennesaw State University was chartered in 1963 by the Georgia Legislature, and first opened in 1967 as Kennesaw Junior College. At the time, Kennesaw was located in a somewhat isolated area of Northwest Georgia. In fact, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1971) noted that all public community colleges in the Atlanta area were, at the time, on the “outer ring of the city” (p. 102). Nevertheless, as metropolitan Atlanta continued to expand outward, Kennesaw began to grow dramatically as well. Frey (2005) notes that metropolitan Atlanta had four of the ten fastest growing counties in the United States between 2000 and 2004. The once tiny and somewhat isolated Kennesaw Junior College with a total enrollment of 1,000 students in the fall of 1967 now stands as a suburban university, with a fall 2008 enrollment of more than 20,000 students (Kennesaw State University, 2009). We glean from this that both student recruitment and institutional advancement are related to geographic location or place.

Finally, with respect to place and geographical understandings of institutions, Lucas (1996) argued:

Conditions obtaining in Ivy League schools do not always much resemble those within large public state universities, and so on. Localism plays a part as well. What might be true of West Coast public institutions might not apply to Midwestern state universities, and still less to schools ranged along the Atlantic seaboard. This is not to claim that no general conclusions whatsoever may be drawn, but, simply, that rethinking what is happening on the nation's campuses today require, at a minimum, that the analysis take into account the specific sort of institutions under scrutiny (p. xiv).

What we learn from this quote is that geographic locale matters. As higher education is a vast and widely diverse "universe," it seems entirely reasonable to begin examining each specific sector of higher education with respect to geographic location, which of course is implicit in the quote above.

#### Students at AASCU-Type Institutions

In his seminal work describing the characteristics of state colleges and universities, Dunham (1969) observed that a large majority of state college and university students were first-generation students. Harclerod and Ostar (1987) echoed the findings of Dunham. These students have commanded considerable attention in the higher education literature and are worthy of extended examination within the context of state colleges and universities. While the present study does not propose to specifically study the characteristics of first-generation students attending publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities, it would be remiss to disregard the vast literature discussing these students, certainly in light of the fact that many of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' publications acknowledge first-generation students as a significant portion of the students attracted to such institutions. For example, the AASCU mission statement notes:

Members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities work to extend higher education to all citizens. Access is a hallmark of AASCU institutions, colleges and

universities that embrace students who traditionally have been underrepresented in higher education as well as those who are first generation college students. By *Delivering America's Promise*, these institutions fulfill the expectations of a public university by working for the public good through education and engagement, thereby improving the lives of people in their community, their region and their state. AASCU represents more than 400 public colleges, universities and systems of higher education throughout the United States and its territories. AASCU schools enroll more than three million students or 55 percent of the enrollment at all public four-year institutions. (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2009c, n. p.)

When examining students served by AASCU institutions, the focus quickly turns to the prevalence of first-generation, first-time college students. Unlike their non first-generation counterparts, first-generation college students face a myriad of difficulties in accessing and negotiating higher education.

It is important to note that some misunderstanding exists as to what constitutes a first-generation student. As Choy (2001) explains, a first-generation student is a student who comes from a family in which neither parent graduated with a bachelor's degree. Given this definitional distinction, it should be of relatively little surprise that first-generation students tend to come from low-income families (Ishitani, 2006), are academically underprepared (Nunez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998; Pike & Kuh, 2005), and experience great difficulty interacting with the campus environment (Carter & Robinson, 2002; Pike & Kuh, 2005). First-generation students have lower educational aspirations and typically report greater dissatisfaction with the college experience (Pike & Kuh, 2005).

The transition to college is perhaps the single greatest transition that a student encounters. Specifically, the transition to college for first-generation college students can be incredibly challenging. While many institutions require some form of first-year experience coursework, relatively few institutions specifically target the needs of first-generation students with first-year experience transitional programs (Pike & Kuh, 2005). Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, and

Terenzini (2004) found existing policy efforts to assist first-generation students were limited to increasing access, and not to increasing campus involvement or social engagement.

Pike and Kuh (2005) found that first-generation students reported lower levels of social engagement and academic aspirations than their non first-generation counterparts. It is interesting to note that approximately 30% of the participants included in Pike and Kuh's study were enrolled in Master's institutions. Given these issues, it is necessary to examine the impacts of first-year experience coursework on the development of students. Students completing first-year experience coursework are more likely than their counterparts to report a sense of community during the first year of college (Hendel, 2006-2007). Keup and Barefoot (2005) observed that students in first-year experience coursework interacted with faculty members more and showed enhanced academic skills when compared to students not taking first-year experience coursework. In addition, Miller, Janz, and Chen (2007) argued that first-year experience coursework positively contributed to retention. Students completing first-year experience coursework, across all academic ability levels, are more likely to return for their second year of college than students failing to enroll in first-year experience coursework. Pike, Kuh, and Gonyea (2003) have called upon all stakeholders within higher education to create systems and opportunities specifically designed to meet the challenges and difficulties that first-generation college students face during the first year of college.

#### *Characteristics of First-Generation College Students*

The issues and difficulties that first-generation college students endure are multi-faceted and complex. Students experience college differently based upon the kind of institution they attend (Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea, 2003). As such, first-generation college students are typically underrepresented at doctoral universities and overrepresented at baccalaureate colleges.

Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, and Terenzini (2004) argued that first-generation college students suffer from greater economic and academic disadvantages than their non first-generation counterparts.

First-generation student status is negatively associated with social involvement, integration of campus experiences, and improvements in learning and intellectual development (Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea). Citing a longitudinal 1998 study from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Carter and Robinson (2002) noted that 45% of first-generation students dropped out of college. Within the same NCES study, the employment prospects of first-generation students that persisted to graduation were the same as non first-generation graduates (Nunez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998). However, as Carter and Robinson (2002) note, the study released by NCES *does not* account for the rural component of students. Simply put, first-generation students from rural environments may face additional difficulties in negotiating the employment market post graduation.

First-generation college students also tend to have difficulty managing their time, particularly in determining the appropriate amounts of time to devote to studying (Collier & Morgan, 2008). When compared to their non first-generation counterparts, first-generation students report having fewer resources outside the classroom to assist in the studying demands of college. In addition, first-generation college students require significantly more faculty investment in the areas of assignment explanation and standards of writing than do their non first-generation counterparts.

First-generation students tend to compare poorly against their counterparts in the areas of educational aspiration and social engagement (Pike & Kuh, 2005). They often report greater dissatisfaction with the college atmosphere and tend to view the college as less supportive than

their non first-generation counterparts. However, the difficulties of first-generation students are not simply byproducts of generational status. Rather, the difficulties appear to be linked to the specific factors of campus living and educational aspirations.

First-generation college students are less likely than their counterparts to live on-campus (Pike & Kuh, 2005). Given this, a sense of communal involvement and campus engagement is less likely to develop. Nevertheless, identity formation among first-generation college students varies across several factors (Orbe, 2004). Orbe qualitatively studied 79 first-generation college students across multiple institutions and from diverse backgrounds. It appears that first-generation students as a cultural group have little to no sense of collective identity. However, first-generation status greatly impacts a student's perception of themselves within other grouping contexts; specifically, the great majority of first-generation students feel that other students on campus are dissimilar from them. Although first-generation students appear to have no universal culturally normalized identities, they do have very contextually specific identities within various groups (Orbe, 2004). This would seemingly suggest that first-generation college students are representatives of larger cultural groups, and are not entirely defined by generational college status; however, Pike and Kuh (2005) found that males and minority groups have tremendous representation among first-generation student populations. Bui (2002) echoes these findings noting that "first-generation college students were more likely to be ethnic minority students" (p. 4). In addition, Rendon and Garza (1996) noted that the general profile of minority students is "first generation, part-timers, employed while attending college, low socioeconomic backgrounds, and poor high school achievement records" (p. 290).

With regard to identity formation, Orbe (2004) reported that minorities, women, and individuals from lower economic backgrounds attach a higher degree of importance to first-

generation student status. Interestingly, the prestige of the institution attended appears to have a small impact on a first-generation college student's identity. First-generation college students attending less prestigious colleges report less importance with regard to generational status, while first-generation students attending selective institutions report greater importance of generational status. Overall, in comparison to other college students, first-generation college students are more likely to attend less selective institutions (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004).

Orbe (2004) argued that first-generation student status was most important in relation to identity when students visited home. The home connection takes on both positive and negative aspects. While many first-generation students used the home connection for motivation and support, others viewed home as yet another place in which they were viewed as *different*. Another difference among first-generation students is their tendency to work more hours at an outside job than their non first-generation counterparts (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004), a fact that likely ties back to their lower levels of on-campus engagement.

#### *Experiences of First-Generation College Students*

Although first-generation students are not entirely defined by their generational status, they do appear to share similar experiences. Using data collected from the Postsecondary Education Transcript Study, Ishitani (2006) observed significant relationships between first-generation students' dropout rates with family income, educational expectations, high school standards and performance, and institutional selection. Ishitani's study examined 4,427 students who enrolled in four-year institutions between 1991 and 1994. The study did not separate these students by type of institution attended. When compared to their non first-generation counterparts, first-generation students showed higher frequencies of dropout in all years of



measurement. In addition, student expectations appear to have impacts upon performance. First-generation students entering college with an expectation of graduation were less likely to drop out than the students who never expected to graduate. Interestingly, students with no expectations of graduation dropped out at higher rates in the fourth year of college.

Beyond the expectations of students, it appears that parental expectations impact first-generation student performance (Ishitani, 2006). When the parents of first-generation college students had little to no anticipation of graduation, the performance of the student was impacted. Students in this category were most likely to withdraw from college during the third year. In response to high dropout rates and low social engagement, Pike and Kuh (2005) suggested that institutions offer targeted programs with an emphasis on campus-living and academic advising to assist first-generation students with the transition to college.

First-generation students' dropout rates begin to decline following the second year of college (Ishitani, 2006). However, the dropout rate resurfaces in the fourth year of college. This seems to suggest a cumulative effect. In short, a first-generation student from a poor family or rural area, if able to negotiate the college environment, becomes at risk for failure in the fourth year of college. Beyond the risk factors of dropout for first-generation students, working and participation in athletics appear to be particularly harmful to first-generation students (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004). Moreover, first-generation students are less likely than other students to engage in extracurricular activities. However, campus involvement improves the academic success of first-generation students. The positive impacts of campus involvement are more beneficial to first-generation students than any other student group.

### *Challenges of First-Generation Students*

Ishitani (2006) discovered a strong association between first-generation student status and family income. First-generation students from low-income families are significantly more likely to dropout of college than their upper-income counterparts. The tipping point of family income appears to be \$50,000. Students from families earning \$50,000 or more were less likely to dropout of college than were students from families earning less. These findings are particularly significant in that in 1990, nearly 60% of all entering White students came from families in this income bracket, while just 30%, respectively, of Black and Hispanic students came from such families (Brown, 1996). The trend of low-income student difficulties has continued. More recently, the median income reported for Whites is \$52,115, while the median incomes for Blacks and Hispanics are \$33,916 and \$38,679, respectively (U. S. Census Bureau, 2007).

The value of a college education is widely recognized. The lifelong impact of a college education normally translates into better standards of living, greater employment, and greater income-earning potential. In fact, Pascarella and Terenzini, as cited by Pike and Kuh (2005), suggest that the baccalaureate degree is the single greatest attainment for future economic benefit. However, for first-generation students from rural areas, who lack concrete knowledge about the post-graduation job market viability, this concept remains under-researched and under-explained.

In an effort to maximize the college experience for rural first-generation students, colleges and universities, particularly those in rural areas, may consider focusing first-year programs to serve first-generation students. Ishitani (2006) noted a continuous dividing gap between first-generation students and their counterparts for the first two years of college, with the second year being the most vulnerable year. Moreover, first-generation students from high

performing high-schools were more likely than their counterparts to graduate. This finding suggests a strong geographical component. In short, underperforming high-schools are typically in economically depressed areas; therefore, the curricula demands lag that of high-schools in more developed areas. Carter and Robinson (2002) describe it as, “Were they from the county seat or from a ‘holler’ school” (p. 6)? Schools in the rural hollers such as those across the rural counties in the Appalachian Regional Commission are far less likely to produce academically prepared students ready for the challenges of college.

#### The Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, a division of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, was first developed in 1967 with the major purpose of studying the vast diversity existing within U.S. higher education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a). During this time period, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education was headed by Clark Kerr. As the former president of the University of California system, Kerr had significantly impacted public higher education as a principal author of the California Master Plan which formally acknowledged and celebrated differences among different types of publicly-controlled degree-granting institutions of higher education within the State of California. As McCormick and Zhao (2005) point out, Kerr largely modeled the Carnegie Classifications after the California Master Plan. Over four decades and 6 iterations, the Carnegie Classifications sought to showcase and further examine the wide diversity within higher education.

By 1970-1971, the Carnegie Commission had created its initial institutional classifications (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a). These classifications were publicly released in 1973 for use by other researchers, practitioners, and

policymakers. The classifications have undergone five revisions since their 1973 release, with revisions made in 1976, 1987, 1994, 2000, and most recently, in 2005. While some changes have occurred with every revision of the classifications, the desire to separate or classify for comparison purposes remains a salient issue for higher education researchers and policymakers (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971). Furthermore, McCormick and Zhao (2005) suggest that the classifications serve as a manageable method by which to compare and contrast institutions, an important factor for those practitioners interested in comparing or benchmarking aspects of performance for institutional improvement.

Classifying institutions can assist researchers in defining research and data parameters. While there is no set or permanent standard by which classifications may be conceptualized, the use of classifications remains the most salient and critical function of limiting and examining diversity within any field (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). With respect to the Carnegie Classifications, the classifications were intended to show the vast diversity and ever-changing structure among the nation's colleges and universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a). However, as McCormick and Zhao argue, the Carnegie Classifications have, over time, projected mental constructs onto the higher education community, thereby creating a system in which institutions attempt to "move up" the classification system. Institutions, for a variety of reasons, may find it advantageous to seek a new classification status. For example, an institution classified as a Baccalaureate College may expand its missions and desire to "move up" to the Master's Colleges and Universities class. Researchers (Dunham, 1969; Harclerod & Ostar, 1987; Hardy, 2005; McCormick & Zhao, 2005) have noted the tendency of institutions to attempt to "move up" within the Carnegie Classifications.

One criticism of classification is that it often creates mental perceptions that become accepted as “real or naturally occurring” (McCormick & Zhao, 2005, p. 53). The major goal of the Carnegie Basic Classification was *not* to suggest differences in educational quality or to suggest a natural order of institutional development among the various institutional types. Rather, the Carnegie Basic Classification was intended simply to make comparison of similar institutions easier (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009a).

The Carnegie Basic Classification relies heavily upon data from prior years to develop classifications (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c). Classification theory is such that observation and reflection of prior events lead to decisions and mental constructs for the present. Simply put, classifications are retrospective and static (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; McCormick & Zhao, 2005). All revisions of the Carnegie Basic Classification since their initial development in 1970-1971 have been retrospective in scope. Due to this retrospective and observation-based nature, continuous re-examination and re-classifications become necessary in order to maintain a system that offers benefits. McCormick and Zhao suggested that classifications should ask four essential questions. These questions include:

- Do its groupings make sense?
- Does it focus attention on the right similarities and differences for its purpose?
- Does it lead to new and valuable insights?
- Does it advance knowledge and understanding? (p. 54)

The first version of the Carnegie Basic Classification was developed in 1970-1971 and released publicly in 1973 and had five broad categories: (1) Two-Year Colleges & Institutions, (2) Comprehensive Colleges & Universities, (3) Doctoral-Granting Institutions, (4) Professional

Schools, and (5) Other Specialized Institutions. Table 3 illustrates these broad categories and also shows the updates made to the classifications in 1976. As Table 3 reveals, very little was changed in the first revision of the classifications. The 1976 revision did, however, welcome the addition of the category -- Institutions for Non-Traditional Study.

Table 3

*The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education  
by Major Class and Subclasses, 1973 and 1976*

1973	1976
<i>Major Class</i>	<i>Major Class</i>
<i>Subclass</i>	<i>Subclass</i>
<i>Two-Year Colleges &amp; Institutions</i>	<i>Two-Year Colleges &amp; Institutions</i>
<i>Liberal Arts Colleges</i>	<i>Liberal Arts Colleges</i>
Liberal Arts Colleges I	Liberal Arts Colleges I
Liberal Arts Colleges II	Liberal Arts Colleges II
<i>Comprehensive Colleges &amp; Universities</i>	<i>Comprehensive Colleges &amp; Universities</i>
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I	Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II	Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II
<i>Doctoral-Granting Institutions</i>	<i>Doctoral-Granting Institutions</i>
Research Universities I	Research Universities I
Research Universities II	Research Universities II
Doctoral-Granting Universities I	Doctoral-Granting Universities I
Doctoral-Granting Universities II	Doctoral-Granting Universities II
<i>Professional Schools &amp; Other Specialized Institutions</i>	<i>Professional Schools &amp; Other Specialized Institutions</i>
Theological Schools	Theological Schools
Medical Schools & Medical Centers	Medical Schools & Medical Centers
Other Separate Health	Other Separate Health
Professional Schools	Professional Schools
Schools of Engineering & Technology	Schools of Engineering & Technology
Schools of Business & Management	Schools of Business & Management
Schools of Art, Music & Design	Schools of Art, Music & Design
Schools of Law	Schools of Law
Teachers' Colleges	Teachers' Colleges
Other Specialized Institutions	Other Specialized Institutions
	<i>Institutions for Non-Traditional Study</i>

Data Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009

The next revision made to the Carnegie Classifications came thirteen years later in 1987. Table 4 showcases the classifications as they appeared in 1987 and also shows the revisions made in 1994. The revisions made in 1994 mark the first use of the terminology “Master’s Colleges and Universities.” Prior versions of the classifications had referred to these institutions as Comprehensive Colleges and Universities. In addition to this change, the 1994 revisions saw the Two-Year Colleges and Institutions category change to Associate of Arts Colleges. The 1994 revision also added a category of Tribal Colleges and Universities.

Table 4

*The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Class and Subclasses, 1987 and 1994*

1987 Major Class Subclass	1994 Major Class Subclass
Two-Year Colleges & Institutions	Associate of Arts Colleges
Liberal Arts Colleges Liberal Arts Colleges I Liberal Arts Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I Baccalaureate Colleges II
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II	Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges & Universities Master's Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I Master's Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II
Doctoral-Granting Institutions Research Universities I Research Universities II Doctoral-Granting Universities I Doctoral-Granting Universities II	Doctoral-Granting Institutions Research Universities I Research Universities II Doctoral-Granting Universities I Doctoral-Granting Universities II
Specialized Institutions Theological Schools Medical Schools & Medical Centers Other Separate Health and Profession Schools	Specialized Institutions Theological Schools Medical Schools & Medical Centers Other Separate Health and Profession Schools
Schools of Engineering & Technology Schools of Business & Management Schools of Art, Music & Design Schools of Law Teachers' Colleges Other Specialized Institutions	Schools of Engineering & Technology Schools of Business & Management Schools of Art, Music & Design Schools of Law Teachers' Colleges Other Specialized Institutions
	Tribal Colleges and Universities

Data Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009



The Carnegie Classifications were again updated in 2000. Table 5 illustrates the classifications as they appeared in 2000. The 2000 revisions to the Carnegie Classifications saw the Associate of Arts Colleges become Associate's Colleges, the Doctoral-Granting Institutions become Doctoral/Research Universities, and the labeling of Baccalaureate Colleges. The table also shows the most recent revisions completed in 2005. As Table 5 illustrates, the 2005 revisions to the classifications showcase considerable changes in an effort to more thoroughly and precisely classify institutions. The 2005 revision for the first time classified Associate's Colleges by specific categories. It is also worth noting that the Associate's Colleges sector is the only sector of higher education that is classified using institutional control (public vs. private) as a specific category of classification.

Table 5

*The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by  
Major Class and Subclasses, 2000 and 2005*

2000 Major Class Subclass	2005 Major Class Subclass
<i>Associate's Colleges</i>	<i>Associate's Colleges</i> Associate's-Public Rural-serving Small Associate's-Public Rural-serving Medium Associate's Public Rural-serving Large Associate's Public Suburban-serving Single Campus Associate's Public Suburban-serving Multicampus Associate's Public Urban-serving Single Campus Associate's Public Urban-serving Multicampus Associate's- Public Special Use Associate's Private Not-for-profit Associate's Private For-profit Associate's Public 2-year Colleges under Universities Associate's Public 4-year, Primarily Associate's Associate's Private Not-for-profit 4-year, Primarily Associate's Associate's Private For-profit 4-year, Primarily Associate's
<i>Doctoral-Granting Institutions</i> Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive	<i>Doctorate-Granting Universities</i> Research Universities (very high research activity) Research Universities (high research activity) Doctoral/Research Universities
<i>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</i> Master's Colleges & Universities I Master's Colleges & Universities II	<i>Master's Colleges and Universities</i> Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs) Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs) Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)
<i>Baccalaureate Colleges</i> Baccalaureate Colleges- Liberal Arts Baccalaureate Colleges- General Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges	<i>Baccalaureate Colleges</i> Baccalaureate Colleges- Arts & Sciences Baccalaureate Colleges- Diverse Fields Baccalaureate Colleges- Associate's Colleges
<i>Specialized Institutions</i> Theological Schools Medical Schools & Medical Centers Other Separate Health Profession Schools Schools of Engineering & Technology Schools of Business & Management Schools of Art, Music & Design Schools of Law Teachers' Colleges Other Specialized Institutions	<i>Special Focus Institutions</i> Theological seminaries, Bible colleges, and other faith-related Institutions Medical Schools and medical centers Other health profession schools Schools of engineering Other technology-related schools Schools of business and Management Schools of Art, Music, and Design Schools of Law Other Special-Focus Institutions
<i>Tribal Colleges &amp; Universities</i>	<i>Tribal Colleges</i>

Data Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009

The first public reference to what would become the Carnegie Basic Classification was in a 1971 report by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education entitled *New students and new places: Policies for the future growth and development of American higher education*. In this report, the Carnegie Commission argued that more Comprehensive Colleges and Universities (now known as Master's Colleges and Universities) and community colleges were needed to better serve students (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971). In fact, the Commission suggested that the United States needed between 85 and 105 new Comprehensive Colleges and Universities in order to provide greater access and opportunities for students. In making this recommendation, the Commission clearly recognized the geographic and regional differences existing among institutions of this type. This recognition is supported by the Commission's statement: "Largely for historical but partly also for economic reasons, there is pronounced diversity in the types of institutions that are predominant in the various regions, as well as marked regional variation in enrollment rates of the college-age population" (p. 31). In short, differences exist between urban-serving and non urban-serving institutions with respect to enrollments and resources. This is extraordinarily significant in that the regional distinctiveness of these institutions has long been under-explained and underdeveloped, yet was recognized in the initial edition of the Carnegie Classifications.

#### Summary

This review of literature has examined the historical development of the Carnegie Classifications, the development of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the distinctiveness of the regional university, types of students served, and challenges for the future. This review has indicated both precedent and need for a sub-classification for the publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities. While many of these

institutions continue to bring America's promise of higher education to many under-served and underrepresented students, little research about their distinctiveness exists.

In regard to the types of students served, the review of the literature has illuminated the challenges faced by many first-generation college students. Beyond the significant challenges faced by the students, higher education faces a great challenge in serving first-generation student populations. As suggested in much of the literature, institutions of higher education may consider targeted programs to assist first-generation students in their transition to college. Moreover, institutions may take heed to the call of the research and begin collecting institutional specific data about first-generation college students. Higher education faces a great challenge, if not a moral crossroad, to bring access to first-generation students while bringing programs and services that facilitate success, and it appears likely Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities will be a part of this saga.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a geographical classification system to which publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities included in the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching were sub-divided based upon their geographic location. In addition to creating a sub-classification system for Master's Colleges and Universities, this study sought to illustrate the characteristics of these institutions with respect to enrollments, degrees awarded, student financial aid, and student race/ethnicity. The subclasses of Master's Colleges and Universities were developed in a manner consistent with the subclass categories for Associate's Colleges developed by Katsinas, Hardy, & Lacey (2005) for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This chapter describes the steps that were taken to create the classification system and the specific methodology by which targeted institutional characteristics were obtained.

#### Description of the Population

One of the major goals of this study was to bring about greater understanding of the Master's College and University sector of higher education in the United States through the development of more precise research tools. This study had two major goals. First, based upon the work of the Carnegie Foundation and the classification methodology employed by Katsinas, Hardy, and Lacey (2005) in their classification of the Associate's College sector, this study

sought to create a more sophisticated, geographical system by which Master's Colleges and Universities can be classified. Second, this study sought to describe the selected institutional characteristics of Master's Colleges and Universities in an effort to illustrate institutional diversity. Specifically, this study sought to classify each publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's College and University as either rural-serving, urban-serving, or suburban-serving. The proposed subclasses in conjunction with the existing subclasses (large, medium, small) created a classification system with nine possible outcomes to include rural-large, medium, small, suburban-large, medium, small, and urban-large, medium, and small. Upon completion of the classification system, this study, through the use of descriptive statistics, sought to describe, compare, and contrast the institutions belonging to each of the nine newly created categories.

This study focuses exclusively on the 266 publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities. As described and graphically depicted in Chapter 2, publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities, as of the fall of 2004, enrolled 2,411,305 or approximately 62% of all students attending such institutions (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b). This is significant in that private not-for-profit institutions, within the Master's Colleges and Universities sector, outnumber the publicly-controlled institutions. Given these larger enrollments, and the focus from President Obama's administration on public higher education, this study, while recognizing the importance of private higher education, only examines public institutions.

Currently, there are 266 publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities operating within the United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b). Of these 266 institutions, two are located outside the confines of a U. S. state, in Guam and Puerto Rico respectively. One

institution is specifically designed for advanced military education. Of these 266 institutions, 250 (94%), as of September 2008, were also members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU).

In their 1971 report *New students new places*, the Carnegie Commission recognized geographic location as a significant issue with respect to institutional distinctiveness. The report called for “about 60 to 70 new comprehensive colleges in metropolitan areas with populations of 500,000 or more” (p. 120). The report also called for “20 to 35 new comprehensive colleges in smaller metropolitan areas, generally those with populations of 200,000 to 500,000” (p. 120). The term used to describe what are now known as Master’s Colleges and Universities was “Comprehensive Colleges and Universities;” thus, the Commission’s report of 1971 was, in fact, discussing the same sector of institutions as the present study.

The National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) labels and assigns each institution of higher education in the United States to a specific geographic region of the country. These geographical regional descriptions closely parallel those used by the federal Bureau of the Census. Each geographic section listed here is also listed and defined in Chapter 1 of this study. Of the 266 institutions included in this study, 17 (6%) are located in New England states, 55 (21%) are located in Mid-East states, 30 (11%) are located in Great Lakes states, 23 (9%) are located in Plains states, 69 (26%) are located in Southeast states, 33 (12%) are located in Southwest states, 6 (2%) are located in Rocky Mountain states, and 31 (12%) are located in Far West states, and 2 (0.75%) are located in territories controlled by the United States.

## Classification Methods

While classification methods with respect to higher education and the Carnegie Basic Classification were described and discussed in Chapter 2, a more detailed look at classification methods is necessary here. While classification techniques are often overlooked by researchers, the means by which a classification is built directly impacts the quality of the classification work. Bailey (1994) noted, “a classification is no better than the dimensions or variables on which it is based” (p. 2).

