

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Alert #6, Update 1

**Executive Summary of Proceedings for the
Policy Panel on Racial/Ethnic Data Collection
March 17-18, 1998**

Sponsored by

National Postsecondary Education Cooperative
Institute of Education Sciences and National Center for Education Statistics
National Science Foundation

Prepared by Westat

1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(301) 251-1500

for the

Institute of Education Sciences and National Center for Education Statistics
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20208-5652

and

The National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22230-0002

September 25, 1998

Background on the Policy Panel on Racial/Ethnic Data Collection

The National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC), the Institute of Education Sciences and National Center for Education Statistics (IES-NCES), and National Science Foundation (NSF) sponsored a Policy Panel on Racial/Ethnic Data Collection, March 17-18, 1998 at the National Science Foundation.

The three sponsoring agencies convened the panel to discuss the new standards for Federal data on race and ethnicity issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in October 1997. These new standards will have a substantial impact on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Enrollment, Completions and Fall Staff surveys. There are two major changes in the new standards:

- Students and staff will be able to indicate if they are members of one or more races; and

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

- Asian or Pacific Islander racial category was split into two separate categories-"Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander."

An NPEC working group selected the 30 panelists and 35 observers for their input and unique perspectives on this issue. Panelists represented a broad spectrum of representatives from the postsecondary community who are responsible for the collection, maintenance, and reporting of IPEDS data. These individuals include admissions and registrar staff, institutional/system researchers, computer systems staff, faculty/researchers; and higher education organizations such as the American Council on Education, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and state commissions of higher education. In addition, the sponsoring agencies invited staff from selected federal government agencies such as OMB, the Office for Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education, and the Census Bureau to serve as observers and as resource people to the panel.

Panel Format

Roslyn Korb, director of cooperative programs at the IES-NCES and Kala Stroup, commissioner of the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education co-chaired the meeting. Susan Hill, policy analyst at NSF, and NSF representative to the OMB Interagency Committee for the Review of Racial/Ethnic Standards, sponsored the meeting and helped facilitate the proceedings.

During the first day of the meeting, the co-chairs and Susan Hill provided background information on the OMB changes and the review process, and an overview of the critical IPEDS issues to be addressed by the panelists. Panelists then raised questions and discussed key issues on the collection and reporting of racial/ethnic data for IPEDS. Korb and Stroup led the panelists through a discussion that focused on the implications of the new standards for each stakeholder in higher education: students, admissions, registration, institutional research, state higher education offices, and computer systems. In addition, the co-chairs invited observers to ask questions or make comments to the panel during the afternoon of the first day.

The 30 panelists met in three separate working groups during the second day to address specific questions and to make recommendations to IES-NCES. These working groups discussed options for timing the implementation of changes, for the process of implementing changes, and for changes to IPEDS survey forms. Following the small group deliberations, each of the three working group chairs presented their recommendations to all the panelists and observers. Panelists then had an opportunity to discuss, comment and suggest revisions to the recommendations before they were finalized. The recommendations that appear at the end of this summary represent the final approved recommendations, although it was agreed that more definitive recommendations would have to await further guidance from OMB.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Executive Summary

This executive summary includes an overview of the OMB review process and major changes to the new standards on race/ethnicity, working group discussion questions that were addressed by the panelists in small groups, recommendations approved by the panelists, and a brief overview of next steps.

For a more complete report of the presentations and panel discussions, consult the proceedings summary for this meeting. The full summary is available from Denise Glover at Westat, Inc., 301-251-2269 or gloverd1@westat.com.

Overview of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review Process

Federal Standards for Racial/Ethnic Categories since 1977

Racial and Ethnic Categories Currently Used

for Federal Statistics and Program

Administrative Reporting

American Indian or Alaskan Native: A Person having origins in any of the original Peoples of North America, and who maintains Cultural identification through tribal Affiliations or community recognition.	Black. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
Asian or Pacific Islander. A person having	White. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Origins in any of the original peoples of the

Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent,

Or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for

Example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the

Philippine islands, and Samoa.

Hispanic. A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican,

Cuban, Central or South American, or other

Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

Issues considered by OMB in revising the Racial/Ethnic Standards

- Whether or not to add a category called "multiracial;"
- How to classify Native Hawaiians;
- Whether to create new or separate categories for Middle Easterners, Cape Verdeans, German Americans, etc.;
- Whether to eliminate racial and ethnic categories.

