

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2016-2019

Supporting Statement Part A **OMB Paperwork Reduction Act Submission**

OMB No. 1850-0582 v.18

Submitted by:

National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education

February 2016
Revised **June** 2016

Table of Contents

Summary.....	1
Proposed Changes to the IPEDS Data Collection for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19.....	1
Background.....	1
Detailed Proposed Changes to Forms by IPEDS Survey Component.....	3
Burden Calculations.....	15
Section A. Justification.....	15
A.1. Purpose of this Submission.....	15
A.1.a. The Design of IPEDS.....	15
A.1.b. Proposed Modifications.....	16
A.1.c. Need for Clearance at This Time.....	17
A.1.d. Statutory Requirements for IPEDS Data.....	17
A.2. Purpose and Use of IPEDS Information.....	18
A.2.a. Institutional Characteristics.....	18
A.2.b. Completions and Compliance Report.....	19
A.2.c. Enrollment.....	20
A.2.d. Student Financial Aid.....	21
A.2.e. Graduation Rates.....	20
A.2.f. Finance.....	20
A.2.g. Human Resources.....	22
A.2.h. Admissions.....	22
A.2.i. Academic Libraries.....	23
A.2.j. Outcome Measures.....	23
A.3. Use of Technology and Other Technological Collection Techniques.....	23
A.4. Efforts to Identify and Avoid Duplication.....	24
A.5. Methods Used to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses/Entities.....	24
A.6. Frequency of Data Collection.....	24
A.7. Special Circumstances.....	24
A.8. Consultations Outside the Agency.....	24
A.9. Paying Respondents.....	25
A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality.....	25
A.11. Justification for Sensitive Questions.....	25
A.12. Estimate of Burden.....	26
A.13. Estimate of Cost Burden.....	29
A.14. Cost to the Federal Government.....	29
A.15. Reasons for Change in Burden.....	29
A.15.1 Fall Collection.....	29
A.15.2 Winter Collection.....	31
A.15.3 Spring Collection.....	36
A.16. Publication Plans/Project Schedule.....	40
A.16.a. Schedule of Activities.....	40
A.16.b. Distribution Methods.....	42
A.17. Request to Not Display Expiration Date.....	43
A.18. Exceptions to the Certification.....	43

Tables

Table 1. IPEDS TRP meetings relevant to proposed changes.....	1
Table 2. Proposed changes to the IC Form (all versions).....	4
Table 3. Proposed changes to the IPEDS SFA Form (all versions).....	4
Table 4. Proposed changes to the Outcome Measures (OM) Form.....	5
Table 5. Proposed changes to the Graduation Rates (GR) Form (all versions).....	7
Table 6. Proposed changes to the Graduation Rates 200 (GR200) Form (all versions).....	8
Table 7. Proposed changes to the Admissions (ADM) Form (all versions).....	8
Table 8. Proposed changes to the Fall Enrollment (EF) Form (all versions).....	9
Table 9. Proposed changes to the Finance (F) Form (GASB Form).....	10
Table 10. Proposed changes to the Finance (F) Form (FASB form).....	11
Table 11. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (Degree-granting Institution Forms)...	13
Table 12. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time staff).....	13
Table 13. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (all versions).....	13
Table 14. Proposed changes to Academic Libraries (AL) Form (all versions).....	14
Table 15. Response rates for IPEDS preparation time item, 2014.....	26
Table 16. Estimated and average preparation hours for experienced and new IPEDS keyholders, and average premium for new keyholders, 2014.....	27
Table 17. Summary of estimated response burden by survey component: 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19.....	27
Table 18. Summary of ranges and averages of time burden estimates by institution type and keyholder experience.....	28
Table 19. Estimates of burden hours and costs to institutions.....	29
Table 20. Burden hours, Institutional Characteristics.....	30
Table 21. Proposed changes to the IC Survey component (all versions).....	30
Table 22. Burden hours, Completions.....	30
Table 23. Burden hours, 12-month Enrollment.....	31
Table 24. Burden hours, Student Financial Aid.....	31
Table 25. Proposed changes to the SFA survey component (all versions).....	32
Table 26. Burden hours, Outcome Measures.....	32
Table 27. Proposed changes to Outcome Measures survey component (all versions).....	32
Table 28. Burden hours, Graduation Rates.....	33
Table 29. Proposed changes to Graduation Rates survey component (all versions).....	34
Table 30. Burden hours, Graduation Rates 200.....	34
Table 31. Proposed changes to Graduation Rates 200 survey component (all versions).....	35
Table 32. Burden hours, Admissions.....	35
Table 33. Proposed changes to Admissions component (all versions).....	35
Table 34. Burden hours, Fall Enrollment.....	36
Table 35. Proposed changes to the Fall Enrollment (EF) Form.....	36
Table 36. Burden hours, Finance.....	37
Table 37. Proposed changes to the Finance Form for GASB institutions.....	37
Table 38. Proposed changes to the Finance Form for FASB institutions.....	38
Table 39. Burden hours, Human Resources.....	38
Table 40. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (Degree-granting Institution Forms)...	39
Table 41. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time staff).....	39
Table 42. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (all versions).....	39
Table 43. Burden hours, Academic Libraries.....	39
Table 44. Proposed changes to the Academic Libraries (AL) component.....	38
Table 45. IPEDS 2016-17 planned data collection schedule.....	40
Table 46. IPEDS 2016-17 data collections communications/follow-up schedule.....	41

Summary

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) seeks authorization from OMB to continue the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection. Current authorization expires 12/31/2016 (OMB No. 1850-0582). NCES is requesting a new clearance for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 data collections to enable us to provide consistency in our collection of postsecondary data over the next 3 years.

IPEDS is a web-based data collection system designed to collect basic data from all postsecondary institutions in the United States and the other jurisdictions. IPEDS enables NCES to report on key dimensions of postsecondary education such as enrollments, degrees and other awards earned, tuition and fees, average net price, student financial aid, graduation rates, student outcomes, revenues and expenditures, faculty salaries, and staff employed. The IPEDS web-based data collection system was implemented in 2000-01, and it collects basic data from approximately 7,300 postsecondary institutions in the United States and the other jurisdictions that are eligible to participate in Title IV Federal financial aid programs. All Title IV institutions 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. Approximately 200 non-title IV institutions elect to respond. IPEDS data are available to the public through the College Navigator and IPEDS Data Center websites.

This clearance package includes a number of proposed changes to the data collection.

Proposed Changes to the IPEDS Data Collection for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19

Background

Many of the proposed changes were suggested by the IPEDS Technical Review Panel (TRP). Meetings of the IPEDS TRP are convened by RTI International, the contractor for the IPEDS web-based data collection system; subject areas for the meetings are determined by legislation, emerging areas of concern in postsecondary education, and an ongoing goal of decreasing reporting burden while retaining the federal data necessary for use by policy makers and education analysts. Detailed summaries of each meeting are posted online (https://edsurveys.rti.org/IPEDS_TRP/TRP.aspx) and comments on panel suggestions are solicited. Six meetings of the TRP have impacted the changes included in this clearance package, as summarized in table 1.

Table 1. IPEDS TRP meetings relevant to proposed changes

Topic (Date)	Summary	Survey components affected
Collecting GRS data for part-time students and Pell Grant Recipients (July 2008)	This TRP recommended adding a subcohort of Pell Grant recipients to the Graduation Rates survey component. The Pell Grant rates would be calculated based on a subcohort of the Graduation Rates cohort (first-time, full-time students). It was also recommended that, should other cohorts be added, then the Pell subcohort should also be required for those cohorts. With the addition of Outcome Measures, Pell subcohorts can be created for four cohorts that are much more representative of higher education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome Measures
Selected outcomes of the Advisory Committee on Measures of Student Success (February and October 2012)	<p>The Committee on Measures of Student Success recommended that the Department of Education (ED) broaden the coverage of student graduation data to reflect the diverse student populations at 2-year institutions and improve the collection of student progression and completion data. In response, ED released an action plan for improving measures of postsecondary student success in support of the Administration's college completion agenda and based on those recommendations.</p> <p>Two IPEDS TRP meetings were convened to address these needs. The first panel suggested that NCES clarify the definition of a degree/certificate-seeking student for IPEDS reporting purposes and collect certain outcome information in IPEDS for first-time, part-time students. The second panel suggested that NCES collect certain outcome information in IPEDS for non-first-time students similar to information that was proposed by the first panel for first-time, part-time students. The panel also suggested that similar outcome information be collected for first-time, full-time students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome Measures

Table 1. IPEDS TRP meetings relevant to proposed changes

Topic (Date)	Summary	Survey components affected
Outcome Measures (September 2014)	<p>As of the date of TRP 45, the specifics regarding data elements, metrics, and data collection had not yet been finalized or released to the public. At the time, ED was in the planning stages of the forthcoming Postsecondary Institutional Rating System (PIRS), which was to create an effective postsecondary rating system used measures on access, affordability, and outcomes. This TRP was asked to revisit the Outcome Measures component and consider any changes that would help inform policymakers, consumers, and other stakeholders, and further improve outcome data in IPEDS.</p> <p>This TRP considered a number of issues related to the Outcome Measures survey component. A few of the topics the TRP discussed were: collecting multiple cohort years, time-to-degree durations, time intervals, and subsequent awards earned from other institutions. In addition, the TRP deliberated on the addition of collecting outcomes by demographics and using Federal Student Aid (FSA) data. In these discussions, the issue of identifying Pell students and tracking their outcomes was identified as an important need to policymakers, researchers, and the public.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome Measures
Clarifying Study Abroad enrollment (September 2015)	<p>This TRP discussed actions that could improve IPEDS instructions related to study abroad students. Despite the variation in the types and requirements of study abroad programs offered by institutions, the panel agreed that clarifications related to counting study abroad students would address reporting inconsistencies and improve the overall quality of data reported to IPEDS. IPEDS used the comments to improve instructions on the most impacted survey components.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation Rates • Fall Enrollment
Improvements to the Human Resources Survey for Degree-granting institutions (November 2014)	<p>While NCES has taken steps in the past to simplify reporting and ensure data consistency and accuracy in the Human Resources component, data providers have indicated that it remains one of the most burdensome components of the IPEDS in terms of time needed to report.</p> <p>This TRP reviewed the Human Resources component and assessed the utility of the data to meet policy and research needs. Given the increased demands placed on institutions over the last several years, the TRP focused on adjusting existing data elements to improve data quality, which may, in turn, lessen or reduce reporting burden for institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Resources
Improvements to the Finance Survey (June 2015)	<p>This TRP engaged the community in discussion on how to increase the accuracy and utility of financial information collected. Panelists were asked to explore desirable outcomes for the Finance component, data elements to add or remove, and methods for streamlining the forms. One recommendation was to collect expense by natural and functional classification separately, and thus not allocated across the matrix. The panel also suggested that NCES identify ways to better compare revenues within and across accounting standards despite the substantial differences that exist between how GASB and FASB standards treat Pell grants. Finally, the panel suggested that NCES investigate how to decrease detail for some institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance

Other changes are made based on NCES review of data quality reports, as well feedback from institutions and others, **including during the 60-day public comment period (Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 32, pp. 8181-8182, February 18, 2016)**. The reasons behind the proposed changes are included in the following section, by survey component.

A Note about the Timing and Implementation of the Changes

NCES will implement many of the proposed changes for the 2016-17 data collection; however, NCES will offer institutions a “preview” year for major additions to IPEDS data reporting forms. During the preview year, new items and associated reporting instructions will be available for preview through the Survey Materials webpage, to give institutions 1-year advance notice of how new data items will be collected in the future. The preview year for affected additions will be 2016-17.

Detailed Proposed Changes to Forms by IPEDS Survey Component

Institutional Characteristics (IC, includes Header and Identification). The proposed changes to the Institutional Characteristics (IC) survey component are minor. The first proposed change originated as a result of data collected in 2015-16 and the subsequent data quality review of the survey component. The changes detailed below are proposed to appropriately direct data providers if they will complete the Academic Libraries (AL) survey component. Currently, we determine eligibility for the AL survey component based on institutions having library expenses greater than zero. This practice has allowed for institutions that do not have library expenses but do have library collections being ineligible to complete the AL survey component. We propose asking institutions an additional Yes/No screening question in IC-Header that states, "Does your institution have access to a library collection?" If data providers answer "Yes" to either AL screening question or "Yes" to both screening questions, then the institution will be eligible for the AL survey component. This change is to mitigate issues of institutions' eligibility for the AL survey component. This will not increase burden, and the additional screening question better allows for the appropriate assignment of survey screens for institutions.

The next set of proposed changes originated during the 2014-15 data collection cycle and the subsequent data quality review of the survey component. The changes detailed below are proposed to allow data providers to report all aspects of an academic library that are accessible to the institution. Also, the proposed changes align the library question in the IC survey component to IPEDS definition of an academic library. Currently, we ask institutions if they have their own library, a shared library that they contribute to financially, or neither of these options. This practice does not account for all available options that an institution might have access to regarding an academic library or library collections. We propose to ask the question, "Which of the following library resources or services does your institution provide to its clientele?" The data provider would check all that apply from the following list: physical facilities; an organized collection of printed materials; access to digital/electronic resources; a staff trained to provide and interpret library materials; established library hours, or access to library collections that are shared with another institution or library. This will not increase burden, and the proposed question design better allows for institutions to report all aspects of an academic library that are accessible to them.

The third set of proposed changes originated during the 2014-15 data collection cycle and the subsequent data quality review of the survey component. The main intent of these proposed changes is to focus institutions on the topic of distance education by creating a new Distance Education screen, which contains a new screening question and the two existing distance education questions. We propose the new screening question, "Does your institution offer distance education courses?" If the answer is "Yes," the institution will be shown the remainder of the Distance Education screen, which would contain the two existing distance education questions. The focus on courses will allow for both of the additional questions to be answered consistently, as programs cannot be offered exclusively via distance education and at different levels if the institution does not offer distance education courses. The change is based on feedback from the IPEDS Help Desk, which stated that institutions find it difficult to follow the screen as it is currently formatted. There will not be an increase in burden and the new page allows for a more focused approach to distance education.

The next proposed changes originated from discussions between NCES and the Office of Postsecondary Education and the Office of the Undersecretary. The addition of Dun and Bradstreet (DUNS) numbers will facilitate the use of IPEDS data in the grants system, with the goal of improving data sharing within the agency and decreasing duplicative reporting by institutions. Institutions will be asked, "If your institution has an assigned Dun and Bradstreet number (DUNS) please enter your institution's DUNS number(s)." There will be a negligible increase in burden due to this change, and only for 1 year, as these numbers will be retained in subsequent years. The addition of web address for Disability Services will allow for the sharing of this information with students on College Navigator.

