

# Seeing Part of the Picture: Who We Can (and Cannot) See in U.S. Distance Education

What Student Demographics at 100% Online  
Institutions Reveal About Exclusively Distance  
Education Enrollment

**Kevin N. Shriner, Ed.D.**

Founder and Executive Director,  
International Distance Education  
Benchmark Project (IDEBP)



## Abstract

Enrollment in distance education courses now represents a 54% share of U.S. postsecondary enrollment, yet our understanding of who distance education students are remains uneven. Using Fall 2024 IPEDS enrollment data, this paper examines the subset of institutions where exclusively distance education enrollment equals total enrollment, referred to here as 100% online institutions under an enrollment-based definition. While these institutions represent a small share of all colleges and universities, they allow for clearer observation of the demographic characteristics of exclusively distance education students. Findings indicate that meaningful insight is possible for a limited segment of the distance education landscape, even as significant portions of exclusively distance education enrollment remain only partially observable in public data.

## Introduction

In Fall 2024, degree-granting institutions reported more than 5.3 million students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses across 3,482 colleges and universities. This reflects a 103% increase in exclusively distance education enrollment since 2012, when 2.6 million students were enrolled across 3,295 degree-granting institutions. Despite this scale, discussions of distance education students often rely on broad generalizations or institutional-level proxies that obscure differences in enrollment modality.

This paper focuses on a small but analytically important segment of the distance education ecosystem: institutions where all enrolled students are reported as exclusively distance education. These institutions offer a useful lens into distance education demographics, not because they represent the typical college or university, but because their enrollment structure allows for a clearer connection between institutional-level data and student-level modality.

Throughout this paper, references to distance education, exclusively distance education, and some distance education reflect student enrollment in courses rather than enrollment in academic programs. IPEDS collects distance education data based on the modality of courses in which students are enrolled during the fall term, categorizing students as enrolled exclusively in distance education courses, enrolled in some but not all distance education courses, or enrolled entirely in in-person courses. Requirements for limited on-campus activities such as orientation, testing, or academic support services do not disqualify a course from being classified as distance education under IPEDS definitions. Institutions report student enrollments into these categories in accordance with IPEDS reporting guidance.

It is important to note that IPEDS does not disaggregate key student characteristics—such as age, gender, race and ethnicity, or attendance status—by distance education enrollment category. As a result, comparisons of student characteristics across instructional modality can typically only be made at the level of total institutional enrollment rather than for students

enrolled exclusively in distance education courses. Because total enrollment at 100% online institutions equals exclusively distance education enrollment, demographic and attendance status reporting at these institutions provides a clearer view of the characteristics of exclusively distance education students.

## Data and Definitions

This analysis uses Fall 2024 IPEDS enrollment data for degree-granting institutions. Rather than relying on institutional self-identification or programmatic flags, the International Distance Education Benchmark Project defines a 100% online institution as one in which reported enrollment in exclusively distance education courses equals total enrollment, with no students reported as enrolled in some but not all distance education courses or not enrolled in any distance education courses.

Using this enrollment-based definition, 89 institutions met the criteria in Fall 2024. These institutions enrolled 651,170 students, all of whom were enrolled in exclusively distance education courses, of whom 217,054 (33%) were graduate students and 434,116 (67%) were undergraduate students. These 89 institutions represent:

- 44 private not-for-profit, four-year institutions;
- 27 private for-profit, four-year institutions;
- 9 public, four-year institutions;
- 6 private for-profit, two-year institutions; and
- 3 private not-for-profit, two-year institutions.

These online institutions were located across 34 states and territories, with California (n=14), Arizona (n=9), Florida (n=4), Missouri (n=4), and West Virginia (n=4), rounding out the top five and accounting for 35 of the online institutions.

This definition is intentionally behavioral. It reflects observed enrollment patterns rather than institutional labels and ensures that all students counted at these institutions are exclusively distance education learners.

## The Scale and Context of 100% Online Institutions

While the 89 institutions identified represent only 2.5% of the 3,482 institutions enrolling students in exclusively distance education courses in Fall 2024, they account for a disproportionate share of exclusively distance education enrollment.

Specifically:

- 100% online institutions enrolled 12% of all exclusively distance education students nationally.
- Graduate students comprised 33% of enrollment at 100% online institutions, compared to 26% at institutions with mixed-modality enrollment.