The basic rules of classification are rather straightforward: the classes formed must be exhaustive and mutually exclusive (Bailey, 1994; Bowker & Star, 2000). The present study is best described as a taxonomy. Taxonomy is a classification method that uses existing empirical data to further group objects or entities (Bailey, 1994). Since the present study accepts the Carnegie Foundation’s existing definition of Master’s Colleges and Universities (large, medium, small), any further sub-classification of these existing categories is based upon the variables already set forth by Carnegie. In short, as noted in Chapter 1 of this study, the large, medium, and small language used to classify Master’s Colleges and Universities is based upon the number of master’s degrees awarded. Since the present study sought only to sub-classify each of these three existing areas geographically (rural-serving, urban-serving, suburban-serving), the cases created are monothetic or identical.

Classification methods are beneficial for several reasons. The most applicable to the present study follow. Classification is “the premier descriptive tool” (Bailey, 1994, p. 12). Moreover, Bailey suggests that classification can reduce complexity, identify similarities, identify differences, and aid in the study of relationships. Since the present desired to document both similarities and differences among institutions belonging to the Master’s Colleges and



Universities sector of higher education, perhaps there is no better methodology than that of classification.

A classification of the Master's Colleges and Universities sectors can bring a sense of clarity and understanding to the sector. Lucas (1996) observed that "American higher education is neither monolithic nor uniform, its diversity creates multiple 'worlds' or environments" (p. 21). While Lucas was not directly discussing Master's Colleges and Universities when he wrote this, the quote rings true for this sector of higher education. A mistake frequently made by scholars, practitioners, and policy-makers alike is that they tend to view the master's sector as a cohesive unit, rather than a sector containing broad internal diversity. There appears to be widespread misunderstanding as to what to call an institution belonging to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector. While the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching did once refer to these institutions as Comprehensive Universities and Colleges, they have not done so since 1994. Beyond the continued misuse of the term "comprehensive," some continue to refer to these institutions as "regional" institutions; a somewhat inexact term as discussed in some length in Chapter 2 of this study. Some continue to refer to this sector as state colleges and universities, which is perhaps more accurate than comprehensive and regional, but still yet causes some confusion. For example, in Lewin's (2009) article entitled: *State colleges also face cuts in ambitions*, the title of this work suggests an article about state colleges and universities belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. This, however, was not the case; the article was discussing the budget cuts at Arizona State University, a very large public research university. The key distinction here is that Arizona State University is *not* a state college in the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities—it is a Research University with very high research activity, a vastly different kind of institution.

Given the ease to which confusion can come about concerning this sector of higher education, the present classification study can assist in greater understanding and reduce misunderstandings about these institutions.

Classification methods, however, are not without limitations and criticisms. Bailey (1994) notes that classification is often limited to description, is often static, and in large cases seemingly unmanageable. Despite these limitations, the present study was descriptive in nature; therefore, the classification process was wholly appropriate.

Bowker and Star (2000) argue that classifications represent boundaries for the discussion of objects. In the case of the present study, the classifications represent a discourse about a set of institutions. The classifications put forth in this study are very time specific and very much living, in that they can be continuously updated and are open to multiple dimensions of interpretation. This is ideologically consistent with Bowker and Star's view of classification in that "the only good classification is a living classification" (p. 326). Moreover, with respect to the present study, classification represents a discourse that provides readers an opportunity to understand Master's Colleges and Universities from a contextually specific viewpoint. A contextually specific viewpoint means separating these institutions from the "universe" of higher education to examine them with respect to each other rather than to a "universe" that masks any distinction that may exist in the sector. Simply put, classification can inform our understanding of situation and context—it gives meaning to an area that has remained meaningless for too long. As Lucas (1996), in his work *Crisis in the academy: Rethinking higher education in America*, noted "higher education is so diverse and varied in character that most sweeping generalizations about its overall condition are practically meaningless" (p. xiii). A more narrowly defined and classified context can bring meaning from the lost.

## Selection of Variables

The variables selected to test or illustrate the proposed classification scheme in this study are bachelor's degrees awarded, student race and ethnicity, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness. It is rather well-documented that higher education costs have increased dramatically over the last decade. President Barack Obama's (2009) rhetoric calling for more Americans to participate in higher education has, again, brought the cost of higher education to the forefront of political and social thought. Unfortunately, as Callan and Atwell (2009) noted:

Choosing retrenchment over reform has helped to make colleges more expensive and less accessible and affordable. Since the last recession of 2001, the U. S. has fallen to tenth in the percentage of young adults with a college degree, the share of income needed for the poorest family to pay public college expenses after financial aid has jumped from 39 percent to 55 percent, and student loan borrowing has nearly doubled. (n. p.)

Moreover, Haskins, Holzer and Lerman (2009) suggested that the rise in student borrowing is directly related to family income and the declining effectiveness of grants to pay for college. This is a justification to explore student financial aid, especially student loan borrowing. More recently, the United States House of Representatives heard testimony discussing the proposal to end the guaranteed student loan program in favor of increases in the Pell grant program. With such focus now turning to how college students finance their education, it seems entirely appropriate to examine the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities sector, a sector that serves 2.5 million students with regard to student financial aid and student loan indebtedness.

Beyond the direct issues of student financial aid, there is still a gap that exists between the achievement of minority students and majority students. This achievement gap is related to finances. Middle and upper-income students are much more likely to borrow while many low-income and minority students are loan-adverse (Haskins, Holzer, & Lerman, 2009). This debt-

aversion is particularly true for Black and Hispanic students. In short, the type of student, the type of institution attended, and the availability and type of financial aid has a tremendous impact on both the access and affordability of higher education. Given these issues, it seems entirely appropriate to document unduplicated student headcount and the race and ethnicity of students attending the institutions under investigation in this study.

### Instrumentation

Beyond the creation of a more sophisticated classification system for the Master's Colleges and Universities sector, this study sought to describe Master's Colleges and Universities with respect to American Association of State Colleges and Universities membership, student unduplicated headcount enrollments, student race/ethnicity, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness. As of September 2008, 250 of the 266 (94%) institutions included in this study were active members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. In describing the institutions included in this study, this study employed the use of basic descriptive statistics.

To create a more sophisticated classification system for the Master's Colleges and Universities sector, this study used population data collected from the 2000 United States Decennial Census. After completing and assigning each institution to the appropriate subclass, NCES/IPEDS data surveys were used to ascertain both aggregate and disaggregate institutional data concerning the newly formed subclasses. The specific NCES/IPEDS surveys used in this study include: student enrollments, student race/ethnicity, and student financial aid. These three surveys were then used for the creation of data tables illuminating the similarities and differences among the institutions under investigation. In addition to the NCES/IPEDS data surveys that were used, the membership directory of the American Association of State Colleges and

Universities was utilized in reporting an institutions involvement with this organization. Moreover, additional data were extracted from the IPEDS Student Financial Aid (SFA) cohort study. The cohort study reveals disaggregated financial aid data by type of student (full-time vs. part-time), type of financial aid received (federal, state, local), and student status (full-time, first-time, degree seeking student). The use of each of these data instruments is entirely consistent with the methodology used by Hardy (2005) in his classifications of the Associate's Colleges sector.

### Data Collection

The data for this study were collected from NCES/IPEDS survey data from academic year 2006-2007, NCES/IPEDS Student Financial Aid (SFA) cohort study data form academic year 2006-2007, population data from the 2000 United States Decennial Census, existing classification data from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the 2008 membership directory of the American Association of State College and Universities (AASCU).

To form the new sub classification system, simple institutional data were taken from NCES/IPEDS concerning publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities. As Carnegie currently classifies Master's Colleges and Universities as either large, medium, or small, each of these sub sections (large, medium, small) were accessed and saved in an Excel spreadsheet. Such data about these institutions included the institution's name, IPEDS Unit ID number, physical address, and 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification. After collecting this information, each existing subclass (large, medium, small) was, per the methodology described below, sub-classified into either primarily rural-serving, urban-serving, or suburban-serving. Finally, cross checking with the membership directory of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), each institution within each subclass was checked for

AASCU membership status. This methodology is consistent with the methodology used by Hardy (2005) in his classification of the Associate's Colleges sector.

In order to determine to which subclass each institution belongs, data from the 2000 United States Decennial Census were accessed. The Census shows population data for any defined area. Working from a similar methodology put forth by Hardy (2005) in his dissertation and the subsequent work from Katsinas, Hardy, and Lacey (2005), population data were accessed for each city in which the institutions under investigation reported their physical address. The system that reports city population data is known as the American FactFinder system and is available for public inspection at the Bureau of the Census website:

[http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTGeoAddressServlet?\\_ts=252946671736](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTGeoAddressServlet?_ts=252946671736) (Hardy, 2005).

The population data retrieved from the American FactFinder system assisted in determining the appropriate subclass to assign each institution under investigation. As defined and discussed in Chapter 1, a city located within the confines of a Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA), or Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) aides in determining subclass assignment (Hardy, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, an institution reporting a physical address within the confines of a PMSA or MSA, with the city's name included in the title of the PMSA or MSA, and with a total population of 500,000 people or more was coded as "urban-serving." An institution with a physical address located in a city within the parameters of a PMSA or MSA but not included in the name of the PMSA or MSA, but yet has a total population of 500,000 people or more, was coded as "suburban-serving." Lastly, an institution with a physical address outside of any PMSA or MSA, or located within the parameters of a PMSA or MSA with fewer than 500,000 people was coded as "rural-serving." On rare occasions, an institution's reported

physical address may not be included in the American FactFinder system. When this occurred, simple exploratory research using the Internet was used in order to determine a location in close proximity. This exactly parallels the approach used by Hardy (2005) in the classifications of the Associate's Colleges sector.

Once these distinctions were determined, each newly created subclass was saved as a separate Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Following this, each of the nine newly-created subclass listings were transferred to Microsoft Word documents, saving each institutions UNIT ID number. With the UNIT ID numbers saved for each institution belonging to each of the newly created subclasses, the copy and paste function offered by NCES/IPEDS was employed to access the appropriate data surveys regarding these institutions. This allowed for aggregate description of each newly created subclass (Hardy, 2005).

The targeted aggregate data table descriptions of each newly created subclass include NCES/IPEDS unduplicated headcount enrollment data surveys from academic year 2006-07, student financial aid surveys, and race/ethnicity surveys. All information taken from IPEDS is free and open to public inspection via the Internet at <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/dct/index.asp> by simply logging into the system via the Guest level log-in. Again, this approach is consistent with the data sources used by the Carnegie Foundation and the methodological approach used by Hardy (2005).

### Research Questions

This study had two primary research questions.

1. In a manner consistent with existing Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching nomenclature, can a more precise classification scheme be developed for the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities?

2. What are the characteristics of a publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities institution with regard to:

- Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded
- Student Race and Ethnicity
- Student Financial Aid
- Student Loan Indebtedness

#### Data Analysis

The newly created subclass system of publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities was described and depicted via a series of tables and lists. This produced:

1. A list of all publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities (large, medium, small) by primary geographical region (rural-serving, urban-serving, suburban-serving).
2. A list of all Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities (large, medium, small) by sector (public, private-not-for-profit, private-for-profit).
3. A list of all publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities (large, medium, small) by primary geographical region (rural-serving, urban-serving, suburban-serving) and by special focus (Historically Black College or University, Hispanic Serving Institution, etc).
4. A table of all Master's Colleges and Universities (large, medium, small) by primary geographical region (rural-serving, urban-serving, suburban-serving) and by American Association of State Colleges and Universities membership status.

In addition to these outputs, other data tables were created showcasing differences and similarities among each subclass concerning student enrollments, student financial aid, and



student race/ethnicity. Such tables primarily show totals, percentages, and averages on the variables noted above.

### Summary

This study created a more sophisticated system by which publicly-controlled institutions belonging to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector may be further sub-classified and studied. While similar analysis has been used to classify and describe the Associate's Colleges sector of higher education, no such system has ever been produced for the Master's Colleges and Universities sector, a sector that enrolled 2.5 million students at 266 colleges and universities in the United States in the 2006-07 academic year. It is hoped that this study can provide a linkage between Master's Colleges and Universities and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities—producing a research methodology that can help improve the research of policies and practices as these two sectors partner to aid the advancement of public higher education.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

#### Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study, which had two major objectives: First, it sought to classify publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities by geographical service (rural, urban, and suburban). While the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies master's institutions as small, medium, or large, the present study further sub classifies these institutions by rural, urban, or suburban. This further sub classification creates nine categories to include rural: small, medium, large, suburban: small, medium, large, and urban: small, medium, large. Second, this study sought to describe selected characteristics of the institutions belonging to each newly created category. The details of the classification system developed and employed in this study were described in Chapter 3. The institutions used in this study and the data used to determine the appropriate classifications of those institutions are presented in Appendix B. What follows is a series of data tables that addresses each aspect of the research questions put forth in this study.

#### Research Question 1

In a manner consistent with existing Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching nomenclature, can a more precise classification scheme be developed for the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities?

### *Discussion*

The data presented here compare the existing Carnegie classification language of small, medium, and large and the using the proposed geographically-based classification of rural, urban, and suburban. Table 6 shows a numerical and percentage breakdown of the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities. It further reveals that Larger Programs make up the vast majority of the Master's Colleges and Universities universe, totaling 166 institutions or 62% of all institutions of this type. While accounting for 62% of the institutions, Larger Programs enroll 1,894,666 students or 76% of all students enrolled in a publicly-controlled Master's institutions during the academic year 2006-07. While the Larger Programs hold the greatest percentages of enrollments in master's institutions, Medium Programs total 69 institutions or 26% of the publicly-controlled master's universe, but only enroll 433,570 students or 18% of the total undergraduate student enrollment. Smaller Programs total 31 institutions or 12% of the public master's universe with a 169,643 students or a tiny 7% of the total undergraduate enrollment. The 166 Larger Program institutions have an average undergraduate enrollment of 11,414 students, while the 69 Medium Programs have an average enrollment of 6,429, and the 31 Smaller Programs have an average enrollment of 5,472 undergraduate students. In total, the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities sector, across all 266 institutions, has an overall average enrollment, per institution, of 9,428 undergraduate students.

While the data presented in Table 6 give a picture of Master's Colleges and Universities, these data do not fully capture the diversity existing in Master's Colleges and Universities. Tables 7 re-presents the data shown in Table 6 using the newly proposed geographically-based classification system, and shows the geographically-based system as a much more precise and complete method by which to study these institutions. Table 7 shows that the public master's

institutional universe is comprised of 163 or 61% rural-serving institutions, 56 or 21% suburban-serving and 46 or 17% urban-serving. Rural-serving institutions account for 1,279,177 or 51% of the total undergraduate enrollment at publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities, while suburban-serving account for 633,165 or 25% and urban-serving institutions have 595,537 or 24% of the total undergraduate enrollment. Table 7 shows the average enrollment at rural-serving institutions is approximately 7,848 students, while the suburban-serving and urban-serving sectors are 11,307 and 12,946 respectively. While the urban-serving sector posts the highest average institutional enrollment figures, the largest single average enrollment figure comes for the Urban-Large class, with an average enrollment of 14,388 undergraduate students. Again, Table 7 provides a much more precise manner in which to examine this set of institutions.

Table 6

*Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Enrollments, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages*

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification

Master's Colleges and Universities:	Institutions		Enrollments		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Average
Smaller Programs	31	12%	169,643	7%	5,472
Medium Programs	69	26%	443,570	18%	6,429
Larger Programs	166	62%	1,894,666	76%	11,414
Total	266	100%	2,507,879	100%	9,428

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, 12 Month Enrollment; 2006-07

Table 7

*Number of Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments at Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities by Geographical Classification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers, Percentages, and Average Enrollments*

	Institutions		Enrollments		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Average
Rural Small	26	10%	127,691	5%	4,911
Rural Medium	46	17%	277,729	11%	6,038
Rural Large	91	34%	873,757	35%	9,602
Rural Total	163	61%	1,279,177	51%	7,848
Suburban Small	3	1%	24,415	1%	8,138
Suburban Medium	12	5%	62,632	2%	5,219
Suburban Large	41	15%	546,118	22%	13,320
Suburban Total	56	21%	633,165	25%	11,307
Urban Small	2	1%	17,537	1%	8,769
Urban Medium	11	4%	103,209	4%	9,383
Urban Large	33	12%	474,791	19%	14,388
Urban Total	46	17%	595,537	24%	12,946
R, S, & U Total	265	100%	2,507,879	100%	9,464
Special Use	1	0%	0	0%	N/A
Total	266	100%	2,507,879	100%	9,428

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, 12 Month Enrollment; 2006-07

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 7 has a “special use” category. The one special use institution, the Naval Postgraduate Academy in Monterey, California, has no undergraduate students. As this institution is a graduate academy designed specifically for graduate education to service men and women, it makes little sense to put this institution in with the other categories. In subsequent tables, this category was removed as to make the data more easily understandable.

In addition to the data presented above, the next series of data tables showcase institutional annual unduplicated enrollments by race/ethnicity at Master’s Colleges and Universities. Table 8 shows the enrollment data using the existing Carnegie classification language of small, medium, and large by race/ethnicity for academic year 2006-07. It indicates that Larger Programs have significantly higher undergraduate enrollments than Medium or Smaller Programs. Of the 2,507,874 undergraduates enrolled in public master’s institutions, 1,894,666 were in Larger Programs, 443,570 were in Medium Programs, and 169,643 were in Smaller Programs, or by percentages these enrollments are 76%, 18%, and 7% respectively. Table 8 shows that 229,119 or 69% of all Black students enrolled in public master’s institutions attend a Carnegie Larger Program institution, and even higher percentages for Hispanics at 215,327 or 81%. However, in total, as shown in table 8, Smaller Programs enroll, in percentages, more Black students (23%) than Medium Programs (15%) or Larger Programs (12%). Larger Programs, in percentages, enroll more Hispanic students (11%) than do Medium (10%) or Smaller Programs (4%).

Table 8

Annual Unduplicated Headcount Undergraduate Enrollments at Public Master's Colleges and Universities by Race/Ethnicity: 2006-

07 Expressed in Numbers and Percentages

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of  
Master's Colleges and Universities:

Type of Program	Total Enrollments		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaskan Native		Race Unknown		Non- Resident Alien	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Smaller	169,643	7	102,706	7	39,859	12	6,843	3	3,234	2	2,675	10	10,762	7	3,564	6
Medium	443,570	18	276,644	18	64,483	19	42,632	16	14,107	10	6,163	23	31,110	21	8,431	14
Larger	1,894,666	76	1,157,114	75	229,119	69	215,327	81	120,167	87	17,653	67	107,675	72	47,701	80
Total	2,507,879	100%	1,536,464	100%	333,461	100%	264,802	100%	137,508	100%	26,491	100%	149,547	100%	59,696	100%
Smaller	100%		61%		23%		4%		2%		2%		6%		2%	
Medium	100%		62%		15%		10%		3%		1%		7%		2%	
Larger	100%		61%		12%		11%		6%		1%		6%		3%	
Total	100%		61%		13%		11%		5%		1%		6%		2%	

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, 12  
Month Enrollment; 2006-07

While the data presented in Table 8 are informative, they are rather limited in scope and precision. As Table 9 reveals, a geographically-based classification system provides a much more precise and thorough description of the enrollment diversity of students served by the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities. When Tables 8 and 9 are compared, it is clear that the geographically-based classification system shown in Table 9 reveals greater diversity by race and ethnicity than was evident in Table 8.



Table 9

Total Undergraduate Annual Unduplicated Headcount Enrollments at Public Master's Colleges and Universities by Race/Ethnicity and

Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages

	Total Undergraduate Enrollment		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaskan Native		Race Unknown		Non-Resident Alien	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rural Small	127,691	5	82,891	5	27,382	8	4,013	2	2,054	1	2,502	9	6,474	4	2,375	4
Rural Medium	277,729	11	178,494	12	32,913	10	34,068	13	8,427	6	5,191	20	13,043	9	5,593	9
Rural Large	873,757	35	647,048	42	87,710	26	49,600	19	22,274	16	11,980	45	40,365	27	14,780	25
<b>Rural Total</b>	<b>1,279,177</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>908,433</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>148,005</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>87,681</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>32,755</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19,673</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>59,882</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>22,748</b>	<b>38</b>
Suburban Small	24,415	1	15,642	1	2,501	1	1,543	1	778	1	136	1	2,637	2	1,178	2
Suburban Medium	62,632	2	41,680	3	8,554	3	4,715	2	2,707	2	299	1	3,402	2	1,275	2
Suburban Large	546,118	22	319,477	21	69,569	21	59,936	23	40,740	30	3,146	12	37,684	25	15,566	26
<b>Suburban Total</b>	<b>633,165</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>376,799</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>80,624</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>66,194</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>44,225</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3,581</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>43,723</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>18,019</b>	<b>30</b>
Urban Small	17,537	1	4,173	0	9,976	3	1,287	0	402	0	37	0	1,651	1	11	0
Urban Medium	103,209	4	56,470	4	23,016	7	3,849	1	2,973	2	673	3	14,665	10	1,563	3
Urban Large	474,791	19	190,589	12	71,840	22	105,791	40	57,153	42	2,437	9	29,626	20	17,355	29
<b>Urban Total</b>	<b>595,537</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>251,232</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>104,832</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>110,927</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>60,528</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>3,147</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>45,942</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18,929</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,507,879</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,536,464</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>333,461</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>264,802</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>137,508</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26,401</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>149,547</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>59,696</b>	<b>100</b>
Rural Small	100%		65%		21%		3%		2%		2%		5%		2%	
Rural Medium	100%		65%		12%		12%		2%		2%		5%		2%	
Rural Large	100%		75%		10%		4%		3%		1%		5%		2%	
<b>Rural Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>72%</b>		<b>12%</b>		<b>6%</b>		<b>2%</b>		<b>2%</b>		<b>5%</b>		<b>2%</b>	
Suburban Small	100%		64%		10%		6%		3%		1%		11%		5%	
Suburban Medium	100%		67%		14%		8%		4%		0%		5%		2%	
Suburban Large	100%		58%		13%		11%		7%		1%		7%		3%	
<b>Suburban Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>60%</b>		<b>13%</b>		<b>10%</b>		<b>7%</b>		<b>1%</b>		<b>7%</b>		<b>3%</b>	
Urban Small	100%		24%		57%		7%		2%		0%		9%		0%	
Urban Medium	100%		55%		22%		4%		3%		1%		14%		2%	
Urban Large	100%		40%		15%		22%		12%		1%		6%		4%	
<b>Urban Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>42%</b>		<b>18%</b>		<b>19%</b>		<b>10%</b>		<b>1%</b>		<b>8%</b>		<b>3%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>62%</b>		<b>13%</b>		<b>11%</b>		<b>5%</b>		<b>1%</b>		<b>6%</b>		<b>2%</b>	

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, 12 month enrollment; 2006-07

Table 9 shows the undergraduate enrollments for public master's colleges by race/ethnicity separated by geographical classifications for academic year 2006-07. When the raw enrollment numbers shown in Table 9 are expressed in percentages, an interesting finding is revealed. Of the 2,507,879 undergraduate students enrolled in a public master's institution during academic year 2006-07, 1,536,464 or 62% were White, 333,461 or 13% Black, and 264,802 or 11% Hispanic. However, a close examination of the subclasses reveals that the Urban-Small institutions had enrollments that totaled 17,537 students of which 9,976 or 57% were Black, while the Urban-Large institutions had enrollments that totaled 474,791 of which 105,791 or 22% were Hispanic. In total, the urban-serving institutions had a total enrollment of 595,537, which was 42% White, 18% Black, and 19% Hispanic. Conversely, Rural-Small institutions had the lowest percentage of Hispanic enrollments at just 3%, while both Rural-Large and Suburban-Small had the lowest percentage of Black enrollments at 10% each. Finally, it is worth noting that Rural-Small institutions and Urban-Medium institutions are separated by only 1 percentage point in Black enrollments with 21% and 22% respectively. It seems clear, from Table 9 that when classified geographically publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities are serving a diverse set of students, and that significant differences exist across Master's Colleges and Universities that are simply not evident using the current Carnegie method of classification.

As further revealed in Table 9, 1,279,177 or 51% of the 2,507,879 total undergraduate enrollments at public master's institutions in academic year 2006-07 were at rural-serving institutions, with just 633,165 or 25% at suburban-serving and 595,537 or 24% at urban-serving institutions. Moreover, 148,805 or 44% of the 333,461 total Black enrollments at public master's institutions were at rural-serving institutions, while 110,927 or 42% of the 264,802 total Hispanic enrollments were at urban-serving institutions. In fact, the Urban-Large institutions accounted

for 105,791 or 40% of all Hispanic enrollments in public master's institutions, while the Rural-Large institutions had the largest single percentage of both Black and White students at 26% and 42% respectively. Urban-serving institutions are majority minority while rural-serving institutions are clearly not.

## Research Question 2

What are the characteristics of a publicly-controlled Carnegie Classified Master's Colleges and Universities institution with regard to:

- Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded
- Student Race and Ethnicity
- Student Financial Aid
- Student Loan Indebtedness

### *Discussion*

Using the current Carnegie classification language of small, medium, and large, Table 10 reveals the number of bachelor's degrees awarded at public master's institutions during academic year 2006-07. As shown in Table 10, Larger Programs account for 286,561 or 78% of all 365,659 bachelor's degrees awarded at public master's institutions. While accounting for 78% of all degrees awarded, Larger Programs account for 186,794 or 77% of all 242,161 White graduates, 25,834 or 72% of all 35,921 Black graduates, and 29,653 or a whopping 86% of all 34,309 Hispanic graduates. While the 166 colleges and universities in the Larger Programs have significantly higher numbers of graduates, the percentages by race and ethnicity in Table 10 tell an interesting story. Larger Programs awarded 286,561 baccalaureate degrees during 2006-07, with 186,794 or 65% of these degrees being awarded to White students, 25,834 or 9% being awarded to Black students, and 29,653 or 10% being awarded to Hispanic students. While

awarding 80% fewer degrees than their Larger Program counterparts, Medium Programs awarded 58,005 degrees with 41,000 or 71% being awarded to White students, 6,527 or 11% Black, and 3,932 or 7% Hispanic. Lastly, Smaller Programs awarded 92% fewer degrees than their Larger Program counterparts and 64% fewer degrees than Medium Programs. Nevertheless, Smaller Programs awarded just 21,093 baccalaureate degrees in 2006-07 with 14,367 or 68% being awarded to White students, 3,540 or 17% to Black students, and 724 or 3% to Hispanics.