Table 2. Proposed changes to the IC Form (all versions)			
Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Part C: Other Survey Screening Questions - Library Expenses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add additional screening question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Does your institution have access to a library collection?” 	2016-17	NCES initiated, institution feedback	No additional
Part C: Student Services - Distance Opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the following item: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Does your institution have its own library or are you financially supporting a shared library with another postsecondary education institution?” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have our own library Do not have our own library but contribute financial support to a shared library Neither of the above Add the following item: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Which of the following library resources or services does your institution provide to its clientele? Check all that apply.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical facilities An organized collection of printed materials Access to digital/electronic resources A staff trained to provide and interpret library materials Established library hours Access to library collections that are shared with another institution None of the Above 	2016-17	NCES initiated, QC review	No additional
Add screening question to determine if school offers any distance education courses: 1. “Does your institution offer distance education courses?”	2016-17	NCES initiated, QC review	No additional
Move existing distance education questions to new Distance Education screen: 2. “Are all of the programs at your institution offered exclusively via distance education?” 3. “Please indicate at what level(s) your institution offers distance education opportunities (courses and/or programs)”	2016-17	NCES initiated, QC review	No additional
Institutional Identification Page. Add question to collect DUNS numbers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “If your institution has an assigned Dun and Bradstreet number (DUNS) please enter your institution’s DUNS number(s).” 	2016-17	NCES initiated	Minimal
Institutional Identification Page. Add a box to collect Disability Services Web Address.	2016-17	NCES initiated	Minimal

Student Financial Aid (SFA). The proposed change to the Student Financial Aid (SFA) survey component is intended to help data providers create useful and meaningful context messages and reduce the number of typos, grammatical mistakes, and inappropriate comments. Currently, there is an open text box to allow data providers to type in contexts. The enhancement will allow data providers to select a prescribed context, write their own context, or leave the text box empty.

This change is in response to survey director review of the context boxes for the SFA survey component.

Table 3. Proposed changes to the IPEDS SFA Form (all versions)			
Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Allow data provider to select a pre-scripted context from the dropdown box. The data provider also has the option to enter their own or leave the text box empty.	2016-17	NCES initiated, QC review	Decrease

Outcome Measures (OM). The proposed changes to the OM survey component are based on recommendations made during the TRP meeting held in July 2008, *Collecting GRS Data on Part-time Students and Pell Grant Recipients* (TRP #24). This TRP recommended adding a subcohort of Pell Grant recipients to the Graduation Rates (GR) survey component. However, the report and suggestions from the TRP were not posted for public comment at that time because NCES’ resources were dedicated to

implementing requirements of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), which became law in August 2008, soon after TRP #24 was held. With the passage of HEOA, which amended the Higher Education Act (HEA), Section 485(a) (20 U.S.C. 1092(a)) required all institutions participating in Title IV HEA student financial aid programs to disclose the graduation rates of Pell Grant recipients. By making Pell Grant graduation rates a disclosure requirement on institutions' websites instead of a federal reporting requirement, federal policymakers, the Administration, and public were still unable to obtain reliable and complete information on the federal investment of the Pell Grant program.

Data from the Federal Student Aid Data Center show that in 2014-15, the federal government disbursed \$30.3 billion in Pell Grants to 8.4 million full-time and part-time undergraduate students. In contrast, \$13.1 billion was disbursed to 5.5 million students 10 years ago. The percent change shows a 10-year growth of the Pell Grant program by 131 percent in federal dollars to 50 percent more students. And while retention and completion rate data on Pell Grant recipients are currently available through the Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS) longitudinal study, a NCES sample survey, BPS cannot provide annual measures at the institutional level. To assess the effectiveness of this large federal investment to undergraduate students, NCES proposes adding a fifth cohort, the Pell Grant recipient cohort, to the OM survey component.

Creating a cohort of Pell Grant recipients in the OM survey component is a better vehicle for data collection than creating a sub-Pell Grant cohort in Graduation Rates. Graduation Rates disaggregates reporting by race/ethnicity and gender and OM does not. The institutional burden, particularly at smaller institutions, would be greater if Pell Grant recipients had to be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender. Also, as several TRP (e.g., #s 24, 37, 40, and 45) have repeatedly argued, while such information would be desirable, small cell sizes become an issue due to potential disclosure of identifying information. Last, by collecting data on Pell Grant recipients through the OM survey component, non-Pell Grant recipient outcome data can also be calculated. The higher education community has frequently advocated for measures that allow for the comparison between Pell Grant recipients and non-Pell Grant recipients. Institutions would report the Pell Grant recipients across all of the OMs, and non-Pell Grant recipients could be calculated by subtraction.

Additionally, NCES proposes allowing institutions to include students who are studying abroad during their first year of postsecondary education when reporting data involving the creation of cohorts. Study abroad students are likely to return the following year and complete at that postsecondary institution. Currently, the OM survey component instructs institutions to exclude these students from its cohorts. OM also draws from the Fall Enrollment (EF) survey component's full-time, first-time degree/certificate-undergraduate students, where study abroad students are excluded. In order to include full-time, first-year degree/certificate-undergraduate students who study abroad, NCES proposes updates to the OM instructions on who to include/exclude, as well as clarifications to the instructions for including study abroad students in their revised cohorts.

Due to comments made during the 60-day public comment period, NCES will hold a Technical Review Panel (TRP) meeting in August 2016 to discuss the potential for further changes to this component (see section A.16 of this document for expected TRP and public comment schedule).

Table 4. Proposed changes to the Outcome Measures (OM) Form

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
<p>A fifth cohort will be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pell Grant recipients <p>The Pell Grant cohort will be drawn and reported from the four OM cohorts (full-time, first-time; part-time, first-time; full-time, non-first-time, part-time, non-first-time).</p> <p>Similar to the other four OM cohorts, institutions will also report the 6-year award status and 8-year award status on undergraduate students who received a Pell Grant during the reporting period.</p> <p>Students from the four OM cohorts who received any Pell Grant dollars (disbursed) at that institution will be included in the Pell Grant cohort. Students who were awarded but did not receive a disbursement are not included.</p>	2017-18 (2016-17 preview year)	Graduation rates and Outcome Measures TRPs	Substantial

Table 4. Proposed changes to the Outcome Measures (OM) Form

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
<p>Students from the four OM cohorts who received a Pell Grant at any time over the 8-year period are included in the Pell Grant cohort.</p> <p>The OM of non-Pell Grant recipients will be calculated by subtracting the Pell Grant recipient cohort from the total of the four OM cohorts.</p> <p>Collect the status update from both 2-year and 4-year institutions at 8 years after the cohort enters the institution with award information collected for both the 6-year and 8-year timeframes. Pell Grant recipient data collection will begin in 2017-18. Institutions will report on their 2009 cohorts.</p> <p>Note: Data will not be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, or gender.</p> <p>Note: No outcome data will be collected from non-degree-granting institutions.</p> <p>Note: Pell Grant cohort data will not be disaggregated by attendance status (full-time or part-time) or postsecondary experience (first-time or non-first-time)</p>			
<p>Update and delete in current instructions on who to exclude:</p> <p>Who to Exclude Exclude students who are not enrolled for credit. For example, exclude:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students enrolled exclusively in courses that cannot be applied toward a formal award • Students enrolled exclusively in Continuing Education Units (CEUs) • Students exclusively auditing classes • Residents or interns in doctor's professional practice programs, because they have already received their doctor's degree <p>In addition, the following students should be excluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any student studying abroad (e.g., at a foreign university) if their enrollment at the 'home' institution serves as an administrative record <p>Students in any branch campus located in a foreign country</p>	2016-17	Study TRP	Abroad No additional
<p>Update the instructions for Revised Cohort column to include an additional inclusion criterion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who studied abroad their first year upon entering the institution 	2016-17	Study TRP	Abroad No additional

Graduation Rates. NCES proposes allowing institutions to include students who study abroad their first year of entering a postsecondary institution in data collections involving the creation of cohorts. Students who study abroad their first year of postsecondary education are likely to return the following year and complete at that postsecondary institution. Currently, the GR survey component uses the fall and 12-month full-time, first-time enrollments, which exclude full-time, first-time study abroad students, to establish the initial cohorts. In order to include full-time, first-year students who study abroad, NCES requests to update the GR instructions on who to exclude as well as provide instructions to include these students in their revised cohorts.

Based on feedback during the 60-day public comment period, NCES also proposes to collect the data necessary to calculate the 150% graduation rates for Pell recipients and recipients of subsidized Stafford Loans who did not receive a Pell Grant. Institutions are currently required to disclose this information on their websites and thus should have the information necessary to report these rates. Currently, there is no federal collection of these rates. This will allow for the rates to be available to students and researchers in a centralized location.

NCES will meet with experts to provide the instructions for this addition to the GR survey component and will announce a 30-day public comment period on the proposed instructions in late summer 2016 (see section A.16 of this document for expected schedule).

Table 5. Proposed changes to the Graduation Rates (GR) Form (all versions)			
Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Update and delete in current instructions on who to exclude: Who to Exclude Exclude students who are not enrolled for credit. For example, exclude: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students enrolled exclusively in courses that cannot be applied toward a formal award • Students enrolled exclusively in Continuing Education Units (CEUs) • Students exclusively auditing classes • Residents or interns in doctor's professional practice programs, since they have already received their doctor's degree In addition, the following students should be excluded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any student studying abroad (e.g., at a foreign university) if their enrollment at the 'home' institution serves as an administrative record Students in any branch campus located in a foreign country	2016-17	Study Abroad TRP	Minimal
Update the instructions for Revised Cohort column to include an additional inclusion criterion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who studied abroad their first year upon entering the institution 	2016-17	Study Abroad TRP	No additional
Add a new section – Section IV – to collect the data necessary to calculate the 150% graduation rates for 2 sub-cohorts that are currently required disclosures per the Higher Education Act, as amended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pell Grant Recipients • Recipients of a subsidized Stafford Loan who did not receive a Pell Grant 	2016-17	60 day comment period	Minimal

Graduation Rates 200 (GR200). NCES proposes asking a screening question to determine applicability of GR200. In the past, the GR200 survey component was automatically made not applicable if the institution reported zero students as still enrolled to the GR survey component. The IPEDS Help Desk would receive numerous calls from institutions that had incorrectly reported zero students as still enrolled in GR, but have additional students to report to GR200. Institutions should be able to report on students who received an award between 151 percent and 200 percent of the normal time to complete. Currently, GR200 is, by default, applicable to all institutions regardless of whether or not institutions reported having students still enrolled. However, this creates confusion among institutions that may not have to complete GR200.

There are many institutions that do not allow students to persist past 150 percent of normal time to complete, and have no data to report. It is unclear if these institutions should report zeros or request to have GR200 not applicable, which requires institutions to contact and request the IPEDS Help Desk to manually override the requirement to complete GR200.

By including a screening question, we can determine the applicability of the GR200 survey component, which will allow institutions to report accurate data for previously reported incorrect data, and eliminate reporting uncertainty and decrease institutional burden for institutions that would not have to complete GR200.

Table 6. Proposed changes to the Graduation Rates 200 (GR200) Form (all versions)			
Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Add screening question to determine if school has students to report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your institution reported to the GR survey component as having the following number of students who did not complete, but were still enrolled at your institution: (preload the number reported from GR) • Do you have students who received an award between 151% and 200% of the normal time to complete? (Y/N) 	2016-17	NCES initiated, QC review	Decrease

Admissions (ADM). The first two proposed changes to the Admissions (ADM) survey component originated during the 2014-15 data collection cycle and the subsequent data quality review of the survey component. Currently, we ask data providers to report “Don’t Know” for admission considerations if they do not know if certain admission criteria are required, recommended, or neither required nor recommended for

their institution. To enable data providers to show a more accurate representation of their institutions' admission criteria, we propose eliminating the "Don't Know" option for admission considerations. In addition, we propose adding a "Considered but Not Required" column to the admission considerations section for the same reason. Additionally, this change would allow institutions for which test scores are "Considered but Not Required" to report test scores later in the survey form.

We also propose eliminating the collection of "SAT Writing" and "ACT Writing" scores, because the data have limited utility for students and researchers. A majority of institutions do not require these test scores and, as a result, do not report them. However, they do feel the need to explain why they are not reporting scores, leading to additional burden. The institutions that do report the scores often do so incorrectly.

The last two proposed changes originated during discussions with the College Board and the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) and are intended to allow institutions to report SAT scores appropriately during the transition to the new SAT scales. Currently, SAT critical reading and math scores are reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. In 2016-17, we propose that SAT critical reading and math scores continue to be reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. Institutions that have scores based on the new (2016) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables. However, in 2017-18, we propose that SAT critical reading and math scores be reported based on the new (2016) SAT score range. At that time, and subsequently, institutions that have scores based on the (2015) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables.

Table 7. Proposed changes to the Admissions (ADM) Form (all versions)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Admissions considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete column "Don't Know" for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Select the option that best describes how your institution uses any of the following data in its undergraduate selection process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Secondary school GPA ▪ Secondary school rank ▪ Secondary school record ▪ Completion of college-preparatory program ▪ Recommendations ▪ Formal demonstration of competencies (e.g., portfolios, certificates of mastery, assessment instruments) ▪ Admission test scores ▪ SAT/ACT ▪ Other test (ABT, Wonderlic, WISC-III, etc.) ▪ TOEFL 	2016-17	NCES initiated, review	QC No additional
Add column "Considered But Not Required" for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select the option that best describes how your institution uses any of the following data in its undergraduate selection process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secondary school GPA ○ Secondary school rank ○ Secondary school record ○ Completion of college-preparatory program ○ Recommendations ○ Formal demonstration of competencies (e.g., portfolios, certificates of mastery, assessment instruments) ○ Admission test scores ○ SAT/ACT ○ Other test (ABT, Wonderlic, WISC-III, etc.) ○ TOEFL 	2016-17	NCES initiated, review	QC No additional
Selection Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete row "SAT Writing" 	2016-17	NCES initiated, review	QC Decrease
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete row "ACT Writing" 	2016-17	NCES initiated, review	QC Decrease

Table 7. Proposed changes to the Admissions (ADM) Form (all versions)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction change for reporting SAT scores <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SAT Critical Reading ○ SAT Critical Math <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently, SAT critical reading and math scores are reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. In 2016-17, SAT critical reading and math scores should continue to be reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. Institutions that have scores based on the new (2016) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables. 	2016-17	College Board/NPEC	Minimal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction change for reporting SAT scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SAT Critical Reading ○ SAT Critical Math <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previously, SAT critical reading and math scores were reported based on the (2015) SAT score range. In 2017-18, SAT critical reading and math scores should be reported based on the new (2016) SAT score range. Institutions that have scores based on the (2015) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables. 	2017-18	College Board/NPEC	Minimal

Fall Enrollment (EF). The proposed changes to the EF survey component originated from the TRP, *Clarifying Study Abroad Enrollment* (TRP #47), which discussed the issue with reporting retention for institutions with study abroad students. Retention is the rate at which students persist in their educational program at an institution. Students enrolled in study abroad programs their freshman year may not be included in the institution’s first-time cohort, causing them to be excluded from the calculation of the institution’s retention rate. NCES requests that a field be added to the Retention Rate screen to allow the institution to include, in their first-time cohort, students who studied abroad their freshman year and re-enrolled or completed their program at the same institution the following year. Additionally, instructions will be added to clarify that students studying abroad their sophomore year should still be included in the institution’s cohort of returning students.

