



# FINANCIAL AID OFFICES FACE INTENSIFYING STAFFING CHALLENGES AMID PANDEMIC

Executive Summary	3
Key Findings	5
Appendix A: Methodology and Response Demographics	8
Appendix B: Overall Responses	9
Appendix C: Responses by Institutional Sector	18
Appendix D: Responses by NASFAA Region	38
Appendix E: Response for Minority Serving Institutions	60
Appendix G: Responses to Follow-Up Survey of Non-Completers	68

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prior to the pandemic, financial aid offices across the country reported ongoing challenges with employee retention and staffing. For example, NASFAA's previous work on [Administrative Burden](#) found that pre-pandemic, staffing levels were not keeping up with increased regulations, work levels, and record levels of financial aid. At best, schools were treading water, but for many schools the inability to keep and replace staff was challenging.

To learn what impacts the pandemic has had on financial aid staffing, NASFAA conducted a brief online survey in March 2022 to NASFAA member institutions and a follow-up survey to non-completers in May 2022. What we learned is simple: What was once a challenge — albeit a manageable one — has become a crisis for many institutional financial aid offices that are struggling to remain administratively capable and adequately serve students, whose own needs have increased in the last two years.

With more than 500 member institutions responding to our initial survey and an additional 500 responding to our follow-up survey, the results brought to light critical issues in financial aid offices, including:

- **Reduced capacity:** Half of respondents to the original survey reported operating at a 75% staffing capacity for both award years 2019-20 and 2020-21. Another 56% of respondents reported in the follow-up survey that they were operating at a reduced staffing capacity and thus did not have time to complete the original survey.
- **Significant turnover rates:** Most offices reported having difficulty filling up to 5-6 positions for both award years 2019-20 and 2020-21.
- **Administrative capability concerns:** Forty percent of institutions indicated they do not feel they have the resources to maintain administratively capability standards. Nearly 80% voiced concern about their ability to be administratively capable in the future. More than half (56%) are concerned about their ability to adequately serve students with current staffing levels.
- **Difficulty hiring:** An overwhelming majority (86%) reported not receiving enough qualified applications, and the large majority of those (67%) felt it was squarely an issue of salary restrictions that made the job uncompetitive.

NASFAA also heard from several member institutions that they are experiencing more difficulty than ever related to staffing now, in the 2021-22 award year. While this survey did not collect data specific to that award year, since it has not yet concluded, when asked about current vacancies many reported two vacancies, and nearly half (41%) indicated their vacancy had been unfulfilled for at least three months.

**Implications:** The findings of this report have many implications for financial aid offices, institutions at large, and most importantly students and families.

Financial aid offices are required to be compliant with an enormous amount of complex federal and state regulations. Inadequate training and staffing in the financial aid office increases the odds that an institution may find itself out of compliance with federal and state program requirements, and those compliance issues could mean dire consequences for both the institution and students. These staffing shortages are coming amid the backdrop of increased scrutiny from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) — which has announced the reprioritization of a Student Aid Enforcement Unit — as well as from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) and state attorneys general. Adverse findings from audits, federal program reviews, or investigations into student complaints

often result in financial penalties (ED may fine a school up to \$57,317 for each statutory or regulatory violation.<sup>1</sup>) and restrictions on how schools administer — and students receive — student financial aid.

Every school exists to serve the students it enrolls. However, past research shows that many of the ancillary support services that help students are the first to be cut in times of financial hardship. NASFAA's [2020 Administrative Burden Survey Report](#) found that when faced with resource shortages, the student services activities most often reported as “greatly affected” included financial literacy, outreach efforts, and target population events. Many of the most important services that financial aid offices offer fall outside the scope of federal requirements. These services help students apply for and receive financial aid, and successfully repay their loans, or qualify for reduced payments and loan forgiveness. They are also the first to be cut when aid offices must focus all of their energies on simply processing existing applications and tracking and disbursing funds.

**Future Work:** While NASFAA and the field have focused heavily over the past few years on succession planning and the creation of a pipeline of employees, the findings of this report highlight areas that must be addressed with all urgency.

- Additional work can be done on college campuses and with senior level administration to address the misclassification of financial aid staff and the salary categories they fall within. This could assist in retention efforts and hiring while addressing one of the largest obstacles to filling vacant financial aid office positions.
- To better address the needs of the financial aid office and help strengthen the potential pipeline to employment, NASFAA will facilitate discussions between member institutions to brainstorm and develop best practices for job duties and responsibilities for Federal Work-Study students and graduate assistants.
- NASFAA wants to partner with federal colleagues to identify best practices for administrative capability and work in partnership with federal agencies to remind schools of this Title IV requirement.
- NASFAA will continue to work with member institutions to develop succession plans that focus on both recruiting and retaining qualified staff in the financial aid community.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://fsapartners.ed.gov/knowledge-center/fsa-handbook/2021-2022/vol2/ch8-program-reviews-sanctions-closeout>

# KEY FINDINGS

## Staffing Levels

The total number of positions in an administratively capable financial aid office (FAO) was an average of 10.9 and a median of 7<sup>2,3</sup>. Of respondents who reported having at least one vacancy (n = 90), the median and average answers were approximately 2-2.5 positions across the 2019-20 and 2020-21 aid years.

A further analysis of the data showed a 30% increase in the number of institutions reporting at least one vacancy from 2019-20 to 2020-21. When looking at the total number of positions reported in an FAO relative to the number of vacant positions, on average institutions who reported having at least one vacancy<sup>4</sup> were operating at a 75% staffing capacity across both aid years.

As a follow-up to our original survey NASFAA asked primary contacts who did not submit a response to share the one reason why. Of the 507 respondents, 78% cited not having the time needed to gather the information for survey completion. Fifty-six percent of those indicated they were operating at a reduced staffing capacity, but 22% were operating at a full staffing capacity.

## Temporary Staffing

Half of all survey respondents indicated their office chooses not to use temporary staffing. Institutions that reported having at least one temporary staffing position had an average number of 2.13 positions and a median of 1 position across both aid years.

*Nearly three-quarters (71%) of graduate/professional institutions, just over one-third of respondents from the WASFAA region, and only 40% of minority-serving institutions (MSIs) reported choosing not to use temporary staffing.*

Aside from choosing not to use temporary staffing, respondents next indicated they used temporary staffing during high processing times (17%) and only for support staff (16%).