Timeline of the Review Process Used by OMB

Date Event

2/94: National Academy of Sciences convened a workshop on this topic

3/94: Interagency Committee set up by OMB

6/94: Federal Register notice invited public comment

7/94: OMB conducted public hearings in 4 cities

7/94-5/97: OMB Subcommittee on Research planned and conducted research on the impact of possible changes to the racial/ethnic categories.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Included cognitive testing and Census Bureau surveys of both the general population and specific groups. Results of each survey made available as completed.

7/15/97: OMB publishes the research and recommendations of the Interagency Committee in the Federal Register for public comment.

10/30/97: OMB published Federal Register notice that revised the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity.

Overview of the Four Major Changes to the Race/Ethnicity Categories

1. When self-identification is used:
 - There should be two questions, with the Hispanic origin question first (Hispanic/Latino origin or not of Hispanic/Latino origin) and the question on race second.
 - There should be a method for reporting more than one race, by using the instructions "Mark one or more" or "Select one or more."
2. When self-identification is *not* possible:
 - Use one question combining race and Hispanic origin,
 - There should be a method for recording more than one race.
3. Asian/Pacific Islander category was split into two separate categories: one for Asian and a second for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander [The Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander category was a decision made by OMB; it did not emanate from a recommendation of the Interagency Committee];
4. Terminology and definition changes. The changes include:
 - For American Indian or Alaskan Native category, the "n" was take off Alaskan;
 - American Indian or Alaskan Native definition added: "peoples of South American (including Central America);" also changed community recognition to "community attachment,"
 - Asian category added examples of different countries: "Cambodia, Malaysia, Pakistan, and Thailand, and Vietnam;" Philippine Islands were considered Asian also;

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

- Black category added "or African American;" in addition, terms such as "Haitian" or "Negro" can be used;
- Hispanic category added "or Latino;" in addition, the term "Spanish origin" can be used;
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander is a totally new category as is its definition: "A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands."
- No changes in the category for whites.

Data Formats

1. Data may be collected in greater detail, but federal agencies were to use these minimum categories in the collection of data.
2. Data on multiple races should be captured on the computer file. If possible, data presentations should show combinations of multiple responses to race; at a minimum, the number of persons who choose more than one race should be aggregated.
3. Methods for collecting and tabulating data must be carefully developed; OMB expects to issue additional guidance with respect to tabulating data by end of 1998.
4. The deadline for implementation of new changes is no later than January 1, 1993, but the new standards are effective immediately for new and revised data collections.

Discussion Questions Addressed by the Panelists

The co-chairs posed the following questions to panelists in their small groups. Panelists presented responses to these questions as their recommendations to IES-NCES.

Roz Korb reviewed the working group discussion questions with the panelists. The discussion covered reporting issues, including a review of IPEDS surveys that collect racial/ethnic data; implementation or process issues, and timing issues. Korb concluded her presentation by clarifying the charges to the three working groups that convened on Wednesday, March 18.

Reporting Issues

Korb asked the panelists to consider the following reporting issues:

1. How should racial/ethnic data be reported to IPEDS?
 - What level of disaggregation is needed at the national level for status reporting (who is enrolling and completing degrees) and for trend reporting? Would there be a difference?

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

- Do institutions/states need more disaggregated student racial/ethnic data than is needed at the national level? If yes, why? If not, why not?
 - What categories should be used for reporting data to IPEDS? Do we need the same racial/ethnic categories across all the student surveys that collect racial/ethnic data?
1. How should nonresident alien be reported? Now it is reported as a separate racial/ethnic category in IPEDS headers. Should we breakout nonresident alien category into race/ethnicity? Many institutions feel they are not getting a proper count of their entire minority population.
 2. How will the new reporting racial/ethnic reporting categories differentially affect trends in racial/ethnic enrollments, completions, or graduation rates?
 - IES-NCES does a lot of reporting of trend data by race/ethnicity. Korb discussed three examples of the kind of reports IES-NCES does in this area.
 - Should IES-NCES try to develop a bridge between the old and the new reporting? What are the parameters of greatest interest? For example, IES-NCES has had to change the finance survey in IPEDS in private, non-profit institutions due to changes in accounting standards. Now IES-NCES is trying to build a bridge back to the old way of reporting, which is taking a few years.