Table 8. Proposed changes to the Fall Enrollment (EF) Form (all versions)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Add the following item to the retention screen and in the instructions for Fall Enrollment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusions to the Fall 20xx cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include eligible students who studied abroad their first year upon entering the institution 	2016-17	Study Abroad TRP	Minimal

Finance (F). The TRP *Improvements to the Finance Survey* (TRP #46) discussed at length the reporting of expenses on the Finance survey component. Since data providers often cite the Expense section of the Finance forms as a challenge, the panel reviewed this section and considered removing or collapsing data elements to reduce the amount of fields collected and to ease institutional burden. Of the three proposals that were brought forth from the TRP, proposal 3, which is to collect expenses by functional and natural classifications separately, appeared as the least likely to disrupt data trends and was the most supported. NCES is proposing to retain the collection of Salaries and Wages by functional classifications, as these figures are used for trend reporting in other ED publications (e.g., the *Digest of Education Statistics*).

Additionally, for GASB institutions, two additional items will be added to comply with GASB Statement 63 - Financial Reporting of Deferred Outflows of Resources, Deferred Inflows of Resources, and Net Position – which required the reporting of deferred outflows and inflows of resources by public institutions. When GASB 63 was implemented in Fiscal Year 2012, NCES had advised institutions in the 2013-14 collection to include deferred outflows of resources with “Total current assets” and deferred inflows of resources with “Total current liabilities”. In order to better align with the display of financial information on the institution’s General Purpose Financial Statement – which shows deferrals as separate items from assets and liabilities – NCES has decided to add two fields to collect “deferred outflows of resources” and “deferred inflows of resources” separately. This will improve clarity of the data and ease some burden for the reporting

institutions since they can now match IPEDS with financial data already recognized in their financial statements.

Table 9. Proposed changes to the Finance (F) Form (GASB Form)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Statement of Financial Position screen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Deferred outflows of resources o Deferred inflows of resources 	2016-17	NCES	None
Expense screen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove matrix of expenses by functional and natural classifications • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following functional classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Instruction o Research o Public service o Academic support o Student services o Institutional support o Operation and maintenance of plant o Scholarship and fellowship expenses o Auxiliary enterprises o Hospital services (if answer Y to screening question) o Independent operations o Other functional expenses o Total expenses and deductions • Add a column to the above table for reporting salaries and wages by the same functional classifications • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following natural classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Salaries and wages (preloaded from above table) o Benefits o Depreciation o Interest o Other natural expenses, calculated from total expenses minus the sum of salaries, benefits, depreciation, and interest o Total expenses and deductions (preloaded from above table) 	2016-17	Finance TRP	Decrease
Pension screen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise screening question to "Does your institution include pension liabilities, expenses, and/or deferrals for one or more defined benefit pension plans in its "Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position?" 	2016-17	NCES	Minimal
Revenue data for Bureau of Census: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Gifts and Private Grants to exclude capital contributions 	2016-17	Census Bureau	Minimal
Expenditure data for Bureau of Census: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove fields for salaries and wages • Employee benefits will no longer be preloaded but must be reported for the following functions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Auxiliary enterprises o Hospitals • Remove fields for scholarships and fellowships 	2016-17	Census Bureau	Minimal
Debt and assets data for Bureau of Census: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise instructions so that long-term debt (lines 01 through 06) is to include all debt issued in the name of the institution • Revise instructions so that assets (lines 07 through 09) can include bond funds established by parent state or local government 	2016-17	Census Bureau	Minimal

Table 10. Proposed changes to the Finance (F) Form (FASB form)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Expense screen:	2016-17	F TRP	Decrease
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove matrix of expenses by functional and natural classifications • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following functional classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction ○ Research ○ Public service ○ Academic support ○ Student services ○ Institutional support ○ Operation and maintenance of plant ○ Net grant aid to students expenses ○ Auxiliary enterprises ○ Hospital services (if answer Y to screening question) ○ Independent operations ○ Other functional expenses ○ Total expenses and deductions • Add a column to the above table for reporting salaries and wages by the same functional classifications • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following natural classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Salaries and wages (preloaded from above table) ○ Benefits ○ Depreciation ○ Interest ○ Other natural expenses, calculated from total expenses minus the sum of salaries, benefits, depreciation, and interest ○ Total expenses and deductions (preloaded from above table) 			

Human Resources (HR). The proposed changes to the HR survey component are a result of recommendations made by the Technical Review Panel, *Improvements to the Human Resources Survey for Degree-Granting Institutions* (TRP #44). The following proposed changes are broken out by section.

Salary Outlays: Currently, IPEDS calculates weighted average monthly salaries for full-time non-medical school instructional staff by gender and academic rank. The number of these staff and the number of months covered by their annual salary (9, 10, 11, or 12 months), along with total salary outlays for these individuals, are used to calculate a weighted average monthly salary for each gender and academic rank. The weighted average monthly salary can then be multiplied by 9 to generate an equated 9-month salary. The TRP panelists suggested collecting outlays separately by contract length/employment agreement (i.e., 9-month, 10-month, 11- month, and 12-month).

Salary Headcounts: Currently, salary headcounts for full-time non-medical school instructional staff are collected from degree-granting institutions in Part G of the survey component, based on the number of months covered by the employee’s annual salary (i.e., 9, 10, 11, or 12 months). A count of the remaining full-time non-medical school instructional staff who are not accounted for is automatically generated by subtracting the number of staff reported in Part G from the total number of full-time non-medical school instructional staff reported in Part A of the survey component. Although the remaining instructional staff in the balance column should include only those staff whose contracts/employment agreements are for less than 9 months, it is difficult from a quality control perspective for IPEDS project staff to ensure that the correct staff—and only the correct staff—are included here. NCES proposes to expand the survey forms for degree-granting institutions to collect the number of full-time non-medical school instructional staff whose contract/employment agreement covers a period of less than 9 months by gender and academic rank to square the data file and clarify reporting.

Noninstructional Occupational Categories: Following the required alignment of the IPEDS HR survey component with the 2010 SOC in 2012-13, institutions are now instructed that each job at the institution must be categorized in one of the available SOC-aligned occupational categories (approved by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for IPEDS reporting) according to the 2010 SOC. However, the SOC classification

system is not designed with postsecondary institutions in mind. Many common postsecondary occupations are not reflected in the SOC classification system, and respondents have identified a number of roles as difficult to classify using the new SOC-aligned occupational categories. The panel agreed that additional guidance on the appropriate classifications for staff would improve the overall quality of the data reported to IPEDS.

Graduate Assistants, by Function: Federal mandates require a headcount of graduate assistants involved in instructional activities, but reporting headcounts in the other occupational categories is not required. All degree-granting institutions report graduate assistants by race/ethnicity, gender, and function. To reduce the amount of burden associated with reporting these data, NCES proposes to collapse the occupation codes for reporting graduate assistants into three general classifications: teaching, research, and other.

Data on New Hires: The period of reporting provides a snapshot of new hires at one point in the fall rather than a full year of data. Institutions are asked to report the number of full-time permanent staff who were included on the payroll of the institution between July 1 and October 31 of the most recent year either for the first time (new to the institution) or after a break in service and who were still on the payroll of the institution as of November 1 of the most recent year. To collect more complete information on new hires and improve data quality, NCES proposes broadening the reporting period for new hires to include any newly hired, full-time, permanent staff on the payroll of the institution between November 1 of the previous calendar year and October 31 of the most recent calendar year.

Employment Agreement/Contract Length: The current subcategories used to classify non-tenure-track contract faculty include multiyear contract, annual contract, and less-than-annual contract. The IPEDS Help Desk received numerous calls asking how to classify continuing and at-will contract employees. To decrease confusion, NCES proposes the addition of the subcategory “employment agreements/contract lengths of indefinite duration (e.g., continuing and at-will).”

Reporting of Race/Ethnicity: The collection and reporting of race/ethnicity and gender data on the HR survey component are mandatory for all institutions that receive, are applicants for, or expect to be applicants for Title IV federal financial assistance. The collection of these data is also mandated by P.L. 88-352, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (29 CFR 1602, subparts O, P, and Q). Data on race/ethnicity and gender of staff are currently collected every other year (in odd-numbered years). The reporting of data by race/ethnicity and gender is optional in even-numbered years. Nearly all IPEDS data items, including student data by race/ethnicity and gender, are collected annually. NCES proposes collecting annual data on faculty and staff by race/ethnicity and gender to provide more comprehensive demographic information and better facilitate trend analysis.

Table 11. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (Degree-granting Institution Forms)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Salary outlays: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect salary outlays separately by contract length/employment agreement (i.e., 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, 12-month). 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal
Salary headcounts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect the headcount of full-time instructional staff on contract/employment agreements of less than 9 months by gender and academic rank. 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal
Noninstructional occupational categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide better guidance on where to classify the most problematic roles among the existing categories. 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal
Graduate assistants, by function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement new, condensed categories specifically for graduate assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduate assistant, teaching; graduate assistant, research; and Graduate assistant, other. 	2016-17	HR TRP	Decrease
Data on new hires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the reporting period for new hires to include any newly hired, full-time, permanent staff on the payroll of the institution between November 1 and October 31 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal

Table 12. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time staff)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Employment agreement/contract length: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add category "Employment agreements/contract lengths of indefinite duration (e.g. continuing and at-will)." 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal

Table 13. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (all versions)

Change	Implementation Year	Source	Estimated burden
Reporting of race/ethnicity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement annual collection of staff data by race/ethnicity. 	2016-17	HR TRP	Minimal

Academic Libraries (AL). The changes below will provide additional information on library collections and were developed from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Joint Advisory Task Force.

The joint task force suggested adding "Serials" to the library collections column and the circulation count (excluding e-serial usage count) for Section I of the AL component. These items were not previously included in the AL component. The joint task force suggested the inclusion of serials in the AL component because they are an important content source by users of academic libraries.

In Section II of the AL component, we currently ask questions regarding interlibrary loan services (total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries, total interlibrary loans and documents received). However, Section II questions are more aligned with library expenditures and Section I questions are more aligned with library collections. We propose moving the questions associated with interlibrary loan services to Section I of the survey since they are more related to library collections. Also, the inclusion of these questions in Section I of the AL component means that all institutions that qualify for the AL component will be eligible to answer these questions.

Additionally in Section II of the AL component we currently ask institutions a yes/no question that states, "Does your library support virtual reference services?" The joint task force proposed eliminating this question due to the fact that almost every library provides some means of virtual reference services. Based on this recommendation, we propose deleting this question from Section II of the AL component.

Finally, a number of definitions/instructions have been revised based on input from the Joint Task Force. They are listed in the table below, and more detail can be viewed on the proposed form. These instructional changes will improve the collection by better aligning with current library standard definitions.

Table 14. Proposed changes to Academic Libraries (AL) Form (all versions)

Change	Implementation year	Source	Estimated burden
Section I: For all degree-granting institutions with library expenses > 0 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add "Serials" row to Library Collections 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	Minimal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include "Serials" in the count for circulation 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	Moderate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change name of Section I from Library Collections/Circulation to Library Collections/Circulation and Interlibrary Loan Services 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interlibrary Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Yes/No question: "Does your institution have interlibrary services?" 	2016-17	NCES	No additional

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Interlibrary services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents received 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	No additional
<p>Section II: For degree-granting institutions with library expenses >= \$100,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the following from Section II (moved to Section I): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Interlibrary services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents received 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the following question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Does your library support virtual reference services?” 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change name of Section II from Expenses and Interlibrary Services to Expenses. 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section I, changes instructions related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Physical books; physical media; physical serials; digital/electronic books; digital/electronic serials; physical circulation; and digital/electronic circulation or usage. 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force; OMB comments	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section I, change interlibrary services to interlibrary loan services and add a definition to the glossary for the term. 	2016-17	ACRL, ALA and ARL Joint Task Force; OMB comments	No additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section II, change instructions related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ One-time purchases of books, serial back-files, and other materials; ongoing commitments to subscriptions; other materials/service cost; all other operations and maintenance expenses 			

All Survey Components. To provide better estimates of burden on an ongoing basis, NCES will ask IPEDS keyholders to voluntarily report the time required to complete each survey component every other year, with the exception of when a new component or major change is implemented. In those cases, NCES will ask for burden estimates the first and second years of data collection, and then they will be moved to the same years as the other components. NCES estimates a burden of 0.2 hour to track, record, and report this time for the following components: Institutional Characteristics and Admissions, Completions, 12-month Enrollment, Graduation Rates, Graduation Rates 200, Outcome Measures, and Fall Enrollment. NCES estimates it will take 0.4 hour for Student Financial Aid, Finance, Human Resources, and Academic Libraries, because these four components typically involve additional offices at the institution and require keyholders to get time estimates from others at the institution.

Burden Calculations

The voluntary collection of time required to submit IPEDS data was implemented in the 2012-13 data collection, and these data were subsequently collected in 2014-15. The results were used for the burden calculations in this clearance package. Detailed findings and calculations can be found in section A.12 of this document.

Section A. Justification

A.1. Purpose of this Submission

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is seeking clearance for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collections. Current clearance covers the 2013-14 through 2015-16 survey years and is due to expire on December 31, 2016. We are therefore requesting a new clearance to conduct the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 data collections.

