



SPRING CONFERENCE

Kansas City, Missouri

2003





Sampling and You

Preliminary results from a pilot study on the return of sampling

Tsze Chan, The American Institutes for Research

David Rhodes, Caliber Associates

Purpose of the Session

- Share the results from a pilot study of sampling
- Discuss the implications for the possible return of sampling to the Quality Assurance Program

Problems with sampling in the past

- Too late: after the award
- Cumbersome process: additional data collection, data entry, tracking, award adjustment
- Public relations disaster: disgruntled students and parents

Reasons for Trying Again

- The need of QA Program participants to monitor the effectiveness of their verification procedures
- Changes within FSA

Rationale for a Pilot Study

- To detect and address the problems of sampling
- To determine whether results from sampling are actually helpful
- Before! re-imposing it on everyone

Pilot Institutions

- How were institutions selected?
- Which schools participated?
- What were their obligations?



Problems Encountered by Pilot Institutions

- Timing: when to draw sample
- Tracking: how to keep track of the additional “documenting” of FAFSA values
- Importing: how to import the right ISIR records into the QA Tool

Problems with Timing

- “Emerging” population
 - Some applicants will not be eligible
 - Some applicants will not enroll
 - Some applicants apply “late” in the process
- Competition with other goals
 - Efficient aid packaging
 - Recruitment

Solutions for Timing

- Allow flexibility (before disbursement)
 - First valid ISIR
 - After student accepted by institution
 - After student pays enrollment deposit
 - After student accepts aid package
- FSA will provide guidance
- Don't misapply the old 95 percent response rate rule

Problems with tracking the documentation process

- Managing the verification of sampled students
- Submitting ALL changes to the ISIR records of sampled students to the central processor

Solutions for tracking the documents

- Integrate the sampling process into existing institutional verification system(s)
 - User database “Sample” field
 - Institution verification “S” code
 - Treat sampled students who do not provide documentation the same as other verification scofflaws
- Separate stand alone sample “system”
 - EDExpress just for doing sample
 - Institution created database



Problems: Importing ISIR's into Quality Analysis Tool

- Multiple ISIR's may be generated by students before, during, and after sample documentation
- Keeping the "initial" ISIR records straight
- Keeping the "paid on" ISIR records straight
- Not a problem if using EDExpress to process aid



Mainframe Solution A – writing SARA files

1. Retrieve the ISIR batch from your SAIG mailbox
2. Upload the data into your school's system
3. Request an ASCII file of the data from computer support staff
4. Import ASCII file into ISIR Analysis Tool
5. Correct records as necessary in your school's system and send the changes to the CPS
6. Repeat steps 1 through 5. As you import subsequent ISIR files into your system and the ISIR Analysis Tool



Mainframe Solution B – use EDEXpress

1. Retrieve the ISIR batch from your SAIG mailbox
2. Before working with file on your system, copy it to a folder so you can import into EDEXpress
3. Import data into EDEXpress (keep all copies of imported files)
4. Import data from EDEXpress into ISIR Analysis Tool
5. Correct records as necessary in your school's system and send the changes to the CPS
6. Repeat steps 1 through 5. As you import subsequent ISIR files into your system and the ISIR Analysis Tool

Summary of Solutions

- Consider the “population” at various “sampling windows”
- FSA will provide guidance on pros and cons of different timing
- Integrate the documentation process into the existing system
- Follow guidance that will be in the help text of 2003-2004 ISIR Analysis Tool

Is it worth the effort?

- FSA: program wide improvement of targeting the “right” students
- Institution: increase the usefulness of reports from the Quality (ISIR) Analysis Tool

Results: Size of the Problem

- Within the samples that were one hundred percent documented, 42 percent of cases experienced a EFC change
- Within the control group, only 4 percent of the EFC changes were self-reported

Results: Accuracy of Institutional Verification

- Of those who had EFC changes (sample),
 - 62% would be identified by institutional verification profiles
 - 48% would be identified by CPS edits



Results: Efficiency of Institutional Verifications

- 50% of those selectable by institutional verification resulted in EFC changes
- 45% of those selectable by CPS edits resulted in EFC changes

Results: Magnitude of EFC changes not detected by verification

- 30% of those not selected by institutional verification had EFC changes
- 42% of those not selected by CPS edits had EFC changes

ISIR Field Changes

- Dependent Students
 - Parent's Income Tax Paid 28.3%
 - Parent's AGI 21.9%
 - Parent's Worksheet B 21.8%
 - Parent's Tax Return Status 20.7%
 - Student's Income Tax Paid 16.5%
 - Parent's Worksheet C 13.8%

ISIR Field Changes

- Independent Students
 - Student's Income Tax Paid 20.9%
 - Student's AGI 15.3%
 - Student Worksheet B 14.5%
 - Student Tax Return Status 9.1%

ISIR field changes and verification

- Problematic ISIR fields featured in pilot schools' verification profiles
- Three basic strategies
 - Population at risk
 - Unusual values
 - Suspect groups
- Fifty percent “efficiency” suggests that profiles could be narrowed

Population at Risk Strategy

- Estimated tax filers
 - (Parents' Tax Return Filed? = "2")
 - (Student's Tax Return Filed? = "2")
- Multiple persons in college
 - Dependency Status="D" and Parents' number in college > "1"
 - Dependency Status="I" and Student's number in college > "1"

Unusual Value Strategy

- Unusually High Taxes
 - Dependency Status="D" and Parents' U.S. Income Taxes $> .3 * \text{tbl_E_Parent.PARAGI}$
 - Dependency Status="I" and Student's U.S. Income Taxes $> .3 * \text{tbl_E_Student.STUDAGI}$

Suspect Group Strategy

- Independent other than by age or graduate student
 - (Dependency Status="1" and Born before 01/01/1979<>"1" and Working on a Master's or Doctorate <>"1") and (Have Children you support? ="1" or Have Dependents other than children or spouse="1" or Is student married="1" or Orphan or Ward of Court="1" or Veteran of U.S. Armed forces?="1")

Narrowing Focus

- Run the list verification by code report using queries to detect substantial EFC change (Activity Guide #3)
- Run transaction comparison reports for cases that meet the criteria for each profile and look for differences between cases with and without EFC changes

Implications

- Sampling will not be required before 2004-2005
- Institutions need lead time to plan integration of sampling into their systems
- FSA needs to provide guidance
- Richer analysis possible



We appreciate your feedback
and comments. We can be
reached:

Email: tchan@air.org
rhodesd@calib.com