

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2019-20 to 2021-22

Supporting Statement Part B

OMB No. 1850-0582 v.24

Submitted by:

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

March 2019

SECTION B. Description of Statistical Methodology

B.1. Respondent Universe

In 2017-18, IPEDS collected data from 6,642 postsecondary institutions in the United States and the other jurisdictions that are eligible to participate in Title IV Federal financial aid programs. By law, 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 each year. Institution closures and mergers have led to a decrease in the number of institutions in the IPEDS universe over the past few years. Due to these fluctuations, combined with the addition of new institutions, NCES uses rounded estimates for the number of institutions in the respondent burden calculations for the upcoming years (estimated 6,400 Title IV institutions plus 200 non-title IV institutions for a total of 6,600 institutions estimated to submit IPEDS data during the 2019-20 through 2021-22 IPEDS data collections).

Table 1 provides the number of institutions that submitted data during the 2017-18 IPEDS data collection and the number of institutions estimated to submit data during the 2019-20 through 2021-22 IPEDS data collections, disaggregated by the type of institution (Title IV institutions are disaggregated by highest level of offering: 4-year award or above, 2-year award, less than 2-year award). Note that based on yet unpublished numbers from the 2018-19 data collection, NCES has decreased the estimates for the number of institutions that are expected to report to IPEDS in the 2019-20 through 2021-22 data collections.

Table 1. Actual 2017-18 and Estimated 2019-20 through 2021-22 Number of Institutions Submitting IPEDS Data

Institution Type	2017-18 Institution Counts*	Estimates Used in Burden Calculations for the 2019-20 to 2021-22 Collections
Total	6,842	6,600
<i>Title IV institutions</i>	6,642	6,400
4-year	2,902	2,800
2-year	1,932	1,800
Less than 2-yr	1,808	1,800
<i>Non-Title IV institutions</i>	200	200

* For Title IV institutions: Ginder, S.A., Kelly-Reid, J.E., and Mann, F.B. (2018). Postsecondary Institutions and Cost of Attendance in 2017–18; Degrees and Other Awards Conferred, 2016–17; and 12-Month Enrollment, 2016–17: First Look (Provisional Data) (NCES 2018-060rev). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Table 2 provides the number of experienced and new keyholders that submitted data for a given IPEDS component during the 2017-18 IPEDS data collection, disaggregated by the type of institution. These experienced vs. new keyholder designation is drawn directly from self-reported data in the data collection system, where users indicate whether they are submitting data for the first time when they register.

Table 2. 2017-18 Counts of Experienced and New Keyholders Submitting IPEDS Data, by Institution Type and IPEDS Component

Survey component	Total		4-year institutions		2-year institutions		Less than 2-year institutions	
	Experienced	New	Experienced	New	Experienced	New	Experienced	New
IC	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
C	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
E12	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
SFA	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
OM	3,166	792	2,016	505	1,150	287	0	0
GR	4,727	1,182	1,893	473	1,487	372	1,347	337
GR200	4,398	1,099	1,642	411	1,461	365	1,295	323

Survey component	Total		4-year institutions		2-year institutions		Less than 2-year institutions	
ADM	1,656	414	1,430	357	138	34	88	23
EF	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
F	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
HR	5,474	1,368	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
AL	3,239	810	2,099	525	1,139	285	0	0

* Note: These counts do not match any published numbers because they include the non-Title IV institutions that voluntarily submit data to IPEDS.

Table 3 provides the actual response rates, by survey component and the type of institution, for the 2017-18 IPEDS data collection. Because IPEDS is a mandated federal data collection, and institutions can be fined for non-response, all response rates approximate 100%.