A.1.a. The Design of IPEDS

Related Background Information. IPEDS was developed to address technical problems with previous postsecondary education statistical programs, including the Higher Education General Information Survey

(HEGIS) and the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS). IPEDS was designed to collect accurate, reliable, and timely data from the entire postsecondary universe. Although it was based on the HEGIS model, which provides institution-level data submitted either directly to NCES by the institution or through a central or state coordinating office, the IPEDS design allows for varying institution types. The institution-level data collection allows for aggregation of results at various levels and permits significant controls on data quality to be exercised by NCES.

IPEDS Components. The IPEDS system consists of several components that obtain and disseminate information on who provides postsecondary education (institutions), who participates in it and completes it (students), what programs are offered and what programs are completed, and the resources involved in the provision of institutionally based postsecondary education, both human and financial. The approved components include:

- Institutional Characteristics (IC);
- Completions (C);
- Fall Enrollment (EF);
- 12-month Enrollment (E12);
- Admissions (ADM);
- Student Financial Aid (SFA);
- Graduation Rates (GR);
- Graduation Rates 200 (GR200);
- Outcome Measures (OM)
- Human Resources (HR);
- Finance (F); and
- Academic Libraries (AL).

A.1.b. Proposed Modifications

1. Data Collection Method. We are proposing to continue using the IPEDS web-based system of collection for all components. This collection is organized into three phases based on data availability at the institutions: Fall, Winter, and Spring.

The Fall collection includes:

- Institutional Characteristics
- Completions
- 12-month Enrollment

The Winter and Spring components open simultaneously to allow respondents to submit Spring data early, if they wish to do so:

Winter collection components:

- Student Financial Aid
- Graduation Rates
- Graduation Rates 200
- Outcome Measures
- Admissions

Spring collection components:

- Fall Enrollment
- Finance
- Human Resources
- Academic Libraries

Institutions are able to enter data manually on a web-based form or to upload a file containing the data. In many instances, prior-year data are provided for comparison purposes. The data are edited as they are entered into the system, and respondents must either correct any errors identified or enter an explanation to submit their response to NCES. This process shortens data processing time, increases data quality, and reduces burden on institutions by precluding the need for repeated callbacks from NCES contractors. The IPEDS system is accessible to persons with disabilities.

2. Data Content. We are proposing considerable additions in data content over the next 3 years. The formats for reporting IPEDS data are very similar to those used for the 2001-02 through 2015-16 data collection cycles.

We anticipate that the IPEDS Technical Review Panel (TRP) may recommend consideration of additional data items; however, no major changes (additional items) will be made to the IPEDS forms without prior notification to OMB and subsequent approval. The IPEDS TRP was formed to assist NCES contractors in a variety of ways including: making suggestions for updating the surveys with items that are more relevant to current postsecondary issues; discussing universe definitions; suggesting ways IPEDS can better serve the institutions and respondents; discussing outcomes and products; and discussing current issues. The TRP generally meets three times a year (on an irregular basis) to discuss various topics of interest to the community of IPEDS data providers and data users. How the panels work:

- issue/topic is identified;
- panelists with expertise on the topic are invited to attend the meeting;
- a background paper is prepared by a consultant and distributed to panel members for review prior to the meeting;
- meetings are held and the topics are discussed at length;
- discussion and any suggestions are summarized and posted to the IPEDS website;
- the contractor accepts comments from the public on the topic;
- when comments are received, they are summarized and sent to NCES; and
- a document is posted to the website that includes a summary of comments and NCES/IPEDS' intent to respond and/or implement actions as a result of the comments.

A.1.c. Need for Clearance at This Time

Clearance helps ensure that IPEDS maintains a consistent set of data items to collect data from the various institutions at the needed time and with the needed detail. This is important because the utility and quality of data collected in one component in some cases are dependent upon, and in all cases are enhanced by, data collected in other components. Internal consistency and the inherent relationships among IPEDS components also permit reliability indicators to be established for many of the IPEDS data elements. Having the capability for assessing reliability on an ongoing basis and, in turn, being able to address individual and systemic problems as they occur will result in significantly better postsecondary education data. Moreover, the concept of a data system rather than a series of standalone, independent survey components, enables elimination of duplication of effort, thereby reducing response burden. The web-based data collection system will continue to allow NCES to comply with the Higher Education Act (HEA), which required the redesign of the data collection system, so as to improve the timeliness and quality of IPEDS data, by increasing the efficiency of data collection.

Additionally, clearance will update the IPEDS burden estimates, reflecting revisions resulting from institutional estimates and NCES and General Accounting Office (GAO) studies. The GAO report suggested that NCES consider basing estimates on institutional characteristics and IPEDS keyholder experience, as these items have a more significant impact on variations in time burden than do the actual forms. Based on the GAO recommendations, NCES developed new time burden estimates for the previous clearance request that took into account the type of institutions and keyholder experience. These new estimates are now updated using institutional estimates submitted voluntarily during the 2012-13 and 2014-15 data collections.

A.1.d. Statutory Requirements for IPEDS Data

General Mandate. IPEDS, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, plays a major role in responding to the Center's Congressional mandate under the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C., § 9573).

Mandatory Reporting for Institutions with Program Participation Agreements. The completion of all IPEDS surveys, in a timely and accurate manner, is mandatory for all institutions that participate in or are applicants for participation in any federal financial assistance program authorized by Title IV of the HEA of 1965, as amended. The completion of the surveys is mandated by 20 USC 1094, Section 487(a)(17) and 34 CFR 668.14(b)(19).

Vocational Education Data. IPEDS responds to certain of the requirements pursuant to Section 421(a)(1) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. The data related to vocational program completions are collected from those postsecondary institutions known to provide occupationally specific vocational education.

Data on Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Students. The collection and reporting of racial/ethnic data on students and completers are mandatory for all institutions that receive, are applicants for, or expect to be applicants for federal financial assistance as defined in the Department of Education (ED) regulations implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (34 CFR 100.13), or defined in any ED regulation implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972. NCES has implemented the new reporting requirements for race/ethnicity, and use of the new race/ethnicity aggregate reporting categories was mandatory as of the collection of 2010-11 data.

Data on Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Staff. The collection and reporting of racial/ethnic data on the Human Resources (HR) component are mandatory for all institutions that receive, are applicants for, or expect to be applicants for federal financial assistance as defined in the ED regulations implementing Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (34 CFR 100.12). The collection of data are also mandated by Public Law 88-352, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (29 CFR 1602, subparts O, P, and Q).

Student Right-to-Know. Sections 668.41, 668.45, and 668.48 of the Student Assistance General Provision were amended to implement the Student Right-to-Know Act, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1991 and further by the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 1993 and 1999. These final regulations require an institution that participates in any student financial assistance program under Title IV of the HEA of 1965, as amended, to disclose information about graduation or completion rates to current and prospective students. Data must also be reported to the Secretary of Education; this is accomplished through the IPEDS Graduation Rates (GR) survey component.

Consumer Information. Section 101 of the HEA amendments of 1965 (PL 105-244) requires that NCES collect the following information from institutions of higher education: tuition and fees; cost of attendance; average amount of financial assistance received by type of aid, and the number of students receiving each type.

Section 132 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (PL 110-315) requires that ED "make publicly available on the College Navigator website, in simple and understandable terms," information regarding enrollments, degree completions, admissions, net price, college costs, students with disabilities, graduation rates, and many additional consumer information items.

A.2. Purpose and Use of IPEDS Information

IPEDS provides NCES with the basic data needed to describe the size of the postsecondary enterprise in terms of students enrolled, staff employed, dollars expended, and degrees earned. The IPEDS universe also provides the institutional sampling frame used in most other postsecondary surveys such as the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS). Each of these surveys uses the IPEDS institutional universe for its first stage sample and relies on IPEDS data on enrollment, completions, or staff to weight its second stage sample.

In addition to use within NCES and other areas of ED, IPEDS data are heavily relied on by Congress, other federal agencies, state governments, education providers, professional associations, private businesses,

media, military, and interested individuals. Finally, IPEDS data are used in the IPEDS Data Feedback Reports, annual reports that are sent to all postsecondary institutions. They contain data and figures comparing each institution to a group of “comparison” institutions, using a variety of IPEDS data variables and derived variables, and are electronically mailed to the Chief Executive Officer of each institution. The reports serve as a means of highlighting the utility of IPEDS data, as well as providing comparative data for institutions to use in meeting their institutional goals relative to their postsecondary “peers.”

Additional uses of IPEDS data, specific to individual survey components, include those listed below.

A.2.a. Institutional Characteristics

Institutional Characteristics (IC) data are the foundation of the entire IPEDS system. These data elements constitute the primary information that is necessary to interrelate and understand other descriptive kinds of statistical data about education, such as enrollments, staff, graduates, and finance. The information is essential to: (1) establishing the universe control file for IPEDS and (2) developing data collection sampling frames. The IPEDS universe is used as the sampling frame for many other NCES studies, including the NPSAS.

In addition to the need for these data within NCES and ED (Title III and HEA programs and the Office for Civil Rights use data from IPEDS), other federal agencies rely on the database and the resulting list of postsecondary institutions. NCES has utilized IPEDS data in fulfilling past information requests from the Air Force; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the Department of Defense (including recruiting offices of all Armed Services); the Departments of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Labor; the National Science Foundation; the Veterans Administration; the Social Security Administration; and members of Congress. NCES continues to fulfill information requests as they are received, and has also significantly increased the volume of IPEDS data available on its public websites, allowing end users increased access to current and historic IPEDS data.

Much of the data collected through the IC survey component are of special interest to consumers, and are made available through College Navigator, a web-based college search tool (see <http://collegenavigator.ed.gov>).

Additionally, NCES makes available on College Navigator data provided by the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) and the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) for the purpose of disseminating relevant information to consumers. These enhancements include information on accreditation, varsity athletics, cohort default rates, 90/10 data, and campus security data.

A.2.b. Completions and Compliance Report

IPEDS information on the number of students who complete a postsecondary education program by type of program and level of award constitutes the only national source of information on the availability and location of highly trained manpower. Types of programs are categorized according to the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP). The CIP is a taxonomic coding scheme that contains titles and descriptions of instructional programs, primarily at the postsecondary level. Business and industry, the military, and other groups that need to recruit individuals with particular skills use these data extensively. The data also help satisfy the mandate in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act for information on completions in postsecondary vocational education programs.

Information on completions in postsecondary education programs has been used extensively, as in the following examples.

- ED and OPE use these data to respond to public inquiries regarding degrees awarded by different types of institutions, and for reference guides in preparation for budget justifications.
- The Department of Labor and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) use these data in preparing the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* and in matching projections of labor supply and demand.
- State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees also use these data on an annual basis for assisting citizens in career planning and in making state and local area estimates of trained manpower.

- The Congressional Research Service and Library of Congress use these data to supply information to members of Congress to assist them in assessing the changing and developing needs of the nation with respect to manpower and postsecondary education.
- The Department of Agriculture and Office of Higher Education Programs use these data to include program data on agriculture and home economics in various reports.
- The National Science Foundation and Division of Science Resource Studies rely heavily on IPEDS Completions survey data, in conjunction with their own surveys, to study degree production, particularly in science, mathematics, and engineering.
- The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) uses these data to provide guidance to other federal agencies in its recruiting efforts.
- The Office for Civil Rights (Department of Education) uses these data in reviewing institutional compliance with antidiscrimination statutes.
- The Department of Justice uses these data when court suits are brought in civil rights cases.
- The Department of Defense uses these data to identify institutions training significant numbers of individuals in occupational programs, particularly those with military-related skills.
- Private firms use these data for recruiting trained manpower and large corporations use the racial/ethnic completions data to identify the potential pool of new employees for equal opportunity employment (EEO) requirements.
- States also use data by program to compare changes in degree patterns among states and for manpower planning and projections.
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has used these data in developing its institutional classification schemes.

A.2.c. Enrollment

Enrollment is probably the most basic parameter in postsecondary education because it indicates access to an educational experience that is potentially both economically and socially advantageous. Because enrollment patterns differ greatly among the various types of postsecondary institutions, there is a need for both different measures of enrollment and several indicators of access. Aspects of enrollment data collection are described below.

1. Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report. Fall enrollment is the traditional measure of student access to higher education, and IPEDS continues this important statistical series. ED uses fall enrollment data in program planning and for setting funding allocation standards for such legislatively controlled programs as the College Work-Study Program and others. NCES collects fall enrollment data through this component of IPEDS to update its annual college projections, its mandated annual *Condition of Education* report, and the *Digest of Education Statistics*. The Bureau of the Census, the National Science Foundation, and most state education agencies depend heavily on annual fall enrollment data for such uses as economic and financial planning, manpower forecasting, and policy formulation. Educational and professional associations also use IPEDS enrollment data for a wide variety of purposes. The race/ethnicity and gender data by level are necessary for the Office for Civil Rights (ED) to perform functions mandated by Title VI and Title IX.

2. Residence of First-Time Students (required in even-numbered years). IPEDS collects data on the counts of first-time freshmen by state of residence, including data on the number who graduated from high school the previous year. These data are used to monitor the flow of students across state lines and calculate college-going rates by state. The primary purpose of these data is to provide states with more complete information about the attendance of their residents in college than states can collect in their own surveys. States can then use resulting data to estimate the college-going rates of their high school graduates, examine problems caused by excessive student out-migration or in-migration, and determine the types of institutions that attract their citizens to other states. Such data are critical for postsecondary education planning at the state level.

States and various associations have made it clear that only a national agency can collect the data needed to examine residence and migration patterns. There are a number of national- and state-level issues that can be addressed by collecting and disseminating residence data. These needs include the following:

- planning/budgeting for institutional support (public and private);
- planning for shifting institutional demand by region, state, and institution;
- monitoring or establishing out-of-state quotas; and
- reassessing state support to private institutions serving large numbers of in-state students.

3. Age Data (required in odd-numbered years). In 1987, NCES began collecting fall enrollment by age of student on a biennial basis. These data offer insight into the relationship between the changing demographics of college-going cohorts and enrollment in different types of postsecondary institutions; they permit detailed projections of enrollment by institutional type and by age. Because a student's dependency status is strongly related to age, the data can also be used to provide estimates of the number of independent/dependent students attending a postsecondary institution, which should be useful in financial aid modeling and projections. In addition, the Department of Defense U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command has indicated a strong need for these data to identify institutions with a sufficient number of recruitment-age students to make recruiting efforts cost effective.

