

The Growing Family Burden of Higher Education in Kentucky¹

by

Robert E Martin

Emeritus Professor of Economics

Centre College

Danville, KY 40422

bmart@centre.edu

November, 2009

I. Introduction.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education publishes a biannual “report card” on higher education by state. The most recent report is entitled *Measuring Up 2008: The State Report Card on Higher Education*. States are graded with respect to preparation, participation, affordability, completion, benefits, and learning. In the 2008 issue, Kentucky received a C in preparation, a C in participation, an F in affordability, a B in completion, a D+ in benefits, and an incomplete in learning.

The Center’s study provides considerable information and it serves a useful public purpose by focusing attention on higher education issues. On the other hand, studies like this can mislead. As is always the case, one has to analyze the study in order to get a clear picture. Reading the press releases and looking at your state’s grades are not sufficient to really understand the issues raised by the report. For example, it is frequently argued that these studies suggest public support for higher education is low in the states that receive low grades. A low affordability score is thought to mean public financial support in that state is low and that taxpayers should be willing to pay higher taxes to support higher education. A closer look at the report reveals there is more to the issue than taxpayer’s unwillingness to pay taxes.

¹ This research was supported in part by a grant from The Family Foundation of Kentucky.

This paper is an analysis of the report itself with specific focus on Kentucky and the affordability issue. In the following section, I review the criterion by which states are graded with detailed focus on affordability. An analysis of the burden imposed on households is contained in the third section and it reveals that the real burden is sensitive to the total cost of attending and median household incomes, not just public support for higher education. In other words, taxpayers can be very generous and the burden can still increase. In the fourth section, I present a detailed analysis of financial burdens by sector, by institution, and for the state. This analysis reveals that the financial burden on households has continued to rise in Kentucky. In the fifth section, I review total expenditures per student, federal support per student, state/local support per student, and enrollment by sector, institution, and the state. This analysis reveals total expenditures, federal support, state/local support, and enrollment continue to grow. Conclusions and recommendations are considered in the final section.

II. Measurement Criterion

The National Center measures preparation by the percent of 18 to 24 year old adults with a high school degree. The preparation criterion is considered over the period from 1990 to 2006 in the most recent report and states are graded according to improvements in preparation. Participation is measured by the percent of 18 to 24 year olds who are enrolled in college. Again, the measure is taken over the period from 1991 to 2007 and states are graded according to improvements in participation. Affordability is measured by the percent of income required to pay for all college expenses at four year public institutions in the state. The incomes used in the analysis are median family incomes by quintile in the income distribution. The college expenses are the net expenses paid by families; they equal the total cost of attendance less state/local grants per student, federal grants per student, and institutional grants per student. This measure represents the financial burden imposed on the representative family to send one child to college each year and is computed over the period from 1999 to 2007. Completion is measured by the percent of students who complete their degrees within six years; the series is computed from 1992 to 2007. Benefits are measured by the percent of 25 to 64 year old adults who have a bachelor's degree or higher from 1990 to 2006. The learning criterion is supposed to measure the value added by higher education in each state.

The National Center's report awards a variety of grades for different states for preparation, participation, completion, and benefits. These grades reflect the Center's

confidence in its ability to discriminate between states based on these criteria. The real national story about higher education in the Center's report concerns affordability and learning. The report focuses our attention on the two pressing issues for higher education: cost and value added (quality).

Every state in the country got an incomplete in the learning category. The Center's point is no state provides enough information that would allow the public, or the Center for that matter, to judge how much value is added by higher education. Without this information, students, parents, and the public are unable to determine what they are actually paying for. The issue reflects the lack of transparency and accountability in higher education throughout the country.

With the exception of California, every state in the country got an F in affordability. California got a C-. This result reflects the well-documented cost problem in higher education. Costs have been rising faster than incomes for several decades and higher education costs have been rising faster than any other sector in the economy, including healthcare costs. Since 1982-84, tuition and fees have risen by 439%, while healthcare costs rose 251% over that same period. Over this period, healthcare quality has steadily improved, while one is hard pressed to find evidence that higher education quality has not declined. It is interesting to note that California faces critical budget problems and faces bankruptcy if it cannot reconcile its budget problems. Making higher education affordable in the face of rapidly rising costs has played some role in California's financial problems.