Table 10

*Bachelor's Degrees Awarded at Public Master's Colleges and Universities in Academic Year 2006-07 for First and Second Major*

*by Race/Ethnicity, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages*

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of  
Master's Colleges and Universities:

Type of Program	Degrees Awarded		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaskan Native		Race Unknown		Non- Resident Alien	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Smaller	21,093	6	14,367	6	3,560	10	724	2	414	2	223	7	989	5	816	9
Medium	58,005	16	41,000	17	6,527	18	3,932	11	1,701	8	709	23	2,923	15	1,213	13
Larger	286,561	78	186,794	77	25,834	72	29,653	86	18,688	90	2,165	70	15,888	80	7,539	79
<b>Total</b>	<b>365,659</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>242,161</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35,921</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34,309</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20,803</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,097</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19,800</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9,568</b>	<b>100%</b>
Smaller		100%		68%		17%		3%		2%		1%		5%		4%
Medium		100%		71%		11%		7%		3%		1%		5%		2%
Larger		100%		65%		9%		10%		7%		1%		6%		3%
<b>Total</b>		100%		66%		9%		10%		6%		1%		5%		3%

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, Completions Survey, 2006-07

Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 11 reveals bachelor's degrees awarded to students at public Carnegie Master's institutions during academic year 2006-07 by geographical classification. Among the 184,939 degrees awarded at rural-serving institutions, 142,108 or 78% were awarded to White students, with 15,426 or 8% to Black, and 9,847 or 5% to Hispanic. Rural-Small institutions had the lowest percentage of degrees awarded to Whites (70%) and Hispanics (3%) while having the largest percentage of degrees awarded to Blacks (18%). The suburban-serving institutions, in total, awarded 96,894 baccalaureate degrees in 2006-07 with 61,421 or 63% going to White students, 9,704 or 10% to Blacks, and 9,107 or 9% to Hispanics.

The rural-serving and suburban-serving institutions were very comparable with one notable difference. Suburban-serving institutions have slightly larger percentages of Hispanic students earning bachelor's degrees. The urban-serving institutions, as clearly shown in Table 11, are by far the most diverse group of institutions with respect to bachelor's degree attainment. Of the 83,826 degrees awarded at urban-serving institutions in 2006-07, 38,632 or 46% were awarded to White students, 10,791 or 13% to Black, and 15,355 or 18% to Hispanics. Within the urban-serving sector, Urban-Small institutions show an impressive 45% of bachelor's degrees earned going to Black students, while the Urban-Large institutions show 21% of their degrees going to Hispanic students. While the Urban-Large institutions show a relatively impressive number of Hispanic graduates, 14,967 or 21% of the 72,235 total Urban-Large graduates, the numbers of Black graduates was a much smaller 8,120 or 11%. In a similar fashion, the Urban-Medium institutions showcase that 2,351 of the 10,872 or 22% of the degrees awarded at Urban-Medium institutions were earned by Black students, while just 314 or 3% were earned by Hispanic students.

Table 11 further indicates that 184,939 or 50% of all the bachelor's degrees earned by students enrolled in public Master's institutions in academic year 2006-07 were awarded to students attending a rural-serving institution, with 96,894 or 26% at suburban-serving, and 83,826 or 23% at urban-serving institutions. Rural-serving institutions account for 103,395 or 43% of all Black graduates, while urban-serving institutions account for 15,355 or 45% of all Hispanic graduates. Urban-Large institutions account for a very large 14,967 or 44% of all Hispanic graduates, while Rural-Large institutions account for the largest percentages of both Black and White students at 26% and 43% respectively. These data are very much in line with the enrollment data presented earlier in this chapter. Again, as revealed in Table 11, the geographically-based classification system is much more precise than the current Carnegie classification system.

Table 11

*Bachelor's Degrees Awarded at Public Master's Colleges and Universities for First and Second Major by Race/Ethnicity and*

*Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages*

	Degrees Awarded		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaskan Native		Race Unknown		Non- Resident Alien	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rural Small	16,536	5	11,541	5	2,962	8	477	1	232	1	202	7	743	4	379	4
Rural Medium	37,224	10	27,172	11	3,262	9	3,028	9	911	3	592	19	1,500	8	759	8
Rural Large	131,179	35	103,395	43	9,202	26	6,342	14	3,554	17	1,366	44	5,240	26	2,080	22
Rural Total	184,939	50	142,108	59	15,426	43	9,847	25	4,697	21	2,160	70	7,483	38	3,218	34
Suburban Small	3,838	1	2,547	1	278	1	173	1	161	1	18	1	225	1	436	5
Suburban Medium	9,909	3	7,242	3	914	3	590	2	433	2	54	2	463	2	213	2
Suburban Large	83,147	23	51,632	21	8,512	24	8,344	24	6,415	31	413	13	5,117	26	2,714	28
Suburban Total	96,894	26	61,421	25	9,704	27	9,107	27	7,009	34	485	16	5,805	29	3,363	35
Urban Small	719	0	279	0	320	1	74	0	21	0	3	0	21	0	1	0
Urban Medium	10,872	3	6,586	3	2,351	7	314	1	357	2	63	2	960	5	241	3
Urban Large	72,235	20	31,767	13	8,120	23	14,967	44	8,719	42	386	12	5,531	28	2,745	29
Urban Total	83,826	23	38,632	16	10,791	30	15,355	45	9,097	44	452	15	6,512	33	2,987	31
Total	365,659	100	242,161	100	35,921	100	34,309	100	20,803	100	3,097	100	19,800	100	9,568	100
Rural Small	100%		70%		18%		3%		1%		1%		4%		2%	
Rural Medium	100%		73%		9%		8%		2%		2%		4%		2%	
Rural Large	100%		80%		7%		4%		3%		1%		4%		2%	
Rural Total	100%		78%		8%		5%		2%		1%		4%		2%	
Suburban Small	100%		66%		7%		5%		4%		0%		6%		11%	
Suburban Medium	100%		73%		9%		6%		4%		1%		5%		2%	
Suburban Large	100%		62%		10%		10%		8%		0%		6%		3%	
Suburban Total	100%		63%		10%		9%		7%		1%		6%		3%	
Urban Small	100%		39%		45%		10%		3%		0%		3%		0%	
Urban Medium	100%		61%		22%		3%		3%		1%		9%		2%	
Urban Large	100%		44%		11%		21%		12%		1%		8%		4%	
Urban Total	100%		46%		13%		18%		11%		1%		8%		4%	
Total	100%		67%		10%		9%		6%		1%		5%		3%	

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, Completions Survey; 2006-07  
Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding



Table 12 shows student financial aid data separated by students receiving any financial aid, federal grant aid, state/local aid, institutional aid, and student loans. As shown in Table 12, Larger Programs have approximately 188,198 or 75% of the 251,660 students in the 2006 financial aid cohort receiving some form of financial aid, with 76,074 or 30% getting federal grant aid, 100,229 or 40% getting state/local aid, 68,060 or 27% with institutional aid, and 109,186 or 43% taking loans. Medium Programs show 47,857 or 80% of the 60,122 students getting some form of financial aid, with 19,328 or 32% getting federal grant aid, 20,452 or 34% getting state/local aid, 19,513 or 32% with institutional aid, and a startling 30,095 or 50% taking loans. Finally, Smaller Program institutions show 17,308 or 83% of the 20,903 students getting any financial aid, with 7,855 or 38% getting federal grant aid, 7,672 or 37% getting state/local aid, 7,197 or 34% with institutional aid, and a massive 11,709 or 56% taking student loans. Table 12 further showcases the dominance of the Larger Program institutions within the public master's universe. Of the 332,685 students included in the 2006-07 student financial aid cohort study, 251,660 or 76% were enrolled in Larger Program institutions, with 60,122 or 18% in Medium, and 20,903 or 6% in Smaller Programs. Interestingly, of all the loans taken by students in public master's institutions, 109,186 or 72% were taken by students at Larger Programs, with just 30,095 or 20% at Medium and, 11,709 or 8% at Smaller Programs.

Table 12

*Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master's Colleges and Universities**2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages*

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification

Master's Colleges and Universities:

Type of Program	Number of Students in Fall Cohort		Received Any Financial Aid		Received Federal Grant Aid		Received State/Local Aid		Received Institutional Aid		Incurred Student Loan Debt	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Smaller	20,903	6	17,308	7	7,855	8	7,672	6	7,197	8	11,709	8
Medium	60,122	18	47,857	19	19,328	19	20,452	16	19,513	21	30,095	20
Larger	251,660	76	188,198	74	76,074	74	100,229	78	68,060	72	109,186	72
<b>Total</b>	<b>332,685</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>253,363</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>103,257</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>128,353</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>94,770</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>150,990</b>	<b>100%</b>
Smaller	<i>100%</i>		<i>83%</i>		<i>38%</i>		<i>37%</i>		<i>34%</i>		<i>56%</i>	
Medium	<i>100%</i>		<i>80%</i>		<i>32%</i>		<i>34%</i>		<i>32%</i>		<i>50%</i>	
Larger	<i>100%</i>		<i>75%</i>		<i>30%</i>		<i>40%</i>		<i>27%</i>		<i>43%</i>	
<b>Total</b>	<i>100%</i>		<i>76%</i>		<i>31%</i>		<i>39%</i>		<i>28%</i>		<i>45%</i>	

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, Student Financial Aid Survey; 2006-07  
 Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 13 represents the student financial aid data shown in Table 12 using the geographically-based classification system. Table 13 shows a very troubling trend. Across all three geographical subclasses (rural, suburban, and urban), there were 332,685 students in the first-time/full-time degree-seeking fall 2006 student financial aid cohort study. Of these 332,685 students, 150,990 or 46% incurred student loans. As indicated in Table 13, students at urban-serving institutions incurred student loans, with 23,669 or 35% of the 67,197 students needing student loans. However, despite the 35% of all urban-serving students, the Urban-Medium institutions show that 4,565 or 50% of their 9,134 students had student loans. The suburban-serving sector, with 32,570 or 43% of their 75,923 students incurred loans. Both the Suburban-Small and Suburban-Medium institutions show that 54% of their students had student loans. In total, the rural-serving institutions show that 94,751 or 51% of their 189,565 students incurred loans. Both the Rural-Medium and Rural-Large institutions show that 50% of their students were taking student loans. The Rural-Small institutions show that of the 18,214 students in the cohort, 10,481 were taking student loans; this is a jaw-dropping 58% of students taking student loans. Table 13 further reveals that a massive 94,751 or 63% of all 150,990 student loans needed by students at public master's institutions were taken by students at rural-serving institutions. In fact, Rural Large institutions accounted for 64,080 or 42% of all the loans taken by students in academic year 2006-07. Again, the geographically-based classification system provides for a much more precise manner in which to study this issue at Master's Colleges and Universities.

Table 13

## Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master's Colleges and Universities

by Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers and Percentages

	Number of Students in Fall Cohort		Received Any Financial Aid		Received Federal Grant Aid		Received State/Local Aid		Received Institutional Aid		Incurred Student Loan Debt	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rural Small	18,214	5	15,479	6	6,917	7	6,739	5	6,745	7	10,481	7
Rural Medium	41,088	12	33,538	13	13,347	13	14,608	11	15,205	16	20,190	13
Rural Large	130,263	39	98,453	38	35,450	33	46,201	35	35,883	38	64,080	42
Rural Total	189,565	56	147,470	58	55,714	52	67,548	52	57,833	61	94,751	63
Suburban Small	1,196	0	877	0	342	0	386	0	265	0	644	0
Suburban Medium	9,900	3	7,147	3	2,695	3	2,686	2	1,881	2	5,340	4
Suburban Large	64,827	19	49,032	19	18,367	18	30,001	23	17,093	18	26,586	18
Suburban Total	75,923	23	57,056	23	21,404	21	33,073	26	19,239	20	32,570	22
Urban Small	1,493	0	952	0	596	1	547	0	187	0	584	0
Urban Medium	9,134	3	7,172	3	3,286	3	3,158	2	2,427	3	4,565	3
Urban Large	56,570	17	40,713	16	22,257	22	24,027	19	15,084	16	18,520	12
Urban Total	67,197	20	48,837	19	26,139	25	27,732	22	17,698	19	23,669	16
Total	332,685	100	253,363	100	103,257	100	128,353	100	94,770	100	150,990	100
Rural Small	100%		85%		38%		37%		37%		58%	
Rural Medium	100%		82%		32%		36%		37%		50%	
Rural Large	100%		76%		27%		35%		28%		50%	
Rural Total	100%		78%		29%		36%		31%		51%	
Suburban Small	100%		73%		29%		32%		22%		54%	
Suburban Medium	100%		72%		27%		27%		19%		54%	
Suburban Large	100%		76%		28%		46%		26%		41%	
Suburban Total	100%		75%		28%		44%		25%		43%	
Urban Small	100%		64%		40%		37%		13%		39%	
Urban Medium	100%		79%		36%		35%		27%		50%	
Urban Large	100%		72%		39%		42%		27%		33%	
Urban Total	100%		73%		39%		41%		26%		35%	
Total	100%		76%		31%		39%		29%		46%	

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS; Student Financial Aid Survey; 2006-07

Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

As indicated in Table 14, the average amount of federal grant aid awarded to students during academic year 2006-07 at public Master's Colleges and Universities—Larger Programs was \$3,118, while the average loan at these same institutions was \$3,675, a difference of \$557. The average amount of federal grant aid awarded to students at Medium Program institutions was \$3,214, while the average loan amount was \$3,813, a difference of \$599. Lastly, the average federal grant aid awarded at Smaller Program institutions was \$3,224, while the average loan amount was \$4,400, a difference of \$1,176. In total, students at publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities are taking out loans of about \$3,962, while getting federal grant aid of approximately \$3,185. In short, students at these institutions are taking out loans that exceed the average federal grant aid awarded by approximately \$777.

As depicted in Table 14, the overall percentage of financial aid amounts awarded to students comes in the form of student loans. All three subclasses of Master's Colleges and Universities have loans as the single highest average of financial aid awards. Student loans at Larger Programs account for approximately 31% of the sum total of financial aid award amounts, while accounting for 31% at Medium Programs and 35% at Smaller Programs. In total, 32% of a student's financial aid award package at public Master's Colleges and Universities is coming in the form of student loans. On balance, higher average amounts of student loans incurred exist across all geographic levels with larger percentages of students incurring student loan debt.

Table 14  
*Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Master's Colleges and Universities: Average Award Amounts 2006-07, Expressed in Dollars*

2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of  
 Master's Colleges and Universities:

Type of Program	Average Amount of Federal Grant Aid Awarded	Average Amount of State/Local Aid Awarded	Average Amount of Institutional Aid Awarded	Average Amount of Student Loan Debt Incurred
	No.	No.	No.	No.
Smaller	\$3,224	\$2,499	\$2,521	\$4,400
Medium	\$3,214	\$2,489	\$2,694	\$3,813
Larger	\$3,118	\$2,422	\$2,652	\$3,675
Average Total Amounts	\$3,185	\$2,470	\$2,622	\$3,962

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, Student Financial Aid Survey; 2006-07

Table 15 shows the average award amounts of student financial aid by federal grant aid, state/local aide, institutional aid, and student loans using the geographically-based classification system. Every category of institutions shows a larger average student loan amount than federal grant aid amount. Again, the rural-serving sector appears to fair the worst. Students at rural-serving institutions are taking out loans that average \$4,059, while getting federal grant aid that averages \$3,222. This means that these students are taking out loans that exceed their federal grant aid awards by \$837. Students at Rural-Small institutions are taking out loans that average \$4,414, while getting federal grant aid that averages \$3,189. This is a difference of \$1,225. In total, the students at rural-serving institutions have approximately 33% of the sum total of their financial aid coming in the form of student loans. The suburban-serving sector fairs very similarly with students taking out loans that average \$4,097, while getting federal grant aid of \$3,300. This is a difference between student loans and federal grant aid of \$797. The Suburban-Small institutions show discrepancies between average federal grant aid and student loans. Student loans at Suburban-Small institutions average \$4,474, while federal grant aid averages \$3,330, a difference of \$1,144. The urban-serving institutions show an average loan amount of \$3,878, while the average federal grant aid is \$3,362, a difference of \$516. Moreover, the Urban-Medium institutions show the average federal grant aid to be \$3,109 and the average student loan to be \$4,175, a difference of \$1,066. As indicated in Table 15, both the suburban-serving and urban-serving sectors have approximately 30% of student's financial aid award packages coming in the form of student loans, with the rural-serving sector showing 33% in student loans. As evident in Table 15, the geographically-based classification system shows larger percentage differences of state/local aid, institutional aid, and student loans than do the existing Carnegie classifications.

Table 15

*Student Financial Aid for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Undergraduates at Public Master's Colleges and Universities by Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07, Average Award Amounts Expressed in Dollars*

	Average Amount of Federal Grant Aid Awarded	Average Amount of State/Local Aid Awarded	Average Amount of Institutional Aid Awarded	Average Amount of Student Loan Debt Incurred
	No.	No.	No.	No.
Rural Small	\$3,189	\$2,286	\$2,401	\$4,414
Rural Medium	\$3,271	\$2,416	\$2,584	\$3,770
Rural Large	\$3,207	\$2,393	\$2,472	\$3,994
Rural Total	\$3,222	\$2,365	\$2,486	\$4,059
Suburban Small	\$3,330	\$3,911	\$3,597	\$4,474
Suburban Medium	\$3,365	\$2,871	\$3,046	\$3,962
Suburban Large	\$3,204	\$2,667	\$3,064	\$3,856
Suburban Total	\$3,300	\$3,150	\$3,236	\$4,097
Urban Small	\$3,521	\$3,147	\$2,469	\$4,099
Urban Medium	\$3,109	\$2,595	\$3,302	\$4,175
Urban Large	\$3,457	\$2,754	\$3,357	\$3,360
Urban Total	\$3,362	\$2,832	\$3,043	\$3,878
Total	\$3,295	\$2,782	\$2,922	\$4,011

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, Student Financial Aid Survey; 2006-07



## Summary

While the descriptive data analyzed using the existing Carnegie classification language of small, medium, and large shown in the tables presented above tells us some about students attending publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities, the data tables using the geographically-based classification system seem to tell a much more descriptive story. The geographically-based classification system developed in this study provides a more accurate and precise manner by which to study Master's Colleges and Universities.

The data shown in this chapter reveal both interesting and disturbing patterns. The data very clearly indicate that many public master's institutions across all sectors (rural, suburban, and urban) and sizes (small, medium, and large) enroll and graduate significant numbers of minority students. Despite these positive outcomes, however, disturbing patterns emerge. Students at public Master's Colleges and Universities incur higher levels of debt to attend and complete college. In no sector is this more pronounced than within the rural-serving sector. For example, 10,454 or 58% of the 18,214 students included the academic year 2006-07 student financial aid cohort attending a Rural-Small institution were required to incur student loans. While the Master's Colleges and Universities sector of higher education may well be an access sector, it too is a sector suffering from increasing costs and higher student loan indebtedness.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

This study proposes a geographically-based classification scheme for the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities that are a part of the 2005 Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Since 1973, Carnegie has classified all accredited/degree-granting institutions in the United States. While the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification has 33 subclasses, the classes can be described using six broad categories: (1) Doctorate-granting Universities, (2) Master's Colleges and Universities, (3) Baccalaureate Colleges, (4) Associate's Colleges, (5) Special Focus Institutions, and (6) Tribal Colleges. As noted throughout the previous chapters, this study had as its primary interest the publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities sector. The Master's sector is sub classified into three subclasses: Large, Medium, or Small. An institution is defined as a Master's institution if that institution is not identified as a Special Focus Institution or Tribal College, and awards a minimum of 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009c). A Master's institution awarding 200 or more master's degrees is considered Large, while institutions awarding between 100-199 master's degrees are Medium, and institutions awarding 50-99 master's degrees are considered Small (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2009b).

One major reason for classifying the Master's sector using a geographically-based system is that Carnegie already uses a geographical system to classify the Associate's Colleges sector.

Based upon the work of Katsinas, Hardy, and Lacey (2005), Carnegie's 2005 Basic Classification categories for the first time classified the Associate's Colleges sector geographically, by rural-serving, urban-serving, and suburban-serving, which allows separation and institutional comparison based upon geography. Using the appropriate Carnegie classification, community college researchers may now access the appropriate federal data sets via the US Department of Education's/National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). This geographically-based classification system has allowed community college researchers to study institutions with greater precision. Given that such a system has worked well for the Associate's Colleges sector, and that the Master's sector has much in common with the Associate's sector (Dunham, 1969; Ostar, 1991; Katsinas, 2009), it seems entirely reasonable to conclude that such a system would benefit the Master's sector as well.

In an attempt to create a geographically-based classification scheme, this study began with the existing 266 publicly-controlled colleges and universities in the existing 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification universe. Each of the 266 institutions were classified geographically in a manner consistent with the geographically-based classification of the Associate's College sector developed by Katsinas, Hardy, and Lacey (2005) for the Carnegie Foundation, which was included in the 2005 Basic Classification. To test to see if the proposed geographically-based classification of the Master's sector would allow researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to observe differences, selected key characteristics of these institutions were tested. The selected characteristics described in this study were number of bachelor's degrees awarded, student race and ethnicity, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness. While these selected characteristics do not provide an exhaustive description of these institutions, these characteristics

are typical measures used to describe access-oriented institutions. Much like the Associate's Colleges sector, the Master's sector serves an access function (Katsinas, 2009). More specifically, an examination of the number of bachelor's degrees awarded can inform research on the sector by showing the number and race/ethnicity of graduates. No serious scholar could deny that a major function of any college or university, be they Doctoral-granting, Master's level, or Baccalaureate, is undergraduate education. In addition, it is rather well-documented that there is an achievement gap that exists that often negatively impacts minority students. Given this, an examination of degree attainment by race/ethnicity seems entirely appropriate. Finally, student financial aid and student loan indebtedness are two issues that continue to permeate all discussions of higher education. It makes very little sense to examine an access sector without examining student aid and loans. As repeatedly shown in Chapter 4, student financial aid and student loan indebtedness are major issues of concern for the Master's sector.

Access to higher education has long been an issue of concern to researchers and policy-makers. Among sectors of higher education, community colleges have long been associated with access; however they are not the only sector to be historically access-oriented. The sector of higher education classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Master's Colleges and Universities are to the four-year sector of higher education what community colleges are to all of higher education—an access point. Katsinas (2009) recently argued that if the ambitious higher education goals of the Obama administration are to be reached, then Master's Colleges and Universities must begin to be seen as access institutions. Reed and Alexander (2009) suggest that it is the Master's Colleges and Universities that have long been serving low-income, minority, and first-generation students with little to no assistance given to them for their long-standing commitment to such students.

Some argue that students should bear the greatest financial responsibility in financing his/her higher education because it is they who benefit the most from attending. The current economic conditions of the United States along with the drastic numbers of students incurring student loan debt suggest a change in the financial aid system is needed. While many argue that the high tuition/high student aid model is effective, it has not delivered America's promise of higher education to the neediest in society. In fact, as Hearn (2001) argued, the increase in the costs of tuition have a major impact on low-income, minority, and underrepresented students—i.e. the exact kind of student served by one of the 266 publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities. As Hearn noted, "there is something embedded in socioeconomic status that distinctively influences postsecondary enrollment" (p. 444).

Using the data that were shown in Chapter 4, this chapter pinpoints the critical findings of this study and attempts to illuminate the areas of greatest concern. Discussion and recommendations will be offered and future studies suggested. Finally, this chapter will end with some concluding thoughts about the current study and its importance and relevance to higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### A Comparison of the Current and Proposed Classification Schema

Perhaps the best method to illustrate the benefits of the proposed geographically-based classification scheme put forth in this study is to compare and contrast two institutions. Take, for example, California State University (CSU)—Long Beach, an Urban-Large institution, compared to Francis Marion University (FMU), a Rural-Small institution located in Florence, SC. Under the current Carnegie classification system, CSU—Long Beach is Large, while the classification for FMU is Small. Total undergraduate enrollments at CSU-Long Beach in the 2006-07 academic year totaled 32,921, while total undergraduate enrollments at FMU totaled 3,880.

These two institutions, both classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Master's institutions, are strikingly different. In addition to serving greatly different numbers of students, student race/ethnicity is also an important factor. Data reported to NCES/IPEDS for the 2006-07 academic year indicate that of the 32,921 undergraduate students at CSU—Long Beach 32% were White students, 6% Black, 26% Hispanic, 23% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 9% Race Unknown, and 5% Non-resident Alien. Thus, CSU—Long Beach is a majority-minority institution, with a total percentage minority enrollment of 68%. In contrast, FMU enrolled 3,880 students with 50% White, 43% Black, 1% Hispanic, 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 3% Race Unknown, and 1% Non-resident Alien. It appears clear that these two institutional types serve different kinds of students. Interestingly, FMU, a Rural-Small institution, serves a larger percentage of Black students than CSU—Long Beach, while CSU—Long Beach serves a much larger percentage of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students. In both cases, the enrollments reflect the diversity found in the nearby population, in that 96% of the CSU—Long Beach student population comes from within the State of California (College Portrait of Undergraduate Education, 2009a), while 95% of the FMU enrollment comes from within the State of South Carolina (College Portrait of Undergraduate Education, 2009b). These marked differences demonstrate the usefulness of the geographically-based classification system proposed in this study. Further comparisons of institutions within each subclass would almost certainly illuminate very similar and striking differences.

While the enrollment figures noted above are interesting, a comparison of the two institutions based upon bachelor's degrees awarded is even more striking. Again, based upon data reported to NCES/IPEDS, CSU—Long Beach awarded 6,535 bachelor's degrees in the

2006-07 academic year, with 36% going to White students, 5% Black, 23% Hispanic, 20% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 11% Race Unknown, and 5% Non-resident Alien. In contrast, FMU awarded 551 bachelor's degrees in 2006-07, with 59% going to White students, 34% Black, 1% Hispanic, 0% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 2% Race Unknown, and 2% Non-resident Alien.

A third characteristic that illuminates the vast differences existing across the various subclasses of the Master's sector of higher education is in the arena of student financial aid. As reported to NCES/IPEDS in the 2006-07 academic year, CSU—Long Beach had 4,334 first-time/full-time degree-seeking students in the fall cohort, with 2,377 or 55% receiving any financial aid, 1,457 or 34% getting federal aid, 1,270 or 29% with state/local aid, 1,390 or 32% receiving institutional aid, and 950 or 22% incurring student loan debt. In contrast, FMU had 797 students in the fall cohort, with 718 or 90% receiving any financial aid, 310 or 39% getting federal aid, 589 or 74% with state/local aid, 137 or 17% receiving institutional aid, and 465 or 58% incurring student loan debt.

The average amount of federal grant aid awarded at CSU—Long Beach during the 2006-07 academic year was \$3,729, while the average amount of state/local aid awarded was \$1,955, the average amount of institutional aid awarded was \$2,887, and the average student loan debt reported was \$2,992. In contrast, FMU saw average federal grant aid of \$3,842, an average state/local aid of \$4,278, an average institutional aid of \$3,274, and an average student loan debt incurred of a whopping \$5,480. Put differently, the average student loan debt incurred by undergraduate students at FMU of \$5,480 was \$2,488 dollars or 45% higher than the average student loan debt incurred by undergraduate students at CSU—Long Beach in 2006-07.

Under the existing 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification of Master's Colleges and Universities, CSU—Long Beach is classified as a Larger institution, and FMU is classified as a Smaller institution. In contrast, the proposed classification scheme classifies CSU—Long Beach as one of the 33 Urban-Large Master's Colleges and Universities in the United States that in the 2006-07 academic year served a total of 474,791 undergraduate students, while FMU is classified as one of the 26 Rural-Small Master's Colleges and Universities in the proposed scheme that together serve a total of 127,691 students. While these two institutions do not necessarily represent the entire subclasses to which they belong, the comparison of the two institutions reveals a critically important point—Master's colleges *can* be classified using a geographically-based system, and that a geographically-based system tells us more about the characteristics of the students these institutions serve than the existing 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification nomenclature of Larger, Medium, and Smaller programs.