Table 3. IPEDS 2017-18 Title IV Institutions Response Rates, by Institution Type and IPEDS Component

Survey component	4-year institutions	2-year institutions	Less than 2-year institutions
IC	100.00%	99.95%	99.94%
C	100.00%	99.90%	99.94%
E12	99.97%	99.90%	99.89%
SFA	99.36%	99.84%	99.61%
OM	99.33%	99.79%	N/A
GR	99.28%	99.89%	99.58%
GR200	99.42%	99.84%	99.57%
ADM	99.89%	100.00%	100.00%
EF	99.34%	99.84%	99.39%
F	99.18%	99.64%	99.11%
HR	99.35%	99.90%	99.44%
AL	99.34%	99.80%	N/A

B.2. Statistical Methodology

No sampling is utilized for any of the IPEDS survey components. Because of the institutional compliance requirements outlined in Part A sections A.1 and A.2 of this submission, and per extensive discussions at the IPEDS Technical Review Panel meetings, with other areas of the Department of Education, including the Office for Civil Rights, the Office of Postsecondary Education, the office of Federal Student Aid, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, and with other Federal Agencies such as Census, the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), IPEDS must collect data from the universe of Title IV institutions.

B.3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates

IPEDS response rates for institutions receiving federal financial aid are consistently 99.8% and higher. IPEDS targets the Title IV institutions (others may respond, but no follow-up is done) and the web-based survey system incorporates an automated e-mail module that automatically generates follow-up e-mail to “keyholders” (individuals appointed by the CEOs as responsible for IPEDS data submission). As shown in Table 19 of Part A section A.16 of this submission, frequent communications occur with the institutions over the course of the data collection to ensure compliance with this statutorily mandated collection. Follow-up e-mails are generated if an institution does not attempt to enter data or if, at two weeks and one week before closeout, the components are not locked. The CEOs of non-responding institutions are also contacted by standard mail and with follow up phone calls if, two weeks prior to closeout, the school has not entered any data. New institutions and institutions with new keyholders receive additional telephone and email prompts. This has proven to be very successful in past years. In addition, the names of institutions that do not respond to the IPEDS surveys, and a history of all regular contact with these institutions, is provided

to the Federal Student Aid office for appropriate action.

B.4. Tests of Procedures and Methods

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

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

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

B.5. Reviewing Individuals

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

Representatives from the National Center for Education Statistics

Aida Ali Akreyi, Survey Director¹

Samuel Barbett, Mathematical Statistician¹

Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner, NCES¹

Elise Christopher, Project Officer, High School Longitudinal Studies¹

Christopher Cody, Survey Director¹

Michelle Coon, Technical Adviser¹

Amanda Dean, American Institutes for Research¹

Moussa Ezzeddine, Statistician¹

Tracy Hunt-White, Education Statistician¹

Gigi Jones, Education Research Scientist¹

Kashka Kubzdela, OMB Liaison¹

Tara Lawley, Team Lead, IPEDS Operations¹

Bao Le, Associate Education Research Scientist¹

Marie Marcum, Program Director, Administrative Data Division: Elementary and Secondary Branch

Andrew Mary, Statistician¹

¹ Individual attended multiple Technical Review Panels at different times and in differing capacities, as an NCES representative and as a representative for another organization.

Stefanie McDonald, IC/SFA Survey Director¹
Richard Reeves, IPEDS Program Director¹
David Richards, Education Statistician¹
Ross Santy, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, NCES¹
Marilyn Seastrom, Chief Statistician and Staff Director¹
Thomas Snyder, Director, Annual Reports and Information Staff¹
Ted Socha, Mathematical Statistician
Imani Stutely, Survey Director¹
Jie Sun, SAS Programmer¹
James L. Woodworth, Commissioner
Kelly Worthington, Administrative Data Division: Elementary and Secondary Branch

