

July 24, 2001

TO: Dottie Kingsley  
FROM: Howard W. Bell, Jr.  
RE: NSLDS Analysis Review

I have reviewed the following documents connected with the proposed Management Analysis and Quality Assurance of the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS Analysis):

- 1) The Statement of Work (SOW)
- 2) The Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC) response to the SOW
- 3) The Summary of the National Student Loan Data System Data Quality Assessment completed by PwC in June 1999
- 4) An internal ED document entitled "Issues Involved in Conducting an NSLDS Verification Study"
- 5) A July 23, 2001 email from Linda Paulsen to a number of persons to include yourself.

In reviewing the above documents, I have tried to determine how the proposed study can be most effectively completed. To that end, I have the following questions related to this project:

- 1) What actions have been taken since 1999 to correct the inconsistency in the methodology used to account for consolidated loans?
- 2) What actions have been taken since 1999 to correct unrealistic payment years in the reinsurance payment file?
- 3) Will PwC have greater access now than it did in 1999, within NSLDS, to claim information and default timing information similar to that for defaulted loans being held by the GA?
- 4) Has the "NSLDS SSCR Data Flow Model" pilot been implemented as a full-scale program?
  - a) If not, why not?
  - b) If so, when was it implemented?
- 5) Have the following entities been consulted as to the NSLDS data problems they want to address as part of this analysis:
  - a) Financial Partners Channel?
  - b) Office of Post Secondary Education?
  - c) Budget Service unit of the Office of the Under Secretary?

- 6) Given the SOW and Linda Paulsen email, why does article 3.2.4 of the PwC response discuss spending time identifying additional management decisions for which the NSLDS data can be used?
- 7) Given the results of the June 1999 Quality Assessment and the Linda Paulsen email:
  - a) Why does article 3.2.6 not propose starting with the business rules used in 1999 for defining “high quality” data?
  - b) Why does article 3.2.7 not propose starting with the “percentage of the data” that was identified in 1999 as having to “be high quality in order for ED to make reliable management decisions”?