

BEYOND NEED AND MERIT

Strengthening State Grant Programs



Getty, Peter Glass

Brookings Institution State Grant Aid Study Group

Sandy Baum, Chair
David W. Breneman
Matthew M. Chingos
Ronald G. Ehrenberg
Pamela Fowler
John Hayek
Donald E. Heller

Allison G. Jones
David A. Longanecker
Tim Nesbitt
Judith Scott-Clayton
Sarah E. Turner
Jane V. Wellman
Grover "Russ" Whitehurst

Sandy Baum, Chair
Senior Fellow, George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development

David W. Breneman
University Professor and Newton and Rita Meyers Professor of Economics of Education, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia

Matthew M. Chingos
Fellow in Governance Studies and Research Director of the Brown Center on Education Policy, Brookings Institution

Ronald G. Ehrenberg
I.M. Ives Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics, Cornell University

Pamela Fowler
Executive Financial Aid Director, University of Michigan

John Hayek
Vice President, Finance, Planning, and Performance, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education

Donald E. Heller
Dean, College of Education, Michigan State University

Recent increases in tuition levels, accelerated by declining state funding to institutions, have combined with stagnant or falling household incomes to make it more difficult for many college students to finance postsecondary education. In this environment, state grant programs are more important than ever. These funds have the potential to make college possible for many students who could not otherwise afford to enroll.

For these dollars to make as much difference as possible in the lives of students and in the future of state economies, state grant programs must be designed to produce the largest possible return on taxpayers' investment. In this report we examine the variety of state grant programs currently in place and make policy recommendations based on the best available research.

No one model would be optimal for all states. The characteristics of the population and the circumstances in each state make the appropriate trade-offs different for different states. But these programs share one central goal—increasing the educational attainment of the state's citizens. States should use their scarce resources more effectively by designing grant programs that are most likely to affect students' odds of enrolling in and completing college.

We propose moving away from the dichotomy between “need-based” and “merit-based” aid and instead designing programs that integrate targeting of students with financial need with appropriate expectations and support for college success. Specifically, we recommend that states:

1. *Focus resources on students whose chances of enrolling and succeeding in college will be most improved by the receipt of state support.*
2. *Consolidate and simplify programs in order to make them easily understood by prospective college students and their families.*
3. *Design programs so that they not only help students gain access to college but also encourage success after they arrive.*

Help students with financial need

- To maximize the impact of their financial aid programs, states should do a better job of targeting aid dollars at students whose potential to succeed is most constrained by limited resources.
- Students whose options are constrained by limited resources are most likely to be affected by state grant awards—in terms of both their ability to attend college and the likelihood that they will graduate.

Allison G. Jones
Senior Fellow for
Postsecondary
Engagement, Achieve

David A. Longanecker
President, Western
Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

Tim Nesbitt
Former Chief of Staff,
State of Oregon
Governor's Office

Judith Scott-Clayton
Assistant Professor in
Economics and
Education, Teachers
College, Columbia
University

Sarah E. Turner
University Professor of
Economics and
Education, University of
Virginia

Jane V. Wellman
Executive Director,
National Association of
System Heads

Grover J. Whitehurst
Senior Fellow in
Governance Studies and
Director of the Brown
Center on Education
Policy, Brookings
Institution

*Exceptional research
support was provided by
Charlie Kurose and
Sarah Whitfield.*

Consolidate and simplify

- States should consolidate programs to make the system simpler and easier for prospective students and their families to understand and navigate.
- Programs can be better targeted but still relatively simple. Look-up tables like those that would base grant eligibility only on income and family size might serve as a model.
- States should welcome federal simplification efforts and should resist any temptation to collect additional data—restoring complication even as the federal government reduces it.
- States should create a single net-price calculator that students can use to calculate the cost of attendance at every public institution in the state.

Design programs that encourage timely completion

- To encourage on-time degree attainment, state grant programs should reward concrete accomplishments such as the completion of credit hours.
- Academic requirements embodied in state grant programs should provide meaningful incentives for success in college; they should not be focused exclusively on past achievement or be so high as to exclude students on the margin of college access and success.
- States should provide second chances for students who lose funding because they do not meet targets the first time around.

Improving state grant programs in difficult financial times

- Rationing funds is unavoidable and there may be no good options under these circumstances, but some choices are worse than others. Providing assistance to those who apply early and denying aid to those who apply after the money has run out is quite arbitrary, particularly if an application deadline cannot be specified in advance.
- States under pressure to reduce their budgets quickly could lower income limits; cut grants for all recipients, with the neediest students losing the least; or build more incentives for college completion into their programs.
- States should use this time of financial exigency to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of existing grant programs and put in place systems for periodic review of these programs.
- In addition to tweaking their existing programs, states should test and evaluate innovative approaches. A pilot program found to be very successful could then be scaled up and replace another program found to be less effective.

Introduction

Recent increases in tuition levels, accelerated by declining state funding to institutions, have combined with stagnant or falling household incomes to make it more difficult for many college students to finance postsecondary education.¹ In this environment, state grant programs are more important than ever. Although they constitute only about 12% of state funding for higher education, with most state dollars funding institutions, the dollars spent on grant aid to students have the potential to make college possible for many students who could not otherwise afford to enroll.²

State governments provided \$9.2 billion in grant aid for students in 2010-11.³ For these dollars to make as much difference as possible in the lives of students and in the future of state economies, state grant programs must be well-designed. In this report we examine the variety of state grant programs currently in place and make policy recommendations based on the best available evidence.

Funding for higher education makes up about 10% of total state expenditures, following Medicaid (22%) and elementary/secondary education (21%) in size.⁴ Several factors in addition to the size of this budget item contribute to the vulnerability of higher education funding when the economy is weak. States that increase the educational attainment of their citizens will eventually reap the rewards of stronger economies and increased tax revenues—not to mention other benefits such as reduced income inequality and reduced spending on social support programs—but the benefits of these investments will not be immediately realized.⁵ Moreover, while there is nowhere else to turn to fund most other areas of state budgets, parents and students can be asked to shoulder a larger portion of the costs of higher education. State appropriations declined, in inflation-adjusted terms, from \$85 billion to \$79 billion between 2007-08 and 2010-11—a decrease from \$8,700 to \$7,100 per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. Over this three-year period, funding for state grant aid increased from \$8.4 billion to \$9.2 billion.⁶

States vary widely in their populations, economies, and priorities. Some face rapidly growing populations of students from groups traditionally under-represented in higher education. Others face a declining manufacturing base and an aging population. As shown in Appendix A, overall educational attainment varies dramatically across states, with the percentage of adults holding a BA ranging from 17% in West Virginia to 38% in Massachusetts and 47% in Washington, DC. Appendix A also reveals that in some states, a large number of students enroll in out-of-state colleges. In others, enrolling in the state public universities is the path taken by the vast majority of high school graduates who continue their educations.

It is clear that there is no single best grant program that should be adopted by every state. But these programs share one central goal—increasing the

educational attainment of the state’s citizens. States could use their increasingly scarce resources more effectively by designing grant programs that are most likely to affect students’ odds of enrolling in and completing college. This can be accomplished by moving away from the traditional dichotomy between “need-based” and “merit-based” aid. Instead, states should design programs that integrate targeting of students with financial need with appropriate expectations and support for college success. State grant policies should be designed deliberately, with attention to the interaction of state appropriations for the operation of postsecondary institutions, the setting of tuition, and the provision of grant aid.

Specifically, we recommend that states:

- 1) Focus resources on students whose chances of enrolling and succeeding in college will be most improved by the receipt of state support.**
- 2) Consolidate and simplify programs in order to make them easily understood by prospective college students and their families.**
- 3) Design programs so that they not only help students gain access to college but also encourage success after they arrive.**

We detail these policy recommendations below, discussing the challenge of balancing sometimes conflicting program strengths, but first provide some background on state support for higher education.

Background: State support for higher education

States vary significantly in their overall approach to funding higher education. Some states provide relatively little support to institutions, concentrating their efforts more on providing grants to individual students. Other states work to keep tuition low and provide minimal grant aid. And of course, there are states that do not rank well by either measure.

Table 1 provides some examples of different subsidy patterns (similar data for all states are included in Appendix A). New Hampshire has the highest public four-year college tuition in the country and provides very little state grant aid. New Jersey has relatively high tuition, but provides generous need-based grant aid. Louisiana has low tuition for in-state students and provides generous state grant aid, but almost all of it is distributed without regard to financial circumstances. Alaska has relatively low tuition, but provides very little state grant aid.

States also vary widely in how much support they provide to their postsecondary institutions, ranging from 3% of operating expenses in Colorado and 10% in Vermont, to 45% in Nevada and 56% in Wyoming (see Appendix A). Despite growing concerns over declining state appropriations per student, it is

States could use their increasingly scarce resources more effectively by designing grant programs that are most likely to affect students’ odds of enrolling in and completing college.

clear that students would pay much more for their college educations if these appropriations did not subsidize tuition across the board for students enrolling in colleges and universities in their home states.

Table 1. Published Tuition and Fees and State Grant Aid (2009–10), Selected States

	Tuition and Fees: Public Four-Year Institutions	Average State Grant Aid per FTE Student	Percent of State Grant Aid Based on Financial Circumstances	
Nation	\$7,050	\$627	73%	
Alaska	\$4,922	\$44	100%	Low tuition / low aid
Utah	\$4,573	\$55	53%	Low tuition / low aid
New Hampshire	\$11,075	\$71	100%	High tuition / low aid
Michigan	\$9,761	\$108	95%	High tuition / low aid
Louisiana	\$4,282	\$883	16%	Low tuition / high aid
West Virginia	\$4,980	\$1,076	44%	Low tuition / high aid
New Jersey	\$11,133	\$1,205	93%	High tuition/ high aid
South Carolina	\$9,520	\$1,780	19%	High tuition / high aid

Sources: The College Board, *Trends in College Pricing 2011*; NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009–10.

Note: Because of limited data availability, the calculation of average grant per student includes both in-state and out-of-state students. However, only state residents are eligible for state grant program.

State grant aid, the focus of this report, allows states to charge different prices to different students enrolling in the same institution. Some states charge different prices depending on ability to pay, while others use academic credentials as the basis for determining different prices for different students. As recently as 1992-93, 90% of state grant funds were allocated at least partially on the basis of financial circumstances. Now that proportion is closer to 70%.⁷

There has been an upward trend over time in state support of grant programs, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of state funds devoted to higher education. Table 2 shows that total grant dollars (adjusted for inflation) more than quadrupled between 1980-81 and 2010-11, and over the same period rose from a 4% share of state spending on postsecondary education to a 12% share. These trends partly reflect the initiation of new programs. At least 13 states have enacted large-scale, non-need-based grant programs in the last two decades.⁸ But states are also spending about three times as much (after adjusting for inflation), and about 1.6 times as much per student, on need-based grant aid as they were 30 years ago.⁹

There is no typical state grant program. A comprehensive list of these programs, created from data published by the National Association of State

Beyond Need and Merit: Strengthening State Grant Programs

Student Grant and Aid Programs and included in Appendix B, reveals wide variation both across states and among programs within states. Some states have many such programs, adopted over the years, with divergent goals and varying (or unknown) efficacy. For example, North Carolina has several large grant programs and a number of smaller ones. The state has recently consolidated two grant programs directed at students enrolled in private nonprofit colleges and is considering merging three programs now serving students at community colleges and public universities. Several programs providing funds for distribution by campuses would not be affected. The largest of Virginia’s grant programs, the Virginia Commonwealth Award, accounts for a little more than 20% of the state grant funds. Two other programs each account for just under 20% and there are a number of smaller programs. In contrast, New Jersey’s Tuition Aid Grant program distributes close to 85% of all funds, but there are a number of other small programs.

