



Brown, Todd <todd.brown@iowa.gov>

FW: NASSGAP Survey

1 message

Sharpe, Rachele (WSAC) <RacheleS@wsac.wa.gov>
To: "Solomon, Michael" <Michael.Solomon@illinois.gov>, "Brown, Todd" <todd.brown@iowa.gov>

Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 6:33 PM

It's NASSGAP survey day.

We can probably discuss the sum total of feedback in May and "stage" any responses to "easy fix now"; "not do-able" or "would take technical resources to fix" or whatever.

Thanks much,
Rachele

From: Brian Prescott [mailto:brian@nchems.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 3:36 PM
To: Sharpe, Rachele (WSAC) <RacheleS@wsac.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: NASSGAP Survey

Hi Rachele,

Apologies for the delay in responding. It is no indication that I am in any way ungrateful for the chance to chime in!

Here are some thoughts in no particular order, some of which are possibly a bit outlandish:

- In the query tool, allow me to select all items within each category with one click.
- Provide easy access to the survey instrument on the query tool.
- It's been a while, but if I recall correctly, there was a huge amount of reshaping of the data necessary to make it useful for Tableau or pivot tables.
- I would echo the comments from Sarah about the income bands, but in addition, it would be helpful to have more bands at the upper end of the income spectrum. \$100,000 and above is too wide a range, and especially so for merit programs.
- Consider collecting data on FTFT recipients and dollars awarded in income bands that match IPEDS SFA cohorts data, possibly just for public and private non-profit four-years and for the most significant programs in each state only, since this is probably pretty burdensome. This would allow analysts to much more easily (and appropriately) unpack the IPEDS data on grant aid awards by source as a way to better understand the growing role of institutional aid.
- Consider collecting data on FAFSA applicants in ways that help inform the affordability conversation. One example would be to report applicants who do not show up as enrolled, by income. A related example would be to report applicants who are enrolled by income, in this case to calculate the average award for all eligible students, regardless of whether they received an award or not.
- To the extent that there might be students receiving awards from multiple significant programs in a state, it might be helpful to know what the unduplicated recipients would be at the state level. I don't know how much of a problem this is, however.
- It might be helpful to identify all new and newly discontinued programs each year.
- It would be interesting to have some information about how programs were rationed: deadline, awards capped, pro-rated, etc., as well as how far short of full funding the program is estimated to be.

Hope this is helpful. I'll be interested to hear where the conversation goes.

Brian

From: Sharpe, Rachele (WSAC) [mailto:RacheleS@wsac.wa.gov]
Sent: Sunday, January 07, 2018 2:20 PM
To: 'David Tandberg'; Brian Prescott
Subject: NASSGAP Survey

Hi.

Here are some things we discussed with Sarah Pingel regarding the NASSGAP survey. We are also talking to NCES folks. Let us know if you have thoughts and... I'll be at SHEEO Th/F next week if you want to chat in-person.

Best,
Rachelle

- Combine the survey instrument PDF with the User Guide for responders
- Make survey more prominently displayed
- Mike suggested placing the College Board inflation adjustment factors under Resources (Mike uses CB's Trends for Student Aid)
- Provide program ID in the query tool to avoid confusion with name changes
- Difference between Y/N/n/a – clarify blanks definition
- Provide guidance on which number is the best – Mike noted the largest is most valid
- Independent and Dependent bands are not the same – holdover from LEAP/SLEAP report – could be changed – if you don't care about dependency they don't match
 - Many states are missing data for this question
 - If they do exist, should the income bands match
 - The dependent band is 0 to 20k – would need to be more granular on the Dep side
 - The distributions are different among D/I which is why they were different
- Figures don't match across breakouts (EFC, dependency, funding, etc) within a program
- Total disbursed versus total expenditures – clarify differences – sources should match expenditures
- Should we note decentralized/centralized program – does not mean there are not data



RACHELLE SHARPE, PHD

Deputy Executive Director

Washington Student Achievement Council

360-753-7872 | 360-292-3090

www.wsac.wa.gov