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

Seth Allen, Pomona College²
LaJanis Allen, Douglas J Aveda Institute²
Michelle Appel, University of Maryland²
Eric Atchison, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning²
Frank Balz, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)²
Dianne Barker, Technical College System of Georgia
Sandy Baum, Urban Institute²
Angela Bell, Board of Regents of University System of Georgia²
Alexandra Bernadotte, Beyond 12
Jon Boeckenstedt, DePaul University
Sharon Boivin, Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking
Rachel Boon, Iowa Board of Regents
Victor Borden, Indiana University²
Eileen Brennan, Henry Ford College²
Camille Brown, SC Commission on Higher Education²
Julia Carpenter-Hubin, Ohio State University²
Meghan Carr, University of Missouri
E. Ann Carson, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)²
Benjamin Castleman, University of Virginia
Andrés Castro Samayoa, Penn Center for Minority Serving Institutions
Stephanie Cellini, George Washington University²
Diane Cheng, The Institute for College Access & Success²
Henry Childers, University of Arizona
Matthew Chingos, Urban Institute
Marin Clarkberg, Cornell University
Cory Clasemann-Ryan, Ivy Tech Community College
John Clayton, Johnson County Community College
Melissa Clinedinst, National Association for College Admission Counseling²
Elizabeth Clune-Kneuer, Prince George's Community College²
William Congdon, Social and Behavioral Sciences Team
Bryan Cook, The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities²
Kim Cook, National College Access Network²
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College²
Gloria Crisp, Oregon State University
Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Archie Cubarrubia, Miami Dade College²
Alisa Cunningham, rpkGroup²
Cassandra Dortch, Congressional Research Service (CRS)²

² Individual attended multiple Technical Review Panels at different times and in differing capacities, as a representative from more than one organization.

Rebecca Drennen, Berkeley College²
Julie Edmunds, SERVE Center at University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Marne Einarson, Cornell University
Gillian Emmons, Boston University²
Jaqueline Falkenheim, National Science Foundation
Gayle Fink, Bowie State University²
John Fink, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University²
Nancy Floyd, North Carolina State University
Dan Foley, National Science Foundation
Marissa Fox, Career Education Corporation²
Donyell Francis, Technical College System of GA²
Khadish Franklin, The Pell Institute
Doug Franklin, University of Illinois Springfield²
Pam Frugoli, Department of Labor, Employment & Training Administration
Brian Fu, U.S. Department of Education²
Chris Furguele, University of California Office of the President²
Tanya Garcia, Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce²
Marybeth Gasman, Penn Center for Minority-Serving Institutions²
Michael Gass, University of North Carolina at Asheville
Luke Gentala, Liberty University²
Eric Godin, Division of Florida Colleges
Carlos Gonzalez, Education Management Corporation (EDMC)²
Mary Goodhue Lynch, Massasoit Community College²
Kurt Gunnell, Western Governors University²
Lou Guthrie, LED Fast Start - Louisiana Community & Technical College System
Lakia Hairston, P&A Scholars Beauty School²
Mark Hamburg, U.S. Department of Education (FSA)²
Eric Hardy, U.S. Department of Education, FSA
Thomas Harnisch, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)²
Stephen Haworth, Adtalem Global Education²
Heidi Hedegard, University System of New Hampshire System Office
Dennis Hengstler, University of Tennessee System Office
Nicholas Hillman, University of Wisconsin-Madison²
Teri Hinds, Student Affairs Administrators in higher Education (NASPA)²
Braden Hosch, Stony Brook University²
Lisa Hudson, Sample Surveys Division: Cross-Sectional Surveys Branch, NCES²
John Ingram, Community College of Allegheny County
Michael Itzkowitz, Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)²
Manju Iyer, Lincoln Tech²
Matt Jans, Abt Associates
Carrie Jones, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Jolanta Juskiewicz, American Association of Community Colleges
Darby Kaikkonen, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges²
James Karangu, U.S. Department of Education, Federal Student Aid²
Robert Kelchen, Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy²
Jonathan Keller, Massachusetts Department of Higher Education²
Heather Kelly, University of Delaware²
Patrick Kelly, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)²
Dawn Kenney, Central New Mexico Community College²
Wendy Kilgore, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
Stephen Kimata, University of Virginia²
Sandra Kinney, Georgia Institute of Technology²
Jeremy Kintzel, Missouri Department of Higher Education²

