

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2022-23 to 2024-25

Supporting Statement Part B

OMB No. 1850-0582 v. 30

Submitted by:

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

February 2022

SECTION B. Description of Statistical Methodology

B.1. Respondent Universe

In 2020-21, IPEDS collected data from 6,440 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 300 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 6,100 Title IV institutions plus 300 non-title IV institutions for a total of 6,400 institutions estimated to submit IPEDS data during the 2022-23 through 2024-25 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 Note that based on yet unpublished numbers from the 2018-19 data collection, NCES has decreased the estimates for the number of institutions that are expected to report to IPEDS in the 2019-20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.

Institution Type	2020-21 Institution Counts*	Estimates Used in Burden Calculations for the 2019-20 to 2021-22 Collections
Total	6,400	6,400
<i>Title IV institutions</i>	6,063	6,100
4-year	2,724	2,750
2-year	1,623	1,650
Less than 2-yr	1,716	1,700
<i>Non-Title IV institutions</i>	337	300

* For Title IV institutions: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS, Fall 2020 Institutional Characteristics component (provisional data).

Table 2 provides the number of experienced and new keyholders that submitted data for a given IPEDS component during the 2020-21 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.

Survey component	Total		4-year institutions		2-year institutions		Less than 2-year institutions	
	Experienced	New	Experienced	New	Experienced	New	Experienced	New
IC	4,791	1,597	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
C	4,630	1,543	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
E12	4,627	1,542	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
SFA	4,548	1,516	2,382	595	1,569	392	1,523	381
OM	2,771	923	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

Table 2. 2021 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	
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 20-20-21 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%	100.00%	99.94%
C	99.96%	99.94%	99.88%
E12	99.93%	99.94%	99.82%
SFA	100.00%	99.94%	99.77%
OM	99.96%	99.92%	N/A
GR	99.96%	100.00%	99.81%
GR200	99.42%	99.84%	99.57%
ADM	100.00%	99.28%	100.00%
EF	99.96%	99.88%	99.82%
F	99.96%	99.87%	99.76%
HR	99.96%	99.88%	99.82%
AL	99.96%	99.92%	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 timelier 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
Elise Christopher, Project Officer, High School Longitudinal Studies¹
Carrie Clarady, OMB Liaison
Christopher Cody, Survey Director¹
Moussa Ezzeddine, Statistician¹
Mark Glander, Research Scientist
Tracy Hunt-White, Education Statistician¹
Gigi Jones, Education Research Scientist¹
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
Audrey Peek, Survey Director
Stacey Peterson, Statistician

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.

McCall Pitcher, Survey Director

Richard Reeves, IPEDS Program Director¹

Roman Ruiz, Survey Director

Ross Santy, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, NCES¹

Jie Sun, SAS Programmer¹

Kelly Worthington, Administrative Data Division: Elementary and Secondary Branch

Representatives from Associations, Postsecondary Institutions/Systems, and Other Federal Offices – TRP 22

Patrick Alles, Independent Colleges of Indiana²

Craig Bach, Kaplan University

Victor Borden, Indiana University

Keith Brown, North Carolina Community College System

Bryan Cook, American Council on Education

Jason Hill, American Institutes for Research

Christine Keller, MASULGC/University of Kansas, OIRP

Marnia Kennon, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana

Sandra Kinney, Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education

Nancy Krogh, University of Idaho

Hans L'Orange, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEE)

Tod Massa, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Lesley McBain American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Soon Merz, Austin Community College

John Milam, HigherEd.org, Inc.

Patrick Perry, California Community Colleges Chancellors Office

Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges

LuWayne Phillips, Lorain County Community College

John Porter, State University of New York – SUNY System Administration

Matt Reed, The Institute for College Access and Success

Steve Robison, Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education

Jessica Shedd, National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)

Michael Tamada, Occidental College

Judith Taylor, Jobs for the Future

Dawn Terkla, Tufts University

Judith Thompson, Florida Department of Education

Michelle Van Noy, Columbia University

Jamie Wescott, National Accrediting Commission of Cosmetology Arts & Sciences

Nathan Wilson, Illinois Community College Board

TRP 55

Eric Atchison, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning

Dianne Barker, Technical College System of Georgia

Cory Clasemann, Ivy Tech Community College

Melissa Clinedinst, National Association for College Admission Counseling

Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College

Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System

Rebecca Drennen, Berkeley College

Julie Edmunds, SERVE Center at University of North Carolina at Greensboro

John Fink, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University

Doug Franklin, University of Illinois Springfield

Tanya Garcia, Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce

² Attended TRP 22

Luke Gentala, Liberty University
Thomas Harnisch, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AACSU)
Stephen Haworth, Adtalem Global Education
Braden Hosch, Stony Brook University
Darby Kaikkonen, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Christine Keller, Association for Institutional Research
Wendy Kilgore, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
Carolyn Mata, Georgia Independent College Association
Patrick Meldrim, Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association (TICUA)
Elise Miller, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Jason Ramirez, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Learty Shaw, Georgia Institute of Technology
Jason Taylor, University of Utah
David Troutman, University of Texas System
Jonathan Turk, American Council on Education (ACE)
Jennifer Zinth, Education Commission of the States