III. Affordability and Access.

The affordability question is really about access to higher education for low income students. As the rate of growth in median household incomes has barely kept pace with inflation over the last several decades, the college access issue has grown in importance. The US's remarkable prosperity is primarily the story of upward economic mobility among individuals and households. Education at all levels is a vital part of the ladder that individuals and households use to climb the income distribution. Economic mobility is essential for economic efficiency and prosperity. If individuals and households are not prepared for college and/or do not have access to education, they cannot climb the ladder.

More importantly, a careful study of the income distribution statistics reveals the increasing importance of marketable skills in determining lifetime income (Bound and Johnson,

1992). The gap between the low income quintile and the high income quintile has widened steadily (Fernandez-Kranz, 2006; Danziger and Gottschalk, 1995).

The economic explanation for the gap is due to increasing demand for knowledge workers and the increasing gap is the reward to those willing and able to invest in the acquisition of marketable skills. This is the market based explanation for the income distribution. A corollary to this argument is that labor markets have become more international, so low skilled workers in the US now find themselves in competition with low skilled workers elsewhere; this tends to drive low skilled wages down in the US (Wood, 1995). The market based explanation presumes individuals will respond to the higher incentives paid to skilled workers and the gap will narrow as more unskilled workers acquire marketable skills. If individuals and households respond to the incentives, they climb the income distribution, economic mobility takes place, and the result is efficient.

The beneficent outcome implied by the market based argument assumes low income students are prepared for college, have access to education, and have the means/motivation to acquire marketable skills; so, affordability and preparation are necessary conditions for market incentives to work efficiently. It is obvious the affordability issue is a critical component of economic mobility and rising real incomes.

There are other important nuances to be derived from a careful review of the income distribution. Consider the distribution of incomes around the median income for a high school graduate and the distribution of incomes around the median income for a college graduate. The gap analysis above reveals that the difference between the median income for a college graduate and the median income for a high school graduate has risen steadily over the past decades. This means the return on a college education has risen over time. However, looking at the median income gap can be misleading, because both distributions have become much more dispersed overtime. The lower tail of the income distribution for college graduates overlaps the upper tail for the income distribution for high school graduates. What does this mean?

It means college majors are important. Choosing some majors can result in a lifetime income little different than what one would receive with a high school education. The return on that education investment is zero or negative. Since low income students can be saddled with considerable debt after graduation, they and their families experience an undue financial

hardship. It is cruel to encourage low income students to go to college if it does not improve their expected income and burdens them with debt.

Additional insights can be obtained by studying how affordability is measured. Let the index of financial burden be 'B,' let the total attendance price be 'P,' let federal grants per student be 'F,' let state/local grants per student be 'S,' let institutional grants be 'I,' and let

median income be 'M;' then the index of financial burden is $B = \frac{P - F - S - I}{M}$. The numerator in this ratio is the net attendance price, the cost to students after all grants have been applied. As B increases, the financial burden imposed by college costs on median households increases; families must make greater sacrifices and students wind up with more debt after graduation. As B decreases, the financial burden declines.

The first thing to notice is that the financial burden does not depend exclusively on how much federal student support or state/local student support is available. Both F and S can rise briskly over time and the index of financial burden can still increase. If the attendance price (P) grows faster than public support (F, S, and I) and still faster than median income, the burden will rise. In other words, taxpayer's can be very diligent in their support of higher education and affordability can still decline (the burden rises). This is what has been happening across the board in higher education for the past three decades.

Who is responsible for P, the total attendance price? The total attendance price is determined by the higher education establishment, primarily the administrators of these institutions. As long as P grows faster than everything else, affordability worsens and economic mobility declines. Ironically, *higher education institutions are responsible for making the access problem worse*. Furthermore, the access problem can never be solved until higher education costs, P, are brought under control and costs will never be controlled under the current governance structure. Costs are constrained only by available revenues, since colleges and universities spend whatever they have available. Any relief in revenues, increases costs. When taxpayers provide more support for students, colleges and universities recapture the student's new found ability to pay with higher tuition and fees, effectively canceling the burden relief.

