WISCAPE

Making the Nation's Investment in Student Access and Success

Part I

Refocusing the HEA Reauthorization to Reflect the Priorities of Higher Education Policy Analysts and Researchers

Jacob O. Stampen and W. Lee Hansen

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Feedback:
We welcome your comments on this working paper. Please send your feedback — with reference to "WP001" — to the address below or via email to wiscape-info@education.wisc.edu.

WISCAPE's mission is to facilitate and contribute to a dialogue about the challenges facing postsecondary education among education leaders and policymakers, community and government leaders, and other key stakeholders, including researchers, faculty, staff, and administrators. The goal of these exchanges is to increase participants' understanding of the complex structures and cultures in institutions of postsecondary education, thus improving their decision-making and leadership practices. **WISCAPE** carries out its mission through research and instruction, conferences and forums, and professional education programs.

WISCAPE
University of Wisconsin-Madison
409 Education Building
1000 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706-1398

Telephone: 608-265-6342
Fax: 608-262-4881
Email: wiscape-info@education.wisc.edu
Website: www.wiscape.wisc.edu

20040426WP001

Refocusing the HEA Reauthorization to Reflect the Priorities of Higher Education Policy Analysts and Researchers

Jacob O. Stampen and W. Lee Hansen
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Executive Summary

Background

This study reports the priority rankings given by key researchers and policy analysts to a wide array of proposals that would improve postsecondary student access to college and enhance student success in college. These proposals were advanced in 2002 and through early 2003 for consideration in the 2004 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA).

The survey's immediate purpose was to ascertain the similarity and lack of similarity in the priorities of two different groups of higher education researchers and three different groups of higher education policy analysts. A closely related purpose: to shift the focus of reauthorization legislation away from special interest groups by taking into account the priorities of higher education policy analysts and researchers.

The survey's broader purpose was to take the analysis one step farther, by making it possible for the authors to compare the priority rankings of the various options under examination here with what the new Pathways research says about the data-based, quantitative effectiveness of these options; the results of that examination are reported by the authors in a companion paper (Stampen and Hansen 2004b). This kind of comparison should help the reauthorization legislation focus on what actually works.

In the survey, respondents were asked to rank eight Broad Options, as well as 86 Specific Options, for their likely effects on postsecondary student access and academic success. The Broad Options tried to capture major changes in the educational process; the Specific Options represented smaller changes. Of particular interest were possible differences in the priority rankings between researchers and policy analysts, and within these groups, between education finance researchers and persistence researchers, and among policy analysts in government, private foundations, and Washington DC-based higher education associations. The samples were carefully selected to include individuals who are regarded as key actors in the reauthorization process. The overall response rate was 71 percent, with approximately 40 respondents in each of the five surveyed groups.

Findings

The 203 survey respondents agreed that academic preparation before college is, over and above all other factors, most important in preparing students for success in college. Next is making college affordable by increasing need-based student aid grants. Sixty-three percent of the respondents rated *Improving academic preparation* as one of the two highest priority Broad Options, followed by 43 percent for *Improving student financial aid grants and work study policies*.

At the other end of the spectrum, two options received little positive support: *Supporting institutional reform* and *Improving student aid loan plans* were rated high by only 10 percent of the respondents. Among the respondent groups, substantial agreement prevailed about the relative importance of the Broad Options. Four of the five groups gave *Improving academic preparation*, mostly in K-12 institutions, the highest priority. Higher education association analysts, not surprisingly, rated this priority second after *Improving student aid grants and work study policies*.

Substantial agreement was also apparent in the priority rankings of the 86 Specific Options. Nineteen of the options were given high priority rankings by 72 percent or more of the respondents. Top among these options at 88 and 87 percent respectively were *Informing high school students about different ways to finance college attendance*, and *Informing parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges*.

Interestingly, three of the other five Specific Options with rankings of at least 80 percent called for more and better information and encouragement aimed at students and parents: *Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college, Inform high school students about the range of total college costs e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation*, and *Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college*. Another high-ranked but quite different Specific Option is *Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically*.

The fact that these options rank so high indicates widespread perceptions of serious gaps in the ability of students and parents to grasp the essential information necessary for students to perform academically and to make a successful transition from high school to college. The number of top-ranked options calling for direct expenditure of funds is limited. Three call for increased federal expenditures, largely in the form of more student aid. Another three call for increased expenditures at the state and local levels for the purpose of raising teacher salaries, and increasing the availability of pre-kindergarten programs to improve students' readiness to learn.

Eight Specific Options received low priority rankings. They call for expanding K-12 voucher programs, national testing of learning outcomes in postsecondary education, national learning standards for postsecondary education, and several other options on resource allocation issues, ranging from tuition levels to remedial courses.

The ratings of the respondent groups differed but not as much as might have been expected. Higher education association policy analysts gave high rankings to a greater number of Specific Options than any other group, and to twice as many as finance researchers. Association analysts put great emphasis on policies that increase need-based financial aid grants, while at the same time recognizing the need for better academic preparation if additional student aid is to equalize educational opportunity.

Government policy analysts emphasize stronger academic preparation. This reflects their current emphasis on school outcomes, on student aid grants which they consistently promote, and on improved instruction. Finally, foundation analysts rank academic preparation and improved instruction as most important.

Researchers on finance regard improving students' academic preparation as essential; they favor increasing student aid, and they advocate using market incentives to induce changes in behavior, which is hardly surprising for economists. Persistence researchers responses center on improving academic achievement through informational and school improvement efforts and through student grant aid and student loan programs. They are especially concerned with assisting already enrolled students complete their degrees.

In summary, while the priorities differ somewhat among the five respondent groups, the survey results indicate a reasonably strong consensus about what needs to be done to increase student access and success in postsecondary education. Attention needs to be paid to the priorities expressed by these knowledgeable groups. In the meantime, we need to be certain that the priorities of these groups reflect the best available research findings showing what factors actually work in promoting access and student success.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the conceptual contributions to this study of our colleague, Professor Alberto F. Cabrera, whose research examines the factors affecting higher education access and student success. We also acknowledge the financial and editorial assistance of the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education (WISCAPE). This study is a direct outgrowth of three WISCAPE conferences: Optimizing the Nation's Investment: Persistence and Success in Postsecondary Education, October 23, 2002; State Strategies for Promoting Access and Retention in Postsecondary Education, March 26, 2003; and The Role of Pre-College Programs in Maximizing Access and Persistence, November 4, 2003.

We appreciate the assistance of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Survey Center in developing and executing the survey on which this study is based, especially John Stevenson, Shelley Boulianne, and also Marilyn Gannon who provided invaluable expertise in survey design, dissemination, and follow-up.

The authors further acknowledge the helpful comments of Ann Coles, Robert Fenske, Art Hove, John Lee, Henry Lufler, Thayer Reed, Scott Swail, and David Weerts, as well as the editorial suggestions of Sharon Van Sluijs, and the technical assistance of John Graham. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of any of the above named organizations or individuals.

Refocusing the HEA Reauthorization to Reflect the Priorities of Higher Education Policy Analysts and Researchers

Jacob O. Stampen and W. Lee Hansen*
University of Wisconsin-Madison

*The authors are, respectively, Professor Emeritus Jacob O. Stampen of the Department of Educational Administration, and Professor Emeritus W. Lee Hansen of the Department of Economics, both of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

I. Introduction

To extend and deepen our knowledge of the range of possible policy proposals for the upcoming reauthorization of the 1965 Higher Education Act (HEA), we surveyed 203 leading higher education policy analysts and researchers to ascertain their priorities for the reauthorization of the HEA.[1] Five groups were surveyed: two groups of researchers and three groups of policy analysts, all of whom focus their attention on postsecondary education. Our purpose was to explore their views about the options being publicly discussed on the eve of the reauthorization, and thereby reveal the individual and collective priorities of these important groups.

Individual respondents were asked to "join … in an effort to identify high leverage changes in the Higher Education Act (HEA) that can improve student access and success in higher education." We found a high level of agreement among these groups about how best to improve student access and success, reflecting the fact that they think broadly about the higher education problems and issues. This conclusion was particularly interesting because the views of the participants have never before been researched.[2]

The paper begins by reviewing the literature on reauthorization, describes the survey to ascertain the priorities of the five respondent groups, and reviews the priorities they assign to eight Broad Options and 86 Specific Options. The paper concludes with a brief summary, explores the implications of the study, and raises questions that need to be answered in a companion study (Stampen and Hansen 2004b).

II. Politics of Reauthorization

The classic study of reauthorization is the Gladieux and Wolanin (1976) analysis of the 1972 amendments to the HEA of 1965. This first reauthorization is memorable because it shifted the focus of federal higher education student aid policy from institutional aid and student loans to need-based programs. Its new Basic Education Opportunity Grants (later renamed Pell Grants) became the foundation on which student aid programs were constructed. These grants provided need-based support supplemented by work-study funds and subsidized student loans.[3] The intention was to

[1] The survey required respondents from each group to indicate what level of priority they would assign to each of 86 currently circulating proposals on student access and success.