Under the current Carnegie nomenclature, since both CSU—Long Beach and FMU are Master's level institutions, it is entirely possible that a research might lump these two institutions together thinking that since they belong to the same sector that they are similar. The data shown above clearly indicate that this is not the case. If such striking differences can be observed in just these two institutions, it seems entirely reasonable to conclude that such differences may well exist all across the Master's sector of higher education. Given this, it seems entirely appropriate to conclude that the geographically-based classification scheme put forth in this study is a much more precise method by which to illuminate, study, and discuss diversity and issues facing the public Master's sector.

If the data presented above were not convincing, consider the enrollment profiles of CSU—Long Beach and Western Carolina University (WCU) located in Cullowhee, NC. Under



the existing Carnegie classification language, both of these institutions are classified as Master's—Large institutions. While CSU—Long Beach had 32,921 undergraduate students in the 2006-07 academic year, WCU had 8,046. Of the 32,921 undergraduate students at CSU—Long Beach, 32% were White, 6% Black, 26% Hispanic, and 23% Asian. In contrast, of the 8,046 undergraduate students at WCU, 85% were White, 5% Black, 1% Hispanic, and 1% Asian. Under the existing Carnegie classification system, these two institutions *are* grouped in the same classification subclass. It seems rather clear from these data that the geographically-based classification system proposed in this study reduces error in making comparisons among Master's institutions.

### Findings

*1. A geographically-based classification system is possible for the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities.* The publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities can be classified as 61% rural-serving, 21% suburban-serving, and 17% urban-serving. This finding is based upon the classification work described in Chapter 3 of this study. A complete listing of how the public master's institutional universe of higher education breaks down across geographical classification (rural-serving, suburban-serving, and urban-serving) can be found in Appendix B.

According to the proposed geographic classifications, of the 2,507,879 undergraduate students enrolled at the 266 public Master's institutions in academic year 2006-07, 1,279,177 or 51% were enrolled at the 163 rural-serving institution, while 633,165 or 25% were enrolled at the 56 suburban-serving institution, and 595,537 or 24% were enrolled at the 46 urban-serving institution. Interestingly, the largest single enrollment figure can be found at Rural-Large institutions, with 873,757 students enrolled or approximately 35% of the entire undergraduate

enrollment at public Master's institutions. In contrast, the existing 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification nomenclature shows 1,894,666 or 76% at Larger Program institutions, 443,570 or 18% at Medium Program institutions, and 169,643 or 7% at Smaller Program institutions.

This study is the first major study to attempt to use geographically-based classification system for Master's Colleges and Universities. To date, no other study has attempted to showcase the vast diversity within this sector of higher education, nor has any other study attempted to document the enrollment numbers, degrees awarded, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness issues at this type of institution. While community colleges have a long-standing stigma of being the least studied sector of higher education, it may well be that the Master's institutions receive less scholarly attention.

*2. Significant differences exist across all three geographical types by enrollment size, bachelor's degrees awarded, and student race and ethnicity.* Approximately 61% of 2,507,879 undergraduate students enrolled in public Master's institutions in academic year 2006-07 were White, with 13% Black, and 11% Hispanic. The geographical classifications developed in this study illuminate racial and ethnicity diversity. For example, nearly 21% or 27,382 of the students at Rural-Small institutions were Black students, while nearly 9,976 or 57% of the student enrollments at Urban-Small institutions were Black students. Moreover, 32,913 or 12% of the total enrollments at Rural-Medium institutions were Hispanic students, while 105,791 or 22% of the enrollments at Urban-Large institutions were Hispanic students. Nearly 44% or 148,005 of the entire Black enrollment at public Master's institutions were enrolled at rural-serving institutions, while 110,927 or 42% of the entire Hispanic enrollment were at urban-serving institutions.

While the enrollments at public master's institutions are diverse, these institutions appear to have a rather solid record of graduating diverse student populations. For example, 45% of the degrees awarded at Urban-Small institutions were awarded to Black students, while 21% of the degrees awarded at Urban-Large institutions were awarded to Hispanic students. Additionally, 43% of all the degrees awarded to Black students were awarded at rural-serving institutions, while 45% of all the degrees awarded to Hispanic students came from urban-serving institutions.

*4. Significant differences exist across all three geographical areas with respect to student financial aid and student loan indebtedness.* Student loans represent the single largest category of all financial aid awards across all three geographical types of public master's institutions. In total, nearly 45% of all students enrolled in a public master's institution require student loans to finance their educations. Urban-serving institutions seem to fair the best, with only 35% of students at urban-serving institutions incurring student loans. This is not the case, however, for students attending suburban-serving and rural-serving institutions. Suburban-serving institutions show that 43% of all students take out student loans, while a whopping 51% of students at rural-serving institutions take out student loans. Perhaps the more disturbing fact is that the average student loan, across all three geographical classes (rural-serving, suburban-serving, and urban-serving) is \$4,011.

Student loan indebtedness can put students in positions of extreme stress. Take, for example, a student at a rural-serving institution, where the average loan amount is \$4,059. Assuming that the average student maintains this level of loan need and that the cost of attendance remains relatively constant, this would produce a total indebtedness of \$16,236 over four years. In light of the often slow to depressed economic conditions in some rural areas, this level of indebtedness may well be too much to overcome. At the very least, such levels of

indebtedness may well force talented, well-educated students from rural places to search elsewhere for post-graduation employment. A worst case scenario could see a student fail to graduate and still be burdened with significant student loan debt. As noted in both Chapters 1 and 2, AASCU-type institutions, such as the ones describe in this study, pride themselves on their service to underserved student populations. One such underserved population is first-generation students, and Ishitani (2006) notes that first-generation student dropout rates increased slightly between the third and fourth years of college. Given this finding and the findings noted above, it is entirely possible that a student could drop-out of college with nearly \$16,000 of student loans and no degree in hand. These students would be left with all the debt and none of the educational benefits. This important issue illuminated by geographically based classifications clearly deserves further study.

### Conclusions

*1. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching should give serious consideration to instituting a geographically-based classification system proposed in this study during its 2010 classification update.* As repeatedly documented in the series of data tables presented in Chapter 4 of this study, the geographically-based classification system is a much more precise method to study and document the diversity within Master's Colleges and Universities. Significant differences by institutional type were found when analyzing enrollment, degrees awarded, student financial aid, and student loan indebtedness data. There is reason to assume other differences would be found if other IPEDS data sets were subjected to similar analysis. The classification system put forth in this study may well aid scholars and practitioners alike as they attempt to study and fully understand this important sector of higher education. This study shows significant differences by race and ethnicity among students enrolled and degrees

awarded when the Master's Colleges and Universities sector is analyzed by geography. If policymakers wish to close the well documented achievement gap, a geographic classification scheme can be a useful, if not powerful tool for targeted aid and programs to improve policy and practice. As noted in Chapter 1 of this study, no thorough system by which to study Master's Colleges and Universities exists.

*2. If the geographically-based classifications put forth in this study are published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the final classifications should consider including three subclasses for the rural-sector, and two subclasses each for the suburban and urban sectors.* Within the rural-serving sector of the master's institutional universe, there are 161 institutions, with 26 belonging to the Rural-Small class, 46 belonging to the Rural-Medium class, and 91 belonging to the Rural-Large class. While the Rural-Large is clearly the largest, there are sufficient numbers of institutions in the other two classes to warrant having three subclasses within the rural-serving sector.

The suburban-serving sector has 56 institutions, with 3 institutions belonging to the Suburban-Small class, 12 belonging to the Suburban-Medium class, and 41 belonging to the Suburban-Large class. With the Suburban-Small class having only 3 institutions, it may prove beneficial to future studies to combine the Suburban-Small class with the Suburban-Medium class, thereby reducing the suburban-serving sector to 2 subclasses.

The urban-serving sector has 46 institutions, with 2 institutions belonging to the Urban-Small class, 11 belonging to the Urban-Medium class, and 33 belonging to the Urban-Large class. Much like the suburban-serving sector, it may be beneficial to future studies to combine the Urban-Small and Urban-Medium classes. The number of institutions in each of these respective categories is too small to warrant a stand alone category. As shown below in Table 16,

combining the two categories makes both the suburban-serving and urban-serving sector consistent, and provides a more populous subclass for the institutions belonging to these categories.

Table 16  
*Number of Institutions and Undergraduate Enrollments at Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities by Modified Geographical Classification: 2006-07, Expressed in Numbers, Percentages, and Average Enrollments*

	Institutions		Enrollments		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Average
Rural Small	26	10%	127,691	5%	4,911
Rural Medium	46	17%	277,729	11%	6,038
Rural Large	91	34%	873,757	35%	9,602
Rural Total	163	61%	1,279,177	51%	7,848
Suburban Smaller	15	6%	87,047	3%	5,803
Suburban Larger	41	15%	546,118	22%	13,320
Suburban Total	56	21%	633,165	25%	11,307
Urban Smaller	13	5%	120,746	5%	9,288
Urban Larger	33	12%	474,791	19%	14,388
Urban Total	46	17%	595,537	24%	12,946
R, S, & U Total	265	100%	2,507,879	100%	9,464
Special Use	1	0%	0	0%	N/A
Total	266	100%	2,507,879	100%	9,428

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

As noted in Chapter 4, the rural-serving sector of public master's institutions is the largest single sector within the master's universe, with 163 of the 266 institutions or 61% of the public master's universe. While these institutions account for 61% of the Master's universe, they possess about 50% of the undergraduate enrollments, while awarding approximately 50% of all the degrees conferred at public master's institutions in academic year 2006-07. Unfortunately, rural-serving institutions also account for 63% of all the student loans "awarded" to first-time/full-time undergraduate students at public master's institutions during 2006-07. As Katsinas (2009) has correctly noted, IPEDS reports student loans as financial aid awarded, when in fact

student loans are more accurately described as student debt. Students attending a Rural-Small institution post the highest percentage of student loan need, with 58% of the first-time/full-time undergraduate students at these institutions taking student loans. Despite this, the suburban-serving sector posts higher average loan amounts than the rural-sector. In total, the suburban-sector has an average loan amount of \$4,097. Even more alarming, institutions fitting into the Suburban-Small subclass show an average loan amount of \$4,474. While these institutions show an average loan amount of \$4,474, they show an average federal grant aid to students of just \$3,330. The average loan amount exceeds the average federal grant aid amount by \$1,144 or 36%. Sadly, this is too often the case at institutions all across the United States, as the U.S. continues to shift more and more of the responsible of higher education finance to students and families. The trend in declining public investment in higher education is rather long-standing. As the College Board (2007) reported, the maximum Pell Grant award in 1987-88 covered about 50% of the tuition charged at a public four-year institution, yet by 1997-98 the maximum award covered only 36% of the tuition charged. By academic year 2006-07, federal grant aid covered approximately 32% of the total tuition at a public four-year institution. When the federal grant aid program first began, the maximum awarded amount covered approximately 84% of the cost of public tuition. This massive shift in higher education finance has and will likely continue to impact students in what has unfortunately become a society dependent on loans and debt.

*3. Publicly-controlled Carnegie classified Master's Colleges and Universities are serving as access-oriented institutions by serving and graduating many underrepresented student populations.* As noted in the previous section, public master's institutions enroll and graduate a rather broad diversity of students. Hearn (2001) found that students from both high-income and low-income backgrounds had similar dreams about attending college. However, these dreams

may well remain dreams for a significant portion of low-income students. High-income, low-ability students and low-income, high-ability students attend college at similar rates. This greatly impacts the low-income student. This not only showcases the lower access to college for the low-income student, but also rewards the high-income student on the basis of circumstance. In addition to being shut out from higher education, low-income students are rarely exposed to the cultural and political exercises enjoyed by high-income students. High-income students not only get to attend college based upon their family's income, they also receive the benefits of cultural and political activities enjoyed by high-income families. Given this, being of high-ability and from a low-income family is worse than being of low-ability and from a high-income family.

### Recommendations

#### *Recommendations for Policy*

*1. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, with active participation by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, should begin classifying Master's Colleges and Universities according to the geographically-based classification system put forth in this study. As noted below in Table 17, approximately 94% of the 266 publicly-controlled Master's Colleges and Universities are members of AASCU. With such a strong showing of institutions belonging to AASCU, it would seem inappropriate not to include the insights of AASCU as the classifications developed in this study are further analyzed and developed.*



Table 17

*Master's Colleges and Universities by Modified Geographical Reclassification, Institutions and American Association of State Colleges and Universities Membership*

	Institutions		AASCU Membership	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rural Small	26	10%	25	96%
Rural Medium	46	17%	44	96%
Rural Large	91	34%	89	98%
Rural Total	163	61%	158	97%
Suburban Smaller	15	6%	13	87%
Suburban Larger	41	15%	38	93%
Suburban Total	56	21%	51	91%
Urban Smaller	13	5%	11	85%
Urban Larger	33	12%	30	91%
Urban Total	46	17%	41	89%
R, S, & U Total	265	100%	250	94%
Special Use	1	0%	0	0%
Total	266	100%	250	94%

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS &  
AASCU Membership Directory as of Sept. 2008

*2. Master's Colleges and Universities are in need of a Title I type of financial aid.* There is no shortage of information documenting the current economic and socio-political difficulties facing the future of higher education in the United States. Given these difficulties, many have begun to question the accessibility and affordability of a college education. Accessibility and affordability are perhaps the two most important issues facing the future of higher education in America. With this in mind, it is extremely important to examine the economic impacts that public support of higher education has in both individual and societal constructs. Beyond the economic impacts, support for higher education has a philosophical function as well. This philosophical function is best described as an investment in future opportunity.

It is a relatively stable American belief that future generations are to build upon the advancements of the previous generations. American cultural beliefs emphasize the importance

of personal and collective responsibility so that future generations are not adversely punished for the mistakes of the previous generation. Public investment in higher education is an investment in access and affordability that significantly contributes to the betterment of society and advances American perspectives into future generations.

It has been suggested that higher tuition is followed closely by higher amounts of student aid. This approach makes theoretical sense; however, it has remained largely unsupported by data. Mumper (2001) suggested that higher amounts of tuition do not reflect greater amounts of student aid. In fact, tuition has increased, in percentages, faster than the rates of inflation and wages (Toutkoushian, 2001). Moreover, the perceptual view of higher tuition is one of great concern. High tuition greatly impacts accessibility. Accessibility, or the degree to which higher education appears open to students, is a deeply perceptual construct. The most widely publicized cost of higher education is tuition. If tuition is high, public perception of accessibility will decrease. Few students are fully aware and knowledgeable of the array of financial aid options available. This is especially true for students from low-income backgrounds (Kane, 1999 as cited in Baum, 2001). Low-income students attend college with much less frequency than their middle and high-income counterparts. There is, however, an interesting phenomenon surrounding students from low-income backgrounds. Low-income families appear to be more willing to financially stretch and sacrifice to afford a college education than their middle and higher-income counterparts (Baum, 2001). Ironically, private institutions (which are clearly most expensive) are mostly comprised of middle and high-income students—the very ones who usually don't sacrifice for their educations. Furthermore, there seems to be a sense of entitlement surrounding many middle and high-income American families. This seems to suggest that lower-income families have more of an understanding of the liberating benefits of higher education.

Simply put, lower income families know that the alternative to a college education equates to a bleak economic outlook. Kane (1999) as cited in Baum (2001) as well as Paulsen (2001), explain that low-income students' decisions concerning higher education are more affected by increases in tuition than their middle and upper-income counterparts. This supports the notion that tuition is, at least perceptually, an access issue.

Federal Title I-like funding as proposed by Reed and Alexander (2009) would provide "specific flat capitation institutional grants" (n. p.) to institutions maintaining an enrollment of 20% Pell-eligible students. Such a program could have tremendously positive outcomes on the types of institutions described in this study. As Reed and Alexander noted, it has been community colleges and master's level institutions that have long accepted the burden of educating the underserved and underrepresented student populations. Such Title-I like funding might ease the financial burden felt by so many public institutions.

*3. The U.S. Department of Education should begin collecting student financial aid data and student loan data on more than just first-time/full-time students.* The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is perhaps the most comprehensive data set available to higher education scholars and policymakers, yet the data reported to IPEDS are not as complete as they could be. For example, IPEDS collects financial aid data about first-time/full-time undergraduate students in the Student Financial Aid Cohort Study. While this study offers a great deal on information, it says nothing about students who are anything other than first-time/full-time. Since many students attend college on a part-time basis, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that a significant portion of the financial aid story is not being told. As noted in this study, many first-time/full-time undergraduate students are taking out student loans; yet, these data say nothing of the part-time students attending the very same institutions.

4. *Colleges and universities belonging to the classifications put forth in this study should fully and accurately report data to IPEDS and terminology should reflect reality.* The Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is the most comprehensive source on which higher education scholars rely to access data about institutions. When institutions do not report data or when the data reported is inaccurate or incomplete, scholars have very little information upon which to base studies. Fortunately, the data reported in this study were complete and thorough; however, this is not always the case. Additionally, it may prove beneficial to altering the wording of the student financial aid cohort study within IPEDS. Currently, IPEDS reports student loan data as “loans awarded”, perhaps this should simply be reported as “loans accepted” or “loans incurred.”

#### *Recommendations for Future Research*

1. *While approximately 94% of the 266 publicly-controlled Master’s Colleges and Universities are members of AASCU, and reports that many of the students attending AASCU institutions are first-generation students, future studies should further explore and document this.* While Chapter 2 of this study described and documented some of the challenges faced by first-generation students, this study did not specifically report any findings directly aimed at first-generation student populations. While many have recognized the tendency for AASCU-type institutions to enroll first-generation students (Dunham, 1969; Harclerod & Ostar, 1987), no recently conducted research has fully documented this. A large national study of first-generation college students attending the type of institutions described in this study could shed light onto why so many first-generation students are drawn to AASCU-type colleges and universities. In light of the substantial enrollments—2.5 million—such a study is fully justified.

2. *Future studies should follow and document the number of students who transfer from community colleges to master's colleges.* Ostar (1991) suggested that community colleges and AASCU-type institutions were to two sectors of higher education providing service to most of America's students. While some studies have examined transfer, no study has specifically examined the transfer patterns of students from community colleges to Master's/AASCU-type institutions. Dunham (1969) spoke of this, yet no study in the last 40 years has fully explored the connections between the two institutional types.

3. *Future studies should examine the experiences of students at each type of rural-serving, suburban-serving, and urban-serving Master's institutions.* Based upon the data reported in this study, it is reasonable to conclude that students enrolled in the public Master's sector of higher education have different experiences and different needs based upon the geographical class of institution they attend. For example, we know that rural-serving institutions make up the largest number of public Master's institutions, while urban-serving institutions have the most diverse enrollments, and suburban-serving institutions have the highest average loans incurred. Beyond these findings, additional student experiences that can not be captured in studies such as this, are worthy of exploration. Perhaps a qualitative study examining a group of students from each geographical class (rural-serving, suburban-serving, and urban-serving) could be conducted that attempted to describe the rich and often overlooked experiences of students at these kinds of institutions.

4. *Future studies should apply the geographically-based classifications developed in this study to the private-not-for profit and private-for-profit institutions belonging to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector of higher education.* While it was important to document and showcase the greater precision that such a classification system can have, it is imperative that all

institutions belonging to the Master's Colleges and Universities sector be classified in a consistent manner. Future researchers may find the present study helpful in this endeavor, as Appendix A of this study lists all (public, private-not-for-profit, and private-for-profit) Master's Colleges and Universities with institutional location and zip code. Furthermore, future researchers may find it helpful to classify the Baccalaureate sector of the Carnegie universe using the same geographically-based classification system developed in this study.

*5. Future studies should examine the graduate degrees awarded at Master's Colleges and Universities.* Since Master's Colleges and Universities are classified by their graduate degree production, a close examination of this may prove beneficial to the overall understanding of diversity within Master's Colleges and Universities. Future researchers examining this issue may find it helpful to refer to Appendix D of this study, as it showcases brief data tables examining the graduate degree productions at Master's Colleges and Universities.

### Closing Thoughts

It is important to understand that this study used 500,000 people as the population “cut-point” in determining geographical classification. As noted and thoroughly described in Chapter 3, institutions located within the boundaries of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) with less than 500,000 people were coded rural. While there is precedent for using this method (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971; Hardy, 2005), some institutions may be considered non rural using a different methodology. Two examples come to mind. First, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) is located within the parameters of the Chattanooga MSA, but Chattanooga has a total population of 465,161, thus this is a rural-serving institution. Despite this fact, UTC, as expressed on the university's webpage, considers itself to be “a national model for metropolitan universities” (n.

p.). Second, Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park, California is located within the Santa Rosa MSA, but Santa Rosa has a population of 458,614, which of course is below the 500,000 population needed to be considered as anything other than rural. In short, there are a few institutions included in this study that may consider themselves to be something other than the classifications put forth in this study; however, classifications are only useful if they are mutually exclusive—an institution can not belong to more than one class or subclass. If this study were to be duplicated using only slightly different methods, it is entirely possible that some institutions would be classified differently.

In closing, higher education has a long-standing and deeply rooted position within the American value system. Higher education has both individual and societal benefits. The individual benefits include mental liberation and an increased ability to compete in an increasingly competitive job market. College graduates are exposed to a wealth of ideas and hopefully develop advanced critical thinking skills that translate into greater employment opportunities. On the societal side, a college educated workforce contributes to society via greater community involvement, larger tax burdens, and greater productivity. An educated workforce also improves a community's ability to attract industry.

Expanding access to higher education should be the primary focus of policy (St. John, Asker, & Hu, 2001). If we are to err, we should err in favor of access. Access does not equal poor standards, nor does it equal misguided favoritism. Low-income students are significantly more likely to suffer from sticker shock and thus turn away from higher education. In short, the people who need access to higher education the most are the very ones that feel that it is beyond their reach. The American dream is for everyone. Unfortunately, the portion of the American dream that includes going to college seems to be in favor of middle and high-income families—

the very students that typical do not attend the kinds of institutions described in this study. If the philosophical beliefs of the American dream are to survive, the dream must be open to all.

The American higher education system is composed of several types of institutions. As noted above, all sectors of higher education to include community colleges and 4-year institutions serve varying roles and varying types of students. With access and affordability in mind, low-tuition is perhaps the most impactful issue on public higher education for prospective students. In no sector is this issue more important than for master's colleges, who serve a population of students that desperately needs resources. It is time for each state to have a vested interest in higher education. The students who are receiving financial support now, will be the nation's support in the future.



## REFERENCES

- Adelman, C. (2002). The relationship between urbanicity and educational outcomes. In W. G. Tierney & L. S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing access to college: Extending possibilities for all students* (pp. 35-63). New York: State University of New York Press.
- American Association of Community Colleges & American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2003). *Access to the baccalaureate: Research synopsis*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2000). *Student charges: AASCU special report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2005a, July). Developing transfer and articulation policies that make a difference. *Policy Matters*, 2(7), 1-4.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2005b, September). *A matter of culture and leadership: Student success in state colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006, May). Enrollment trends at AASCU campuses, 1994-2004. *Policy Matters*, 3(5), 1-3.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006, June). Tuition at public colleges and universities: Policy trends and projections. *Policy Matters*, 3(6), 1-3.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2008). *2008 AASCU membership directory*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2009a, January). *Top 10 state policy issues for higher education in 2009*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2009b). *Who we are*. Retrieved January 18, 2009 from <http://www.aascu.org/association/members/index.htm>

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2009c). *Rural Coalition*. Retrieved March 25, 2009 from <http://www.aascu.org/association/committees/index.htm>
- Appalachian Regional Commission (2009). *High school and college completion rates in Appalachia, 2000*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Typologies and taxonomies: An introduction to classification techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baum, S. (2001). College education: Who can afford it? In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.39-52). New York: Agathon Press.
- Brown, S. V. (1996). Responding to the new demographics in higher education. In L. I. Rendon & R. O. Hope (Eds.), *Educating a new majority: Transforming America's educational system for diversity* (pp. 71-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (2000). *Sorting things out classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bui, K. V. (2002). First-generation college students at a four-year university: Background characteristics, reasons for pursuing higher education, and first-year experiences. *College Student Journal*, 36, 3-12.
- Callan, P. M., & Atwell, R. H. (2009). *History we can't afford to repeat*. Retrieved April 3, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/04/07/callan>
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1971). *New students and new places: Policies for the future growth and development of American higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1976). *A classification of institutions of higher education. Revised edition*. (No. 0931050006). Berkley, CA: Author.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009a). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education*. Retrieved January 15, 2009, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009b). *Basic classification description*. Retrieved January 20, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791>

- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009c). *Basic classification technical details*. Retrieved February 12, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=798>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009d). *Basic classification tables*. Retrieved March 21, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=805>
- Carter, C. S., & Robinson, R. (2002, April). "Can we send some of the money back home to our families?": *Tensions of transition in an early intervention program for rural Appalachian students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464787)
- College Board. (2007). *2007 Trends in higher education: Federal student aid*. Retrieved July 30, 2009 from [http://www.collegeboard.com/prod\\_downloads/about/newsinfo/trends/federalstudent\\_aid.pdf](http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/about/newsinfo/trends/federalstudent_aid.pdf)
- College Portrait of Undergraduate Education (2009a). *Undergraduate profile*. Retrieved October 5, 2009 from <http://images.acswebnetworks.com/2017/77/FMUVSA.pdf>
- College Portrait of Undergraduate Education (2009b). *Undergraduate profile*. Retrieved October 5, 2009 from <http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/CSULB/characteristics>
- Collier, P. J., & Morgan, D. L. (2008). "Is that paper really due today?": Differences in first-generation and traditional college students' understandings of faculty expectations. *Higher Education*, 55, 425-446.
- Dees, D. M. (2006). "How do I deal with these new ideas?": The psychological acculturation of rural students. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 21(6). Retrieved July 2, 2008 from <http://www.umaine.edu/jrre/21-6.pdf>
- Dengerink, H. A. (2001). Institutional identity and organizational structure in multi-campus universities. *Metropolitan Universities*, 12, 20-29.
- Doyle, W. R. (2006). Community college transfers and college graduation: Whose choices matter most? *Change*, 38, 56-58.
- Dunham, E. A. (1969). *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and regional universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Finnegan, D. E. (1992). Academic career lines: A case study in two comprehensive universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (07), 2263A. (UMI No. AAT 9236821)

- Frey, W. H. (2001). *Melting pot suburbs: A Census 2000 study of suburban diversity*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Census 2000 Series.
- Frey, W. H. (2005). *America's emerging demography: The role of minorities, college grads & the "aging" and "younging" of the population*. Retrieved May 15, 2009 from [http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/speeches/2005/0818demographicsfrey/20050818\\_frey.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/speeches/2005/0818demographicsfrey/20050818_frey.pdf)
- Haaga, J. (2004). *Educational attainment in Appalachia*. Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.
- Hager, W. E. (1970). *AASCU: The first ten years*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Harclerod, F. F. (1983). *The comprehensive public state colleges and universities in America: A pocket history*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Harclerod, F. F. & Ostar, A. W. (1987). *Colleges and universities for change*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Hardy, D. E. (2005). A two-year college typology for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Updating and utilizing the Katsinas-Lacey classification system. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (07), 2508A. (UMI No. AAT 3181046)
- Haskins, R., Holzer, H., & Lerman, R. (2009). *Promoting economic mobility by increasing postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: Economic Mobility Project: An Initiative of the Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Hearn, J. C. (2001). Assess to postsecondary education: Financing equity in an evolving context. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.439-460). New York: Agathon Press.
- Hendel, D. D. (2006-2007). Efficacy of participating in a first-year seminar on student satisfaction and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8, 413-423.
- Hurley, D. (2008, October). *Tapping state college research and development capacity in support of state economic development*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Immerwahr, J., Johnson, J., Gasbarra, P., Ott, A., & Rochkind, J. (2009). *Squeeze play 2009: The public's views on college costs today*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

- Ishitani, T. T. (2006). Studying attrition and degree completion behavior among first-generation college students in the United States. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 861-885.
- Katsinas, S. G. (2009, February). *The failure of the high tuition/high aid model to fund access*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Research Committee and the Research Institute for Studies in Education at Iowa State University, Ames, IA.
- Katsinas, S. G., Hardy, D. E., & Lacey, V. (2005). *Associate's degree colleges classified by geography, governance, and complexity*. Retrieved March 25, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=798>
- Katsinas, S. G., & Tollefson, T. A. (2009). *Funding and access issues in public higher education: A community college perspective*. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from <http://www.education.ua.edu/edpolicycenter/documents/fundingandaccess2009.pdf>
- Kennesaw State University (2009). *About KSU*. Kennesaw, GA: Author.
- Keup, J. R., & Barefoot, B. O. (2005). Learning how to be a successful student: Exploring the impact of first-year seminars on student outcomes. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 17, 11-47.
- Lamb, B. (Executive Producer). (2009, February 21). *Washington Journal* [Television broadcast]. Washington, DC: C-Span.
- Lewin, T. (2009, March 17). State colleges also face cuts in ambitions. *The New York Times*, pp. A1, A18.
- Lucas, C. J. (1996). *Crisis in the academy: Rethinking higher education in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lumina Foundation (2009). *Meeting President Obama's higher education goal: New report provides 50-state roadmap to increasing college attainment*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- McCormick, A. C. & Zhao, C. M. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change*, 37, 50-57.
- Miller, J. W., Janz, J. C., & Chen, C. (2007). The retention impact of a first-year seminar on students with varying pre-college academic performance. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 19, 47-62.
- Mumper, M. (2001). State efforts to keep public colleges affordable in the face of fiscal stress. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.321-354). New York: Agathon Press.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *IPEDS glossary*. Retrieved January 12, 2009 from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/>
- Obama, B. H. (2009, January 24). Remarks to joint session of Congress. Retrieved March 18, 2009 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov>.
- Orbe, M. P. (2004). Negotiating multiple identities within multiple frames: An analysis of first-generation college students. *Communication Education, 53*, 131-149.
- Ostar, A. W. (1975). *Financing of state colleges and universities*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Postsecondary Education, Washington DC.
- Ostar, A. W. (1991). Community colleges and state colleges and universities: A natural partnership. *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 61*, 21-25.
- Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*, 249-284.
- Paulsen, M. B. (2001). The economics of the public sector: The nature and role of public policy in the finance of higher education. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.95-132). New York: Agathon Press.
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). First-and second-generation college students: A comparison of their engagement and intellectual development. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 276-300.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2003). The relationship between institutional mission and students' involvement and educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 241-261.
- Reed, C. B., & Alexander, F. K. (2009). *We need a new kind of institutional aid*. Retrieved April 25, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/03/30/reed>
- Rendon, L. I., & Garza, G. (1996). Closing the gap between two—and four-year institutions. In L. I. Rendon & R. O. Hope (Eds.), *Educating a new majority: Transforming America's educational system for diversity* (pp. 289-308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- St. John, E. P., Asker, E. H., & Hu, S. (2001). The role of finances in student choice: A review of theory and research. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.419-438). New York: Agathon Press.
- Toutkoushian, R. K. (2001). Trends in revenues and expenditures for public and private higher education. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy & practice* (pp.11-38). New York: Agathon Press.

