



# PRIOR PRIOR-YEAR TASK FORCE: IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY RESULTS



**NASFAA  
RESOURCES**

PUBLISHED JULY 2017



**NASFAA**

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

# Prior Prior-Year Task Force: Implementation Survey Results



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In May 2017 NASFAA, on behalf the Prior-Prior Year (PPY) Implementation Task Force, administered a survey to the primary contacts at NASFAA member institutions. This survey was designed to assess the implementation of PPY and Early FAFSA and allow the task force to deliver final recommendations on the evolution of Early FAFSA and PPY to ensure it is on sound footing going forward.

Our survey findings showed that for schools that provided admissions and/or financial aid application priority filing deadlines for 2016-17 and 2017-18, the overwhelming majority did not change their deadline. Schools that did change their priority deadlines indicated they did so to give students and their families more time to review aid offers. We also found under PPY and Early FAFSA, one-third of schools sent their merit (non-need-based) scholarship decisions with their offer of admission.

Several respondents indicated that despite sending out financial aid award letters much earlier than in previous years, they did not see students making their admissions decisions significantly earlier. The cause of this delayed decision-making is unknown, but could be the result of several factors including:

- Students waiting to receive offer letters from other institutions who chose not to or were unable to send their awards out earlier.
- Students taking more time to consider all their options.

A detailed analysis of the survey's results, including an analysis of 2016-17 and 2017-18 admissions and financial deadlines and need-based aid offers by institutional sector can be found below.

Overall, more than half of survey respondents indicated that they felt the implementation of PPY was generally successful overall, when excluding the unanticipated effects of the IRS Data Retrieval Tool (DRT) outage.

Questions regarding this report or our PPY Implementation Task Force may be directed to NASFAA's Policy Department at [policy@nasfaa.org](mailto:policy@nasfaa.org).

**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary:** ..... **1**  
    **Major findings from this survey:** ..... **3**  
**Overall Survey Findings:** ..... **5**  
**Selected Survey Findings, by Institutional Sector:** ..... **12**  
**Conclusion:** ..... **15**  
**Appendix: Survey Instrument** ..... **16**

## **MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THIS SURVEY:**

### **Deadlines:**

- Of schools that provided admissions and/or financial aid application priority filing deadlines for 2016-17 and 2017-18, the overwhelming majority did not change their deadline, averaging 94.13% and 81.18%, respectively.
- A sector breakdown of admissions and/or financial aid application priority filing deadlines for 2016-17 and 2017-18 yield some small but observable differences:
  - Ten percent of public 4-year and above institutions moved their admissions deadline or regular decision for first-year students one-month earlier, but only five percent of private 4-year and above institutions did so.
  - Twenty-one percent of private 4-year institutions moved their financial aid application priority filing deadline for regular first-year students 1- to 2-months earlier, whereas only 15 percent of 4-year and above public institutions did so.
  - Private 4-year institutions moved their financial aid application priority filing deadline earlier by 1- to 2-months for Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshman (10%), fall 2017 transfer students (13%), and continuing and returning students (18%). This was lower than public 4-year and above institutions who also moved their financial aid application priority filing deadline earlier by 1- to 2-months for Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshman (14%) and fall 2017 transfer students (15%). Twenty percent of both 4-year public and private institutions moved their deadlines earlier by 1- to 2-months for continuing and returning students.
  - Over 90 percent of 2-year or less than 2-year institutions did not change admissions and/or financial aid application priority deadlines for any of their student types.
- Nearly half (45%) of schools that set a financial aid application priority deadline indicated they did so to encourage timely applications for state grants or other purposes and that the deadline is rarely or never enforced in packaging aid, meaning students that apply after can still receive financial aid.
- More than half (62%) of institutions that moved up their priority filing deadlines indicated they did so to allow for earlier financial aid award letters.

### **Offers:**

- Schools that moved their financial aid offer dates to be earlier indicated they wanted to give students more time to review their aid offers (76%) or stay competitive because they believed their competition was moving their dates (68%).
- Of the schools that provided a date for the start of sending their need-based aid offers for 2016-17 and 2017-18, nearly half (average 45.84%) did not change the date. Those who reported changes mostly indicated a move from 1- to 3-months earlier, averaging between 16.7 percent and 14.06 percent.
  - Two-year or less than 2-year institutions saw the largest across-the-board move for starting to send out their need-based aid offers earlier for 2017-18. Nearly 40 percent of these schools reported being able to send out these offers 1- to 2-months earlier.
  - Private and public 4-year and above institutions also reported moving the date they send their need-based aid offers up 1- to 2-months by an average of 29 percent and 33 percent, respectively.
- One-third of all institutional sectors sent their merit (non-need-based) scholarship decisions with their offer of admission.

