	complete	Mean	Predicted	Mice
hgc	0.062	0.050	0.062	0.060
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)
collegenot college grad	0.145	0.168	0.145	0.106
	(0.034)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.029)
tenure	0.050	0.038	0.050	0.043
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
I(tenure^2)	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
age	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
marriedsingle	-0.022	-0.027	-0.022	-0.019
	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.015)
(Intercept)	0.534	0.708	0.534	0.582
	(0.146)	(0.116)	(0.112)	(0.130)
Num.Obs.	1669	2229	2229	2229
R2	0.208	0.147	0.277	0.228
R2 Adj.	0.206	0.145	0.275	0.225
AIC	1179.9	1091.2	925.5	1621.3
BIC	1223.2	1136.8	971.1	1667.0
Log.Lik.	-581.936	-537.580	-454.737	-802.646
F	72.917	63.973	141.686	109.084

8 It looks like imputation methods vary in hgc hat magnitude with complete, predicted and Mice methods providing better estimates. One should avoid using the mean imputation as it results in a higher bias.

9 I'm currently using IPEDS in conjuction with other sources for covariates such as Census Bureau, BEA and SAIPE. The data panel made it possible to use Diff-in-Diff with fixed effects to study the impact of marijuana legalization on educational performance, fall enrollment for now. Other outcome to consider include admission, graduation , and completion rate or counts.