Table 2. Total State Grant Aid and Total State Fiscal Support (Billions of 2010 Dollars), 1980–81 to 2010–11

	Total State Grant Aid	Total Fiscal Support	Grant Aid as Percent of Total
1980-81	\$2.1	\$55.3	3.8%
1985-86	\$2.7	\$61.8	4.3%
1990-91	\$3.1	\$66.6	4.7%
1995-96	\$4.3	\$63.4	6.8%
2000-01	\$6.0	\$76.5	7.9%
2005-06	\$7.6	\$78.4	9.7%
2010-11	\$9.2	\$78.9	11.7%

Sources: The College Board, *Trends in Student Aid 2011* ; Illinois State University Grapevine Data.

Many states that have only one grant program provide very low levels of aid. Compared to a national average of \$627 per undergraduate FTE student in 2009-10, Alaska averaged \$44, and New Hampshire \$71 per student. But Pennsylvania distributed nearly all of its \$742 of grant aid per FTE student through the Pennsylvania State Grant Program, despite the existence of at least one other very small program.

About twenty states consider financial circumstances in distributing all of their aid, with the possible exception of relatively small special purpose programs, while about thirty have at least one general aid program that focuses exclusively on academic achievement, although in most of these states less than half of the aid falls into this category. Georgia and South Carolina provide more

grant aid per student than any other states, but consider financial circumstances for a small percentage of their grant dollars.¹⁰

Some states have an almost equal mix of aid that is “need-based” and aid that

Financial and Academic Criteria

The idea of distinguishing between “need-based” and “merit-based” aid is well-established. States whose primary goal is to help low-income students overcome financial barriers to postsecondary education frequently design programs with strict financial eligibility criteria and minimal requirements for academic achievement. States concerned about keeping talented students in-state or rewarding academic achievement frequently provide aid only to students who performed well in high school. Some states use both academic and financial criteria to distribute their awards, but combining the targeting of financial need with expectations for meaningful but realistic academic progress in college — as recommended in this report — is not a common practice.

Some examples of these different approaches:

- The Illinois Monetary Assistance Program (MAP) and the Connecticut Aid for Public College Students and Independent College Student Grant Programs are based only on financial need.
- The Louisiana Taylor Opportunity Program for Students (TOPS) and the Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program base eligibility entirely on high school grades and test scores.
- Some of California’s Cal Grants require both financial need and relatively strong high school records. The same is true of the South Carolina Tuition Grant program.

is not. West Virginia and Kentucky, both of which provided over \$1,000 of aid per FTE student in 2009-10, are in this category, as is Utah, which provided about \$55 per student. West Virginia’s Promise Scholarship Program awards up to \$4,750 to students who graduate from high school with at least a 3.0 GPA and meet standardized test requirements. In contrast, the West Virginia Higher Education Grant Program awards its funds to low- and moderate-income students. Kentucky has a large merit-based program and separate need-based programs for public and private institutions.¹¹

Some state grant programs combine academic criteria with financial circumstances to determine eligibility. About one-third of state grants fall into this category.¹² For example, California’s Cal Grant A program requires both financial need and a qualifying grade point average and Hawaii’s B Plus Scholarship Program also relies on both financial and academic criteria. Oklahoma’s Promise (OHLAP) Program promises tuition payments to students

from low-income families who take specified courses in high school and maintain a 2.5 GPA.

As the inventory of grant programs in Appendix B shows, states have very different approaches to their grant programs. Some of these differences surely reflect the different circumstances faced by states. But others likely result from the historical accumulation of well-intentioned but poorly designed programs. States that have the necessary political will can do a much better job of providing financial assistance to their college students. We next detail exactly how they can do that.

Help students with financial need

States should do a better job of targeting aid at students with financial need if they want their dollars to have the biggest impact on educational attainment. Students whose options are constrained by limited resources are most likely to be affected by state grant awards—both in terms of their ability to attend college and the likelihood that they will graduate. If a state’s aim is to enable more students to attend and complete college, it should focus on students who have the potential to succeed but are least likely to be able to afford college in the absence of additional support.

Many states do not follow this approach. For example, 35% of dependent recipients of Louisiana state grants in 2009-10 were from families with incomes above \$80,000.¹³ These students received 45% of all state grant funds, while median household income in the state was \$45,433.¹⁴ In Georgia, 64% of students from the highest income quartile received an average of \$2,900 in state grant aid in 2007-08, while 54% of those from the lowest income quartile received an average of to \$1,800.¹⁵

The importance of targeting grant aid to students with high financial need is supported by a large body of research showing that lower-income students are most sensitive to the price of college. Donald Heller provides a compelling summary of this evidence in his 1997 and 2001 reviews of the relevant research.¹⁶ A recent study of graduation rates at public universities found that the graduation rates of lower-income students are associated with the net price charged by flagship universities, whereas the graduation rates of higher-income students are not.¹⁷

Although low- and moderate-income students face the biggest barriers to postsecondary enrollment and success, rapid rises in tuition levels in many states in recent years have made consideration of financial accessibility for middle-income students an important issue. Targeting of aid does not necessarily imply restricting aid to Pell Grant recipients. Median income for families with parents ages 45-54 was about \$75,000 in 2010, considerably higher than the limit for Pell Grant eligibility.¹⁸ Need-based aid programs in states such as Minnesota and

Students whose options are constrained by limited resources are most likely to be affected by state grant awards—both in terms of their ability to attend college and the likelihood that they will graduate.

Missouri subsidize students farther up the income scale than Pell Grants.¹⁹ It is important to distinguish between these programs and those that, ignoring financial circumstances, provide significant portions of their funding to those in the upper portions of the income distribution.

In order to effectively create opportunities, state grant aid—in combination with aid from the federal government and other sources—must be generous enough to make postsecondary study feasible for low- and moderate-income students. The adequacy of grant aid depends, of course, on the tuition and fees charged at public colleges and universities in the state. Given household income levels, states with higher tuition and fee levels require more generous grant programs in order to keep their institutions financially accessible.

The adequacy of state grant programs also depends on institutional grant programs at public colleges and universities in the state. In 2007-08, undergraduate students enrolled in public two-year and four-year institutions received about \$5.4 billion in state grant aid and \$5.7 billion in institutional grant aid.²⁰ Institutional aid funds are generally more available at flagship universities, particularly those with healthy endowments, than at broader access comprehensive universities, which serve less affluent student bodies. Considering the optimal blend of state aid and institutional aid is beyond the scope of this report, but clearly states need to think about the dovetailing of the two types of state-funded aid in order to properly judge the adequacy and targeting of state grant funds. Institutional grant programs focused on improving the academic profile of the student body rather than meeting financial need are likely to work at cross purposes to well-designed state grant programs designed to increase educational attainment.²¹

States seeking to better target their financial aid programs would also do well to look outside the population of traditional college students. Most state grant programs were designed with 18- to 24-year-old college students in mind. These students enroll in college shortly after completing high school and frequently receive financial assistance from their parents, whose financial circumstances determine their ability to pay. Many states limit their grant programs to traditional age students or to those enrolled full-time.²² For example, the TEXAS Grant program requires that students enroll in college within 16 months after high school graduation and the All Iowa Opportunity Scholarship is available only to students taking college courses within two years of high school graduation.²³

Enrolling full-time in college immediately after high school increases the probability of completing a degree, so embedding into grant programs the expectation that students will follow this pattern may be constructive.²⁴ The current reality, however, is that 39 percent of postsecondary students are over the age of 24 and 38 percent are enrolled part-time.²⁵ In 2009-10, 24% of federal Pell Grant recipients were over the age of 30.²⁶ There is broad consensus

that significant increases in the proportion of adults in the U.S. with postsecondary credentials will require many adults to return to and succeed in school.

The different goals and circumstances of older students may make separate programs—or at least separate program characteristics—appropriate. There might, for example, be differences in the maximum award levels, in the criteria for eligibility, or in the length of time for which students are eligible. Some states

Tuition Set-Aside Grant Programs

A number of states have “tuition set-aside” programs that require public institutions to use a portion of their tuition revenues for grant aid to individual students. These policies are frequently designed to prevent tuition increases from putting enrollment out of reach for low-income students. These grants are usually—but not always—allocated based on financial circumstances.

Public institutions receive some of their revenues from state appropriations and some from tuition. Even students who do not receive financial aid generally pay much less than the cost of their education, benefitting from state subsidies. It is not really possible to separate out which institutional expenditures come from tuition revenues and which from state funds. Policy makers think of tuition set-aside grants as coming from tuition dollars and do not count them as state grant programs. But from the students’ perspective, these funds are equivalent to state grant aid.

For example:

- Texas law requires that a portion of tuition beyond a certain level charged to Texas residents be devoted to financial aid.
- The Iowa Tuition Grant Program funds only students enrolled in private institutions. Public university students receive state financial aid only through the tuition set-aside program.
- University of North Carolina campuses are required by the state to set aside a portion of new tuition revenues for need-based aid.

These grant programs are viewed as coming from institutions. They generate political opposition because they appear to involve some students subsidizing other students. In reality, all of the in-state students enrolled in public institutions are paying less than the cost of their education. They are being subsidized by state appropriations—some students just receive larger subsidies than others.

Students would benefit if all of their funding from the state came through one program, with a clear and predictable award.

may decide to separate funding for narrow job training from funding for broad undergraduate education. The Iowa Vocational-Technical Tuition Grant and the Kansas Vocational Education Scholarship Program fund only students in vocational programs. Integration of student aid with other income support programs such as TANF, Trade Assistance Act, or Workforce Investment Act funds for which these students may be eligible can make the dollars go farther.

Despite the challenges they face, non-traditional students—many of whom have already accumulated college credits—represent an opportunity for the state to augment its pool of college graduates. Supporting the students in this population who have the motivation, circumstances, and preparation for success is likely to have a significant pay-off even if this requires distinct program design. This design should acknowledge the barriers many of these students face, including the impracticality of enrolling full-time, while embodying strong expectations for academic progress.

Consolidate and simplify

The system of student aid is too complicated, a well-known fact that is receiving serious attention from policymakers. Students have to navigate their way through financial aid information at the federal, state, and institutional levels. On top of that, as described above, many states have a variety of state grant programs, each with slightly different names, purposes, and conditions. The application process can be complicated and it is frequently difficult for students to predict in advance how much aid they will receive. For state grants, this is sometimes the result of uncertainty in the state budget. There is no substitute for diminishing the impact of state budget cycles on annual higher education funding levels and making both tuition and aid levels more predictable. But the complexities of grant eligibility formulas exacerbate the problem and could more easily be eliminated.

Unfortunately, the goal of simplification frequently conflicts with the goal of targeting. The broad-based merit-aid programs, such as those in Louisiana and Georgia described above, have the advantage that that they are well-known and the eligibility criteria are clear. For this reason, they can be effective in increasing college enrollment, despite their poor targeting and expensive subsidies of students likely to enroll and succeed on their own. In contrast, programs that go to great lengths to differentiate among students and direct their funds to those most in need can be very complicated. Vermont allocates state grants only after collecting a considerable amount of information not available on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), including home equity and non-custodial parent resources. While these data elements provide meaningful information, they are costly to obtain and make it more difficult for students to understand the system, to predict their aid awards in advance, and to apply.

The system of student aid is too complicated. Students have to navigate their way through financial aid information at the federal, state, and institutional levels.

These obstacles may discourage some students from attending college at all. Balancing the trade-offs between simplicity and targeting is one of the greatest challenges of designing an effective student grant program.

A considerable amount of research supports the notion that student aid programs that are simple and transparent are more effective than similar amounts of funding made available through complex application processes or with complicated eligibility requirements and conditions. Susan Dynarski and Judith Scott-Clayton detailed the complexity of the student aid application

Who Allocates State Grant Funds: The State or the Institution?

Some state grant programs are “centralized.” The exact amount an individual student receives is determined through a formula set at the state level. Other states have “decentralized” state grant programs. The state sets the basic criteria for eligibility, but provides funding to institutions, which have some discretion in determining the awards received by individual students. For example:

- In California, New York, and South Carolina, each student’s award is set by the state.
- In Texas, Virginia, and Colorado, the state provides grant funds to institutions, which allocate awards to students within the eligibility limits set by the states.