### **FAFSA Completion:**

- Half of respondents were unable to compare their Institutional Student Information Report (ISIR) data for the two award years. Among those that were able to do a comparison, nearly one-third (29%) indicated they had seen an increase in the number of Pell-eligible ISIRs received, with the median increase being 19 percent.

### **PPY Implementation:**

- More than half (61%) of institutions indicated that they felt the implementation of PPY was generally successful overall, when excluding the effects of the unanticipated IRS Data Retrieval Tool (DRT) outage.

### **Changes Experienced (Open-ended):**

- Respondents provided rich feedback in the open-ended comment section of the survey. When asked to describe changes in workload, timing, professional judgment requests (PJs), etc., the most common responses from institutions included:
  - An increase in the number of PJs received or the time to process individual PJs had increased
  - 399 codes (conflicting information) caused the most increased workload
  - That the financial aid office's workload had shifted, was more spread out, or changed in general due to PPY (including both positive and negative reactions to this change)

### **Issues Related to the DRT Outage (Open-ended):**

- Half of respondents indicated the accommodations made by the Department of Education (ED) helped with their processing, but 10 percent felt ED should have been more upfront or made accommodations earlier in the filing cycle.
- Twenty-seven percent indicated that there was confusion among students and families in general, related to verification, or related to filing their FAFSA after the outage.
- Thirty-five percent indicated that their verification workload increased or that the time to complete each verification increased.

### **Overall Impressions (Open-ended):**

- Forty-one percent of respondents left positive remarks about the move to PPY, with many indicating they felt it was a success, felt the change to PPY was beneficial to students, or that they could see the long-term benefits.
- Eighteen percent indicated they felt students and families had more time to make their decisions, but that they did not see the earlier decision-making they had expected.
- Twelve percent cited outside areas for remaining issues including moving up admissions deadlines and addressing the readiness of state and institutional grants to allow for earlier awarding.

## OVERALL SURVEY FINDINGS:

**Question 1:** In what month are/were your admission application deadlines for the following award years?

- 2016-17
- 2017-18

*Changes in admissions application deadlines from 2016-17 to 2017-18:*

		Earlier		
		Did not change	1 month	2 months
Regular Decision First Year ( <i>n=101</i> )	89.1%	5.9%	2.0%	0.0%
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshman ( <i>n=98</i> )	91.8%	4.1%	2%	2%
Fall 2017 Transfers ( <i>n=83</i> )	97.6%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%
Graduate Students ( <i>n=49</i> )	98.0%	2.0%	0%	0.0%

*Non-deadline Answers:*

	2016-18				2017-18			
	No deadlines	We do not have this population	We are a rolling admission school	n	No deadlines	We do not have this population	We are a rolling admission school	n
Regular Decision First Year	22.56%	4.88%	72.56%	164	22.84%	4.94%	72.22%	162
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen	22.50%	33.13%	44.38%	160	22.15%	32.91%	44.94%	158
Fall 2017 Transfers	27.53%	6.74%	65.73%	178	27.84%	6.82%	65.34%	176
Graduate Students	22.01%	40.19%	37.80%	209	20.77%	41.06%	38.16%	207

**Question 2:** In what month are/were your financial aid application priority filing deadlines for the following award years?

- 2016-17
- 2017-18

*Changes in financial aid application priority filing deadlines from 2016-17 to 2017-18:*

	Did not change	Earlier					
		1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	5 months	6 months
Regular Decision First Year ( <i>n</i> =198)	72.7%	8.1%	8.6%	8.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshman ( <i>n</i> =254)	79.5%	5.1%	4.3%	0.4%	0%	0.0%	0.4%
Fall 2017 Transfers ( <i>n</i> =256)	82.4%	4.7%	5.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Graduate Students ( <i>n</i> =254)	92.9%	2.4%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Continuing/Returning Students ( <i>n</i> =259)	78.4%	8.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%

