



Implementing a Federal Student-Level Data Network (Part II): INSIGHTS FROM INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Josh Pretlow and Erin Dunlop Velez, RTI International
Amanda Janice Roberson, IHEP

JANUARY 2021



INTRODUCTION

The current federal postsecondary data landscape, although composed of high-quality data that help stakeholders answer some questions related to students and their outcomes, has gaps that leave many questions from policymakers, institutions, and students unanswered.

Seeking to close these gaps and streamline the federal data infrastructure, Congress introduced legislation that would reshape the federal postsecondary data collections, including the **College Affordability Act** ([CAA], U.S. House of Representatives) and the College Transparency Act ([CTA], **U.S. Senate** and **U.S. House of Representatives**). These bills propose the creation of a federal student-level data network (SLDN) that would leverage data available at institutions of higher education and federal agencies to increase transparency and report important, aggregate information on all postsecondary students and their outcomes. If Congress passes and the President signs either of these bills into law, the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) will be tasked with the construction and implementation of the data system. The legislation defers to NCES to determine the precise structure, governance, technology, and data definitions in the implementation and regulatory processes.

To help inform the development of a potential SLDN, RTI International,¹ an independent nonprofit institute with extensive experience with federal postsecondary data collection, partnered with the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP)—leader of the Postsecondary Data Collaborative—to engage a diverse array of stakeholders in a discussion centered on early decisions required of NCES in the development and implementation of an SLDN. The first forum RTI and IHEP hosted took place in June 2020 and discussed specific measures and underlying data elements required by the legislation. The results of that forum—including a detailed table of proposed data elements to be captured—are summarized in "**Implementing a Federal Student-Level Data Network: Advice from Experts.**"² In September 2020, RTI and IHEP convened a second forum, which focused on data submission to an SLDN from the institution perspective, and this brief captures the key points of that discussion.

1 RTI International conducts several postsecondary education data collections on behalf of NCES, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B), and Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS). For this effort, however, RTI is acting independently, not on behalf of NCES.

2 Dunlop Velez, E., Pretlow, J., & Roberson, A.J. (August 2020). Implementing a Federal Student-Level Data Network: Advice from Experts. Retrieved from <http://www.ihep.org/research/publications/implementing-federal-student-level-data-network>.

PROCESS

Ridofranz/iStock

The September 2020 virtual forum included 12 representatives from diverse institutional backgrounds, including public 2-year, private nonprofit 4-year, and private for-profit 4-year institutions, as well as individuals who work in public system and association offices (for a complete list, please see Appendix A). Panelists brought their years of experience in institutional research (IR), including institution data reporting, and their knowledge of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to bear on questions of data availability, limitations, timing of reporting, and expected obstacles and opportunities.

Prior to the forum, we spoke with more than 10 individuals responsible for data and reporting at their institutions. Leveraging their insights and what we learned in the first forum about data elements required by the legislation, we developed the proposed variables displayed in Figures 1–4, the majority of which are required by the CAA.³ The variables in these Figures that are not required by legislation are included based on panelist feedback, indicating that these variables potentially provide value to institutions or policymakers over and above the burden of collecting them. Defining the specifics of the SLDN is ultimately the responsibility of NCES and the Postsecondary Student Data System Advisory Committee; however, we provided example file layouts for panelists to consider as a basis for constructive conversation.

In the examples below, we assumed that institutions would submit four files: enrollment, completion, financial aid, and demographics. In considering the example file layouts and various models of data collection, we asked panelists to consider the following questions:

- Are these data available for all students?
- When are these data available for reporting?
- Would it be preferable to submit these elements once or multiple times during the year?
- What factors would impact data submission practices?
- What resources could potentially streamline data submission and/or reduce burden for institutions?

³ For a complete list of data elements required by legislation in the SLDN, including how those requirements build upon current IPEDS reporting requirements, see Appendix B in [“Implementing a Federal Student-Level Data Network: Advice from Experts.”](#)

FINDINGS

Ridofranz/iStock

In each of the following sections, we include the file layout shared with panelists and discuss their feedback. Through this brief, our intention is not to come to conclusions or answers related to the issues raised by panelists; instead, we seek to raise important points that NCES and the designers of the SLDN will face if the CAA or similar bills become law.

Enrollment and Completions

Panelists expressed confidence that the enrollment and completion data elements are largely available for reporting (shown in Figures 1 and 2) and raised specific questions and comments on the following topics about how to define and report these data to an SLDN.