Treadway, D. M. (1984). *Higher education in rural America: Serving the adult learner*. New York: College Board.

University of Tennessee Chattanooga. (2009). *About us*. Chattanooga, TN: Author.

U. S. Census Bureau. (2007). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2007*. Retrieved March 23, 2009 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2008pubs/p60-235.pdf>

U. S. Census Bureau. (2009). *Decennial Management Division glossary*. Retrieved January 15, 2009 from <http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/glossary.html>

Warner, A. C. (2001). An urban university's approach to anywhere, anytime learning. *Metropolitan Universities, 12*, 28-34.

APPENDIX A

ALL MASTER'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY TYPE, CARNEGIE  
CLASSIFICATION AND HBCU STATUS



ALL MASTER'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY TYPE (PUBLIC, PRIVATE, PRIVATE-FOR PROFIT),  
CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION (LARGE, MEDIUM, SMALL), AND HBCU STATUS

Note: Each listing includes the following data from left to right:

Column 1: Institution's IPEDS UNIT ID

Column 2: Name of Institution

Column 3: City

Column 4: State

Column 5: Zip Code

Column 6: Sector (Public, Private, For Profit)

Column 7: HBCU (Yes or No)

Column 8: 2005 Carnegie Classification (Large, Medium, Small)

Unit ID	Institution	City	State	ZIP	Sector	HBCU	2005 Carnegie
222178	Abilene Christian University	Abilene	TX	79699	Private	No	Medium
126182	Adams State College	Alamosa	CO	81102	Public	No	Large
100654	Alabama A & M University	Normal	AL	35762	Public	Yes	Large
100724	Alabama State University	Montgomery	AL	36101	Public	Yes	Large
102669	Alaska Pacific University	Anchorage	AK	99508	Private	No	Small
138716	Albany State University	Albany	GA	31705	Public	Yes	Medium
175342	Alcorn State University	Alcorn State	MS	39096	Public	Yes	Medium
188641	Alfred University	Alfred	NY	14802	Private	No	Medium
210775	Alvernia College	Reading	PA	19607	Private	No	Medium
238193	Alverno College	Milwaukee	WI	53234	Private	No	Small
222628	Amberton University	Garland	TX	75041	Private	No	Medium
138725	American InterContinental University	Atlanta	GA	30326	For Profit	No	Large
109013	American Intercontinental University	Los Angeles	CA	90066	For Profit	No	Small
438601	American Intercontinental University	Weston	FL	33326	For Profit	No	Small
438586	American Intercontinental University-Dunwoody Campus	Atlanta	GA	30328	For Profit	No	Medium
164447	American International College	Springfield	MA	1109	Private	No	Medium
150066	Anderson University	Anderson	IN	46012	Private	No	Medium
222831	Angelo State University	San Angelo	TX	76909	Public	No	Medium
164492	Anna Maria College	Paxton	MA	1612	Private	No	Medium
245892	Antioch University McGregor	Yellow Springs	OH	45387	Private	No	Medium
245883	Antioch University Seattle	Seattle	WA	98121	Private	No	Large
245838	Antioch University-Los Angeles Branch	Culver City	CA	90230	Private	No	Medium
245847	Antioch University-Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	CA	93101	Private	No	Small
197869	Appalachian State University	Boone	NC	28608	Public	No	Large
168786	Aquinas College	Grand Rapids	MI	49506	Private	No	Medium
211088	Arcadia University	Glenside	PA	19038	Private	No	Large
366748	Argosy University-Hawaii	Honolulu	HI	96813	For Profit	No	Small
428268	Argosy University-Tampa	Tampa	FL	33614	For Profit	No	Small
420574	Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus	Mesa	AZ	85212	Public	No	Medium

407009	Arizona State University at the West Campus	Glendale	AZ	85306	Public	No	Large
106458	Arkansas State University-Main Campus	State University	AR	72467	Public	No	Large
106467	Arkansas Tech University	Russellville	AR	72801	Public	No	Medium
138789	Armstrong Atlantic State University	Savannah	GA	31419	Public	No	Large
201104	Ashland University	Ashland	OH	44805	Private	No	Large
164562	Assumption College	Worcester	MA	1609	Private	No	Medium
100830	Auburn University-Montgomery	Montgomery	AL	36117	Public	No	Large
173045	Augsburg College	Minneapolis	MN	55454	Private	No	Small
138983	Augusta State University	Augusta	GA	30904	Public	No	Medium
143118	Aurora University	Aurora	IL	60506	Private	No	Large
219602	Austin Peay State University	Clarksville	TN	37044	Public	No	Medium
176628	Avila University	Kansas City	MO	64145	Private	No	Medium
201195	Baldwin-Wallace College	Berea	OH	44017	Private	No	Large
241225	Bayamon Central University	Bayamon	PR	959	Private	No	Small
175421	Belhaven College	Jackson	MS	39202	Private	No	Medium
156286	Bellarmino University	Louisville	KY	40205	Private	No	Large
180814	Bellevue University	Bellevue	NE	68005	Private	No	Large
219709	Belmont University	Nashville	TN	37212	Private	No	Large
173124	Bemidji State University	Bemidji	MN	56601	Public	No	Small
154712	Benedictine College	Atchison	KS	66002	Private	No	Small
145619	Benedictine University	Lisle	IL	60532	Private	No	Large
164739	Bentley University	Waltham	MA	2452	Private	No	Large
219718	Bethel College	McKenzie	TN	38201	Private	No	Small
173160	Bethel University	Saint Paul	MN	55112	Private	No	Medium
211158	Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Bloomsburg	PA	17815	Public	No	Large
217749	Bob Jones University	Greenville	SC	29614	Private	No	Medium
142115	Boise State University	Boise	ID	83725	Public	No	Large
162007	Bowie State University	Bowie	MD	20715	Public	Yes	Large
143358	Bradley University	Peoria	IL	61625	Private	No	Large
139199	Brenau University	Gainesville	GA	30501	Private	No	Large
165024	Bridgewater State College	Bridgewater	MA	2325	Public	No	Large
217165	Bryant University	Smithfield	RI	2917	Private	No	Medium
150163	Butler University	Indianapolis	IN	46208	Private	No	Medium
211352	Cabrini College	Radnor	PA	19087	Private	No	Medium
183910	Caldwell College	Caldwell	NJ	7006	Private	No	Small
110361	California Baptist University	Riverside	CA	92504	Private	No	Small

110413	California Lutheran University	Thousand Oaks	CA	91360	Private	No	Large
110422	California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	CA	93407	Public	No	Large
110529	California State Polytechnic University-Pomona	Pomona	CA	91768	Public	No	Large
110486	California State University-Bakersfield	Bakersfield	CA	93311	Public	No	Large
110538	California State University-Chico	Chico	CA	95929	Public	No	Large
110547	California State University-Dominguez Hills	Carson	CA	90747	Public	No	Large
110574	California State University-East Bay	Hayward	CA	94542	Public	No	Large
110556	California State University-Fresno	Fresno	CA	93740	Public	No	Large
110565	California State University-Fullerton	Fullerton	CA	92831	Public	No	Large
110583	California State University-Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90840	Public	No	Large
110592	California State University-Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA	90032	Public	No	Large
110608	California State University-Northridge	Northridge	CA	91330	Public	No	Large
110617	California State University-Sacramento	Sacramento	CA	95819	Public	No	Large
110510	California State University-San Bernardino	San Bernardino	CA	92407	Public	No	Large
366711	California State University-San Marcos	San Marcos	CA	92096	Public	No	Medium
110495	California State University-Stanislaus	Turlock	CA	95382	Public	No	Medium
211361	California University of Pennsylvania	California	PA	15419	Public	No	Large
150172	Calumet College of Saint Joseph	Whiting	IN	46394	Private	No	Small
165167	Cambridge College	Cambridge	MA	2138	Private	No	Large
206914	Cameron University	Lawton	OK	73505	Public	No	Medium
198136	Campbell University Inc	Buies Creek	NC	27506	Private	No	Medium
189705	Canisius College	Buffalo	NY	14208	Private	No	Large
201548	Capital University	Columbus	OH	43209	Private	No	Medium
238430	Cardinal Stritch University	Milwaukee	WI	53217	Private	No	Large
211431	Carlow University	Pittsburgh	PA	15213	Private	No	Medium
238458	Carroll University	Waukesha	WI	53186	Private	No	Small
230834	Castleton State College	Castleton	VT	5735	Public	No	Small
183974	Centenary College	Hackettstown	NJ	7840	Private	No	Medium
128771	Central Connecticut State University	New Britain	CT	6050	Public	No	Large
234827	Central Washington University	Ellensburg	WA	98926	Public	No	Large
141486	Chaminade University of Honolulu	Honolulu	HI	96816	Private	No	Large
111948	Chapman University	Orange	CA	92866	Private	No	Large
262086	Chapman University-University College	Orange	CA	92866	Private	No	Large
217688	Charleston Southern University	Charleston	SC	29406	Private	No	Small
211556	Chatham University	Pittsburgh	PA	15232	Private	No	Medium
211583	Chestnut Hill College	Philadelphia	PA	19118	Private	No	Medium

211608	Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Cheyney	PA	19319	Public	Yes	Medium
144005	Chicago State University	Chicago	IL	60628	Public	No	Large
219833	Christian Brothers University	Memphis	TN	38104	Private	No	Medium
217864	Citadel Military College of South Carolina	Charleston	SC	29409	Public	No	Large
234915	City University of Seattle	Bellevue	WA	98005	Private	No	Large
211644	Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Clarion	PA	16214	Public	No	Large
217819	College of Charleston	Charleston	SC	29424	Public	No	Medium
193399	College of Mount Saint Vincent	Bronx	NY	10471	Private	No	Small
204200	College of Mount St. Joseph	Cincinnati	OH	45233	Private	No	Medium
163578	College of Notre Dame of Maryland	Baltimore	MD	21210	Private	No	Large
186618	College of Saint Elizabeth	Morristown	NJ	7960	Private	No	Small
188146	College of Santa Fe	Santa Fe	NM	87505	Private	No	Medium
175005	College of St Catherine	Saint Paul	MN	55105	Private	No	Large
231077	College of St Joseph	Rutland	VT	5701	Private	No	Small
126669	Colorado Christian University	Lakewood	CO	80226	Private	No	Small
126827	Colorado Technical University	Colorado Springs	CO	80907	For Profit	No	Large
430087	Colorado Technical University	Greenwood Village	CO	80111	For Profit	No	Medium
402615	Colorado Technical University of Sioux Falls	Sioux Falls	SD	57108	For Profit	No	Small
177065	Columbia College	Columbia	MO	65216	Private	No	Small
217934	Columbia College	Columbia	SC	29203	Private	No	Large
144281	Columbia College Chicago	Chicago	IL	60605	Private	No	Medium
139366	Columbus State University	Columbus	GA	31907	Public	No	Large
144351	Concordia University	River Forest	IL	60305	Private	No	Medium
112075	Concordia University	Irvine	CA	92612	Private	No	Small
208488	Concordia University	Portland	OR	97211	Private	No	Medium
173328	Concordia University-Saint Paul	Saint Paul	MN	55104	Private	No	Medium
238616	Concordia University-Wisconsin	Mequon	WI	53097	Private	No	Large
217961	Converse College	Spartanburg	SC	29302	Private	No	Large
162283	Coppin State University	Baltimore	MD	21216	Public	Yes	Medium
170037	Cornerstone University	Grand Rapids	MI	49525	Private	No	Small
181002	Creighton University	Omaha	NE	68178	Private	No	Medium
219949	Cumberland University	Lebanon	TN	37087	Private	No	Large
190512	CUNY Bernard M Baruch College	New York	NY	10010	Public	No	Large
190549	CUNY Brooklyn College	Brooklyn	NY	11210	Public	No	Large

190567	CUNY City College	New York	NY	10031	Public	No	Large
190558	CUNY College of Staten Island	Staten Island	NY	10314	Public	No	Large
190594	CUNY Hunter College	New York	NY	10021	Public	No	Large
190600	CUNY John Jay College Criminal Justice	New York	NY	10019	Public	No	Large
190637	CUNY Lehman College	Bronx	NY	10468	Public	No	Large
190664	CUNY Queens College	Flushing	NY	11367	Public	No	Large
190716	D'Youville College	Buffalo	NY	14201	Private	No	Large
190725	Daemen College	Amherst	NY	14226	Private	No	Medium
224226	Dallas Baptist University	Dallas	TX	75211	Private	No	Large
169479	Davenport University	Grand Rapids	MI	49512	Private	No	Medium
130934	Delaware State University	Dover	DE	19901	Public	Yes	Small
175616	Delta State University	Cleveland	MS	38733	Public	No	Medium
210739	DeSales University	Center Valley	PA	18034	Private	No	Large
104531	DeVry University-Arizona	Phoenix	AZ	85021	For Profit	No	Medium
113607	DeVry University-California	Pomona	CA	91768	For Profit	No	Large
439163	DeVry University-Florida	Orlando	FL	32839	For Profit	No	Medium
139533	DeVry University-Georgia	Decatur	GA	30030	For Profit	No	Large
144759	DeVry University-Illinois	Addison	IL	60101	For Profit	No	Large
177162	DeVry University-Missouri	Kansas City	MO	64131	For Profit	No	Medium
202541	DeVry University-Ohio	Columbus	OH	43209	For Profit	No	Small
224402	DeVry University-Texas	Irving	TX	75063	For Profit	No	Small
440536	DeVry University-Virginia	Arlington	VA	22202	For Profit	No	Small
448284	Doane College-Lincoln Grand Island and Master	Lincoln	NE	68504	Private	No	Medium
190761	Dominican College of Blauvelt	Orangeburg	NY	10962	Private	No	Medium
148496	Dominican University	River Forest	IL	60305	Private	No	Large
113698	Dominican University of California	San Rafael	CA	94901	Private	No	Medium
190770	Dowling College	Oakdale	NY	11769	Private	No	Large
153269	Drake University	Des Moines	IA	50311	Private	No	Large
177214	Drury University	Springfield	MO	65802	Private	No	Medium

207041	East Central University	Ada	OK	74820	Public	No	Large
212115	East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	East Stroudsburg	PA	18301	Public	No	Large
129215	Eastern Connecticut State University	Willimantic	CT	6226	Public	No	Medium
144892	Eastern Illinois University	Charleston	IL	61920	Public	No	Large
156620	Eastern Kentucky University	Richmond	KY	40475	Public	No	Large
169798	Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti	MI	48197	Public	No	Large
187648	Eastern New Mexico University-Main Campus	Portales	NM	88130	Public	No	Small
208646	Eastern Oregon University	La Grande	OR	97850	Public	No	Medium
212133	Eastern University	Saint Davids	PA	19087	Private	No	Large
235097	Eastern Washington University	Cheney	WA	99004	Public	No	Large
238661	Edgewood College	Madison	WI	53711	Private	No	Medium
212160	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Edinboro	PA	16444	Public	No	Large
144962	Elmhurst College	Elmhurst	IL	60126	Private	No	Small
198516	Elon University	Elon	NC	27244	Private	No	Small
133553	Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Daytona Beach	Daytona Beach	FL	32114	Private	No	Medium
426314	Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Worldwide	Daytona Beach	FL	32114	Private	No	Large
165662	Emerson College	Boston	MA	2116	Private	No	Large
165671	Emmanuel College	Boston	MA	2115	Private	No	Small
155025	Emporia State University	Emporia	KS	66801	Public	No	Large
137810	Everest University-Largo	Clearwater	FL	33759	Profit	No	Small
129242	Fairfield University	Fairfield	CT	6824	Private	No	Large
184694	Fairleigh Dickinson University-College at Florham	Madison	NJ	7940	Private	No	Large
184603	Fairleigh Dickinson University-Metropolitan Campus	Teaneck	NJ	7666	Private	No	Large
198543	Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville	NC	28301	Public	Yes	Small
169910	Ferris State University	Big Rapids	MI	49307	Public	No	Medium
165820	Fitchburg State College	Fitchburg	MA	1420	Public	No	Large
433660	Florida Gulf Coast University	Fort Myers	FL	33965	Public	No	Large
177418	Fontbonne University	Saint Louis	MO	63105	Private	No	Large
155061	Fort Hays State University	Hays	KS	67601	Public	No	Large
139719	Fort Valley State University	Fort Valley	GA	31030	Public	Yes	Small
165866	Framingham State College	Framingham	MA	1701	Public	No	Large
218061	Francis Marion University	Florence	SC	29506	Public	No	Small
205957	Franciscan University of Steubenville	Steubenville	OH	43952	Private	No	Medium
220215	Freed-Hardeman University	Henderson	TN	38340	Private	No	Medium
114813	Fresno Pacific University	Fresno	CA	93702	Private	No	Medium

155089	Friends University	Wichita	KS	67213	Private	No	Large
162584	Frostburg State University	Frostburg	MD	21532	Public	No	Large
131450	Gallaudet University	Washington	DC	20002	Private	No	Medium
212601	Gannon University	Erie	PA	16541	Private	No	Large
198561	Gardner-Webb University	Boiling Springs	NC	28017	Private	No	Large
139861	Georgia College & State University	Milledgeville	GA	31061	Public	No	Large
139764	Georgia Southwestern State University	Americus	GA	31709	Public	No	Medium
184773	Georgian Court University	Lakewood	NJ	8701	Private	No	Medium
230889	Goddard College	Plainfield	VT	5667	Private	No	Medium
235316	Gonzaga University	Spokane	WA	99258	Private	No	Large
145336	Governors State University	University Park	IL	60466	Public	No	Large
153366	Graceland University-Lamoni	Lamoni	IA	50140	Private	No	Small
159009	Grambling State University	Grambling	LA	71245	Public	Yes	Medium
104717	Grand Canyon University	Phoenix	AZ	85017	Profit	No	Large
170082	Grand Valley State University	Allendale	MI	49401	Public	No	Large
212771	Gratz College	Melrose Park	PA	19027	Private	No	Medium
212832	Gwynedd Mercy College	Gwynedd Valley	PA	19437	Private	No	Medium
173665	Hamline University	Saint Paul	MN	55104	Private	No	Large
232265	Hampton University	Hampton	VA	23668	Private	Yes	Medium
225247	Hardin-Simmons University	Abilene	TX	79698	Private	No	Medium
107044	Harding University	Searcy	AR	72143	Private	No	Large
141644	Hawaii Pacific University	Honolulu	HI	96813	Private	No	Large
203085	Heidelberg College	Tiffin	OH	44883	Private	No	Small
107071	Henderson State University	Arkadelphia	AR	71999	Public	No	Medium
235422	Heritage University	Toppenish	WA	98948	Private	No	Large
367884	Hodges University	Naples	FL	34119	Private	No	Small
212984	Holy Family University	Philadelphia	PA	19114	Private	No	Large
115728	Holy Names University	Oakland	CA	94619	Private	No	Small
162760	Hood College	Frederick	MD	21701	Private	No	Medium
120537	Hope International University	Fullerton	CA	92831	Private	No	Small
225399	Houston Baptist University	Houston	TX	77074	Private	No	Medium
115755	Humboldt State University	Arcata	CA	95521	Public	No	Medium
161165	Husson College	Bangor	ME	4401	Private	No	Medium
151360	Indiana University-Northwest	Gary	IN	46408	Public	No	Small
151102	Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne	IN	46805	Public	No	Medium



151342	Indiana University-South Bend	South Bend	IN	46634	Public	No	Large
151379	Indiana University-Southeast	New Albany	IN	47150	Public	No	Large
151801	Indiana Wesleyan University	Marion	IN	46953	Private	No	Large
242617	Inter American University of Puerto Rico-San German	San German	PR	683	Private	No	Large
191931	Iona College	New Rochelle	NY	10801	Private	No	Large
191968	Ithaca College	Ithaca	NY	14850	Private	No	Medium
101480	Jacksonville State University	Jacksonville	AL	36265	Public	No	Large
134945	Jacksonville University	Jacksonville	FL	32211	Private	No	Medium
232423	James Madison University	Harrisonburg	VA	22807	Public	No	Large
203368	John Carroll University	Cleveland	OH	44118	Private	No	Large
116712	John F Kennedy University	Pleasant Hill	CA	94523	Private	No	Large
217235	Johnson & Wales University	Providence	RI	2903	Private	No	Large
230913	Johnson State College	Johnson	VT	5656	Public	No	Small
444723	Jones International University	Centennial	CO	80112	Profit	No	Medium
185262	Kean University	Union	NJ	7083	Public	No	Large
440031	Keck Graduate Institute	Claremont	CA	91711	Private	No	Small
183062	Keene State College	Keene	NH	3435	Public	No	Small
140164	Kennesaw State University	Kennesaw	GA	30144	Public	No	Large
213321	King's College	Wilkes Barre	PA	18711	Private	No	Small
213349	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Kutztown	PA	19530	Public	No	Large
213358	La Roche College	Pittsburgh	PA	15237	Private	No	Small
213367	La Salle University	Philadelphia	PA	19141	Private	No	Large
117627	La Sierra University	Riverside	CA	92515	Private	No	Small
238980	Lakeland College	Plymouth	WI	53073	Private	No	Small
226091	Lamar University	Beaumont	TX	77705	Public	No	Large
170675	Lawrence Technological University	Southfield	MI	48075	Private	No	Large
192323	Le Moyne College	Syracuse	NY	13214	Private	No	Large
220613	Lee University	Cleveland	TN	37320	Private	No	Medium
166452	Lesley University	Cambridge	MA	2138	Private	No	Large
226231	LeTourneau University	Longview	TX	75607	Private	No	Medium
146612	Lewis University	Romeoville	IL	60446	Private	No	Large
232557	Liberty University	Lynchburg	VA	24502	Private	No	Large
140252	Life University	Marietta	GA	30060	Private	No	Small
220631	Lincoln Memorial University	Harrogate	TN	37752	Private	No	Medium
177940	Lincoln University	Jefferson City	MO	65102	Public	Yes	Small

213598	Lincoln University of Pennsylvania	Lincoln University	PA	19352	Public	Yes	Medium
177968	Lindenwood University	Saint Charles	MO	63301	Private	No	Large
219976	Lipscomb University	Nashville	TN	37204	Private	No	Small
213613	Lock Haven University	Lock Haven	PA	17745	Public	No	Small
192563	Long Island University-Brentwood	Brentwood	NY	11717	Private	No	Large
192439	Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	Brooklyn	NY	11201	Private	No	Large
232566	Longwood University	Farmville	VA	23909	Public	No	Medium
159416	Louisiana State University-Shreveport	Shreveport	LA	71115	Public	No	Medium
163046	Loyola College in Maryland	Baltimore	MD	21210	Private	No	Large
117946	Loyola Marymount University	Los Angeles	CA	90045	Private	No	Large
159656	Loyola University New Orleans	New Orleans	LA	70118	Private	No	Large
226383	Lubbock Christian University	Lubbock	TX	79407	Private	No	Small
232609	Lynchburg College	Lynchburg	VA	24501	Private	No	Small
132657	Lynn University	Boca Raton	FL	33431	Private	No	Small
170806	Madonna University	Livonia	MI	48150	Private	No	Large
153861	Maharishi University of Management	Fairfield	IA	52557	Private	No	Small
203775	Malone University	Canton	OH	44709	Private	No	Small
192703	Manhattan College	Bronx	NY	10471	Private	No	Medium
192749	Manhattanville College	Purchase	NY	10577	Private	No	Large
213783	Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Mansfield	PA	16933	Public	No	Small
239080	Marian University-Wisconsin	Fond Du Lac	WI	54935	Private	No	Large
192819	Marist College	Poughkeepsie	NY	12601	Private	No	Large
440411	Marlboro College Graduate Center	Brattleboro	VT	5301	Private	No	Small
237525	Marshall University	Huntington	WV	25755	Public	No	Large
232672	Mary Baldwin College	Staunton	VA	24401	Private	No	Small
170842	Marygrove College	Detroit	MI	48221	Private	No	Large
209108	Marylhurst University	Marylhurst	OR	97036	Private	No	Medium
232706	Marymount University	Arlington	VA	22207	Private	No	Large
178059	Maryville University of Saint Louis	Saint Louis	MO	63141	Private	No	Large
213826	Marywood University	Scranton	PA	18509	Private	No	Large
159717	McNeese State University	Lake Charles	LA	70609	Public	No	Large
192925	Medaille College	Buffalo	NY	14214	Private	No	Large
140447	Mercer University	Macon	GA	31207	Private	No	Large
193016	Mercy College-Main Campus	Dobbs Ferry	NY	10522	Private	No	Large
213987	Mercyhurst College	Erie	PA	16546	Private	No	Small