*Non-deadline Answers:*

	2016-17			2017-18		
	No deadlines	We do not have this population	n	No deadlines	We do not have this population	n
Regular Decision First Year	83.33%	16.67%	60	83.87%	16.13%	62
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen	42.64%	57.38%	122	42.98%	57.02%	121
Fall 2017 Transfers	84.15%	15.85%	82	84.81%	15.19%	79
Graduate Students	53.76%	46.24%	186	54.01%	45.99%	187
Continuing/Returning Students	91.43%	8.57%	70	91.04%	8.96%	67

**Question 3:** Which of the following best describes your financial aid application priority filing date? (n=266)

This is a strict or mostly strict deadline for institutional aid after which students must appeal.	8.65%
This is our published date, but a later date is chosen to stop awarding institutional aid based upon available funds.	22.56%
This date is strictly to encourage applications for state grants or other purposes and is rarely or never enforced in packaging aid.	44.74%
We have no priority deadlines.	18.42%
Other	5.64%

Other answers include:

- Our deadlines pertain to campus-based aid.

**Question 4:** If your 2017-18 priority filing deadline for financial aid was earlier than your 2016-17 deadline, why did you make this change? (Check all that apply) (n=100)

To allow earlier financial aid award letters	62.00%
To align with state grant deadlines	17.00%
To align better with admissions deadlines	26.00%
To have information earlier to share with enrollment managers/admissions	22.00%
Other	27.00%

**Question 5:** If your 2017-18 financial aid offer date was earlier than your 2016-17 deadline, why did you make this change? (Check all that apply) (n=141)

To give students more time to review their financial aid offer	75.89%
To stay competitive or because I believe my competing institutions will move their dates	68.09%
I was asked to move by Admissions or my upper administration	27.66%
To align with scholarship notifications	14.89%
To allow more time for other financial aid/scholarships processing	21.20%
Other	11.35%

Other answers for questions 4 and 5 include:

- To give families more time to plan.



**Question 6:** When did you start sending need-based aid offers for the following award years?

*Changes in sending need-based aid offers from 2016-17 to 2017-18:*

	Did not change	Earlier					
		1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	5 months	6 months
Regular Decision First Year ( <i>n</i> =221)	31.7%	17.6%	19.5%	21.3%	8.1%	0%	0.5%
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshman ( <i>n</i> =144)	34.7%	18.8%	16.7%	22.2%	5.6%	0%	0.7%
Fall 2017 Transfers ( <i>n</i> =200)	43.5%	19.0%	14.0%	13.5%	6.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Graduate Students ( <i>n</i> =152)	59.3%	14.6%	9.8%	7.3%	6.5%	0%	0%
Continuing/Returning Students ( <i>n</i> =215)	60.0%	13.5%	13.0%	6.0%	4.2%	0%	0.5%

*Non-deadline answers:*

	2016-17			2017-18		
	No deadlines	We do not have this population	n	No deadlines	We do not have this population	n
Regular Decision First Year	54.17%	45.83%	24	54.55%	45.45%	22
Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen	21.28%	78.72%	94	21.74%	78.26%	92
Fall 2017 Transfers	65.00%	35.00%	40	63.16%	36.84%	38
Graduate Students	33.33%	66.67%	120	33.05%	66.95%	118
Continuing/Returning Students	85.19%	14.81%	27	85.19%	14.81%	27

**Question 7:** If your school has merit (non-need-based) scholarship programs, in what month did you send those decisions? (n=272)

With the offer of admission	33.82%
With the need-based aid decision	9.56%
With both the offer of admission and the need-based aid decision	12.13%
Separately from both the offer of admission and the need-based aid decision	26.47%
We have not sent these decisions yet	4.78%
We do not award merit scholarship programs	13.24%

**Question 8:** If you are able to compare the ISIRs your school received before March 1, 2016 for the 2016-17 award year, to those received before January 1, 2017 for the 2017-18 award year what has the approximate percentage change of Pell-eligible ISIRs you have received been? (n=266)

Percent increase	28.95%
Percent decrease	8.65%
No change	12.03%
Unable to get this information	50.38%

- Percentage increase:
  - Average: 46.86
  - Median: 19
- Percentage decrease:
  - Average 18.2
  - Median: 13

**Question 9:** Prior to the DRT outage, and excluding its effects as much as possible, describe any change in workload amounts, timing experienced by your office, or any change in professional judgment adjustments that has resulted from the implementation of PPY. (open-ended) (n=234)

The following themes emerged:

