

NASSGP

National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs

Kenneth Reeher
President
Pennsylvania

Ronald Jursa
President-Elect
Michigan

Lindsay Baldner
Treasurer
Colorado

Richard Stillwagon
Secretary
Missouri

May 29, 1979

SUBJECT: NASSGP Testimony Before the House Subcommittee
on Postsecondary Education

TO: Members of NASSGP

FROM: Kenneth R. Reeher
President, NASSGP



Enclosed is the testimony I presented to the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 24, 1979. Haskell Rhett accompanied me and presented testimony on behalf of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and the New Jersey Higher Education Assistance Authority. President-Elect Ron Jursa was not able to accompany me due to a board meeting in his state which required his attendance.

My presentation or the paper was not intended to set forth the positions previously submitted to Congressman Ford but discusses the Association's positions as they relate to specific issues dealing with Kornfeld's single form, the Multiple Data Entry (MDE) system, and the SSIG program. The paper also takes Pennsylvania's analysis of changes under consideration for the BEOG program which include reducing the minimum award to \$100 and removal of the one-half cost limitation in the maximum award amount. Pennsylvania has studied these two issues and on page 6 of the testimony, I discuss the results of going to a \$100 BEOG award in Pennsylvania. Also, attached to the testimony is our study which shows the impact of removing BEOG one-half cost limit on the projected 1979-80 Pennsylvania State Grant Program and the BEOG applicants. You will recall that we do offset a student's need by their BEOG entitlement prior to determination of their state grant. You may find this study interesting as it relates to your state program.

KRR:jwe

Enclosure

Correspondence Address:

Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency
Towne House
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102 (717) 787-1937

NASSGP

National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs

Kenneth Roher
President
Pennsylvania

Ronald Jursa
President-Elect
Michigan

Lindsay Baldner
Treasurer
Colorado

Richard Stillwagon
Secretary
Missouri

TESTIMONY OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
OF THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

MAY 24, 1979

PRESENTED BY
KENNETH R. REEHER, PRESIDENT

Correspondence Address:

**Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency
Towne House
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102 (717) 787-1937**

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the committee for giving me the opportunity to testify on behalf of the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs concerning the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. You have specifically asked that I discuss the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, and the State Student Incentive Grant Programs.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program has become the base upon which state programs build grant aid and upon which financial aid officers build a student's financial aid package. We are pleased that the maximum grant will now be \$1,800 per year beginning with the 1979-80 academic year and recommend minimum annual increases of \$100 per year in the maximum BEOG award beginning with the 1981-82 appropriation to take into account the rising cost of education. Student costs are currently increasing annually, moving up by 8% in 1978-79 and estimated to be 9% higher in 1979-80. The automatic annual adjustments in the future would help needy students handle these increased costs.

There has been a partnership between state and BEOG program administrators the past two years in that efforts have been made to ease the access to public funds through a common data collection device and procedure. This process has been termed the Multiple Data Entry System and has developed administratively as a result of Congressional direction under the Thompson/Eshleman amendment. MDE caused the development of a so-called "common form," an instrument or a number of such which had common items to collect data and common instructions on how to complete the data collection items. The "common form" has been utilized by about 34 states to gather a data base upon which grant eligibility is then determined for both state and federal funds. This process, which has been a tremendous step towards simplification of the application process, has taken several forms. Most states have gathered data to determine eligibility for state funds through the utilization of an overprint on a small portion

of the need analysis form used by either College Scholarship Service or the American College Testing Program. Pennsylvania utilized its own composite state/federal form and functioned as a Multiple Data Entry contractor for its residents and those non-residents in attendance at Pennsylvania institutions. It did not gather the institutional required data during the MDE function as CSS and ACT did. However, because state policy could not be altered on an immediate basis, the Pennsylvania form was rather complex though not so complicated as filing two separate forms for state and federal aid would have been. California utilized a state grant application form in addition to the CSS form and "bundled" therewith a common form to gather the demographic data required or desired by the colleges in California. This, too, was complex but a substantial improvement over multiple institutional forms distributed and collected separately.

