

Report and Suggestions from IPEDS Technical Review Panel #48: Institutional Groupings

SUMMARY: The Technical Review Panel discussed the impact of current institutional groupings on IPEDS data collection and dissemination and considered a number of potential changes to IPEDS variables and survey forms. This summary provides feedback on how potential institutional grouping solutions would impact data quality and identifies topics for further discussion. Comments from interested parties are due to Janice Kelly-Reid, IPEDS Project Director at RTI International, at ipedstrpcomment@rti.org by January 7, 2016.

On October 20 and 21, 2015, RTI International, the contractor for the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) web-based data collection system, convened a meeting of the IPEDS Technical Review Panel (TRP) in Washington, DC. Meetings of the IPEDS TRP are conducted by RTI to solicit expert discussion and suggestions on a broad range of issues related to postsecondary education and the conduct of IPEDS. The TRP is designed to allow the public to advise and work with RTI to improve IPEDS data collection and products, data quality, and user-friendliness. The TRP does not report to or advise the Department of Education.

RTI's specific purpose for TRP 48 was to examine situations that are not well represented by current IPEDS institutional groupings and discuss how potential changes in collection and dissemination would impact institutions, researchers, and the Department of Education. The panel consisted of 43 individuals representing institutions, researchers and other data users, state governments, the federal government, higher education associations, and other experts.

Background and Scope of Institutional Groupings in IPEDS

IPEDS uses classification variables to divide the universe into institutional groupings to collect and disseminate IPEDS data.¹ Level of institution (4-year, 2-year, or less-than-2-year), based on the highest award level offerings reported in the Institutional Characteristics Header (ICH) file, is a common factor used in these classification variables. Sector, which is a derived variable by combining the control of an institution (public, private nonprofit, or public for-profit) with the level of institution, is used to determine the applicability for IPEDS survey components. Beyond the reporting ramifications, sector is often used to determine institutional type for IPEDS publications and consumer information tools.

In many cases the current groupings work as intended, but some institutions do not fall neatly into one category. A National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC)² working group examined institutional groupings in IPEDS and prepared an internal paper in 2013, *Institutional Grouping Working Group, Identification of Issues and Recommendations*. The findings suggest that using sector as a grouping method can be problematic for 2-year institutions with limited baccalaureate programs. As discussed in the paper, these institutions are grouped with 4-year institutions on the basis of highest award level offerings but are more like 2-year institutions based on awards actually conferred during a given academic year. The types of data that are collected as a result of those groupings may lead to confusion and misinterpretation when data are used for consumer information or accountability purposes.

Beyond the background paper is another institutional grouping problem. An increasing number of school mergers have occurred, which can affect sector and institutional category depending on the number and type of degrees conferred after the two institutions have merged. If a 2-year (sub-

¹ An overview of variables used for current grouping methods is provided in appendix A.

² NPEC was established by NCES in 1995 as a voluntary organization that encompasses all sectors of the postsecondary education community including federal agencies, postsecondary institutions, associations, and other organizations with a major interest in postsecondary education data collection.

baccalaureate) institution merges into a 4-year institution, the merged entity is considered a 4-year institution based on highest degree offered. Because merged entities that offer programs at both the associate's and bachelor's level are categorized as 4-year institutions based on highest award level; the resulting categorization may not be consistent with the primary mission if the institution has limited 4-year offerings, but a large offerings of sub-baccalaureate awards. For example, merged entities may have merged two institutions with distinct admissions requirements, test scores, admissions yields, costs, enrollment patterns, and patterns of completions, among other concerns. In the last two years, this growth trend in the number of school mergers between primary associate's degrees into primary baccalaureate institutions has occurred most often for institutions in the private for-profit sector. This trend continued in the 2015-16 collection year.

RTI convened this TRP to engage the community in an exploratory discussion on potential solutions for categorizing institutions that do not fall neatly into one category. To that end, panelists were asked to examine situations that are not well represented by current IPEDS institutional groupings and discuss potential changes that could be considered for the data collection to improve the quality of the data.

Discussion Item #1: Impact of Institutional Groupings on Collections

Background on this topic has been informed by discussions with institutions, concerns drawn from the NPEC working group, and issues identified during the NCES data review process. Much of the discussion of institutional groupings is focused on how the data are presented to the public. However, simply changing the way the data are presented does not eliminate all issues associated with institutional groupings because the data that are being collected are determined by institution type. The panel reviewed the survey components affected by institutional type and considered possible options for reporting data for institutions that do not fit into one category.

