

Memorandum

**United States Department of Education
Institute of Education Sciences
National Center for Education Statistics**

DATE: October 27, 2015
 TO: Robert Sivinski, OMB
 THROUGH: Kashka Kubzdela, OMB Liaison, NCES
 FROM: Tracy Hunt-White, Sample Surveys Division: Longitudinal Surveys Branch, NCES
 SUBJECT: 2015-16 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:16) Full Scale Institution Contacting And Enrollment List Collection Sampling Update Change Request (OMB# 1850-0666 v.16)

The 2015-16 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:16) Full Scale Institution Contacting And Enrollment List Collection package (OMB# 1850-0666 v.15) was approved in July 2015. This request is to correct the approved response burden estimates and summarizes the final plans for identifying students eligible for inclusion in the NPSAS:16 sampling frame.

The burden table (table 2) in the Supporting Statement Part A section 12 of the approved package (OMB# 1850-0666 v.15) listed incorrect institution sample size, resulting in erroneous burden estimates:

Table 2. Maximum estimated burden on institutions for the NPSAS:16 full scale enrollment list collection

Data collection activity	Institution sample	Expected eligible institutions	Number of responding institutions	Percent expected response rate	Average time burden per response (mins)	Range of response times (mins)	Total time burden (hours)
NPSAS:16 full scale study							
Eligibility screening calls	1,690	1,640	1,690	100	4.8	1.8-6.0	135
Institutional registration page	†	1,640	1,394	85	4.8	3.0-6.6	112
Institutional enrollment lists	†	1,640	1,394	85	165.0	60.0-360.0	3,834
Full scale Institutional total			1,690	(4,478 responses)			4,081

† Not applicable.

The correct number of institutions in the starting institution sample is 2,000. The corrected burden table shown below has been replaced in the Supporting Statement Part A section 12.

Table 2. Maximum estimated burden on institutions for the NPSAS:16 full scale enrollment list collection

Data collection activity	Institution sample	Expected eligible institutions	Expected response rate (percent)	Number of responding institutions	Expected number of responses	Average time burden per response (mins)	Total time burden (hours)
NPSAS:16 full scale study							
Eligibility screening calls	2,000	1,980	100	2,000	2,000	5	167
Institutional registration page	†	1,980	85	1,683	1,683	5	140
Institutional enrollment lists	†	1,980	85	1,683	1,683	165	4,628
Institutional total				2,000	5,366		4,935

† Not applicable.

In addition to revising the burden table, we revised the first paragraph of Part A, section 12 to reflect the revised burden hours and to update the hourly cost rate for institutions to make it consistent with the rate IPEDS provides in its clearance package. The supporting package has been revised to read:

Table 2 provides the projected estimates for response burden for NPSAS:16, which are based on experiences from prior rounds of NPSAS. Using time burden data for similar institutional data collection tasks, we estimate the average burden associated with the enrollment list collection to be approximately 165 minutes per institution. The estimated hourly cost to institutions was raised to \$38, adopted from the recent IPEDS collection, to reflect salary increases at those institutions. The total estimated cost to institutions participating in the NPSAS:16 full scale enrollment list data collection for the 4,935 total burden hours is \$187,530. This submission is for data collection of institution materials and enrollment lists only. We will submit burden estimates for data collection from and about sampled students in a separate package in fall 2015.

Identifying Eligible Students for the Sampling Frame

In the original submission (OMB# 1850-0666 v.15), we described two approaches to determining student eligibility for NPSAS. Under Option A, we proposed that NPSAS staff would request institution enrollment lists for all students enrolled during the NPSAS study period and, for each student, would collect additional data elements so that NPSAS staff could determine each student's study eligibility rather than requiring institutions to do so. Under the alternative option, we proposed the same approach as was used in the field test (and all previous cycles of NPSAS), with institution staff determining students' study eligibility, and excluding ineligible students from the enrollment list before submitting it. In the summer of 2015, the two approaches were presented to institution staff participating in focus groups. The majority opinion was that Option A would create an inordinate burden on the institutions. Consequently, the full-scale design will continue to use the same approach as was used during the field test and the text for Part B, section 2.b., Student Sample, has been revised to reflect this approach. Appendix H provides a summary of the results from the focus group sessions.