[2] This study is in the same spirit as an earlier effort by the authors to adapt system improvement theory to higher education policy analysis (Stampen & Hansen, 1999).

[3] Other provisions of the 1972 amendments are detailed in Gladieux & Wolanin, Chapter 10.

equalize opportunity so that low-income students could overcome the traditional financial barriers to college, and to accomplish this goal by funding students directly rather than through institutions.

In reflecting on the 1972 reauthorization, Gladieux and Wolanin (1976) summarize the process of making higher education policy as "incremental in three senses: It occurs within the limits of a slowly evolving political culture; it is built on and related to existing policy; and it draws from existing policy models." (257). But, it is more than this, as Hannah (1996) shows in her study of the 1992 reauthorization of the HEA. Drawing on the words of Gladieux and Wolanin, she notes: "Within this evolutionary process, specific policy outcomes are shaped by the 'skills and intentions' of the key participants and the 'constraints and crosscurrents of the political setting in which they work." (499). She also observes that Gladieux and Wolanin place considerable emphasis on the importance of the "interactions among political actors and government institutions," including the executive and legislative branches, the higher education associations in their lobbying role, and the clientele of these programs who seek to expand their own benefits. Hannah believes that public attitudes, available resources, and the calendar of national politics all shape and delineate the political arena. In addition, she agrees that reauthorization is a highly "incremental and fragmented federal policy making process" and that "only unusual coalitions can produce policies that deviate significantly from the status quo." (498). She notes as well that the original vision of the grant aid was compromised because of a lack of consensus for the necessary reforms caused by:

> "the fiscal constraints of the 1980s and with its consequences of flat allocations and rising tuition. The pressures for middle class relief, joined with public support for the ideas of personal responsibility and institutional accountability received a full hearing in a presidential election year. Power shifts within the three major clusters of actors made unified action impossible. Legislative leadership (including staff) was powerful but could not impose its preferences; Administration officials were divided and ED [U.S. Department of Education] was under attack; and the higher education community was fragmented by self-interest and turf." (p. 523).

Hannah concludes that the "fragmented decision-making structure has led to specialized policy centers of legislators, bureaucrats, and interest groups." What they can accomplish is limited, however. "History, public ideas, and the economic and social environment help shape issues and limit the options these actors can select." She concludes that any substantial change in federal student aid policy depends on "[a] new president with a new agenda, new sets of congressional leaders, a realignment within the higher education community, a more stable economic environment, and a new set of public ideas." (524).[4] In short, it requires a new political world.

Hannah's assessment is reinforced by Wolanin's (2003) analysis of the prospects for the upcoming 2004 reauthorization of the HEA. Wolanin is not optimistic about the possibilities for major changes. He points out that neither the intellectual or political foundations for change have been laid. Moreover, other national priorities have captured public and legislative attention; public elementary and secondary education rather than postsecondary

[4] Hannah makes the interesting observation that cannot be explored here, namely, that the 1992 reauthorization was "a disappointment which had the effect of backing into a policy change that converted higher education from a social good to a consumer product." She further argues that this paved the way for much greater federal regulation of academic quality (1996, p. 524).

education is the dominant concern. Meanwhile, federal budget surpluses have evaporated, replaced by enormous revenue deficits. International concerns have shunted domestic concerns to the end of the queue. And despite the dominance of Republicans, who command the presidency and control both houses of Congress, the balance of power is too close to give Republicans free reign to set higher education policy.

Wolanin details the major higher education policy issues that are likely to shape the 2004 reauthorization. They include: addressing the social, cultural, and financial barriers facing students who are capable of benefitting from higher education but for one reason or another do not apply or attend; and dealing with academic barriers to naturally able students who are educated in low quality elementary and secondary schools. Another barrier is incompatibility among different forms of student aid (tuition subsidies, need based grants and loans, and tuition tax credits), which can lead to inefficiencies that transform a collective abundance of aid into resource shortages for individual students. There are also unanswered questions about institutional capacity, rising college costs, college quality, and regulation. (Wolanin p. 5).

An interesting thread in the work of both Hannah and Wolanin is the role of new ideas. These ideas can refer to some new vision about what should be done, such as the concept of need-based grants in the 1972 reauthorization, or a new twist on an existing idea, such as expanding the definition of "independent students" in the 1986 reauthorization. In looking back at the historic 1972 reauthorization, we find that the one big idea dominating early discussions was direct institutional aid. That idea faltered and a new idea emerged. Rather than continuing to supply institutional aid, Congress opted to provide need-based grant aid directly to students. It is true that need-based grants had been recommended in a series of earlier reports, including the Rivlin report (1969), the Carnegie Foundation report (1968), and the Hansen-Weisbrod studies (1967, 1969, 1969, 1970, 1971), but few observers would have predicted the quick triumph of this new idea. New ideas can instead focus on specific programs with the intention of improving them and also producing better and more visible outcomes.[5]

Finally, new ideas can also refer to a new and more inclusive approach to establishing priorities for the reauthorization. We see this survey reported here as an effort to ascertain and publicize the views of five key groups of higher education researchers and policy analysts, concerning what options already being discussed are most likely to be effective in increasing student access and success in American higher education. This open approach seems more likely to diminish the influence of the purely political factors that, unfortunately, have been so influential in shaping past reauthorizations of the HEA.

[5] One year prior to the 1986 reauthorization, the authors under the auspices of the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (WCER) organized a Washington, D.C. conference to bring the results of WCER research to the attention of the US. Department of Education and more generally to federal policy makers; the conference papers were later published in a special edition of the Economics of Education Review: Stampen & Cabrera, 1988; Hansen, Reeves, & Stampen, 1988; Hansen & Rhodes, 1988; and Stampen, Reeves, & Hansen, 1988.

III. Survey Design and Implementation

Objectives

We described the purpose of the survey and the larger study of which it is a part to participants in this way:

> We invite you to join us in an effort to systematically identify high leverage changes in the Higher Education Act that can improve student access and success in higher education. The purpose of this effort is to inform the reauthorization process, and thereby avoid producing a new set of amendments that though well intended will do little to promote the goals of expanding and improving the nation's educated population. And,
>
> We are asking close observers of higher education like you to assess the importance of a wide variety of options for improving student access and success in postsecondary education.. Through this process, we hope to identify similarities and differences among higher education researchers, policy analysts, and leaders of important higher education constituencies. A related goal is to learn more about how research shapes the views and priorities of policy analysts and those who lobby for change. The ultimate aim of this study is to ensure that what is learned from research on higher education feeds into the policy-legislative process.

Identifying the Options

How did we select the options we presented in the survey? We assembled an inventory of proposals pertaining both to student financial aid and to the larger issues regarding access and academic achievement. We began by identifying the options that had received press attention from January 2002 through January 2003 in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The list grew as we examined a variety of published reports as well as higher education association websites. In addition, we tried to take account of several options that were rumored to be strongly promoted in the coming reauthorization. One rumored option was an increase in student loan limits; we included this item among our Specific Options *Raise annual borrowing limits in federal student loan programs* (XI.a). The other rumored option was the possibility that the Bush administration would push for a postsecondary version of the No Child Left Behind legislation. To address this possibility, we included three Specific Options *Adopt national learning standards for postsecondary education* (I.e), *Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for postsecondary education* (I.f), and *Recognize and reward schools showing improvements in student outcomes* (I.i). In the questionnaire, the 86 Specific Options in the questionnaire were divided into eight groups which we refer to as Broad Options. It is important for the reader to keep in mind that no part of the survey, neither our groupings nor individual survey items, were presented as representing or describing anything more than an organized collection of current discussed policy proposals.

The Specific Options can be examined in several ways. At one level, some options apply to progressive stages of schooling, beginning with the home environment and pre-school experience, then elementary and middle school, high school, and continuing to postsecondary schooling. Other options would require government action, that is, they must be implemented and funded by some level of government—federal, state, or local. Some are in the domain of individual schools, while others suggest changes in colleges and universities. Others enter the realm of family and student "choices." In some instances, the options would produce represent relatively minor changes; in others, they

would have major effects.[6] Whatever the case, we focused on the options that might help improve students' access and success in postsecondary education.

Identifying the Respondents

The respondents consisted of 203 education policy experts. The lists of these experts were compiled by the authors and included the following five target groups:

(1) Higher Education Policy Analysts in the Federal and State Governments,
(2) Higher Education Analysts in Associations and Washington DC-based Policy Organizations,
(3) Heads of Foundations Interested in Student Success and Persistence,
(4) Researchers Focusing on Economics and Finance in Higher Education, and
(5) Researchers Focusing on Student Success and Persistence.

The first two target groups included higher education analysts who are most interested and involved in the reauthorization process and its results. One group of analysts was from the many higher education associations in the Washington D.C. area, such as the American Council of Education. A second group included analysts from the federal and state governments. A third group included higher education analysts from private foundations that fund education-related research and play a major role in exploring new ideas and approaches. The other two groups included members of the research communities that conduct research on the effects of programs designed to enhance access and academic success. One of these research communities included economists who focus on the finance of higher education, such as revenue sources and expenditures of higher education institutions, as well as the impact of tuition charges, student aid, costs of attendance, and student financial aid in its various forms, such as loans, grants, and work study employment. The other group was composed of education researchers who are concerned with the various factors, including existing programs, that affect students' access to college and their subsequent persistence toward a degree. These last two groups can be seen as those that produce and often disseminate the results of new research-based behavioral knowledge to the legislative process.