Institutional Characteristics and Student Financial Aid

Total cost of attendance (COA) is the sum of published tuition and required fees³ (lower of in-district or in-state for public institutions), books and supplies, and the weighted average for room and board and other expenses⁴ and represents the educational expenses that a full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate student will expect to pay to attend the institution for one academic year, before financial aid is considered. COA data are collected in the Institutional Characteristics (IC) component of IPEDS, and financial aid data are collected in the Student Financial Aid (SFA) component of IPEDS. The panel discussed several options for reporting COA if an institution offers both associate's and bachelor's degrees:

- ***Report COA Separately for Each Degree:*** Institutions that offer programs at both the associate's degree and bachelor's degree levels would report COA separately for each degree level. Separate COA values by level would only be collected for purposes of making them available to the public on College Navigator; the COA that is carried forward to the SFA survey to compute the average net price is stipulated in requirements⁵ of the *Higher Education Act of 1965* (HEA), as amended. This potential solution could result in an institution reporting as many as four separate COA values in a given year: a separate COA

³ The amount of tuition and required fees covering a full academic year most frequently charged to students. These values represent what a typical student would be charged and may not be the same for all students at an institution. If tuition is charged on a per-credit-hour basis, the average full-time credit hour load for an entire academic year is used to estimate average tuition. Required fees include all fixed sum charges that are required of such a large proportion of all students that the student who does not pay the charges is an exception.

⁴ Estimates of expenses for books and supplies, room and board, and other expenses are those from the Cost of Attendance report used by the financial aid office in determining financial need.

⁵ One of several provisions related to net price requires the Department of Education to report the average institutional net price of attendance for first-time, full-time aided students (this also forms the basis for transparency and accountability lists, or so-called "watch lists"). Institutional net price is defined as "the average yearly price actually charged to first-time, full-time undergraduate students receiving student aid at an institution of higher education after deducting such aid."

for each undergraduate degree level (associate's and bachelor's degree), a separate "published" COA, and the average yearly price actually charged to first-time, full-time undergraduate students (used to calculate net price), as stipulated in the requirements of the HEA.

- **Report COA Based on Screening Question:** A screening question would determine if an institution should report a COA for the associate's, bachelor's, or some combination, using a threshold as the deciding criteria. Panelists expressed concern that enrollment fluctuations could result in a lack of consistency each year regarding what data (i.e., bachelor's, associate's, or both) were used for institutions on the cusp of the threshold. Further, this type of change could also result in an institution landing on one of the CATC 'watch lists'⁶ for high increases in tuition and fees.
- **No Change but Add Clarification:** There would be no changes to the way institutions currently report COA; if the institution offers both associate's and bachelor's level programs, the data provider would be instructed to add a context note to explain what data were used to arrive at COA to allow for the appropriate interpretation of the data.

Admissions

The Admissions (ADM) component collects basic information about the undergraduate selection process for entering first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students. This includes information about admissions considerations, admission yields, and SAT and ACT test scores (if test scores are required for admission). ADM is only applicable to first-time entering students; institutions should not include data on non-first-time students (e.g., students admitted into bachelor's programs for which an associate's degree is required). Some institutions that have both associate's and bachelor's programs may only report for one or the other (often noted in context boxes). The panel considered suggestions for data collection, including the following:

- **Separately by Award Level:** Institutions that offer programs at the associate's degree and bachelor's degree level would report ADM data separately for first-time entering students by degree level (associate's and bachelor's degree). Given that many students do not declare their degree intent (associate's, bachelor's, or certificate) at the time of admission, panelists felt that separating out ADM data by award level could be problematic.
- **Based on Screening Question:** A screening question with a defined threshold would determine whether the institution predominantly offers baccalaureate or sub-baccalaureate level programs. Admissions data would be collected for the predominant award level. For the same reason cited above, panelists noted that separating out ADM data for the predominant award level could be challenging.
- **No Change but Add Clarification:** There would be no changes to the way institutions currently report ADM data; if the institution offers both associate's and bachelor's level programs, the data provider would be instructed to add a context note to explain what data were used to arrive at ADM reporting to allow for the appropriate interpretation of the data.