4. Total Entering Class. NCES began collecting total entering class data in the 2002-03 data collection, based on a recommendation from the TRP. These data are collected to address concerns that the cohort used by the GR component is not representative of an institution's entering class because the GR cohort is composed only of full-time, first-time students. The collection of a total entering class allows for a more accurate picture of incoming students, and permits the calculation of the fall GR cohort as a proportion of the total entering student body.

5. Retention Rates. NCES began collecting retention rates data in the 2003-04 data collection, based on a need identified by the TRP. Retention rates data provide an indicator of postsecondary performance that is broader in scope than completions data or graduation rates data, and is a critical measure of success as viewed by many 2-year and 4-year institutions.

6. Unduplicated 12-Month Head Count. The collection of unduplicated head count data for students enrolled over a 12-month period provides a way of looking at enrollment that is especially valuable for institutions that utilize nontraditional calendar systems and institutions that offer short programs. An enrollment figure that encompasses an entire year provides a more complete picture of the services being provided by these schools.

7. Instructional Activity. The collection of instructional activity data, as measured in total credit and/or contact hours delivered by institutions during a 12-month period, provides an overall indicator of the scope of educational activity provided by the institutions. NCES uses the total instructional activity measure as a basis for computing a total student full-time equivalency (FTE). FTE is commonly used by postsecondary institutions as a measure of size and performance, and is one of the best available indicators for the measurement of educational endeavors.

A.2.d. Student Financial Aid

The Student Financial Aid component was added to IPEDS to respond to the request for information on the cost and price of higher education in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. Data collected through this component allow prospective students to compare average amounts of financial aid received by full-time, first-time degree, or certificate-seeking undergraduates by type of aid received across institutions. Data collected here are also used to calculate institutional net prices, as required in the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) of 2008. These data are posted on College Navigator.

A.2.e. Graduation Rates

The GR component provides a structure for calculating comparable graduation rate statistics across institutions. The data also provide much needed information to researchers as an outcome measure of institutional productivity, and offer insight into the relationship between the changing demographics of college-going cohorts within different types of institutions. The information collected in this component is used by institutions to help satisfy regulations regarding the Student Right-to-Know Act to disclose 150

percent of normal time graduation rates. The GR200 component collects consumer information on 200 percent graduation rates to meet requirements in the HEOA.

A.2.f. Finance

Finance data are needed for reporting and projecting the revenues and expenditures of a national activity representing a significant component of the gross national product (GNP). To enhance the comparability and utility of the finance data, IPEDS redesigned the data collection instruments to conform to the accounting standards governing both public and private institutions.

ED's Title III (Institutional Aid) grant program relies on the finance data to help determine whether an applicant college or university is eligible to receive a grant. These data are needed annually. The GAO published a report, *Postsecondary Education Financial Trends in Public and Private Nonprofit Institutions for the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions*, that used IPEDS finance data. The National Science Foundation is a regular user of IPEDS finance data. The Bureau of the Census relies on this form to collect data required in its census of governments. NCES and the Census Bureau worked closely to ensure that one instrument satisfied the needs of both agencies. The Bureau of Economic Analysis also contributed significantly to this endeavor. OMB asked NCES to collect these data because the Bureau's survey universe was a subset of the IPEDS universe. The Bureau of the Census also uses the data from other parts of the survey to:

- develop estimates of state and local governments' finances to provide to the Bureau of Economic Analysis for calculation of the GNP; and
- collect supplemental data that their census of governments does not collect.

The BLS and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are secondary users of NCES/Census finance data. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has used finance data to determine states' or institutions' compliance with antidiscrimination laws. From these data, OCR was able to determine whether predominantly black, publicly controlled institutions were being discriminated against through funding decisions made by state boards of higher education. The Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce uses financial statistics to prepare totals and forecasts on total nonfarm expenditures for structures and equipment, and to develop GNP accounts. Increasing numbers of state agencies use the NCES Finance report to assemble data to plan and evaluate their higher education policies.

Among associations, the American Council on Education (ACE), the Association for Institutional Research, the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and The Delta Cost Project are frequent users of Finance data. Researchers from these and other organizations use the data to assess the economic future of the nation's colleges and universities.

A.2.g. Human Resources

HR data provide another basic measure of postsecondary education because they indicate the extent of the human infrastructure and knowledge base represented at institutions of higher learning. Because the size and type of staffing patterns vary greatly across postsecondary education, there is a need to measure different aspects of the human capital in postsecondary institutions.

The HR section that collects race, ethnicity, and gender data (previously referred to as the fall staff section, and required in odd-numbered years) replaces the former EEO-6 survey, and is used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in place of its data collection efforts. Under Public Law 88-352, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, all institutions of higher education that have 15 or more (full-time) employees are required to keep records and to make such reports biennially to EEOC. NCES now collects the data and provides them to EEOC as required in its regulations. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) of the Department of Labor also use these data. The filing of race, ethnicity, and gender data on staff is mandated under Section 709(c) of Title VII.

The data provide information on staffing levels at the institutions for various occupational categories, and are used extensively in peer institution analysis, manpower utilization studies, and in examining the health of the institutions. Good-quality data on racial/ethnic composition of postsecondary employees are useful to EEOC and OCR for monitoring compliance with Title VII.

On an annual basis, institutions also classify all of their employees by full- or part-time status, faculty status, and occupational category; in addition, medical school staff are reported separately.

Salary outlays for full-time instructional staff and other full-time employees are also collected annually. These data are used by:

- the ED Grants and Contracts Service, which makes frequent use of the salary data collected by NCES to set standards for expected salary outlays during grants and contracts negotiations processes; and
- the BLS, Department of Labor, which includes salary data when developing its *Occupational Outlook Handbook*.

The House Labor and Human Resources Committee, the OCR, and the Bureau of the Census have requested trend data. State agencies rely on salary data to determine budgets for their state-supported institutions and to make comparative studies with other states.

Institutions use salary data to establish their own compensation packages, and institution officials study the compensation packages offered by their peers and/or competitors prior to developing their salary schedules.

A.2.h. Admissions

The Admissions survey component was broken out from the Institutional Characteristics survey component starting with the 2014-15 data collection. This change was proposed by the TRP so that all institutions would report data for the most recent Fall period. As a result, admissions data are less confusing for IPEDS data users, given that only one reporting period is represented in each data file. Additionally, the change enabled admissions data to be used for the Trend Generator, and data on College Navigator will represent the same Fall period.

A.2.i. Academic Libraries

The AL survey component was reintegrated into IPEDS as a result of TRP #35, replacing the Academic Libraries Survey (ALS), which had been a standalone, biennial data collection conducted by NCES. This change allowed for refinements and improvements in the quality of the data collected, and reduced burden for the institutions. Although fewer data elements are collected in the Academic Libraries component, compared to the prior ALS, they are now collected annually and they align with key elements collected in other IPEDS components.

A.2.j. Outcome Measures

The OM survey component was added as the result of two TRPs (e.g., #37 and #40) and based on recommendations provided by the ED Committee on Student Success, which concluded its work in 2011. The first collection of this survey component is during the current (2015-16) data collection year. This component will improve the quality and availability of student success data for consumers, institutions, policymakers, and researchers. It will do so by making data available for student outcomes going beyond the historical limitation of the cohort of traditional full-time, first-time students.

A.3. Use of Technology and Other Technological Collection Techniques

The IPEDS web-based data collection system uses advanced technology to reduce respondent burden and to improve the timeliness and quality of the reported data. NCES has taken several actions to facilitate the cooperation of postsecondary institutions responding to IPEDS. These actions include the following:

- *Developing a fully automated web-based data collection for all components of IPEDS data.* The data collection is organized into three modules, taking full advantage of data availability schedules.
- Customizing survey components based on screening information so that institutions are prompted to respond only to those items relevant to their institution. For example, if a private institution does not have a differential tuition charge for out-of-state students, they will be prompted for one tuition charge. Additionally, many data items (answered previously) will be available to the respondent on the collection instrument, so that only those items that have actually changed since the previous report need to be completed or updated.

The system allows for direct data entry as well as file upload and batch import. Edit checks and data verification procedures are built into the system, thus improving the efficiency of data collection by resolving errors at the time of data submission. Processing time and cost are thus reduced. All administrative functions are provided through the Web, including nonresponse follow up, distribution of passwords, and other activities and correspondence. IPEDS also provides a Help Desk, which is available to respondents during and after data collection to respond to questions, assist with data entry and error resolution, and provide general assistance with many other types of requests.

Data release is timelier. The system is designed to migrate reported/edited data to an SQL server as soon as the administrative functions have been performed and NCES has cleared the data. Institutions whose data have been migrated to the SQL server have *immediate* access to data for other institutions that have also completed the process through the IPEDS Data Center. This means that data may be available before survey closeout for peer analysis. National data will become available within a matter of months after closeout.

- *Enabling institutions to provide data to their state and to NCES simultaneously.* NCES works closely with state coordinators, many of who submit IPEDS reports for institutions in their state. Increasingly, states obtain data from institutions electronically on a student unit record basis (data per student). Other states collect institutional data using either IPEDS forms or their own state forms, which are compatible with IPEDS. Data are then extracted from the state database in the IPEDS format and file uploaded to the collection system. Thus institutions can provide data to their state and to NCES simultaneously.
- NCES will continue to encourage respondents to prepare IPEDS data in a format for uploading to the web-based collection instrument by providing detailed file specifications and instructions as well as "do's" and "don'ts" for data submission. Three upload formats are available for institutions to use: fixed length, key value pair, and XML.

A.4. Efforts to Identify and Avoid Duplication

NCES devotes considerable effort to ensure that IPEDS does not duplicate other data collection activities involving postsecondary education providers. In developing IPEDS, NCES continues to assess the data collection efforts of other federal agencies (e.g., National Science Foundation, Department of Agriculture, Department of Defense, Census Bureau, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Veterans Administration) through an examination of their forms. In addition, NCES has in-depth discussions with the Department of Labor, as well as other Education Department offices (e.g., OCR, FSA, OPE, OVAE) to ascertain their needs for data and the role IPEDS can play in meeting those needs. Through meetings, workshops, and TRPs, NCES works closely with other stakeholders including the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities (APSCU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), and others. Duplication is avoided as various federal agencies, groups within ED, and other agency representatives share access to IPEDS data.

A.5. Methods Used to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses/Entities

Certain providers of postsecondary education included in the IPEDS universe of Title IV eligible institutions—operators of proprietary (private for-profit) schools—are small businesses. NCES has taken several actions to reduce reporting burden for these entities. These actions include: requesting a reduced set of data items from schools offering only certificates below the baccalaureate level; and maintaining a close liaison with the APSCU, which represents proprietary postsecondary institutions, to ensure the appropriateness of data being requested and the feasibility of collecting it.

A.6. Frequency of Data Collection

The survey components proposed for this request are those that will be collected beginning with the Fall 2016 collection and extending through the Spring 2019 collection (table 45), which will cover three full survey cycles. The survey data items are similar to those used through the 2015-16 collection, with the additional items and modifications to improve clarity and enhance the use of the data as described in this submission.

A.7. Special Circumstances

None of the special circumstances described apply to these collections.

A.8. Consultations Outside the Agency

IPEDS was developed in conjunction with providers and users of postsecondary education data. Continuing a pattern that began with the initial development of the project in 1983, opportunities are taken throughout the year to discuss the project with data respondents, Federal agencies, data users, and any other interested parties.

NCES has a strong relationship with many stakeholder groups that provide feedback on proposals for IPEDS. Identified below are organizations that have played a major consultative role:

- An IPEDS Technical Review Panel (TRP) was formed to assist in survey revisions and to discuss universe definitions. Representatives include state coordinators, federal representatives, educational association members, and institutional researchers and registrars from all postsecondary education sectors.
- The National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) is responsible for IPEDS research and development activities. NPEC's mission is to promote the quality, comparability, and utility of postsecondary data and information that support policy development at the federal, state, and institution levels. The NPEC IPEDS R&D Panel achieves this goal by developing an R&D agenda for IPEDS, identifying topics that will help improve the quality, comparability, and utility of IPEDS data for the postsecondary education community, consumers, and policymakers, as well as providing expertise to NCES on related IPEDS R&D projects.
- Annual meetings are held with IPEDS coordinators to obtain state input on IPEDS operations, survey revisions, analysis plans, and data needs.
- IPEDS workshops and presentations are made at various conferences and annual or regional meetings of educational and professional associations. IPEDS staff discuss proposed modifications or problem areas and receive input from the data providers as part of the data collection training.
- The Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), the American Library Association (ALA), and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) have a joint advisory task force that reaches out to IPEDS regularly with suggestions.

A.9. Paying Respondents

There are no payments or gifts offered to respondents.

A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality

IPEDS data are not collected under any pledge of confidentiality.

The PRA language for IPEDS is made available on the institutional burden page for the data collection. The statement for the 2016-17 collection reads as follows (it is updated annually to reflect approval by OMB of the new respondent burden hour estimates):

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0582.

Summary of ranges and averages of time burden estimates by institution type and keyholder experience	
	2016-17

	Range	Average
4-year institution		
New keyholder	132 - 294 hours	203 hours
Returning keyholder	85 - 189 hours	130 hours
2-year institution		
New keyholder	122 - 272 hours	188 hours
Returning keyholder	80 - 178 hours	123 hours
<2-year institution		
New keyholder	61-136 hours	94 hours
Returning keyholder	40 - 89 hours	61 hours

These IPEDS reporting burden estimates include the time it takes to review instructions, query and search data sources, complete and review the components, and submit the data through the Data Collection System. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, National Center for Education Statistics, PCP, 550 12th St., SW, 4th floor, Washington, DC 20202. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission, please direct them to ipedshelp@rti.org.

A.11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

These collections contain no questions of a sensitive nature.

A.12. Estimate of Burden

Annual Burden Calculation. Table 17 displays the estimated burden to respondents for the upcoming 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 collection years for which we are seeking approval in this submission, including the proposed changes. The estimated number of responding institutions reflects those that are required to respond (approximately 7,300 Title IV eligible institutions) plus those that voluntarily respond (approximately 200 per data collection year). Table 18 shows estimated burden time ranges for institutions based on type of institution and keyholder experience.

NCES currently asks institutions to report the time it takes them to complete each survey component once every 2 years. The results of this data collection were used in establishing burden estimates for all components except for OM, for which we only have the estimated burden time, as we do not yet have self-reported burden times. The response rates for self-reported preparation times are shown in table 15.

Response rates for the preparation time question are high enough to incorporate these data into burden estimate calculations. The response rates for the Completions component are lower than for the other two Fall components because more data are uploaded by states and systems for this survey component; the item does not appear on the import layouts.