- Professional Judgment (PJ):
  - 35% Indicated there had been an increase in PJs received, or the time to process PJs has increased
  - 0% Indicated there had been an decrease in PJs received
  - 16% Indicated there had been no change in PJs received, that their institution had not yet started accepting PJs, or that there had been no change in volume but a change in timing or receiving and processing PJs.
- Verification:
  - 10% Indicated there had been an increase in verification or the time to process verifications had increased due to more/different requirements
  - 4% Indicated there had been a decrease in verification
  - 3% Indicated there had been no change in verification or they were unsure if there had been a change
  - 6% Indicated the verification process was easier or able to be started earlier

- Awarding Students:
  - 16% Indicated they could award students earlier
  - 2% Indicated they were unable or chose not to award students earlier
- FAFSA Completion:
  - 3% Indicated they received earlier FAFSA completions
  - 4% Indicated they received increased FAFSA completions
- Timing Changes:
  - 23% Indicated their office’s workload shifted, was more spread out, or changed in general due to PPY
  - 2% Indicated students took longer to accept their award
  - 1% Indicated students took longer to complete the verification process
- 15% Indicated they had experienced no changes, their workload had remained steady, or that they could not determine if there was a change yet.
- 25% Indicated 399 codes caused increase workload
- 8% Indicated students and/or families were confused for a variety of reasons
- 14% Indicated that working on two award years increased their office’s workload or made their work more difficult
- 3% Indicated that state funding, tuition prices, or other such factors were not ready in time to award students early. Some awarded students anyway, having to later make adjustments, and some chose to wait.

**Question 10:** Again excluding the effects of the DRT outage, overall, how would you characterize the implementation of PPY? (n=265)

Generally successful overall	61.51%
Somewhat successful	31.32%
Somewhat unsuccessful	4.15%
Very unsuccessful	3.02%
Total	100%

**Question 11:** Please describe the effect of the DRT outage and the accommodations made by ED on your workload and success answers above. (open-ended) (n=214)

The following themes emerged:

- Confusion for students and families:
  - 15% indicated students and/or families were generally confused
  - 7% indicated students and/or families were confused on how to complete the verification process
  - 5% indicated students and/or families were confused on how to file their FAFSA after the DRT outage
- ED Accommodations:
  - 50% indicated that the accommodations made by ED helped
  - 2% indicated that the accommodations made by ED did not help
  - 10% felt that ED should have been more upfront with the DRT outage announcement or should have made accommodations earlier in the cycle
- 17% indicated they did not experience any changes as a result of the DRT outage. Most attributed this to the fact that their priority filing date was before the outage began, so the bulk of their FAFSAs were already filed.
- 34% indicated that their workload increased or that the time to complete activities like verification increased.

- 5% indicated they were worried that the accommodations made by ED would result in confusion for future academic years.
- 2% indicated they felt that the end of the Quality Assurance Program may have caused their increased workload, in addition to the DRT outage.

**Question 12:** Please let us know your overall impression of the impact of moving to Early FAFSA/Prior-Prior Year and any remaining issues or questions NASFAA might address. If you have seen any change in your student yield you believe may be related to Early FAFSA/PPY please note it here along with any other comments. (Open-ended) (n=194)

The following themes emerged:

- 41% indicated that moving to PPY was successful and they had a good overall impression. Several mentioned they did not see a need to change to PPY and earlier FAFSA, but the overwhelming majority expressed success. 9% of respondents were unsure of their feelings on the switch to Early FAFSA/PPY as they felt it was too early to decide.
- Yield:
  - 14% indicated they saw no yield changes and/or it was too early to determine if there were any changes.
  - 8% indicated that there were positive yield changes.
  - Respondents across both groups felt this data might be better gauged mid-summer or Fall 2017.
- Student decision making:
  - 18% of respondents felt that the move gave students and families more advanced notice of the financial aid award. The results were mixed on whether or not this outcome was good, as many thought that students would make their decisions earlier. Several cited that students were still waiting until the May 1 deadline to “look for other offers,” ask more questions, or other answers.
- Outside factors
  - 6% indicated they felt that the admissions deadline needed to be revisited and should be moved up sooner or that research should look at how schools admissions deadlines may have changed.
  - 6% indicated that they were unable to send award letters out earlier because tuition and fees or room and board were not set in time, and/or state, and/or institution grants were not available in time.
- Misc:
  - 6% indicated that they would like to see better solutions for the cross-year awarding difficulties.
  - 4% indicated they felt that traditional underserved populations’ filing rates should be examined to ensure the benefits of Early FAFSA/PPY are reaching them as well.