*Nonprofit institutions and proprietary institutions also indicated the temporary staffing at their institution does not fulfill their office needs, at 14% and 33% respectively, and graduate/professional institutions indicated they only use temporary staffing for leadership positions (14%). WASFAA, MASFAA, and EASFAA regions indicated the temporary staffing at their institution does not fulfill their office needs, at 15%, 19%, and 23% respectively. Additionally, WASFAA and MSIs indicated they only used temporary staffing for support staff more often (29% and 30% respectively) than overall respondents.*

## Employee Departures

---

<sup>2</sup>This number is calculated by adding the following for each institution: the number of permanent positions reported for 2020-21, the number of temporary positions reported for 2020-21 and the number of additional positions reported by offices who did not feel they had the staffing necessary to be administratively capable.

<sup>3</sup> Because a few institutions had a high number of total permanent positions, the average was inflated, therefore we also report the median (middle value).

<sup>4</sup> n=193 for 2019-20 and n=275 for 2020-21.

Most respondents indicated one permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employee left their institution during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 aid years across the following categories for each year: resigned, transferred, retired, terminated, promoted, and deceased. On average, one of those departures was COVID-19-related.

*Proprietary institutions, EASFAA and WASFAA regions, and MISs indicated an average of zero COVID-19-related departures.*

Permanent FTE employees cited three main reasons for transferring or resigning: a higher salary or better benefits in their new/different position (69%), no longer having the desire to work in financial aid (35%), and moving to a different office at the same institution (29%).

*Nonprofit institutions, the EASFAA region, and MSIs cited family obligations (28%, 31%, and 35% respectively) in their top three responses, instead of moving to a different office at the same institution. Proprietary institutions indicated a dislike of current workplace policies (27%) and relocation (27%) in their top three, both equal to moving to a different office at the same location (27%). The WASFAA and SASFAA regions and MSIs cited relocation (42%, 32%, and 35% respectively) in their top three responses, instead of moving to a different office at the same institution.*

## Filling Positions

Most institutions filled vacant positions with newly hired staff, filling one (25%) to two positions (25%). Those who used temporary staffing indicated filling one (50%) to two vacant positions (25%). Of respondents who rehired staff, more than three-quarters (81%) indicated they filled one position, but it is noteworthy that this category was selected by the smallest number of respondents (n = 32).

When asked about difficulty filling vacant positions due to COVID-19, roughly one-third (30%) of respondents indicated zero, meaning they had no difficulty. Approximately half of overall respondents indicated one to two positions were difficult to fill due to COVID-19.

*A higher percentage of proprietary institutions (42%) reported difficulty filling zero positions, and an additional 40% indicated they had difficulty filling one to two positions. Three regions indicated they had difficulty filling more positions than overall respondents averaged, with 11% of SWASFAA respondents having difficulty filling five positions, 8% of SASFAA respondents having difficulty filling six to eight positions, and 7% of MASFAA respondents having difficulty filling six to eight positions. MSIs also saw a slight variance, with only 42% indicating they had difficulty filling one to two positions, but 14% indicating they had difficulty filling five to six positions.*

Almost all respondents (84%) indicated it was “very difficult” or “difficult” to fill vacant positions with qualified staff, and an overwhelming majority (86%) indicated they did not receive enough qualified applications. The second most cited response was a lack of competitive salary.

*It is worth noting that nearly half of community college (44%) and MSI (45%) respondents also cited their hiring process was delayed and they lost candidates.*

At the time of survey completion, respondents with at least one vacancy reported an average of 2.74 vacancies and a mean of 2 vacancies, and nearly half (41%) indicated their vacancy had been unfilled for three months.

## Administrative Capability

Slightly more than half (61%) of respondents felt they had the staffing and resources necessary to be administratively capable.

*Nearly three-quarters (73%) of graduate/professional institutions indicated yes, but closer to half of public four-year institutions (54%) and MSIs (53%) indicated yes.*

Approximately 78% of respondents indicated they were “slightly concerned” or “very concerned” about their ability to be administratively capable, and just over half (56%) were “slightly concerned” or “very concerned” about their ability to adequately serve students.

*Slightly more, 66% of respondents from EASFAA and 63% of public four-year institutions, and slightly less, 44% of respondents from SWASFAA and 36% of graduate/professional institutions, reported being concerned about their ability to adequately serve students. MSIs reported being more concerned with their ability to be administratively capable (85%) and adequately serve students (62%).*

## Outsourcing

Most respondents indicated they do not outsource almost all areas, with the exception of delinquency/default management (31% indicated this was outsourced prior to March 2020) and collections or institutional loans (36% indicated this was outsourced prior to March 2020).

*Responses varied slightly by institutional sector. Public four-year institutions also ranked debt management in their top three outsourcing areas prior to 2020 (20%), proprietary institutions ranked verification in their top two outsourcing areas prior to March 2020 (20%) but did not rank delinquency/default management as high as other sectors (13%), and community colleges ranked debt management in their top two outsourcing areas prior to 2020 (19%) but did not rank “collections or institutional loans” as high as others (18%).*

Those who did not outsource any area cited funding (61%), lack of time to coordinate or onboard the services (32%), lack of confidence in the quality of an outside contractor’s work (26%), or other (26%).

## APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY AND RESPONSE DEMOGRAPHICS

On March 14, 2022 NASFAA distributed an electronic survey to 2,646 primary contacts at NASFAA member institutions. A reminder email was sent on March 23, 2022 and the survey was closed on March 25, 2022. There were 494 completed survey responses submitted and an additional 25 partial survey responses for a total of 518 responses. Demographics of respondents are provided below.

As a follow-up to the original survey, on May 2, 2022 NASFAA emailed 2,090 primary contacts at NASFAA member institutions asking a single question to learn more about why they did not complete the survey. A reminder email was sent on May 5, 2022 and the survey was closed on May 6, 2022. There were 507 completed survey responses submitted. Results from this survey are found in Appendix G.

NASFAA does not display responses for a sample size of less than ten.

Together these two surveys represent 39% of NASFAA's primary contacts at member institutions.

NASFAA Region	Survey Respondents	NASFAA Membership
MASFAA	24%	22%
EASFAA	23%	24%
WASFAA	15%	16%
SASFAA	14%	20%
SWASFAA	13%	11%
RMASFAA	9%	7%

NASFAA Sector	Survey Respondents	NASFAA Membership
Nonprofit	42%	38%
Community Colleges	27%	30%
Public Four-Year	25%	19%
Proprietary	4%	8%
Graduate/Professional	3%	4%



## APPENDIX B: OVERALL RESPONSES

How many **permanent positions** were there in your office during the following aid years, and of those how many were vacant?