Decentralized programs allow institutions flexibility in meeting the needs of their students, but make it more difficult for students to predict their aid in advance.

process, showing that it creates significant barriers, particularly for those least able to pay.²⁷ Another study showed that helping lower-income families complete the FAFSA significantly increased the odds that their children would enroll in college the following fall, suggesting that the sheer difficulty of filling out the FAFSA was an impediment to families eligible for need-based aid.²⁸

The federal government has taken a number of steps to make applying for financial aid easier by simplifying the FAFSA and making it possible to transfer information from tax forms to the FAFSA. It is possible that Congress will eliminate more questions from the FAFSA in the interest of simplification. Although states would then have less information on which to base their aid allocation, the likely changes would have little impact on grant eligibility in most states. A recent study of five state grant programs estimated that relying on a small number of data elements available from the IRS would lead to a two percentage point increase in the number of aid applicants eligible for grant aid in one state, and would have no measurable impact on the number of applicants eligible for grants in the other states. Any increases in award eligibility resulting

from the elimination of some income sources or assets from consideration could be counteracted by minor changes to the need analysis formula.²⁹ States should welcome the simplification and should resist any temptation to complicate the process for students by attempting to collect additional data—restoring complication even as the federal government reduces it.

Aside from the application process, eligibility formulas designed to better target aid also add complexity. To elucidate the trade-offs states face, it may be useful to consider the continuum of options from the simplest program, which would provide each student with a fixed sum, regardless of their circumstances, to a program that would calculate as precisely as possible the ability of each student to pay the bills without assistance. Neither extreme is desirable—good solutions lie somewhere in the middle. There is no solution that would be optimal for all states. However, as discussed above, broad programs that do not take financial circumstances into account at all tend to direct significant portions of their funds to students whose educational attainment is unaffected by the awards. Programs that go to the other extreme are likely to have high administrative costs and to be difficult for students to understand and access, thus discouraging enrollment.

The appropriate balance will be different depending on state characteristics. States with lower-income populations have less risk of over-subsidizing large numbers of affluent students. Median household income was 21% lower in Georgia than in Vermont in 2010.³⁰ It is not surprising that Vermont goes to greater lengths to weed out affluent students in its state grant program.

Some states have much more unequal distributions of income than others. Greater inequality creates greater differences in grant aid allocated according to financial circumstances and greater potential loss from the failure to target aid. In New Mexico, New York, and Mississippi, the average income of the top 20% of households is over 8 times as large, and the average income of the middle 20% at least 2.8 times as large, as the average income of the bottom 20%. In Montana, Hawaii, Delaware, New Hampshire and Wyoming, the average income of the top 20% of households is less than 6 times as large, and the average income of the middle 20% less than 2.3 times as large, as the average income of the bottom 20%.³¹ Lower income levels and less inequality are likely to increase the costs of complexity in the student aid system relative to the cost of imprecise targeting.

Some states have complex formulas for their aid, while others have more straightforward allocation criteria. The Minnesota State Grant Shared Responsibility formula derives state grant eligibility by beginning with a student budget and subtracting 46% for the student share, a portion of the Expected Family Contribution, and the Pell award. Vermont uses a complicated formula that relies on detailed financial data, conditions the award on the institution attended, and provides some ineligible students with a grant with a different name. At the other end of the spectrum, some programs give the same amount

to every eligible student.³² This simple approach creates a sharp distinction between one group of students and others who may have only slightly more resources available. This sort of “cliff effect” is inequitable and is also an invitation to conceal resources. A similar problem applies to rigid cut-offs for tests scores and high school GPA.

Programs can be well-targeted but still relatively simple. Look-up tables that have been proposed for Pell Grants might serve as a model.³³ Grants would increase gradually as incomes decline, but a simple table could provide award levels for incomes at regular intervals.³⁴ Table 3 shows an example of what such a table might look like. The starting and ending points as well as the grant levels could be modified to fit the state’s circumstances, and it would be possible to add straightforward credit completion requirements for students after they enroll in college. The advantage of this or a similar approach is that it is easily understood and allows people to predict their awards.

Program consolidation provides an opportunity for state policymakers to move away from the traditional dichotomy of “need-based” and “merit-based” aid and adopt a more holistic approach to financial aid.

Table 3. A Model for Clear and Simple Grant Allocation

Family Income	Grant
\$0	\$4,000
\$20,000	\$4,000
\$25,000	\$3,500
\$30,000	\$3,000
\$35,000	\$2,500
\$40,000	\$2,000
\$45,000	\$1,500
\$50,000	\$1,000
\$55,000	\$500
\$60,000	\$0

In addition to the eligibility criteria for individual awards, complexity is increased by the existence of multiple programs within states. States may want to have different elements of a program target students with different circumstances, but doing that under one program is likely to make more sense than having multiple programs. Even more confusing is the existence of multiple programs with the same purpose.

Program consolidation provides an opportunity for state policymakers to move away from the traditional dichotomy of “need-based” and “merit-based” aid and adopt a more holistic approach to financial aid. States should think about the appropriate roles of both ability to pay and academic progress and performance in shaping a successful grant system. States that have emphasized merit-based approaches to financial aid are likely to find increased value in

Multiple Grant Programs

Many states have multiple state grant programs, increasing administrative costs and making it difficult for students to understand and predict the awards for which they will be eligible.

Some states have “need-based” and “merit-based” programs. For example:

- Kentucky’s College Access Program (CAP) supports students with very limited ability to pay. Eligibility for the Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarship (KEES) is based on high school grades and test scores. Numerous additional smaller programs serve a variety of different populations.
- The West Virginia Higher Education Grant program provides funding to students with financial need. Eligibility for the West Virginia Promise Program is based on high school grades and test scores, with continuing eligibility depending on meeting college GPA and credit completion criteria.

Some states have separate programs for students enrolled in different sectors of postsecondary education. For example:

- In Texas, state residents enrolled in public institutions may qualify for the TEXAS Grant program, while those enrolled in private institutions may receive funding from the Texas Equalization Grant (TEG) program.
- North Carolina recently combined two separate programs for private college students into one program. The state’s largest program, the UNC Need-Based Grant Program, applies only to students in public four-year institutions. Those enrolled in community colleges may qualify for a Community College Grant.

In contrast:

- New York provides almost all of its aid through the need-based Tuition Assistance Program (TAP).
- Pennsylvania relies almost exclusively on the need-based Pennsylvania State Grant Program.
- The need-based Vermont Incentive Grant program provides almost all of the state grant funding to Vermont students.

incorporating need-based features to target their grants to students whose participation in college is most dependent on overcoming financial constraints. Similarly, states that have focused on need-based programs are likely to find additional value by incorporating financial incentives for progress towards degree completion, a point developed further below.

Consolidating need- and merit-based programs in this way also has the advantage of shoring up political support for the combined program. Middle- and upper-income families may be more supportive of a state program that includes significant subsidies to low-income families if, under the same name, the program also has components that benefit middle-income families.

Simplifying and consolidating state grant programs will certainly help families better understand the costs of going to college, but it is a mistake to believe that state grant programs can be designed and funded and then stand on their own to ensure college access and success. An important component of state grant programs is communication.³⁵ If families throughout the state are aware of the grant program, understand how to access it, and can make reasonable estimates of the funding they will receive, they can plan and act accordingly. Grant programs that are structured to allow students and parents to predict with reasonable accuracy how much support they will receive can significantly reduce the strain associated with paying for college. Early notification of awards can help even more. An example is Kentucky’s awarding of its merit scholarships to students as they progress through high school.

Some students will pay the full sticker price. Others will receive generous grant aid. All students benefit from being able to predict the net-price they will actually have to pay to go to college. The state has the data required to make these predictions for students who complete the FAFSA. Incorporating state grants—and institutional grants at public colleges and universities—into solid information about net price can make a significant difference in public understanding. The most widely publicized piece of information is generally the sticker price at the state university. The most vulnerable students and those for whom price is the biggest barrier may be totally unaware that this is not the price they will be expected to pay.

Institutions are now required to make net price calculators available on their websites. But institutions have been slow to comply with this requirement and often bury the calculators in hard-to-find places.³⁶ And students who manage to locate the calculators may still find that they get information that is difficult to compare across institutions. States should enable “one-stop shopping” by creating a single net-price calculator that students can use to calculate their eligibility for grant aid and the resulting cost of attendance at every public institution in the state.

Broad-based state grant programs with clear and simple eligibility criteria have the advantage of being easily understood and there is evidence that these programs have increased educational attainment in states with historically low college enrollment rates. On the other hand, when based on stringent academic requirements, they distribute their funds disproportionately to relatively affluent students who are likely to enroll and succeed in college without this assistance. Some programs that fund only low- and moderate-income students are

Beyond Need and Merit: Strengthening State Grant Programs

States should enable “one-stop shopping” by creating a single net-price calculator that students can use to calculate the cost of attendance at every public institution in the state.

straightforward and effective. Others are complicated, open to gaming, difficult to apply for, and lacking in political support. The bottom line is that state grant programs should be provided as clearly, simply, and predictably as possible; communication with families and students about college opportunity should be early, sustained, and accurate. And this simplicity should be balanced with the imperative that grant aid be targeted as well as possible towards those whose educational opportunities and progress will be most affected by the subsidies.

Expect and encourage timely completion

In addition to being simple and targeted towards students who need them most, state grant programs should embody expectations of and encouragement for desired behaviors on the part of both students and institutions. Financial aid alone cannot eliminate enrollment and completion gaps, but all grant programs embody incentives and those incentives should be designed carefully. It is important to consider the impact of requirements for academic achievement on access for disadvantaged students. But it is also important that the access enabled by public subsidies be coupled with the best possible opportunity for success.

High-quality studies of grant programs consistently find that students respond to expectations and financial incentives when deciding whether and where to go to college. Reducing the price of college generally causes some students to go to college who otherwise would not have. Likewise, reducing the price of certain types of colleges causes some students who otherwise would have attended other types of colleges to attend these colleges. Moreover, rewarding the completion of more credit hours speeds student progress towards degrees.

The introduction of the DC Tuition Assistance Grant (DC TAG) program substantially reduced the price of attending a public university outside of Washington, DC, so it is not surprising that it increased the share of students applying to a public university by 13 percentage points. This did not just represent a shift of students from one set of colleges to another—the overall college enrollment rate increased by about nine percentage points.³⁷ Susan Dynarski’s finding that the elimination of the Social Security benefit for college students significantly reduced college enrollment among the eligible population reinforces the power of simple, predictable, and generous grant programs.³⁸

Many state aid programs create incentives for students to go to college, and to go to certain types of college (e.g., in-state public universities) but few programs incentivize specific behaviors in college that encourage progress toward a degree. Some states support timely completion by funding students according to credit hours. For example, in Minnesota, students enrolled for at least 15 credit hours during the semester receive full-time awards. Funding is

pro-rated gradually as enrollment intensity declines. West Virginia’s PROMISE program requires participating students to complete at least 30 credits each year in addition to maintaining at least a 3.0 GPA. A rigorous evaluation of this program by Judith Scott-Clayton found that it increased both GPA and credits earned, and in turn had a large impact on four-year graduation rates. The impact on five-year graduation rates was positive but somewhat smaller, suggesting that the program’s main impact was in reducing time to degree. Students expressed appreciation for the incentive the program provided to progress quickly.³⁹

The West Virginia program has the advantage of encouraging students to take a concrete step—completing a certain number of credits—rather than focusing on a more abstract goal, such as maintaining a minimum GPA (especially a relatively high GPA). Programs that only require a certain GPA may encourage students to take fewer courses or easier courses in order to earn higher grades—as has apparently been the case in Georgia.⁴⁰ The scholarship renewal requirements in West Virginia both discourage this kind of gaming and provide positive incentives for students to finish their degrees in a timely fashion.