190114	Metropolitan College of New York	New York	NY	10013	Private	No	Large
174020	Metropolitan State University	Saint Paul	MN	55106	Public	No	Medium
155520	MidAmerica Nazarene University	Olathe	KS	66062	Private	No	Large
220978	Middle Tennessee State University	Murfreesboro	TN	37132	Public	No	Large
226833	Midwestern State University	Wichita Falls	TX	76308	Public	No	Medium
214041	Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Millersville	PA	17551	Public	No	Large
118888	Mills College	Oakland	CA	94613	Private	No	Medium
173920	Minnesota State University-Mankato	Mankato	MN	56001	Public	No	Large
174358	Minnesota State University-Moorhead	Moorhead	MN	56563	Public	No	Small
200253	Minot State University	Minot	ND	58707	Public	No	Small
214069	Misericordia University	Dallas	PA	18612	Private	No	Medium
176053	Mississippi College	Clinton	MS	39058	Private	No	Medium
176035	Mississippi University for Women	Columbus	MS	39701	Public	No	Small
176044	Mississippi Valley State University	Itta Bena	MS	38941	Public	Yes	Small
178244	Missouri Baptist University	Saint Louis	MO	63141	Private	No	Medium
179566	Missouri State University	Springfield	MO	65897	Public	No	Large
193292	Molloy College	Rockville Centre	NY	11571	Private	No	Medium
		West Long					
185572	Monmouth University	Branch	NJ	7764	Private	No	Large
180179	Montana State University-Billings	Billings	MT	59101	Public	No	Medium
185590	Montclair State University	Montclair	NJ	7043	Public	No	Large
119058	Monterey Institute of International Studies	Monterey	CA	93940	Private	No	Large
157386	Morehead State University	Morehead	KY	40351	Public	No	Large
219198	Mount Marty College	Yankton	SD	57078	Private	No	Small
239390	Mount Mary College	Milwaukee	WI	53222	Private	No	Small
193353	Mount Saint Mary College	Newburgh	NY	12550	Private	No	Medium
119173	Mount St Mary's College	Los Angeles	CA	90049	Private	No	Small
163462	Mount St Mary's University	Emmitsburg	MD	21727	Private	No	Medium
237154	Mountain State University	Beckley	WV	25801	Private	No	Medium
157401	Murray State University	Murray	KY	42071	Public	No	Large
204264	Muskingum College	New Concord	OH	43762	Private	No	Medium
127653	Naropa University	Boulder	CO	80302	Private	No	Large
119605	National University	La Jolla	CA	92037	Private	No	Large
147536	National-Louis University	Chicago	IL	60603	Private	No	Large
119678	Naval Postgraduate School	Monterey	CA	93943	Public	No	Large
193584	Nazareth College	Rochester	NY	14618	Private	No	Large

214272	Neumann College	Aston	PA	19014	Private	No	Small
119711	New College of California	San Francisco	CA	94110	Private	No	Medium
185129	New Jersey City University	Jersey City	NJ	7305	Public	No	Large
187897	New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas	NM	87701	Public	No	Large
187967	New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	Socorro	NM	87801	Public	No	Medium
194107	New York Institute of Technology-Manhattan Campus	New York	NY	10023	Private	No	Large
194091	New York Institute of Technology-Old Westbury	Old Westbury	NY	11568	Private	No	Large
155335	Newman University	Wichita	KS	67213	Private	No	Medium
193973	Niagara University	Niagara University	NY	14109	Private	No	Large
159966	Nicholls State University	Thibodaux	LA	70310	Public	No	Medium
232937	Norfolk State University	Norfolk	VA	23504	Public	Yes	Large
199157	North Carolina Central University	Durham	NC	27707	Public	Yes	Large
147660	North Central College	Naperville	IL	60540	Private	No	Medium
140669	North Georgia College & State University	Dahlonega	GA	30597	Public	No	Medium
147679	North Park University	Chicago	IL	60625	Private	No	Medium
147776	Northeastern Illinois University	Chicago	IL	60625	Public	No	Large
207263	Northeastern State University	Tahlequah	OK	74464	Public	No	Large
157447	Northern Kentucky University	Highland Heights	KY	41099	Public	No	Large
171456	Northern Michigan University	Marquette	MI	49855	Public	No	Large
178624	Northwest Missouri State University	Maryville	MO	64468	Public	No	Medium
142461	Northwest Nazarene University	Nampa	ID	83686	Private	No	Small
160038	Northwestern State University of Louisiana	Natchitoches	LA	71497	Public	No	Large
230995	Norwich University	Northfield	VT	5663	Private	No	Medium
120184	Notre Dame de Namur University	Belmont	CA	94002	Private	No	Large
194161	Nyack College	Nyack	NY	10960	Private	No	Small
152099	Oakland City University	Oakland City	IN	47660	Private	No	Medium
204617	Ohio Dominican University	Columbus	OH	43219	Private	No	Small
207324	Oklahoma Christian University	Edmond	OK	73013	Private	No	Small
207458	Oklahoma City University	Oklahoma City	OK	73106	Private	No	Large
147828	Olivet Nazarene University	Bourbonnais	IL	60914	Private	No	Large
105367	Ottawa University-Phoenix	Phoenix	AZ	85021	Private	No	Medium
204936	Otterbein College	Westerville	OH	43081	Private	No	Medium
227331	Our Lady of the Lake University-San Antonio	San Antonio	TX	78207	Private	No	Large
236230	Pacific Lutheran University	Tacoma	WA	98447	Private	No	Medium
120838	Pacific States University	Los Angeles	CA	90006	Private	No	Small

136330	Palm Beach Atlantic University-West Palm Beach	West Palm Beach	FL	33401	Private	No	Medium
178721	Park University	Parkville	MO	64152	Private	No	Small
214607	Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Great Valley	Malvern	PA	19355	Public	No	Large
214713	Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Harrisburg	Middletown	PA	17057	Public	No	Large
199306	Pfeiffer University	Misenheimer	NC	28109	Private	No	Large
215114	Philadelphia Biblical University-Langhorne	Langhorne	PA	19047	Private	No	Medium
215099	Philadelphia University	Philadelphia	PA	19144	Private	No	Medium
140818	Piedmont College	Demorest	GA	30535	Private	No	Large
155681	Pittsburg State University	Pittsburg	KS	66762	Public	No	Large
183080	Plymouth State University	Plymouth	NH	3264	Public	No	Large
121309	Point Loma Nazarene University	San Diego	CA	92106	Private	No	Small
215442	Point Park University	Pittsburgh	PA	15222	Private	No	Medium
241410	Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico-Ponce	Ponce	PR	717	Private	No	Medium
227526	Prairie View A & M University	Prairie View	TX	77446	Public	Yes	Large
105589	Prescott College	Prescott	AZ	86301	Private	No	Small
217402	Providence College	Providence	RI	2918	Private	No	Large
152248	Purdue University-Calumet Campus	Hammond	IN	46323	Public	No	Medium
199412	Queens University of Charlotte	Charlotte	NC	28274	Private	No	Medium
130226	Quinnipiac University	Hamden	CT	6518	Private	No	Large
233277	Radford University	Radford	VA	24141	Public	No	Large
186201	Ramapo College of New Jersey	Mahwah	NJ	7430	Public	No	Small
167598	Regis College	Weston	MA	2493	Private	No	Small
127918	Regis University	Denver	CO	80221	Private	No	Large
129428	Rensselaer Hartford Graduate Center Inc	Hartford	CT	6120	Private	No	Large
217420	Rhode Island College	Providence	RI	2908	Public	No	Large
186283	Rider University	Lawrenceville	NJ	8648	Private	No	Large
183211	Rivier College	Nashua	NH	3060	Private	No	Large
215655	Robert Morris University	Moon Township	PA	15108	Private	No	Large
194958	Roberts Wesleyan College	Rochester	NY	14624	Private	No	Large
195003	Rochester Institute of Technology	Rochester	NY	14623	Private	No	Large
148405	Rockford College	Rockford	IL	61108	Private	No	Medium
179043	Rockhurst University	Kansas City	MO	64110	Private	No	Large
136950	Rollins College	Winter Park	FL	32789	Private	No	Large
148487	Roosevelt University	Chicago	IL	60605	Private	No	Large
215691	Rosemont College	Rosemont	PA	19010	Private	No	Medium
184782	Rowan University	Glassboro	NJ	8028	Public	No	Large

186371	Rutgers University-Camden	Camden	NJ	8102	Public	No	Medium
130253	Sacred Heart University	Fairfield	CT	6825	Private	No	Large
195137	Sage College of Albany	Albany	NY	12208	Private	No	Large
172051	Saginaw Valley State University	University Center	MI	48710	Public	No	Large
154235	Saint Ambrose University	Davenport	IA	52803	Private	No	Large
195164	Saint Bonaventure University	Saint Bonaventure	NY	14778	Private	No	Large
174783	Saint Cloud State University	Saint Cloud	MN	56301	Public	No	Large
227845	Saint Edward's University	Austin	TX	78704	Private	No	Large
215743	Saint Francis University	Loretto	PA	15940	Private	No	Large
195720	Saint John Fisher College	Rochester	NY	14618	Private	No	Large
130314	Saint Joseph College	West Hartford	CT	6117	Private	No	Medium
161518	Saint Joseph's College of Maine	Standish	ME	4084	Private	No	Small
215770	Saint Joseph's University	Philadelphia	PA	19131	Private	No	Large
195562	Saint Josephs College-Suffolk Campus	Patchogue	NY	11772	Private	No	Small
137032	Saint Leo University	Saint Leo	FL	33574	Private	No	Medium
236452	Saint Martin's University	Lacey	WA	98503	Private	No	Small
123554	Saint Marys College of California	Moraga	CA	94556	Private	No	Large
186432	Saint Peters College	Jersey City	NJ	7306	Private	No	Large
195243	Saint Thomas Aquinas College	Sparkill	NY	10976	Private	No	Medium
137476	Saint Thomas University	Miami Gardens	FL	33054	Private	No	Large
148627	Saint Xavier University	Chicago	IL	60655	Private	No	Large
167729	Salem State College	Salem	MA	1970	Public	No	Large
163851	Salisbury University	Salisbury	MD	21801	Public	No	Large
217536	Salve Regina University	Newport	RI	2840	Private	No	Small
227881	Sam Houston State University	Huntsville	TX	77341	Public	No	Large
122597	San Francisco State University	San Francisco	CA	94132	Public	No	Large
122755	San Jose State University	San Jose	CA	95192	Public	No	Large
122931	Santa Clara University	Santa Clara	CA	95053	Private	No	Large
140960	Savannah State University	Savannah	GA	31404	Public	Yes	Small
404338	Schiller International University	Largo	FL	33770	Profit	No	Small
231068	School for International Training	Brattleboro	VT	5302	Private	No	Medium
236577	Seattle Pacific University	Seattle	WA	98119	Private	No	Large
236595	Seattle University	Seattle	WA	98122	Private	No	Large
233541	Shenandoah University	Winchester	VA	22601	Private	No	Large
216010	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Shippensburg	PA	17257	Public	No	Large

172264	Siena Heights University	Adrian	MI	49221	Private	No	Small
239743	Silver Lake College	Manitowoc	WI	54220	Private	No	Small
167783	Simmons College	Boston	MA	2115	Private	No	Large
216038	Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Slippery Rock	PA	16057	Public	No	Large
123572	Sonoma State University	Rohnert Park	CA	94928	Public	No	Large
192466	Southampton College of Long Island University	Southampton	NY	11968	Private	No	Small
179557	Southeast Missouri State University	Cape Girardeau	MO	63701	Public	No	Large
160612	Southeastern Louisiana University	Hammond	LA	70402	Public	No	Large
207847	Southeastern Oklahoma State University	Durant	OK	74701	Public	No	Medium
131788	Southeastern University	Washington	DC	20024	Private	No	Medium
130493	Southern Connecticut State University	New Haven	CT	6515	Public	No	Large
149231	Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	Edwardsville	IL	62026	Public	No	Large
206862	Southern Nazarene University	Bethany	OK	73008	Private	No	Medium
183026	Southern New Hampshire University	Manchester	NH	3106	Private	No	Large
210146	Southern Oregon University	Ashland	OR	97520	Public	No	Large
141097	Southern Polytechnic State University	Marietta	GA	30060	Public	No	Medium
160621	Southern University and A & M College	Baton Rouge	LA	70813	Public	Yes	Large
160630	Southern University at New Orleans	New Orleans	LA	70126	Public	Yes	Medium
230603	Southern Utah University	Cedar City	UT	84720	Public	No	Small
217776	Southern Wesleyan University	Central	SC	29630	Private	No	Large
179326	Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar	MO	65613	Private	No	Large
175078	Southwest Minnesota State University	Marshall	MN	56258	Public	No	Small
155900	Southwestern College	Winfield	KS	67156	Private	No	Small
188207	Southwestern College	Santa Fe	NM	87507	Private	No	Small
207865	Southwestern Oklahoma State University	Weatherford	OK	73096	Public	No	Small
172334	Spring Arbor University	Spring Arbor	MI	49283	Private	No	Large
102234	Spring Hill College	Mobile	AL	36608	Private	No	Small
167899	Springfield College	Springfield	MA	1109	Private	No	Large
228149	St Marys University	San Antonio	TX	78228	Private	No	Large
228431	Stephen F Austin State University	Nacogdoches	TX	75962	Public	No	Large
137546	Stetson University	DeLand	FL	32723	Private	No	Medium
131803	Strayer University	Washington	DC	20005	Profit	No	Large
168005	Suffolk University	Boston	MA	2108	Private	No	Large
228501	Sul Ross State University	Alpine	TX	79832	Public	No	Large
157793	Sullivan University	Louisville	KY	40205	Profit	No	Small

196158	SUNY at Fredonia	Fredonia	NY	14063	Public	No	Large
196167	SUNY at Geneseo	Geneseo	NY	14454	Public	No	Medium
196121	SUNY College at Brockport	Brockport	NY	14420	Public	No	Large
196130	SUNY College at Buffalo	Buffalo	NY	14222	Public	No	Large
196149	SUNY College at Cortland	Cortland	NY	13045	Public	No	Large
196176	SUNY College at New Paltz	New Paltz	NY	12561	Public	No	Large
196185	SUNY College at Oneonta	Oneonta	NY	13820	Public	No	Small
196194	SUNY College at Oswego	Oswego	NY	13126	Public	No	Large
196246	SUNY College at Plattsburgh	Plattsburgh	NY	12901	Public	No	Large
196200	SUNY College at Postdam	Potsdam	NY	13676	Public	No	Large
196264	SUNY Empire State College	Saratoga Springs	NY	12866	Public	No	Small
196112	SUNY Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome	Utica	NY	13504	Public	No	Medium
228529	Tarleton State University	Stephenville	TX	76402	Public	No	Large
221847	Tennessee Technological University	Cookeville	TN	38505	Public	No	Large
226152	Texas A & M International University	Laredo	TX	78041	Public	No	Medium
224147	Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	TX	78412	Public	No	Large
224545	Texas A & M University-Texarkana	Texarkana	TX	75505	Public	No	Medium
229063	Texas Southern University	Houston	TX	77004	Public	Yes	Medium
228459	Texas State University-San Marcos	San Marcos	TX	78666	Public	No	Large
229160	Texas Wesleyan University	Fort Worth	TX	76105	Private	No	Medium
187134	The College of New Jersey	Ewing	NJ	8628	Public	No	Large
193645	The College of New Rochelle	New Rochelle	NY	10805	Private	No	Large
195234	The College of Saint Rose	Albany	NY	12203	Private	No	Large
174899	The College of Saint Scholastica	Duluth	MN	55811	Private	No	Large
235167	The Evergreen State College	Olympia	WA	98505	Public	No	Small
186876	The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Pomona	NJ	8240	Public	No	Small
202763	The University of Findlay	Findlay	OH	45840	Private	No	Large
137847	The University of Tampa	Tampa	FL	33606	Private	No	Medium
221740	The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Chattanooga	TN	37403	Public	No	Large
221768	The University of Tennessee-Martin	Martin	TN	38238	Public	No	Medium
227377	The University of Texas at Brownsville	Brownsville	TX	78520	Public	No	Medium
229027	The University of Texas at San Antonio	San Antonio	TX	78249	Public	No	Large
228802	The University of Texas at Tyler	Tyler	TX	75799	Public	No	Large
229018	The University of Texas of the Permian Basin	Odessa	TX	79762	Public	No	Medium
227368	The University of Texas-Pan American	Edinburg	TX	78541	Public	No	Large
157809	Thomas More College	Crestview Hills	KY	41017	Private	No	Small



206048	Tiffin University	Tiffin	OH	44883	Private	No	Medium
196592	Touro College	New York	NY	10010	Private	No	Large
164076	Towson University	Towson	MD	21252	Public	No	Large
229267	Trinity University	San Antonio	TX	78212	Private	No	Medium
131876	Trinity Washington University	Washington	DC	20017	Private	No	Large
102368	Troy University	Troy	AL	36082	Public	No	Large
178615	Truman State University	Kirksville	MO	63501	Public	No	Medium
221953	Tusculum College	Greeneville	TN	37743	Private	No	Medium
157863	Union College	Barbourville	KY	40906	Private	No	Medium
221971	Union University	Jackson	TN	38305	Private	No	Large
243601	Universidad Del Turabo	Gurabo	PR	778	Private	No	Large
241739	Universidad Metropolitana	Cupey	PR	928	Private	No	Large
102553	University of Alaska Anchorage	Anchorage	AK	99508	Public	No	Large
102632	University of Alaska Southeast	Juneau	AK	99801	Public	No	Small
106485	University of Arkansas at Monticello	Monticello	AR	71656	Public	No	Small
161873	University of Baltimore	Baltimore	MD	21201	Public	No	Large
106704	University of Central Arkansas	Conway	AR	72035	Public	No	Large
176965	University of Central Missouri	Warrensburg	MO	64093	Public	No	Large
206941	University of Central Oklahoma	Edmond	OK	73034	Public	No	Large
126580	University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	Colorado Springs	CO	80933	Public	No	Large
224323	University of Dallas	Irving	TX	75062	Private	No	Large
169716	University of Detroit Mercy	Detroit	MI	48221	Private	No	Large
150534	University of Evansville	Evansville	IN	47722	Private	No	Small
180258	University of Great Falls	Great Falls	MT	59405	Private	No	Small
240754	University of Guam	Mangilao	GU	96923	Public	No	Medium
225414	University of Houston-Clear Lake	Houston	TX	77058	Public	No	Large
225502	University of Houston-Victoria	Victoria	TX	77901	Public	No	Large
148654	University of Illinois at Springfield	Springfield	IL	62703	Public	No	Large
151263	University of Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN	46227	Private	No	Large
159993	University of Louisiana Monroe	Monroe	LA	71209	Public	No	Large
200217	University of Mary	Bismarck	ND	58504	Private	No	Large
226471	University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Belton	TX	76513	Private	No	Small
232681	University of Mary Washington	Fredericksburg	VA	22401	Public	No	Medium
163338	University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Princess Anne	MD	21853	Public	Yes	Small
163204	University of Maryland-University College	Adelphi	MD	20783	Public	No	Large
167987	University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	North Dartmouth	MA	2747	Public	No	Large

171137	University of Michigan-Dearborn	Dearborn	MI	48128	Public	No	Large
171146	University of Michigan-Flint	Flint	MI	48502	Public	No	Medium
174233	University of Minnesota-Duluth	Duluth	MN	55812	Public	No	Medium
101693	University of Mobile	Mobile	AL	36663	Private	No	Small
101709	University of Montevallo	Montevallo	AL	35115	Public	No	Medium
181215	University of Nebraska at Kearney	Kearney	NE	68849	Public	No	Medium
181394	University of Nebraska at Omaha	Omaha	NE	68182	Public	No	Large
161457	University of New England	Biddeford	ME	4005	Private	No	Large
129941	University of New Haven	West Haven	CT	6516	Private	No	Large
101879	University of North Alabama	Florence	AL	35632	Public	No	Large
199281	University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Pembroke	NC	28372	Public	No	Medium
199218	University of North Carolina-Wilmington	Wilmington	NC	28403	Public	No	Large
136172	University of North Florida	Jacksonville	FL	32224	Public	No	Large
154095	University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls	IA	50614	Public	No	Large
432232	University of Phoenix-Central Florida Campus	Maitland	FL	32751	Profit For	No	Medium
405988	University of Phoenix-Denver Campus	Lone Tree	CO	80124	Profit For	No	Large
420042	University of Phoenix-Hawaii Campus	Honolulu	HI	96813	Profit For	No	Large
416962	University of Phoenix-Las Vegas Campus	Las Vegas	NV	89128	Profit For	No	Large
421009	University of Phoenix-Louisiana Campus	Metairie	LA	70001	Profit For	No	Medium
405997	University of Phoenix-New Mexico Campus	Albuquerque	NM	87109	Profit For	No	Large
434955	University of Phoenix-North Florida Campus	Jacksonville	FL	32216	Profit For	No	Medium
432241	University of Phoenix-Oregon Campus	Tigard	OR	97223	Profit For	No	Small
438610	University of Phoenix-Philadelphia Campus	Wayne	PA	19087	Profit For	No	Medium
105516	University of Phoenix-Phoenix-Hohokam Campus	Phoenix	AZ	85040	Profit For	No	Large
419509	University of Phoenix-Sacramento Valley Campus	Sacramento	CA	95833	Profit For	No	Large
372222	University of Phoenix-San Diego Campus	San Diego	CA	92123	Profit For	No	Large
434946	University of Phoenix-South Florida Campus	Plantation	FL	33324	For	No	Medium

					Profit		
405979	University of Phoenix-Southern Arizona Campus	Tucson	AZ	85712	Profit For Profit	No	Large
406015	University of Phoenix-Southern California Campus	Costa Mesa	CA	92626	Profit For Profit	No	Large
438382	University of Phoenix-Southern Colorado Campus	Colorado Springs	CO	80919	Profit For Profit	No	Medium
380465	University of Phoenix-Utah Campus	Salt Lake City	UT	84123	Profit For Profit	No	Large
434964	University of Phoenix-West Florida Campus	Temple Terrace	FL	33637	Profit For Profit	No	Large
438416	University of Phoenix-West Michigan Campus	Grand Rapids	MI	49544	Profit	No	Small
209825	University of Portland	Portland	OR	97203	Private	No	Medium
243197	University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez	Mayaguez	PR	681	Public	No	Large
121691	University of Redlands	Redlands	CA	92373	Private	No	Large
205203	University of Rio Grande	Rio Grande	OH	45674	Private	No	Small
152336	University of Saint Francis-Ft Wayne	Fort Wayne	IN	46808	Private	No	Small
155812	University of Saint Mary	Leavenworth	KS	66048	Private	No	Large
215929	University of Scranton	Scranton	PA	18510	Private	No	Medium
102094	University of South Alabama	Mobile	AL	36688	Public	No	Large
151306	University of Southern Indiana	Evansville	IN	47712	Public	No	Medium
161554	University of Southern Maine	Portland	ME	4103	Public	No	Large
148584	University of St Francis	Joliet	IL	60435	Private	No	Large
227863	University of St Thomas	Houston	TX	77006	Private	No	Large
131399	University of the District of Columbia	Washington	DC	20008	Public	Yes	Small
225627	University of the Incarnate Word	San Antonio	TX	78209	Private	No	Large
188182	University of the Southwest	Hobbs	NM	88240	Private	No	Small
377555	University of Washington-Bothell Campus	Bothell	WA	98011	Public	No	Small
377564	University of Washington-Tacoma Campus	Tacoma	WA	98402	Public	No	Medium
101587	University of West Alabama	Livingston	AL	35470	Public	No	Medium
141334	University of West Georgia	Carrollton	GA	30118	Public	No	Large
240268	University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	Eau Claire	WI	54702	Public	No	Medium
240329	University of Wisconsin-La Crosse	La Crosse	WI	54601	Public	No	Large
240365	University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	Oshkosh	WI	54901	Public	No	Large
240462	University of Wisconsin-Platteville	Platteville	WI	53818	Public	No	Medium
240471	University of Wisconsin-River Falls	River Falls	WI	54022	Public	No	Medium

240480	University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point	Stevens Point	WI	54481	Public	No	Medium
240417	University of Wisconsin-Stout	Menomonie	WI	54751	Public	No	Large
240426	University of Wisconsin-Superior	Superior	WI	54880	Public	No	Medium
240189	University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	Whitewater	WI	53190	Public	No	Large
154493	Upper Iowa University	Fayette	IA	52142	Private	No	Small
206349	Ursuline College	Pepper Pike	OH	44124	Private	No	Medium
197045	Utica College	Utica	NY	13502	Private	No	Small
141264	Valdosta State University	Valdosta	GA	31698	Public	No	Large
152600	Valparaiso University	Valparaiso	IN	46383	Private	No	Small
216597	Villanova University	Villanova	PA	19085	Private	No	Large
234155	Virginia State University	Petersburg	VA	23806	Public	Yes	Medium
240107	Viterbo University	La Crosse	WI	54601	Private	No	Large
197197	Wagner College	Staten Island	NY	10301	Private	No	Medium
236896	Walla Walla University	College Place	WA	99324	Private	No	Medium
206437	Walsh University	North Canton	OH	44720	Private	No	Small
156082	Washburn University	Topeka	KS	66621	Public	No	Medium
229780	Wayland Baptist University	Plainview	TX	79072	Private	No	Medium
181783	Wayne State College	Wayne	NE	68787	Public	No	Medium
216694	Waynesburg University	Waynesburg	PA	15370	Private	No	Medium
230782	Weber State University	Ogden	UT	84408	Public	No	Medium
179894	Webster University	Saint Louis	MO	63119	Private	No	Large
216764	West Chester University of Pennsylvania	West Chester	PA	19383	Public	No	Large
229814	West Texas A & M University	Canyon	TX	79016	Public	No	Large
200004	Western Carolina University	Cullowhee	NC	28723	Public	No	Large
130776	Western Connecticut State University	Danbury	CT	6810	Public	No	Large
149772	Western Illinois University	Macomb	IL	61455	Public	No	Large
106102	Western International University	Phoenix	AZ	85021	Profit	No	Medium
157951	Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green	KY	42101	Public	No	Large
168254	Western New England College	Springfield	MA	1119	Private	No	Large
188304	Western New Mexico University	Silver City	NM	88061	Public	No	Medium
210429	Western Oregon University	Monmouth	OR	97361	Public	No	Large
237011	Western Washington University	Bellingham	WA	98225	Public	No	Large
168263	Westfield State College	Westfield	MA	1086	Public	No	Medium
230807	Westminster College	Salt Lake City	UT	84105	Private	No	Medium
238078	Wheeling Jesuit University	Wheeling	WV	26003	Private	No	Small

