

SECTION B. Description of Statistical Methodology

B.1. Respondent Universe

The primary universe of interest for IPEDS consists of approximately 7,300 institutions (according to our most recent count) that are eligible to participate in Title IV student financial aid programs. By law, these schools are required to respond to IPEDS. (Section 490 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (P.L. 102-325). IPEDS allows other (non-title IV) institutions to participate on a voluntary basis. About 200 elect to respond. Title IV schools are shown by highest level of offering (4-year award or above, 2-year award, less than 2-year award) and by control (public, private not-for-profit, private for-profit):

**Table 33. Title IV Institutions in the IPEDS Universe
Estimated Counts for 2014-15 Collection**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private not-for-profit</u>	<u>Private for-profit</u>
Total	7,500	2,000	1,900	3,600
4-year	3,100	700	1,600	800
2-year	2,300	1,050	200	1,050
Less than 2-yr	2,100	250	100	1,750

B.2. Statistical Methodology

There is no sampling done for any of the IPEDS survey components.

Because of the institutional compliance requirements outlined in sections A.1 and A.2, in Part A of this submission, sampling is not an option. This has been discussed at length at meetings of our Technical Review Panel, with other areas of the Department of Education, including the Office for Civil Rights, the Office of Postsecondary Education, the office of Federal Student Aid, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, and with other Federal Agencies such as Census, BEA and EEOC.

B.3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates

IPEDS response rates for institutions receiving federal financial aid are consistently 99.8% and higher. IPEDS targets the Title IV institutions (others may respond, but no follow-up is done) and the web-based survey system incorporates an automated e-mail module that automatically generates follow-up e-mail to “keyholders” (individuals appointed by the CEOs as responsible for IPEDS data submission). As shown in section A.16, Table 32, frequent communications occur with the institution over the course of the data collection to ensure compliance with this statutorily mandated collection. Follow-up e-mails are generated if the institution does not attempt to enter data or if, at two weeks and one week before closeout, the components are not locked. The CEOs of non-responding institutions are also contacted by standard mail and with follow up phone calls if, two weeks prior to closeout, the school has not entered any data. New institutions and institutions with new keyholders receive additional telephone and email prompts. This has proven to be very successful in past years. In

addition, the names of institutions that do not respond to the IPEDS surveys, and a history of all regular contact with these institutions, is provided to the Federal Student Aid office for appropriate action.

B.4. Tests of Procedures and Methods

The data collection procedures and data items described in this submission have been tested in a number of ways. Most of the data elements requested have already been collected in previous IPEDS surveys and prior to that, similar data elements had been collected for over 20 years in HEGIS.

However, data quality is an overriding concern that NCES must continue to assess and evaluate. One approach is to assess relevant data from different IPEDS components and from different survey years to evaluate the consistency and reliability of reported data. These interrelationships among surveys and relationships over time were used to develop the automated tests used to edit each IPEDS data submission. Edit checks currently help to identify potential problems and provide opportunities to correct them early in the data collection. As the number of institutions that automate their responses to IPEDS increases, it becomes increasingly difficult to fully validate their responses. However, by implementing a web-based data collection effort that requires error resolution and correction *prior to* data submission, NCES has been gathering cleaner data in a more timely fashion. The web-based system still accommodates intermediate reporting units such as community college boards, state university systems offices, and corporate offices.

The web-based data collection method was tested in a successful pilot collection of Institutional Price and Student Financial Aid information in August 1999, and has been in full-scale implementation since the Fall of 2000. Throughout the implementation of the web-based system, as a result of discussions with data providers and associations that use the data, NCES has revised the data collection items, definitions, and instructions based on the recommendations of our constituents, and following appropriate public comment periods.

B.5. Reviewing Individuals

Listed below are individuals who have reviewed, in whole or in part, the IPEDS surveys, and/or participated in Technical Review Panel meetings charged with revising and refining the surveys and data items collected.