MDRC is currently running a series of experiments to test the effectiveness of performance-based scholarship programs in community colleges. Preliminary results indicate that attaching academic progress requirements to supplemental grant dollars has a measurable positive impact on the success of at-risk students. Low-income parents in Louisiana community colleges were more likely to enroll full-time, persist in college, and earn more credits when grants were linked to enrolling at least half-time and maintaining at least a C average. A program targeted to low-income adults in New York City who need remedial course work led to more full-time enrollment and more summer enrollment. A program in New Mexico that increased financial support for low-income entering students who enrolled for a minimum number of credits and maintained a minimum grade point average encouraged students to attempt and earn more credits.⁴¹

Combining elements of need-based and merit-based programs to target aid while creating incentives for success is a promising strategy. However, the academic requirements embodied in some state grant programs are too high. They serve to exclude students on the margin of college access and success rather than to provide them with meaningful incentives. If the aim of a program is to enable students to attend and complete college, making satisfactory progress toward a degree—by enrolling in and completing courses—should be sufficient. All students will not be—and need not be—outstanding. About two-thirds of merit scholarship recipients in Georgia and 40% of those in Kentucky lose their scholarships after the first year because they do not attain the necessary GPA.⁴² This level of stringency would probably disqualify an even larger share of students if the program were not already limited to the students who were most successful in high school. Continuing to fund students who are making

academic progress even if their GPAs are below 3.0 would benefit both the students and the state's economy.

At a minimum, states should provide second chances for students who do not meet targets the first time around. These students should face the consequence of losing the scholarship—otherwise the incentive will not be a very strong one. But they should have the opportunity to regain funding if they meet the targets in the future.

Incentives should look forward, not backward, to the greatest extent possible. Most state grant programs for which academic qualifications play a significant role focus almost entirely on high school performance. From the perspective of a graduating high school student, their college funding depends on how much they have achieved in the past, rather than on what they may be able to achieve in the future. These policies may encourage academic achievement in high school, and may be most effective when they specify the completion of rigorous coursework rather than a specific GPA. But it is unwise to permanently penalize students for their high school performance if they later show that they are capable of doing well in college.

In sum, states should tie grants to on-time progress toward a degree. Finishing a four-year degree in four years means that students must complete 15 credit hours every semester, so states should consider defining full-time as 15 credit hours even though the federal definition is only 12—or at least follow the example of Minnesota and create incentives that encourage full-time students to take enough courses to finish their degrees on time. But awards should not be limited to students who achieve the best grades.

Confronting Budgetary Challenges

Few states have enough funding for their grant programs to provide the aid they consider optimal to all qualified students, especially under current economic circumstances. Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania are rare examples of states with large need-based grants programs that fund all eligible students. There are numerous examples of states making significant cuts to their grant programs without redesigning them to function well at lower funding levels. Rationing funds is unavoidable and there may be no good options under these circumstances, but some choices are worse than others.

Budget constraints have led a number of states, including Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee and others to distribute funds until they run out, not announcing an effective cut-off date in advance.⁴³ Implementing a first-come, first-served policy—providing assistance to those who apply early and denying aid to those who apply after the money has run out—is quite arbitrary, since an

Rationing Funds

Some states treat their grant programs as entitlements, funding all eligible students at a level set in advance. But many states fund only a fraction of the students who meet the eligibility requirements. This problem has been exacerbated as both state revenues and family resources have dwindled, while both college enrollments and tuition levels have risen rapidly.

- In order to save money on the HOPE Scholarship Program, Georgia raised the high school GPA required for a full tuition scholarship and implemented an SAT score requirement. The state also eliminated coverage of books and mandatory fees.
- Minnesota increases the percentage of costs for which students are responsible when state funds are insufficient. This allows the state to maintain a fully funded program.
- Oregon overhauled its state grant program in 2007 to follow Minnesota's model of beginning with student responsibility, adding family and federal contributions, and defining the state's role as filling the remaining gap. Despite widespread satisfaction with the new program, the pressures of the recession led Oregon to modify major elements of the program, reverting to early deadlines and flat grant levels for a smaller pool of eligible students.
- The state of Texas, which funds only a fraction of the students who are eligible for TEXAS Grant aid, is seeking ways to limit eligibility without damaging access. Provisions under consideration include limiting the number of credit hours and semesters for which students can be funded, and funding only full-time students.
- Illinois funds its Monetary Award Program (MAP) on a first-come, first-served basis. The filing cut-off date is not known in advance, but depends on the applications received.
- Tennessee Student Assistance awards go only to low-income students. Funds are awarded on a first-come, first-served basis until funds are depleted.

application deadline cannot be specified in advance. Vulnerable students are more likely than others to miss announced deadlines, but expecting them to meet an un-announced deadline is particularly unreasonable.

In addition to developing "rainy day funds," reviewing the state's priorities and assuring that the remaining dollars are allocated in a way most likely to support those priorities is a more constructive approach. In a program with eligibility based on grades or test scores, raising the bar for qualification is likely to target the program even more on students from relatively affluent backgrounds who are most likely to attend college regardless of whether they get support from the state. An alternative is to cut grant levels across the board or to

add an income cap. In income-based programs, changing the eligibility requirements could exclude the least needy of the needy population. Across-the-board cuts might be designed to affect all students, with students who need the funds most losing the least.⁴⁴ The state of Texas, searching for an alternative to the practice of funding only a fraction of eligible students, is currently considering focusing state aid on students enrolled full-time and limiting eligibility to the number of credit hours and semesters required for a degree.

States facing budget restrictions should redesign their programs to maximize the return on the taxpayers' investment. Our recommendations offer constructive approaches to cost savings. First, when forced to reduce funding states should target the reductions at students whose behavior is least likely to be affected by a reduction in grant aid. Second, states can save on administrative costs by consolidating and simplifying programs. Third, states can reduce time-to-degree—and the associated costs of educating students—by incentivizing on-time academic progress.

In addition to tweaking their existing programs, states should test innovative approaches and evaluate them. A pilot program found to be very successful could then be scaled up and replace another program that was found to be less effective. For example, states might follow the models of the MDRC experiments, rewarding high-need students for making academic progress. Or they might implement an emergency aid program that provides supplementary funding to students who encounter unforeseen financial hurdles, such as the sudden unavailability of a family member to babysit or a car that breaks down, making travel to school impossible. The provision of student support services is central to the success of at-risk students, and strengthening these activities should be seen as a core part of the student aid system.⁴⁵

In the current policy environment, states are deciding which programs to cut and by how much. States should use this difficult time as an opportunity to rethink programs they have had in place for years that might be modified to have a larger effect on educational attainment in the state. Such reforms are necessary if states wish to minimize harm to students in tight financial times. At the same time, they should be preparing for the time when more funding will be available, increasing their understanding of how new dollars can be spent most effectively. Students with limited financial means need adequate funds to pursue and succeed in postsecondary education. But not all grant funds are created equal. Increasing funding levels might fail to improve outcomes if programs are not well-designed. And reducing funding levels can be done strategically to minimize the negative impact on students and on the state.

Conclusion

Financial aid alone cannot bring educational attainment to its desired level or close the troubling disparities in outcomes between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. Even institutions that charge nothing have students who fail to graduate.⁴⁶ And encouraging students to complete more credit hours will not solve the time-to-degree problems at institutions that face capacity problems and do not provide access to the courses students require, as is now occurring in California’s community colleges.⁴⁷

But state grant programs are among a limited set of policy levers available to lawmakers and have been demonstrated to affect students’ access to and success in college. These programs should be designed to use taxpayer dollars as effectively as possible to increase the educational opportunities and attainment levels of state residents. They should be viewed as part of an integrated system of higher education funding, including appropriations for operating expenditures, tuition setting, and student aid. Although the specifics will differ across states, the best programs are well-targeted towards students with limited financial resources, whose opportunities and behaviors will be most influenced by the subsidies. The precision of the targeting must be balanced with the understanding that simple and predictable programs are most effective. The characteristics of the population and the circumstances in each state will make the ideal program different for different states.

The traditional dichotomy between “need-based” and “merit-based” aid is not constructive. Instead, states should design programs that will have the biggest effect on collegiate attainment. This means targeting grants at students least likely to be able to afford college without assistance and tying grants to on-time progress toward a degree, but not to the receipt of exceptional grades. Rewarding academic progress in college is likely to be more constructive than limiting aid to the most successful high school students. In addition, programs should be easy for prospective students to understand. In many states, this means consolidating a number of programs that have been enacted over the years.

States should use this time of financial exigency to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of existing grant programs and to put in place systems for periodic review of these programs. Last-minute budget slashing efforts have the potential to do serious damage to the states’ students, colleges and universities, and long-run economic health. Careful planning, program design, and monitoring can increase the effectiveness of vital state grant programs and maximize the impact of taxpayer dollars.

States should use this time of financial exigency to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of existing grant programs and to put in place systems for periodic review of these programs.

Appendix A: State Data

State	Percent with BA, 2006–08	Percent Students Stay In State, 2008	Median Income, 2010	Tuition and Fees, Four-Year Publics, 2009–10	Average State Grant Aid per Student, 2009–10	Percent Grant Aid Based on Need, 2009–10	Percent Funding of Publics from State/Local Gov., 2008–09
<i>United States</i>	27%	82%	\$49,445	\$7,050	\$627	73%	29%
Alabama	22%	88%	\$40,976	\$6,487	\$125	87%	24%
Alaska	26%	57%	\$58,198	\$4,922	\$44	100%	44%
Arizona	25%	91%	\$47,279	\$6,554	\$31	99%	40%
Arkansas	19%	87%	\$38,571	\$5,980	\$347	69%	25%
California	29%	93%	\$54,459	\$6,550	\$609	100%	30%
Colorado	35%	82%	\$60,442	\$6,270	\$303	100%	3%
Connecticut	35%	57%	\$66,452	\$8,456	\$469	100%	35%
Delaware	27%	69%	\$55,269	\$9,012	\$523	68%	24%
Florida	26%	87%	\$44,243	\$4,444	\$795	26%	37%
Georgia	27%	81%	\$44,108	\$5,008	\$1,766	0%	36%
Hawaii	29%	69%	\$58,507	\$6,638	\$74	100%	42%
Idaho	24%	70%	\$47,014	\$4,886	\$95	30%	39%
Illinois	29%	76%	\$50,761	\$10,410	\$727	95%	29%
Indiana	22%	87%	\$46,322	\$7,643	\$730	95%	27%
Iowa	24%	86%	\$49,177	\$6,712	\$245	92%	24%
Kansas	29%	84%	\$46,229	\$6,312	\$130	99%	36%
Kentucky	20%	86%	\$41,236	\$7,116	\$1,029	49%	23%
Louisiana	20%	88%	\$39,443	\$4,282	\$883	16%	34%
Maine	26%	70%	\$48,133	\$8,544	\$281	100%	32%
Maryland	35%	65%	\$64,025	\$7,476	\$450	95%	33%
Massachusetts	38%	70%	\$61,333	\$9,239	\$273	94%	29%
Michigan	25%	88%	\$46,441	\$9,761	\$108	95%	20%
Minnesota	31%	76%	\$52,554	\$8,788	\$743	100%	29%
Mississippi	19%	88%	\$37,985	\$4,952	\$161	14%	31%
Missouri	25%	83%	\$46,184	\$7,215	\$445	69%	28%
Montana	27%	76%	\$41,467	\$5,485	\$142	76%	22%
Nebraska	27%	82%	\$52,728	\$6,234	\$157	100%	40%
Nevada	21%	83%	\$51,525	\$4,543	\$542	46%	45%
New Hampshire	32%	53%	\$66,707	\$11,075	\$71	100%	16%
New Jersey	34%	63%	\$63,540	\$11,133	\$1,205	93%	27%
New Mexico	25%	84%	\$45,098	\$4,786	\$816	30%	31%
New York	32%	82%	\$49,826	\$5,740	\$1,062	97%	38%
North Carolina	26%	87%	\$43,753	\$4,539	\$983	84%	42%
North Dakota	26%	73%	\$51,380	\$6,335	\$234	90%	28%