	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	186	196	9.74	9.55	6	6	518	518
Vacancies	0	0	20	40	0.92	1.42	0	1	507	513
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	20	40	2.40	2.66	2	2	193	275

How many **temporary positions** worked in your office during the following aid years?

	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	15	14	0.36	0.47	0	0	511	513
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	15	14	2.06	2.21	1	1	90	110

What role does temporary staffing have in your financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

We use it during high processing times	17%
We began using it during COVID-19	8%
We only use temporary staffing for leadership positions	3%
We only use temporary staffing for support staff	16%
My institution does not allow the use of temporary staffing	9%
Temporary staffing at my institution does not fulfill my office needs	14%
My office chooses not to use temporary staffing	50%
n	435

During the following aid years, how many permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees left your institution's financial aid office for any of the following reasons?

2019-20	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	57%	26%	12%	3%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	190
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	76%	19%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	78
Retired	85%	9%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	89
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	77%	13%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	47
Promoted	67%	22%	7%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	45
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2020-21	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	51%	21%	12%	9%	3%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	234
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	70%	20%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	91
Retired	80%	11%	9%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	103
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	78%	10%	7%	2%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	59
Promoted	66%	21%	11%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	76
Deceased	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10

Approximately how many of those departures were COVID-19-related?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	n
0	8	1	261

What were some reasons permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees cited for transferring or resigning? (Check all that apply.)

Higher salary or better benefits in new/different position	69%
Dislike of current workplace policies	18%
Desire for permanent remote workplace	20%
Family obligations	26%
No longer desire to work in financial aid	35%
No longer desire to work in higher education	13%
Relocation	28%
Furthering their education	5%
Moved to a different office at the same institution	29%
Left the workforce	13%
Other (Please specify below.)	5%
n	216

*Open-ended responses: Respondents who provided open-ended comments that fit within a category above were recoded into that analysis. The remaining eight open-ended comments included reasons related to general career advancement, illness and/or health-related, and making a lateral move.*

How many positions did you fill during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	28%	26%	18%	11%	6%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%	2%	246
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	81%	13%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	32
Temporary staff	52%	26%	9%	9%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	58

How many positions did you have difficulty filling during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years due to COVID-19?

0	30%
1	21%
2	23%
3	10%
4	5%
5	5%
6	4%
7	1%
8	1%
9	0%
10	0%
11+	0%
n	261

How difficult was it to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff?

Very Difficult	43%
Difficult	41%
Easy	13%
Very Easy	3%
n	268

Why was it difficult to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff? (Check all that apply.)

We did not receive enough qualified applications	86%
The pool of applicants we received were overqualified	8%
The salary we offered was not competitive	67%
Applicants cited a desire for permanent remote workplace	23%
Due to remote work and COVID-19, our student worker pipeline was reduced	8%
Our institution experienced a hiring freeze	21%
Our institution experienced budget cuts that made filling positions difficult	18%
Hiring process was delayed and we lost candidates	30%
Hiring process was too time-intensive and we were unable to conduct searches for some/all vacant positions	12%
Other (Please specify below.)	4%
n	224

*Open-ended responses: Respondents who provided open-ended comments that fit within a category above were recoded into that analysis. The remaining nine open-ended comments included reasons related to the inability to list salaries on job descriptions, job requirements, and position elimination.*

At the time you are completing this survey, how many vacant positions are there in your financial aid office? (Please include permanent and temporary positions.)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	76	1.42	1	484
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	76	2.74	2	250

On average, how long have your currently vacant positions been unfilled?

30 days	14%
3 months	41%
6 months	29%
1 year	7%
Longer than one year	9%
n	346

Do you feel you have the staff and resources necessary to administer the financial aid programs in compliance with the administrative capability requirements outlined in section 668.16(b) of the Standards for Participation in Title IV, HEA Programs?

Yes	61%
No	39%
n	495

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to be administratively capable?

Very unconcerned	6%
Slightly unconcerned	11%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	5%
Slightly concerned	47%
Very concerned	31%
n	194

How many additional positions do you feel your office needs to be adequately staffed?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	14	2.5	2.0	192

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to adequately serve your students?

Very unconcerned	13%
Slightly unconcerned	13%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	19%
Slightly concerned	42%
Very concerned	14%
n	491

Please answer the following questions related to outsourcing (contracting out to a third party to complete a service):

	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	2%	2%	97%	397
Financial aid offers	3%	1%	96%	395
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	4%	3%	94%	396
Verification	12%	4%	84%	406
Debt management	17%	1%	83%	399
Financial literacy	9%	3%	88%	396
Delinquency/default management	31%	2%	67%	406
Collections or Institutional Loans	36%	1%	62%	384
Grace/repayment loan counseling	17%	1%	82%	386
Loan reconciliation	2%	1%	98%	392
Policies and procedures	1%	3%	97%	398
Temporary staffing	5%	6%	89%	373
Record keeping/document storage	4%	1%	95%	394
Other (Please specify below.)	7%	21%	72%	43

*Open-ended responses: Respondents who provided open-ended comments that fit within a category above were recoded into that analysis. The remaining 14 open-ended comments included: Professional Judgment Processing/Financial Aid Appeals (which notably could fit into Packaging, but as this is a new area of outsourcing NASFAA left it separate for this survey analysis), research and data analysis, HEERF fund awarding, compliance-related topics, and scholarship processing.*



What was the reason that your office began outsourcing this during the pandemic?

*Fifty-nine respondents provided open-ended responses to this question. These responses could be grouped into four main categories:*

- *Staffing levels were too low to complete the work internally and/or the newly hired staff were not experienced enough to manage the area that was outsourced (n=30).*
- *Financial aid offices, or the institution as a whole, were not equipped to manage this area with staff working remotely and/or it was easier to outsource this area than to equip staff to manage it while working remotely (n=7).*
- *Increased workload required the financial aid office to outsource an area to meet demand (n=6).*
- *The decision to outsource was not pandemic related and/or had been planned before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (n=12)*

Why does your office not outsource any services? (Check all that apply.)

Funding	63%
Institution's contracting / procurement policies	16%
Lack of confidence in the quality of an outside contractor's work	26%
Lack of time to coordinate or onboard services	32%
Overwhelmed by vendor choices	5%
Privacy concerns	11%
Don't know vendors	5%
Other (please specify below.)	26%
n	19

*Open-ended responses: Five respondents provided open-ended answers. Of those, most indicated their office does not have a need to outsource.*

## APPENDIX C: RESPONSES BY INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR

How many **permanent positions** were there in your office during the following aid years, and of those how many were vacant?