Representatives from the National Center for Education Statistics

Samuel Barbett, Mathematical Statistician
Allison Bell, Associate Research Scientist
Sarah Crissey, Research Scientist
Archie Cubarrubia, IPEDS Survey Director, Student Financial Aid
Tracy Hunt-White, Statistician
Tara Lawley, Associate Research Scientist/Specialist
Colleen Lenihan, Associate Research Scientist
Andrew Mary, Statistician
Elise Miller, Program Director, IPEDS
Isaiah O'Rear, Associate Research Scientist
Jeffrey Owings, Associate Commissioner
Tai Phan, Mathematical Statistician

Jan Plotczyk, Education Statistician
Sabrina Ratchford, Education Statistician
Jessica Shedd, Program Director, IPEDS
Matthew Soldner, Senior Technical Advisor
Thomas Weko, Associate Commissioner, Postsecondary, Adult, and Career Education Division

Representatives from Associations, Postsecondary Institutions/Systems, and Other Federal Offices

Gary Andeen, Oregon Independent Colleges Association
Thomas Bailey, Teachers College, Columbia University
Julia Blixrud, Association of Research Libraries
Eileen Brennan, Oakland Community College
Chris Brewer, Post Secondary Consultants
Keith Brown, North Carolina Community College System
Robert Burke, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio
Susan Campbell, College Center for Library Automation
Julie Carpenter-Hubin, Ohio State University
Stephanie Cellini, George Washington University
Janice Childress, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Melodie Christal, Washburn University
Margaret Cohen, George Washington University
Valerie Conley, Ohio University
Bryan Cook, American Council on Education
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield Colleg
Kristina Cragg, Bridgepoint Education
Alisa Cunningham, Institute for Higher Education Policy
Michael Dakduk, Student Veterans of America (SVA)
Dawn Dawson, DeVry Inc.
Jill DeAtley, Career Education Corporation
Faith DesLauriers, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Cassandra Dortch, Congressional Research Service (CRS)
Ray Emry, Capella University
Christy England-Siegerdt, Washington Student Achievement Council
Thomas Erickson, Veterans Benefits Administration
Gayle Fink, Bowie State University
Michael Frola, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA), U.S. Department of Education
Bernard Fryshman, Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools
Carol Fuller, Independent Consultant
Ryan Gallucci, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW)
Carlos Gonzalez, EDMC
Kerry Grosse, Marquette University
Tammy Halligan, Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities
Laura Hardesty, U.S. Census Bureau
Kimberly Harvey, Louisiana Board of Regents
Stephen Haworth, DeVry Inc.
Billy Helton, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Cherron Hoppes, Golden Gate University
Braden Hosch, Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education
Myrna Huffman, California Community Colleges Chancellors Office
Gigi Jones, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA)
Laura Keck, American Association of Community Colleges
Jeffrey Keith, Sterling Partners

Christine Keller, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
Jonathan Keller, Massachusetts Department of Higher Education
Kit Keller, American Library Association
Marsha Kelman, University of Texas System
Sandra Kinney, Technical College System of Georgia
Martha Kyrillidou, Association of Research Libraries
Albertha Lawson, Baton Rouge Community College
Erez Lenchner, CUNY LaGuardia Community College
Fred Lillibridge, Doña Ana Community College
Marc LoGrasso, Bryant & Stratton College
Hans L'Orange, State Higher Education Executive Officers
Mary Goodhue Lynch, Massasoit Community College
Shelly Martinez, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
Tod Massa, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Lesley McBain, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Mari McCarty, WI Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU)
Frank McCluskey, American Public University System (APUS)
Susan Menditto, National Association of College and University Business Officers
Soon Merz, Austin Community College
Gary Nigh, NJ Commission on Higher Education
Jon O'Bergh, Office of the Under Secretary, US Department of Education
Emily Parker, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
Ginger Pauley, University of Phoenix
Kimberly Pearce, Capella University
Mary Jane Petrowski, Association of College and Research Libraries
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community College
Lu Wayne Phillips, Lorain County Community College
John Porter, State University of New York-SUNY System Administration
Brian Prescott, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Pat Profeta, Indian River State College, Miley Library
Chris Rasmussen, Midwestern Higher Education Compact
Kenneth Redd, National Association of College and University Business Officers
George Rezendes, Three Rivers Community College
Gary Rice, University of Alaska Anchorage
Stephanie Rikard, Utah College of Applied Technology
Terrence Russell, Association for Institutional Research
Rebecca Sanders, Apollo Accounting
Mary Sapp, University of Miami
Jim Selbe, University of Maryland University College
Rajat Shah, Lincoln College
Cindy Sheckells, U.S. Census Bureau
Donna Silber, Maricopa Community College District
Randy Swing, Association for Institutional Research
Dawit Teklu, Strayer University
Judith Thompson, Florida Department of Education
Kimberly Thompson, Pearson eCollege
Wendy Weiler, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)
Judith Wheaton, Austin College
Christina Whitfield, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Rachel Zinn, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)