

# **Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2024-25 to 2026-27**

## **Supporting Statement Part B**

**OMB No. 1850-0582 v. 33**

***Submitted by:***

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

**February 2024**

## SECTION B. Description of Statistical Methodology

### B.1. Respondent Universe

In 2022-23, IPEDS collected data from 5,983 Title IV postsecondary institutions in the United States and the other jurisdictions. 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 6,000 Title IV institutions plus 200 non-title IV institutions for a total of 6,200 institutions estimated to submit IPEDS data during the 2024-25 through 2026-27 IPEDS data collections).

Table 1 provides the number of institutions that submitted data during the 2022-23 IPEDS data collection and the number of institutions estimated to submit data during the 2024-25 through 2026-27 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 the 2022-23 data collection, NCES has decreased the estimates for the number of institutions that are expected to report to IPEDS in the 2024-25 through 2026-27 data collections.

Table 1. Actual 2022-23 and Estimated 2024-25 through 2026-27 Number of Institutions Submitting IPEDS Data		
Institution Type	2022-23 Institution Counts*	Estimates Used in Burden Calculations for the 2024-25 to 2026-27 Collections
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,183</b>	<b>6,115</b>
<i>Title IV institutions</i>	5,983	5,935
4-year	2,757	2,750
2-year	1,569	1,560
Less than 2-yr	1,657	1,625
<i>Non-Title IV institutions</i>	200	180

\* For Title IV institutions: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS, Fall 2022 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 2022-23 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. 2022-23 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	4,515	1,505	1,913	763	1,155	424	1,447	318
C	4,515	1,505	2,121	796	1,109	386	1,285	323
E12	4,507	1,502	1,906	820	1,102	389	1,499	293
SFA	4,416	1,472	1,889	779	1,093	386	1,434	307
OM	2,742	914	1,847	616	895	298	0	0
GR	4,019	1,339	1,611	663	1,031	396	1,377	280
GR200	3,762	1,254	1,403	593	1,017	383	1,342	278
ADM	1,496	499	1,339	443	94	20	63	36

Table 2. 2022-23 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	
EF	4,487	1,495	1,952	789	1,083	393	1,452	313
F	4,375	1,458	1,935	760	1,162	415	1,278	283
HR	4,484	1,494	1,976	779	1,118	396	1,390	319
AL	2,811	937	1,954	675	857	262	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 2022-23 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 2022-23 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%	100.00%
C	100.00%	99.94%	99.82%
E12	99.42%	99.94%	99.82%
SFA	100.00%	99.94%	99.88%
OM	100.00%	100.00%	N/A
GR	99.96%	100.00%	99.81%
GR200	100.00%	100.00%	99.93%
ADM	100.00%	99.84%	100.00%
EF	100.00%	99.94%	99.76%
F	99.96%	99.87%	99.82%
HR	99.93%	100.00%	99.88%
AL	99.96%	100.00%	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, Team Lead, IPEDS Operations<sup>1</sup>  
Samuel Barbett, Mathematical Statistician<sup>1</sup>  
Elise Christopher, Project Officer, High School Longitudinal Studies<sup>1</sup>  
Carrie Clarady, OMB Liaison  
Christopher Cody, Survey Director<sup>1</sup>  
Moussa Ezzeddine, Statistician<sup>1</sup>  
Tracy Hunt-White, Education Statistician<sup>1</sup>  
Tara Lawley, IPEDS Program Director<sup>1</sup>  
Marie Marcum, Administrative Data Division: Elementary and Secondary Branch  
Andrew Mary, Statistician<sup>1</sup>  
Audrey Peek, Research Fellow  
Stacey Peterson, Statistician  
McCall Pitcher, Survey Director  
Roman Ruiz, Survey Director  
Ross Santy, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division, NCES<sup>1</sup>  
Jie Sun, SAS Programmer<sup>1</sup>  
Kelly Worthington, Administrative Data Division: Elementary and Secondary Branch

---

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

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

TRP 69

Kathryn Akers, Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education  
Eric Atchison, Arkansas State University System  
Amy Ballagh, Georgia Southern University  
Angella Bell, Board of Regents of University System of Georgia  
Matthew Case, California State University, Office of the Chancellor  
Nate Clark, Career College of Northern Nevada  
Gloria Crisp, Oregon State University  
Alicia Crouch, Kentucky Community and Technical College System  
Nancy Dugan, Eastern Iowa Community Colleges  
John Fink, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University  
Nancy Floyd, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities  
Kurt Gunnell, Western Governors University  
Misty Haskamp, University of Missouri  
Michael Johnston, Pensacola State College  
Jacob Kamer, Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
Bryan Kelley, Education Commission of the States  
Wendy Kilgore, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)  
Bao Le, Association of Public and Land Grant Universities  
Luis Maldonado, American Association of State Colleges and Universities  
Tod Massa, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia  
Carolyn Mata, Oglethorpe University  
Hironao Okahana, American Council on Education  
Kent Phillippe, American Association of Community Colleges  
Kristina Powers, Institute for Effectiveness in Higher Education  
Elena Quiroz-Livanis, Massachusetts Department of Higher Education  
Jason Ramirez, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities  
Tracy Rhoades, University of Phoenix  
Mikyung Ryu, National Student Clearinghouse  
Bill Schneider, NC Community College System  
Colby Spencer Cesaro, Michigan Independent Colleges and Universities  
Adam Swanson, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College  
Loralyn Taylor, Ohio University  
David Troutman, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Mamie Voight, Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP)  
Zach Waymer, Higher Learning Commission (HLC)  
Christina Whitfield, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)  
Shaun Williams-Wyche, Midwestern Higher Education Compact