In spite of the variations on a state-by-state basis, the MDE System resulted in a substantial reduction to the forms filed by students during the initial year of MDE with a reduction of 3 million duplicate forms filed nationally. More than 2.75 million students (78%) filed on a single application form and only 750,000 filed more than one form. In prior years, almost all students had filed at least two forms. There was only a 6% overlap nationally in the filing of duplicate application forms under MDE. In Pennsylvania prior to MDE, we required that every applicant get his or her BEOG eligibility index before we would run them through our state system. We felt the new MDE role of the Pennsylvania agency would simplify the application process and ease access of our residents to both state and federal public funds.

To determine the effectiveness of the new process PHEAA conducted surveys of the BEOG applicants, the college financial aid officers and the high school guidance counselors. Our surveys of the renewal BEOG applicants showed 88.6% of the applicants felt the 1978-79 process was simpler than when they were required to seek aid on separate forms through BEOG and Pennsylvania during 1977-78. The survey of all

financial aid officers in the Commonwealth indicated that 77% felt the Multiple Data Entry system had simplified the application process and 87% of the FAO's were in favor of the state agency's involvement in MDE. This survey was conducted during the end of September at a time when the financial aid officers had a good chance to feel the impact of MDE on the application processing system and the ability of BEOG and PHEAA to make timely awards. The high school guidance counselor's survey showed 93.1% in favor of PHEAA involvement in MDE and 86.8% of the high school counselors felt that MDE simplified the application process.

There were some unusual gains for Pennsylvania residents as a result of the Multiple Data Entry System. PHEAA received from the BEOG central processor the names and addresses of those students who had received a BEOG in 1977-78 but who had not applied to the state grant program for aid. PHEAA sent a composite PHEAA/BEOG application to the home of each of these students so that they could apply to renew their BEOG award and apply for a state grant for the first time. This resulted in 4,342 new state grant recipients in 1978-79 with awards amounting to \$2,889,339. Remember these students had not applied to the state program previously and as a result of MDE they received state grants for the first time. This group of state grant recipients had an average family income of \$6,933 as compared to an average family income of \$11,480 among the total state grant recipients. I think it is obvious that this large group of very needy Pennsylvania residents were aided by state grants in 1978-79 through a procedure that was a direct result of federal-state partnership in Multiple Data Entry.

Although it is too early to report final results, there appear to be similar benefits under the MDE System for those new BEOG constituents brought into the potential eligibility pool under the leadership of the Chairman of this Subcommittee through the adoption of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act (MISA). As you may or may not be aware, the BEOG Program does not mail application forms on which current

recipients can file for renewal of their award. BEOG does not mail applications to those who applied and were ineligible but who may be eligible in a subsequent year because program parameters have been liberalized. Aware that this committee intended eligibility extension under MISAA, PHEAA mailed its composite federal-state application form to 37,000 BEOG applicants who failed to qualify for BEOG in 1978-79 even though they had filed a complete BEOG application form. The MDE application form was mailed with a letter explaining the new potential eligibility in BEOG under MISAA.

As of May 21, more than 14,000 of these students returned their application to PHEAA and 7,165 have been processed by the BEOG national processor with 3,605 qualifying for \$2,637,908 in BEOG (average award of \$732) and 2,684 receiving Pennsylvania grants valued at \$1,328,228 (average award of \$495). More than 90% of these recipients were dependent students and their family income was 35% above the average income of all eligible students (\$19,520 vs \$14,478). Although we only have a 50% return from this mailing to date it seems quite obvious that the MISAA which you fostered has truly moved the long forgotten middle class into the student aid programs and with some assistance from the new MDE System functioning under the state-federal partnership for data entry.

There were some problems getting the MDE System functional and there were complications caused by the more stringent edits initiated by BEOG at the national processor for the 1978-79 academic year. However, once the system was in gear it seemed to work very smoothly and efficiently. The major problems BEOG experienced because of its more substantial edits and data validation were problems that would have probably occurred without MDE. Since 1978-79 was the first year for the MDE System, it is only reasonable to assume that the system will be even better in 1979-80 since it will be in its second year and we are operating MDE with a minimum of change. This process of gathering data to determine eligibility in multiple programs started with Congressional direction that MDE be undertaken on an experimental basis.