Conducting the Survey

The survey was conducted in Spring 2003 by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Survey Center. Survey questionnaires were mailed to 203 carefully selected individuals; responses were received from 142 of the 200 individuals who could be located, for a 71 percent response rate. For more details on selecting the sample, administering the survey, and the response rates, see "Notes on Survey" at the end of this paper. For a copy of the survey questionnaire, see Appendix A.

[6] We make no claim for the comprehensiveness of our list of proposals. However, the 86 Specific Options derived from them give ample scope for our analysis, as suggested by our subsequent examination of more recent efforts to identify key issues for the reauthorization, such as the AAU (Stedman, 2003; and Wolanin, 2003).

IV. Findings

The overall results show a wide range of responses to both the Broad Options and the Specific Options for increasing postsecondary access and academic success. Here we review the priority rankings. For convenience, the options are identified by their numbers in the questionnaire, using Roman numerals for the Broad Options and Arabic lettering for the Specific Options. The complete survey results for both sets of options are shown in Appendix B.

Broad Options

The overall results for the Broad Options are shown in the Total column of Table 1. They reveal that *Improving academic preparation* (IV) led, being viewed by 63 percent of the respondents as one of the two highest priority options.[7] *Improving student financial aid grants and work study policies* (VIII) followed with 43 percent. At the other end of the spectrum, two options received virtually no support: *Supporting institutional reform* (VII) and *Improving student aid loan plans* (VIII), both with rankings under 10 percent. The remaining four options received moderate support, clustering in the middle range of from 15-23 percent. These results seem to suggest widespread recognition that too many students are inadequately prepared to be successful at college-level academic work. These results also suggest strongly that student financial aid support provided should be in the form of need-based grants rather than as loans. Finally, neither institutional reform nor improved loan programs are not perceived to be effective means of improving access or success in postsecondary education.

Table 1: Percentages of Broad Options Given Highest Priority Rank by Respondent Groups

Broad Options	Total	Researchers		Policy Analysts		
		Finance	Persistence	Foundations	Government	HE Associations
Improving Academic Preparation (IV)	63	68	84	48	58	55
Improving Student Aid Grants and Work Study Policies (VII)	43	50	45	16	31	65
Measuring and Improving Academic Achievement (I)	23	21	13	28	35	23
Improving Instruction (V)	19	7	23	40	23	7
Increasing Teacher Training and Rewards (II)	18	29	7	36	12	10
Taking Full Advantage of Learning Aids and Opportunities (VI)	15	11	16	20	12	16
Improving Student Aid Loan Policies (VIII)	9	7	0	4	23	10
Supporting Institutional Reform (III)	8	0	13	8	8	10

In summary, four of the five groups of analysts identified *Improving academic preparation* (IV), mostly in K-12 institutions, as the highest priority among the eight Broad Options whose overall importance they were asked to rank. Only higher education association analysts rated this priority second after *Improving student aid grants and work study policies* (VII). Of the remaining six Broad Options, foundation analysts rated *Improving instruction* (V) second highest and *Increasing teacher training and rewards* (II) third highest. What the respondents seem to be saying is

[7] Respondents were asked to evaluate the priorities they would assign to the two Broad Options they believed merited the highest priority and the two broad options they believed merited the lowest priority in increasing student access and success in postsecondary education. For example, "For the following list of items, place an "H" beside TWO items that you feel are the HIGHEST priority in increasing student access and success in postsecondary education." The purpose of this was to obtain a broader sense of what respondents consider to be the most and least important issues requiring resolution. We also asked respondents to identify the two Broad Options that they considered least important. These results are reported in Appendix B.

that there is wide agreement that academic preparation before college is, over and above all other factors, the most important aspect in preparing students for success in college. Enabling students to afford college occupied the spot of second highest priority for everyone except the foundation analysts. They differed from the rest in their almost exclusive emphasis on the importance of efforts to improve the ability of educational institutions to educate. Members of all the other groups favored initiatives that would improve instructional capacity and initiatives employing student aid to improve access. The lowest rated options for virtually all groups were improving student aid loan policies and supporting postsecondary institutional reform.

Specific Options

Because the reauthorization of the HEA must deal with specific proposals rather than broad possibilities, it is important to identify the Specific Options that received highest priority rankings in the survey. The first column in Table 2 lists in descending order the top-ranked Specific Options based on the percentage of respondents giving rankings of "highest/high" to each of them; the second column lists the percentages giving "highest" ratings to each of these Specific Options. We established an arbitrary cutoff point of 72 percent for a combination of the "Highest" and "High" priority rankings. The purpose was both to limit consideration to those options with the strongest support and to include options with the strongest rankings on the "highest" priority scale.[8] Thus, among the 86 options included in the survey, 19 received what are referred to a high priority rankings of 72 percent or more.

Table 2: Specific Options with "Highest/High" Priority Rankings of 72 Percent and Above, and also their "Highest" Priority Rankings

Broad Options	Percent Ranking Highest/High Priority	Percent Ranking Highest Priority
Inform high school students about different ways to finance college attendance (VII.a)	88	36
Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges (IV.d)	87	45
Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers (II.e)	83	46
Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college (IV.a)	82	24
Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation) (VII.b)	81	29
Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college (VIII.e)	80	33
Increase funding levels for Pell grants (VIII.a)	79	41
Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students (III.b)	79	32
Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college (VII.d)	79	25
Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically (III.e)	78	28
Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning (II.f)	77	33
Help low-income students reduce total debt burdens (XI.f)	77	26
Reward teachers who receive training in high need academic subjects (II.c)	76	18
Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive at school ready to learn (III.g)	74	43
Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid (IX.h)	73	24
Reward faculty for effective teaching (VI.a)	73	22
Increase size of need-based grants provided by federal government (IX.i)	72	40
Train teachers and staff to evaluate student learning progress (II.d)	72	33
Improve coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs, and tax benefits (XI.g)	72	33

The top two options–*Informing high school students about different ways to finance college attendance* (VII.a), and *Informing parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges* (IV.d)–were clear leaders, with highly favorable rankings of 88 percent and 87 percent, respectively. Three of the remaining five options with rankings of 80 percent or more are of a similar nature, calling for more and better information and encouragement to students and parents: *Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college* (IV.a), *Inform high school students about the range of total college costs. e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation* (VII.b), and *Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college* (VII.d). Another highly-ranked option is of the same type: *Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically* (III.e). Providing these kinds of information and help are not without a cost. But the fact that respondents ranked these options so highly indicates a widespread perception that there are serious gaps in the ability of students and parents to understand the essential information necessary for a child's successful transition from high school to college.

The number of top-ranked options calling for direct expenditure of funds is limited. Two options involve increased federal expenditures: *Increase funding levels for Pell grants* (VIII.a), and *Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college* (VIII.e). Another four options involve increased expenditures at the state and local levels, namely options *Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students* (III.b), *Reward teachers who receive training in high need academic subjects* (II.c), *Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers* (II.e), and *Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive at school ready to learn* (III.g).

Table 3 shows the rankings of all 86 Specific Options organized within the framework of the Broad Options. The results are illuminating because this table shows not only which Specific Options received high priority rankings but also those with lower rankings. For information on the percentages of "low/no" priority rankings, readers are invited to consult the complete survey results in Appendix B. The results indicate that eight of the Specific Options received "low/no" priority rankings of 50 percent or more. The least favored option was to *Expand access to private K-12 schools through a voucher system* (IX.d), followed by *Adopt national testing of learning outcomes of postsecondary education* (I.f), *Convert Pell grants to loans for students who fail to obtain academic degrees* (VIII.f), *Adopt national learning standards for postsecondary education* (I.e), *Limit undergraduate loan eligibility to four years* (XI.h), *Charge higher tuition for students taking excessive number of course credits* (X.a), *Pay public college tuition costs for all students maintaining a B average in high school* (VII.e), and *Phase out remedial courses at four year colleges and universities* (V.b). A possible explanation for the low ratings these options received may be that they are considered too narrow and specific to remedy complex problems.

It is hardly surprising, by contrast, that Specific Options calling for increased federal spending on student aid received such high priority rankings. Inasmuch as student financial aid is at the center of reauthorization legislation, increased spending for student aid is considered essential by most respondents. Nevertheless, respondents list an impressive

[8] We refer to the option, *Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government* (IX.i).

variety of other options that they deem important for increasing student access and success, but these options do not fit easily within the traditionally framework of the HEA of 1965 as it has been amended. Of particular importance is the need to do better to inform and educate students and parents about what it takes to enter college and the advantages that can result from successful completion of a postsecondary degree.