Community Colleges	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	98	95	8.55	8.40	6	0.5	141	141
Vacancies	0	0	6	8	0.63	1.09	0	0.5	139	140
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	6	8	1.81	2.17	1	2	49	70
Proprietary Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	37	37	5.63	5.79	4	4	19	19
Vacancies	0	0	2	7	0.37	0.84	0	0	19	19
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate / Professional Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	9	9	3.60	3.67	3	3	15	15
Vacancies	0	0	1	3	0.27	0.53	0	0	15	15
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nonprofit Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	186	196	7.73	7.60	5	5	215	215
Vacancies	0	0	20	40	0.77	1.23	0	0	208	212
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	20	40	2.42	2.50	2	2	66	104

Public Four-Year Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	2	2	89	79	15.74	15.34	11	11	128	128
Vacancies	0	0	17	10	1.63	2.32	1	1	126	127
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	17	10	2.94	3.35	2	3	70	88

How many **temporary positions** worked in your office during the following aid years?

Community Colleges	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	15	14	0.47	0.51	0	0	140	140
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	15	14	2.75	2.48	3	2	24	29
Proprietary Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	1	1	0.05	0.11	0	0	19	19
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate / Professional Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	3	3	0.47	0.47	0	0	15	15
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Nonprofit Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	2	4	0.11	0.19	0	0	212	213
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	2	4	1.05	1.33	1	1	22	30
Public Four-Year Institutions	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	13	13	0.71	0.97	0	0	125	126
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	13	13	2.23	2.71	1	2	40	45

What role does temporary staffing have in your financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
We use it during high processing times	12%	18%	23%	20%	7%
We began using it during COVID-19	7%	10%	8%	7%	0%
We only use temporary staffing for leadership positions	2%	2%	5%	7%	14%
We only use temporary staffing for support staff	9%	21%	25%	0%	7%
My institution does not allow the use of temporary staffing	9%	11%	5%	7%	7%
Temporary staffing at my institution does not fulfill my office needs	14%	16%	11%	33%	7%
My office chooses not to use temporary staffing	57%	46%	42%	47%	71%
n	170	125	111	15	14

During the following aid years, how many permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees left your institution's financial aid office for any of the following reasons?

2019-20

Nonprofit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	57%	33%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	70
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	82%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	22
Retired	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	23
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	82%	12%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17
Promoted	69%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	13
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Community Colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	67%	19%	10%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	48
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	83%	13%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24
Retired	76%	20%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	58%	33%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Promoted	77%	8%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Public Four-Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	49%	26%	13%	8%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	61
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	63%	30%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27
Retired	85%	5%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	39
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	80%	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	15
Promoted	61%	28%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proprietary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	60%	10%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	10
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Graduate/Professional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2020-21

Nonprofit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	55%	27%	9%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	99
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	83%	8%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	24
Retired	78%	13%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	40
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	79%	10%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	29
Promoted	67%	22%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	27
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Community Colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	56%	22%	9%	9%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	55
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	63%	26%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27
Retired	75%	21%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	63%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Public Four-Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	39%	15%	17%	14%	5%	5%	2%	3%	2%	0%	0%	66
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	67%	23%	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	39
Retired	84%	3%	11%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	37
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	72%	11%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	18
Promoted	61%	21%	14%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	28
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proprietary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Graduate / Professional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approximately how many of those departures were COVID-19-related?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	n
Nonprofit	0	5	1	94
Community Colleges	0	6	1	66
Public Four-Year	0	8	1	86
Proprietary	0	1	0	12
Graduate / Professional	-	-	-	-



What were some reasons permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees cited for transferring or resigning? (Check all that apply.)

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Higher salary or better benefits in new/different position	71%	64%	80%	27%	-
Dislike of current workplace policies	23%	12%	16%	27%	-
Desire for permanent remote workplace	19%	14%	27%	18%	-
Family obligations	28%	28%	27%	9%	-
No longer desire to work in financial aid	29%	41%	41%	18%	-
No longer desire to work in higher education	10%	16%	14%	18%	-
Relocation	22%	28%	36%	27%	-
Furthering their education	6%	3%	6%	0%	-
Moved to a different office at the same institution	18%	31%	42%	27%	-
Left the workforce	11%	19%	11%	18%	-
Other (Please specify below.)	2%	5%	8%	0%	-
n	83	58	64	11	-

How many positions did you fill during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years?

Nonprofit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	33%	25%	18%	13%	6%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	88
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Temporary staff	56%	33%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18

Community Colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	26%	23%	23%	14%	6%	6%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	65
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	57%	29%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	14

Public Four-Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	22%	31%	14%	9%	6%	8%	4%	1%	3%	0%	3%	78
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	80%	10%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10
Temporary staff	42%	21%	17%	13%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	24

Proprietary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	42%	17%	17%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	12
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Graduate / Professional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

How many positions did you have difficulty filling during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years due to COVID-19?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
0	33%	29%	24%	42%	-
1	23%	19%	18%	33%	-
2	23%	27%	22%	8%	-
3	8%	13%	10%	0%	-
4	2%	4%	9%	8%	-
5	6%	4%	5%	0%	-
6	1%	3%	8%	8%	-
7	1%	0%	3%	0%	-
8	2%	0%	1%	0%	-
9	0%	1%	0%	0%	-
10	0%	0%	1%	0%	-
11+	1%	0%	0%	0%	-
n	97	70	79	12	-

How difficult was it to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Very Difficult	43%	43%	41%	50%	-
Difficult	38%	42%	44%	42%	-
Easy	16%	10%	12%	8%	-
Very Easy	3%	6%	2%	0%	-
n	98	72	82	12	-

Why was it difficult to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff? (Check all that apply.)

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
We did not receive enough qualified applications	87%	82%	89%	82%	-
The pool of applicants we received were overqualified	10%	8%	4%	18%	-
The salary we offered was not competitive	74%	49%	80%	45%	-
Applicants cited a desire for permanent remote workplace	21%	23%	26%	27%	-
Due to remote work and COVID-19, our student worker pipeline was reduced	5%	8%	13%	0%	-
Our institution experienced a hiring freeze	22%	20%	23%	27%	-
Our institution experienced budget cuts that made filling positions difficult	19%	20%	16%	27%	-
Hiring process was delayed and we lost candidates	22%	44%	33%	9%	-
Hiring process was too time-intensive and we were unable to conduct searches for some/all vacant positions	6%	25%	9%	9%	-
Other (Please specify below.)	6%	2%	1%	18%	-
n	78	61	70	11	-

At the time you are completing this survey, how many vacant positions are there in your financial aid office? (Please include permanent and temporary positions.)