It is our opinion that the experiment has worked and we have given the Chairman recommended reauthorization to keep MDE in place and to expand its function as state agencies demonstrate their administrative capacity to the Commissioner. The recommendation also allows states to enter into mutual interstate agreements to provide joint processing of application forms under the MDE System.

The U. S. Office of Education plans to introduce a new "Single Application Form" during the 1980-81 processing year. The new federal single form will be used for all applications for Basic Grant or other federal aid. This will be a form geared to gather the federal data whereas the Multiple Data Entry System and its "common form" are generally gathering the data necessary for state, federal and institutional consideration of needy applicants. It might be remembered that institutional aid and BEOG are grounded on unrecognized but basic differences. BEOG is not outright entitlement such as Social Security and Veteran's Administration benefits but is rather entitlement tempered by program eligibility standards similar to but not the equivalent of generally accepted standards of need analysis. The entitlement concept does not exist in campus funded programs and the campus financial aid officer has traditionally required and continues to see a need for data which more appropriately moves eligibility from the entitlement concept towards a pure assessment of the parents' ability to pay. The administrator of limited funds is properly concerned with "equity" in the distribution of the limited funds being administered, be they federal, private or institutional. For this reason the financial aid community has opposed the move of the USOE to its so-called single form. It is a single form for application to federal sources of student aid but fails to serve as a common form designed to meet the state and institutional needs. Future federal intrusion on the state and institutional definition of the data base required to administer funds under programs which do not carry any concept of entitlement but are rather based upon an analysis of parental ability to pay should undergo Congressional consideration either through regulatory pronouncement subject to Congressional review or specific legislative establishment of the federal role.

There are two other questions related to changes to the BEOG Program, one being changing the minimum award to \$100 and the other being removal of the one-half cost limitation in the maximum award amount. In Pennsylvania, we have simulated the Pennsylvania 1979-80 BEOG applicant file and a test run on the \$100 award indicates that this change would create about a 4% increase in the number of awards. The awards would occur across all college sectors (public and independent) and would be made to those students in the higher income ranges (generally increasing in number as you go above \$12,000 income). Removal of the one-half cost limitation shows an expenditure increase of about 8% with none of the funds going to the full-charge independent sector. The state subsidized community and state-owned colleges where tuition is lowest would derive the maximum benefit from removal of the one-half cost limitation. The increased BEOG eligibility would flow to families at income levels below \$12,000. A report of our study of this is attached.

A change such as removal of the one-half cost limitation has a serious potential policy impact for the broad and comprehensive state grant programs. As the maximum BEOG grant in the Pennsylvania community college moves from \$1,050 under the present system to \$1,800 under removal of the one-half cost limitation, the state program must redirect its state funds away from the BEOG recipient or the student will be overawarded. This means the state program will lose the public college low-income student as a state student aid program constituent and this sector of higher education will lobby for direct state subsidy of institutions rather than extension of student aid program support. Ninety-two percent of the new BEOG dollars go to the state subsidized colleges and 91% of the state money it causes to be redirected are removed from state grant recipients attending these colleges. Families below the \$12,000 income level receive 80% of the new BEOG dollars when the one-half cost criteria is removed and 87% of the state money that is redirected is withdrawn from the below \$12,000 income level. To illustrate the impact of this change in Pennsylvania, the low-income student enrolled at a community college and commuting from home would

receive \$1,800 in BEOG and \$100 in state grant aid to finance college costs of \$2,110. At our typical community college this would finance the \$590 in tuition and fees payable to the college and the student would receive a check in the amount of \$1,310 to cover the costs of commuting from home, books and so forth.

There has been considerable discussion during the last eighteen months concerning the base year in the State Student Incentive Grant Program and consideration of a change so as to encourage new state funding in those states which have over matched the federal allocation. I would suggest that possibly the problem is not in the base year but rather in the fact that this particular subcommittee has done its job but this has not been followed up by the Appropriations Committee. The enabling legislation which the Postsecondary Subcommittee enacted provided for \$50 million authorization during the initial year of the SSIG Program, growing to an authorized \$200 million after four years. The Labor-HEW Appropriations Committee has not seen fit to fund the SSIG Program at this level. One of our Association's recommendations would suggest that appropriate federal funding could be acquired if the authorizing committee would tie mandated federal funding to the growth of the Basic Grant Program as has been done in the campus-administered programs and this could be established at a percentage of the federal funds available through the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program.