Discussion Item: Graduation Rates and Outcome Measures

The purpose of the Graduation Rates (GR) component is to track cohorts of full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students as well as their program completion status at 150% of the normal time to complete all requirements of their program of study. The Graduation Rates 200 (GR200) survey component's primary purpose is to calculate graduation rates at 200% of normal

⁶ The College Affordability and Transparency Center (CATC) includes information for students, parents, and policymakers about college costs at America's colleges and universities. CATC includes several lists of institutions based on the tuition and fees and net prices (the price of attendance after considering all grant and scholarship aid) charged to students.

time for the subcohort of full-time, first-time bachelor's or equivalent degree-seeking students at 4-year institutions; and for all full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students at less-than-4-year institutions.

As noted in the NPEC paper, primarily associate's degree institutions that offer programs at both the associate's and bachelor's level are categorized as 4-year institutions and may not have, as a result of institution policy, a full-time, first-time bachelor's degree-seeking subcohort⁷ and could not report GR200. This situation occurs when institutions require students to first obtain an associate's degree before entering a bachelor's program; students who earned an associate's degree prior to entering the bachelor's degree program would not meet the first-time requirement and thus would not be captured in GR. The panel considered the following suggestions for data collection:

- ***Outcome Measures (OM) Solution:*** Students who earned an associate's degree prior to entering a bachelor's degree program would not meet the first-time requirement and thus would be excluded from the GR bachelor's-seeking cohort.⁸ The forthcoming OM component will expand graduation rates by collecting additional success measures (i.e., award and enrollment status) on non-first-time entering students (e.g., students who enter a bachelor's degree program having already earned an associate's degree from another institution). The panel agreed that for the purposes of consumer information, the OM component solves most of the institutional grouping issue with graduation rates by collecting data on non-first-time students, who were not captured in GR.
- ***Separately by Award Level:*** There would be no change to reporting options, except with respect to a possible timing change related to reporting the graduation rates for the other degree/certificate-seeking subcohort. Currently, institutions that offer both bachelor's and associate's degree programs are classified in IPEDS as 4-year institutions on the basis of award level offerings. Panelists suggested that in reporting graduation rates, institutions that offer both associate's and bachelor's degree programs should use different reporting periods to track each cohort, one being the 6-year reporting period for tracking graduation rates for the bachelor's degree-seeking subcohort and the other being a 3-year reporting period for tracking the other degree/certificate-seeking subcohort.
- ***No Change but Add Clarification:*** There would be no changes to the way institutions currently report GR or OM data; if the institution offers both associate's and bachelor's level programs, the data provider would be instructed to add a context note to explain what student population is represented in the graduation rate, for example if the cohort is comprised of a small group of traditional full-time, first-time students but is not representative of the institution's nontraditional student makeup.

Fall Enrollment

Retention rates examine the percentage of first-time degree-/certificate-seeking undergraduate students enrolled in the fall of the prior year that are either still enrolled in the fall of the current year or have completed their program in that time. For 4-year institutions, retention rates are based on the bachelor's degree-seeking subcohort only, regardless of whether the institution confers mostly associate's degrees or sub-baccalaureate certificates (i.e., non-bachelor's-seeking students are not reported). For all institutions, because students entering a baccalaureate program with an associate's degree do not meet the IPEDS definition for the first-time bachelor's degree-seeking subcohort, they are not included in the enrollment denominator of the retention ratio. The panel considered the following suggestions for data collection:

⁷ This issue is discussed in the unpublished 2013 NPEC report *Institutional Grouping Working Group Identification of Issues and Recommendations*.

⁸ By definition, the IPEDS bachelor's degree-seeking subcohort is defined as full-time, first-time bachelor's degree-seeking students.

- **Separately by Award Level:** Institutions that offer programs at both the associate’s degree and bachelor’s degree level would separately report retention rate data for their first-time bachelor’s-seeking subcohort and first-time other degree-/certificate-seeking subcohort.
- **Based on Screening Question:** A screening question with a defined threshold would determine whether the institution offers primarily baccalaureate or sub-baccalaureate level programs. One rate would be collected for institutions based on the predominant level of award if the institution conferred more than an established threshold for that level.