State	Percent with BA, 2006–08	Percent Students Stay In State, 2008	Median Income, 2010	Tuition and Fees, Four-Year Publics, 2009–10	Average State Grant Aid per Student, 2009–10	Percent Grant Aid Based on Need, 2009–10	Percent Funding of Publics from State/Local Gov., 2008–09
Ohio	24%	83%	\$46,093	\$8,170	\$211	70%	22%
Oklahoma	22%	87%	\$43,400	\$5,421	\$538	88%	30%
Oregon	28%	83%	\$50,526	\$6,906	\$474	100%	16%
Pennsylvania	26%	83%	\$48,460	\$10,764	\$742	100%	15%
Rhode Island	30%	70%	\$51,914	\$8,503	\$168	100%	23%
South Carolina	23%	87%	\$41,709	\$9,520	\$1,780	19%	21%
South Dakota	24%	75%	\$45,669	\$6,031	\$105	5%	27%
Tennessee	22%	83%	\$38,686	\$6,098	\$1,335	23%	33%
Texas	25%	87%	\$47,464	\$7,328	\$630	100%	33%
Utah	29%	91%	\$56,787	\$4,573	\$55	48%	19%
Vermont	33%	47%	\$55,942	\$12,016	\$599	100%	10%
Virginia	33%	81%	\$60,363	\$7,936	\$546	63%	23%
Washington	30%	78%	\$56,253	\$7,321	\$882	98%	24%
Washington, DC	47%	23%	\$55,528	\$5,370	\$611	6%	50%
West Virginia	17%	85%	\$42,839	\$4,980	\$1,076	44%	28%
Wisconsin	26%	82%	\$50,522	\$7,169	\$415	97%	35%
Wyoming	23%	75%	\$52,359	\$3,726	\$7	100%	56%

Notes and Sources

- (1) Percentage of persons age 25 and over with at least BA, 2006–08; Digest of Education Statistics 2010, Table 13.
- (2) Percentage of first-year students enrolled in state of residence, Fall 2008; Digest of Education Statistics 2010, Table 230.
- (3) Median income, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, Table H-8.
- (4) Tuition and fees at public four-year institutions, 2009–10; The College Board, Trends in College Pricing 2011.
- (5) Average grant aid per full-time equivalent student, 2009–10; NASSGAP Annual Survey 2009-10, Table 12.
- (6) Percentage of state grant aid based on financial circumstances, 2009–10; NASSGAP Annual Survey 2009-10, Tables 4 and 5.
- (7) State/local appropriations as percentage of operating expenditures, 2008–09; Digest of Education Statistics 2010, Tables 364, 374.

Appendix B: Inventory of State Grant Programs, 2009–10

The data in this table are from the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs' (NASSGAP) 41st Annual Survey (<http://www.nassgap.org>) and describe state student grant aid programs for the academic year 2009–10. The table below excludes programs listed by NASSGAP that are conditional grants or loans, loans, loan assumption or forgiveness, or work-study; those that do not fund any undergraduate students; those that fund highly specific groups of people such as foster children or members of the National Guard; those that support select occupations such as nursing or teaching; and those that fund fewer than 100 students.

The columns displayed were selected to offer the reader the most basic and relevant information about the universe of existing state grant programs. Although most of the columns are shown exactly as they appear in the NASSGAP dataset, the eligibility columns relating to enrollment intensity and financial or academic criteria, as well as the columns that show the percentage of program dollars awarded to dependent students in two income brackets, are derived from the responses to multiple questions on the NASSGAP Annual Survey. Likewise, the column displaying program dollars as a percentage of all state grant aid contains derived data. Although this process of selecting which rows and columns appear in the table required the use of professional discretion, the source of all of the program information is the NASSGAP 41st Annual Survey.

An expanded version of the inventory, which includes many more columns than could be included here, is available on the Brookings web site at: http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2012/0508_state_grants_chingos_whitehurst/0508_state_grants_chingos_whitehurst.xlsx

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
AK AlaskAdvantage Education Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$855,800	100%	869	\$985	\$500	\$3,000	94%	1%	5%		
AL Alabama Student Assistance Program	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$5,204,129	68%	7,457	\$698	\$300	\$5,000	77%	18%	4%	73%	0%
AL AL Student Grant Program	FT, HT	Aca	\$2,299,025	30%	7,217	\$319		\$1,200	0%	100%	0%		
AL American Legion Scholarships	FT, HT	Aca	\$112,500	1%	150	\$750	\$750	\$750					
AR Academic Challenge Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$21,908,171	52%	8,281	\$2,646	\$2,500	\$3,500	89%	11%	0%		
AR Governor's Scholars Program	FT	Aca	\$10,745,885	25%	1,290	\$8,330	\$2,524	\$10,000	70%	30%	0%		
AR Higher Ed. Opportunities Grant Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$5,385,500	13%	7,624	\$706	\$250	\$1,000	90%	8%	2%	98%	0%
AR Workforce Improvement Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$4,246,612	10%	3,954	\$1,074			95%	5%	0%		
AZ (AFAT) Arizona Financial Aid Trust	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$14,130,775	77%	6,651	\$2,125	\$2	\$10,069	100%	0%	0%	55%	6%
AZ AZ LEAP/SLEAP Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$3,512,952	19%	3,753	\$936	\$100	\$2,500	79%	3%	18%	69%	2%
AZ Arizona College Access Aid Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$527,557	3%	303	\$1,741	\$500	\$2,000	52%	5%	43%	66%	0%
AZ Early Graduation Scholarship Grant	FT, HT	Aca	\$267,201	1%	292	\$915	\$500	\$2,000	94%	1%	5%	33%	44%
CA Cal Grant B	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$596,194,000	57%	149,255	\$3,994	\$1,551	\$11,259	83%	8%	9%	88%	1%
CA Cal Grant A	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$434,368,000	42%	60,800	\$7,144	\$4,026	\$9,708	62%	31%	7%	39%	7%
CA Cal Grant C	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$9,956,000	1%	8,429	\$1,181	\$576	\$3,168	21%	4%	75%	59%	2%
CO Colorado Student Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$65,965,418	93%	60,357	\$1,093	\$250	\$5,000	91%	4%	5%	61%	2%
CO GOS	FT, HT	Fin	\$2,224,727	3%	265	\$8,395	\$0	\$10,700	89%	11%	0%	80%	0%
CO CO LEAP	FT, HT	Fin	\$1,460,315	2%	1,631	\$895	\$120	\$5,000	96%	4%	0%	94%	0%
CO Supplemental LEAP	FT, HT	Fin	\$975,158	1%	513	\$1,901	\$0	\$12,500	91%	9%	0%	40%	20%
CO Dependent Tuition Assistance Program	FT, HT	Aca	\$364,922	1%									
CT Tuition Set Aside	FT, HT	Fin	\$72,593,099	53%					100%	0%	0%		
CT CT Aid for Public College Students Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$30,208,469	22%	16,674	\$1,812			100%	0%	0%		
CT CT Independent College Student Grant P	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$23,441,421	17%	5,789	\$4,049	\$200	\$8,730	0%	91%	9%		
CT Capitol Scholarship Program	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$9,464,359	7%	5,500	\$1,721	\$500	\$3,000	72%	27%	1%	43%	14%
DC DCTAG	FT, HT	N/A	\$32,464,376	95%	5,069	\$6,404	\$250	\$10,000	69%	31%	0%		
DC DC LEAP	FT, HT	Fin	\$1,754,857	5%	2,632	\$667	\$250	\$1,500	80%	20%	0%	89%	0%

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
DE Delaware SEED Program	FT	Aca	\$4,081,033	23%	1,847	\$2,210			100%	0%	0%		
DE University of DE Other State Funded Sch	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$2,903,622	16%					100%	0%	0%		
DE University of Delaware General Fund Scholarships		Fin	\$2,414,145	14%					100%	0%	0%		
DE Delaware State University Aid to Needy Students		Fin	\$2,057,400	12%					100%	0%	0%		
DE University of Delaware Aid to Needy Students		Fin	\$1,985,032	11%					100%	0%	0%		
DE Scholarship Incentive Program	FT	Fin, Aca	\$1,952,318	11%	1,461	\$1,336	\$700	\$2,200				36%	22%
DE DE Tech and Comm College Aid to Needy Students		Fin	\$887,000	5%					100%	0%	0%		
DE Delaware State University Scholarships		Aca	\$836,000	5%					100%	0%	0%		
DE Michael C. Ferguson Achievement Award	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$460,000	3%	405	\$1,136	\$500	\$4,000	58%	42%	0%		
DE Diamond State Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$194,790	1%	160	\$1,217	\$1,250	\$1,250	60%	40%	0%		
DE Governor's Ed Grant for Unemployed Workers	HT, BHT	Fin	\$59,021	0%									
FL FL Bright Futures Scholarship Program-F	FT, HT	Aca	\$294,601,476	45%	137,189	\$2,147			89%	10%	1%	38%	33%
FL FL Bright Futures Scholarship Program-F	FT, HT	Aca	\$124,710,818	19%	37,963	\$3,285			89%	11%	0%	25%	47%
FL FL Student Assistance Grant Public	FT, HT	Fin	\$101,955,047	16%	86,940	\$1,173			100%	0%	0%	85%	0%
FL William L. Boyd IV, Florida Resident Accountant	FT	N/A	\$84,129,001	13%	38,674	\$2,175			0%	100%	0%	42%	32%
FL FL Student Assistance Grant Private	FT	Fin	\$16,416,306	2%	12,832	\$1,279			0%	100%	0%	77%	1%
FL First Generation Matching Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$13,692,940	2%	9,628	\$1,422			100%	0%	0%	89%	0%
FL FL Student Assistance Grant Postsecondary	FT	Fin	\$11,315,977	2%	13,656	\$829	\$200	\$2,235	0%	18%	82%	85%	0%
FL Access to Better Learning and Education	FT	N/A	\$3,907,083	1%	5,278	\$740		\$986	0%	31%	69%	59%	17%
FL FL Bright Futures Scholarship Program-C	FT, HT	Aca	\$3,860,194	1%	2,460	\$1,569			86%	9%	5%	48%	25%
FL FL Student Assistance Grant Career Education	FT, HT	Fin	\$2,160,204	0%	3,615	\$598			100%	0%	0%	70%	3%
FL Mary McLeod Bethune Scholarship Program	FT	Fin	\$597,000	0%	232	\$2,573			20%	80%	0%	75%	3%
FL FL Bright Futures Scholarship Program-A	FT, HT	Aca	\$360,288	0%	245	\$1,471			89%	11%	0%	22%	51%

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
GA HOPE Scholarship	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$453,950,684	67%	117,061	\$3,878			90%	9%	1%		
GA HOPE Grant	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$183,895,626	27%	143,268	\$1,284			100%	0%	0%		
GA Tuition Equalization Grant	FT	N/A	\$24,295,793	4%	36,423	\$667			0%	78%	22%		
GA Accel	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$6,542,634	1%	3,955	\$1,654			88%	12%	0%		
GA HOPE GED Voucher	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$2,866,643	0%	5,738	\$500			93%	4%	2%		
GA LEAP Grant Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$1,295,452	0%	2,613	\$496			83%	13%	4%		
HI Hawaii B Plus Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$2,995,116	88%	1,212	\$2,471	\$103	\$9,362	100%	0%	0%		
HI Hawaii State Student Incentive Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$413,371	12%	346	\$1,195			86%	14%	0%		
IA Iowa Tuition Grant Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$46,443,782	88%	17,745	\$2,617		\$4,000	0%	90%	10%	32%	16%
IA Iowa Vocational-Technical Tuition Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$2,478,269	5%	2,912	\$851		\$1,200	100%	0%	0%	30%	1%
IA All Iowa Opportunity Scholarship	FT, HT, BHT	Fin, Aca	\$2,377,235	4%	535	\$4,443		\$6,704	80%	19%	1%	68%	0%
IA Iowa Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$1,717,149	3%	2,674	\$642		\$1,000	64%	31%	5%	78%	2%
ID Idaho Promise Category B Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$3,456,906	62%	5,761	\$600							
ID Opportunity Scholarship	FT	Fin, Aca	\$979,479	17%	381	\$2,571							
ID ID Leveraging Educational Assistance P	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$712,402	13%	1,800	\$396							
ID Idaho Promise Category A Scholarship P	FT	Aca	\$300,000	5%	100	\$3,000							
ID SLEAP	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$149,902	3%	317	\$473							
IL Monetary Award Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$390,465,309	99%	141,380	\$2,762	\$300	\$4,968	53%	41%	6%	59%	4%
IL Silas Purnell Illinois Incentive for Access	FT, HT	Fin	\$4,718,500	1%	18,874	\$250	\$250	\$1,000	82%	13%	5%	98%	0%
IL Student to Student	FT, HT	Fin	\$948,281	0%	3,012	\$315	\$1	\$1,000	100%	0%	0%		
IL Bonus Incentive Grant	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$206,440	0%	262	\$788	\$60	\$400					
IL Higher Education License Plate (HELP) P	FT, HT	Fin	\$68,425	0%	274	\$250			0%	100%	0%		