The Association now suggests additionally that the most urgent federal assistance might be in the maintenance of state funding levels and that further growth of the well established state grant programs might be an unrealistic expectation. If the Committee shares in the belief that a lack of priority in the Labor-HEW Appropriations Committee has been our problem and that maintenance of state effort is our current crises then there would be no need to address the question of revision of the base year to encourage new state funds. We would suggest that the first \$100 million appropriated in the SSIG Program be available on the current allocation formula and

that a maintenance of effort formula similar to that utilized in the campus-based programs be introduced to assure retention of state funding during a period of restrictive state budgets. The state funding levels of 1976, 1977, and 1978 could be averaged to establish the state's level of effort and a state should then be eligible for its federal allocation on the current enrollment formula so long as its level of effort is maintained in the state appropriation. Federal funding through the \$100 million level should also be allocated on a state-by-state basis on the current allocation formula utilizing this level of effort concept. Federal allocations above the \$100 million level can then be based on a supplemental allocation formula that reflects our Association's recommendation to base allocations on the state's share of graduating high school seniors. This two-tier concept will hold harmless those states which have received extra funds under the current allocation procedure. The states should be required to match all funding from the federal government with the growth matching for developing states and maintenance of effort for the more established programs being the federal policy objectives.

The Association is concerned with the trend to tie policy objectives of the Congress to the State Student Incentive Grant Program. There are those that think there ought to be possibly some new device that would cause the overmatched states to put new money into the SSIG. There has been interest in using SSIG funding in order to get less than half-time students, graduate students and other new groups into the SSIG. The Association wants to point out that the direction of SSIG (and its state matching) towards those not eligible in BEOG will impact on the policy of a "package of aid" consisting in part of an entitlement through the Basic Grant Program. Since the new constituents would not be in BEOG, there could not be the building concept and if this should occur within the current funding level we would be directing current SSIG and state matching funds away from the current BEOG recipients.

One of the major concerns in the financial aid community particularly at the

federal policy level is that the broad based Basic Grant Program with its recent enhancements might lead state legislators to allow tuition increases in order to capture additional federal dollars. It might be that the Congress would want to look at a direct program of assistance grants to either the states or the institutions of higher learning with such grants to piggyback on the Basic Grant Program. The size of the institutional grant if such were desired could be related somewhat to the tuition costs at the various institutions or the success of the institution to hold tuition levels from some specific base year. This could discourage tuition increases to capture BEOG dollars. A more comprehensive approach might be to consider the total state support of the institutions of higher learning be it through direct appropriations to retain tuition charges, the number and average amount in the state grant programs for students, or the state funding of construction costs. In fact, it could be a combination of all of these and possibly other factors. The federal government has adopted student aid as its main thrust for assisting the higher education community whereas the states have not done this. The states have carried responsibility for building facilities, paying salaries, retarding tuition increases and possibly all of this should be taken into account in making the SSIG allocation above the \$100 million level.

Another approach to deter policy change to capture BEOG dollars could be to base the allocations upon the percentage of the total cost of education or the percentage of the tuition charges which is being met by the state's student grant program. It would also be possible to relate total state grants to the total BEOG dollars coming into that state. Any of these concepts could be used for BEOG piggyback grants to the institutions or the states and should work towards leveling of tuition.

In the case of the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program we recommend legislation which would tie funding of the SEOG program to a percentage of the BEOG funding to more effectively provide student freedom of choice. If the SEOG grant is

packaged with the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant and state grant assistance the opportunity for freedom of choice is enhanced.