This behavior threatens the social contract that has supported higher education for generations. Under the social contract, the older generation agrees to subsidize the education of the younger generation (as their education was subsidized by a previous generation) with the

understanding that the younger generation will pass the subsidy along to the following generation when their time comes. *The higher education establishment is the third party to this contract. Indeed, the higher education establishment is the steward of the contract. The higher education establishment is responsible for keeping the cost reasonable and for maintaining quality.* The higher education establishment is failing on both counts and the social contract is in danger.

IV. Kentucky Burden by Sector, Institution, and the State.

Using the same methodology as the Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, I drew data from the National Center for Education Statistics on each public 4 year and above institution, public 2 year institution, and private 4 year and above institution in Kentucky. Generally, the data covers the period from academic year 2000 through academic year 2006, which is the most recent year for which data was available.

Table 1 contains data for the public 4 year institutions. The weighted average burden for all institutions grew from 12% in 2000 to 14.4% in 2006. What is interesting is the variation in the burden calculations for individual institutions. Even though the University of Louisville's total cost of attendance grew at a 3.5% compound growth rate over the period, it reduced its burden from 21.2% of median household income to 13.4% in 2006. They accomplished this improvement by increasing student support faster than the total cost of attendance increased, lowering the net cost of attendance. In contrast, the University of Kentucky's burden grew from 10.3% in 2000 to 18% in 2006. It is instructive to compare the compound growth rates in the total attendance price at each institution and the compound growth rate in median household income, every attendance price growth rate is at least double the growth rate in median household income.

Table 2 contains the data for the public 2 year institutions. The weighted average burden for all institutions fell from 17.4% in 2000 to 16.1% in 2006. Four of the sixteen institutions reduced their burden over this period: Elizabethtown C and T College, Hopkinsville C College, Jefferson C and T College, and Somerset College. Owensboro C and T College had the largest increase in burden. Again, the compound growth rates in the attendance price at each institution greatly exceeded the growth rate in median household income.

Table 3 contains the data for the private 4 year institutions. The weighted average burden for all private institutions grew from 22.2% in 2002 (earliest available data) to 27% in 2006. The

unique nature of Berea College is reflected in these data. Since every student is on full scholarship and must work at Berea, their burden is negative. It can actually be considered a subsidy to the low income families of students who attend Berea. Three institutions reduced their burden over this period: Asbury College, Kentucky Wesleyan College, and Thomas More College. Brescia College kept its burden constant, while all the other institutions increased their burden. The colleges that reduced or kept their burdens constant achieved this result by keeping the net price of attendance from exceeding the growth rate in median household income. Spalding University had the largest increase in burden. As with the public institutions, the growth rate in the attendance price significantly exceeded the growth rate in median household income.

The forgoing reveals the very high compound growth rates in the attendance price are responsible for Kentucky's college access problem. For example, suppose the compound growth rates in the attendance price had been capped at the same growth rate as median household income for the periods under study (3%). Had this been the case, the burden imposed by each public 4 year institution would have fallen and the weighted average burden would have fallen from 12% to 6.5%. Similarly, the weighted average burden imposed by the public 2 year institutions would have declined from 17.4% to 7% and the weighted average burden imposed by the private 4 year institutions would have declined from 22.2% to 14.3%. These reductions in the burden index are substantial for each higher education sector. Most importantly, this analysis reveals the problem is not a lack of public and private charitable support for students; it is the result of poor cost control by higher education institutions.

V. Appropriations, Grants, Contracts, and Gifts.

Public and private institutions are engaged in activities other than housing, feeding, and teaching students and the amount they charge students to attend the institution is less than the total amount each institution spends per full time student. Furthermore, all of the institution's activities are supported by appropriations, grants, contracts, and gifts from the federal government, state/local government, and private benefactors. In other words, total expenditure per full time student exceeds the total attendance price per student. Public colleges and universities frequently argue they are forced to raise tuition and fees because state governments do not provide adequate appropriations support.