Discussion Item #2: Potential Institutional Grouping Solutions

Currently, institutions implement their own solutions for handling grouping issues for data collection purposes, such as selecting certain programs to report on and providing context (e.g., context notes indicate that tuition was reported for the bachelor’s program only, or that admissions requirements are only for a particular program within the institution because all other programs are open admission). As another solution currently used, NCES creates separate reporting entities in IPEDS on a case-by-case basis. An example of this would be the establishment of two separate UnitIDs to allow for the reporting of a traditional bachelor’s degree program separately from an online bachelor’s degree program if an institution serves both populations. Using separate UnitIDs to report data for each program level is intended to provide a possible solution for institutions that do not fit into one category, although can potentially be problematic to data users who may not be aware of the separate and additional data reporting.

Panelists discussed several potential institutional grouping solutions during their review of the affected survey components, but a cohesive strategy did not emerge from the discussions. The panel was asked to consider changes that would improve the utility of the data and offer additional options beyond the current solutions, when available. Ultimately, the panel identified four options for additional consideration. The panel acknowledged that the potential solutions discussed do not address every solution or, for that matter, every problem. RTI would appreciate additional comments on this topic, particularly with respect to specific issues that affect for-profit institutions and degree-granting institutions with a mix of degree and certificate programs.

The following summarizes the potential solutions for data collection for each of the affected survey components.

Potential Solution #1: Group Institutions by New Variable (Level Combined with Primary Degree)

Collect a new institutional grouping variable in the ICH.

- **Award Level Offerings.** Institutions select applicable award levels on ICH for all credit-bearing programs offered at the institution (no change).
 - **Add a new screening question.** If an institution selects program offerings at both the associate’s and bachelor’s degree levels, populate a new screening question in ICH for the institution to select its primary award level (using a mission-driven distinction, rather than a numbers-driven distinction):
 - primarily bachelor’s degree;
 - primarily associate’s degree; or
 - Equivalent proportions of bachelor’s and associate’s degrees (dual-mission institutions)⁹

⁹ These are institutions that offer both bachelor’s level programs and associate’s level programs but do not have a primary award level offering. The panel referred to this as scenario as “hybrid” during discussion but agreed that using “hybrid” would be a mistake given its current usage in other aspects of IPEDS. RTI would appreciate additional input on the appropriate label for these types of institutions.

- **Verify self-selected primary award level.** Previous years of Completions data should be used to verify the institution's response. For 2-year institutions that begin offering a bachelor's degree program, three years of Completion data would be used to verify their predominant offering. Verify new institutions when an institution's first Completion file becomes available.

Under this proposed solution, institutions that offer both associate's and bachelor's degree level programs would report according to primary award offerings. Institutions that primarily offer bachelor's level programs would report appropriate data at the baccalaureate level for comparing with 4-year institutions; institutions that primarily offer associate's level programs would report appropriate data at the sub-baccalaureate level for comparing with 2-year institutions. As such, institutions would report in the following ways by survey component:

- **IC:** Report the COA for primary award level offering (bachelor's or associate's).
- **ADM:** Report admissions data for primary award level offering (bachelor's or associate's level and below).
- **EF:** Report retention for one cohort (first-time bachelor's seeking subcohort or all first-time degree-/certificate-seeking). Consultation with NCES general council is needed to determine if this approach is compliant with current legislative mandates.
- **GR:** Report on both first-time cohorts (bachelor's seeking subcohort and other degree/certificate-seeking subcohort). There would be no change to reporting options, except with respect to a possible timing change related to reporting the graduation rates for the other degree/certificate-seeking subcohort. Consultation with NCES general council is needed to determine if the timing change is compliant with current legislative mandates.

Dual-mission institutions that offer both bachelor's level programs and associate's level programs but do not have a primary award level offering would be required to report on all data at both the baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate level. The challenge to this approach is identifying which institutions should indicate a mission that serves associate's and bachelor's students equivalently. The panel agreed that dual-mission category should be clearly defined to avoid variability within categories, with several panelists suggesting that this category should align with how institutions identify themselves. Several panelists suggested that all institutions that offer both associate's and bachelor's degree levels should be required to report all data (i.e., at both the baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate levels), regardless of primary offerings. However, the panel did not reach agreement on which groups of institutions should track two cohorts.

Given that several IPEDS components would be affected by this potential solution, panelists noted that further study would be helpful to better understand how this potential solution would impact institutions, particularly with respect to net price calculations, retention rates, graduation rates cohorts and other items as defined in current legislation. Additional consultation is needed to determine how dual-mission institutions would report SFA data for two separate full-time, first-time cohorts (bachelor's and associate's), how the aid data for both cohorts would be averaged into a single cohort for net price, and whether this approach would be in compliance with federal regulations outside of IPEDS (i.e., HEA). Additionally, further study is needed to identify how certificates should be accounted for in this solution.