168290	Wheelock College	Boston	MA	2215	Private	No	Large
237066	Whitworth University	Spokane	WA	99251	Private	No	Small
244190	Widener University-Delaware Campus	Wilmington	DE	19803	Private	No	Small
216931	Wilkes University	Wilkes-Barre	PA	18766	Private	No	Large
176479	William Carey University	Hattiesburg	MS	39401	Private	No	Large
187444	William Paterson University of New Jersey	Wayne	NJ	7470	Public	No	Large
179964	William Woods University	Fulton	MO	65251	Private	No	Large
175272	Winona State University	Winona	MN	55987	Public	No	Medium
218964	Winthrop University	Rock Hill	SC	29733	Public	No	Large
125897	Woodbury University	Burbank	CA	91510	Private	No	Small
168430	Worcester State College	Worcester	MA	1602	Public	No	Medium
206622	Xavier University	Cincinnati	OH	45207	Private	No	Large
160904	Xavier University of Louisiana	New Orleans	LA	70125	Private	Yes	Small
206695	Youngstown State University	Youngstown	OH	44555	Public	No	Large

APPENDIX B

GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PUBLICLY-CONTROLLED CARNEGIE  
CLASSIFIED MASTER'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PUBLICLY-CONTROLLED CARNEGIE CLASSIFIED  
MASTER'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Note: Each listing includes the following data from left to right:

Column 1: Classification

L = Large

M = Medium

S = Small

R = Rural

U = Urban

Sub = Suburban

Y = Historical Black College of University (HBCU)

Z = Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)

X = Special Use

Column 2: Name of Institution

Column 3: Participation in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)—(Yes or No)

Column 4: City

Column 5: Name of Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA)—

(if not in a MSA or PMSA, coded as N/A)

Column 6: Total population of MSA or PMSA, if not in a MSA or PMSA total population of city location

Class.		AASCU	City	MSA/PMSA	Population
	<b>Alabama</b>				
Y-L-R	Alabama A&M University	yes	Normal	Huntsville, AL, MSA	342,376
Y-L-R	Alabama State University	yes	Montgomery	Montgomery, AL, MSA	333,055
L-R	Auburn University at Montgomery	yes	Montgomery	Montgomery, AL, MSA	333,055
L-R	Jacksonville State University	yes	Jacksonville	Anniston, AL, MSA	112,249
L-R	Troy University	yes	Troy	N/A	11,903
M-Sub	University of Montevallo	yes	Montevallo	Birmingham, AL, MSA	921,106
L-R	University of North Alabama	yes	Florence	Florence, AL, MSA	142,950
L-U	University of South Alabama	yes	Mobile	Mobile, AL, MSA	540,258
M-R	University of West Alabama	yes	Livingston	N/A	3,297
	<b>Alaska</b>				
L-R	University of Alaska Anchorage	yes	Anchorage	Anchorage, AK, MSA	260,283
S-R	University of Alaska Southeast	yes	Juneau	Native Alaskan Area	71,507
	<b>Arkansas</b>				
L-R	Arkansas State University- Jonesboro	yes	Jonesboro	Jonesboro, AR, MSA	82,148
M-R	Arkansas Tech University	yes	Russellville	N/A	26,635
M-R	Henderson State University	yes	Arkadelphia	N/A	10,565
S-R	University of Arkansas at Monticello	yes	Monticello	N/A	9,146
L-Sub	University of Central Arkansas	yes	Conway	Little Rock--North Little Rock, AR, MSA	583,845
	<b>Arizona</b>				
L-Sub	Arizona State University at the West Campus	no	Glendale	Phoenix--Mesa, AZ, MSA	3,251,876
M-U	Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus	no	Mesa	Phoenix--Mesa, AZ, MSA	3,251,876
	<b>California</b>				
L-R	California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo	yes	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo--Atascadero Paso Robles, CA, MSA	246,681
Z-L-Sub	California State Polytechnic University- Pomona	yes	Pomona	Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA, PMSA	9,519,338
Z-L-U	California State University- Bakersfield	yes	Bakersfield	Bakersfield, CA, MSA	661,645
L-R	California State University- Chico	yes	Chico	Chico--Paradise, CA, MSA	203,171
Z-L-Sub	California State University- Dominguez Hills	yes	Carson	Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA, PMSA	9,159,338
L-Sub	California State University- East Bay	yes	Hayward	Oakland, CA, PMSA	2,392,557
Z-L-U	California State University- Fresno	yes	Fresno	Fresno, CA, MSA	922,516
Z-L-Sub	California State University- Fullerton	yes	Fullerton	Orange County, CA, PMSA	2,846,289
Z-L-U	California State University- Long Beach	yes	Long Beach	Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA, PMSA	9,159,338
Z-L-U	California State University- Los Angeles	yes	Los Angeles	Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA, PMSA	9,159,338



Z-L-Sub	California State University- Northridge	yes	Northridge	Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA, PMSA	9,159,338
L-U	California State University- Sacramento	yes	Sacramento	Sacramento, CA, PMSA	1,628,197
Z-L-U	California State University- San Bernardino	yes	San Bernardino	Riverside--San Bernardino, CA, PMSA	3,254,821
M-Sub	California State University- San Marcos	yes	San Marcos	San Diego, CA, MSA	2,813,833
Z-M-R	California State University- Stanislaus	yes	Turlock	Modesto, CA, MSA	446,997
M-R	Humbolt State University	yes	Arcata	N/A	30,429
L-X	Naval Postgraduate School	no	Monterey	Salinas, Ca, MSA	401,762
L-U	San Francisco State University	yes	San Francisco	San Francisco, CA, PMSA	1,731,183
L-U	San Jose State University	yes	San Jose	San Jose, CA, PMSA	1,682,585
L-R	Sonoma State University	yes	Rohnert Park	Santa Rosa, CA, PMSA	458,614
<b>Colorado</b>					
Z-L-R	Adams State College	yes	Alamosa Colorado	N/A	9,238
L-U	University of Colorado- Colorado Springs	yes	Colorado Springs	Colorado Springs, CO, MSA	516,929
<b>Connecticut</b>					
L-Sub	Central Connecticut State University	yes	New Britain	Hartford, CT, MSA	1,183,110
M-Sub	Eastern Connecticut State University	yes	Willimantic	Hartford, CT, MSA	1,183,110
L-U	Southern Connecticut State University	yes	New Haven	New Haven--Meriden, CT, PMSA	542,149
L-R	Western Connecticut State University	yes	Danbury	Danbury, CT, PMSA	217,980
<b>District of Columbia</b>					
Y-S-U	University of District of Columbia	yes	Washington DC	Washington, DC--MD--VA--WV, PMSA	4,923,153
<b>Delaware</b>					
Y-S-R	Delaware State University	yes	Dover	Dover, DE, MSA	126,697
<b>Florida</b>					
L-R	Florida Gulf Coast University	yes	Fort Myers	Fort Myers--Cape Coral, FL, MSA	440,888
L-U	University of North Florida	yes	Jacksonville	Jacksonville, FL, MSA	1,100,491
<b>Georgia</b>					
Y-M-R	Albany State University	yes	Albany	Albany, GA, MSA	120,822
L-R	Armstrong Atlantic State University	yes	Savannah	Savannah, GA, MSA	293,000
M-R	Augusta State University	yes	Augusta	Augusta--Aiken, GA--SC, MSA	477,441
L-R	Columbus State University	yes	Columbus	Columbus, GA--AL, MSA	274,624
Y-S-R	Fort Valley State University	yes	Fort Valley	Macon, GA, MSA	322,549
L-R	Georgia College and State University	yes	Milledgeville	N/A	29,562
M-R	Georgia Southwestern State University	yes	Americus	N/A	18,825
L-Sub	Kennesaw State University	yes	Kennesaw	Atlanta, GA, MSA	4,112,198
M-R	North Georgia College and State University	yes	Dahlonega	N/A	3,064

Y-S-R	Savannah State University	yes	Savannah	Savannah, GA, MSA	293,000
M-Sub	Southern Polytechnic State University	yes	Marietta	Atlanta, GA, MSA	4,112,198
L-Sub	University of West Georgia	yes	Carrollton	Atlanta, GA, MSA	4,112,198
L-R	Valdosta State University	yes	Valdosta	N/A	57,647
<b>Guam</b>					
M-R	University of Guam	yes	Mangilao	N/A	
<b>Iowa</b>					
L-R	University of Northern Iowa	yes	Cedar Falls	Waterloo--Cedar Fall, IA, MSA	128,012
<b>Idaho</b>					
L-R	Boise State University	yes	Boise	Boise City, MSA	432,345
<b>Illinois</b>					
L-U	Chicago State University	yes	Chicago	Chicago, IL, PMSA	8,272,768
L-R	Eastern Illinois University	yes	Charleston	N/A	21,200
L-Sub	Governors State University	yes	University Park	Chicago, IL, PMSA	8,272,768
Z-L-U	Northeastern Illinois University	yes	Chicago	Chicago, IL, PMSA	8,272,768
L-Sub	Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	yes	Edwardsville	St. Louis, MO--IL, MSA	2,603,607
L-R	University of Illinois at Springfield	yes	Springfield	Springfield, IL, MSA	201,437
L-R	Western Illinois University	yes	Macomb	N/A	19,254
<b>Indiana</b>					
S-U	Indiana University Northwest	yes	Gary	Gary, IN, PMSA	631,362
L-Sub	Indiana University Southeast	yes	New Albany	Louisville, KY--IN, MSA	1,025,598
L-R	Indiana University South Bend	yes	South Bend	South Bend, IN, MSA	265,559
M-U	Indiana University- Purdue University Fort Wayne	yes	Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne, IN, MSA	502,141
M-Sub	Purdue University Calumet	yes	Hammond	Gary, IN, PMSA	631,362
M-R	University of Southern Indiana	yes	Evansville	Evansville--Henderson, IN--KY, MSA	296,195
<b>Kansas</b>					
L-R	Emporia State University	yes	Emporia	N/A	26,876
L-R	Fort Hays State University	yes	Hays	N/A	20,499
L-R	Pittsburg State University	yes	Pittsburg	N/A	21,508
M-R	Washburn University	yes	Topeka	Topeka, KS, MSA	169,871
<b>Kentucky</b>					
L-R	Eastern Kentucky University	yes	Richmond	Lexington, KY, MSA	479,198
L-R	Morehead State University	yes	Morehead	N/A	5,914
L-R	Murray State University	yes	Murray	N/A	16,201
L-Sub	Northern Kentucky University	yes	Highland Heights	Cincinnati, OH--KY--IN, PMSA	1,646,395

L-R	Western Kentucky University	yes	Bowling Green	N/A	58,314
	<b>Louisiana</b>				
Y-M-R	Grambling State University	yes	Grambling	N/A	4,693
M-R	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	yes	Shreveport	Shreveport--Bossier City, LA, MSA	392,302
L-R	McNeese State University	yes	Lake Charles	Lake Charles, LA, MSA	183,577
M-R	Nicholls State University	yes	Thibodaux	Houma, LA, MSA	194,477
L-R	Northwestern State University of Louisiana	yes	Natchitoches	N/A Native American Area	19,020
L-R	Southeastern Louisiana University	yes	Hammond	N/A	43,458
Y-L-U	Southern University and A & M College	no	Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge, LA, MSA	602,894
Y-M-U	Southern University at New Orleans	yes	New Orleans	New Orleans, LA, MSA	1,337,726
L-R	University of Louisiana at Monroe	yes	Monroe	Monroe, LA, MSA	147,250
	<b>Maine</b>				
L-R	University of Southern Maine	yes	Portland	Portland, ME, MSA	243,537
	<b>Maryland</b>				
Y-L-Sub	Bowie State University	yes	Bowie	Washington, DC--MD--VA--WV, PMSA	4,923,153
Y-M-U	Coppin State University	yes	Baltimore	Baltimore, MD, PMSA	2,552,994
L-R	Frostburg State University	yes	Frostburg	Cumberland, MD--WV, MSA	102,008
L-R	Salisbury University	yes	Salisbury	N/A	59,426
L-Sub	Towson University	yes	Towson	Baltimore, MD, PMSA	2,552,994
L-U	University of Baltimore	no	Baltimore	Baltimore, MD, PMSA	2,552,994
Y-S-R	University of Maryland Eastern Shore	yes	Princess Anne	N/A	8,364
L-Sub	University of Maryland University College	yes	Adelphi	Washington, DC--MD--VA--WV, PMSA	4,923,153
	<b>Massachusetts</b>				
L-R	Bridgewater State College	yes	Bridgewater	Brockton, MA, PMSA	255,459
L-R	Fitchburg State College	yes	Fitchburg	Fitchburg--Leominster, MA, PMSA	142,284
L-Sub	Framingham State College	yes	Framingham	Boston, MA--NH, PMSA	3,406,829
L-Sub	Salem State College	yes	Salem	Boston, MA--NH, PMSA	3,406,829
L-R	University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	yes	North Dartmouth	New Bedford, MA, PMSA	175,198
M-Sub	Westfield State College	yes	Westfield	Springfield, MA, MSA	591,932
M-U	Worcester State College	yes	Worcester	Worcester, MA--CT, PMSA	511,389
	<b>Michigan</b>				
L-Sub	Eastern Michigan University	yes	Ypsilanti	Ann Arbor, MI, PMSA	578,736
M-R	Ferris State University	yes	Big Rapids	N/A	11,937
L-Sub	Grand Valley State University	yes	Allendale	Grand Rapids--Muskegon Holland, MI, MSA	1,088,514

L-R	Northern Michigan University	yes	Marquette	N/A	24,431
L-R	Saginaw Valley State University	yes	Saginaw	Saginaw--Bay City--Midland, MI, MSA	403,700
L-Sub	University of Michigan- Dearborn	yes	Dearborn	Detroit, MI, PMSA	4,441,551
M-R	University of Michigan- Flint	yes	Flint	Flint, MI, PMSA	436,141
<b>Minnesota</b>					
S-R	Bemidji State University	yes	Bemidji	N/A	12,321
L-R	Minnesota State University- Mankato	yes	Mankato	N/A	47,115
S-R	Minnesota State University Moorhead	yes	Moorhead	Fargo--Moorhead, ND--MN, MSA	174,367
M-U	Metropolitan State University	yes	Saint Paul	Minneapolis--St. Paul, MN--WI, MSA	2,968,806
S-R	Southwest Minnesota State University	yes	Marshall	N/A	12,650
L-R	St. Cloud State University	yes	Saint Cloud	Saint Cloud, MN, MSA	167,392
M-R	University of Minnesota- Duluth	yes	Duluth	Duluth--Superior, MN--WI, MSA	243,815
M-R	Winona State University	yes	Winona	N/A	29,440
<b>Missouri</b>					
Y-S-R	Lincoln University of Missouri	yes	Jefferson City	N/A	53,714
M-R	Northwest Missouri State University	yes	Maryville	N/A	11,582
L-R	Southeast Missouri State University	yes	Cape Girardeau	N/A	46,968
L-R	Missouri State University	yes	Springfield	Springfield, MO, MSA	325,721
M-R	Truman State University	yes	Kirkville	N/A	16,988
L-R	University of Central Missouri	yes	Warrensburg	N/A	18,025
<b>Mississippi</b>					
Y-M-R	Alcorn State University	yes	Alcorn State	N/A	N/A
M-R	Delta State University	yes	Cleveland	N/A	13,841
Y-S-R	Mississippi Valley State University	yes	Itta Bena	N/A	2,208
S-R	Mississippi University for Women	yes	Columbus	N/A	33,066
<b>Montana</b>					
M-R	Montana State University- Billings	yes	Billings	Billings, MT, MSA	129,352
<b>Nebraska</b>					
M-R	University of Nebraska at Kearney	yes	Kearney	N/A	N/A
L-U	University of Nebraska at Omaha	yes	Omaha	Omaha, NE--IA, MSA	716,998
M-R	Wayne State College	yes	Wayne	N/A	5,513
<b>New Hampshire</b>					
S-R	Keene State College	yes	Keene	N/A	21,436
L-R	Plymouth State University	yes	Plymouth	N/A	3,957
<b>New Jersey</b>					
L-Sub	Montclair State University	yes	Montclair	Newark, NJ, PMSA	2,032,989

Z-L-U	New Jersey City University	yes	Jersey City	Jersey City, NJ, PMSA	608,975
L-Sub	Kean University	no	Union	Newark, NJ, PMSA	2,032,989
S-Sub	Ramapo College	yes	Mahwah	Bergen--Passaic, NJ, PMSA	1,373,167
L-Sub	Rowan University	yes	Glassboro	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931
S-R	The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	yes	Pomona		
M-Sub	Rutgers University- Camden	no	Camden	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931
L-R	The College of New Jersey	yes	Ewing	Trenton, NJ, PMSA	350,761
L-Sub	William Patterson University of New Jersey	yes	Wayne	Bergen--Passaic, NJ, PMSA	1,373,167
<b>New Mexico</b>					
Z-S-R	Eastern New Mexico University	yes	Portales	N/A	11,625
Z-L	New Mexico Highlands University	yes	Las Vegas	N/A	17,892
M-R	New Mexico Institute of Mining	no	Socorro	N/A	8,399
Z-M-R	Western New Mexico University	yes	Silver City	N/A	11,950
<b>New York</b>					
L-U	The City University of New York Bernard Baruck College	yes	New York	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-Sub	The City University of New York, Brooklyn College	yes	Brooklyn	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
Z-L-U	The City University of New York, City College	yes	New York	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-Sub	The City University of New York College of Staten Island	yes	Staten Island	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-U	The City University of New York, Hunter College	yes	New York	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
Z-L-Sub	The City University of New York, Lehman College	yes	Bronx	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-U	The City University of New York, John Jay College of Criminal Justice	yes	New York	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-Sub	The City University of New York, Queens College	yes	Flushing	New York, NY, PMSA	9,314,235
L-Sub	State University of New York, Brockport	yes	Brockport	Rochester, NY, MSA	1,098,201
L-U	State University of New York, College at Buffalo	yes	Buffalo	Buffalo--Niagara Falls, NY, MSA	1,170,111
L-R	State University of New York, Cortland	yes	Cortland	N/A	26,820
S-Sub	State University of New York, Empire State College	yes	Saratoga Springs	Albany--Schenectady--Troy, NY, PMSA	875,583
L-R	State University of New York, Fredonia	yes	Fredonia	Jamestown, NY, MSA	139,750
M-Sub	State University of New York, Geneseo	yes	Geneseo	Rochester, NY, MSA	1,098,201
L-R	State University of New York, New Paltz	yes	New Paltz	N/A	10,751
S-R	State University of New York, Oneonta	yes	Oneonta	N/A	13,292
L-Sub	State University of New York, Oswego	yes	Oswego	Syracuse, NY, MSA	732,117
L-R	State University of New York, Plattsburgh	yes	Plattsburgh	N/A	27,076

L-R	State University of New York, Potsdam	yes	Potsdam	N/A	9,103
M-R	State University of New York Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome	no	Utica	Utica--Rome, NY, MSA	299,896
<b>North Carolina</b>					
L-R	Appalachian State University	yes	Boone	N/A	17,151
Y-S-R	Fayetteville State University	yes	Fayetteville	Fayetteville, NC, MSA Raleigh--Durham--Chapel Hill, NC, MSA	302,963
Y-L-U	North Carolina Central University	yes	Durham	MSA	1,187,941
M-R	University of North Carolina at Pembroke	yes	Pembroke	N/A Native American Area	474,100
L-R	University of North Carolina at Wilmington	yes	Wilmington	Wilmington, NC, MSA	233,450
L-R	Western Carolina University	yes	Cullowhee	N/A	7,177
<b>North Dakota</b>					
S-R	Minot State University	yes	Minot	N/A	37,679
<b>Ohio</b>					
L-U	Youngstown State University	yes	Youngstown	Youngstown--Warren, OH, MSA	594,746
<b>Oklahoma</b>					
M-R	Cameron University	yes	Lawton	Lawton, OK, MSA	114,996
L-R	East Central University	yes	Ada	N/A Native American Area	277,416
L-R	Northeastern State University	yes	Tahlequah	N/A Native American Area	462,327
M-R	Southeastern Oklahoma State University	yes	Durant	N/A-Native American Area	277,416
S-R	Southwestern Oklahoma State University	yes	Weatherford	N/A-Native American Area	157,869
L-Sub	University of Central Oklahoma	yes	Edmond	Oklahoma City, OK, MSA	1,083,346
<b>Oregon</b>					
M-R	Eastern Oregon University	yes	La Grande	N/A	14,278
L-R	Southern Oregon University	yes	Ashland	Medford--Ashland, OR, MSA	181,269
L-R	Western Oregon University	yes	Monmouth	Salem, OR, PMSA	347,214
<b>Pennsylvania</b>					
L-Sub	Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	yes	Bloomsburg	Scranton--Wilkes--Barre Hazleton, PA, MSA	624,776
L-Sub	California University of Pennsylvania	yes	California	Pittsburgh, PA, MSA	2,358,695
Y-M-Sub	Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	yes	Cheyney	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931
L-R	Clarion University of Pennsylvania	yes	Clarion	N/A	9,001
L-R	East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	yes	East Stroudsburg	N/A	40,664
L-R	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	no	Edinboro	Eri, PA, MSA	280,843
L-R	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	yes	Kutztown	Reading, PA, MSA	373,638
Y-M-	Lincoln University of Pennsylvania	yes	Lincoln	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931

			University		
Sub					
S-R	Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	yes	Lock Haven	N/A	24,189
S-R	Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	yes	Mansfield	N/A	3,996
L-R	Millersville University of Pennsylvania	yes	Millersville	Lancaster, PA, MSA	470,658
L-Sub	Penn State Harrisburg	yes	Middletown	Harrisburg--Lebanon--Carlisle, PA, MSA	629,401
L-Sub	Pennsylvania State University- Great Valley	no	Malvern	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931
L-Sub	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	yes	Shippensburg	Harrisburg--Lebanon--Carlisle, PA, MSA	629,401
L-Sub	Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	yes	Slippery Rock	Pittsburgh, PA, MSA	2,358,695
L-Sub	West Chester University of Pennsylvania	yes	West Chester	Philadelphia, PA--NJ, PMSA	5,100,931
<b>Puerto Rico</b>					
Z-L-R	University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez	yes			
<b>Rhode Island</b>					
L-U	Rhode Island College	yes	Providence	Providence--Fall River Warwick, RI--MA, MSA	1,188,613
<b>South Carolina</b>					
M-U	College of Charleston	yes	Charleston	Charleston--North Charleston, SC, MSA	549,033
S-R	Francis Marion University	yes	Florence	Florence, SC, MSA	125,761
L-U	The Citadel	yes	Charleston	Charleston--North Charleston, SC, MSA	549,033
L-U	Winthrop University	yes	Rock Hill	Charlotte--Gastonia Rock Hill, NC-SC, MSA	1,499,293
<b>Tennessee</b>					
M-R	Austin Peay State University	yes	Clarksville	Clarksville--Hopkinsville, TN--KY, MSA	207,033
L-Sub	Middle Tennessee State University	yes	Murfreesboro	Nashville, TN, MSA	1,231,311
L-R	Tennessee Technological University	yes	Cookeville	N/A	34,784
L-R	University of Tennessee- Chattanooga	yes	Chattanooga	Chattanooga, TN--GA, MSA	465,161
M-R	University of Tennessee- Martin	yes	Martin	N/A	9,735
<b>Texas</b>					
M-R	Angelo State University	yes	San Angelo	San Angelo, TX, MSA	104,010
L-R	Lamar University	yes	Beaumont	Beaumont--Port Arthur, TX, MSA	385,090
M-R	Midwestern State University	yes	Wichita Falls	Wichita Falls, TX, MSA	140,518
Y-L	Prairie View A & M University	yes	Prairie View	N/A	N/A
L-R	Sam Houston State University	yes	Huntsville	N/A	33,656
L-R	Stephen F. Austin State University	yes	Nacogdoches	N/A	30,877
Z-L	Sul Ross State University	yes	Alpine	N/A	5,906
L-R	Tarleton State University	yes	Stephenville	N/A	15,140
Z-M-R	Texas A & M International University	yes	Laredo	Laredo, TX, MSA	193,117

Z-L	Texas A & M University- Corpus Christi	yes	Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi, TX, MSA	380,783
M-R	Texas A & M University- Texarkana	yes	Texarkana	Texarkana, TX--AR, MSA	129,749
L-U	Texas State University- San Marcos	yes	San Marcos	Austin--San Marcos, TX, MSA	1,249,763
Y-M-U	Texas Southern University	yes	Houston	Houston, TX, PMSA	4,177,646
L-U	University of Houston- Clear Lake	yes	Houston	Houston, TX, PMSA	4,177,646
L-R	University of Houston- Victoria	yes	Victoria	Victoria, TX, MSA	84,088
Z-M-R	University of Texas at Brownsville	yes	Brownsville	Brownsville--Harlingen San Benito, TX, MSA	335,227
Z-M-R	University of Texas at Permian Basin	yes	Odessa	Odessa--Midland, TX, MSA	237,132
Z-L-U	University of Texas at San Antonio	yes	San Antonio	San Antonio, TX, MSA	1,592,383
L-R	University of Texas at Tyler	yes	Tyler	Tyler, TX, MSA	174,706
Z-L-U	University of Texas- Pan American	yes	Edinburg	McAllen--Edinburg--Mission, TX, MSA	569,463
L-R	West Texas A & M University	yes	Canyon	Amarillo, TX, MSA	217,858
<b>Utah</b>					
S-R	Southern Utah University	yes	Cedar City	N/A	21,978
M-U	Weber State University	yes	Ogden	Salt Lake City--Ogden, UT, MSA	1,333,914
<b>Vermont</b>					
S-R	Castleton State College	yes	Castleton	N/A	3,910
S-R	Johnson State College	yes	Johnson	N/A	3,274
<b>Virginia</b>					
L-R	James Madison University	yes	Harrisonburg	N/A	52,647
M-R	Longwood University	yes	Farmville	N/A	6,029
Y-L-U	Norfolk State University	no	Norfolk	Norfolk--Virginia Beach Newport News, VA-NC, MSA	1,569,541
L-R	Radford University	yes	Radford	N/A	23,506
M-Sub	University of Mary Washington	yes	Fredericksburg	Washington, DC--MD--VA--WV, PMSA	4,923,153
Y-M-U	Virginia State University	no	Petersburg	Richmond--Petersburg, VA, MSA	996,512
<b>Washington</b>					
L-R	Central Washington University	yes	Ellensburg	N/A	16,675
L-R	Eastern Washington University	yes	Cheney	Spokane, WA, MSA	417,939
L-R	Western Washington University	yes	Bellingham	Bellingham, WA, MSA	166,814
S-R	The Evergreen State College	no	Olympia	Olympia, WA, PMSA	207,355
S-Sub	University of Washington, Bothell Campus	no	Bothell	Seattle--Bellevue--Everett, WA, PMSA	2,414,616
M-U	University of Washington, Tacoma	yes	Tacoma	Tacoma, WA, PMSA	700,820
<b>West Virginia</b>					