- Undergraduate students comprised 67% of enrollment at 100% online institutions, compared to 74% at institutions with mixed-modality enrollment. IPEDS distinguishes between degree-seeking and non-degree-seeking undergraduate students.
  - Degree-seeking undergraduate students comprised 95% of undergraduate enrollment at 100% online institutions, compared to 83% at institutions with mixed-modality enrollment.
  - Non-degree-seeking students comprised 5% of undergraduate enrollment at 100% online institutions, compared to 17% at institutions with mixed-modality enrollment.

This concentration highlights both the influence and the distinct role of fully online institutions within the broader distance education ecosystem. Because these institutions enroll a substantial share of exclusively distance education students while remaining a small fraction of institutions overall, they provide a focused lens for examining student characteristics within this modality.

Because all students at these institutions are exclusively distance education learners, institutional-level demographic reporting provides a direct window into the characteristics of exclusively distance education students.

## Online Student Residence

Student residence is reported in IPEDS using several distance education location categories. For this analysis, the category identifying students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses and located in the United States, but not in the same state or jurisdiction as the institution, was used to identify out-of-state enrollment. Across all 100% online institutions, 82% of students were reported as residing outside the state or jurisdiction of the institution. Out-of-state enrollment predominated across all institutional control types, with private for-profit online institutions reporting the highest share (93%), followed by private not-for-profit institutions (79%) and public institutions (67%).

### Figure 1

*Out-of-state enrollment counts and percentages for students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses at 100% online institutions, by institutional control.*

Institution Control	Enrollments	Out of State Enrollments	Percentage
Public	107,762	72,099	67%
Private not-for-profit	312,765	246,008	79%
Private for-profit	230,643	214,979	93%
Total	651,170	533,086	82%

The share of out-of-state students at 100% online institutions was substantially higher than national patterns among all exclusively distance education students, where 34% were reported as residing outside the state or jurisdiction of the institution. Among all institutions, out-of-state enrollment varied by control, with private for-profit institutions reporting the highest share (82%), followed by private not-for-profit institutions (61%) and public institutions (13%). These geographic patterns provide important context for interpreting the demographic characteristics of students enrolled at 100% online institutions.

## Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity are reported to IPEDS using nine distinct categories. In accordance with federal guidelines (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2007), race and ethnicity are collected using a two-part question: individuals are first asked whether they are Hispanic or Latino (ethnicity), followed by a question asking them to identify one or more racial categories. Individuals who select more than one race are categorized as “Two or more races.”

Unless otherwise noted in individual charts, this report presents data only for three racial/ethnic groups—Black, Hispanic, and White. Percentages within those figures reflect only these groups and therefore may not total 100%.

The most represented race/ethnicity categories at online institutions in fall 2024 were Black (18.3%), Hispanic (13.9%), and White (43.8%), which together comprised 494,773 students, representing 75.9% of total enrollment at 100% online institutions.

At all degree-granting institutions, the race/ethnicity breakdown was distributed differently across racial and ethnic categories, but most students were Black (12.2%), Hispanic (21.2%), and White (44.3%); which comprised a total student enrollment of 15,489,499 (77.7%).

When comparing race and ethnicity across institution control, 100% online institutions exhibited different enrollment distributions when compared to all degree-granting institutions. As reflected in Figure 2, the percentage of white students at 100% online institutions (43.8%) was less than all degree-granting colleges (44.3%). Fewer Hispanic students enrolled in online institutions, 13.9% compared to 21.2% at all degree-granting institutions, but more Black students enrolled online 18.3% compared to 12.2% at all degree-granting institutions.

### Figure 2

*Comparison of 100% online institution enrollments to degree-granting enrollments by institution control and race/ethnicity*

Control of institution and race/ethnicity	Total		Public		Private Not-For-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>100% Online Institution Total Students</b>	<b>651,170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>107,762</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>312,765</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>230,643</b>	<b>35.4</b>
Black	119,012	18.3	11,307	10.4	43,935	14.0	63,770	27.6
Hispanic	90,824	13.9	21,412	19.9	39,805	12.7	29,607	12.8
White	284,937	43.8	53,123	49.3	133,233	42.6	98,581	42.7
<b>All Degree-Granting Total Students</b>	<b>19,934,337</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>14,387,415</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>4,406,526</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>1,140,396</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Black	2,436,026	12.2	1,657,230	11.5	491,141	11.1	287,655	25.2
Hispanic	4,228,864	21.2	3,345,892	23.3	635,284	14.4	247,688	21.7
White	8,824,609	44.3	6,413,367	44.8	2,040,447	46.3	370,795	32.5

**Note.** Data shown for Black, Hispanic, and White students only. Percentages reflect these groups as a share of total enrollment, excluding other races and unknown categories.