Table 4 contains total expenditures per FTE, total state/local support per FTE, total federal support per FTE, and total full time equivalent enrollment for the public 4 year institutions. The compound growth rates for state/local support vary from .6% to 5.1%. The compound growth rates for federal support vary from 2.8% to 17.8%. Federal support has been more forthcoming than state support per student. Given the slow growth in median household income, the state/local tax burden represented by state/local support for public higher education seems to be about constant and was more than offset by increased federal support.

Table 5 contains total expenditure per FTE, total state/local support per FTE, total federal support per FTE, and total full time equivalent enrollment for the public 2 year institutions. A comparison of the results in Tables 4 and 5 is very instructive. The public 2 year institutions are much simpler institutions, almost all of their activities relate to teaching students; they are not complicated by other missions. As enrollment increases, average expenditure per student tends to decline due to returns to scale. Both of the institutions that reduced expenditures per student experienced enrollment increases over that period. The institutions that experienced declines in enrollment have larger increases in expenditures per student. Notably, the rate of growth in state/local support was robust, although federal support tended to decline.

Table 6 contains expenditure per FTE, private support per FTE, public support per FTE, and full time equivalent enrollment for private 4 year institutions. Private institutions may argue that they are forced to raise the total attendance price at rates that significantly exceed the inflation rate if they have little private support, or that private support is declining. The data in Table 6 reveals that several private institutions are indeed experiencing significant declines in private support per student. On the other hand, several private institutions have experienced handsome increases in private support per student. Ironically, the private institutions with increasing private support also had growth rates in the total attendance price that significantly exceeded the inflation rate.

On the whole, the case that institutions are forced to raise the cost of attendance rapidly because of inadequate public and private support seems weak. The case can be made for a subset of the private 4 year institutions that have limited private support and are tuition driven. It is more likely that institutions use their own uncontrolled historical costs to justify increases in tuition and fees. As we have seen, this has a very damaging effect on low income college access in Kentucky.

VI. Conclusions.

Kentucky ranked number 48 among the states in 2007 with respect to median household income; hence, it is a low income state with a big college access problem (US Census Bureau). Economic conditions in Kentucky improve when residents earn higher real incomes and Kentucky residents can earn higher real incomes only if they acquire more and better marketable skills. Therefore, the higher education attendance price should be a primary public policy variable for state economic development.

The attendance price should not be left to higher education institutions, particularly since they have not been responsible in the past. As federal, state, and private gift support to college students increases, students and their families recapture part of the purchasing power they would have lost if they paid for college without this support. Higher education institutions, public and private, recapture that purchasing power by raising the attendance price. The institutions know they can do this because the student's ability to pay for college is increased every time direct subsidies to students increase. Without controlling the attendance price, the public can never solve the college access problem. More direct subsidies to students raise attendance prices, increase college and university revenues and increase higher education costs because colleges and universities spend every dollar in revenue they have. This is a cycle the public can never catch up with and it is at the heart of the higher education cost control problem.

Student preparation for college is another important policy variable for state economic development. It will avail the state little benefit if it lowers the financial burden associated with higher education only to find low income students are not prepared to take advantage of the opportunity created.

The analysis in this paper reveals that had the growth rate in the total attendance price been capped at the same rate of growth as median household income (3%), the weighted average financial burden for public 4 year institutions would have declined by 46% from academic year 2000 through academic year 2006. Capping the growth rate in the total attendance price at public 2 year institutions would have lowered the financial burden by 60% over the same period. Similarly, if private 4 year institutions had capped their growth rates in the total attendance price, the financial burden would have declined by 36%. This suggests a state policy for lowering the financial burden and improving college access.

The program has seven component parts. The first part limits the growth in the attendance price to the growth rate in median household incomes in Kentucky. There are several ways to do this; some involve a heavier hand than others. Simply capping the growth rate at that number is the most direct way. Another way would be to devise incentives and disincentives for institutions to keep the growth in the attendance price in line with the growth in median family incomes.

The second part of the program is to set the growth rate in direct state grants to low income students at a growth rate that is higher than the growth rate in median household income. The first two parts of the program would insure that the financial burden would decline and college access would increase. It would not insure that the education quality did not decline. In order to do that the state will have to get total cost per student under control.