Priorities for Respondent Groups

What remains unclear is the extent to which the different respondent groups agree or disagree with each other on priorities for the Specific Options. The results in Table 4 provide data that may answer that question. A quick scan of the priority rankings by each of the respondent groups for the 19 Specific Options that received the top rankings suggests considerable agreement among the five respondent groups. A closer look, however, also reveals some differences.

We find complete agreement on five of the 19 high priority options, with all five groups giving them "HIGHEST/HIGH" priority rankings of 72 percent or more: *Inform high school students about different ways to finance college attendance* (VII.a), *Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges* (IV.d), *Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers* (II.e), *Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college* (VIII.e), and *Reward teachers who receive training in high need academic subjects* (II.c). The first two options address the provision of information, the third and fifth concern teacher salaries, and the fourth acknowledges the need for larger need-based federal student financial aid grants.

Can we learn anything by examining which respondent groups did not give a high priority for all 19 of the specific options? In seven cases, it was finance researchers; in another seven cases it was foundation analysts; in three cases it was persistence researchers; and in one case it was government analysts. General patterns emerge and suggest broad conclusion: Government and association policy analysts generally agree about the importance of improving academic preparation and lowering financial barriers to college attendance. A second distinct group, composed of foundation analysts, reflects the same commitment to improving teaching and learning in schools. The third group, persistence researchers, have priorities that generally parallel those of government analysts. The final group, finance researchers, is the least enthusiastic about many of the Specific Options, yet they rank pre-school programs highly.

Some of the differences among respondent groups may be also explained in part by the varying approaches the groups took in ranking their priority options. The kinds of approaches can be seen in the number of options given high priority rankings. For example, association policy analysts proved to be most generous in their priority rankings, giving 32 of the 86 specific options a "highest/high" priority ranking. Next came government analysts, who ranked 26 options with "highest/high" ranking. Persistence researchers followed with 19 rankings, foundation analysts with 15 rankings, and finance researchers with a low of only 10 such rankings.

What can we make of this information?[9] First, the greater number of high priority rankings by policy analysts in both associations and government increases the likelihood of agreement among them, as already noted, regarding a

[9] This problem might have been avoided by instructing recipients to give "highest/high" priority rankings to no more than, say, 19 options.

Table 3: Classification of Specific Options Based on "High", "Moderate," and "Low" Priority Interval Rankings, by Broad Options

Broad Options	Priority Interval Rankings	
	High Range = 72%+	
Improving Academic Preparation (IV)	88% Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges (IV.d) 82% Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college (IV.a)	
Improving Student Aid Grants and Work Study Policies (VII)	80% Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college (VIII.e) 79% Increase funding levels for Pell grants (VIII.a) 72% Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid (IX.h) 72% Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government (IX.i) 72% Improve coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs (XI.g)	
Measuring and Improving Academic Achievement (I)		
Improving Instruction (V)	73% Reward faculty for effective teaching (VI.a)	
Increasing Teacher Training and Rewards (II)	83% Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers (II.e) 78% Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning (II.f) 76% Reward teachers who receive training in high need academic subjects (II.c) 72% Train teachers and staff to evaluate student learning progress (II.d)	
Taking Full Advantage of Learning Aids and Opportunities (VI)	88% Inform high school students about different ways to finance college attendance (VII.a) 81% Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation) (VII.b) 80% Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college (VII.d)	
Improving Student Aid Loan Policies (VIII)	77% Help low-income students reduce total debt burdens (XI.f)	
Supporting Institutional Reform (III)	79% Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students (III.b) 78% Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically (III.e) 74% Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive at school ready to learn (III.g)	

	Medium Range = 50-71%	**Low Range = Under 50%**
	64% Develop effective ways of involving parents in student learning (IV.f) 59% Expand availability of advanced placement programs to all high schools (IV.e) 59% Provide promising middle ability students with sufficient aid to attend college (VI.c) 54% Promote social and academic relationships among students from diverse backgrounds (V.e) 50% Assess learning of individual college students as a criterion for graduation (e.g.,) (V.h)	47% Raise faculty expectations of acceptable academic performance among students (V.d) 44% Guarantee college student financial aid to promising elementary students (IV.b) 43% Expand first year academic skills seminars on postsecondary campuses (V.c) 40% Stop grade inflation in schools and colleges (V.g) 33% Expand awareness of ethnic and/or multicultural needs through required college courses (V.f) 24% Increase academic requirements for admission to 4-year colleges (IV.g) 24% Enable students to graduate from high school with both diplomas and 2-year technical college degrees (V.a) 24% Phase out remedial courses at four year colleges and universities (V.b)
	70% Increase the size of need-based grants provided by state governments (IX.j) 63% Strengthen GEAR-UP and TRIO to equip at-Risk students to succeed in college (IX.e) 61% Make Pell grants an entitlement (VIII.b) 61% Increase funding for colleges and universities to provide need-based grants (IX.k) 59% Simplify methods of calculating available financial aid (IX.c) 57% Expand federal funding for work-study programs (X.e) 57% Provide extra federal support for institutions serving neediest students (X.b) 55% Increase federal incentives for states to expand grant programs (LEAP/former SSIG) (X.d) 51% Increase funding for TRIO program (IX.g) 50% Create "rainy day" funds to limit tuition increases during hard economic times (X.c)	48% Increase funding for GEAR-UP program (IX.f) 47% Target work-study funds toward low-income students (X.g) 40% Coordinate funding for student aid with tuition tax credits (IX.a) 35% Increase (front load) Pell grants for first two years of college (VIII.c) 33% Link work-study funding to service learning programs (X.f) 28% Increase the size of Pell grants by limiting eligibility to four years (VIII.d) 13% Use academic merit to determine student aid eligibility (IX.b) 12% Charge higher tuition for students taking excessive number of course credits (X.a) 12 % Convert Pell grants to loans for students who fail to obtain academic degrees (VIII.f) 10% Expand access to private K-12 schools through a voucher system (IX.d)
	71% Conduct controlled experiments to discover effective ways to improve student learning (I.h) 60% Expand state data bases to support comparisons of student performance across schools (I.j) 57% Recognize/reward schools showing improvement in student outcomes (I.i) 56% Educate the public about how schools and communities can work together to improve teaching and learning (I.g) 50% Expand federal databases to support state comparisons of student performance across states and schools (I.k)	48% Adopt state learning standards for elementary, middle and high school grade levels (I.c) 43% Adopt state testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels (I.d) 35% Adopt national learning standards for elementary, middle and high school grade levels (I.a) 27% Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels (I.b) 14% Adopt national learning standards for postsecondary education (I.e) 14% Adopt national testing of learning outcomes of postsecondary education (I.f)
	67% Provide more training for college faculty on how to teach (VI.c) 63% Provide more training for college faculty and staff on how to evaluate student learning (VI.b)	45% Tailor academic programs and support services to meet individual student needs (VI.e) 42% Use new technologies to enhance instruction and learning (VI.d) 40% Employ race/ethnicity as a criterion for determining students admissibility to college (VI.g) 39% Provide additional student services to returning and older students (VI.f)
		36% Offer financial incentives for national certification of teachers (II.a) 30% Offer financial incentives for state certification of teachers (II.b)
	63% Increase incentives for students/families to save for college (IRA, etc) (VII.g) 52% Encourage students to study harder in college (VII.f)	48% Develop programs to help Pell grant recipients improve academic performance (VII.g) 15% Pay public college tuition costs for all students maintaining a B average in high school (VII.e)
	58% Reduce students' dependence on loans to finance college (XI.b)	46% Encourage states to help students repay student loans (XI.d) 38% Limit interest subsidies to student borrowers who can demonstrate financial need (XI.i) 36% Raise annual borrowing limits in federal student loan programs (XI.a) 31% Extend time allowed to repay student loans (XI.c) 17% Provide lines of credit for all students to cover college costs (XI.e) 7% Limit undergraduate loan eligibility to four years (XI.h)
	70% Mobilize community resources to provide coaching and extra instruction for K-12 student art risk of failing (III.a) 66% Increase curricular alignment between K-12 and postsecondary education (III.d) 58% Require more 8-12 grade students to enroll in traditional college preparation courses (III.c) 49% Improve K-12 vocational education for those not planning to attend 4-year college (III.f)	

core group of high priority options. Second, the number of high priority rankings also appears to be associated with the roles of the various respondent groups. We can surmise that researchers, particularly finance researchers, may be less certain about which of the many options would be most likely to increase student access and academic success. Or perhaps, they see fewer possibilities for bringing about substantial change. Foundation analysts may have a similar outlook, based on their own experiences trying to promote change through their grant programs. In contrast, association policy analysts in particular are more likely to be in the business of promoting change. They are closely allied with the positions taken by their organizations, and are often pressed into advocacy roles. Government analysts behave more like association analysts because they are frequently involved in policy discussions and also provide information in support of such discussions.

Several specific differences in priorities chosen by the respondent groups deserve mention. These differences are revealed as one reads down the columns of Table 3. There is substantial agreement among government and association policy analysts, with only four exceptions, three of them concerning student financial aid. Association policy analysts give much higher priority than government analysts do to increasing need-based aid in their selection of options *Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college* (VIII.e), *Increase funding levels for Pell grants* (VIII.a), and *Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government* (IX.i). The other exception is that government analysts are much more inclined to *Reward faculty for effective teaching* (VI.a). Analysts from foundations are generally less enthusiastic about most options, with the most marked differences for *Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college* (IV.a), *Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation)* (VII.b), *Increase funding levels for Pell grants* (VIII.a), *Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students* (III.b), *Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid* (IX.h), and *Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government* (IX.i).