REPORTING TIMING:

- Data definitions and the information required on the student-level file will affect when the data would be available to submit. For example, if credits attempted and earned are used to derive measures of enrollment and are included on the same file submission, institutions could not submit until the following semester because they, in many cases, allow a grace period to rectify an incomplete course or grade.
- Participants noted that many institutions operate on varied calendar systems with differing course start and end dates. Thus, relying on typical fall, spring, and summer semesters cannot capture the varied types of enrollment options institutions offer. The legislation requires this collection to replicate IPEDS, including the fall and 12-month enrollment counts; therefore, panelists suggested that institutions could submit enrollment on a time-based schedule, similar to the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). By reporting credits attempted and

FIGURE 1
Enrollment Variables

Student Identifier
Calendar Period/Term
Credits Attempted
Credits Earned
Program of Study-1st Major
Program of Study-2nd Major
Credential Sought
Student Level
Permanent Residence (State)
Recent H.S. Graduate
Distance Education Credits Attempted
Distance Education Credits Earned
Remedial Coursework Credits Attempted
Remedial Coursework Credits Earned

KEY

- Item required by current legislation in order to recreate IPEDS.
- Item required by current legislation but is not necessary to recreate IPEDS.
- Item, or a similar item, is needed in order to recreate IPEDS or meet other legislative requirements; however, the item could take a different format (e.g., binary indicator).
- This item is either suggested by the legislation but not required or was suggested by panelists as an item that should possibly be included.

earned in a defined time period, the system would not need to accommodate variations in institutions' specific calendaring systems. Despite the flexibility this option provides institutions, some panelists voiced reservations with that model because the NSC data are used for different purposes and present analytical challenges. For example, although NSC offers flexibility in the frequency of data submission (e.g., monthly, by term), institution leadership often expects the IR office to provide per-term enrollment totals, which are not easily calculated by rolling up monthly enrollment values.

DEFINITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- If a student changes majors over the course of a collection period, what major should institutions report—the original, the revised, or both? Currently, IPEDS instructions indicate to submit the current major(s) at the point of credential completion (reported annually) and enrollment (reported every other year for certain majors only).
- Panelists noted that, in certain instances, a student can be enrolled in fewer than 12 credits—the federal financial aid minimum for a full-time undergraduate—and still be considered a full-time student, which is an issue if credits attempted and earned are used to derive a measure of enrollment intensity. For example, if a student has a documented learning disability, that student could be considered full-time for financial aid purposes although enrolled in fewer than 12 credits. Therefore, panelists suggested the inclusion of a binary full-time/part-time flag in addition to reporting on credits attempted and earned.

DATA COMPLETENESS:

- Data that institutions currently collect can be limited for certain subgroups of students. For example, institutions typically do not have access to high school graduation information for international or transfer students. Likewise, reporting on major for dual-enrollment students presents issues because dual-enrollment students are often classified as nondegree students and thus do not have official majors.

FIGURE 2
Completion Variables

Student Identifier
Calendar Period/Term
Credential Conferred
Conferral Date
Length of Program (Normal Time)
Program of Study-1st Major
Program of Study-2nd Major

- Item required by current legislation in order to recreate IPEDS.
- Item required by current legislation but is not necessary to recreate IPEDS.
- Item, or a similar item, is needed in order to recreate IPEDS or meet other legislative requirements; however, the item could take a different format (e.g., binary indicator).
- This item is either suggested by the legislation but not required or was suggested by panelists as an item that should possibly be included.



Financial Aid

Because institutional representatives comprised the panel, the discussion of financial aid metrics centered on the data elements and variables submitted through their offices or the financial aid offices at their institution, as opposed to those elements derived from other sources. Panelists commented that reporting on financial aid variables (shown in Figure 3) would present the greatest challenges in an SLDN for the following reasons: data access, ownership, and governance; addition of relevant data elements; and challenges with CAA and panelist-proposed elements.

The timing of reporting will be important because financial aid data are often in flux long after the close of the financial aid year.

DATA ACCESS, OWNERSHIP, AND GOVERNANCE:

- Because institutions and states interpret Section 483 of the Higher Education Act differently, IR offices have different levels of access to financial aid data, which complicates data reporting despite clarifications that show that Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) data can be used for IPEDS reporting.⁴ Panelists would like additional clarity from the U.S. Department of Education or Congress on access to financial aid data, using a vehicle such as a “Dear Colleague” letter or clarification within the legislation itself.
- The timing of reporting will be important because financial aid data are often in flux long after the close of the financial aid year. Further, financial aid office personnel are often busy in the winter and spring preparing financial aid packages for potential and incoming students, so panelists recommended that the reporting timeframe take this into account.