Potential Solution #2: No Changes to Reporting Options: Collect Context

No changes would be made to institutional groupings in data collection, but additional guidance would be provided for institutions that offer both associate's and bachelor's degrees. Institutions would be instructed to provide context notes describing methodology used to arrive at the reported data in the context box on all applicable surveys. For example, clarify in context box how retention rate is calculated or what student population(s) is represented in graduation rates. Panelists noted that this potential solution is less disruptive than the self-selection option but not helpful to IPEDS data users. This approach gives institutions the opportunity to describe special situations, for example if the cohort population comprises nontraditional students, such as working adults. However, panelists pointed out that NCES does not migrate context notes into the Data Center and questioned how (or if) IPEDS would make these explanations available to researchers and data users.

Potential Solution #3: No Changes to Reporting Options: Use INSTCAT but With Different Thresholds

Calculate the INSTCAT variable¹⁰ for each collection cycle based on the mix of degrees awarded and resulting in the six categories listed below. Similar to Potential Solution #1, this approach would draw from the Completions data file to determine the category in which an institution is classified in one of six categories:

- degree-granting, graduate with no undergraduate degrees
- degree-granting, primarily baccalaureate or above
- degree-granting, not primarily baccalaureate or above
- degree-granting, associate's and certificates
- non-degree-granting, above the baccalaureate
- non-degree-granting, sub-baccalaureate

This would allow 4-year primarily associate's degree institutions to be grouped in one of three ways: with other 2-year institutions, with 4-year institutions, or to be kept separate. Panelists considered using a defined threshold (e.g., ratio of awards by level as a percentage of total awards) as the deciding criteria for primary award offerings, but did not reach agreement on the appropriate cut points for a minimum threshold. The panel suggested that additional consideration is needed with respect to the establishment of a threshold.

Potential Solution #4: Comprehensive Option: New Derived Variable for Sector or Subsector Categories

Add the following new sector categories for institutions that offer both associate's degree and bachelor's degree programs:

- Sector 10: Primarily bachelor's degree; with associate's
- Sector 11: Primarily associate's degree; with bachelor's
- Sector 12: Primarily associate's degree, with certificates

Institutions that offer both associate's and bachelor's degree levels would be required to report all data (i.e., at both the baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate levels), regardless of primary offerings. Data could be rolled up to the existing sector classifications to maintain trends. Panelists also considered splitting the existing sector categories into subsectors, for example:

- Sector 1a: Public 4-year, primarily bachelor's degree
- Sector 1b: Public 4-year, primarily associate's degree
- Sector 2a: Private nonprofit 4-year, primarily bachelor's degree
- Sector 2b: Private nonprofit 4-year, primarily associate's degree

¹⁰ See Appendix A for a description of the INSTCAT variable.

- Sector 3a: Private for-profit 4-year, primarily bachelor’s degree
- Sector 3b: Private for-profit 4-year, primarily associate’s degree

This would allow for the acknowledgment of differences within each sector while maintaining the historical aspects of the data. However, panelists noted that using highest award level to define the overall sector category and predominant award level to define the subsector classification would be problematic for reporting purposes. Furthermore, such classifications may well become too specific that meaningful comparisons would be difficult. Further, this approach does not take certificates or graduate-level programs into account.

Discussion Item #3: Potential Impact on Burden

Burden varies by survey component as well as by sector.¹¹ Adding mandatory additional reporting will increase burden for institutions that offer both bachelor’s and associate’s degree programs. If institutions were to report for both degree programs, institutions would have to report graduation rates and retention rates on two cohorts of students as well as additional pricing information and admissions data in any given year. Additionally, changes to the data collection would impact institutions on the cusp of the threshold that could go in and out of a grouping frequently over a period of several years.

Discussion Item #4: Data Dissemination Solutions

The current grouping methods used in NCES applications and tools draw from the same classification variables (i.e., INSTCAT, highest degree offered, sector, level and control) as those used in data collection. Currently, College Navigator uses the INSTCAT variable to return institutions matching any of the mix of degrees selected. For example, traditional 2-year institutions that offer one or more baccalaureate programs will be returned in the results of a search by either level of degree (bachelor’s or associate’s) as well as either institution type (4-year or 2-year). However, the data on the institution’s page comes from data reported to IPEDS, the applicability of which is currently determined by sector. Panelists considered how to incorporate the hybrid classification into College Navigator and suggested that consumer behavior should inform this discussion and drive any potential changes.