NCES anticipated using the keyholder reported times in two ways:

- to gauge whether the recalculated burden estimates from the previous clearance submission are realistic compared with what keyholders report; and
- to determine whether the new keyholders require more time and whether a 50 percent additional time premium is an accurate estimation for them.

Table 15. Response rates for IPEDS preparation time item, 2014

	Returning keyholders	New keyholders
Institutional Characteristics (IC)	77.9%	82.9%
Completions (C)	52.3%	58.9%
12-month Enrollment (E12)	73.8%	81.6%
Student Financial Aid (SFA)	73.1%	79.1%
Outcome Measures (OM)	NA	NA
Graduation Rates (GR & GR200)	76.1%	82.4%
Admissions (ADM)	73.4%	86.0%
Fall Enrollment (EF)	73.3%	77.6%
Finance (F)	72.8%	78.7%
Human Resources (HR)	74.5%	82.8%

The actual time to prepare and complete the survey components is reported by keyholders by responding to the voluntary question “How long did it take to prepare this survey component?” Through conversations with respondents and based on feedback from the industry, we believe that respondents sometimes include only the time it took for the keyholder to pull the data from institutional systems, organize it, and submit it into the IPEDS collection system, but that the time spent briefing superiors and others within the institution and the time spent by other technical staff preparing queries and organizing data is sometimes omitted.

To include time for these additional data-submission related activities, we added a 75 percent time premium to the time estimates reported by IPEDS keyholders. A proportion of time estimate (75%), not a constant, was used because we believe the time spent interacting with others at the institution is directly correlated with the amount of time spent preparing the response to the IPEDS survey. That is, new keyholders and those at more complex institutions may need additional time to discuss the IPEDS survey with others at their respective institution compared to keyholders that are more experienced or are at smaller institutions (estimates provided by new keyholders are higher than those of returning keyholders and time estimates from 4-year institutions are higher than burden time estimates from 2-year institutions, which are higher than burden time estimates from <2 year institutions). In addition, the amount of time needed to brief institutional constituents is related to the complexity and length of the survey.

The OM component was treated differently, because it was first collected in 2015-16 and keyholders have not yet had the chance to report their preparation times. The estimates for OM are based on a premium of 7 times the Graduation Rates component, given that the two survey components are similar with OM having 4 total cohorts. We expect that the need to recreate past cohorts will be time consuming and have allocated 200 percent time for each new cohort (three) and 100 percent for the existing cohort in the new OM survey. This totals 7 times the burden of the Graduation Rates component. We show the same burden estimates for each of the three years of data collection, because the expected decrease in burden time from the 2016-17 to the 2017-18 data collection is expected to be balanced out by the addition of the Pell cohort to the 2017-18 OM survey component.

The preparation times reported by keyholders support the observation that it takes new keyholders longer to prepare and submit their IPEDS components. Although the premiums reported for the Fall vary from component to component, and are somewhat less than the 50 percent used in IPEDS burden calculations, NCES continues to use the 50 percent time premium for new keyholders in the this submission to ensure that burden estimates remain equal or greater to what is needed by respondents. Table 16 summarizes the estimated preparation hours based on reported time estimates by experienced and new keyholders, and shows the average premium for new keyholders.

Table 16. Estimated average preparation hours for experienced and new IPEDS keyholders, and average premium for new keyholders, 2014

	Total preparation hours, experienced keyholders	Number of experienced keyholders responding	Average preparation hours, experienced keyholders	Total preparation hours, new keyholders	Number of new keyholders responding	Average preparation hours, new keyholders	Average premium for new keyholders
IC	34,800	6,000	5.8	12,450	1,500	8.3	43.1%
C	58,800	6,000	9.8	21450	1,500	14.3	45.9%
E12	32,400	6,000	5.4	11850	1,500	7.9	46.3%
SFA	111,000	6,000	18.5	37500	1,500	25.0	35.1%
GR	39,520	5,200	7.6	13600	1,200	11.3	49.1%
GR200	16,120	5,200	3.1	5640	1,200	4.7	51.6%
ADM	6,825	1,950	3.5	2,675	550	4.9	39.0%
EF	72,000	6,000	12	24,000	1,500	16.0	33.3%
F	73,200	6,000	12.2	28,050	1,500	18.7	53.3%
HR	153,000	6,000	25.5	57000	1,500	38.0	49.0%

Table 17. Summary of estimated response burden by survey component: 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19

Survey component	Number of institutions (respondents)	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
		Avg hours per institution	Total hours	Avg hours per institution	Total hours	Avg hours per institution	Total hours
IC	7,500	6.3	47,250	6.3	47,250	6.3	47,250
C	7,500	10.7	80,250	10.7	80,250	10.7	80,250
E12	7,500	5.9	44,250	5.9	44,250	5.9	44,250
SFA	7,500	19.8	148,500	19.8	148,500	19.8	148,500
GR	6,400	8.3	53,120	8.3	53,120	8.3	53,120
GR200	6,400	3.4	21,760	3.4	21,760	3.4	21,760
OM	4,900	27.7	135,730	27.7	135,730	27.7	135,730
ADM	2,500	3.8	9,500	3.8	9,500	3.8	9,500
EF	7,500	12.8	96,000	12.8	96,000	12.8	96,000
F	7,500	13.5	101,250	13.5	101,250	13.5	101,250
HR	7,500	28	210,000	28	210,000	28	210,000
AL	4,900	10.5	51,450	10.5	51,450	10.5	51,450
Total	77,600 responses from 7,500 respondents	—	999,060	—	999,060	—	999,060

Table 17 shows that across the 3 years of data collection, on average there are 77,600 responses per year, from 7,500 institutions, resulting, on average, in 999,060 estimated annual burden hours across all respondents. There is a decrease in total estimated burden of 51,810 hours per year. This decrease is the result of an estimated decrease in burden of 58,910 due to burden time revision based on 2014-15 institutional responses, and burden increase of 7,100 hours due to changes outlined in this submission.

Table 18. Summary of ranges and averages of time burden estimates by institution type and keyholder experience

	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average
4-year institution						
New keyholder	132 - 294 hours	203 hours	132 - 294 hours	203 hours	132 - 294 hours	203 hours
Returning keyholder	85 - 189 hours	130 hours	85 - 189 hours	130 hours	85 - 189 hours	130 hours
2-year institution						
New keyholder	122 - 272 hours	188 hours	122 - 272 hours	188 hours	122 - 272 hours	188 hours
Returning keyholder	80 - 178 hours	123 hours	80 - 178 hours	123 hours	80 - 178 hours	123 hours
<2-year institution						
New keyholder	61-136 hours	94 hours	61 - 136 hours	94 hours	61 - 136 hours	94 hours
Returning keyholder	40 - 89 hours	61 hours	40 - 89 hours	61 hours	40 - 89 hours	61 hours

In all cases, if the data are readily accessible in machine-readable files, the time required is less than the estimated burden hours. Estimates include the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The number of institutions responding is estimated based on the 2015-16 universe; changes to these numbers for successive years are expected to be small.

To improve the accuracy of self-reported burden times, and to minimize the likely current burden time overestimation, NCES plans to develop and test a better question or a set of questions to properly measure the burden related to all aspects of completing the IPEDS survey. IPEDS keyholders' answers to the current question: "How long did it take to prepare this survey component?" may be answered by some respondents only for the time localized to the respondent and not include the total person hours expended by the institution in relation to the IPEDS data submission. NCES will submit a separate generic clearance request to OMB for review to conduct cognitive interviews with institutional respondents to determine and evaluate a better set of questions that address the time use and burden constructs for IPEDS respondents. It will be submitted under the NCES clearance vehicle designed for cognitive and other developmental studies

(OMB# 1850-0803). The cognitive interviews study will be conducted from January through March 2017 to develop a new set of time use and burden questions. Once testing is complete and NCES has created an improved measurement that will not require a proportional adjustment, we will submit a change request to OMB under the IPEDS clearance (OMB# 1850-0582) to implement the improved burden question in the 2017-18 IPEDS collection cycle.

The 2016-17 estimated total burden time cost to respondents is based on the estimated response burden hours multiplied by the estimated hourly wage \$40.21 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2016-17 Edition, Operations Research Analysts, <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/math/operations-research-analysts.htm>). The hourly wage is increased by an estimated 2.0 percent cost-of-living adjustment for each subsequent year. Total estimated costs to respondents for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 data collections are shown in table 19.

Table 19. Estimates of burden hours and costs to institutions			
	Estimated total burden hours for all institutions	Estimated cost to all institutions	Average estimated costs per institution
2016-17	999,060	\$40.21	\$5,357
2017-18	999,060	\$41.02	\$5,465
2018-19	999,060	\$41.84	\$5,574

A.13. Estimate of Cost Burden

There are no capital or startup costs associated with this data collection.

A.14. Cost to the Federal Government

We estimate a total cost to the government for the IPEDS 2016-17 through 2018-19 survey years of approximately \$36,000,000. The total annual cost for this collection will be \$12 million. On an annual basis, over the 3 survey years, the contract costs will average about \$10 million per year. Federal S&E will be approximately \$2,000,000 per year. More than 95 percent of this amount will be spent in direct support of the institutional training, and the collection, analysis, and reporting of the IPEDS data described herein. The contract amount includes all activities related to program support; data collection system maintenance; help desk support activities; programming and software modifications and documentation; training of contractor staff as well as institutional respondents; data collection, data review, and analysis; survey administration; imputations; file preparation, reporting, and data dissemination; TRP meetings; and activities including training, dissertation and research grants, and other related activities. The costs include personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, computer-related activities, consultants, other direct and indirect costs, plus overhead and G&A.

The time estimates and costs associated with the activities described above and in the IPEDS Statement of Work for the RFP are based on recent experience with the contractors that currently support the IPEDS operations (RTI, IT Innovative Solutions, AIR, and others). IPEDS in-house staff costs are based on FY2015 pay schedules and on an estimated 1 percent pay increase for each of the subsequent fiscal years due to the uncertainty surrounding pay increases for federal employees.

A.15. Reasons for Change in Burden

The presented in this package net decrease in estimated annual burden to respondents is a sum of estimated burden time changes resulting from:

- continued refining of the previous burden estimates as a result of incorporating institutionally reported burden; and
- a set of changes to the data collection, described in this submission, in the areas of Institutional Characteristics, Student Financial Aid, Graduation Rates, Graduation Rates 200, Outcome Measures, Admissions, Fall Enrollment, Finance, Human Resources, and Academic Libraries that will improve the quality and the usefulness to IPEDS data for users including policymakers, researchers, and consumers. The changes will also clarify reporting for IPEDS data providers. Many of these changes were suggested by the IPEDS TRPs and have been previously posted for public comment from the higher education community.

The overall average change in response burden can best be explained by looking at the burden hour estimates on a component-by-component basis.

A.15.1 Fall Collection

Institutional Characteristics (IC). Detailed estimates for the IC component are presented in table 20. These estimates account for both institution type and keyholder experience.

	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	8.0	12.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	12.0
2-year schools	2,200	4.8	7.3	4.8	7.3	4.8	7.3
<2-year schools	2,100	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.5
Total	7,500	5.5	8.3	5.5	8.3	5.5	8.3

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the changes to the form listed in table 21, and take into consideration respondent self-reported preparation time for this component.

Change	Implementation year
Part C: Other Survey Screening Questions - Library Expenses: • Add additional screening question: o "Does your institution have access to a library collection?"	2016-17
Part C: Student Services - Distance Opportunities: • Delete the following item: o Does your institution have its own library or are you financially supporting a shared library with another postsecondary education institution? ▪ Have our own library ▪ Do not have our own library but contribute financial support to a shared library ▪ Neither of the above	2016-17
Add the following item: • "Which of the following library resources or services does your institution provide to its clientele?" Check all that apply. o Physical facilities o An organized collection of printed materials o Access to digital/electronic resources o A staff trained to provide and interpret library materials o Established library hours o Access to library collections that are shared with another institution o None of the above	2016-17
Add screening question to determine if school offers any distance education courses: 1. "Does your institution offer distance education courses?"	2016-17
Move existing distance education questions to new Distance Education screen: 2. Are all of the programs at your institution offered exclusively via distance education? 3. Please indicate at what level(s) your institution offers distance education opportunities (courses and/or programs).	2016-17
Institutional Identification Page. Add question to collect DUNS numbers: • "If your institution has an assigned Dun and Bradstreet number (DUNS) please enter your institution's DUNS number(s)."	2016-17

Completions (C): Detailed estimates for the C component are presented in table 22. These estimates account for institution type, number of programs, and keyholder experience, and take into consideration respondent self-reported preparation time for this component. No changes have been requested for the C survey component.

Table 22. Burden hours, Completions							
		2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	12.4	18.5	12.4	18.5	12.4	18.5
Fewer than 10 programs	740	5.2	7.8	5.2	7.8	5.2	7.8
10-100 programs	2,030	15.0	22.5	15.0	22.5	15.0	22.5
More than 100 programs	430	25.5	38.3	25.5	38.3	25.5	38.3
2-year schools	2,200	10.8	16.2	10.8	16.2	10.8	16.2
Fewer than 10 programs	890	5.5	8.3	5.5	8.3	5.5	8.3
10-100 programs	1,110	13.2	19.8	13.2	19.8	13.2	19.8
More than 100 programs	200	24.0	36.0	24.0	36.0	24.0	36.0
<2-year schools	2,100	4.6	6.9	4.6	6.9	4.6	6.9
Fewer than 3 programs	970	2.9	4.4	2.9	4.4	2.9	4.4
3 to 9 programs	990	4.7	7.1	4.7	7.1	4.7	7.1
10 or more programs	140	13.9	20.8	13.9	20.8	13.9	20.8
Total	7,500	8.6	13.0	8.6	13.0	8.6	13.0

12-month Enrollment (E-12): Detailed estimates for the E12 component are presented in table 23. These estimates account for institution type, enrollment size, and keyholder experience, and take into consideration respondent self-reported preparation time for this component. No changes have been requested for the 12-month E12 survey component.

