

8. As applicable, state that the Department has published the 60 and 30 Federal Register notices as required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB.

Include a citation for the 60 day comment period (e.g. Vol. 84 FR ##### and the date of publication). Summarize public comments received in response to the 60 day notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden. If only non-substantive comments are provided, please provide a statement to that effect and that it did not relate or warrant any changes to this information collection request. In your comments, please also indicate the number of public comments received.

For the 30 day notice, indicate that a notice will be published. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instruction and record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years – even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

ED (the Department) published the applicable 60-day notice in the Federal Register inviting public comment on the data collection and the burden assessment. On February 23, 2026, ED received 2 comments regarding the DAPIP package. One comment received was regarding NAEP scores, which is not relevant to this package. One comment from MSCHE was received and reviewed.

MSCHE commented on the relevance of the DAPIP system and whether it is necessary. DAPIP is a central repository for collecting, storing, and disseminating thousands of accreditation notifications that are required to be made to the Secretary each year. Although the Department is interested in increasing stakeholder and public awareness of the information recorded in the system, it is not currently the method by which agencies communicate accreditation information to any entity other than the Department. There are capabilities available and utilized in the DAPIP system that do not appear to even exist in any other sole source.

MSCHE also commented on accuracy of the information available through the DAPIP system. The Department does not enter the information into the system and cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information in an all-encompassing nod. The accrediting agencies are charged with providing this information timely and accurately. However, during reviews of agencies for initial or renewed recognition by the Secretary, Department staff check to ensure that notifications made by agencies are timely and accurate. When the contrary is discovered, corrections are required. Additionally, Department staff receive

“daily log” emails from the system that provide us all actions that were entered across all recognized agencies on that particular calendar date. This allows analysts that are assigned to these agencies to spot-check for any accuracy or timeliness issues throughout the year even if a particular agency is not currently under review for initial or renewed recognition.

MSCHE requested a drop-down selection that is open-ended. The various accrediting agencies use various terms to refer to the same things and regulations and subregulatory guidance and tools have been crafted to try to respect those variances. There are currently over 50 different types of accreditation actions that can be reported in DAPIP. If an instance arises where an agency believes the available action does not capture some important nuance, agencies can select an “Other” justification and then complete a free form text box providing any additional explanation or information it desires.

MSCHE commented on review and accreditation cease dates. ED is currently reviewing the review date function in the system. Cease dates should only be input in DAPIP once the closure has taken place.

MSCHE commented on why DAPIP and ED staff review actions and approve it before it can be published to the website. This function provides DAPIP and ED staff the time and opportunity to review the information.

ED is currently reviewing the search functionality and file size limitations.