There is a notable difference between the responses of researchers on persistence and those in finance on eight of the 19 options. In all except one instance, the rankings of persistence researchers are higher than those of finance researchers. Persistence researchers give higher priority to the student-aid related options: *Increase funding levels for Pell grants* (VIII.a), *Help low-income students reduce total debt burdens* (XI.f), *Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid* (IX.h), and *Improve coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs* (XI.g). They also give higher priority to *Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically* (III.e), *Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning* (II.f), and *Reward faculty for effective teaching* (VI.a). By contrast, finance researchers give higher priority than persistence researchers to only one option, *Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive at school ready to learn* (III.g). And, as noted above, finance researchers also favor the option *Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students* (III.b). The considerable differences between these two groups of researchers could be explained by the general skepticism that exists among economists about the effectiveness of policy measures. Similarity, the views of the persistence researchers may reflect their more intimate knowledge of the broad range of variables that shape and influence students from pre-kindergarten years through college graduation.

Table 4: Percentages of Highest/High Priority Rankings of Specific Options by Respondent Groups

	Respondent Groups					
	Total	Researchers		Policy Analysts		
		Finance	Persistence	Foundations	Government	HE Associations
Inform high school students about different ways to finance college attendance (47)	88	83	91	84	93	94
Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges (28)	87	85	90	84	88	90
Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers (16)	83	79	81	80	83	92
Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college (25)	82	78	77	67	96	93
Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room and board, transportation (48)	81	78	77	68	85	93
Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college (58)	80	75	83	74	73	93
Increase funding levels for Pell grants (54)	79	72	90	58	73	97
Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students (19)	79	89	87	60	72	83
Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college (50)	79	78	68	78	85	90
Help parents of at-risk K-8 student influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically (22)	78	60	75	83	83	90
Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning (17)	77	64	83	60	84	93
Help low-income students reduce total debt burdens (83)	77	62	77	72	81	90
Reward teachers who receive training in high need academic subjects (14)	76	72	78	76	79	76
Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive at school ready to learn (24)	74	81	67	76	76	73
Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid (67)	73	61	83	60	77	80
Reward faculty for effective teaching (40)	73	61	78	76	84	69
Increase size of need-based grants provided by federal government (68)	72	68	78	54	65	90
Train teachers and staff to evaluate student learning progress (15)	72	54	64	80	84	82
Improve coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs, and tax benefits (84)	72	54	73	80	76	75

V. Conclusion

The survey reported here solicited the views of key participants in the higher education reauthorization process regarding eight Broad Options and 86 Specific Options that were being publically discussed and debated just prior to the 2004 HEA reauthorization. The five respondent groups included two types of researchers, Finance and Persistence, and three types of policy analysts, from Foundations, Government, and Higher Education Associations. Previous research has revealed a highly fragmented authorization process in which many competing groups jockey for power to enact and implement narrowly defined, often superficial solutions. Two broad findings emerged from this study. First, the survey revealed strong interest in the reauthorization, with survey response rates for the five groups ranging from a low of 64 percent to a high of 82 percent. Second, the survey results revealed widespread agreement among key participants about their priority ratings of both the Broad and Specific Options for increasing student access and success in postsecondary education.

All five respondent groups gave highest priority to the Broad Option of *Improving Academic Preparation* (IV), followed by *Improving Student Aid Grants and Work Study Policies* (VII). By contrast, the lowest priority rankings went to *Improving Student Aid Loan Policies* (VIII) and *Supporting Institutional Reform* (III). Among the 86 Specific Options, 19 of them were given the highest priority rankings. However, the number of options receiving high priority rankings ranged widely, from a high of 32 to a low of 10. Higher education association analysts identified the largest number of high priority options, 32 of them, in contrast to higher education finance researchers who ranked only 10 as high priority options.

While there was broad agreement among the five respondent groups about the priority rankings, some interesting differences did emerge. They are best summarized as follows: (1) Researchers on finance regarded improvement in students' academic preparation as essential. They favored increasing student aid, and they advocated the use of market incentives to induce changes in behavior, not surprising for economists; (2) Persistence researchers' responses centered on improving academic achievement through school improvement efforts, better information dissemination, and through student grant aid and student loan programs. They were especially concerned with assisting those students already enrolled to complete their degrees; (3) Foundation analysts consistently ranked academic preparation and improved instruction as most important. They favored improving learning delivery systems and want students and their parents to take full advantage of available learning opportunities; (4) Government policy analysts emphasized stronger academic preparation. This is reflected in their interest in improving instruction and how much students are learning; and (5) Association policy analysts continued to promote policies that increase the number and amount of need-based financial aid grants, while they also recognize the importance of improving students' academic preparation if additional student aid is to increase educational opportunity.

The survey reveals that the respondents think broadly about how to improve the educational system. They recognize the importance of what happens within families, in grade school, in high school and in college, and are aware of the important roles of community groups and state and national governments. In addition, they agree to a great extent

about what needs to be done to improve college access and student success at the federal level and at various other levels through the entire public education system.

This general sense of agreement, though comforting, may say little about the possibility that adoption of these options will indeed increase student access and academic success. That question can only be answered by determining what current educational research has to say about the likely effectiveness of incorporating these options into the 2004 reauthorization. At the same time, there is the critical issue of who has the leverage, the power, to make such changes work. In short, are the responses of policy analysts and researchers in education a reliable guide to improving students' access and success in postsecondary education?

If those who play and influential role in formulating legislation know what works and does not work, then widespread agreement among them may mean something. However, other possibilities remain. Respondents may lack sufficient familiarity with the issues and their effects to accurately identify potentially effective solutions. Respondents may be incorrect in their estimates of the impact of the options. Respondents even if they know what works may be overpowered by the larger political environment is which the reauthorization process unfolds.

One way to resolve these questions is to build the reauthorization process on the results of recent empirical research that shows not only what factors affect student access and success but also the relative strength of these effects. With this information at hand, the priority rankings from the five respondent groups can be compared with what the empirical evidence indicates about the effect of a wide array of factors on student access and success. Even if the priority rankings agree with the empirical evidence, knowing the strength of the factors influencing access and success will be critical in putting together an effective reauthorization bill.

In a companion paper (Stampen and Hansen 2004b), the authors examine the priority ratings for the Specific Options in light of Pathways research that identifies factors affecting success in high school and later graduation from high school. By taking this step, we hope to identify options that can significantly increase access to higher education and college student success.

Notes on the Survey

Here we offer additional detail about the survey.

Selecting the Participants

To assemble a list of names of federal and state government policy analysts, we included the staff of congressional committee chairs and ranking members, executive branch policy analysts from the Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, and also from non-federal research agencies. Finally, we included policy analysts from the executive and legislative branches of state governments. We did not include members of the Congress or representatives of the White House because it seemed too early in the legislative cycle (Spring 2003) to expect informed responses from them. Moreover, elected officials cannot always be candid about their views; they may be tied to a partisan agenda, or may be fluid in their positions on issues until they are finally required to vote in committee or on the floor.

The panel of association policy analysts we assembled included government relations analysts from the major public and private higher education associations and constituency-based groups, all of them members of the One Dupont Circle (Washington, D. C.) "Secretariat" of postsecondary education organizations; this loose affiliation of organizations plays an important role in coordinating their advocacy efforts on behalf of postsecondary education. In some cases, we also included well-known people from private policy analysis firms that regularly provide analytical support to the major associations.

To assemble a list of names from the foundations, we first identified those foundations that invest at least $6 million annually in possible solutions to education-related problems. We then identified the staff person who deals with higher education issues or, in lieu of such a person, the foundation president.

The criterion we used to select academic researchers of higher education finance was whether they had published at least three important, policy-related papers or reports in the past decade. We consulted with colleagues who are knowledgeable about recent and current economics research, and also checked the National Bureau of Economic Research's roster of economists working in the economics and finance of higher education. We examined several specialized economics and education journals for additional names.

Similarly, we chose academic researchers of access and persistence based on evidence of important contributions they have made. Again, we consulted with colleagues who are knowledgeable about recent and current higher education research; we checked the rosters of researchers who are members of various higher education research organizations and networks; and we examined several specialized education journals for additional candidates.

In assembling these rosters, web pages proved to be invaluable in helping us identify participants for the survey and providing their current addresses. These included web sites for the American Council of Education, the Education

Commission of the States, regional higher education boards, the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, university-affiliated centers for the study of higher education; and U.S. Department of Education. Each of the five lists was reduced to 40 individuals whom we judged to play the most important roles within their group.