⁴ Bussey, K., Dancy, K., & Voight, M. (November 2019). Better Data, Better Outcomes: Promoting Evidence, Equity, and Student Success through the Framework for State Postsecondary Data Solutions. Retrieved from http://www.ihep.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/pubs/ihep_working_group_brief_v4.pdf; National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. (June 2019). Financial Aid Data Sharing. Retrieved from https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/June_2019_Data_Sharing_White_Paper.pdf.

- Although the panelists did not spend much time discussing variables that could be collected from other sources, panelists did express skepticism that the proposed matches to the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS), because of its nature as a transactional database, would return data that exactly match what they store locally. This is another issue area where NCES would benefit from further conversations with financial aid officers to explore these concerns more fully.

ADDITION OF RELEVANT DATA ELEMENTS:

- Dependency status, a key variable for understanding how students and families pay for college, is currently not included in the CAA, and the information to determine it is only available for those students who fill out the FAFSA. All panelists agreed that it would be useful to include information on dependency status, given the policy and practice implications. At the same time, collecting the needed information to determine dependency status for those students who do not fill out the FAFSA would be burdensome for the institutions and students.
- Although not currently collected by IPEDS, stakeholders discussed the utility and feasibility of separately collecting information on financial aid awarded based on need. Panelists supported adding a distinction between need-based and non-need-based aid, although they were unsure of how to do it in a nonburdensome manner, especially for institutions that do not capture that level of detail as part of their current business practices. Given the number of aid categories included in the potential submission (e.g., federal, state, institution), panelists raised the idea of dividing the aggregated nonfederal aid amount by whether it was awarded based on need.

FIGURE 3
Financial Aid Variables

COLLECTED FROM INSTITUTION	COLLECTED FROM OTHER SOURCES (SOURCE)
Student Identifier	Pell Grant Awarded (NSLDS)
Calendar Period/Term	Pell Grant Disbursed (NSLDS)
Living Arrangement	Federal Loans Awarded (NSLDS)
Title-IV Recipient	Federal Loans Disbursed (NSLDS)
Dependency Status	Military or veteran benefit status (VBA/DoD)
Student Budget (Cost of Attendance)	Cumulative student debt (NSLDS)
State Grants Awarded	Loan repayment status (NSLDS)
State Grants Disbursed	Repayment plan (NSLDS)
Local Grants Awarded	Post 9/11 GI Bill Disbursed (VBA)
Local Grants Disbursed	DOD TA Aid Disbursed (DoD)
Institutional Grants Awarded	
Institutional Grants Disbursed	
Private Grants Awarded	
Private Grants Disbursed	
Non-federal Loan Type	
Non-federal Loans Disbursed	
In-state Tuition Flag	

- Item required by current legislation in order to recreate IPEDS.
- Item required by current legislation but is not necessary to recreate IPEDS.
- Item, or a similar item, is needed in order to recreate IPEDS or meet other legislative requirements; however, the item could take a different format (e.g., binary indicator).
- This item is either suggested by the legislation but not required or was suggested by panelists as an item that should possibly be included.

CHALLENGES WITH CAA AND PANELIST-PROPOSED ELEMENTS:

- The CAA requires that institutions report on cost of attendance (COA) as it is currently collected by IPEDS. NCES should explore ways to accurately measure student-level COA, as panelists raised questions about burden, data availability for the IR office, and data quality.
- Similar to the outcome of the first forum, there was no consensus around the utility of reporting both awarded and disbursed aid amounts for all students because IPEDS currently collects only awarded amount for loans and disbursed amount for grants. One panelist commented that estimated amounts of awarded and disbursed funds at the national level are available through NPSAS estimates, and the increase in burden for all institutions would not be warranted. On the other hand, another panelist noted that examining who turns down awarded aid, especially at lower-cost community colleges, is an important distinction and is worth collecting for institutions' practice and policy purposes.

It was clear from panelists that, because of the differing access that IR offices have to financial aid data, further discussions with financial aid administrators would be necessary to determine the optimal cadence for reporting and to identify data opportunities and challenges.



Demographics

There was nearly universal agreement among panelists that all of the demographic information is available and that the related burden on institutions to report it to the SLDN would be minimal. Panelists also overwhelmingly agreed that the current method for collecting and reporting demographic data should be revisited as part of this process. Some of their suggestions to consider during the implementation process include a focus on revisiting demographic definitions and collections, changes over time and cohorts, and matching considerations.