The third part of the program establishes a “firewall” between the revenues generated by tuition/fees, federal student grants, state/local student grants, and the part of state appropriations dedicated to undergraduate instruction. Colleges and universities engage in activities other than undergraduate teaching; the firewall is necessary to prevent them from using undergraduate revenues to subsidize these other activities and to insure that revenues the public wants applied to undergraduate education actually get applied to undergraduate education.

The fourth part of the program requires governing boards to hold senior administrators responsible for effective cost control. Boards place too much emphasis on fund raising and too little emphasis on using resources efficiently.

The fifth part of the program is designed to reinforce the previous four parts. Each institution should be required to report the number of staff members employed in each overhead activity for the last ten years. Staff to student ratios should be calculated for each activity and those trends monitored. There should be significant returns to scale in these overhead activities, meaning the staff to student ratios should decline over time. If the ratios do not decline, it suggests expenses in that overhead activity are excessive.

The sixth part of the program is to steer more high school graduates to the public 2 year institutions with shorter programs to teach marketable skills. Every high school graduate should not attend a 4 year college program. Students who are unprepared for college or are more interested in becoming skilled workers in jobs that do not require a college education should have the opportunity to acquire those skills.

The seventh and final part of the program would be an audit of all programs/activities the college or university engages in. The highest priority for activities carried out by higher education institutions should be: How does this activity help Kentucky's economic development? What does the program do for economic mobility? If a tight connection can be found for that activity, then it should be a top priority for the institution. Institutions must acknowledge that all activities are not equally important; some should have higher priority than others.

Clearly, colleges and universities serve constituents other than low income students. The purpose of the aforementioned audit is to identify programs/activities that should be self-supporting. If the activity does not enable economic development, it should generate its own revenues and be self-sustaining.

Recessions lower the opportunity cost of education and unemployment leaves young people with time that could be used to further their education. It will be a tragedy if higher education institutions use the current state budget problem as an excuse to raise the attendance price. This should be an opportune time for low income students to attend college.

References

- Symposia: "Income Inequality and Trade," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(3), Summer 1995, pp 15-80.
- Freeman, Richard B. "Are Your Wages Set in Beijing?"
Richardson, J. David "Income Inequality and Trade: How to Think, What to Conclude."
Wood, Adrian "How Trade Hurt Unskilled Workers."
- Bound, John, and George Johnson. 1992. "Changes in the Structure of Wages in the 1980's: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations." *American Economic Review* 82(3): 371-392.
- Burtless, Gary. 1993. "The Contribution of Employment and Hours Changes to Family Income Inequality." *American Economic Review* 83 (May): 131-135.
- Dansiger, Sheldon and Peter Gottschalk. 1985. "A Framework for Evaluating the Effects of Economic Growth and Transfers on Poverty." *American Economic Review* 75 (March): 153-161.
- _____, and Eugene Smolensky. 1989. "How the Rich Have Fared, 1973-1987." *American Economic Review* 79(May): 310-314.
- _____. 1995. *America Unequal*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Fernández-Kranz, Daniel, "Why has wage inequality increased more in the United States than in Europe: an empirical investigation of the demand and supply of skill," *Applied Economics*, Vol. 38, April 2006).
- Galor, Oded and Daniel Tsiddon. 1996. "Income Distribution and Growth: The Kuznets Hypothesis Revisited." *Economica* 63: S103-S117.
- National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education.
- The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, *Measuring Up 2008: The State Report Card on Higher Education*, 152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, California 95112

U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Ranking Tables, Median Household
Income, 2007.

Table 1
Public 4 year and above Institutions

Institutions	Household Burden		Total Attendance			Net Attendance		Growth Rate
	AY 99/00	AY 05/06	Price AY 99/00	AY 05/06	Growth Rate	Price AY 99/00	AY 05/06	
Eastern Kentucky University	15.1	16.9	8488	13494	7.7	4974	6641	4.8
Kentucky State University		15.8	6335	12650	11.5		6223	
University of Kentucky	10.3	18.0	10526	17236	8.2	3379	7086	12.3
University of Louisville	21.2	13.4	13815	17062	3.5	6969	5260	-4.7
Morehead State University	9.2	8.9	7910	12778	8.0	3037	3510	2.4
Murray State University	6.8	6.5	8195	12236	6.7	2230	2578	2.4
Northern Kentucky University	12.9	15.8	9282	14262	7.2	4232	6210	6.4
Western Kentucky University	8.3	12.8	8497	13648	7.9	2731	5053	10.3
Weighted Average Value	12.0	14.4	9906	14949	6.9	3957	5682	6.0
Median Household Income	32862	39372			3.0			

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education, data cutting tool. U. S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Ranking Tables, Median Household Income.

