

OMB Comment	NCES Response
1) Please provide the TRP notes, as applicable, that informed the addition of item 1 on page 10, SS	This addition did not originate with suggestions from a TRP; it comes directly from the list of consumer items included in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (PL 110-315). See HEOA, Sec. 111(i)(1) items (Q) and (S).
2) Please clarify the origin of the 3% cut off in the proposed disability services question.	The following text was added on pg. 10 to clarify: “Note: The language for this additional question, including the 3 percent cut off, was established by Congress in HEOA. See HEOA, Sec. 111(i)(1)(I).”
3) On page 16, SS, does “Summary item 5 above,” refer to item 4 on page 6? Please clarify in the SS.	Text was corrected to read “Summary item 4 above”
4) Can you clarify what the Census Bureau and NSF uses of the data are? The list provided (page 20) seems primarily applicable to SEAs and others.	<p>The following explanations have been added or expanded upon on page 20:</p> <p>The National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Studies, relies heavily on IPEDS Completions survey data, in conjunction with their own surveys, to study degree production, particularly in STEM fields.</p> <p>The U.S. Census uses the data collected in the IPEDS Finance for its State and Local Government Finance surveys. The data is essentially imbedded into the surveys and rolled up into the parent state or local government for revenue, expenditures, debt and assets.</p>
5) Please provide more information about the extent and nature of conversations at ED related to the public commenter’s suggestion about NCES collaborating with other ED offices on somewhat similar collections. What are the future explorations referenced?	NCES, OPE, and FSA staff have had preliminary discussions on how to best move this effort forward under the new administration. NCES is commissioning expert work to develop options for data integration. In addition, a memo will be developed and sent to new assistant secretary for postsecondary education, once appointed, proposing this effort as an important project for the new administration.
6) Please correct and clarify the burden estimate (given as over 25 million hours) for the change in race/ethnicity categories, page 31, SS. The number presented is incorrect (it appears to be an average annual number of total respondents el/sec/postsec/etc but is listed as “hours”). The burden estimate presented should be limited to those relevant to IPEDS, such as the postsecondary institution total hours, which is just shy of 5 million hours. Whatever estimate is presented, please describe it in enough detail to clarify what it is.	The burden estimate has been corrected to 4,975,000 for changing the records of postsecondary students, teachers and support staff, as detailed in a new Table 2 on page 32. [The original Table 2 has been redesignated as Table 3 throughout the document.]
7) Please update the list of individuals in B5. For example, Jessica Shedd is now with NCES, not with NACUBO, right?	Both the NCES staff list and the other representative lists have been updated to reflect individuals’ current positions and members of the current NPEC group have also been added.
8) Please clarify how many additional OMB packages are in the queue to fully implement the HEOA amendments.	One additional clearance package will be needed to implement the changes related net price for the 2009-10 data collection. This package is currently being written and is set to go to RIMS by the end of this month (January).