DEMOGRAPHIC DEFINITIONS AND COLLECTIONS:

- Panelists expressed a desire to revisit the gender and race/ethnicity definitions, voicing frustration that gender is still limited to two options and race and ethnicity is separated into two distinct fields.⁵ Additionally, because institutions cannot submit IPEDS data with missing values, IR personnel have to submit data that conform to U.S. Department of Education requirements, and in many cases, aggregate up to less granular or accurate categories. This misalignment has understandably led to discomfort among panelists. Further, they also report feeling uncomfortable combining reported race categories into “two or more” when additional disaggregated categories would improve insights available to institutions and policymakers.

5 The CAA requires the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a study to review the use of racial groups established by the American Community Survey of the U.S. Bureau of the Census no later than one year after enactment. The CAA also requires the U.S. Department of Education to “carry out a study on the options for disaggregating data reported under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) to the Secretary of Education by sexual orientation and gender identity” no later than one year after passage. For more information, see the legislation: <https://www.congress.gov/bills/116th-congress/house-bill/4674/text#HCA21453A9A874F38A0B22B55736CAC73>.

FIGURE 4
Demographic Variables

COLLECTED FROM INSTITUTION

Student Identifier

Date of Birth

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

COLLECTED FROM OTHER SOURCES (SOURCE)

First-generation college student status (FAFSA)

Economic Status (FAFSA)

Veteran Status (VBA)

Military Status (DoD)

Household Income (FAFSA)

- Item required by current legislation in order to recreate IPEDS.
- Item required by current legislation but is not necessary to recreate IPEDS.
- Item, or a similar item, is needed in order to recreate IPEDS or meet other legislative requirements; however, the item could take a different format (e.g., binary indicator).
- This item is either suggested by the legislation but not required or was suggested by panelists as an item that should possibly be included.

- Panelists vocalized concerns about collecting household income data for those students who did not fill out the FAFSA, centering on how to accurately collect the data, whether students (and families) would submit these data to the institution, and how to collect this information in a way that would not conflict with an institution's stated need-blind admission process.

CHANGES OVER TIME AND COHORTS:

- Panelists, even though it would potentially increase their reporting burden, expressed a desire to allow demographic data to change over time to ensure the data are reflective of their student population. This could be accomplished by institutions submitting a demographic file annually to include any updated responses for student demographics.
- If demographic data could change over time, NCES will need to consider how that would affect inclusion into cohorts to calculate outcomes. For example, in the case of graduation rates by gender, if a student's gender changes, in what gender category would a student's outcome be counted?

MATCHING CONSIDERATIONS:

- Related to data matching, both within the system alongside the student identifier and with other federal data sources for post-college outcomes measures, stakeholders noted that collecting student name could be potentially beneficial, as an additional data point for a "fuzzy match."

There was nearly universal agreement among panelists that all of the demographic information is available and that the related burden on institutions to report it to the SLDN would be minimal



Timing and Frequency Models

Although the CAA does not outline potential data reporting models, NCES and the Postsecondary Student Data System Advisory Committee will need to determine the timing and frequency of data collections to the SLDN. To facilitate this discussion and spur conversation, we provided panelists with four example models, shown in Appendix B. Starting from the existing IPEDS model, we varied the frequency and timing of data collection to devise our example models. Participants did not provide specific comments on the four proposed models but rather focused the discussion on principles that they hope NCES incorporates regardless of the specific model selected. Themes included the following:

- Different institutions are likely to prefer a timeline and method of reporting that aligns with internal factors such as business practices and other mandated reporting. To design a system that works for all institutions, panelists encouraged NCES to consult with institutions of various types in the implementation phase.
- Many panelists suggested that remaining on a reporting schedule that mirrors IPEDS, as shown in Model 1, is the least burdensome given reporters' familiarity and current workflow.⁶ However, institutions that have varied calendars with multiple starting points and different course lengths suggested that examining the NSC model for enrollment reporting by term could prove beneficial. Relatedly, institutions are increasingly shifting away from a focus on fall enrollment, so panelists viewed continuing to preference fall reporting over other time periods as out of sync with institutional realities.
- The current IPEDS reporting structure that includes lagging data is seen as less burdensome for both institutions and NCES, as the collector and aggregator of the data. If NCES adjusts the reporting schedule, the agency should appropriately outline and provide rationale for these changes to the schedule so institutions understand why there may be increases in initial reporting burden.
- There was agreement that all files should be submitted once annually, with the exception of enrollment, which panelists see value in submitting on a rolling basis and at multiple times due to the diverse nature of calendar systems at different institutions.