Sector, level, and control are used in a large number of IPEDS publications including the *Digest of Education Statistics*, *First Look*, and the *IPEDS Methodology* reports. IPEDS publications have been consistent throughout the years, allowing for historical trend data. Panelists noted that it is unclear what latitude is feasible with respect to changes to publications, but generally agreed that it would be unwise to incorporate new grouping variables into publications and other NCES applications and tools if the variables break historical data. Given that IPEDS data are highly visible and are used in a variety of ways, the panel suggested that institutions should report out in classifications that can be rolled up to existing categories in order to preserve trends.

IPEDS forms the institutional sampling frame for other NCES postsecondary surveys, such as the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. The IPEDS institutional universe, stratified by sector, is used as the first-stage sample. As long as institutional classifications can be rolled up or down to sector classifications, NCES postsecondary surveys should not be impacted by data collection or dissemination changes.

¹¹ IPEDS reporting burden estimates include the time it takes to review instructions, query and search data sources, complete and review the components, and submit the data through the Data Collection System. Every 3 years, data preparers are asked to provide burden estimates to help NCES continue to improve its estimates of the reporting burden associated with IPEDS. This information is collected through an optional question at the end of each component.

Next Steps

Once the TRP summary comment period has closed, RTI will review the comments and outline recommendations for NCES based on the outcome of the TRP meeting and subsequent public comment period. NCES will review the recommendations to determine next steps and any reporting implications for IPEDS. Proposed burden estimates will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for information collection clearance. The current collection expires in December 2016.

Comments

RTI is committed to improving the quality and usefulness of IPEDS data as well as strategies that might be helpful in minimizing additional institutional reporting burden. We encourage interested parties to send any comments or concerns about this topic to Janice Kelly-Reid, IPEDS Project Director, at ipedstrpcomment@rti.org by January 7, 2016.

Appendix A. Variables for current IPEDS institutional groupings

Sector (SECTOR)	One of nine institutional categories resulting from dividing the universe according to control and level. For example: public, 4-year institutions.																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="526 317 773 380">Level \ Control</th> <th data-bbox="773 317 976 380">Public</th> <th data-bbox="976 317 1216 380">Private nonprofit</th> <th data-bbox="1216 317 1427 380">Private for-profit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="526 380 773 415">4-year</td> <td data-bbox="773 380 976 415">1</td> <td data-bbox="976 380 1216 415">2</td> <td data-bbox="1216 380 1427 415">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="526 415 773 451">2-year</td> <td data-bbox="773 415 976 451">4</td> <td data-bbox="976 415 1216 451">5</td> <td data-bbox="1216 415 1427 451">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="526 451 773 480">Less-than-2-year</td> <td data-bbox="773 451 976 480">7</td> <td data-bbox="976 451 1216 480">8</td> <td data-bbox="1216 451 1427 480">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level \ Control	Public	Private nonprofit	Private for-profit	4-year	1	2	3	2-year	4	5	6	Less-than-2-year	7	8	9			
Level \ Control	Public	Private nonprofit	Private for-profit																
4-year	1	2	3																
2-year	4	5	6																
Less-than-2-year	7	8	9																
Institutional Category (INSTCAT)	<p>Derived using the level of offerings reported on the IC component and the number and level of awards that were reported on the Completions (C) component:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Degree-granting, graduate with no undergraduate degrees 2. Degree-granting, primarily baccalaureate or above 3. Degree-granting, not primarily baccalaureate or above 4. Degree-granting, associate's and certificates 5. Non-degree-granting, above the baccalaureate 6. Non-degree-granting, sub-baccalaureate <p>INSTCAT is based on level of offering variables in combination with number of degrees conferred.</p>																		
Highest degree offered (HDEGOFR1)	<p>Derived from the level of offering reported in the IC component. Splits institutions into eight groups based on highest degree offered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Doctor's degree – research/scholarship and professional practice 2. Doctor's degree – research/scholarship 3. Doctor's degree – professional practice 4. Doctor's degree – other 5. Master's degree 6. Bachelor's degree 7. Associate's degree 8. Non-degree-granting <p>HDEGOFR1 is based on LEVEL1-LEVEL8, LEVEL12, and LEVEL17-LEVEL19.</p>																		