Table 23. Burden hours, 12-month Enrollment							
		2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	6.4	9.7	6.4	9.7	6.4	9.7
800 or fewer students	1,240	4.5	6.7	4.5	6.7	4.5	6.7
801-3,000 students	970	6.6	9.9	6.6	9.9	6.6	9.9
>3,000 students	990	8.5	12.7	8.5	12.7	8.5	12.7
2-year schools	2,200	4.1	6.2	4.1	6.2	4.1	6.2
500 or fewer students	1000	3.7	5.5	3.7	5.5	3.7	5.5
501-1,500 students	360	7.3	11.0	7.3	11.0	7.3	11.0
>1,500 students	840	7.5	11.3	7.5	11.3	7.5	11.3
<2-year schools	2,100	4.9	7.4	4.9	7.4	4.9	7.4
100 or fewer students	1050	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8
101 to 250 students	670	6.2	9.2	6.2	9.2	6.2	9.2
>250 students	380	7.1	10.6	7.1	10.6	7.1	10.6
Total	7,500	4.9	7.4	4.9	7.4	4.9	7.4

A.15.2 Winter Collection

Student Financial Aid (SFA): Detailed estimates for the SFA component are presented in table 24. Estimates account for institution type, enrollment size, and keyholder experience.

	2016-17			2017-18		2018-19	
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	21.7	32.6	21.7	32.6	21.7	32.6
800 or fewer students	1,240	16.9	25.3	16.9	25.3	16.9	25.3
801-3,000 students	970	18.7	28.0	18.7	28.0	18.7	28.0
>3,000 students	990	30.9	46.3	30.9	46.3	30.9	46.3
2-year schools	2,200	19.4	29.1	19.4	29.1	19.4	29.1
500 or fewer students	1000	15.3	23.0	15.3	23.0	15.3	23.0
501-1,500 students	360	22.9	34.4	22.9	34.4	22.9	34.4
>1,500 students	840	27.7	41.5	27.7	41.5	27.7	41.5
<2-year schools	2,100	10.9	16.3	10.9	16.3	10.9	16.3
100 or fewer students	1050	10.7	16.1	10.7	16.1	10.7	16.1
101 to 250 students	670	19.1	28.7	19.1	28.7	19.1	28.7
>250 students	380	12.3	18.4	12.3	18.4	12.3	18.4
Total	7,500	18.0	27.0	18.0	27.0	18.0	27.0

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the changes to the form shown in table 25.

Change	Implementation year
Allow data provider to select a prescribed caveat from the dropdown box. The data provider also has the option to enter their own or leave the text box empty.	2016-17

Outcome Measures (OM): Detailed estimates for the OM component are presented in table 26. Estimates account for institution type, enrollment size, and keyholder experience.

	2016-17			2017-18		2018-19	
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	2,500	23.7	35.6	23.7	35.6	23.7	35.6
800 or fewer students	720	19.6	29.4	19.6	29.4	19.6	29.4
801-3,000 students	850	13.6	20.4	13.6	20.4	13.6	20.4
>3,000 students	930	31.0	46.4	31.0	46.4	31.0	46.4
2-year schools	2,000	27.1	40.6	27.1	40.6	27.1	40.6
500 or fewer students	860	16.2	24.3	16.2	24.3	16.2	24.3
501-1,500 students	340	28.3	42.5	28.3	42.5	28.3	42.5
>1,500 students	800	34.7	52.0	34.7	52.0	34.7	52.0
Total	4,500	23.5	35.3	23.5	35.3	23.5	35.3

The burden estimates for 2016-17 cover the changes that will be made for 2016-17, and the burden estimates for 2017-18 and 2018-19 cover those changes as well as the proposed change to begin in 2017-18. The proposed changes for the OM survey form are listed in table 27.

Table 27. Proposed changes to Outcome Measures survey component (all versions)

Change	Implementation year
<p>A fifth cohort will be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pell Grant recipients <p>The Pell Grant cohort will be drawn and reported from the 4 OM cohorts (full-time, first-time; part-time, first-time; full-time, non-first-time, part-time, non-first-time).</p> <p>Similar to the other four OM cohorts, institutions will also report the 6-year award status and 8-year award status on undergraduate students who received a Pell Grant during the reporting period.</p> <p>Students from the four OM cohorts who received any Pell Grant dollars (disbursed) at that institution will be included in the Pell Grant cohort. Students who were awarded but did not receive a disbursement are not included.</p> <p>Students from the four OM cohorts who received a Pell Grant at any time over the 8-year period are included in the Pell Grant cohort.</p> <p>The outcomes measures of non-Pell Grant recipients will be calculated by subtracting the Pell Grant recipient cohort from the total of the four OM cohorts.</p> <p>Collect the status update from both 2-year and 4-year institutions at 8 years after the cohort enters the institution with award information collected for both the 6-year and 8-year timeframes. Pell Grant recipient data collection will begin in 2017-18. Institutions will report on their 2009 cohorts.</p> <p>Note: Data will not be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, or gender.</p> <p>Note: No outcome data will be collected from non-degree-granting institutions.</p> <p>Note: Pell Grant cohort data will not be disaggregated by attendance status (full-time or part-time) or postsecondary experience (first-time or non-first-time).</p>	2017-18
<p>Update and delete in current instructions on who to exclude:</p> <p>Who to Exclude</p> <p>Exclude students who are not enrolled for credit. For example, exclude:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> students enrolled exclusively in courses that cannot be applied towards a formal award; students enrolled exclusively in Continuing Education Units (CEUs); students exclusively auditing classes; and residents or interns in doctor's professional practice programs, because they have already received their doctor's degree. <p>In addition, the following students should be excluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any student studying abroad (e.g., at a foreign university) if their enrollment at the 'home' institution serves as an administrative record <p>Students in any branch campus located in a foreign country</p>	2016-17
<p>Update the instructions for revised cohort column to include an additional inclusion criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who studied abroad their first year upon entering the institution. 	2017-18

Graduation Rates (GR): Detailed estimates for the GR component are presented in table 28. Estimates account for institution type, enrollment size, and keyholder experience.

Table 28. Burden hours, Graduation Rates

	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	2,500	9.4	14.0	9.4	14.0	9.4	14.0
800 or fewer students	720	6.9	10.4	6.9	10.4	6.9	10.4
801-3,000 students	850	8.3	12.5	8.3	12.5	8.3	12.5
>3,000 students	930	12.0	18.0	12.0	18.0	12.0	18.0
2-year schools	2,100	9.2	13.8	9.2	13.8	9.2	13.8
500 or fewer students	890	5.9	8.8	5.9	8.8	5.9	8.8
501-1,500 students	360	11.6	17.4	11.6	17.4	11.6	17.4
>1,500 students	850	16.2	24.3	16.2	24.3	16.2	24.3
2-year schools	1,800	3.2	4.7	3.2	4.7	3.2	4.7

100 or fewer students	870	3.0	4.6	3.0	4.6	3.0	4.6
101 to 250 students	590	7.8	11.7	7.8	11.7	7.8	11.7
>250 students	340	7.9	11.8	7.9	11.8	7.9	11.8
Total	6,400	8.8	13.2	8.8	13.2	8.8	13.2

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the items on the GR survey forms shown in table 29.

Table 29. Proposed changes to Graduation Rates survey component (all versions)

Change	Implementation year
Update and delete in current instructions on who to exclude: Who to Exclude Exclude students who are not enrolled for credit. For example, exclude: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> students enrolled exclusively in courses that cannot be applied toward a formal award; students enrolled exclusively in Continuing Education Units (CEUs); students exclusively auditing classes; and residents or interns in doctor's professional practice programs, because they have already received their doctor's degree. In addition, the following students should be excluded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any student studying abroad (e.g., at a foreign university) if their enrollment at the 'home' institution serves as an administrative record Students in any branch campus located in a foreign country	2016-17
Update the instructions for Revised Cohort column to include an additional inclusion criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who studied abroad their first-year upon entering the institution 	2016-17
Add a new section – Section IV – to collect the data necessary to calculate the 150% graduation rates for 2 sub-cohorts that are currently required disclosures per the Higher Education Act, as amended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pell Grant Recipients Recipients of a subsidized Stafford Loan who did not receive a Pell Grant 	2016-17

Graduation Rates 200 (GR200): Detailed estimates for the GR200 component are presented in table 30. Estimates account for institution type, enrollment size, and keyholder experience.

Table 30. Burden hours, Graduation Rates 200

	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	2,500	3.4	5.1	3.4	5.1	3.4	5.1
800 or fewer students	720	2.8	4.2	2.8	4.2	2.8	4.2
801-3,000 students	850	1.9	2.9	1.9	2.9	1.9	2.9
>3,000 students	930	4.4	6.6	4.4	6.6	4.4	6.6
2-year school	2,100	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8
500 or fewer students	890	2.3	3.5	2.3	3.5	2.3	3.5
501-1,500 students	360	4.0	6.1	4.0	6.1	4.0	6.1
>1,500 students	850	5.0	7.4	5.0	7.4	5.0	7.4
<2-year schools	1,800	1.9	2.8	1.9	2.8	1.9	2.8
100 or fewer students	870	1.8	2.7	1.8	2.7	1.8	2.7
101 to 250 students	590	2.4	3.6	2.4	3.6	2.4	3.6
>250 students	340	3.5	5.3	3.5	5.3	3.5	5.3
Total	6,400	3.5	5.5	3.5	5.5	3.5	5.5

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the items on the GR200 survey forms shown in table 31.

Table 31. Proposed changes to Graduation Rates 200 survey component (all versions)

Change	Implementation Year
Add screening to determine if school has students to report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Your institution reported to the GR survey component as having this number of students who did not complete, but were still enrolled at your institution: (preload the number reported from GR) Do you have students who received an award between 151% and 200% of the normal time to complete? (Y/N) 	2016-17

Admissions (ADM): Detailed estimates for the ADM component are presented in table 32. Estimates account for both institution type and keyholder experience.

Table 32. Burden hours, Admissions

	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	2,100	2.9	4.4	2.9	4.4	2.9	4.4
2-year schools	250	3.3	5.0	3.3	5.0	3.3	5.0
<2-year schools	150	1.6	2.4	1.6	2.4	1.6	2.4
Total	2,500	2.9	4.3	2.9	4.3	2.9	4.3

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the items on the ADM survey forms shown in table 33, with the last change impacting the 2017-18 and 2018-19 forms.

Table 33. Proposed changes to Admissions component (all versions)

Change	Implementation year
Admissions Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Column "Don't Know" for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the option that best describes how your institution uses any of the following data in its undergraduate selection process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary school GPA Secondary school rank Secondary school record Completion of college-preparatory program Recommendations Formal demonstration of competencies (e.g., portfolios, certificates of mastery, assessment instruments) Admission test scores SAT/ACT Other test (ABT, Wonderlic, WISC-III, etc.) TOEFL 	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Column "Considered But Not Required" for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the option that best describes how your institution uses any of the following data in its undergraduate selection process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary school GPA Secondary school rank Secondary school record Completion of college-preparatory program Recommendations Formal demonstration of competencies (e.g., portfolios, certificates of mastery, assessment instruments) Admission test scores SAT/ACT Other test (ABT, Wonderlic, WISC-III, etc.) TOEFL 	2016-17
Selection Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Row "SAT Writing" for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide writing test scores only if used for admission 	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Row "ACT Writing" for: 	2016-17

Table 33. Proposed changes to Admissions component (all versions)	
Change	Implementation year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Provide writing test scores only if used for admission 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction change for reporting SAT scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SAT Critical Reading o SAT Critical Math • Currently, SAT critical reading and math scores are reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. In 2016-17, SAT critical reading and math scores should continue to be reported based on the current (2015) SAT score range. Institutions that have scores based on the new (2016) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables. 	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction change for reporting SAT scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o SAT Critical Reading o SAT Critical Math • Previously, SAT critical reading and math scores were reported based on the (2015) SAT score range. In 2017-18, SAT critical reading and math scores should be reported based on the new (2016) SAT score range. Institutions that have scores based on the (2015) SAT score range should convert scores using the College Board concordance tables. 	2017-18

A.15.3 Spring Collection

Fall Enrollment (EF): Detailed estimates for the EF component are presented in table 34. These estimates account for institution type and enrollment and keyholder experience.

Table 34. Burden hours, Fall Enrollment							
	2016-17			2017-18		2018-19	
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	16.0	23.9	16.0	23.9	16.0	23.9
800 or fewer students	1,240	6.9	10.4	6.9	10.4	6.9	10.4
801-3,000 students	970	15.8	23.7	15.8	23.7	15.8	23.7
>3,000 students	990	28.4	42.6	28.4	42.6	28.4	42.6
2-year school	2,200	11.9	17.9	11.9	17.9	11.9	17.9
500 or fewer students	1000	7.9	11.8	7.9	11.8	7.9	11.8
501-1,500 students	360	14.6	21.9	14.6	21.9	14.6	21.9
>1,500 students	840	23.3	35.0	23.3	35.0	23.3	35.0
<2-year schools	2,100	4.6	6.9	4.6	6.9	4.6	6.9
50 or fewer students	1050	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8	3.9	5.8
51 to 250 students	670	4.7	7.1	4.7	7.1	4.7	7.1
>250 students	380	10.3	15.4	10.3	15.4	10.3	15.4
Total	7,500	15.0	22.5	15.0	22.5	15.0	22.5

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the changes to the EF forms shown in table 35.

Table 35. Proposed changes to the Fall Enrollment (EF) Form	
Change	Implementation year
Add the following item to the retention screen and in the instructions for Fall Enrollment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusions to the Fall 20xx cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Include eligible students who studied abroad their first year upon entering the institution 	2016-17

Finance (F): Detailed estimates for the F component are presented in table 36. Estimates account for both institution type and keyholder experience.

Table 36. Burden hours, Finance

	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
		Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	18.1	18.4	18.1	18.4	18.1	18.4
GASB	750	41.1	44.9	41.1	44.9	41.1	44.9
FASB not for profit	1,690	13.7	13.2	13.7	13.2	13.7	13.2
FASB for profit	760	5.4	10.7	5.4	10.7	5.4	10.7
2-year schools	2,200	13.6	13.7	13.6	13.7	13.6	13.7
GASB	1,060	21.8	18.3	21.8	18.3	21.8	18.3
FASB not for profit	170	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.2
FASB for profit	970	6.5	7.1	6.5	7.1	6.5	7.1
<2-year schools	2,100	5.6	8.1	5.6	8.1	5.6	8.1
GASB	250	9.6	12.6	9.6	12.6	9.6	12.6
FASB not for profit	100	4.8	12.6	4.8	12.6	4.8	12.6
FASB for profit	1,750	5.1	6.9	5.1	6.9	5.1	6.9
Total	7,500	13.0	14.3	13.0	14.3	13.0	14.3

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the changes to the F Forms shown in table 37.