6 The current IPEDS schedule is to report fall enrollment data elements in spring, 12-month data elements in October for the previous year, and financial aid for the prior year in February.



Cross-Cutting Findings

Throughout the discussion, stakeholders raised issues that cut across multiple dimensions of the SLDN. Some common themes include:

- Panelists universally expressed a desire for NCES to explain how each data point enumerated in implementation is needed to fulfill the needs of the legislation, especially for those data that are not currently required to reproduce IPEDS.
- Panelists also urged NCES to design a system that is useful to those who submit the data, such as states, systems, and institutions. Designing a system that benefits stakeholders by securely providing access to information they would otherwise not have fulfills the spirit of the legislation to increase transparency and augment the utility of data already collected by institutions and the federal government. Specific suggestions included access to deidentified dashboards of peer institution data for more detailed benchmarking and the ability to submit a cohort of an institution's own students and receive information in return for internal analysis.⁷
- Panelists commented on how centered this collection and IPEDS in general are on undergraduate students. Some panelists indicated that the creation of an SLDN is the proper time to reexamine what information is collected for which students. Given the expansion of graduate education and its contribution to student debt, panelists welcomed future discussions that balance the costs and benefits of collecting additional information, especially related to finances of graduate students.

Panelists also urged NCES to design a system that is useful to those who submit the data, such as states, systems, and institutions. Designing a system that benefits stakeholders by securely providing access to information they would otherwise not have fulfills the spirit of the legislation to increase transparency and augment the utility of data already collected by institutions and the federal government.

⁷ The CAA requires feedback reports to institutions and states at least annually, with the content to be determined by the NCES Commissioner in consultation with the Advisory Committee. Read more at <https://www.congress.gov/bills/116/congress/house-bill/4674/text/HCECEBBAE57D04DF6975420C39AA92DB2>.

- Panelists expressed concerns about an initial increase in reporting burden for all institutions, calling special attention to smaller, less-resourced institutions that may have only one – or even less than one – full-time employee in their IR office. To help minimize burden, panelists proposed ideas like data coaches, code templates that institutions can modify, a flexible reporting window to help manage workload, allowing multiple submissions, and different options for submitting the data. For example, panelists cited the flexibility that the U.S. Department of Education provided in the reporting templates for the Gainful Employment regulations. Related to code templates, they agreed that clear and detailed definitions—especially related to financial aid data—will be useful early in the process so they can align internal business processes as needed.

- Panelists noted the cross-campus collaboration needed to collect and report IPEDS data. For example, the bursars and financial aid offices often provide the IR office the information to complete the Student Financial Aid survey. As previously noted, varying interpretations of the Higher Education Act also complicate IR access to detailed financial aid data for reporting purposes. If the national data infrastructure shifts to an SLDN, campuses, systems, and states will need to address internal data governance issues (e.g., who has access to data, who checks the data, who submits the data), and institutions will likely need capacity and support to properly communicate changes and train personnel across functions. To date, panelists noted, a majority of the trainings and resources provided to support IPEDS reporting are focused on IR office staff.

Panelists universally expressed a desire for NCES to explain how each data point enumerated in implementation is needed to fulfill the needs of the legislation, especially for those data that are not currently required to reproduce IPEDS.



NEXT STEPS

The conceptualization and implementation of the SLDN will be a large but necessary undertaking for both NCES and institutions if legislation is passed. Although the CAA currently stipulates a 4-year window for implementation, it is important to begin thinking critically about the implementation now. Conversations should engage diverse institutions across levels, sectors, and offices to better understand perceived obstacles and opportunities. Only by deliberately engaging all stakeholders will NCES be able to thoughtfully design a system that simultaneously meets legislative requirements and augments institutions' understanding of how they serve all of their students.

To date, the two RTI- and IHEP-hosted forums have involved conversations with practitioners and policy thinkers, with the ultimate goal of raising issues of interest to NCES for implementation of an SLDN. Additionally, we have worked to produce a detailed list of data elements outlined in the CAA, the transformation of those data elements into potential variables, and the creation of potential file layouts and reporting timelines. Perhaps most importantly, the forums engaged stakeholders and the reporting community in thoughtful discussions, bringing their expertise to bear on the implementation process.