Community College	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	13	1.29	1	133
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	13	2.41	2	71
Proprietary Institutions	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	9	0.83	0	17
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate / Professional Institutions	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	1	0.15	0	13
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-
Nonprofit Institutions	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	22	0.85	0	199
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	22	1.98	1	86
Public Four-Year Institutions	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	76	2.69	2	122
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	76	3.77	2	87

On average, how long have your currently vacant positions been unfilled?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
30 days	11%	16%	17%	-	-
3 months	47%	32%	44%	-	-
6 months	32%	31%	21%	-	-
1 year	4%	9%	7%	-	-
Longer than one year	6%	13%	10%	-	-
n	131	95	107	-	-

Do you feel you have the staff and resources necessary to administer the financial aid programs in compliance with the administrative capability requirements outlined in section 668.16(b) of the Standards for Participation in Title IV, HEA Programs?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Yes	62%	63%	54%	65%	73%
No	38%	37%	46%	35%	27%
n	206	134	123	17	15

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to be administratively capable?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Very unconcerned	4%	4%	11%	-	-
Slightly unconcerned	10%	10%	12%	-	-
Neither unconcerned or concerned	5%	8%	2%	-	-
Slightly concerned	51%	47%	40%	-	-
Very concerned	29%	31%	35%	-	-
n	78	49	57	-	-

How many additional positions do you feel your office needs to be adequately staffed?

Community Colleges				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	8	2.26	2	49
Proprietary Institutions				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
-	-	-	-	-
Graduate/Professional Institutions				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
-	-	-	-	-
Nonprofit Institutions				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	22	1.86	2	76
Public 4-Year Institutions				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
1	14	3.63	3	57

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to adequately serve your students?

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Very unconcerned	12%	12%	11%	19%	29%
Slightly unconcerned	11%	14%	16%	13%	14%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	21%	23%	9%	19%	21%
Slightly concerned	45%	38%	41%	44%	29%
Very concerned	10%	14%	22%	6%	7%
n	206	133	122	16	14

Please answer the following questions related to outsourcing (contracting out to a third party to complete a service):

Nonprofit	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	3%	2%	95%	164
Financial aid offers	3%	2%	95%	163
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	1%	1%	98%	162
Verification	11%	3%	86%	167
Debt management	16%	0%	84%	160
Financial literacy	6%	1%	93%	161
Delinquency/default management	26%	1%	73%	164
Collections or Institutional Loans	48%	1%	52%	165
Grace/repayment loan counseling	17%	1%	83%	157
Loan reconciliation	1%	1%	98%	160
Policies and procedures	1%	2%	97%	164
Temporary staffing	5%	7%	88%	154
Record keeping/document storage	3%	1%	96%	162
Other (Please specify below.)	10%	14%	76%	21



Community Colleges	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	0%	2%	98%	107
Financial aid offers	0%	1%	99%	107
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	5%	6%	90%	108
Verification	11%	5%	84%	111
Debt management	19%	1%	80%	109
Financial literacy	11%	4%	85%	105
Delinquency/default management	54%	4%	41%	114
Collections or Institutional Loans	18%	2%	80%	99
Grace/repayment loan counseling	25%	1%	75%	106
Loan reconciliation	2%	1%	97%	107
Policies and procedures	0%	5%	95%	108
Temporary staffing	4%	2%	94%	97
Record keeping/document storage	2%	1%	97%	107
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

Public Four-Year	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	1%	1%	98%	99
Financial aid offers	5%	0%	95%	98
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	6%	3%	91%	99
Verification	15%	4%	81%	101
Debt management	20%	1%	79%	102
Financial literacy	14%	4%	83%	103
Delinquency/default management	20%	2%	78%	100
Collections or Institutional Loans	39%	2%	59%	94
Grace/repayment loan counseling	13%	1%	86%	96
Loan reconciliation	2%	0%	98%	98
Policies and procedures	1%	2%	97%	99
Temporary staffing	9%	7%	84%	98
Record keeping/document storage	7%	1%	92%	98
Other (Please specify below.)	8%	25%	67%	12

Proprietary	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	7%	0%	93%	15
Financial aid offers	7%	0%	93%	15
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	7%	7%	87%	15
Verification	20%	0%	80%	15
Debt management	6%	0%	94%	16
Financial literacy	0%	0%	100%	15
Delinquency/default management	13%	0%	88%	16
Collections or Institutional Loans	20%	0%	80%	15
Grace/repayment loan counseling	0%	0%	100%	15
Loan reconciliation	0%	0%	100%	15
Policies and procedures	0%	0%	100%	15
Temporary staffing	0%	8%	92%	13
Record keeping/document storage	0%	0%	100%	15
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

Graduate/Professional	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	0%	0%	100%	12
Financial aid offers	0%	0%	100%	12
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	0%	0%	100%	12
Verification	0%	0%	100%	12
Debt management	0%	0%	100%	12
Financial literacy	8%	8%	83%	12
Delinquency/default management	0%	0%	100%	12
Collections or Institutional Loans	27%	0%	73%	11
Grace/repayment loan counseling	17%	0%	83%	12
Loan reconciliation	0%	0%	100%	12
Policies and procedures	0%	0%	100%	12
Temporary staffing	0%	0%	100%	11
Record keeping/document storage	8%	0%	92%	12
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

	Nonprofit	Community Colleges	Public Four-Year	Proprietary	Graduate / Professional
Funding	58%	-	-	-	-
Institution's contracting / procurement policies	8%	-	-	-	-
Lack of confidence in the quality of an outside contractor's work	25%	-	-	-	-
Lack of time to coordinate or onboard services	25%	-	-	-	-
Overwhelmed by vendor choices	0%	-	-	-	-
Privacy concerns	17%	-	-	-	-
Don't know vendors	0%	-	-	-	-
Other (please specify below.)	33%	-	-	-	-
Total	12	-	-	-	-

## APPENDIX D: RESPONSES BY NASFAA REGION

How many **permanent positions** were there in your office during the following aid years, and of those how many were vacant?

EASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	89	79	9.84	9.40	7	7	121	121
Vacancies	0	0	17	8	0.77	1.39	0	1	119	119
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	17	8	2.24	2.63	1	2	41	63
MASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	39	38	8.24	7.98	6	6	126	126
Vacancies	0	0	6	5	0.72	1.09	0	1	119	124
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	6	5	2.00	2.11	2	2	43	64
RMASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	186	196	12.43	12.47	5	5	49	49
Vacancies	0	0	20	40	1.31	2.06	0	0.5	48	48
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	20	40	3.71	4.13	2	2	17	24
SASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	2	2	54	54	10.28	10.20	7	7	74	74
Vacancies	0	0	8	10	0.95	1.68	0	1	73	74
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	8	10	2.56	2.95	2	2	27	42

SWASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	98	95	9.63	9.54	6	6	68	68
Vacancies	0	0	12	10	1.09	1.24	0	0	68	68
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	12	10	3.08	2.63	2	2	24	32
WASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	34	34	9.92	9.92	9	9	79	79
Vacancies	0	0	9	9	0.94	1.48	1	1	79	79
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	9	9	1.85	2.39	1	2	40	49

How many **temporary positions** worked in your office during the following aid years?

EASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	15	12	0.36	0.44	0	0	120	120
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	15	12	2.05	1.89	1	1	21	28
MASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	3	4	0.12	0.17	0	0	122	123
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	3	4	1.25	1.62	1	1	12	13

RMASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	13	13	0.43	0.43	0	0	49	49
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	6	10	0.42	0.62	0	0	74	74
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	6	10	1.82	2.30	1	1	17	20
SWASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	4	14	0.27	0.43	0	0	67	67
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WASFAA	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	10	10	0.73	0.92	0	0	78	79
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	10	10	2.48	2.35	1	2	23	31



What role does temporary staffing have in your financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
We use it during high processing times	11%	24%	20%	17%	11%	16%
We began using it during COVID-19	4%	11%	13%	6%	7%	5%
We only use temporary staffing for leadership positions	4%	5%	3%	5%	0%	2%
We only use temporary staffing for support staff	11%	12%	29%	20%	13%	19%
My institution does not allow the use of temporary staffing	14%	9%	1%	9%	5%	9%
Temporary staffing at my institution does not fulfill my office needs	15%	19%	23%	9%	4%	7%
My office chooses not to use temporary staffing	55%	41%	38%	47%	71%	53%
n	103	99	69	64	56	43

During the following aid years, how many permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees left your institution's financial aid office for any of the following reasons?

2019-20

MASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	56%	23%	18%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	39
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	79%	16%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19
Retired	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	28
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	80%	0%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

EASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	54%	30%	11%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	37
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	75%	17%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Retired	86%	5%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	70%	20%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

WASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	71%	19%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	31
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	85%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13
Retired	82%	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

SASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	50%	34%	3%	6%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	32
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Retired	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

SWASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	52%	26%	13%	6%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	31
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	69%	23%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

RMAFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	Total
Resigned	60%	20%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	20
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

2020-21

MASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	51%	25%	11%	7%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	61
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	74%	21%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19
Retired	73%	14%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	77%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	13
Promoted	87%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

EASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	55%	22%	15%	7%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	55
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	78%	11%	0%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18
Retired	77%	13%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	31
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	81%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	16
Promoted	74%	21%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

WASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	62%	17%	12%	2%	5%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	42
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	75%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	12
Retired	87%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	70%	10%	10%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

SASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	28%	25%	13%	19%	3%	0%	3%	3%	3%	0%	3%	32
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15
Retired	83%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	67%	25%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Promoted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

SWASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	48%	14%	10%	14%	5%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	53%	35%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17
Retired	86%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	62%	23%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

RMAFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	61%	22%	4%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	23
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	60%	20%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	10
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promoted	62%	23%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approximately how many of those departures were COVID-19-related?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	n
MASFAA	0	8	1	60
EASFAA	0	4	0	57
WASFAA	0	2	0	40
SASFAA	0	6	1	42
SWASFAA	0	6	1	34
RMAFAA	0	5	1	28

What were some reasons permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees cited for transferring or resigning? (Check all that apply.)

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
Higher salary or better benefits in new/different position	80%	62%	73%	55%	71%	78%
Dislike of current workplace policies	18%	24%	27%	13%	10%	13%
Desire for permanent remote workplace	12%	24%	24%	26%	16%	17%
Family obligations	29%	31%	24%	26%	23%	22%
No longer desire to work in financial aid	33%	33%	33%	32%	35%	52%
No longer desire to work in higher education	10%	10%	12%	13%	16%	22%
Relocation	27%	21%	42%	32%	23%	22%
Furthering their education	6%	2%	0%	3%	10%	13%
Moved to a different office at the same institution	35%	19%	27%	21%	42%	35%
Left the workforce	12%	19%	12%	8%	16%	13%
Other (Please specify below.)	0%	2%	9%	11%	3%	4%
Total	49	42	33	38	31	23

How many positions did you fill during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years?

MASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Newly hired staff	25%	22%	18%	16%	6%	6%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	51
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

EASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Newly hired staff	35%	29%	19%	6%	8%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	52
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	18%	55%	9%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11

WASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Newly hired staff	25%	35%	20%	10%	5%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%	40
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	50%	14%	14%	7%	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14

SASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Newly hired staff	33%	19%	10%	19%	10%	5%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	42
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	64%	21%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14

SASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Newly hired staff	33%	19%	10%	19%	10%	5%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	42
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	64%	21%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14

RMASFAA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Newly hired staff	19%	26%	22%	11%	7%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4%	27
Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temporary staff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

How many positions did you have difficulty filling during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years due to COVID-19?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
0	32%	27%	26%	36%	29%	27%
1	18%	23%	26%	20%	11%	27%
2	22%	29%	23%	20%	23%	19%
3	8%	9%	10%	9%	11%	12%
4	8%	5%	3%	7%	0%	4%
5	3%	7%	5%	0%	11%	4%
6	5%	0%	5%	4%	6%	4%
7	2%	0%	0%	2%	3%	0%
8	2%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%
9	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
10	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
11+	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
n	60	56	39	45	35	26

How difficult was it to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
Very Difficult	33%	56%	44%	37%	43%	43%
Difficult	46%	32%	41%	43%	38%	50%
Easy	16%	8%	15%	13%	16%	7%
Very Easy	5%	3%	0%	7%	3%	0%
n	57	59	41	46	37	28



Why was it difficult to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff? (Check all that apply.)