Implementation or Process Issues

Korb raised the following process issues:

1. How do we implement the recommended changes?
2. Should IES-NCES develop minimal guidance for institutions to collect racial/ethnic data from students? If so, should the guidance reflect the IPEDS reporting categories or should they provide a wide range of options for aggregating data so they result in the same categories in the end?
3. Can institutions continue to report to IPEDS using the old categories while collecting data using the new categories? What does that mean for the institutions? Do they keep two sets of racial/ethnic data on their students?
4. How do we inform institutions, particularly the smaller, unconnected institutions, about the change in reporting,
5. When IES-NCES changes the categories, is a pilot test needed? Do all forms that collect racial/ethnic data for students need to be pilot-tested? What would the objectives of a pilot test be?

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Timing Issues

Timing concerns centered around general, state, and IES-NCES issues:

1. When do we implement the changes to IPEDS?
2. How much time do institutions need to have before they can be expected to have consistent data on all their students? Do we have to wait that long?
3. When should institutions collect racial/ethnic data on their students? Just at admissions or throughout students' academic life?
4. Can institutions convert all at once or will their conversion be gradual?
5. How long will it take for institutions to update their programming to respond to new IPEDS surveys?

If states report to IPEDS for institutions:

6. Is there a significant lag time between when institutions can report to states and states can report to IPEDS?
7. How long after data are available to the states can they begin to report to IPEDS?

Assuming full implementation by 2003, IES-NCES must address these timing issues:

8. When does IES-NCES have to start getting word out about the new racial/ethnic categories? Now? What do we tell them?
9. Should IES-NCES implement the changes on all its student surveys at the same time?
10. Should IES-NCES implement changes for all institutional sectors at the same time? (e.g., sooner at 2-year than at 4-year institutions?)
11. If IES-NCES needs to pilot the changes, when is the earliest IES-NCES can do this?

Korb concluded her overview of questions by giving the three working groups their respective charges:

- Provide recommendations a reporting format for IPEDS;
- Provide recommendation for the best way to implement changes; and
- Provide recommendations for when these changes can and should be implemented.

Charge to Working Group 1:

Options for the Timing of Implementing Changes

To make recommendations and when IPEDS should change its forms and institutions should begin new collections.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Small Group Recommendations from Working Group #1: Options for the Timing of Implementing Changes

Group Chair: Mark Chisholm; Roz Korb, Notetaker

Prior to responding to the specific working group discussion questions, Mark Chisholm presented a list of five general principles that apply to all Group 1's recommendations:

1. All agencies and vendors must coordinate with the College Board, Scholastic Aptitude Test, ACT, Educational Testing Service, Medical College Admission Test, Law School Admission Test, Department of Education (Title III); Department of Defense, NCAA, state agencies, and accrediting groups.
2. At the time of instituting new reporting, institutions should update existing biographical data on students through a one-time survey.
3. Institutions should carry old codes on new files to store data for students and staff whose data have not be recoded using the new codes.
4. All issues related to the timeline for implementing changes must be conditioned on the resolution of the following decisions and issues.
 - One versus two- question format for Hispanics; how to handle "other" category;
 - Crosswalks/tabulations rules; and
 - Grace period in which institutions might not fill in the new categories and would not be in jeopardy of losing financial aid.
1. If institutions convert early, they must have crosswalk and tabulation rules. Group 1 recommended that institutions wait for an official crosswalk strategy that should exist by late 1999.

Recommended (Optimistic) Timeline for Implementation

Group 1 agreed that the timeline is conditional on crosswalks, feasibility study (see recommendations for Group 2), one or two-question format, and size of institution. It is possible that the timeline could slip at least one year. The *most optimistic* timeline appears below:

Fall 1998 OMB aggregates and reviews recommendations [??]

Fall 1999 Reconvene to settle crosswalks (a bridge from current to future

racial/ethnic categories for IPEDS), tabulation rules, and format

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Fall 2000 Discussion and consensus building with higher education community
Draft to institutions for review and comment

Fall 2001 Final forms approved

Fall 2002 Institutions and states complete conversion of databases and programs; institutions survey students and staff using new codes

Fall 2002 First collection of data for Fall Enrollment, Consolidated, and Fall Enrollment Occupational Surveys

January 2003 Effective

Fall 2003 First collection of Completions and Staff Surveys

Mike Chisholm then responded to the small group discussion questions:

Group 1 Discussion Question

- 1. Is it possible for all institutions to convert to the new federal standards all at once or will implementation be gradual?**

Group 1 recommended that institutions convert all the systems simultaneously and no later than 2002. Group 1 also recommended that all institutions must have crosswalks and that they must be able to collect data in the old and new ways.