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients	Award	% Dollars by Sector			Family Income				
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
IN Frank OBannon Grant	FT	Fin	\$170,202,947	71%	60,932	\$2,793	\$400	\$7,584	62%	34%	4%	80%	0%
IN Twenty-First Century Scholars Program	FT	Fin	\$39,734,586	17%	12,859	\$3,090	\$20	\$8,612	89%	10%	1%	47%	11%
IN CVO/CDV Fee Remission Program	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$20,509,343	9%	5,633	\$3,641	\$5	\$14,320	100%	0%	0%	15%	50%
IN Part-Time Grant Program	HT, BHT	Fin	\$5,460,609	2%	5,096	\$1,072	\$50	\$2,730	74%	26%	0%	92%	0%
IN Institutional financial aid	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$2,235,368	1%	1,785	\$1,252							
IN Hoosier Scholars Program	FT	Aca	\$397,500	0%	795	\$500	\$500	\$500	67%	33%	0%	18%	56%
KS Kansas Comprehensive Grant	FT	Fin	\$16,395,672	94%	10,682	\$1,535	\$100	\$3,500	8%	92%	0%	67%	0%
KS Kansas State Scholarship	FT	Fin, Aca	\$1,000,503	6%	970	\$1,031		\$1,000	78%	22%	0%		
KS Kansas Vocational Ed Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$120,000	1%	258	\$465		\$500	40%	58%	2%		
KY Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholar	FT, HT	Aca	\$93,764,507	49%	67,892	\$1,381	\$36	\$2,500	81%	17%	2%		
KY College Access Program (CAP) Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$63,334,714	33%	40,333	\$1,570	\$200	\$1,900	73%	17%	9%	74%	0%
KY Kentucky Tuition Grant	FT	Fin	\$32,419,998	17%	12,491	\$2,595	\$200	\$2,964	0%	89%	11%	40%	22%
KY Go Higher Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$222,954	0%	229	\$974		\$1,000	56%	18%	26%		
LA Taylor Opportunity Program for Students	FT	Aca	\$130,033,770	80%	42,626	\$3,051	\$323	\$4,806	92%	8%	0%	22%	52%
LA Louisiana Go Grants	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$24,515,546	15%	22,395	\$1,095	\$200	\$2,000	91%	9%	0%	71%	0%
LA Early Start	BHT	Aca	\$5,560,100	3%	13,297	\$418	\$100	\$600	100%	0%	0%		
LA LA LEAP	FT	Aca	\$1,951,145	1%	4,810	\$406	\$200	\$2,000	86%	11%	3%	61%	0%
LA TOPS Tech Early Start	HT	Aca	\$33,750	0%	145	\$233	\$100	\$600	100%	0%	0%		
MA MASSGrant	FT	Fin	\$33,848,047	31%	43,988	\$769	\$300	\$1,900	53%	45%	2%	80%	1%
MA Massachusetts Access Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$26,391,254	24%	28,198	\$936	\$200	\$11,500	100%	0%	0%		
MA Need-Based Tuition Waiver Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$17,271,013	16%	31,953	\$541	\$150	\$1,893	100%	0%	0%		
MA Gilbert Matching Grant	FT	Fin	\$16,618,807	15%	9,126	\$1,821	\$200	\$2,500	0%	100%	0%		
MA John & Abigail Adams Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$13,191,939	12%	14,927	\$884	\$780	\$1,714	100%	0%	0%		
MA Massachusetts Part-Time Grant	HT	Fin	\$2,243,982	2%	7,239	\$310	\$200	\$2,300	80%	17%	3%		
MA Educational Rewards Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$575,196	1%	252	\$2,283	\$500	\$3,000	26%	7%	67%		

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
MD H. P. Rawlings Educational Assistance Gr	FT	Fin	\$60,151,975	62%	28,683	\$2,097	\$400	\$3,000					
MD H. P. Rawlings Guaranteed Access Grant	FT	Fin, Aca	\$12,272,699	13%	1,380	\$8,893	\$400	\$13,700					
MD Senatorial Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$6,288,925	6%	7,715	\$815	\$400	\$9,000					
MD Part-Time Grant	HT	Fin	\$5,910,293	6%	11,221	\$527	\$200	\$2,000					
MD Delegate Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$4,520,616	5%	6,058	\$746	\$200	\$9,000					
MD H. P. Rawlings Campus-Based Grant	FT	Fin	\$3,688,700	4%	1,966	\$1,876	\$400	\$3,000					
MD Distinguished Scholar Award	FT	Aca	\$3,549,000	4%	1,201	\$2,955		\$3,000					
MD Edward T. Conroy Memorial Scholarship	FT, HT	N/A	\$769,525	1%	140	\$5,497		\$9,000					
ME Maine State Grant Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$13,720,134	100%	19,516	\$703	\$250	\$1,250					
MI Tuition Incentive Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$31,519,636	40%	15,558	\$2,026			88%	12%	0%		
MI Michigan Tuition Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$25,480,385	32%	23,520	\$1,083	\$100	\$1,512	0%	100%	0%		
MI Michigan Competitive Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$21,377,766	27%	32,220	\$663	\$100	\$510	57%	43%	0%		
MI Michigan Merit Award	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$1,289,278	2%	915	\$1,409	\$1,000	\$3,000	88%	8%	5%		
MN MN State Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$168,503,310	95%	103,544	\$1,627	\$100	\$9,444	58%	28%	14%	54%	6%
MN Achieve Scholarship Program	FT	Fin, Aca	\$9,315,372	5%	3,974	\$2,344	\$1,200	\$4,172	64%	36%	0%		
MO Access Missouri Financial Assistance Pro	FT	Fin	\$82,814,302	69%	49,146	\$1,685	\$300	\$4,600	49%	51%	0%	43%	11%
MO A+ Program	FT	Aca	\$22,216,216	18%	10,242	\$2,169			99%	1%	0%	6%	53%
MO Higher Education Academic Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$14,812,756	12%	7,730	\$1,916	\$100	\$2,000	77%	23%	0%		
MO Ross Barnett Memorial Scholarship	HT	Fin	\$397,424	0%	182	\$2,184	\$100	\$4,421	40%	60%	0%	41%	0%
MS Mississippi Resident Tuition Grant	FT	Aca	\$13,950,739	65%	23,227	\$601	\$50	\$1,000	89%	11%	0%		
MS Mississippi Eminent Scholars Grant	FT	Aca	\$4,712,408	22%	1,990	\$2,368		\$2,500	83%	17%	0%		
MS MS Higher Ed. Legislative Plan	FT	Fin, Aca	\$1,265,238	6%	289	\$4,378	\$830	\$5,151	89%	11%	0%		
MS MS LEAP	FT	Fin	\$928,932	4%	1,273	\$730	\$100	\$1,500	76%	24%	0%		
MS Summer Developmental Grant	FT	Fin	\$750,309	3%	208	\$3,607	\$358	\$6,961	100%	0%	0%		

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients	Award	% Dollars by Sector			Family Income				
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
MT Montana Tuition Assistance Program	FT	Fin	\$2,152,815	38%	2,564	\$840	\$100	\$2,000	95%	5%	0%	33%	6%
MT Governor's PSE Scholarship - Need	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$1,055,000	19%	1,086	\$971	\$1,000	\$2,000	100%	0%	0%		
MT Governor's PSE Scholarship - Merit	FT	Aca	\$863,500	15%	487	\$1,773	\$2,000	\$2,000	100%	0%	0%		
MT Montana Higher Education Grant	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$660,715	12%	1,017	\$650			94%	6%	0%	70%	2%
MT Governor's PSE Scholarship - Merit At-La	FT	Aca	\$478,000	8%	255	\$1,875	\$2,000	\$2,000	100%	0%	0%		
MT State SEOG Match	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$438,449	8%					100%	0%	0%		
NC UNC Need Based Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$133,351,783	36%	61,952	\$2,153			100%	0%	0%		
NC NC Legislative Tuition Grants	FT, HT	N/A	\$55,593,122	15%	35,181	\$1,580			0%	100%	0%		
NC Education Access Rewards NC (EARN)	FT	Fin	\$44,401,620	12%	22,288	\$1,992			84%	16%	0%		
NC Tuition Remission	FT	N/A	\$43,551,979	12%	3,850	\$11,312			100%	0%	0%		
NC North Carolina Education Lottery Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin	\$38,296,362	10%	31,599	\$1,212			87%	13%	0%		
NC Appropriated Grants	FT, HT	Fin	\$23,888,259	7%					100%	0%	0%		
NC Community College Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$14,748,619	4%	27,195	\$542			100%	0%	0%		
NC North Carolina Student Incentive Grant	FT	Fin	\$5,834,475	2%	9,501	\$614	\$500	\$700	85%	15%	0%		
NC UNC Campus Scholarships	FT, HT	Fin	\$5,501,762	2%	2,472	\$2,226			100%	0%	0%		
NC NC Reach	FT, HT	N/A	\$923,494	0%	321	\$2,877			100%	0%	0%		
NC Certain Private Education Institutions	FT, HT	N/A	\$313,815	0%	174	\$1,804			0%	100%	0%		
ND ND State Student Incentive Grant Program	FT	Fin	\$8,519,795	90%	7,815	\$1,090	\$1,200	\$1,200	86%	11%	2%	35%	0%
ND ND Scholars Program	FT	Aca	\$926,369	10%	153	\$6,055	\$4,160	\$5,461	96%	4%	0%		
NE Remission/Tuition Waivers	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$113,966,044	89%	29,294	\$3,890			100%	0%	0%		
NE Nebraska State Grant	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$14,093,053	11%	15,704	\$897		\$1,714	62%	19%	18%		
NE Access College Early	FT, HI, BHT	Fin	\$338,149	0%	1,301	\$260			83%	16%	1%		
NH New Hampshire Incentive Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$3,208,727	86%	4,535	\$708	\$125	\$1,000					
NH Leveraged Incentive Grant Program	FT	Fin, Aca	\$540,000	14%	566	\$954	\$200	\$3,000					