TRP 61

Maureen Amos, Northeastern Illinois University
Eric Atchison, Arkansas State University System
Eileen Brennan, Henry Ford College
Bryan Cook, The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College
Bill DeBaun, NCAN
Charlotte Etier, NASFAA
Meredith Fergus, Minnesota Office of Higher Education
Nancy Floyd, Minnesota State Colleges & Universities (MnSCU)
Donyell Francis, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia
Brian Fu, U.S. Department of Education
Tanya Garcia, Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce
Luke Gentala, Liberty University
Emmanuel Guillory, UNCF
Eric Hardy, U.S. Department of Education, FSA
Stephen Haworth, Adtalem Global Education
Nicholas Hillman, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Aaron Horn, MHEC
John Ingram, Community College of Allegheny County
Darby Kaikkonen, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Christine Keller, Association for Institutional Research
Susan Lounsbury, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
Brent Madoo, U.S. Department of Education: Office of the Chief Data Officer
Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Sarah Pingel, Education Commission of the States
Jason Ramirez, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Nerissa Rivera, Duke University
Mary Sommers, University of Nebraska Kearney
Jonathan Turk, American Council on Education (ACE)
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

TRP 62

Eric Atchinson, Arkansas State University System
Peter Bahr, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education
Vladimir Basis, Iowa Department of Education
Victor Borden, Indiana University
Eileen Brennan, Henry Ford College
John Clayton, Johnson County Community College
Rooney Columbus, University of Michigan
Bryan Cook, The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College
Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Mark D'Amico, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Nancy Dugan, Eastern Iowa Community Colleges
Mason Erwin, Coffey Consulting
Nancy Floyd, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Tanya Garcia, Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce
Luke Gentala, Liberty University
Mary Goodhue Lynch, Massasoit Community College
Lou Guthrie, LED Fast Start – Louisiana Community and Technical College System
Stephen Haworth, Adtalem Global Education
Tamar Jacoby, Opportunity America
Darby Kaikkonen, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Christine Keller, Association for Institutional Research
Susan Lounsbury, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
Martha Oburn, Houston Community College
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Stephanie Richter, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana
Maria Scott Cormier, Columbia University, CCRC
Ashley Sieman, North Carolina Community College System
Zun Tang, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
Michelle Van Noy, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

TRP 63

Brian An, University of Iowa
Eric Atchison, Arkansas State University System
Dianne Barker, Technical College System of Georgia
Vladimir Basis, Iowa Department of Education
Eileen Brennan, Henry Ford College
Cory Clasemann, Ivy Tech Community College
Bryan Cook, The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College
Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Rebecca Drennen, Berkeley College
Nancy Dugan, Eastern Iowa Community Colleges
July Edmunds, SERVE Center at University of North Carolina at Greensboro
John Fink, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University
Michael Flanigan, Virginia Commonwealth University
Nancy Floyd, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Luke Gentala, Liberty University
Kurt Gunnell, Western Governors University
Darby Kaikkonen, Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Christine Keller, Association for Institutional Research

Wendy Kilgore, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
Susan Lounsbury, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
Carolyn Mata, Oglethorpe University
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Bill Schneider, NC Community College System
Troy (Learty) Shaw, Georgia Institute of Technology
Sean Simone, Rutgers University
Amanda Sterk, Florida SouthWestern State College
Jason Taylor, University of Utah
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
Shaun Williams-Wyche, Midwestern Higher Education Compact

TRP 64

Eric Atchison, Arkansas State University System
Dianne Barker, National Alliance of Current Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP)
Eileen Brennan, Henry Ford College
Matthew Case, California State University, Office of the Chancellor
Melissa Clinedinst, National Association for College Admission Counseling
Bryan Cook, The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Mary Ann Coughlin, Springfield College
Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System
Michael Flanigan, Virginia Commonwealth University
Nancy Floyd, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Kurt Gunnell, Western Governors University
Misty Haskamp, University of Missouri
Christine Keller, Association for Institutional Research
Wendy Kilgore, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
Abby Miller, ASA Research
Joann Moore, ACT, Inc
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges
Jason Pontius, Board of Regents State of Iowa
Jason Ramirez, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
Ashley Robinson-Spann, College Board
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
Shaun Williams-Wyche, Midwestern Higher Education Compact