Though the five samples of approximately 40 people each may seem small, we believe that these are the people with, in the words of Gladieux and Wolanin, the "skills and intentions" that place them in the class of "key actors," that is, people who have important concerns about both reauthorization and the larger goals of improving higher education access and quality.[10]

Administering the Survey

The survey questionnaire we developed was administered by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center. Funding was provided under a grant to the authors from the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education (WISCAPE). WISCAPE is a campus-wide center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Created in 2000, its mission is to engage researchers, faculty members, university staff, senior administrators, and community and government leaders in an ongoing dialogue about higher education. It is especially concerned with enhancing the role of higher education in "our society and our lives."

After we assisted in finalizing the questions and the questionnaire format, the staff of the Wisconsin Survey Center was ready to mail copies of the questionnaire to members in each of the surveyed groups. First, however, a test questionnaire was distributed via e-mail to several potential respondents between January 22 and February 1, 2003. Based on the comments we received from this test, we changed some questions. The pre-test was then repeated with these same respondents, resulting in a few further changes in the questions and their wording.[11]

The survey itself consisted to three mailings and two phone calls, administered in the period beginning February 17 and ending July 15, 2003. The first mailing included a cover letter, questionnaire, business reply envelope, a $5 incentive for completing the survey, and a postcard for participants to request a copy of the results. Subsequent mailings were similar, with slight modifications in the language. After the initial field period, further efforts were made to increase the response rate among higher education policy analysts in Federal and State Governments (their initial response rate was 37 percent). These analysts were contacted via telephone during the period of June 12 to July 15, 2003 and invited to participate in the survey. They were provided with the option of completing the questionnaire via mail, phone, fax, or e-mail. Most respondents opted to complete the questionnaire through a telephone interview. Several government analysts reported that they were prohibited by their employers from participating in surveys such as this one.

[10] Representatives of individual college and university institutions and postsecondary systems are represented in our study by the associations through which they normally work concerning legislative matters.

[11] Responses to the pre-test were not included in the final data file. Several respondents to the pre-test indicated they modified some of their responses on the second pre-test. When their responses were reviewed, we found that despite the many alterations in assigning priority, most of the changes were relatively minor.

Survey Response Rates

The overall response rate to the survey was 71 percent. Of the 203 surveys mailed to individuals for whom addresses were available, 142 surveys were completed and returned. Several mailings were returned incorrectly addresses; these addresses were corrected and mailed again. Fifty-eight of those invited to participate did not respond; of these, 53 failed to return the survey questionnaires, and five wrote letters stating their refusal to participate. The reported response rate is based on the number of returned questionnaires (142) divided by the net sample size of 200 (203 minus three individuals who were reported as no longer working for the organizations and for whom no forwarding address was available).

Survey Response Patterns by Respondent Groups

Respondent Groups	Number Responding				Response Rate (%)
	Sample Total	Could Not Locate	Non-Response	Responses	
Higher Education Policy Analysts in Federal and State Governments	36	2	10	24	71
Higher Education Policy Analysts in Associations and Interest Groups	43	0	12	31	72
Researchers Focusing on Economics and Finance in Higher Education	45	0	16	29	64
Heads of Foundations Interested in Student Success and Persistence	41	1	13	27	68
Researchers Focusing on Student Success and Persistence	38	0	7	31	82
TOTAL	**203**	**3**	**58**	**142**	**71**

Response rates for the various sample groups, shown in the accompanying table, ranged from a high of 82 percent for researchers focusing on student success and persistence to a low of 64 percent for researchers focusing on the economics and finance of higher education. The response to individual questions proved to be remarkably high, most likely because a response required only the ranking of each of the options rather than answering many separate questions. A number of individuals elaborated upon their responses with written comments. These comments ranged from minor concerns about the details of the survey questions to more major concerns about how the questions were framed and the larger purposes of the survey and the assumptions that generated it.

References

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1968). Quality and equality: New levels of federal responsibility for higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gladieux, L. E., & Wolanin, T. R. (1976). Congress and the colleges: The national politics of higher education. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company.

Hannah, S. B. (September/October 1996). The Higher Education Act of 1992: Skills, constraints, and the politics of higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 67(5), 498-527.

Hansen, W. L., & Weisbrod, B. A. (1967). Benefits and costs of public higher education in California. Madison Wisconsin: Report to the Joint Committee on Higher Education, California State Legislature.

Hansen, W. L., & Weisbrod, B. A. (1969). Benefits, costs and finance of public higher education. Chicago: Markham.

Hansen, W. L., & Weisbrod, B. A. (1969). Financing undergraduate education: A preliminary report on the Governor's Commission on Higher Education. Madison, WI.

Hansen, W. L., & Weisbrod, B. A. (1970). Financing undergraduate education, A forward look: Final report of the Governor's Commission on Education. Madison, WI.

Hansen, W. L., Reeves, R. W., & Stampen, J. O. (1988). Implications of redefining independent student status. Economics of Education Review, 7(1), 85-101.

Hansen, W.L., & Rhodes, M. S. (1988) Student debt crisis: Are students incurring excessive debt? Economics of Education Review, 7(1), 101-113.

Rivlin, A. M. (1969). Toward a long range plan for federal financial support for higher education. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Stampen, J. O., & Cabrera, A. F. (1988). Targeting and packaging of student financial aid and its effects on attrition. Economics of Education Review, 7(1), 29-47.

Stampen, J. O., & Hansen, W. L. (1999). Improving higher education access and persistence: New directions from a "systems" perspective. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21(4), 417-26.

Stampen, J. O., & Hansen, W. L. (2004b). Reorienting the HEA reauthorization to reflect what research-based evidence says about what works. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education.

Stampen, J. O., Reeves, R. W., & Hansen, W. L. (1988). The impact of student earnings in offsetting "unmet need." Economics of Education Review, 7(1), 113-27.

Steadman, J. B. (2003, March 19). The Higher Education Act: Reauthorization status and issues. Washington, DC: U.S. Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. Domestic Social Policy Division.

Wolanin, T. (2003). Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Issues and options. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Making the Nation's Investment in Student Access and Success–Part I

Appendix A

Field [illegible]
Increasing Student Access [illegible]
Postsecondary Education

Please read the following lists of options and identify the extent to which you believe that these options are a priority in increasing student access and success in higher education.

Please circle the number corresponding to your response**.** If you are not sure about a particular option, place a question mark (?) beside the item.

I.	**Academic Achievement**	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
a	Adopt national learning standards for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels	1	2	3	4	5
b	Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels	1	2	3	4	5
c	Adopt state learning standards for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels	1	2	3	4	5
d	Adopt state testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels	1	2	3	4	5
e	Adopt national learning standards for postsecondary education	1	2	3	4	5
f	Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for postsecondary education	1	2	3	4	5
g	Educate the public about how schools and communities can work together to improve teaching and learning	1	2	3	4	5
h	Conduct controlled experiments to discover effective ways to improve student learning	1	2	3	4	5
l	Recognize/reward schools showing improvement in student outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
j	Expand state databases to support comparisons of student performance across schools	1	2	3	4	5
k	Expand federal databases to support state comparisons of student performance across states and schools	1	2	3	4	5

achers	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Offer financial incentives for national certification of teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Offer financial incentives for state certification of teachers	1	2	3	4	5
ward teachers who obtain training in high need academic subjects	1	2	3	4	5
Train teachers and staff to evaluate student learning progress	1	2	3	4	5
Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning	1	2	3	4	5

Institutions	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Mobilize community resources to provide coaching and extra instruction for K-12 students at risk of failing	1	2	3	4	5
Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at-risk K-12 students	1	2	3	4	5
Require more 8-12 grade students to enroll in ditional college preparation courses	1	2	3	4	5
rease curricular alignment between K-12 and tsecondary education	1	2	3	4	5
Help parents of at-risk K-8 students influence their children to take advantage of opportunities designed help them succeed academically	1	2	3	4	5
Improve K-12 vocational education for those not nning to attend 4-year college	1	2	3	4	5
rease availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive to school ready to learn	1	2	3	4	5

ademic Preparation & Incentives -List 1-	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Encourage low-income students to take entrance ams and apply for college	1	2	3	4	5
arantee college student financial aid to promising elementary students	1	2	3	4	5
vide promising middle ability students with sufficient aid to attend college	1	2	3	4	5
Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students to succeed in 4-year colleges	1	2	3	4	5
pand availability of advanced placement programs all high schools	1	2	3	4	5
velop effective ways of involving parents in student learning (e.g., FAST programs)	1	2	3	4	5
Increase academic requirements for admission to 4-year colleges	1	2	3	4	5

ademic Preparation & Incentives -List 2-	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Enable students to graduate from high school with h diplomas and 2-year technical college degrees	1	2	3	4	5
Phase out remedial courses at 4-year colleges and versities	1	2	3	4	5
Expand first year academic skills seminars on postsecondary campuses	1	2	3	4	5
se faculty expectations of acceptable academic performance among students	1	2	3	4	5
mote social and academic relationships among students from diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
pand awareness of ethnic and/or multicultural eds through required college courses	1	2	3	4	5
p grade inflation in schools and colleges	1	2	3	4	5
sess learning of individual college students as a criterion for graduation (e.g., assess portfolios, comprehensive exams in majors)	1	2	3	4	5