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients	Award	% Dollars by Sector		Family Income					
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
NJ Tuition Aid Grant	FT	Fin	\$311,182,687	84%	72,609	\$4,286	\$200	\$11,340	69%	28%	4%		
NJ EOF Article III Undergraduate	FT, HT	Fin	\$26,826,899	7%	13,587	\$1,974	\$200	\$2,500	73%	27%	0%		
NJ NJ STARS	FT	Aca	\$11,052,629	3%	3,559	\$3,106			100%	0%	0%		
NJ Part-Time TAG for County College Stude	HT	Fin	\$9,004,019	2%	12,650	\$712	\$224	\$1,590	100%	0%	0%		
NJ NJ STARS II	FT	Aca	\$6,032,677	2%	2,003	\$3,012	\$0	\$3,500	100%	0%	0%		
NJ Edward J. Bloustein Distinguished Schola	FT	Aca	\$4,857,576	1%	5,351	\$908	\$200	\$1,000	84%	16%	0%		
NJ Urban Scholars	FT	Aca	\$2,054,741	1%	2,344	\$877	\$200	\$1,000	84%	15%	1%		
NJ Part-Time TAG/EOF	HT	Fin	\$493,997	0%	503	\$982	\$100	\$8,505	88%	12%	0%		
NM Legislative Lottery Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$47,166,128	66%	19,748	\$2,388							
NM NM State Student Incentive Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$12,376,238	17%	14,889	\$831		\$2,500					
NM 3% Scholarships	FT, HT, BHT	Fin, Aca	\$9,536,170	13%	9,757	\$977							
NM NM Scholars	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$906,197	1%	203	\$4,464							
NM NM Competitive Scholarship	FT, HT	Aca	\$564,915	1%	882	\$640							
NM Student Choice	FT	Fin	\$516,054	1%	116	\$4,449			0%	100%	0%	50%	31%
NM Legislative Endowment	FT	Fin	\$112,800	0%	273	\$413							
NV Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship	FT, HT	Aca	\$25,244,197	41%	19,729	\$1,280	\$15	\$2,880	100%	0%	0%		
NV Nevada Student Access Grants/Scholars	FT, HT	Fin	\$20,793,244	34%	16,955	\$1,226	\$25	\$30,000	100%	0%	0%	47%	11%
NV Nevada Grant-in-Aid	FT, HT	Fin	\$13,954,974	23%	4,852	\$2,876	\$25	\$15,500	100%	0%	0%		
NV Regents Service Program	FT, HT	N/A	\$1,443,112	2%	498	\$2,898	\$100	\$12,939	100%	0%	0%		
NV LEAP	FT, HT	Fin	\$348,876	1%	412	\$847	\$127	\$4,025	100%	0%	0%	39%	8%
NY Tuition Assistance Program	FT	Fin	\$901,400,000	89%	330,110	\$2,731	\$500	\$5,000	59%	39%	1%		
NY Allocations	FT	Fin, Aca	\$85,195,537	8%									
NY NYS Aid for Part-Time Study	HT	Fin	\$11,647,000	1%	17,962	\$648	\$0	\$2,000	83%	0%	17%		
NY NYS Scholarships for Academic Excellen	FT	Aca	\$11,454,000	1%	16,818	\$681	\$500	\$1,500	43%	57%	0%		
NY NY Lottery - Leaders of Tomorrow Schol	FT	Aca	\$4,000,000	0%	3,601	\$1,111		\$5,000	42%	58%	0%		

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
OH Ohio College Opportunity Grant Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$76,301,177	87%	66,779	\$1,143	\$300	\$2,256	51%	49%	0%		
OH Choose Ohio First Scholarship Program	FT	N/A	\$6,090,390	7%	2,650	\$2,298			81%	19%	0%		
OH Academic Scholarships	FT	Aca	\$5,171,017	6%	2,770	\$1,867		\$2,000	68%	32%	0%		
OK Oklahoma Tuition Waiver	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$129,517,955	60%	56,509	\$2,292							
OK Oklahoma's Promise - OHLAP	FT, HT, BHT	Fin, Aca	\$53,121,555	24%	19,416	\$2,736	\$306	\$3,941	93%	6%	1%		
OK Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$20,273,564	9%	22,491	\$901	\$200	\$1,300	91%	9%	0%	92%	0%
OK Academic Scholars	FT	Aca	\$9,526,350	4%	2,213	\$4,305	\$1,800	\$5,500	80%	20%	0%		
OK Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant	FT	Fin	\$4,019,000	2%	2,340	\$1,718	\$1,000	\$2,000	0%	100%	0%	80%	0%
OK Regional University Baccalaureate Schol	FT	Aca	\$919,500	0%	314	\$2,928		\$3,000	100%	0%	0%		
OR Oregon Opportunity Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$76,702,680	58%	43,111	\$1,779	\$400	\$2,625	94%	6%	0%	95%	0%
OR Fee Remissions	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$56,018,000	42%	20,212	\$2,772	\$6	\$28,120	100%	0%	0%		
PA Pennsylvania State Grant Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$413,349,249	100%	171,702	\$2,407	\$200	\$4,120	53%	34%	13%		
PA Partnership for Access to Higher Educati	FT, HT	Fin	\$1,837,234	0%	1,534	\$1,198	\$200	\$3,500	52%	46%	2%		
RI Rhode Island State Grant Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$11,001,880	100%	14,431	\$762	\$250	\$900	62%	34%	5%	39%	21%
SC LIFE Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$160,977,991	50%	33,271	\$4,838	\$1	\$5,000	82%	18%	0%		
SC Lottery Tuition Assistance	FT, HT	N/A	\$47,000,000	15%	45,628	\$1,030			99%	1%	0%		
SC Palmetto Fellows Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$42,277,240	13%	5,971	\$7,080	\$0	\$7,500	73%	27%	0%		
SC SC Tuition Grants Program	FT	Fin, Aca	\$34,757,848	11%	14,200	\$2,448	\$100	\$2,800	0%	100%	0%	43%	26%
SC SC Need-based Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$26,775,963	8%	29,723	\$901	\$0	\$2,500	81%	19%	0%		
SC SC HOPE Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$8,076,110	3%	2,888	\$2,796	\$1	\$2,800					
SC Access & Equity Undergraduate Scholar	FT, HT	Aca	\$130,000	0%	250	\$520							
SD South Dakota Opportunity Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$3,767,833	96%	3,464	\$1,088	\$1,000	\$2,000	83%	17%	0%		
SD South Dakota LEAP	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$177,504	4%	548	\$324		\$1,000	79%	17%	4%	70%	0%

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
TN HOPE Scholarship	FT, HT	Aca	\$232,816,811	70%	68,010	\$3,423		\$4,000	79%	20%	0%		
TN Tennessee Student Assistance Award	FT, HT	Fin	\$44,863,238	14%	24,616	\$1,823		\$2,000	70%	24%	6%		
TN ASPIRE supplement to the HOPE Scholar	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$21,293,984	6%	16,724	\$1,273		\$1,500	79%	20%	0%		
TN Wilder-Naifeh Technical Skills Grant	FT, HT	N/A	\$15,906,073	5%	13,435	\$1,184		\$2,000	100%	0%	0%		
TN TSAA-Restoration	FT, HT	Fin	\$9,041,700	3%	4,661	\$1,940		\$2,000	0%	100%	0%		
TN GAMS Supplement to the HOPE Scholars	FT, HT	Aca	\$5,380,251	2%	5,562	\$967		\$1,000	69%	31%	0%		
TN HOPE Access Grant	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$894,715	0%	408	\$2,193		\$2,750	80%	20%	0%		
TN Ned McWherter Scholars Program	FT	Aca	\$541,500	0%	188	\$2,880		\$3,000	46%	54%	0%		
TX TEXAS Grant with S/LEAP	FT, HT	Fin	\$277,791,346	42%	71,919	\$3,863	\$1	\$8,580	100%	0%	0%	75%	1%
TX Texas Public Education Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$137,417,372	21%	107,717	\$1,276	\$1	\$17,850	100%	0%	0%	50%	8%
TX Designated Tuition- Grants	FT, HT	Fin	\$116,980,135	18%	63,127	\$1,853	\$1	\$16,616	100%	0%	0%	50%	8%
TX TX Tuition Equalization Grant with S/LEA	FT, HT	Fin	\$103,938,097	16%	28,017	\$3,710	\$8	\$9,852	0%	100%	0%	50%	12%
TX Texas Education Opportunity Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$11,881,008	2%	7,490	\$1,586	\$75	\$6,080	100%	0%	0%	90%	0%
TX Early H.S. Graduation Scholarship	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$7,270,970	1%	7,312	\$994			95%	5%	0%		
TX Student Deposit Scholarships	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$1,378,102	0%	1,727	\$798	\$5	\$6,080	100%	0%	0%	54%	8%
UT Tuition Waivers	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$56,715,415	86%					100%	0%	0%		
UT New Century Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$2,976,749	5%	1,195	\$2,491			75%	25%	0%		
UT UT Centennial Opportunity Program for	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$2,832,270	4%	2,988	\$948	\$300	\$5,000	88%	12%	0%		
UT UT LEAP	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$1,928,157	3%	3,252	\$593		\$2,500	98%	2%	0%	39%	0%
UT Regents' Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$1,309,171	2%									

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
VA VSFAP - Virginia Commonwealth Award	FT, HT	Fin	\$70,658,772	30%	47,870	\$1,476			100%	0%	0%		
VA Tuition Assistance Grant Program	FT	N/A	\$57,954,362	25%	21,482	\$2,698			0%	100%	0%		
VA VSFAP - Virginia Guaranteed Assistance	FT	Fin, Aca	\$56,056,011	24%	14,220	\$3,942			100%	0%	0%		
VA Unfunded Scholarships - Undergraduate	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$26,322,213	11%	8,819	\$2,985			100%	0%	0%		
VA Various Waivers - Undergraduate	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$16,546,167	7%	6,324	\$2,616			100%	0%	0%		
VA College Scholarship Assistance Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$5,079,346	2%	6,844	\$742			76%	24%	0%		
VA VSFAP Matching Program	FT, HT	Fin	\$1,090,909	0%	4,555	\$239	\$0	\$0	100%	0%	0%		
VA Southwest Virginia Burley Tobacco Schol	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$1,068,768	0%	514	\$2,079	\$1,250	\$2,500					
VA GEARUP Scholarship	FT, HT	N/A	\$877,005	0%	320	\$2,741		\$6,000	83%	16%	1%		
VA Virginia Two-Year College Transfer Grar	FT	Fin	\$271,500	0%	240	\$1,131			89%	11%	0%		
VT Vermont Incentive Grant	FT	Fin	\$17,575,114	89%	9,228	\$1,905	\$700	\$10,900	53%	41%	5%	49%	9%
VT VT Part-Time Grant	HT, BHT	Fin	\$1,213,382	6%	2,431	\$499	\$350	\$8,180	69%	25%	6%	72%	2%
VT Vermont Endowment Scholarship	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$246,358	1%	298	\$827	\$125	\$1,000	77%	22%	0%		
VT VSAC Next Generation Scholarship (Col	FT	Fin	\$234,000	1%	239	\$979	\$500	\$2,500	21%	74%	5%		
VT VSAC Next Generation Scholarship (Col	FT	Fin	\$208,709	1%	225	\$928	\$250	\$2,500	20%	67%	12%		
VT VSAC Next Generation Scholarship (Col	FT	Fin	\$201,400	1%	220	\$915	\$500	\$1,000	53%	45%	2%		
WA Washington State Need Grant Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$211,054,963	88%	70,376	\$2,999	\$1	\$6,876	86%	11%	2%	77%	0%
WA Worker Retraining Program	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$10,569,991	4%	8,691	\$1,216			100%	0%	0%		
WA Opportunity Grant	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$9,717,821	4%	5,494	\$1,769			95%	0%	5%	85%	2%
WA Washington Scholars	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$2,695,058	1%	408	\$6,606	\$1	\$6,840	71%	29%	0%		
WA Education Opportunity Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$2,566,901	1%	1,158	\$2,217	\$1	\$2,500	73%	27%	0%		
WA Passport to College Promise Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin	\$1,314,405	1%	314	\$4,186	\$1	\$6,793	88%	8%	4%		
WA Washington Award for Vocational Excell	FT, HT, BHT	Aca	\$1,123,360	0%	258	\$4,354	\$1	\$7,600	85%	11%	5%		

State and Program	Eligibility		Total Dollars	Recipients		Award		% Dollars by Sector			Family Income		
	Full, Half, and Below Half Time	Financial/ Academic	Disbursed	% of All State Programs	Number of	Avg. Dollars Per	Min.	Max.	Public	Private	For-Profit	Less than \$40k	More than \$80k
WI Wisconsin Higher Education Grant - UW	FT, HT	Fin	\$54,977,370	52%	25,423	\$2,163	\$674	\$2,980	100%	0%	0%		
WI Wisconsin Tuition Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$25,909,981	24%	10,300	\$2,516	\$1,000	\$2,900	0%	100%	0%		
WI Wisconsin Higher Education Grant - WTC	FT, HT	Fin	\$16,686,129	16%	18,207	\$916	\$494	\$1,170	100%	0%	0%		
WI Talent Incentive Program Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$4,419,019	4%	4,311	\$1,025	\$250	\$1,800	77%	23%	0%		
WI Academic Excellence Scholarship	FT, HT	Aca	\$3,126,180	3%	2,853	\$1,096		\$2,250	82%	18%	0%		
WI Minority Undergraduate Retention Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$400,550	0%	487	\$822	\$250	\$2,500	100%	0%	0%		
WI Minority Undergraduate Retention Grant	FT, HT	Fin	\$385,747	0%	310	\$1,244	\$250	\$2,500	0%	100%	0%		
WV PROMISE Scholarship	FT	Aca	\$45,599,720	40%	9,224	\$4,944	\$2,064	\$5,304	90%	10%	0%		
WV West Virginia Higher Education Grant Pr	FT	Fin, Aca	\$40,082,411	36%	14,997	\$2,673	\$500	\$3,300	84%	12%	5%	62%	1%
WV Institutional Tuition & Fee Waivers	FT, HT, BHT	N/A	\$22,762,192	20%	7,723	\$2,947			100%	0%	0%		
WV Higher Education Adult Part-Time Progra	HT, BHT	Fin	\$4,252,879	4%	3,986	\$1,067							
WY Hatha way Scholarship	FT, HT	Fin, Aca	\$13,621,921	99%	5,813	\$2,343	\$100						
WY LEAP	FT, HT, BHT	Fin	\$164,942	1%	274	\$602	\$125	\$1,071	100%	0%	0%	78%	0%

Notes: The federal government provided matching funds to state under the LEAP program, which was discontinued in 2011. Family income breakdowns are for dependent students only.