Kimberly Kirkpatrick, Louisiana Board of Regents²
Duane Knudson, Texas State University
Laurie Koehler, George Washington University
Tammy Kolbe, University of Vermont²
Sophia Laderman, SHEEO
Erez Lenchner, CUNY John Jay College²
Eric Lichtenberger, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Marc LoGrasso, Bryant & Stratton College²
Adam Looney, U.S. Department of the Treasury
Susan Lounsbury, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)²
Mona Lucas, University of Connecticut²
Jennifer Ma, The College Board²
Marta Maldonado, Education Corporation of America²
Noah Mann, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)²
Tod Massa, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia²
Carolyn Mata, Georgia Independent College Association²
Michael Matier, Academic Analytics (AcA).²
Jordan Matsudaira, Cornell University
Lisa Mazure, Lansing Community College
Clare McCann, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD)²
Deborah McNeal, Coahoma Community College²
Allan Medwick, Urisdae Analytics²
Patrick Meldrim, Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association (TICUA)²
Susan Menditto, National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)²
Soon Merz, Austin Community College²
Ivan Metzger, U.S. Department of Education
Erie Meyer, The White House
John Milam, Lord Fairfax Community College²
Abby Miller, Coffey Consulting, LLC²
Ben Miller, Center for American Progress²
Jack Miner, The Ohio State University
Ted Mitchell, U.S. Department of Education²
Julie Morgan, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation²
Christopher Mullin, Strong Start to Finish²
Denise Nadasen, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities²
Amanda Nagle, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
Ayushi Narayan, Council of Economic Advisers
Christopher Nellum, The Education Trust–West (ETW)²
Andrew Nichols, The Education Trust
Danyelle Norman, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
Jon O'Bergh, Office of the Under Secretary (OUS)²
Karen O'Brien, Penn State University, University Budget Office²
Martha Oburn, Houston Community College²
Peter Oldershaw, American Institutes for Research/NCES²
Iris Palmer, New America
Anthony Parandi, Indiana Wesleyan University
Emily Parker, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)²
Amelia Parnell, Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education
Audrey Peek, American Institutes for Research²
Patrick Perry, California State University²
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges²
Shawn Potter, Tulane University
Kristina Powers, K Powers Consulting Inc²

Brian Prescott, The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)²
David Price, Ancora Education Inc.²
Sam Quinney, U.S. Department of Education
Jason Ramirez, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities²
Kenneth Redd, National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)²
Nerissa Rivera, Duke University²
Jamey Rorison, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
D'Juana Scarborough, Centura/AIM/Tidewater Tech Corporate²
Oliver Schak, Department of Education / OPEPD / PPSS²
Abigail Seldin, America Forward²
Rajat Shah, Lincoln Tech²
Jessica Sharkness, Tufts University
Learty Shaw, Georgia Institute of Technology
Daniel Shephard, U.S. General Services Administration
Lena Shi, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development (OPEPD)²
Christy Siegerdt, State University System of Florida - Board of Governors²
Donna Silber, Maricopa Community College District²
Sean Simone, NJ Longitudinal Data System²
Robert Sivinski, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)²
Sharon Snyder, Department of Homeland Security - ICE
Matthew Soldner, Institute of Education Sciences²
Mike Sperko, Kent State University²
Shafali Srivastava, National Center for Health Workforce Analysis
Jamiene Studley, Deputy Under Secretary of Education²
Jennifer Sutton, National Institutes of Health
David Tandberg, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
Jason Taylor, University of Utah
Jessica Teal, The White House
Charles Tegen, Clemson University²
Dawn Terkla, Tufts University²
Kimberly Thompson, University of Phoenix-Central Office²
Jessica Thompson, Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS)
Philip Tizzani, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
Amelia Topper, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Christine Tracy, American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN)²
Red Tremmel, Tulane University
Jill Triplett, Spelman College
David Troutman, University of Texas System²
Jonathan Turk, American Council on Education (ACE)²
Laura Uerling, Roxbury Community College²
Mamie Voight, Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP)²
Lindsay Wayt, National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)²
Jeffrey West, University of Utah²
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)²
Sabrina Williams, The White House
Michael Williams, Ruffalo Noel Levitz
Nathan Wilson, Illinois Community College Board²
Jennifer Zinth, Education Commission of the States