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
We did not receive enough qualified applications	91%	85%	83%	86%	83%	88%
The pool of applicants we received were overqualified	13%	8%	3%	8%	3%	12%
The salary we offered was not competitive	76%	60%	51%	67%	80%	73%
Applicants cited a desire for permanent remote workplace	18%	37%	23%	31%	7%	15%
Due to remote work and COVID-19, our student worker pipeline was reduced	7%	4%	9%	14%	7%	12%
Our institution experienced a hiring freeze	20%	23%	23%	22%	30%	8%
Our institution experienced budget cuts that made filling positions difficult	22%	13%	26%	17%	23%	8%
Hiring process was delayed and we lost candidates	22%	31%	37%	28%	37%	31%
Hiring process was too time-intensive and we were unable to conduct searches for some/all vacant positions	9%	10%	14%	19%	10%	12%
Other (Please specify below.)	2%	8%	3%	6%	3%	0%
n	45	52	35	36	30	26

At the time you are completing this survey, how many vacant positions are there in your financial aid office? (Please include permanent and temporary positions.)

EASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	76	1.73	1	117
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	76	3.26	2	62
MASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	6	0.88	0	118
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	6	1.93	1	54
RMASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	22	1.55	1	44
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	22	2.96	2	23
SASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	1	1.54	1	68
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	14	2.76	2	38
SWASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	12	1.23	0	61
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	12	2.88	2	26
WASFAA	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	13	1.69	1	75
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	13	2.76	2	46

On average, how long have your currently vacant positions been unfilled?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
30 days	18%	6%	10%	12%	23%	21%
3 months	42%	39%	40%	43%	40%	41%
6 months	31%	32%	33%	27%	21%	26%
1 year	5%	11%	10%	4%	6%	3%
Longer than one year	4%	11%	7%	14%	9%	9%
n	78	79	58	49	47	34

Do you feel you have the staff and resources necessary to administer the financial aid programs in compliance with the administrative capability requirements outlined in section 668.16(b) of the Standards for Participation in Title IV, HEA Programs?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
Yes	63%	57%	58%	61%	63%	63%
No	37%	43%	42%	39%	37%	37%
n	119	114	77	74	65	46

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to be administratively capable?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
Very unconcerned	7%	4%	0%	3%	9%	18%
Slightly unconcerned	11%	6%	16%	21%	4%	6%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	7%	6%	0%	3%	4%	12%
Slightly concerned	52%	49%	53%	28%	61%	35%
Very concerned	23%	35%	31%	45%	22%	29%
n	44	49	32	29	23	17

How many **additional** positions do you feel your office needs to be adequately staffed?

EASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	7	2.28	2	48
MASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0.5	14	2.50	2	44
RMASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	6	2.53	2.5	16
SASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
1	5	2.29	2	29
SWASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
1	10	2.57	2	23
WASFAA				
Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
0	11	2.84	2	32

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to adequately serve your students?

	MASFAA	EASFAA	WASFAA	SASFAA	SWASFAA	RMASFAA
Very unconcerned	7%	13%	14%	19%	15%	9%
Slightly unconcerned	13%	9%	12%	16%	15%	20%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	29%	12%	12%	18%	26%	11%
Slightly concerned	45%	53%	44%	27%	32%	36%
Very concerned	7%	13%	18%	19%	12%	23%
n	118	113	77	73	66	44

Please answer the following questions related to outsourcing (contracting out to a third party to complete a service):

MASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	0%	1%	99%	99
Financial aid offers	2%	1%	97%	100
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	2%	3%	95%	99
Verification	5%	2%	93%	100
Debt management	14%	0%	86%	100
Financial literacy	7%	1%	92%	98
Delinquency/default management	24%	0%	76%	100
Collections or Institutional Loans	45%	2%	53%	97
Grace/repayment loan counseling	13%	1%	86%	97
Loan reconciliation	1%	0%	99%	98
Policies and procedures	0%	2%	98%	99
Temporary staffing	3%	4%	92%	90
Record keeping/document storage	4%	1%	95%	99
Other (Please specify below.)	20%	20%	60%	10

EASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	0%	1%	99%	99
Financial aid offers	2%	1%	97%	100
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	2%	3%	95%	99
Verification	5%	2%	93%	100
Debt management	14%	0%	86%	100
Financial literacy	7%	1%	92%	98
Delinquency/default management	24%	0%	76%	100
Collections or Institutional Loans	45%	2%	53%	97
Grace/repayment loan counseling	13%	1%	86%	97
Loan reconciliation	1%	0%	99%	98
Policies and procedures	0%	2%	98%	99
Temporary staffing	3%	4%	92%	90
Record keeping/document storage	4%	1%	95%	99
Other (Please specify below.)	20%	20%	60%	10

WASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	3%	2%	95%	60
Financial aid offers	3%	0%	97%	58
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	7%	3%	90%	60
Verification	12%	5%	83%	60
Debt management	19%	0%	81%	59
Financial literacy	5%	4%	91%	57
Delinquency/default management	31%	2%	67%	61
Collections or Institutional Loans	27%	2%	71%	56
Grace/repayment loan counseling	19%	2%	79%	57
Loan reconciliation	0%	2%	98%	59
Policies and procedures	0%	7%	93%	60
Temporary staffing	11%	4%	85%	55
Record keeping/document storage	0%	0%	100%	58
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-



SASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	3%	2%	95%	60
Financial aid offers	3%	0%	97%	58
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	7%	3%	90%	60
Verification	12%	5%	83%	60
Debt management	19%	0%	81%	59
Financial literacy	5%	4%	91%	57
Delinquency/default management	31%	2%	67%	61
Collections or Institutional Loans	27%	2%	71%	56
Grace/repayment loan counseling	19%	2%	79%	57
Loan reconciliation	0%	2%	98%	59
Policies and procedures	0%	7%	93%	60
Temporary staffing	11%	4%	85%	55
Record keeping/document storage	0%	0%	100%	58
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

SWASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	2%	2%	96%	53
Financial aid offers	4%	0%	96%	53
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	2%	0%	98%	53
Verification	11%	0%	89%	53
Debt management	28%	0%	72%	53
Financial literacy	15%	2%	83%	53
Delinquency/default management	45%	2%	53%	53
Collections or Institutional Loans	33%	0%	67%	49
Grace/repayment loan counseling	18%	0%	82%	50
Loan reconciliation	6%	0%	94%	52
Policies and procedures	2%	0%	98%	53
Temporary staffing	2%	4%	94%	47
Record keeping/document storage	2%	0%	98%	50
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