Table 37. Proposed changes to the Finance Form for GASB institutions

Change	Implementation year
Statement of Financial Position screen:	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deferred outflows of resources ○ Deferred inflows of resources 	
Expense screen:	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove matrix of expenses by functional and natural classifications. • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following functional classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction ○ Research ○ Public service ○ Academic support ○ Student services ○ Institutional support ○ Operation and maintenance of plant ○ Scholarship and fellowship expenses ○ Auxiliary enterprises ○ Hospital services (if answer Y to screening question) ○ Independent operations ○ Other functional expenses ○ Total expenses and deductions • Add a column to the above table for reporting salaries and wages by the same functional classifications. • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following natural classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Salaries and wages (preloaded from above table) ○ Benefits ○ Depreciation ○ Interest ○ Other natural expenses, calculated from total expenses minus the sum of salaries, benefits, depreciation, and interest • Total expenses and deductions (preloaded from above table) 	
Pension screen:	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise screening question to "Does your institution include pension liabilities, expenses, and/or deferrals for one or more defined benefit pension plans in its Statement of Revenues, Expenses, 	

Table 37. Proposed changes to the Finance Form for GASB institutions

and Changes in Net Position?"	
Revenue data for Bureau of Census: • Revise Gifts and Private Grants to exclude capital contributions.	2016-17
Expenditure data for Bureau of Census: • Remove fields for salaries and wages. • Employee benefits will no longer be preloaded but must be reported for the following functions: o Auxiliary enterprises o Hospitals • Remove fields for scholarships and fellowships.	2016-17
Debt and Assets data for Bureau of Census: • Revise instructions so that long-term debt (lines 01 through 06) is to include all debt issued in the name of the institution. • Revise instructions so that assets (lines 07 through 09) can include bond funds established by parent state or local government.	2016-17

Table 38. Proposed changes to the Finance Form for FASB institutions

Change	Implementation year
Expense screen • Remove matrix of expenses by functional and natural classifications. • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following functional classifications: o Instruction o Research o Public service o Academic support o Student services o Institutional support o Operation and maintenance of plant o Net grant aid to students expenses o Auxiliary enterprises o Hospital services (if answer Y to screening question) o Independent operations o Other functional expenses o Total expenses and deductions • Add a column to the above table for reporting salaries and wages by the same functional classifications. • Create separate table for reporting total expenses by the following natural classifications: o Salaries and wages (preloaded from above table) o Benefits o Depreciation o Interest o Other natural expenses, calculated from total expenses minus the sum of salaries, benefits, depreciation, and interest o Total expenses and deductions (preloaded from above table)	2016-17

Human Resources (HR): Detailed estimates for the HR component are presented in table 39. Estimates account for both institution type and keyholder experience.

Table 39. Burden hours, Human Resources

	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
		Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,200	23.3	35.0	23.3	35.0	23.3	35.0
2-year schools	2,200	10.5	15.7	10.5	15.7	10.5	15.7
<2-year schools	2,100	1.4	2.2	1.4	2.2	1.4	2.2
Total	7,500	12.4	18.6	12.4	18.6	12.4	18.6

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the changes to the HR forms are shown in table 40.

Table 40. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (Degree-granting Institution Forms)	
Change	Implementation Year
Salary outlays: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect salary outlays separately by contract length/employment agreement (i.e., 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, 12-month). 	2016-17
Salary headcounts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect the headcount of full-time instructional staff on contract/employment agreements of less than 9 months by gender and academic rank. 	2016-17
Non-instructional occupational categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide better guidance on where to classify the most problematic roles among the existing categories. 	2016-17
Graduate assistants, by function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement new, condensed categories specifically for graduate assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> graduate assistant, teaching; graduate assistant, research; and graduate assistant, other. 	2016-17
Data on new hires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the reporting period for new hires to include any newly hired, full-time, permanent staff on the payroll of the institution between November 1 and October 31. 	2016-17

Table 41. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time staff)	
Change	Implementation year
Employment agreement/contract length: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add category, "Employment agreements/contract lengths of indefinite duration (e.g., continuing and at-will)." 	2016-17

Table 42. Proposed changes to the Human Resources (HR) Form (all versions)	
Change	Implementation year
Reporting of race/ethnicity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement annual collection of staff data by race/ethnicity. 	2016-17

Academic Libraries (AL): Detailed estimates for the AL component are presented in table 43. Estimates account for both institution type and keyholder experience.

Table 43. Burden hours, Academic Libraries							
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19		
	Number of institutions (Title IV and non-Title IV)	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder	Burden for returning keyholder	Burden for new keyholder
4-year schools	3,100	10.7	16.1	10.7	16.1	10.7	16.1
2-year schools	1,800	7.7	11.5	7.7	11.5	7.7	11.5
Total	4,900	9.6	14.4	9.6	14.4	9.6	14.4

The burden estimates for 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 cover the items listed in table 44.

Table 44. Proposed changes to the Academic Libraries (AL) component	
Change	Implementation year
Section I: For all degree-granting institutions with library expenses >0 Add "Serials" row to Library Collections.	2016-17
Include "Serials" in the count for circulation	2016-17
Change name of Section I from "Library Collections/Circulation" to "Library Collections/Circulation and Interlibrary Loan Services."	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interlibrary Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Yes/No question, "Does your institution have interlibrary services?" 	2016-17

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Interlibrary Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents received 	2016-17
<p>Section II: For degree-granting institutions with library expenses >= \$100,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the following from Section II (moved to Section I): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Interlibrary Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents provided to other libraries ▪ Total interlibrary loans and documents received 	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the following question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ “Does your library support virtual reference services?” 	2016-17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change name of Section II from “Expenses and Interlibrary Services” to “Expenses.” 	2016-17

All Collections: All Survey Components. To provide better estimates of burden on an ongoing basis, NCES will ask IPEDS keyholders to voluntarily report the time required to complete each survey component every other year, with the exception of when a new component or major change is implemented. In those cases, NCES will ask for burden estimates the first and second years of data collection, and then they will be moved to the same years as the other components. NCES estimates a burden of 0.2 hour to track, record, and report this time for the following components: Institutional Characteristics and Admissions, Completions, 12-month Enrollment, Graduation Rates, Graduation Rates 200, Outcome Measures, and Fall Enrollment. NCES estimates it will take 0.4 hour for Student Financial Aid, Finance, Human Resources, and Academic Libraries, because these four components typically involve additional offices at the institution and require keyholders to get time estimates from others at the institution.

A.16. Publication Plans/Project Schedule

A.16.a. Schedule of Activities

Table 45. IPEDS 2016-17 planned data collection schedule

Date	Activity
July-August 2016	Meet with experts to develop instructions for the additional sub-cohorts proposed for GR.
No later than August 3, 2016	Development of new and revised screens based on OMB approval of proposed changes and development of training materials; preview year for some changes 2016-17
No later than August 3, 2016	Development of all 2016-17 survey materials (screens, instructions, FAQs, import specifications)
August 2016	Hold a Technical Review Panel meeting to discuss potential changes to the OM survey component related to comments made during the last 60 day comment period.
Early-September 2016	Finalize the directions for the additional sub-cohorts proposed for the GR component, submit them to OMB, and announce in Federal Register a 30-day public comment period.
Early September 2016	Fall Data Collection opens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Characteristics and Prices (2016-17 data) • Completions (2015-16 data) • 12-month enrollment (2015-16 data)
Late-September 2016	Publish on Regulations.gov proposed changes to the OM component, and announce in Federal Register a 60-day public comment period.
Mid-October 2016	Fall Data Collection closes
Early-December 2016	Submit proposed changes to the OM component to OMB and announce in Federal Register a 30-day public comment period.
Early December 2016	Winter and Spring Data Collection opens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Financial Aid (2015-16 data) • Graduation Rates (2015-16 data) • Graduation Rates 200 (2015-16 data) • Outcome Measures (2015-16 data) • Admissions (Fall 2016 data) • Fall Enrollment (Fall 2016 data) • Finance (Fiscal Year 2016) • Human Resources (Fall 2016 data)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Libraries (NEW) (Fiscal Year 2015)
Early-January 2017	Begin cognitive interviews to develop questions for measuring actual response burden
Mid-February 2017	Winter Collection closes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Financial Aid (2015-16 data) Graduation Rates (2015-16 data) Graduation Rates 200 (2015-16 data) Outcome Measures (2015-16 data) Admissions (Fall 2016 data)
Mid-April 2017	Spring Collection closes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall Enrollment (Fall 2016 data) Finance (Fiscal Year 2016) Human Resources (Fall 2016 data) Academic Libraries (NEW) (Fiscal Year 2015)
June 2017	Noncompliance Report due to Office of Federal Student Aid
No later than January 2017	Public release of data in IPEDS Data Center of data collected in Fall 2016
No later than May 2017	Public release of data in IPEDS Data Center of data collected in Winter 2016-17
No later than July 2017	Public release of data in IPEDS Data Center of data collected in Spring 2017

Survey activity will include the registration period followed by a collection cycle that varies in length depending on the collection. Registration must take place (only once) before data can be entered into the system. Data can be entered directly or through file or batch upload. However, respondents must resolve all errors/flags before data can be locked. This lock must take place before the collection period closes if data are to be considered as submitted in a timely fashion. Once the collection closes for institutions, coordinators have a 2-week period for review. Once complete, the survey administrators (Help Desk) review the data, additional error resolution is performed, and a preliminary file is created for review by NCES. Following NCES approval of this file, a publication is prepared, and preliminary data are released to the public. Then, imputations are run. Following NCES approval of the imputed file, the publication is revised, and these provisional data are released to the public.

Frequent communications occur with the institution over the course of the data collection to ensure compliance with this statutorily mandated collection. The planned 2016-17 communications and follow-up schedule is detailed in table 46.

Table 46. IPEDS 2016-17 data collections communications/follow-up schedule

Collection	Correspondence type	When	Why
Registration	Email to keyholder	Early August - registration open	UserID + password
	Letter to CEO	Early August - registration open	UserID + password; importance of keyholder selection; thank you
	Email, Mailed packet	At registration	Welcome to new keyholders
	Letter to CEO	Late August	No registered keyholder
	Letter & phone call to CEO	Mid-September	No registered keyholder
Each collection: Fall Winter Spring	Email to keyholder	Open	Collection open
	Email to keyholder	Close – 4 wks	No data entered
	Email to new keyholder	Close – 4 wks	All surveys not locked
	Thank you email to CEO	Close – 3 wks	All surveys locked
	Phone call to CEO/keyholder	Close – 2 wks	No data entered
	Phone call to new keyholder	Close – 2 wks	All surveys not locked
	Email to keyholder	Close – 2 wks	All surveys not locked
	Email to keyholder	Close – 1 wk	All surveys not locked

Additional for Spring	Email to keyholder	Late March	No data entered since Winter
	Email – This week in IPEDS	Twice in February	Reminder that Spring surveys are open

A.16.b.Distribution Methods

NCES distributes IPEDS data to users in a timely fashion and in a format that is easy to use. Specifically, IPEDS will be distributed in the following ways.

1. Data Dissemination Tools. Use the Data: The Use the Data portal is the primary method of disseminating IPEDS data to the postsecondary education, policy, and research communities. This portal allows data users to create different reports and datasets, depending on their individual needs. Users can create reports that highlight a particular institution and compare it with other institutions, or they can simply create a report about a group of institutions.

Data Trends: View trends on most frequently asked subject areas including Enrollment, Completions, Graduation Rates, Employees and Staff, Institutional Revenues, and Financial Aid.

Look Up an Institution: Look up information for one institution at a time. Data can be viewed in two forms: institution profile (similar to College Navigator) and reported data (institution's response to each survey question).

Data Feedback Report: Download, print, or customize an institution's Data Feedback Report, a report that graphically summarizes selected institutional data and compares the data with those of peer institutions.

Statistical Tables: Create simple descriptive statistics (e.g., total, count, average, median, standard deviation, percentiles) on selected IPEDS institutions and variables.

Summary Tables: Customize a summary table for a select subgroup of institutions on the following popular topics: tuition and fees, room and board, student financial aid, admissions, test scores, student enrollment, degree/certificate awarded, and graduation rates.

Compare Institutions: Download IPEDS data files for more than 7,000 institutions and up to 250 variables. Step-by-step process guides users through the process of selecting institutions and variables. Data files are provided in comma separated value (*.csv) format.

Survey Data: Download the complete data file for each survey or create a custom data file across multiple surveys. IPEDS data files and data dictionaries are zipped *.csv format, including read programs for easily importing data into a statistical software package (SPSS, STATA, and SAS).

College Navigator: In response to the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, NCES developed a searchable website to provide up-to-date statistics on a broad range of postsecondary institutions for easy access by consumers. The site presents general information about each institution and its mission, as well as data on institution prices and average net price, admissions, financial aid, enrollment, program offerings, degrees and awards conferred, graduation and retention rates, accreditation, varsity athletic teams, campus security, and cohort default rates. College Navigator is designed to help college students, future students, and their parents understand the differences among colleges and how much it costs to attend college. The site also provides direct links to each institution's home page and net price calculator, the College Affordability and Transparency Center; Federal Student Aid's Prepare for College website and the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); and the Occupational Outlook Handbook. Visit <http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/> for more information.

Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web: The Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) now uses IPEDS data on graduation and retention rates, college costs, and net prices in its online FAFSA application. When students look up schools to which they want their FAFSA information sent, they are presented with information on these schools based on IPEDS data.

Tabulated Data: IPEDS data are tabulated and are available through the Tables Library.

2. Survey Reports. NCES releases data in a wide variety of formats, including basic tables, descriptive reports, and more detailed analyses. A few of these types of reports are detailed below.

- *First Look Reports*: Concurrent with the preliminary and provisional release of the data file for each IPEDS collection cycle, a predetermined set of tables called is produced and disseminated to the public. These tabulations include 1-year data tables and selected findings.
- *Descriptive Survey Reports*: Shortly after First Look reports are produced, reports highlighting additional findings from the survey may be produced for various components. These reports are widely distributed to policymakers as well as the general public.
- *Analytic Reports*: Comprehensive reports are produced periodically to analyze major policy issues, such as trends in minority enrollment and degrees, trends in faculty salaries, and trends in degrees by field of study.
- *Other NCES Reports*: The *Digest of Education Statistics*, *Projections of Education Statistics*, and the *Condition of Education* contain major sections based on IPEDS data. These publications have large distributions to a broad spectrum of users of postsecondary education statistics.

A.17. Request to Not Display Expiration Date

ED is not seeking approval to forego displaying the OMB approval expiration date.

A.18. Exceptions to the Certification

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.