## SELECTED SURVEY FINDINGS, BY INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR:

Note: the sample sizes in this section are small, as an overwhelming majority of institutions in each student type indicated that they were a rolling admissions school (for admission application deadline questions), did not have deadlines, or did not serve that population of students (for admissions application, financial aid, and need-based aid questions). To protect the privacy of respondent's sector information has not been included if less than five institutions responded.

*Changes in admissions application deadlines from 2016-17 to 2017-18, by student type and institutional sector:*

	Admissions, regular decision		
	Did not change	1 month	2 months
Two year or less (n=6)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=58)	93.1%	5.2%	1.7%
Public 4 years and above (n=29)	86.7%	10.0%	0.0%

	Admissions, early decision			
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months
Two year or less	-	-	-	-
Private 4 years and above (n=63)	88.9%	4.8%	3.2%	3.2%
Public 4 years and above (n=29)	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%

	Admissions, transfer decision		
	Did not change	1 month	2 months
Two year or less (n=5)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=48)	95.8%	2.1%	2.1%
Public 4 years and above (n=23)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

	Admissions, graduate decision	
	Did not change	1 month
Two year or less	-	-
Private 4 years and above (n=24)	95.8%	4.2%
Public 4 years and above (n=18)	100.0%	0.0%

Changes in financial aid application priority filing deadlines from 2016-17 to 2017-18, by student type and institutional sector:

	Priority deadline, regular decision				
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months
Two year or less (n=35)	91.4%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=95)	67.7%	11.5%	9.4%	9.4%	1.0%
Public 4 years and above (n=53)	66.7%	7.4%	7.4%	14.8%	1.9%

	Priority deadline, early decision				
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=56)	94.6%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%
Private 4 years and above (n=100)	74.6%	5.1%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Public 4 years and above (n=52)	72.9%	8.5%	5.1%	1.7%	0.0%

	Priority deadline, transfer decision					
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	6 months	12 months
Two year or less (n=55)	91.1%	1.8%	3.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=109)	79.5%	5.1%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	.9%
Public 4 years and above (n=56)	74.2%	8.1%	6.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%

	Priority deadline, graduate decision		
	Did not change	1 month	2 months
Two year or less (n=53)	98.10%	1.90%	0.00%
Private 4 years and above (n=115)	94.00%	1.70%	3.40%
Public 4 years and above (n=58)	83.90%	4.80%	4.80%

	Priority deadline, continuing & returning decision					
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	5 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=54)	90.9%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
Private 4 years and above (n=111)	74.8%	10.9%	6.7%	0.0%	.8%	0.0%
Public 4 years and above (n=55)	69.4%	9.7%	8.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%

Changes in sending need-based aid offers from 2016-17 to 2017-18, by student type and institutional sector:

	Need-based aid, regular decision					
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=43)	45.5%	20.5%	25.0%	4.5%	2.3%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=114)	34.2%	16.7%	15.8%	22.8%	9.6%	.9%
Public 4 years and above (n=58)	16.7%	18.3%	23.3%	30.0%	8.3%	0.0%

	Need-based aid, early decision					
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=20)	38.1%	23.8%	23.8%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=82)	40.2%	17.1%	13.4%	22.0%	6.1%	1.2%
Public 4 years and above (n=40)	22.0%	19.5%	19.5%	29.3%	7.3%	0.0%

	Need-based aid, transfer decision						
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	5 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=36)	51.4%	18.9%	18.9%	5.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=103)	42.7%	18.4%	13.6%	15.5%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%
Public 4 years and above (n=54)	41.4%	20.7%	12.1%	13.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%

	Need-based aid, graduate decision				
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months
Two year or less	-	-	-	-	-
Private 4 years and above (n=64)	60.6%	16.7%	9.1%	4.5%	6.1%
Public 4 years and above (n=50)	56.9%	11.8%	11.8%	9.8%	7.8%

	Need-based aid, continuing & returning decision					
	Did not change	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	6 months
Two year or less (n=41)	54.8%	14.3%	19.0%	7.1%	2.4%	0.0%
Private 4 years and above (n=104)	61.7%	13.1%	12.1%	4.7%	4.7%	.9%
Public 4 years and above (n=58)	58.3%	13.3%	11.7%	8.3%	5.0%	0.0%

## **CONCLUSION:**

While the survey data provide great insight to the first year of Early FAFSA and PPY, NASFAA recognizes that an implementation of such scope will take several years. To that end, it will not be possible to fully assess the effectiveness of both Early FAFSA and PPY until both have been in place for several years. From a policy standpoint, NASFAA, along with the broader Washington, D.C. policy community, will continue to monitor the implementation process, and will remain engaged in efforts to gather feedback and address any acute issues that may arise.