RMASFAA	My office outsourced this prior to March 2020	My office began outsourcing this after March 2020	My office does not outsource this area	n
Financial aid packaging	3%	5%	92%	38
Financial aid offers	8%	3%	89%	38
Call centers (Incoming/Returning Calls)	0%	0%	100%	37
Verification	13%	0%	87%	38
Debt management	16%	0%	84%	38
Financial literacy	13%	0%	87%	39
Delinquency/default management	43%	5%	53%	40
Collections or Institutional Loans	37%	0%	63%	35
Grace/repayment loan counseling	28%	0%	72%	36
Loan reconciliation	0%	0%	100%	37
Policies and procedures	0%	3%	97%	38
Temporary staffing	3%	6%	91%	34
Record keeping/document storage	3%	0%	97%	38
Other (Please specify below.)	-	-	-	-

## APPENDIX E: RESPONSE FOR MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTIONS

Institutions in this breakout have eligibility designations from the fiscal year 2021 U.S. Department of Education of Federal Eligibility Matrices found [here](#) or are designated as historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) or tribal colleges and universities (TCUs) in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

How many **permanent positions** were there in your office during the following aid years, and of those how many were vacant?

	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Total Positions	1	1	98	95	11.73	11.64	9	9	97	97
Vacancies	0	0	12	10	1.28	1.95	1	1	96	96
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	1	12	10	2.37	2.83	1	2	52	66

How many **temporary positions** worked in your office during the following aid years?

	Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Median		n	
	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21	19-20	20-21
Temporary Positions	0	0	7	10	0.55	0.72	0	0	96	96
Temporary Positions, Excluding zeros	1	1	7	10	1.83	2.16	1	1.5	29	32

What role does temporary staffing have in your financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

We use it during high processing times	20%
We began using it during COVID-19	8%
We only use temporary staffing for leadership positions	1%
We only use temporary staffing for support staff	30%
My institution does not allow the use of temporary staffing	2%
Temporary staffing at my institution does not fulfill my office needs	19%
My office chooses not to use temporary staffing	40%
n	83

During the following aid years, how many permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees left your institution's financial aid office for any of the following reasons?

2019-20

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20	11+	n
Resigned	50%	32%	9%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	34
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	19
Retired	81%	13%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16
Promoted	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11+	n
Resigned	48%	18%	9%	14%	5%	0%	0%	5%	2%	0%	0%	44
Transferred (Took a different position at the same institution)	63%	25%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16
Retired	88%	8%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	26
Terminated (Could include budget cuts or layoffs.)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11
Promoted	73%	13%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15
Deceased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approximately how many of those departures were COVID-19-related?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	n
0	3	0	49

What were some reasons permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) employees cited for transferring or resigning? (Check all that apply.)

Higher salary or better benefits in new/different position	70%
Dislike of current workplace policies	13%
Desire for permanent remote workplace	23%
Family obligations	35%
No longer desire to work in financial aid	28%
No longer desire to work in higher education	18%
Relocation	35%
Furthering their education	8%
Moved to a different office at the same institution	23%
Left the workforce	18%
Other (Please specify below.)	5%
n	40

How many positions did you fill during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years?

	Newly hired staff	Rehired staff (Does not include internal promotions)	Temporary staff
1	33%	-	53%
2	33%	-	24%
3	14%	-	6%
4	6%	-	12%
5	4%	-	0%
6	4%	-	6%
7	2%	-	0%
8	2%	-	0%
9	2%	-	0%
10	0%	-	0%
11+	0%	-	0%
n	49	-	17

How many positions did you have difficulty filling during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 award years due to COVID-19?

0	35%
1	12%
2	31%
3	6%
4	0%
5	8%
6	6%
7	0%
8	2%
9	0%
10	0%
11+	0%
n	51

How difficult was it to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff?

Very Difficult	38%
Difficult	42%
Easy	19%
Very Easy	2%
n	53



Why was it difficult to fill your vacant positions with qualified staff? (Check all that apply.)

We did not receive enough qualified applications	81%
The pool of applicants we received were overqualified	2%
The salary we offered was not competitive	57%
Applicants cited a desire for permanent remote workplace	19%
Due to remote work and COVID-19, our student worker pipeline was reduced	19%
Our institution experienced a hiring freeze	21%
Our institution experienced budget cuts that made filling positions difficult	29%
Hiring process was delayed and we lost candidates	45%
Hiring process was too time-intensive and we were unable to conduct searches for some/all vacant positions	26%
Other (Please specify below.)	7%
n	42

At the time you are completing this survey, how many vacant positions are there in your financial aid office? (Please include permanent and temporary positions.)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
Vacancies	0	13	1.78	1	96
Vacancies, Excluding zeros	1	13	2.76	2	62

On average, how long have your currently vacant positions been unfilled?

30 days	14%
3 months	38%
6 months	28%
1 year	7%
Longer than one year	13%
n	85

Do you feel you have the staff and resources necessary to administer the financial aid programs in compliance with the administrative capability requirements outlined in section 668.16(b) of the Standards for Participation in Title IV, HEA Programs?

Yes	53%
No	47%
n	97

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to be administratively capable?

Very unconcerned	7%
Slightly unconcerned	9%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	2%
Slightly concerned	52%
Very concerned	30%
n	46

How many additional positions do you feel your office needs to be adequately staffed?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	n
1	11	3.1	2.8	46

What is your level of concern about your school's ability to adequately serve your students?

Very unconcerned	7%
Slightly unconcerned	16%
Neither unconcerned or concerned	16%
Slightly concerned	44%
Very concerned	18%
n	96

## APPENDIX G: RESPONSES TO FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF NON-COMPLETERS

Please select the top reason why you were unable to submit a response to NASFAA’s recent survey on financial aid office staffing shortages:

My office is operating at a reduced staffing capacity and I did not have time to gather the information needed to complete this survey.	56%
My office is operating at full staffing capacity, and I did not have time to gather the information needed to complete this survey.	22%
My institution and/or I were not interested in the topic of this survey.	1%
My institution’s policies interfered with my ability to complete this survey.	0%
I have/had concerns about disclosing the information requested on the survey.	0%
I was unaware this survey was distributed.	10%
Other	10%
n	507

**The National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) provides professional development for financial aid administrators; advocates for public policies that increase student access and success; serves as a forum on student financial aid issues; and is committed to diversity throughout all activities.**

© 2022 National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

1801 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, SUITE 850  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-3606

202.785.0453 | fax 202.785.1487 | [WWW.NASFAA.ORG](http://WWW.NASFAA.ORG)