We recommend that the SEOG maximum award be increased to \$2,000 which will in part offset inflation trends. This increase will also assure that SEOG resources are available on an individual basis in a sufficient amount to meet as many cases of "exceptional need" as possible. It will also allow more realistic packaging of BEOG, SSIG and other aid in the independent institutions.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for hearing our position on these very vital issues. Our membership stands ready to assist in the federal-state-institutional partnership and looks to this committee for the definition of a most important role as we work jointly to obtain a priority for and secure higher education funds, define eligibility standards, assure access to aid and improve the application and administrative process. I will be glad to attempt to answer any questions now or prepare responses to your inquiries subsequent to this session.

PENNSYLVANIA HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE AGENCY
REPORT

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT

ON

PROJECTED 1979-80 STATE GRANT PROGRAM AND BEOG APPLICANTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
CHANGE IN AWARD DOLLAR FLOW	1
COMPARATIVE BEOG DATA BY INCOME LEVEL	2
COMPARATIVE BEOG DATA BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION	3
COMPARATIVE STATE GRANT DATA BY INCOME LEVEL	4
COMPARATIVE STATE GRANT DATA BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION	5

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT
 CHANGE IN AWARD DOLLAR FLOW
 STATE GRANT PROGRAM vs. BEOG PROGRAM
 (ALL VALUES IN THOUSANDS)

	<u>STATE GRANT PROGRAM</u>		<u>BEOG PROGRAM</u>			<u>STATE GRANT PROGRAM</u>		<u>BEOG PROGRAM</u>		
	<u>Award Dollars</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>	<u>Award Dollars</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>		<u>Award Dollars</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>	<u>Award Dollars</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>	
PENNSYLVANIA										
DEPENDENT STUDENTS										
INDEPENDENT FOUR-YEAR	-\$ 1	- 0.2%	+\$ 4	+ 1.4%	Below \$3,000	-\$ 103	- 3.2%	+\$ 515	+13.5%	
STATE OWNED	- 697	-10.0	+ 2,518	+13.7	3,000 - 5,999	- 350	- 6.7	+ 1,502	+15.0	
STATE RELATED	- 422	- 3.0	+ 1,538	+ 6.4	6,000 - 8,999	- 332	- 4.3	+ 1,351	+10.8	
INDEPENDENT TWO-YEAR	- 19	- 0.5	+ 28	+ 1.3	9,000 - 11,999	- 191	- 2.0	+ 829	+ 6.5	
COMMUNITY	- 354	-15.2	+ 3,064	+40.0	12,000 - 14,999	- 88	- 0.9	+ 432	+ 3.6	
NURSING	- 42	- 3.6	+ 164	+ 9.7	15,000 - 17,999	- 43	- 0.4	+ 276	+ 2.3	
BUSINESS/TECHNICAL	- 52	- 1.3	+ 245	+ 4.2	18,000 - 20,999	- 13	- 0.1	+ 163	+ 1.6	
TOTAL PENNSYLVANIA	-\$1,577	- 2.2%	+\$7,561	+8.5%	21,000 - 23,999	- 2	0.0	+ 75	+ 1.2	
TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE	- 37	- 4.7	+ 192	+1.7	24,000 - ABOVE	- 1	0.0	+ 80	+ 1.3	
TOTAL PROGRAM	-\$1,614	-2.0%	+\$7,753	+7.7%	Total Dependent Students	-\$1,123	- 1.7%	+\$5,223	+ 6.1%	
Other Applicants										
TOTAL AWARD DOLLARS					Veterans	- 10	-20.5			
WITH ONE-HALF COST LIMIT	\$81,183		\$100,211		Self-Supporting	- 481	- 5.1	+ 2,190	+17.3	
ONE-HALF COST LIMIT REMOVED	\$79,569		\$107,964		TOTAL PROGRAM	-\$1,614	- 2.0%	+\$7,753	+ 7.7%	

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT
 ** BEOG PROGRAM DATA **
 DEPENDENT STUDENTS BY INCOME/OTHER APPLICANTS