struction	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Reward faculty for effective teaching	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more training for college faculty and staff on how to evaluate student learning	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more training for college faculty on how to teach	1	2	3	4	5
e new technologies to enhance instruction and rning	1	2	3	4	5
Tailor academic programs and support services to meet individual student needs	1	2	3	4	5
Provide additional student services to returning and older students	1	2	3	4	5
Employ race/ethnicity as a criterion for determining dents' admissibility to college	1	2	3	4	5

udent Incentives	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
Inform high school students about different ways to ance college attendance	1	2	3	4	5
Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room & board, transportation)	1	2	3	4	5
Increase incentive for students/families to save for college (e.g., education IRA, tuition savings plans)	1	2	3	4	5
Educate parents about different strategies for paying college	1	2	3	4	5
y public college tuition costs for all students intaining a B average in high school	1	2	3	4	5
courage students to study harder in college	1	2	3	4	5
velop programs to help Pell grant recipients improve academic performance	1	2	3	4	5

udent Aid -List 1-	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
rease funding levels of Pell grants	1	2	3	4	5
Make Pell grants an entitlement (pre-commitment of government to fund)	1	2	3	4	5
Increase ("front load") Pell grants for first two years of ege	1	2	3	4	5
rease size of Pell grants by limiting eligibility to four years	1	2	3	4	5
Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students o are admitted to college	1	2	3	4	5
Convert Pell grants to loans for students who fail to ain academic degrees	1	2	3	4	5

udent Aid -List 2-	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priority
ordinate funding for student aid with tuition tax credits	1	2	3	4	5
Use academic merit to determine student aid ibility	1	2	3	4	5
mplify methods of calculating available financial aid	1	2	3	4	5
pand access to private K-12 schools through a voucher system	1	2	3	4	5
Strengthen GEAR UP and TRIO to equip at-risk dents to succeed in college	1	2	3	4	5
rease funding for GEARUP program	1	2	3	4	5
Increase funding for TRIO program	1	2	3	4	5
mplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid	1	2	3	4	5
Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government	1	2	3	4	5
Increase size of need-based grants provided by state governments	1	2	3	4	5
Increase funding for colleges and universities to vide need-based grants	1	2	3	4	5

tudent Aid **-List 3-**	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priorit
harge higher tuition for students taking excessive number of course credits	1	2	3	4	5
Provide extra federal support for institutions serving neediest students	1	2	3	4	5
Create "rainy day" funds to limit tuition increases during hard economic times	1	2	3	4	5
Increase federal incentives for states to expand grant programs (LEAP/former SSIG)	1	2	3	4	5
Expand federal funding for work-study programs	1	2	3	4	5
Link work-study funding to service learning programs	1	2	3	4	5
Target work-study funds toward low-income students	1	2	3	4	5

oans	Highest Priority	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	No Priorit
aise annual borrowing limits in federal student loan programs	1	2	3	4	5
educe students' dependence on loans to finance ollege	1	2	3	4	5
xtend time allowed to repay student loans	1	2	3	4	5
Encourage states to help students repay student loans (loan forgiveness programs)	1	2	3	4	5
Provide lines of credit for all students to cover college costs	1	2	3	4	5
elp low-income students reduce total debt burdens	1	2	3	4	5
mprove coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs, and tax benefits	1	2	3	4	5
mit undergraduate loan eligibility to four years	1	2	3	4	5
Limit interest subsidies to student borrowers who can emonstrate financial need	1	2	3	4	5

For the following list of items, place an "H" beside TWO items that you feel are the GHEST priority in increasing student access and success in postsecondary education.

___ Measuring and improving academic achievement

___ Increasing teacher training and rewards

___ Supporting institutional reform

___ Improving academic preparation

___ Improving instruction

___ Students/parents taking full advantage of learning aids and opportunities

___ Improving student aid grants and work-study policies

___ Improving student aid loan policies

Using the list above, please place an "L" beside the TWO items that you feel are the WEST priority in increasing student access and success in postsecondary education.

the space provided below or on a separate sheet, please recommend alternative options that have not been mentioned.

the purpose of classifying responses to this survey, we would like you to answer the ing questions. Please check or mark the response that applies to you.

your primary employer

- ❍ a college or university?
- ❍ a higher education association?
- ❍ a private foundation?
- ❍ a private consulting firm?
- ❍ a state agency?
- ❍ a federal agency?
- ❍ other (please specify)

How many years have you been working as a professional in the area of education policy

____years

e you

- ❍ male?
- ❍ female?

you for your input into this important initiative.

return this questionnaire within 10 days in the envelope provided to:

University of Wisconsin Survey Center
630 W. Mifflin Street Room 174
Madison, WI 53703-2636

Appendix B

Broad option

I. Measuring and improving academic acheivement

	All	ReFin	RePersis	Found	Gov	Assoc
% rating higest	23	21	13	28	35	23
% rating lowest	30	32	42	28	12	32
Highest-Lowest	-7	-11	-29	0	23	-9
Specific option						

a. Adopt national learning standards for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels.

	All	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	9	10	16	12	0	7
Low Priority	27	28	23	28	25	33
Moderate Priority	28	21	26	20	42	33
High Priority	31	38	36	32	33	17
Highest Priority	4	3	0	8	0	10
	100	100	100	100	100	100

b. Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	13	17	19	8	0	17
Low Priority	31	21	32	40	40	27
Moderate Priority	29	17	32	20	40	33
High Priority	23	41	16	24	16	17
Highest Priority	4	3	0	8	4	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100

c. Adopt state learning standards for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	3	10	0	0	0
Low Priority	18	14	19	24	13	18
Moderate Priority	31	35	29	24	13	54
High Priority	35	38	36	40	46	18
Highest Priority	13	10	7	12	29	11
	100	100	101	100	101	101

d. Adopt state testing of learning outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school grade levels.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	5	3	13	0	0	7
Low Priority	25	24	29	36	16	18
Moderate Priority	28	24	36	16	12	46
High Priority	30	35	19	40	40	18
Highest Priority	13	14	3	8	32	11
	101	100	100	100	100	100

e. Adopt national learning standards for postsecondary education.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	35	48	40	21	23	38
Low Priority	35	35	30	38	41	35
Moderate Priority	16	10	23	8	27	10
High Priority	10	3	7	21	9	14
Highest Priority	4	3	0	13	0	3
	100	99	100	101	100	100
f. Adopt national testing of learning outcomes for postsecondary education .						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	38	55	52	17	24	35
Low Priority	33	31	23	38	40	38
Moderate Priority	15	7	23	8	20	14
High Priority	10	7	3	25	12	7
Highest Priority	4	0	0	13	4	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Educate the public about how schools and communities can work together to improve teaching and learning.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	10	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	15	28	3	12	30	7
Moderate Priority	26	24	33	36	17	20
High Priority	32	31	40	32	13	40
Highest Priority	24	7	23	20	39	33
	100	100	100	100	100	100
h. Conduct controlled experiments to discover effective ways to improve student learning .						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	0	7	4	0	3
Low Priority	9	7	10	20	4	3
Moderate Priority	23	17	30	12	24	31
High Priority	41	52	40	32	44	38
Highest Priority	24	24	13	32	28	24
	100	100	100	100	100	100
i. Recognize/reward schools showing improvement in student outcomes.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	3	3	0	4	0
Low Priority	9	10	7	16	0	14
Moderate Priority	32	35	45	28	17	31
High Priority	41	45	39	44	46	35
Highest Priority	15	7	7	12	33	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100

j. Expand state databases to support comparisons of student performance.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	3	3	0	0	7
Low Priority	12	3	16	16	8	14
Moderate Priority	26	24	36	24	16	28
High Priority	36	41	39	32	36	31
Highest Priority	24	28	7	28	40	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100
k. Expand federal databases to support state comparisons of student performanceaccross states and schools.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	7	3	7	8	4	10
Low Priority	18	17	13	20	17	21
Moderate Priority	26	21	33	24	29	24
High Priority	35	41	43	32	29	28
Highest Priority	15	17	3	16	21	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
Broad option						
II. Increasing teacher training and rewards						
	All	ReFin	RePersis	Found	Gov	Assoc
% rating higest	18	29	7	36	12	10
% rating lowest	14	7	23	8	15	16
Highest-Lowest	4	22	-18	40	-3	-6
Specific options						
a. Offer financial incentives for national certification of teachers.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	10	25	13	8	0	3
Low Priority	21	25	13	16	25	28
Moderate Priority	33	36	39	24	42	24
High Priority	31	11	36	44	29	38
Highest Priority	4	4	0	8	4	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Offer financial incentives for state certification of teachers.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	8	18	3	13	4	4
Low Priority	21	21	19	26	16	21
Moderate Priority	41	43	36	44	52	32
High Priority	27	14	42	17	24	36
Highest Priority	3	4	0	0	4	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100

c. Reward teachers who obtain training in high need academic subjects.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	0	0	0	4	3
Low Priority	4	7	0	8	4	0
Moderate Priority	19	21	23	16	13	21
High Priority	58	61	65	56	50	59
Highest Priority	18	11	13	20	29	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Train teachers and staff to evaluate student learning progress.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	4	0	0	4	0
Low Priority	6	11	3	8	8	0
Moderate Priority	20	32	32	12	4	17
High Priority	39	54	36	32	32	41
Highest Priority	33	0	29	48	52	41
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Raise teacher salaries to attract and retain high quality teachers.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	4	11	3	8	0	0
Moderate Priority	13	11	16	12	17	7
High Priority	37	43	39	36	39	28
Highest Priority	46	36	42	44	44	66
	100	101	100	100	100	101
f. Prepare teachers in urban settings to work with parents and community groups to improve learning.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	4	0	0	4	0
Low Priority	4	11	0	12	0	0
Moderate Priority	17	21	16	28	12	7
High Priority	44	50	36	24	48	62
Highest Priority	33	14	48	36	36	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100
III. Supporting institutitonal reform						
	All	**ReFin**	**RePersis**	**Found**	**Gov**	**Assoc**
% rating higest	8	0	13	8	8	10
% rating lowest	49	50	42	48	50	55
Highest-Lowest	-41	-50	-29	-40	-42	-45