Group 1 Discussion Question

- 2. When will institutions implement the changes? At what stage of the institutional data collection and reporting process will these changes be made? How long will it take for an institution to have consistent racial/ethnic data on all its students at all levels?**

Group 1 recommended that the changes be made at the point of intake and that institutions survey their current staff and students. Group 1 concluded that it will take many years before institutions have consistent racial/ethnic data on their students.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Group 1 Discussion Question

- 3. When will states make the changes in their data systems to reflect the changes at the institutional level?**

Group 1 recommended that changes should be coordinated by states by 2002. States will need to decide what to do with the data they have collected prior to that time.

Group 1 Discussion Question

- 4. How long after data files are updated to reflect the changes in racial/ethnic designation will it take to update programming to respond to the new IPEDS surveys that collect racial/ethnic data?**

Group 1 recommended that updating data files and programming should occur simultaneously. Institutions must plan for programming how they will collapse categories at the same time they are designing the system. Institutions will need about 2 years for this process.

Group 1 Discussion Question

- 5. Should IES-NCES implement the changes on all the surveys at the same time? Should enrollment be implemented first?**

Group 1 recommended that data from the IPEDS Enrollment Survey should be collected in new categories for fall 2002. It should be optional for institutions to implement IPEDS Completions Survey in 2002. However, since the Completions Survey reports race/ethnicity data the fall after data are coded on the system, it would be required in 2003. Group 1 further recommended adding a field on the Completions survey to indicate the status of conversion (e.g., what percent of respondents are in the new versus the old categories?). For the Graduate Rate Survey, they recommended using the new form but shading out the new parts until enough time elapses to have entering cohorts with new codes. For the staff survey, Group 1 recommended institutions have a system in place by 2002, but the next scheduled staff survey would be conducted in 2003.

Group 1 Discussion Question

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

6. **Should IES-NCES implement changes for all institutional sectors at the same time? Should the changes be implemented sooner for schools with only short programs?**

Group 1 recommended that IES-NCES should implement changes for all institutional sectors at the same time.

Group 1 Discussion Question

7. **If a pilot test is necessary, when is the earliest it might be possible to field a pilot test?**

Group 1 recommended a broader institutional review instead of a pilot test. They suggested that a field test with schools that are ready—primarily to field test the crosswalks and tabulation rules—should be done in 2000 or 2001.

**Charge to Working Group 2:
Options for the Process of Implementing Changes**

To make recommendations on how institutions, states, and IPEDS can implement the change.

Small Group Recommendations from Working Group #2: Options for the Process of Implementing Changes

Group Chair: Richard Voorhees; Notetaker: Denise Glover

Rick Voorhees and other panelists explained that each institution is responsible for the implementation of the collection with recommendations and guidelines, but all institutions would implement reporting on the same timetable.

Voorhees provided the following report by responding to the discussion questions directed toward

Group 2.

Group 2 Discussion Question

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

**1. How do institutions currently collect racial/ethnic data from students and staff?
When in the various institutional administrative processes are the data collected?**

Institutions collect racial/ethnic data from students during admissions to the university and at the time of employment for staff. Both processes are voluntary until students are admitted or staff are hired. Community colleges typically do not routinely request updates because the number of part-time students and "churn" students (i.e., students who regularly drop in and out of college) makes this task formidable. Racial/ethnic data are collected on staff (e.g., professional, paraprofessional, and technical only) about once per year when they renew their contracts. These data are also collected during staff searches.

In addition, Voorhees reported that racial/ethnic data are collected at the precollegiate level through admissions interviews, and later on through exit interviews and later on through exit interviews and alumni surveys at the postgraduate level. Some institutions collect data on student performance and employment. Challenges of students and staff changing their racial/ethnic identification or preferences pose an even greater need for crosswalks and tabulation rules.

Group 2 Discussion Question

2. Should IES-NCES develop minimal guidance for institutions to collect racial/ethnic data from students? If so, what should they entail?