Table 2
Public 2 year Institutions

Institutions	Household Burden		Total Attendance			Net Attendance		
	AY	AY	Price		Growth	Price		Growth
	99/00	05/06	AY	AY	Rate	AY	AY	Rate
Ashland C and T College	13.1	21.5	7611	12906	8.8	4313	7058	8.2
Bowling Green T College	13.7	23.1	6974	12906	10.3	4494	7606	8.8
Bluegrass C and T College	10.6	13.1	5374	12906	14.6	3475	4290	3.5
Elizabethtown C and T College	25.2	18.0	8280	12906	7.4	8277	5910	-5.6
Hazard C and T College	17.8	18.5	8810	12906	6.4	5854	6070	0.6
Henderson C College	17.1	23.1	8320	12906	7.3	5606	7604	5.1
Hopkinsville C College	25.3	19.7	8330	12906	7.3	8327	6490	-4.2
Jefferson C and T College	27.7	20.2	9106	12906	5.8	9103	6634	-5.3
Madisonville C College	12.3	20.8	7720	12906	8.6	4030	6839	8.8
Maysville C and T College	12.2	19.1	8220	12906	7.5	4019	6273	7.4
Gateway C and T College	13.6	19.6	5392	12906	14.5	4465	6426	6.1
West Kentucky C and T College	12.4	21.9	8234	12906	7.5	4091	7185	9.4
Big Sandy C and T College	14.8	21.7	7961	12906	8.1	4868	7138	6.4
Somerset C College	26.6	15.2	8760	12906	6.5	8757	4999	-9.3
Southeast Kentucky C and T College	12.3	19.0	8310	13050	7.5	4048	6238	7.2
Owensboro C and T College	8.3	23.6	7720	12906	8.6	2720	7767	17.5
Weighted Average Value	17.4	16.1	8189	12913	7.6	6166	6239	0.2
Median Household Income	32862	39372			3.0			

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education, data cutting tool. U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Ranking Tables, Median Household Income.

Table 3
Private 4 year Institutions

Institution	Household Burden		Total Attendance			Net Attendance		
	AY	AY	Price		Growth	Price		Growth
	01/02	05/06	AY	AY	Rate	AY	AY	Rate
Alice Lloyd College	2.2	11.9	8380	15010	14.6	778	4701	45.0
Asbury College	35.6	30.6	21038	27944	7.1	12458	12038	-0.9
Bellarmine University	35.8	49.2	23040	36314	11.4	12515	19355	10.9
Berea College	-44.5	-58.3	6250	8505	7.7	-15577	-22950	
Brescia University	20.2	20.2	16825	22200	6.9	7062	7954	3.0
Campbellsville University	23.3	30.1	16330	24592	10.2	8162	11862	9.3
Centre College	35.3	40.5	25650	34900	7.7	12342	15960	6.4
University of the Cumberland	21.6	25.1	16894	22824	7.5	7539	9880	6.8
Georgetown College	26.4	33.8	20120	30070	10.0	9246	13300	9.1
Kentucky Wesleyan College	50.9	21.9	17790	22200	5.5	17790	8613	-18.1
Kentucky Christian University	21.3	30.2	15596	21515	8.0	7455	11876	11.6
Lindsey Wilson College	36.9	43.7	18362	23851	6.5	12920	17197	7.1
Mid-Continent University	27.3	27.7	14270	24000	13.0	9537	10922	3.4
Midway College	27.4	36.7	18366	25400	8.1	9588	14450	10.3
Pikeville College	26.3	29.2	14500	23350	11.9	9200	11496	5.6
Saint Catharine College	18.7	30.7	13536	21430	11.5	6552	12099	15.3
Spalding University	21.4	41.9	17796	22362	5.7	7470	16488	19.8
Thomas More College	50.0	44.9	21660	29350	7.6	17475	17691	0.3
Transylvania University	33.7	35.7	23580	29950	6.0	11801	14064	4.4
Union College	21.7	28.5	17970	21750	4.8	7602	11219	9.7
Weighted Average	22.2	27.0	17886	25346	8.7	7752	10641	7.9
Median Household Income	34973	39372			3.0			