L-R	Marshall University	yes	Huntington	Huntington--Ashland WV--KY--OH, MSA	315,538
	<b>Wisconsin</b>				
M-R	University of Wisconsin- Eau Claire	yes	Eau Claire	Eau Claire, WI, MSA	148,337
L-R	University of Wisconsin- La Crosse	yes	Lacrosse	Lacrosse, WI--MN, MSA	126,838
L-R	University of Wisconsin- Oshkosh	yes	Oshkosh	Appleton--Oshkosh--Neenah, WI, MSA	358,365
M-R	University of Wisconsin- Platteville	yes	Platteville	N/A	10,012
M-Sub	University of Wisconsin- River Falls	yes	River Falls	Minneapolis--St. Paul, MN--WI, MSA	2,968,806
M-R	University of Wisconsin- Stevens Point	yes	Stevens Point	N/A	40,983
L-R	University of Wisconsin- Stout	yes	Menomonie	N/A	16,550
M-R	University of Wisconsin- Superior	yes	Superior	Duluth--Superior, MN--WI, MSA	243,815
L-R	University of Wisconsin- Whitewater	yes	Whitewater	N/A	13,218

APPENDIX C

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
MEMBERSHIP AS OF SEPTEMBER 2008

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MEMBERSHIP  
AS OF SEPTEMBER 2008

Note: Each listing includes the following data from left to right:

Column 1: Name of Institution

Column 2: City

Column 3: State

Column 4: Zip Code

AASCU Membership as of September 2008

	City	State	Zip
<b>ALABAMA</b>			
Alabama A&M University	Normal	AL	35762
Alabama State University	Montgomery	AL	36101
Athens State University	Athens	AL	35611
Auburn University Montgomery	Montgomery	AL	36117
Jacksonville State University	Jacksonville	AL	36265
Troy University	Troy	AL	36082
University of Montevallo	Montevallo	AL	35115
University of North Alabama	Florence	AL	35632
University of South Alabama	Mobile	AL	36688
University of West Alabama	Livingston	AL	35470
<b>ALASKA</b>			
University of Alaska Anchorage	Anchorage	AK	99508
University of Alaska Southeast	Juneau	AK	99801
University of Alaska Statewide System	Fairbanks	AK	99775
<b>ARKANSAS</b>			
Arkansas State University Jonesboro	State University	AR	72467
Arkansas State University System	State University	AR	72467
Arkansas Tech University	Russellville	AR	72801
Henderson State University	Arkadelphia	AR	71999
Southern Arkansas University	Magnolia	AR	71753
University of Arkansas - Fort Smith	Fort Smith	AR	72913
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock	AR	72204
University of Arkansas at Monticello	Monticello	AR	71656
University of Arkansas System	Little Rock	AR	72204
University of Central Arkansas	Conway	AR	72035
<b>ARIZONA</b>			
Arizona Board of Regents	Phoenix	AZ	85004

Northern Arizona University	Flagstaff	AZ	86011
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>			
California Maritime Academy	Vallejo	CA	94590
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	CA	93407
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Pomona	CA	91768
California State University Bakersfield	Bakersfield	CA	93311
California State University Channel Islands	Camarillo	CA	93012
California State University Chico	Chico	CA	95929
California State University Dominguez Hills	Carson	CA	90747
California State University Fresno	Fresno	CA	93740
California State University Fullerton	Fullerton	CA	92831
California State University Long Beach	Long Beach	CA	90840
California State University Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA	90032
California State University Monterey Bay	Seaside	CA	93955
California State University Northridge	Northridge	CA	91330
California State University Sacramento	Sacramento	CA	95819
California State University San Bernardino	San Bernardino	CA	92407
California State University San Marcos	San Marcos	CA	92096
California State University, East Bay	Hayward	CA	94542
California State University, Stanislaus	Turlock	CA	95382
Humboldt State University	Arcata	CA	95521
San Diego State University	San Diego	CA	92182
San Francisco State University	San Francisco	CA	94132
San Jose State University	San Jose	CA	95192
Sonoma State University	Rohnert Park	CA	94928
<b>COLORADO</b>			
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO	81102
Colorado State University-Pueblo	Pueblo	CO	81001
Fort Lewis College	Durango	CO	81301

Mesa State College  
Metropolitan State College of Denver  
University of Northern Colorado  
Western State College of Colorado

**CONNECTICUT**

Central Connecticut State University  
Connecticut State University System  
Eastern Connecticut State University  
Southern Connecticut State University  
Western Connecticut State University

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Howard University  
University of the District of Columbia

**DELAWARE**

Delaware State University

**FLORIDA**

Florida A&M University  
Florida Atlantic University  
Florida Gulf Coast University  
New College of Florida  
University of Central Florida  
University of North Florida  
University of South Florida Lakeland  
University of South Florida St. Petersburg  
University of West Florida

**GEORGIA**

Albany State University  
Armstrong Atlantic State University  
Augusta State University

Grand Junction CO 81501  
Denver CO 80217  
Greeley CO 80639  
Gunnison CO 81231

New Britain CT 06050  
Hartford CT 06105  
Willimantic CT 06226  
New Haven CT 06515  
Danbury CT 06810

Washington DC 20008  
Washington DC 20008

Dover DE 19901

Tallahassee FL 32307  
Boca Raton FL 33431  
Fort Myers FL 33965  
Sarasota FL 34243  
Orlando FL 32816  
Jacksonville FL 32224  
Lakeland FL 33803  
Saint Petersburg FL 33701  
Pensacola FL 32514

Albany GA 31705  
Savannah GA 31419  
Augusta GA 30904

Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia	Atlanta	GA	30334
Clayton State University	Morrow	GA	30260
Columbus State University	Columbus	GA	31907
Dalton State College	Dalton	GA	30720
Fort Valley State University	Fort Valley	GA	31030
Georgia College & State University	Milledgeville	GA	31061
Georgia Southern University	Statesboro	GA	30460
Georgia Southwestern State University	Americus	GA	31709
Kennesaw State University	Kennesaw	GA	30144
Macon State College	Macon	GA	31206
North Georgia College & State University	Dahlonega	GA	30597
Savannah State University	Savannah	GA	31404
Southern Polytechnic State University	Marietta	GA	30060
University of West Georgia	Carrollton	GA	30118
Valdosta State University	Valdosta	GA	31698
<b>GUAM</b>			
University of Guam	Mangilao	GU	96923
<b>HAWAII</b>			
University of Hawaii at Hilo	Hilo	HI	96720
University of Hawaii System	Honolulu	HI	96822
<b>IOWA</b>			
Peru State College	Peru	IA	68421
University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls	IA	50614
<b>IDAHO</b>			
Boise State University	Boise	ID	83725
Lewis-Clark State College	Lewiston	ID	83501
<b>ILLINOIS</b>			
Chicago State University	Chicago	IL	60628
Eastern Illinois University	Charleston	IL	61920

Governors State University	University Park	IL	60466
Illinois Board of Higher Education	Springfield	IL	62701
Illinois State University	Normal	IL	61790
Northeastern Illinois University	Chicago	IL	60625
Northern Illinois University	DeKalb	IL	60115
Southern Illinois University Carbondale	Carbondale	IL	62901
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	Edwardsville	IL	62026
University of Illinois at Springfield	Springfield	IL	62703
Western Illinois University	Macomb	IL	61455
<b>INDIANA</b>			
Ball State University	Muncie	IN	47306
Indiana State University	Terra Haute	IN	47809
Indiana University East	Richmond	IN	47374
Indiana University Kokomo	Kokomo	IN	46902
Indiana University Northwest	Gary	IN	46408
Indiana University South Bend	South Bend	IN	46634
Indiana University Southeast	New Albany	IN	47150
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne	IN	46805
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN	46202
Purdue University Calumet	Hammond	IN	46323
Purdue University North Central	Westville	IN	46391
University of Southern Indiana	Evansville	IN	47712
<b>KANSAS</b>			
Emporia State University	Emporia	KS	66801
Fort Hays State University	Hays	KS	67601
Pittsburg State University	Pittsburg	KS	66762
Washburn University	Topeka	KS	66621
<b>KENTUCKY</b>			
Eastern Kentucky University	Richmond	KY	40475



Kentucky State University	Frankfort	KY	40601
Morehead State University	Morehead	KY	40351
Murray State University	Murray	KY	42071
Northern Kentucky University	Highland Heights	KY	41099
Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green	KY	42101
<b>LOUISIANA</b>			
Grambling State University	Grambling	LA	71245
Louisiana Board of Regents	Baton Rouge	LA	70821
Louisiana State University in Shreveport	Shreveport	LA	71115
Louisiana Tech University	Ruston	LA	71272
McNeese State University	Lake Charles	LA	70609
Nicholls State University	Thibodaux	LA	70310
Northwestern State University of Louisiana	Natchitoches	LA	71497
Southeastern Louisiana University	Hammond	LA	70402
Southern University at New Orleans	New Orleans	LA	70126
University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Lafayette	LA	70503
University of Louisiana at Monroe	Monroe	LA	71209
University of Louisiana System	Baton Rouge	LA	70802
<b>MAINE</b>			
University of Maine at Augusta	Augusta	ME	04330
University of Maine at Fort Kent	Fort Kent	ME	04743
University of Maine at Machias	Machias	ME	04654
University of Maine at Presque Isle	Presque Isle	ME	04769
University of Maine System	Bangor	ME	04401
University of Southern Maine	Portland	ME	04103
<b>MARYLAND</b>			
Bowie State University	Bowie	MD	20715
Coppin State University	Baltimore	MD	21216
Frostburg State University	Frostburg	MD	21532

Morgan State University	Baltimore	MD	21251
Salisbury University	Salisbury	MD	21801
Towson University	Towson	MD	21252
University of Maryland Baltimore County	Baltimore	MD	21250
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Princess Anne	MD	21853
University of Maryland University College	Adelphi	MD	20783
University System of Maryland	Adelphi	MD	20783
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>			
Bridgewater State College	Bridgewater	MA	02325
Fitchburg State College	Fitchburg	MA	01420
Framingham State College	Framingham	MA	01701
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	North Adams	MA	01247
Salem State College	Salem	MA	01970
University of Massachusetts Boston	Boston	MA	02125
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	North Dartmouth	MA	02747
Westfield State College	Westfield	MA	01086
Worcester State College	Worcester	MA	01602
<b>MICHIGAN</b>			
Central Michigan University	Mount Pleasant	MI	48859
Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti	MI	48197
Ferris State University	Big Rapids	MI	49307
Grand Valley State University	Allendale	MI	49401
Lake Superior State University	Marie	MI	49783
Michigan Technological University	Houghton	MI	49931
Northern Michigan University	Marquette	MI	49855
Oakland University	Rochester	MI	48309
Saginaw Valley State University	Saginaw	MI	48710
University of Michigan - Dearborn	Dearborn	MI	48128
University of Michigan - Flint	Flint	MI	48502

Wayne State University	Detroit	MI	48202
Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo	MI	49008
<b>MINNESOTA</b>			
Bemidji State University	Bemidji	MN	56601
Metropolitan State University	Saint Paul	MN	55106
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities	Saint Paul	MN	55101
Minnesota State University Mankato	Mankato	MN	56001
Minnesota State University Moorhead	Moorhead	MN	56563
Southwest Minnesota State University	Marshall	MN	56258
St. Cloud State University	Saint Cloud	MN	56301
University of Minnesota Duluth	Duluth	MN	55812
Winona State University	Winona	MN	55987
<b>MISSOURI</b>			
Harris-Stowe State University	Saint Louis	MO	63103
Lincoln University of Missouri	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Missouri Southern State University	Joplin	MO	64801
Missouri State University	Springfield	MO	65897
Missouri Western State University	Saint Joseph	MO	64501
Northwest Missouri State University	Maryville	MO	64468
Southeast Missouri State University	Cape Girardeau	MO	63701
Truman State University	Kirksville	MO	63501
University of Central Missouri	Warrensburg	MO	64093
University of Missouri at Saint Louis	Saint Louis	MO	63103
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>			
Alcorn State University	Alcorn State	MS	39096
Delta State University	Cleveland	MS	38733
Jackson State University	Jackson	MS	39217
Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning	Jackson	MS	39211
Mississippi University for Women	Columbus	MS	39701

Mississippi Valley State University	Itta Bena	MS	38941
University of Southern Mississippi	Hattiesburg	MS	39406
<b>MONTANA</b>			
Montana State University, Billings	Billings	MT	59101
Montana State University, Northern	Havre	MT	59501
Montana Tech of The University of Montana	Butte	MT	59701
University of Montana Western	Dillon	MT	59725
<b>NEBRASKA</b>			
Chadron State College	Chadron	NE	69337
Nebraska State Colleges	Lincoln	NE	68509
University of Nebraska	Lincoln	NE	68509
University of Nebraska at Kearney	Kearney	NE	68849
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Omaha	NE	68182
Wayne State College	Wayne	NE	68787
<b>NEVADA</b>			
Nevada State College	Henderson	NV	89002
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Las Vegas	NV	89154
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>			
Keene State College	Keene	NH	03435
Plymouth State University	Plymouth	NH	03264
University System of New Hampshire		NH	
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>			
Montclair State University	Montclair	NJ	07043
New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities	Trenton	NJ	08608
New Jersey City University	Jersey City	NJ	07305
Ramapo College of New Jersey	Mahwah	NJ	07430
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Pomona	NJ	08240
Rowan University	Glassboro	NJ	08028
The College of New Jersey	Ewing	NJ	08628

Thomas Edison State College	Trenton	NJ	08608
William Paterson University of New Jersey	Wayne	NJ	07470
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>			
Eastern New Mexico University	Portales	NM	88130
New Mexico Higher Education Department	Santa Fe	NM	87505
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas	NM	87701
Western New Mexico University	Silver City	NM	88061
<b>NEW YORK</b>			
City University of New York	New York	NY	10075
City University of New York Lehman College	Bronx	NY	10468
City University of New York, Baruch College	New York	NY	10010
City University of New York, Brooklyn College	Brooklyn	NY	11210
City University of New York, College of Staten Island	Staten Island	NY	10314
City University of New York, Hunter College	New York	NY	10021
City University of New York, John Jay College of Criminal Justice	New York	NY	10019
City University of New York, Medgar Evers College	Brooklyn	NY	11225
City University of New York, Queens College	Flushing	NY	11367
City University of New York, York College	Jamacia	NY	11451
The City College of New York, CUNY	New York	NY	10075
Farmingdale State College (SUNY)	Farmingdale	NY	11735
Purchase College, State University of New York	Purchase	NY	10577
State University of New York	New York	NY	10018
State University of New York - Empire State College	Saratoga Springs	NY	12866
State University of New York at Fredonia	Fredonia	NY	14063
State University of New York at New Paltz	New Paltz	NY	12561
State University of New York College at Brockport	Brockport	NY	14420
State University of New York College at Buffalo	Buffalo	NY	14222
State University of New York College at Cortland	Cortland	NY	13045
State University of New York at Geneseo	Geneseo	NY	14454

State University of New York College at Old Westbury	Old Westbury	NY	11568
State University of New York College at Oneonta	Oneonta	NY	13820
State University of New York College at Oswego	Oswego	NY	13126
State University of New York College at Plattsburgh	Plattsburgh	NY	12901
State University of New York College at Potsdam	Potsdam	NY	13676
State University of New York College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill	Cobleskill	NY	12043
State University of New York College of Technology at Alfred	Alfred	NY	14802
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>			
Appalachian State University	Boone	NC	28608
East Carolina University	Greenville	NC	27858
Elizabeth City State University	Elizabeth City	NC	27909
Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville	NC	28301
North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University	Greensboro	NC	27411
North Carolina Central University	Durham	NC	27707
University of North Carolina at Asheville	Asheville	NC	28804
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	Charlotte	NC	28223
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Greensboro	NC	27402
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Pembroke	NC	28372
University of North Carolina at Wilmington	Wilmington	NC	28403
Western Carolina University	Cullowhee	NC	28723
Winston-Salem State University	Winston-Salem	NC	
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>			
Dickinson State University	Dickinson	ND	58601
Mayville State University	Mayville	ND	58257
Minot State University	Minot	ND	58707
North Dakota University System Office	Bismarck	ND	58505
University of North Dakota	Grand Forks	ND	58202
Valley City State University	Valley City	ND	58072
<b>OHIO</b>			

Bowling Green State University	Bowling Green	OH	43403
Central State University	Wilberforce	OH	45384
Cleveland State University	Cleveland	OH	44115
Kent State University Stark Campus	North Canton	OH	44720
Shawnee State University	Portsmouth	OH	45662
The University of Akron	Akron	OH	44325
Wright State University	Dayton	OH	45435
Youngstown State University	Youngstown	OH	44555
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>			
Cameron University	Lawton	OK	73505
East Central University	Ada	OK	74820
Langston University	Langston	OK	73050
Northeastern State University	Tahlequah	OK	74464
Northwestern Oklahoma State University	Alva	OK	73717
Oklahoma Panhandle State University	Goodwell	OK	73939
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Oklahoma City	OK	73104
Rogers State University	Claremore	OK	74017
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	Durant	OK	74701
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	Weatherford	OK	73096
University of Central Oklahoma	Edmond	OK	73034
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma	Chickasha	OK	73018
<b>OREGON</b>			
Eastern Oregon University	La Grande	OR	97850
Oregon Institute of Technology	Klamath Falls	OR	97601
Portland State University	Portland	OR	97207
Southern Oregon University	Ashland	OR	97520
Western Oregon University	Monmouth	OR	97361
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>			
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Bloomsburg	PA	17815

California University of Pennsylvania	California	PA	15419
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Cheyney	PA	19319
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Clarion	PA	16214
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	East Stroudsburg	PA	18301
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Indiana	PA	15705
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Kutztown	PA	19530
Lincoln University of Pennsylvania	Lincoln University	PA	19352
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Lock Haven	PA	17745
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Mansfield	PA	16933
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Millersville	PA	17551
Penn State Altoona	Altoona	PA	16601
Penn State Erie, The Behrend College	Erie	PA	16563
Penn State Harrisburg	Middletown	PA	17057
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	Harrisburg	PA	17110
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Shippensburg	PA	17257
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Slippery Rock	PA	16057
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford	Bradford	PA	16701
University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg	Greensburg	PA	15601
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown	Johnstown	PA	15904
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	West Chester	PA	19383
<b>PUERTO RICO</b>			
University of Puerto Rico at Arecibo	Arecibo	PR	00614
University of Puerto Rico at Bayamon	Bayamon	PR	00960
University of Puerto Rico at Carolina	Carolina	PR	00984
University of Puerto Rico at Humacao	Humacao	PR	00791
University of Puerto Rico Cayey	Cayey	PR	00736
University of Puerto Rico in Ponce	Ponce	PR	00716
University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez	Mayaguez	PR	00681
University of Puerto Rico Rio Piedras	Rio Piedras	PR	00931



**RHODE ISLAND**

Rhode Island College	Providence	RI	02908
----------------------	------------	----	-------

**SOUTH CAROLINA**

Clemson University	Clemson	SC	29634
--------------------	---------	----	-------

Coastal Carolina University	Conway	SC	29528
-----------------------------	--------	----	-------

College of Charleston	Charleston	SC	29424
-----------------------	------------	----	-------

Francis Marion University	Florence	SC	29506
---------------------------	----------	----	-------

Lander University	Greenwood	SC	29649
-------------------	-----------	----	-------

South Carolina State University	Orangeburg	SC	29117
---------------------------------	------------	----	-------

The Citadel - The Military College of South Carolina	Charleston	SC	29409
--	------------	----	-------

University of South Carolina Aiken	Aiken	SC	29801
------------------------------------	-------	----	-------

University of South Carolina Beaufort	Beaufort	SC	29902
---------------------------------------	----------	----	-------

University of South Carolina Upstate	Spartanburg	SC	29303
--------------------------------------	-------------	----	-------

Winthrop University	Rock Hill	SC	29733
---------------------	-----------	----	-------

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Black Hills State University	Spearfish	SD	57799
------------------------------	-----------	----	-------

Dakota State University	Madison	SD	57042
-------------------------	---------	----	-------

Northern State University	Aberdeen	SD	57401
---------------------------	----------	----	-------

South Dakota Board of Regents	Pierre	SD	57501
-------------------------------	--------	----	-------

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Rapid City	SD	57701
---	------------	----	-------

University of South Dakota	Vermillion	SD	57069
----------------------------	------------	----	-------

**TENNESSEE**

Austin Peay State University	Clarksville	TN	37044
------------------------------	-------------	----	-------

East Tennessee State University	Johnson City	TN	37614
---------------------------------	--------------	----	-------

Middle Tennessee State University	Murfreesboro	TN	37132
-----------------------------------	--------------	----	-------

Tennessee Board of Regents	Nashville	TN	37217
----------------------------	-----------	----	-------

Tennessee State University	Nashville	TN	37209
----------------------------	-----------	----	-------

Tennessee Technological University	Cookeville	TN	38505
------------------------------------	------------	----	-------

University of Memphis	Memphis	TN	38152
-----------------------	---------	----	-------

University of Tennessee	Knoxville	TN	37996
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Chattanooga	TN	37403
University of Tennessee at Martin	Martin	TN	38238
<b>TEXAS</b>			
Angelo State University	San Angelo	TX	76909
Lamar University	Beaumont	TX	77705
Midwestern State University	Wichita Falls	TX	76308
Prairie View A&M University	Prairie View	TX	77446
Sam Houston State University	Huntsville	TX	77341
Stephen F. Austin State University	Nacogdoches	TX	75962
Sul Ross State University	Alpine	TX	79832
Tarleton State University	Stephenville	TX	76402
Texas A&M International University	Laredo	TX	78041
Texas A&M University-Commerce	Commerce	TX	75429
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	TX	78412
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	Kingsville	TX	78363
Texas A&M University-Texarkana	Texarkana	TX	75505
Texas Southern University	Houston	TX	77004
Texas State University System	Austin	TX	78701
Texas State University-San Marcos	San Marcos	TX	78666
Texas Woman's University	Denton	TX	76204
The University of Texas at San Antonio	San Antonio	TX	78249
University of Houston-Clear Lake	Houston	TX	77058
University of Houston-Downtown	Houston	TX	77002
University of Houston-Victoria	Victoria	TX	77901
University of North Texas	Denton	TX	76203
University of Texas at Arlington	Arlington	TX	76019
University of Texas at Brownsville	Brownsville	TX	78520
University of Texas at Dallas	Richardson	TX	75080

University of Texas at Tyler	Tyler	TX	75799
University of Texas of the Permian Basin	Odessa	TX	79762
West Texas A & M University	Canyon	TX	79016
<b>UTAH</b>			
Southern Utah University	Cedar City	UT	84720
Utah System of Higher Education	Salt Lake City	UT	84101
Utah Valley University	Orem	UT	84058
Weber State University	Ogden	UT	84408
<b>VERMONT</b>			
Castleton State College	Castleton	VT	05735
Johnson State College	Johnson	VT	05656
Lyndon State College	Lyndonville	VT	05851
Vermont State Colleges	Waterbury	VT	05676
<b>VIRGIN ISLANDS</b>			
University of the Virgin Islands	Charlotte Amalie	VI	00802
<b>VIRGINIA</b>			
George Mason University	Fairfax	VA	22030
James Madison University	Harrisonburg	VA	22807
Longwood University	Farmville	VA	23909
Norfolk State University	Norfolk	VA	23504
Old Dominion University	Norfolk	VA	23529
Radford University	Radford	VA	24141
The University of Virginia's College at Wise	Wise	VA	24293
University of Mary Washington	Fredericksburg	VA	22401
<b>WASHINGTON</b>			
Central Washington University	Ellensburg	WA	98926
Eastern Washington University	Cheney	WA	99004
University of Washington, Tacoma	Tacoma	WA	98402
Western Washington University	Bellingham	WA	98225

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Bluefield State College	Bluefield	WV	24701
Concord University	Athens	WV	24712
Fairmont State University	Fairmont	WV	26554
Glenville State College	Glenville	WV	26351
Shepherd University	Shepherdstown	WV	25443
West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission	Charleston	WV	25301
West Virginia State University	Institute	WV	25112
West Virginia University Institute of Technology	Montgomery	WV	25136

**WISCONSIN**

University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire	Eau Claire	WI	54702
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay	Green Bay	WI	54311
University of Wisconsin - La Crosse	La Crosse	WI	54601
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh	Oshkosh	WI	54901
University of Wisconsin - Parkside	Kenosha	WI	53144
University of Wisconsin - Platteville	Platteville	WI	53818
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point	Stevens Point	WI	54481
University of Wisconsin - Stout	Menomonie	WI	54751
University of Wisconsin - Superior	Superior	WI	54880
University of Wisconsin - Whitewater	Whitewater	WI	53190
University of Wisconsin System	Madison	WI	53706
University of Wisconsin-River Falls	River Falls	WI	54022

APPENDIX D

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT DATA AT PUBLIC MASTER'S COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES BY GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATION

*Number and Percent of Total for Undergraduate, Graduate, and First-Professional Enrollments at Publicly-Controlled Master's Colleges and Universities by Geographical Reclassification: 2006-07*

	Institutions		Enrollments by Level of Student				Total Enrollments	
	No.	%	Undergraduate	%	Graduate	%	No.	%
Rural Small	26	10%	127,691	5%	15,787	3%	143,478	5%
Rural Medium	46	17%	277,729	11%	47,880	8%	325,609	11%
Rural Large	91	34%	873,757	35%	212,143	36%	1,085,900	35%
Rural Total	163	61%	1,279,177	51%	275,810	47%	1,554,987	50%
Suburban Small	3	1%	24,415	1%	1,564	0%	25,979	1%
Suburban Medium	12	5%	62,632	2%	10,845	2%	73,477	2%
Suburban Large	41	15%	546,118	22%	148,785	25%	694,903	22%
Suburban Total	56	21%	633,165	25%	161,194	28%	794,359	26%
Urban Small	2	1%	17,537	1%	1,597	0%	19,134	1%
Urban Medium	11	4%	103,209	4%	15,950	3%	119,159	4%
Urban Large	33	12%	474,791	19%	128,980	22%	603,771	20%
Urban Total	46	17%	595,537	24%	146,527	25%	742,064	24%
R, S, & U Total	265	100%	2,507,879	100%	583,531	100%	3,091,410	100%
Special Use	1	0%	0	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	266	100%	2,507,879	100%	583,531	100%	3,091,410	100%

Data Source: NCES/IPEDS, 12 Month Enrollment; 2006-07

APPENDIX E  
IRB APPROVAL

Office for Research

Office of the Director of  
Research Compliance

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**ALABAMA**

April 3, 2009

John Clinton Kinkead  
Department of ELPTS  
College of Education  
Box 870231

Re: IRB: EX-09-CM-023, A Geographical Classification of Master's  
Colleges and Universities

Dear Mr. Kinkead:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part 46.101 (b)(4) as outlined below:

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

This approval expires on April 3, 2010. You will receive a notice of expiration, 90 days in advance. If the study continues beyond that date, you must complete the appropriate portion of the Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, please complete the Continuing Review and Closure Form for closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this application, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM  
Director of Research Compliance & Research Compliance Officer  
Office of Research Compliance  
The University of Alabama



152 Rose Administration Building  
Box 870104  
Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 35487-0104  
(205) 348-5152  
fax (205) 348-8882