PHEAA PARENTS' GROSS INCOME	<u>WITH ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>					<u>WITHOUT ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>					<u>NET CHANGE</u>		
	<u>APPLICANTS</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>Percent Aided</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>PER CENT AIDED</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>PERCENT AIDED</u>
DEPENDENT STUDENTS													
Below \$3,000	3,712	2,880	\$ 3,810	\$1,323	77.6	2,880	\$ 4,325	\$1,502	77.6	0	+\$ 515	+\$179	0.0
3,000 - 5,999	7,484	7,032	9,991	1,421	94.0	7,032	11,493	1,634	94.0	0	+ 1,502	+ 213	0.0
6,000 - 8,999	10,188	9,212	12,471	1,354	90.4	9,212	13,822	1,500	90.4	0	+ 1,351	+ 146	0.0
9,000 - 11,999	12,400	10,604	12,747	1,202	85.5	10,604	13,576	1,280	85.5	0	+ 829	+ 78	0.0
12,000 - 14,999	14,104	11,240	12,106	1,077	79.7	11,240	12,538	1,115	79.7	0	+ 432	+ 38	0.0
15,000 - 17,999	17,000	12,264	11,928	973	72.1	12,264	12,204	995	72.1	0	+ 276	+ 22	0.0
18,000 - 20,999	21,312	12,248	10,193	832	57.5	12,248	10,356	846	57.5	0	+ 163	+ 14	0.0
21,000 - 23,999	15,336	7,940	6,043	761	51.8	7,940	6,118	771	51.8	0	+ 75	+ 10	0.0
24,000 ABOVE	<u>25,588</u>	<u>8,384</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>716</u>	<u>32.8</u>	<u>8,384</u>	<u>6,080</u>	<u>725</u>	<u>32.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>+ 80</u>	<u>+ 9</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL DEPENDENT STUDENTS	127,124	81,804	\$ 85,289	\$1,043	64.3	81,804	\$ 90,512	\$1,106	64.3	0	+\$5,223	+\$ 63	0.0
OTHER APPLICANTS													
VETERANS	5,084	2,068	\$ 2,290	\$1,107	40.7	2,068	\$ 2,630	\$1,272	40.7	0	+ 340	+\$165	0.0
SELF-SUPPORTING	<u>13,560</u>	<u>9,868</u>	<u>12,632</u>	<u>1,280</u>	<u>72.8</u>	<u>9,868</u>	<u>14,822</u>	<u>1,502</u>	<u>72.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>+ 2,190</u>	<u>+ 222</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL PROGRAM	145,768	93,740	\$100,211	\$1,069	64.3	93,740	\$107,964	\$1,152	64.3	0	+\$7,753	+\$ 83	0.0

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT
 ** BEOG PROGRAM DATA **
 BY TYPES OF INSTITUTION

	<u>WITH ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>					<u>WITHOUT ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>					<u>NET CHANGE</u>		
	<u>APPLICANTS</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>Percent Aided</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>PER CENT AIDED</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>PERCENT AIDED</u>
PENNSYLVANIA													
Independent Four-Year	44,504	26,360	\$ 29,371	\$1,114	59.2	26,360	\$ 29,375	\$1,114	59.2	0	+\$ 4	\$ 0	0.0
State Owned	27,452	18,644	18,388	986	67.9	18,644	20,906	1,121	67.9	0	+ 2,518	+ 135	0.0
State Related	34,572	22,496	24,112	1,072	65.1	22,496	25,650	1,140	65.1	0	+ 1,538	+ 68	0.0
Independent Two-Year	2,272	1,664	2,132	1,281	73.2	1,664	2,160	1,298	73.2	0	+ 28	+ 17	0.0
Community	10,500	7,960	7,651	961	75.8	7,960	10,715	1,346	75.8	0	+ 3,064	+ 385	0.0
Nursing	2,556	1,740	1,685	968	68.1	1,760	1,849	1,063	68.1	0	+ 164	+ 95	0.0
Business/Technical	<u>6,888</u>	<u>4,760</u>	<u>5,793</u>	<u>1,217</u>	<u>69.1</u>	<u>4,760</u>	<u>6,038</u>	<u>1,269</u>	<u>69.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>+ 245</u>	<u>+ 52</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL PENNSYLVANIA	128,744	83,624	\$ 89,123	\$1,066	65.0	83,624	\$ 96,693	\$1,156	65.0	0	+\$7,561	+ 90	0.0
TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE	<u>17,024</u>	<u>10,116</u>	<u>11,079</u>	<u>1,095</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>10,116</u>	<u>11,271</u>	<u>1,114</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>+ 192</u>	<u>+ 19</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL PROGRAM	145,768	93,740	\$100,211	\$1,069	64.3	93,740	\$107,964	\$1,152	64.3	0	+\$7,753	+\$ 83	0.0