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education, data cutting tool. U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Ranking Tables, Median Household Income.

Table 4

Public 4 year Institutions

Institution	Expenditure per FTE		Growth Rate	State/Local support per FTE		Growth Rate
	AY 00/01	AY 05/06		AY 00/01	AY 05/06	
Eastern Kentucky University	15245	15469	0.3	6956	7712	2.1
Kentucky State University	28206	28215	0.0	11849	13497	2.6
University of Kentucky	55075	65069	3.3	16110	18230	2.5
University of Louisville	32475	36975	2.6	11828	12204	0.6
Morehead State University	13361	15835	3.4	6474	7492	2.9
Murray State University	14619	15450	1.1	6445	7388	2.7
Northern Kentucky University	10018	12284	4.1	4401	5680	5.1
Western Kentucky University	11955	13939	3.1	5338	6338	3.4

Institution	Federal Support per FTE		Growth Rate	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)		Growth Rate
	AY 00/01	AY 05/06		AY 00/01	AY 05/06	
Eastern Kentucky University	3333	4387	5.5	12046	13734	2.6
Kentucky State University	6559	7546	2.8	1959	1945	-0.1
University of Kentucky	4724	8975	12.8	21100	25092	3.5
University of Louisville	2644	6428	17.8	15639	17002	1.7
Morehead State University	1880	2787	7.9	7427	7433	0.0
Murray State University	1271	1523	3.6	8113	8931	1.9
Northern Kentucky University	633	958	8.3	10105	11382	2.4
Western Kentucky University	1841	2330	4.7	13763	15907	2.9

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education, data cutting tool.

Table 5
Public 2 year Institutions

Institutions	Cost per FTE AY		Growth Rate	State and Local Support per FTE		Growth Rate
	04/05	AY 05/06		AY 04/05	AY 05/06	
Ashland C and T College	7289	7963	8.8	3848	4455	14.6
Bowling Green T College	7151	7008	-2.0	4502	4528	0.6
Bluegrass C and T College	6660	6894	3.5	3085	2790	-10.1
Elizabethtown C and T College	7025	7392	5.1	3402	3875	13.0
Hazard C and T College	9914	10720	7.8	5403	5895	8.7
Henderson C College	9282	9328	0.5	5065	5298	4.5
Hopkinsville C College	7417	7739	4.2	3139	3503	11.0
Jefferson C and T College	6339	6748	6.2	2806	3214	13.6
Madisonville C College	8708	8219	-5.8	4158	4338	4.2
Maysville C and T College	7656	8228	7.2	4503	4869	7.8
Gateway C and T College	9109	9720	6.5	4813	5370	11.0
West Kentucky C and T College	5993	6638	10.2	2968	3429	14.4
Big Sandy C and T College	8054	8343	3.5	3861	4473	14.7
Somerset C College	7493	7491	0.0	3649	3664	0.4
Southeast Kentucky C and T College	8010	9038	12.1	4156	4823	14.9
Owensboro C and T College	6112	6660	8.6	2989	3398	12.8