## Attendance Status

In addition to demographic characteristics, enrollment intensity provides important context for understanding how students engage with fully online institutions. IPEDS reports student attendance status as full-time or part-time based on credit load during the fall term. Examining attendance patterns at 100% online institutions offers insight into whether exclusively distance education enrollment is more commonly associated with part-time or full-time study.

In fall 2024, most enrollments at all degree-granting institutions were full-time (61%), compared to 59% of enrollments at 100% online institutions. Online institutions enrolled a higher share of students in graduate programs (33%) compared to all degree-granting institutions (17%). Private not-for-profit 100% online institutions enrolled more students as full-time (80%) compared to the other two online institution controls.

### Figure 3

*Comparison of 100% online institution enrollments to degree-granting enrollments by institution control, level of student and attendance status*

Control of institution, level of student and attendance status	Total		Public		Private Not-For-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>100% Online Institution</b>								
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>651,170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>107,762</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>312,765</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>230,643</b>	<b>35.4</b>
Full-time	387,049	59.4	39,702	36.8	250,992	80.2	96,355	41.8
Part-time	264,121	40.6	68,060	63.2	61,773	19.8	134,288	58.2
<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>434,116</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>78,943</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>233,340</b>	<b>74.6</b>	<b>121,833</b>	<b>52.8</b>
Full-time	266,394	61.4	30,556	38.7	187,226	80.2	48,612	39.9
Part-time	167,722	38.6	48,387	61.3	46,114	19.8	73,221	60.1
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>217,054</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>28,819</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>79,425</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>108,810</b>	<b>47.2</b>
Full-time	120,655	55.6	9,146	31.7	63,766	80.3	47,743	43.9
Part-time	96,399	44.4	19,673	68.3	15,659	19.7	61,067	56.1
<b>All Degree-Granting</b>								
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>19,934,337</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>14,387,415</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>4,406,526</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>1,140,396</b>	<b>5.6</b>
Full-time	12,111,709	60.8	8,051,583	55.9	3,319,801	75.3	740,325	64.9
Part-time	7,822,628	39.2	6,335,832	44.1	1,086,725	24.7	400,071	35.1
<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>16,599,333</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>12,747,047</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>2,976,342</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>875,944</b>	<b>76.8</b>
Full-time	10,117,073	60.9	7,117,421	55.8	2,390,162	80.3	609,490	69.6
Part-time	6,482,260	39.1	5,629,626	44.2	586,180	19.7	266,454	30.4
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>3,335,004</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>1,640,368</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>1,430,184</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>264,452</b>	<b>23.2</b>
Full-time	1,994,636	59.8	934,162	56.9	929,639	65.0	130,835	49.5
Part-time	1,340,368	40.2	706,206	43.1	500,545	35.0	133,617	50.8

## Gender

IPEDS reports student gender as men and women based on institutional records submitted as part of the fall enrollment survey. Figure 4 displays the distribution of enrollment by gender at 100% online institutions compared to all degree-granting institutions.

In Fall 2024, women comprised a larger share of enrollment at 100% online institutions (62%) compared to all degree-granting institutions (58%). Men accounted for the remaining 38% of enrollment at 100% online institutions, a smaller share than observed across all degree-granting institutions (42%). Differences in gender composition were most pronounced among graduate students, where women at 100% online institutions were more likely to be enrolled part-time (32.5%) compared to women at all degree-granting institutions (25.4%).

### Figure 4

*Comparison of 100% online institution enrollments to degree-granting enrollments by institution control, level of student, attendance status, and gender*