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT
 ** STATE GRANT PROGRAM DATA **
 DEPENDENT STUDENTS BY INCOME/OTHER APPLICANTS

PHEAA PARENTS' GROSS INCOME	<u>WITH ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>			<u>WITHOUT ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>			<u>NET CHANGE</u>		
	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>
DEPENDENT STUDENTS									
Below \$3,000	3,772	\$ 3,198	\$848	3,772	\$ 3,095	\$820	0	-\$ 103	-\$28
3,000 - 5,999	7,540	5,222	693	7,540	4,872	646	0	- 350	- 47
6,000 - 8,999	10,300	7,686	746	10,300	7,354	714	0	- 332	- 32
9,000 - 11,999	12,428	9,363	753	12,428	9,172	738	0	- 191	- 15
12,000 - 14,999	14,160	10,053	710	14,160	9,965	704	0	- 88	- 6
15,000 - 17,999	16,352	10,020	613	16,352	9,977	610	0	- 43	- 3
18,000 - 20,999	16,936	9,552	564	16,936	9,539	563	0	- 13	- 1
21,000 - 23,999	10,068	5,449	541	10,068	5,447	541	0	- 2	0
24,000 ABOVE	<u>11,744</u>	<u>6,354</u>	<u>541</u>	<u>11,744</u>	<u>6,353</u>	<u>541</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 1</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL DEPENDENT STUDENTS	103,300	\$66,897	\$648	103,300	\$65,774	\$637	0	-\$1,123	-\$11
OTHER APPLICANTS									
VETERANS	4,604	4,880	1,060	4,532	4,870	1,075	-72	- 10	+\$15
SELF-SUPPORTING	<u>12,076</u>	<u>9,406</u>	<u>779</u>	<u>12,076</u>	<u>8,925</u>	<u>739</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 481</u>	<u>- 40</u>
TOTAL PROGRAM	119,980	\$81,183	\$677	119,908	\$79,569	\$664	-72	-\$1,614	-\$13

IMPACT OF REMOVING BEOG ONE-HALF COST LIMIT
 ** STATE GRANT PROGRAM DATA **
 BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	<u>WITH ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>			<u>WITHOUT ONE-HALF COST LIMIT</u>			<u>NET CHANGE</u>		
	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>VALUE (THOUSANDS)</u>	<u>FULL-YEAR AVERAGE</u>
PENNSYLVANIA									
Independent Four-Year	40,304	\$43,000	\$1,067	40,304	\$42,999	\$1,067	0	-\$ 1	\$ 0
State Owned	19,548	6,989	358	19,548	6,292	322	0	- 697	- 36
State Related	27,092	13,966	515	27,052	13,544	501	-40	- 422	- 14
Independent Two-Year	2,072	1,767	853	2,064	1,758	852	- 8	- 9	- 1
Community	7,712	2,331	302	7,708	1,977	257	- 4	- 354	- 45
Nursing	2,336	1,180	505	2,336	1,138	487	0	- 42	- 18
Business/Technical	<u>6,148</u>	<u>4,054</u>	<u>659</u>	<u>6,128</u>	<u>4,002</u>	<u>653</u>	<u>-20</u>	<u>- 52</u>	<u>- 6</u>
TOTAL PENNSYLVANIA	105,212	\$73,287	\$ 697	105,104	\$71,710	\$ 682	-72	-\$1,577	-\$15
TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE	<u>14,768</u>	<u>7,896</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>14,768</u>	<u>7,859</u>	<u>532</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 37</u>	<u>- 3</u>
TOTAL PROGRAM	119,980	\$81,183	\$ 677	119,908	\$79,569	\$ 664	-72	-\$1,614	-\$13