Table 5 Cont'd
Public 2 year Institutions

Institutions	Federal Support per FTE			Full Time Enrollment		Growth Rate
	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	Growth Rate	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	
Ashland C and T College	2077	2099	1.0	2561	2546	-0.6
Bowling Green T College	1636	1400	-15.6	1420	1651	15.1
Bluegrass C and T College	1927	1771	-8.5	2326	7679	119.4
Elizabethtown C and T College	1921	1760	-8.7	3219	3211	-0.2
Hazard C and T College	3321	3151	-5.3	2523	2434	-3.6
Henderson C College	2212	2121	-4.2	1071	1085	1.3
Hopkinsville C College	2526	2589	2.5	1965	1959	-0.3
Jefferson C and T College	1484	1461	-1.6	7939	8057	1.5
Madisonville C College	3082	2636	-15.6	2237	2356	5.2
Maysville C and T College	2048	2100	2.5	1833	1946	6.0
Gateway C and T College	1992	2552	24.8	1459	1610	9.8
West Kentucky C and T College	1650	1742	5.4	3971	3870	-2.6
Big Sandy C and T College	2627	2219	-16.9	2897	2749	-5.2
Somerset C College	2826	2657	-6.2	3909	4248	8.3
Southeast Kentucky C and T College	3008	2957	-1.7	2719	2572	-5.6
Owensboro C and T College	1811	1888	4.2	2778	2806	1.0
				44827	50779	12.5

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. US Department of Education, data cutting tool.

Table 6
Private 4 year Institutions

Institution	Cost per FTE			Growth Rate	Private support per FTE			Growth Rate
	AY 02	AY 06			AY 02	AY 06		
Alice Lloyd College	16955	15314	-2.5	5743	5371	-1.7		
Asbury College	19293	21587	2.8	3811	3538	-1.9		
Bellarmino University	12261	14721	4.6	2418	5243	19.4		
Berea College	39345	41325	1.2	18398	16776	-2.3		
Brescia University	14800	17521	4.2	2981	2977	0.0		
Campbellsville University	12525	14383	3.5	2277	3929	13.6		
Centre College	28664	35356	5.2	3995	6412	11.8		
University of the Cumberlands	18932	16439	-3.5	10112	6508	-11.0		
Georgetown College	22857	21771	-1.2	6455	6553	0.4		
Kentucky Wesleyan College	14226	15981	2.9	14345	8598	-12.8		
Kentucky Christian University	19296	23942	5.4	2400	7529	28.6		
Lindsey Wilson College	17541	12163	-9.2	2282	2246	-0.4		
Mid-Continent University	9592	10090	1.3	1765	564	-28.5		
Midway College	12531	10273	-5.0	2022	2093	0.9		
Pikeville College	16537	19312	3.9	3903	2959	-6.9		
Saint Catharine College	8403	14415	13.5	4057	2995	-7.6		
Spalding University	13782	13213	-1.1	935	1494	11.7		
Thomas More College	17477	20462	3.9	2747	2901	1.4		
Transylvania University	21971	20983	-1.1	4485	4037	-2.6		
Union College	17780	11314	-11.3	2638	1135	-21.1		

Table 6 Cont'd

Institution	Private 4 year Institutions			Full Time Enrollment (FTE)		
	Public support per FTE			Growth		
	AY 02	AY 06	Growth Rate	AY 02	AY 06	Growth Rate
Alice Lloyd College	1545	1638	1.5	562	623	2.6
Asbury College	243	270	2.7	1263	1199	-1.3
Bellarmine University	217	247	3.3	2330	2535	2.1
Berea College	2650	5105	16.4	1546	1546	0.0
Brescia University	2869	867	-29.9	631	497	-6.0
Campbellsville University	1469	662	-19.9	1415	1636	3.6
Centre College	304	273	-2.7	1048	1115	1.5
University of the Cumberlands	520	415	-5.6	1501	1636	2.2
Georgetown College	337	486	9.2	1380	1610	3.9
Kentucky Wesleyan College	1302	314	-35.6	618	733	4.3
Kentucky Christian University	1784	2808	11.3	573	569	-0.2
Lindsey Wilson College	1958	621	-28.7	1421	1759	5.3
Mid-Continent University	0	235		553	819	9.8
Midway College	81	0		809	1259	11.1
Pikeville College	751	901	4.6	1161	1068	-2.1
Saint Catharine College	0	142		609	530	-3.5
Spalding University	942	757	-5.5	1264	1450	3.4
Thomas More College	80	28	-26.4	1194	1225	0.6
Transylvania University	0	0		1104	1358	5.2
Union College	2083	827	-23.1	710	1184	12.8

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, US Department of Education, data cutting tool.