Control of institution, level of student, attendance status, and gender	Total		Public		Private Not-For-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>100% Online Institution</b>	<b>651,170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>107,762</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>312,765</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>230,643</b>	<b>35.4</b>
<b>Total Students</b>								
<b>Total Men</b>	<b>248,363</b>	<b>38.1</b>	<b>39,064</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>128,878</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>80,421</b>	<b>34.9</b>
<b>Total Women</b>	<b>402,807</b>	<b>61.9</b>	<b>68,698</b>	<b>63.7</b>	<b>183,887</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>150,222</b>	<b>65.1</b>
<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>434,116</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>78,943</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>233,340</b>	<b>74.6</b>	<b>121,833</b>	<b>52.8</b>
Full-time Men	111,046	25.6	10,741	13.6	81,416	34.9	18,889	15.5
Full-time Women	155,348	35.8	19,815	25.1	105,810	45.3	29,723	24.4
Part-time Men	76,232	17.6	19,115	24.2	22,056	9.5	35,061	28.8
Part-Time Women	91,490	21.1	29,272	37.1	24,058	10.3	38,160	31.3
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>217,054</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>28,819</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>79,425</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>108,810</b>	<b>47.2</b>
Full-time Men	35,124	16.2	2,732	9.5	19,517	24.6	12,875	11.8
Full-time Women	85,531	39.4	6,414	22.3	44,249	55.7	34,868	32.0
Part-time Men	25,961	12.0	6,476	22.5	5,889	7.4	13,596	12.5
Part-Time Women	70,438	32.5	13,197	45.8	9,770	12.3	47,471	43.6
<b>All Degree-Granting</b>	<b>19,934,337</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>14,387,415</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>4,406,526</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>1,140,396</b>	<b>5.6</b>
<b>Total Students</b>								
<b>Total Men</b>	<b>8,439,368</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>6,213,519</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>1,850,547</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>375,302</b>	<b>32.9</b>
<b>Total Women</b>	<b>11,494,969</b>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>8,173,896</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>2,555,979</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>765,094</b>	<b>67.1</b>
<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>16,599,333</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>12,747,047</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>2,976,342</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>875,944</b>	<b>76.8</b>
Full-time Men	4,462,282	26.9	3,197,306	25.1	1,042,159	35.0	222,817	25.4
Full-time Women	5,654,791	34.1	3,920,115	30.8	1,348,003	45.3	386,673	44.1
Part-time Men	2,670,677	16.1	2,350,076	18.4	237,310	8.0	83,291	9.5
Part-Time Women	3,811,583	23.0	3,279,550	25.7	348,870	11.7	183,163	20.9
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>3,335,004</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>1,640,368</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>1,430,184</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>264,452</b>	<b>23.2</b>
Full-time Men	814,061	24.4	394,836	24.1	379,919	26.6	39,306	14.9
Full-time Women	1,180,575	35.4	539,326	32.9	549,720	38.4	91,529	34.6
Part-time Men	492,348	14.8	271,301	16.5	191,159	13.4	29,888	11.3
Part-Time Women	848,020	25.4	434,905	26.5	309,386	21.6	103,729	39.2

## Age

IPEDS requires institutions to report the age of enrolled students as part of the annual fall enrollment collection; however, age reporting is only required in odd-numbered years. Accordingly, age data from Fall 2024 are included in this analysis. Age is reported in combination with student level (undergraduate or graduate) and attendance status (full-time or part-time), but not by distance education enrollment category. As a result, age comparisons at most institutions reflect total enrollment rather than exclusively distance education enrollment.

For the purposes of this analysis, IPEDS age categories were collapsed into two groups: age 24 and under, and age 25 and over. At 100% online institutions, 84% of students were age 25 or older, compared to 31% at all other degree-granting institutions. Only public online institutions fell below this average, with 68% of students age 25 or older. Private for-profit online institutions enrolled the highest share of students age 25 and over (94%), a pattern that was also observed among private for-profit institutions across all degree-granting colleges (79%).

### Figure 5

*Comparison of 100% online institution enrollments to all degree-granting enrollments by institution control and age distribution*

Control of institution, level of student, attendance status, and age	Total		Public		Private Not-For-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>100% Online Institution Total Students</b>	<b>439,517</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>101,389</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>241,142</b>	<b>54.9</b>	<b>96,986</b>	<b>22.0</b>
Age 24 and under	72,118	16.4	32,400	31.9	33,665	13.9	6,053	6.2
Age 25 and over	367,399	83.6	68,989	68.1	207,477	86.1	90,933	93.8
<b>All Degree-Granting Total Students</b>	<b>16,035,889</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>12,354,179</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>3,062,871</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>618,839</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Age 24 and under	10,998,733	68.6	9,073,101	73.4	1,797,445	58.7	128,187	20.7
Age 25 and over	5,037,156	31.4	3,281,078	26.6	1,265,426	41.3	490,652	79.3

**Note.** Data shown for known age categories only. Percentages reflect these groups as a share of total enrollment, excluding students with unknown age.

## What Remains Partially Observable

While institutions where total enrollment equals exclusively distance education enrollment provide a clearer view of student characteristics, they represent only a small portion of the broader distance education landscape.

At 100% online institutions, institutional-level reporting aligns directly with exclusively distance education enrollment, allowing for clearer observation of student demographics and enrollment patterns. At institutions with mixed enrollment modalities, however, exclusively distance education students are embedded within aggregate institutional reporting, limiting the ability to distinguish their characteristics from those of students enrolled in face-to-face or hybrid courses.