To build upon this work, we are considering hosting additional forums and investigating the mechanics of how an SLDN system could be structured, taking lessons learned from state SLDNs and considering different technologies and data collection procedures. Furthermore, as recommended by panelists in this forum, we plan to engage both the financial aid and larger postsecondary IR communities in further discussions, with the goal of informing NCES and the field as legislation seeks to close gaps in federal data systems to provide more complete data for policymakers, institutions, and students.

Only by deliberately engaging all stakeholders will NCES be able to thoughtfully design a system that simultaneously meets legislative requirements and augments institutions' understanding of how they serve their students

APPENDIX A:

LIST OF FORUM PANELISTS

Shama Akhtar

GOUCHER COLLEGE

Michelle Appel

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Cory Clasemann-Ryan

IVY TECH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Gayle Fink

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Stephen Haworth

ADTALEM GLOBAL EDUCATION

Braden Hosch

STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY (SUNY)

Christine Keller

ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH (AIR)

Marc LoGrasso

BRYANT & STRATTON COLLEGE

Bethany Miller

MACALESTER COLLEGE

Laura Palucki Blake

HARVEY MUDD COLLEGE

David Troutman

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM

Diane Vickrey

MAINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

APPENDIX B:

POTENTIAL MODELS FOR COLLECTING STUDENT-LEVEL DATA IN THE SLDN

In development of these models, our assumption was that student-level data in the SLDN would be collected in conjunction with the non-student components of IPEDS (Institutional Characteristics, Admissions, Finance, HR, Libraries). With this in mind, we developed four possible models for data collection for the basis of discussion, although many other models are possible.

MODEL 1 – SIMILAR TO EXISTING IPEDS SCHEDULE

Student-level data elements would be collected **once per year at different times in the year** to correspond with existing IPEDS schedule.

Collection Period	Fall (Sept. - Oct.)	Winter (Dec. - Feb.)	Spring (Dec. - Apr.)
Student-Level Data Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements (full year) <input type="checkbox"/> Completions Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements (fall only)
Student-Level IPEDS Surveys Generated/ Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Completions <input type="checkbox"/> 12-Month Enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> 200% Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome Measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student Financial Aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fall Enrollment
Institution-Level Data Provided (Surveys Completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IC-Header <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Admissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Libraries

MODEL 2 – ONCE PER YEAR COLLECTION OF ALL ELEMENTS

Student-level data elements would be collected **once per year during a single collection window**. For illustration, this model would collect student-level data during the winter collection period. The reporting would cover the prior year and include current fall headcount.

Collection Period	Fall (Sept. - Oct.)	Winter (Dec. - Feb.)	Spring (Dec. - Apr.)
Student-Level Data Provided		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Completions Elements 	
Student-Level IPEDS Surveys Generated/ Completed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Completions <input type="checkbox"/> 12-Month Enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> Fall Enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> Student Financial Aid <input type="checkbox"/> Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> 200% Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome Measures 	
Institution-Level Data Provided (Surveys Completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IC-Header <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Admissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Libraries

MODEL 3 – ALL COMPONENTS COLLECTED THREE TIMES A YEAR

All data elements would be collected **multiple times per year** (possibly after each term—fall, winter, summer), rather than discrete data elements in each of the three collection windows.

Collection Period	Fall (Sept. - Oct.)	Winter (Dec. - Feb.)	Spring (Dec. - Apr.)
Student-Level Data Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Completions Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Completions Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Completions Elements
Student-Level IPEDS Surveys Generated/ Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Completions <input type="checkbox"/> 12-Month Enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> 200% Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome Measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student Financial Aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fall Enrollment
Institution-Level Data Provided (Surveys Completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IC-Header <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Admissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Libraries

MODEL 4 – COLLECTION SCHEDULE VARIES BY DATA ELEMENTS

Student-level data elements would be collected **on different schedules**, with some data elements collected multiple times per year (e.g., enrollment) and other data elements collected once per year (e.g., completions, financial aid).

Collection Period	Fall (Sept. – Oct.)	Winter (Dec. – Feb.)	Spring (Dec. – Apr.)
Student-Level Data Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Completion Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid Elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Demographic Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Elements
Student-Level IPEDS Surveys Generated/ Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Completions <input type="checkbox"/> 12-Month Enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> 200% Graduation Rates <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome Measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student Financial Aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fall Enrollment
Institution-Level Data Provided (Surveys Completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IC-Header <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Admissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Libraries



RTI.ORG



IHEP.ORG