Group 2 recommended that it would be useful for IES-NCES to develop minimal guidance for institutions. For example, institutions need rules for using a one -or two-question format for ethnicity in order to produce consistent reporting. IES-NCES should consider rules that will provide specific guidance and assistance to special interest institutions (e.g., historically black institutions, tribal colleges, and colleges serving Hispanic/Latino populations). These schools need resources such as computers, researchers, etc. to ensure that their data and methods of collecting data are compatible at the state and institutional levels. Finally, institutions need assistance in working with vendors so they understand the emerging tabulation rules.

Group 2 Discussion Question

3. Should IES-NCES develop guidelines for maintaining racial/ethnic data on student files?

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

If IPEDS goes unitary, IES-NCES should develop guidelines. Otherwise, no guidelines are needed from IES-NCES.

Group 2 Discussion Question

- 4. Would data provided on a student record level enable IPEDS to have more information on students reporting more than one race? Is it possible for institutions/states to report to IPEDS on a student record format rather than aggregated formats?**

Group 2 indicated that data provided on a student record level would enable IPEDS to have more information on students reporting more than one race. Group 2 recommended that IES-NCES should explore this as an alternative, optional data reporting mechanism because it would provide excellent outcome data. However, there is likely to be considerable resistance to this decision, especially from private colleges and those public colleges not part of a state unit record system. Some of this resistance might be overcome as people see the utility of using these data.

Group 2 Discussion Question

- 5. Is a pilot test of the new reporting needed? Is it needed for all IPEDS surveys that collect racial/ethnic data? What would be the objectives of a pilot test?**

Group 2 recommended a pilot test that includes crosswalks and tabulation rules. The test should also consider additional direct and indirect costs, resources, and technology associated with or needed for implementation. Group 2 also recommended IES-NCES conduct a thorough survey or assessment of institutional capability, feasibility, and capacity for implementing changes that targets small, special interest, and unconnected institutions in the pilot.

Group 2 Discussion Question

- 6. How much advance notice do institutions/states need prior to the first year of IPEDS data collection?**

Group 2 recommended proactively notifying all institutions as soon as possible. Group 2 also recommended that the pilot test and assessment (from #5 above) should be completed by fall 2000. Decisions on changes should be made by 2001, with implementation by 2003.

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

Group 2 Discussion Question

7. **Do we inform institutions about the change in reporting, particularly the smaller, unconnected institutions.**

Group 2 agreed that IES-NCES should work cooperatively with higher education and community organizations to inform institutions and groups of the changes. NPEC should facilitate the dissemination of information and the discussion. Other organizations to work with include the Association of Institutional Research, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, Title IV institutions, American Association of Community Colleges, State Higher Education Executive Officers, Society for College and University Planning, Education Commission of the States, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, American College Testing Program, College Board, parent organizations, tribal colleges, and community-based organizations.

Charge to Working Group 3:

Options for the IPEDS Survey Form Changes and Institutional Collection

To make recommendations on the format that IPEDS and institutions can use in the collection of racial/ethnic data

Small Group Recommendations from Working Group #3: Options for the IPEDS Survey Form Changes and Institutional Collection

Group Chair: Mike McGuire; Notetaker: Susan Hill

Mike McGuire summarized his group's report by discussing various issues: data collection, tabulation, institutional collections, bridging, research, and other issues.

Data Collection Issues

McGuire characterized the one-versus two-question data collection format (primary collection) as a critical issue. Group 3 generally decided, with some further study, that the two-question format is preferable, but it should not be mandatory for institutions to use it. The choice of one- or two-question format influences the applicability of reporting options. Group 3 agreed that Option B is the better option because it provides institutions with sufficient detail without overburdening them. However, Option B needs to be modified if institutions use the two-question format, especially the positioning of Hispanic/Latino counts on the survey. For

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

example, in unduplicated counts of more than one racial/ethnic group, which group takes precedence--Hispanic or other racial group?

Tabulation Issues

Group 3 recommended that IES-NCES should provide clear instructions to institutions that are providing and reporting out data. It is essential that institutions report unduplicated counts (to 100%). A supplemental set of duplicated breakdowns are also necessary. Institutions and IES-NCES need layers of detail provided by duplicated counts. Finally, Group 3 recommended that racial/ethnic categories should be consistent across IPEDS with possible modifications for staff and faculty (e.g., EEOC constraints).