In Fall 2024, the majority of students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses attended institutions that also reported students enrolled in some but not all distance education courses or entirely in-person courses. For these institutions, IPEDS does not link demographic or attendance status data to students' mode of instruction.

As a result, key characteristics of exclusively distance education students enrolled at mixed-modality institutions remain partially observable. Publicly available IPEDS data do not indicate which academic programs students are enrolled in, whether students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses are also enrolled exclusively online at the program level, or how demographic characteristics vary by instructional modality within an institution. These limitations apply to age, gender, race and ethnicity, attendance status, and student level.

Accordingly, while IPEDS provides a reliable and consistent picture of distance education participation at the national level, it offers only a partial view of who exclusively distance education students are across most institutions. The findings presented in this paper should therefore be interpreted as illustrative of what can be observed under conditions of full alignment between institutional enrollment and instructional modality, rather than as representative of all exclusively distance education students nationwide.

## Implications

The findings presented in this analysis underscore both the value and the limitations of existing public data for understanding students enrolled exclusively in distance education. Institutions where total enrollment aligns fully with exclusively distance education enrollment provide a rare opportunity to observe demographic and enrollment patterns with greater clarity. At the same time, these institutions represent a small share of the overall distance education landscape, limiting the extent to which their characteristics can be generalized to all exclusively distance education students.

For the majority of institutions offering distance education, student characteristics such as age, gender, race and ethnicity, attendance status, and program of study remain only partially observable in public data and cannot be used in benchmarking private institutional data.

IPEDS reliably captures whether students are enrolled in distance education courses, but it does not link those enrollments to academic programs, nor does it disaggregate student demographics by instructional modality within institutions. As a result, many of the questions most relevant to institutional leaders—who online students are, how they engage with their programs, and how enrollment patterns vary across disciplines—cannot be fully addressed using IPEDS data alone.

These gaps highlight the importance of complementary data strategies that build on, rather than replace, federal reporting. The International Distance Education Benchmark Project (IDEBP), in strategic partnership with UPCEA, is designed to help bridge these gaps by collecting institution-submitted data that extend beyond IPEDS. By focusing on program-level characteristics, student demographics, enrollment patterns, and outcomes for fully online programs, IDEBP aims to provide participating institutions with a more comprehensive and actionable understanding of online learners while maintaining alignment with existing federal definitions and reporting structures.

Through this collaborative approach, institutions can move beyond what is partially observable in public datasets and toward a more complete picture of online education that supports informed decision-making, strategic planning, and continuous improvement.

## Conclusion

Distance education now accounts for a substantial share of postsecondary enrollment, yet understanding the demographics of exclusively distance education students remains constrained by the structure of publicly available data. By examining institutions where exclusively distance education enrollment equals total enrollment, this paper demonstrates that meaningful insight into online student demographics is possible under specific conditions of alignment between enrollment and instructional modality.

At the same time, the analysis reinforces that such clarity is the exception rather than the norm. For most institutions, exclusively distance education students are embedded within mixed-modality enrollment reporting, limiting the visibility of their demographic and enrollment characteristics. As online education continues to evolve, advancing institutional understanding will require approaches that complement federal data collection with more granular, program-level information.

By leveraging collaborative initiatives such as IDEBP, in partnership with organizations like UPCEA, the higher education community can build on the foundation provided by IPEDS to develop a richer, more nuanced understanding of online learners. Doing so will be essential for institutions seeking to align strategy, program design, and student support with the realities of contemporary distance education.

## References

- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Collecting Race and Ethnicity Data From Students and Staff Using the New Categories*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/report-your-data/race-ethnicity-collecting-data-for-reporting-purposes>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS): Fall Enrollment Component*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Distance Education in IPEDS*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data/distance-education-in-ipeds>



### **ABOUT IDEBP**

The International Distance Education Benchmark Project (IDEBP) provides higher education institutions with data-driven tools for online education benchmarking—enabling them to better understand, evaluate, and improve their distance education strategies. By combining publicly available IPEDS data with confidential, institution-submitted benchmarks, IDEBP empowers institutions to make informed decisions that strengthen student success and institutional strategy. Learn more at [www.idebp.org](http://www.idebp.org).

### **ABOUT UPCEA**

UPCEA is the online and professional education association. Our members continuously reinvent higher education, positively impacting millions of lives. We proudly lead and support them through cutting-edge research, professional development, networking and mentorship, conferences and seminars, and stakeholder advocacy. Our collaborative, entrepreneurial community brings together decision makers and influencers in education, industry, research, and policy to improve educational access and outcomes. Learn more at <https://UPCEA.edu> and follow @UPCEA on social media.