In particular, over time, we hope to learn more about the impact of Early FAFSA and PPY on:

- Low-income students
- Overall FAFSA application numbers
- Admissions and financial aid deadlines
- Administrative burden to students and financial offices

NASFAA's Policy Team welcomes any feedback, questions, or concerns related to Early FAFSA and PPY. Please contact [policy@nasfaa.org](mailto:policy@nasfaa.org).



## APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**Question 1)** In what month are/were your admission application deadlines for the following award years?

2016-17 Award Year

2017-18 Award Year

Regular Decision

First Year Early

Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen

Fall 2017 Transfers

Graduate Students

Answer choices for each column will be:

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December
- No deadlines
- We do not have this population
- We are a rolling admissions school

**Question 2)** In what month are/were your financial aid application priority filing deadlines for the following award years?

2016-17 Award Year

2017-18 Award Year

Regular Decision

First Year Early

Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen

Fall 2017 Transfers

Graduate Students

Answer choices for each column will be:

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December
- No deadlines
- We do not have this population

**Question 3)** Which of the following best describes your financial aid application priority filing date?

- This is a strict or mostly strict deadline for institutional aid after which students must appeal.
- This is our published date, but a later date is chosen to stop awarding institutional aid based upon available funds.
- This date is strictly to encourage applications for state grant or other purposes and is rarely or never enforced in packaging aid.
- We have no priority deadlines.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Question 4)** If your 2017-18 priority filing deadline for financial aid was earlier than your 2016-17 deadline, why did you make this change? (Check all that apply)

- To allow earlier financial aid award letters
- To align with state grant deadlines
- To align better with admissions deadlines
- To have information earlier to share with enrollment managers/admissions
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Question 5)** If your 2017-18 financial aid offer date was earlier than your 2016-17 deadline, why did you make this change? (Check all that apply)

- To give students more time to review their financial aid offer
- To stay competitive or because I believe my competing institutions will move their dates
- I was asked to move by Admissions or my upper administration
- To align with scholarship notifications
- To allow more time for other financial aid/scholarships processing
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Question 6)** When did you start sending need-based aid offers for the following award years?

	2016-17 Award Year	2017-18 Award Year
Regular Decision		
First Year Early Admission/Decision/Action Freshmen		
Fall 2017 Transfers		
Graduate Students		

Answer choices for each column will be:

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December
- No deadlines
- We do not have this population

**Question 7)** If your school has merit (non-need-based) scholarship programs, in what month did you send those decisions?

- With the offer of admission
- With the need-based aid decision
- With both the offer of admission and the need-based aid decision
- Separately from both the offer of admission and the need-based aid decision
- We have not set these decisions yet
- We do not award merit scholarship programs

**Question 8)** If you are able to compare the ISIRs your school received before March 1, 2016 for the 2016-17 award year, to those received before January 1, 2017 for the 2017-18 award year what has the approximate percentage change of Pell Eligible ISIRs you have received been.

Please enter whole numbers only, do not use a decimal point (.) or percentage sign (%).

- Percent increase \_\_\_\_\_
- Percent decrease \_\_\_\_\_
- No change
- Unable to get this information

**Question 9)** Prior to the DRT outage, and excluding its effects as much as possible, describe any change in workload amounts, timing experienced by your office, or any change in professional judgment adjustments that has resulted from the implementation of PPY. (Open-ended)

**Question 10)** Again excluding the effects of the DRT outage, overall, how would you characterize the implementation of PPY?

- Generally successful overall
- Somewhat successful
- Somewhat unsuccessful
- Very unsuccessful

**Question 11)** Please describe the effect of the DRT outage and the accommodations made by ED on your workload and success answers above? (Open-ended)

**Question 12)** Please let us know your overall impression of the impact of moving to Early FAFSA/Prior Prior Year and any remaining issues or questions NASFAA might address. If you have seen any change in your student yield you believe may be related to Early FAFSA/PPY please note it here along with any other comments. (Open-ended)



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)