Institutional Collections

Group 3 recommended that IES-NCES set up groups to study and design a minimum "best approach" to collect data. This group would answer the question, "What is the minimum level of detail required for institutions to supply the needed data (e.g. instructions, categories)?" The assumption is that there is latitude for different institutions or states to collect more data beyond the minimum, if they desire.

Bridging Issues

Group 3 acknowledged that IPEDS has a bridge for nonresident alien, Hispanic, and unknown categories. However, there should be a bridge for other racial groups that might be expressed as a range instead of a single number, if option B is used. Institutions would report on a continuum from minimum (those identifying only one category) to maximum (those reporting more than one category) as a reporting, rather than a collection device. Finally, institutions should use a bridge if they resurvey students (which might be meaningful for large institutions and states).

Research Issues

Group 3 recommended that research should be conducted on the one-or two-question format. For example, IES-NCES can ask institutions that are providing IPEDS data whether they collected their data at the unit record level using the one-or two-question format. This will provide information about whether and how the question format has made a difference. Second, institutions should be asked to add a counting measure to the "more than one race" category on Option B to describe the number of multiracial people who responded to this question. This counting measure would allow institutions to identify the number of respondents who reported two races, three races, four races, etc. Third, IES-NCES should consider pilot testing header

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

options (Revised Option B) as soon as possible for collection and reporting out. Finally, IES-NCES and the higher education community will need to educate users on how to communicate and make sense of multiple data displays.

Other Issues

Group 3 proposed several recommendations that fell under "other" issues. They recommended that nonresident alien category be relabeled, without providing racial detail on this group. Second, they recommended that institutions consider "trumping" rules for collapsing duplicated into unduplicated counts only for bridging purposes, if necessary, to preserve trends. The third recommendation from Group 3 is to respect the choice of those who have selected more than one race. They urged institutions and states not to force respondents into one race again. Group 3 also recommended adding three items to the end of the form: (1) institutions should indicate if they used the combined question or separate question format; (2) institutions should indicate the number of respondents who reported one race, two races, three races, etc.; and (3) institutions should indicate the percentage of students reporting under the multiple response approach ("mark one or more" responses).

Final Comments from Panelists

In the final comments, a panelist recommended IPEDS consider not imputing data on the Graduation Rate Survey, except as a last resort, because it would distribute race back to individuals. A second panelist recommended that models of tabulation or aggregation ("trumping rules") should be as data-driven as possible, rather than politically driven.

Next Steps

Roz Korb identified the sequence of steps for the work of the panelists. First, IES-NCES will provide a summary of the panel meeting and try to capture the flavor of discussion. The panel and IES-NCES need to answer important questions as soon as possible (e.g., crosswalk, tabulation rules, one or two-question format). Korb and the panelists made the following recommendations regarding how the work of the panel will proceed from this point:

1. IES-NCES will use the same group of panelists to continue the discussion and the work.
2. Several panelists invited Roz Korb and Susan Hill to come to California. The level of complexity in dealing with different racial/ethnic classifications in California's higher education institutions is greater than anywhere else in the country.
3. Panelists underscored the need to structure in interaction and coordination among practitioners (panelists), OMB and Census in this process.
4. David Davis-Van-Atta is preparing an AIR Alert issue on the panel meeting that will be available for others to read. [This issue was electronically disseminated.]

**Attention: Information No Longer Current
(Alert archived November 2011)**

5. Susan Hill will set up a panel for the Association for Institutional Research meeting to discuss the issue with OMB staff. [The panel was held on May 19, 1998 at the AIR conference.]
6. Roz Korb indicated that IES-NCES could establish a listserv for the panel working groups.
7. John Stewart for the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) will write up a two-page summary of the meeting that will be inserted in everyone's folder on April 4. Everyone underscored the complexity of the issues, and advised institutions not to change everything right away.
8. The panelists suggested IES-NCES set up a public listserv in addition to a private one.
9. The panelists agreed to share membership information with one another via e-mail or listserv.

Office of Management and Budget (1997), "Recommendations from the Interagency Committee for the Review of the Racial and Ethnic Standards to the Office of Management and Budget Concerning Changes to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity; Notice," *Federal Register* 62, No. 131, pp. 36864-36946, July 9, 1997.

Information No Longer Current