Endnotes

- ¹ The College Board. *Trends in College Pricing 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>; U.S. Census Bureau, Historical Income Tables, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/historical/index.html>.
- ² Illinois State University Grapevine Data. <http://grapevine.illinoisstate.edu/index.shtml>; The College Board, *Trends in Student Aid 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- ³ The College Board. *Trends in Student Aid 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- ⁴ National Association of State Budget Officers. *State Expenditures, FY 2010, Table 5*. <http://www.nasbo.org/sites/default/files/2010%20State%20Expenditure%20Report.pdf>. In FY 2010, the proportion of state expenditures devoted to higher education ranged from 2% in Vermont and 3% in Pennsylvania to 22% in Nebraska and 24% in Iowa.
- ⁵ Goldin, Claudia, and Lawrence Katz. *The Race Between Education and Technology*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2008; Baum, Sandy, Jennifer Ma, and Kathleen Payea. *Education Pays: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society*. The College Board, 2010.
- ⁶ Illinois State University Grapevine Data. <http://grapevine.illinoisstate.edu/index.shtml>; The College Board. *Trends in Student Aid 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- ⁷ National Association of State Student Grant & Aid Programs. *NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009-10*. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx#>.
- ⁸ Doyle, William. "Adoption of Merit-Based Student Grant Programs: An Event History Analysis." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 28, no. 3 (2006): 259-285.
- ⁹ The College Board. *Trends in Student Aid 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- ¹⁰ National Association of State Student Grant & Aid Programs. *NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009-10*. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx#>.
- ¹¹ National Association of State Student Grant & Aid Programs. *NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009-10*. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx#>.
- ¹² National Association of State Student Grant & Aid Programs. *NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009-10*. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx#>.
- ¹³ National Association of State Student Grant & Aid Programs. *NASSGAP Annual Survey, 2009-10*. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx#>.
- ¹⁴ United States Census. *State Median Income*. <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/statemedian/index.html>.
- ¹⁵ The College Board. *Trends in Student Aid 2011*. <http://trends.collegeboard.org>.
- ¹⁶ Heller, Donald. *The Effects of Tuition Prices and Financial Aid on Enrollment in Higher Education: California and the Nation*. Ed Fund, 2001; Heller, Donald. "Student Price Response in Higher Education: An Update to Leslie and Brinkman." *Journal of Higher Education* 68, no. 6 (1997): 624-659.
- ¹⁷ Bowen, William G., Matthew M. Chingos, and Michael S. McPherson. *Crossing the Finish Line: Completing College at America's Public Universities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- ¹⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. *Current Population Survey, FINC-02*. http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032011/faminc/new02_001.htm.
- ¹⁹ The Expected Family Contribution cut-off for the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program is \$12,000 (<http://dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/accessmo.php>). In contrast, the cut-off for the Texas Grant Program is \$4,000 (<http://finaid.utpa.edu/finaid/new%20wp/Types/types.html>) and for the Ohio College

Opportunity Grant it is \$2,200

(http://www.ohio.edu/financialaid/grants/grant_ocog.cfm).

²⁰ NPSAS Power Stats, <http://nces.ed.gov/datalab/>.

²¹ The intended incentives of different grant programs — federal, state, and institutional — can also interact in unintended ways. For example, a state program that rewards on-time progress toward a degree may be undermined by an institutional program that provides additional funding to students who lose the state award (not purposefully, but as a result of the institution’s financial aid formula).

²² In 2010, about 9% of state grant programs had age restrictions and an additional 20% considered high school academic performance, likely excluding older students (NASSGAP 2010 data query).

²³ The University of Texas-Pan American, *Student Financial Services*.

<http://finaid.utpa.edu/finaid/new%20wp/Types/types.html>; iowa.gov. *All Iowa Opportunity Scholarship*.

<http://www.iowacollegeaid.gov/ScholarshipsGrants/alliowaopportunitiescholarship.html>.

²⁴ Bozick, Robert, and Stefanie DeLuca. "Better Late than Never? Delayed Enrollment in the High School to College Transition." *Social Forces* 84, no. 1 (2005): 531-554.

²⁵ U.S. Department of Education. *Digest of Education Statistics 2010, Tables 197 and 199*.

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables_3.asp.

²⁶ U.S. Department of Education. *Federal Pell Grant End-of-year Report, 2009-10*.

<http://www.ed.gov/finaid/prof/resources/data/ope.html>.

²⁷ Dynarski, Susan, and Judith E. Scott-Clayton. "The Cost of Complexity in Federal Student Aid: Lessons from Optimal Tax Theory and Behavioral Economics." *National Tax Journal* 59, no. 2 (2006): 319-356.

²⁸ Bettinger, Eric P., Bridget Terry Long, Philip Oreopoulos, and Lisa Sanbonmatsu. "The Role of Simplification and Information in College Decisions: Results from the H&R Block FAFSA Experiment." *NBER, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 15361*, 2009.

²⁹ Baum, Sandy, Jennifer Ma, and Anne Sturtevant. *Simplifying Student Aid: What It Would Mean for States*. The College Board, 2012.

³⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. *Households, Table H-8*.

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/data/historical/household/>.

³¹ Bernstein, Jared, Elizabeth McNichol, and Andrew Nicholas. "Pulling Apart: A State by State Analysis of Income Trends." Economic Policy Institute and Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2008. <http://www.cbpp.org/files/4-9-08sfp.pdf>.

³² The Texas and Kentucky state grant programs follow this model, with most recipients receiving the same award, rather than having smaller awards for students with lower levels of need.

³³ A similar model for the federal Pell Grant program was proposed by the Rethinking Student Aid Study Group. The proposal included setting the income limits in relation to the poverty level for the appropriate family size. See Rethinking Student Aid Study Group. *Fulfilling the Commitment: Recommendations for Reforming Federal Student Aid*. The College Board, 2008.

³⁴ Aid tables that are not based on a gradual decline of awards as incomes increase may create undesirable "cliff effects," with a large jump in aid corresponding to a small change in income moving students from one cell to another.

- ³⁵ For evidence on knowledge of financial aid and the impact of information, see "Paving the Way: How Financial Aid Awareness Affects College Access and Success." The Institute for College Access and Success. October 2008.
http://projectonstudentdebt.org/fckfiles/Paving_the_Way.pdf.
- ³⁶ O'Shaughnessy, Lynn. "Good Luck Finding a Net Price Calculator." U.S. News.com. November 15, 2011. <http://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/the-college-solution/2011/11/15/good-luck-finding-a-net-price-calculator>.
- ³⁷ Abraham, Katharine, and Melissa Clark. "Financial Aid and Students' College Decisions: Evidence from the District of Columbia Tuition Assistance Grant Program." *Journal of Human Resources* 41, no. 3 (2006): 578-610.
- ³⁸ Dynarski, Susan. "Does Aid Matter? Measuring the Effect of Student Aid on College Attendance and Completion." *American Economic Review* 93, no. 1 (2003): 279-288.
- ³⁹ Scott-Clayton, Judith. "On Money and Motivation: A Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Financial Incentives for College Achievement." *Journal of Human Resources* 46, no. 3 (2011): 614-646.
- ⁴⁰ Bradbury, John Charles, and Noel D. Campbell. "Local Lobbying for State Grants: Evidence from Georgia's HOPE Scholarship." *Public Finance Review* 31, no. 4 (2003): 367-391; Cornwell, Christopher M., Kyung Hee Lee, and David B. Mustard. "Student Responses to Merit Scholarship Retention Rules." *The Journal of Human Resources* 40, no. 4 (2005): 895-917.
- ⁴¹ Scrivener, Susan, and Erin Coghlan. "Opening Doors to Student Success: A Synthesis of Findings from an Evaluation at Six Community Colleges." *MDRC Policy Brief*, 2011; Miller, Cynthia, Melissa Binder, Vanessa Harris, and Kate Krause. "Staying on Track: Early Findings from a Performance-Based Scholarship Program at the University of New Mexico." *MDRC*, 2011; Ritchburg-Hayes, Lashawn, Colleen Sommo, and Rashida Welbeck. "Promoting Full-time Attendance among Adults in Community College: Early Impacts from the Performance-Based Scholarship Demonstration in New York." *MDRC*, 2011.
- ⁴² Waldroup, Daniel. *HOPE Scholarship Eligibility and Retention Rates as a Function of High School Characteristics*. 2005. Data from Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority <http://juro.uga.edu/2005/HOPE%20Scholarship%20Eligibility%20and%20Retention%20Rates%20as%20a%20Function%20of%20High%20School%20Characteristic1.pdf>; See also Henry, Gary T., Ross Rubenstein, and Daniel T. Bugler. "Is HOPE enough? Impacts of receiving and losing merit-based financial aid." *Educational Policy* 18, no. 5 (2004): 686-709.
- ⁴³ Lourosa-Ricardo, Cristina, ed. "Cash-Strapped States Cut College Financial Aid." *Wall Street Journal*. January 29, 2012.
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203718504577183224210159412.html?mod=googlenews_wsj.
- ⁴⁴ Across-the-board cuts of equal percentages for all grant recipients take more dollars away from poorer students than from those with less financial need.
- ⁴⁵ For evidence of the effectiveness of expenditures on support services, see Webber, Douglas A., and Ronald G. Ehrenberg. "Do Expenditures Other Than Instructional Expenditures Affect Graduation and Persistence Rates in American Higher Education?" *Economics of Education Review* 29, no. 6 (2010): 947-958.

⁴⁶ Stinebrickner, Ralph, and Todd R. Stinebrickner. "Understanding Educational Outcomes of Students from Low-Income Families: Evidence from a Liberal Arts College with a Full Tuition Subsidy Program." *Journal of Human Resources* 38, no. 3 (2003).

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Fain, Paul. "Who Comes First?" *Inside Higher Ed*. January 5, 2012.

<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/01/05/two-year-colleges-california-move-toward-rationing-student-access>.

About the Brown Center on Education Policy

Established in 1992, the Brown Center on Education Policy conducts research and provides policy recommendations on topics in American education. The Brown Center is part of The Brookings Institution, a private nonprofit organization devoted to independent research and innovative policy solutions. For more than 90 years, Brookings has analyzed current and emerging issues and produced new ideas that matter—for the nation and the world.

Brown Center on Education Policy

The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20036
202.797.6090
202.797.6144 (f)
<http://www.brookings.edu/brown.aspx>

Support for this project was generously provided by the Lumina Foundation for Education.

Governance Studies

The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202.797.6090
Fax: 202.797.6144
www.brookings.edu/governance.aspx

Editors

Christine Jacobs
Sarah Whitfield

Production & Layout

Tiara Johnson
Sarah Whitfield

Email your comments to BrownCenter@brookings.edu

This paper is distributed in the expectation that it may elicit useful comments and is subject to subsequent revision. The views expressed in this piece are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the staff, officers or trustees of the Brookings Institution or the Lumina Foundation.