Specific options

a. Mobilize community resources to provide coaching and extra instruction for K12 students at risk of failing.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	1	0	0	4	0	0
Low Priority	5	12	0	8	4	0
Moderate Priority	25	20	36	28	25	14
High Priority	49	56	48	40	33	66
Highest Priority	21	12	16	20	38	21
	101	100	101	100	100	100

b. Provide supplemental support to after-school and summer programs for at risk K-12 students.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	4	7	0	8	8	0
Moderate Priority	17	4	13	32	20	17
High Priority	47	52	58	32	40	48
Highest Priority	32	37	29	28	32	35
	100	100	100	100	100	101

c. Require more 8-12 grade students to enroll in traditional college preparation courses.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	4	12	0	0	0	7
Low Priority	16	15	26	17	17	3
Moderate Priority	22	27	23	17	13	31
High Priority	34	31	26	38	50	31
Highest Priority	24	15	26	29	21	28
	100	100	100	100	100	100

d. Increase curricular alignment between K-12 and postsecondary education.

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	12	3	0	0	0
Low Priority	8	15	3	8	8	7
Moderate Priority	23	19	32	16	24	21
High Priority	38	46	32	36	28	45
Highest Priority	29	8	29	40	40	28
	100	100	100	100	100	100

e. Help parents of at-risk K-8 students influence their children to takeadvantage of opportunities designed to help them succeed academically .

	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	1	0	0	4	0	0
Low Priority	4	11	3	0	8	0
Moderate Priority	17	30	23	13	8	10
High Priority	50	30	52	50	58	59
Highest Priority	28	30	23	33	25	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Improve K-12 vocational education for those not planning to attend 4-year college.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	5	4	3	8	8	4
98145.451	16	19	10	12	17	21
Moderate Priority	30	26	35	40	33	18
High Priority	32	41	24	28	29	39
Highest Priority	17	11	28	12	13	18
	100	100	101	100	100	100
g. Increase availability of pre-kindergarten programs so students arrive to school ready to learn.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	3	4	7	4	0	0
Low Priority	3	0	10	0	4	0
Moderate Priority	20	15	16	20	20	28
High Priority	31	33	32	24	40	28
Highest Priority	43	48	36	52	36	45
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Broad option

IV. Improving academic preparation						
	All	**ReFin**	**RePersis**	**Found**	**Gov**	**Assoc**
% rating higest	63	68	84	48	58	55
% rating lowest	1	4	3	0	0	0
Highest-Lowest	62	64	81	48	58	55

Specific options

a. Encourage low-income students to take entrance exams and apply for college.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	2	7	0	4	0	0
Moderate Priority	15	14	23	29	4	7
High Priority	58	64	47	46	88	50
Highest Priority	24	14	30	21	8	43
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Guarantee college student financial aid to promising elementary students.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	12	11	10	33	0	7
Low Priority	20	21	13	25	29	14
Moderate Priority	24	39	19	8	25	28
High Priority	30	21	42	21	29	35
Highest Priority	14	7	16	13	17	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100

c. Provide promising middle ability students with sufficient aid to attend college.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	7	0	8	0	0
Low Priority	8	14	0	17	9	3
Moderate Priority	30	36	42	21	26	21
High Priority	40	21	42	42	52	45
Highest Priority	19	21	16	13	13	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Inform parents of academic subjects needed by students so succeed in 4-year colleges and universities.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	2	4	0	4	0	0
Moderate Priority	11	11	10	12	12	10
High Priority	42	46	42	44	40	40
Highest Priority	45	39	48	40	48	50
	101	100	100	100	100	100
e. Expand availability of advanced placement programs to all high schools.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	1	4	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	12	25	10	20	0	7
Moderate Priority	28	18	32	24	29	33
High Priority	43	39	42	32	63	40
Highest Priority	17	14	16	24	8	20
	100	100	100	100	100	100
f. Develop effective ways of involving parents in student learning (e.g., Fast programs).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	2	4	0	5	0	0
Low Priority	5	11	0	14	4	0
Moderate Priority	29	36	23	9	44	33
High Priority	43	39	45	50	44	37
Highest Priority	21	11	32	23	8	30
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Increase academic requirements for admission to 4-year colleges.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	12	18	3	25	4	10
Low Priority	36	29	47	21	50	33
Moderate Priority	28	21	33	38	25	23
High Priority	20	25	10	13	21	30
Highest Priority	4	7	7	4	0	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100

a. Enable students to graduate from high school with both diplomas and and 2-year technical college degrees.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	11	33	16	0	0	3
Low Priority	34	41	26	30	38	35
Moderate Priority	36	22	32	44	42	41
High Priority	14	4	19	22	8	17
Highest Priority	5	0	7	4	13	3
	100	100	100	101	100	100
b. Phase out remedial courses at 4-year colleges and universitie.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	24	32	23	20	13	31
Low Priority	37	39	45	28	33	35
Moderate Priority	15	7	16	16	21	17
High Priority	18	11	13	28	29	14
Highest Priority	6	11	3	8	4	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Expand first year academic skills seminars on postsecondary campuses.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	3	4	0	13	0	0
Low Priority	13	25	7	13	13	7
Moderate Priority	42	32	55	38	44	40
High Priority	32	32	32	29	35	33
Highest Priority	10	7	7	8	9	20
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Raise faculty expectations of acceptable academic performance among students.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	4	0	4	0	0
Low Priority	15	18	16	20	8	13
Moderate Priority	36	21	39	32	54	37
High Priority	35	43	39	24	29	37
Highest Priority	12	14	7	20	8	13
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Promote social and academic relationships among students from diverse backgrounds.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	4	7	0	12	4	0
Low Priority	7	11	0	4	13	7
Moderate Priority	35	25	40	36	38	35
High Priority	40	54	37	36	38	38
Highest Priority	14	4	23	12	8	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Expand awareness of ethnic and/or multicultural needs through required college courses.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	10	21	3	16	8	4
Low Priority	19	29	10	12	32	14
Moderate Priority	37	43	41	44	28	29
High Priority	25	7	35	16	28	39
Highest Priority	8	0	10	12	4	14
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Stop grade inflation in schools and colleges.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	13	21	10	16	4	10
Low Priority	19	11	24	16	25	17
Moderate Priority	29	36	35	16	21	35
High Priority	21	14	21	28	21	21
Highest Priority	19	18	10	24	29	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
h. Assess learning of individual college students as a criterion for graduation (e.g., assess portfolios, comprehensive exams in majors).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
98145.451	10	25	10	4	4	3
Low Priority	19	21	30		28	14
Moderate Priority	22	18	27	28	12	24
High Priority	35	21	23	52	32	48
Highest Priority	15	14	10	16	24	10
	100	100	100	100	100	100
Broad option						
V. Improving instruction						
	All	ReFin	RePersis	Found	Gov	Assoc
% rating higest	19	7	23	40	23	7
% rating lowest	8	11	7	4	8	10
Highest-Lowest	11	-4	16	36	15	-3
Specific options						
a. Reward faculty for effective teaching.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	1	4	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	2	4	3	4	0	0
Moderate Priority	24	32	19	20	16	31
High Priority	51	43	65	52	60	38
Highest Priority	22	18	13	24	24	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100

b. Provide more training for college faculty and staff on how to evaluate student learning.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	7	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	9	17	7	8	12	3
Moderate Priority	27	35	36	25	19	17
High Priority	43	38	45	38	46	48
Highest Priority	19	3	13	29	23	31
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Provide more training for college faculty on how to teach.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	7	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	4	3	0	4	12	0
Moderate Priority	28	35	39	29	16	17
High Priority	38	45	36	21	44	41
Highest Priority	30	10	26	46	28	41
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Use new technologies to enhance instruction and learning.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	0	3	4	0	0
Low Priority	11	21	7	24	8	0
Moderate Priority	45	59	55	36	42	31
High Priority	29	17	26	20	31	48
Highest Priority	14	3	10	16	19	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Tailor academic programs and support services to meet individual student needs.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	11	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	9	18	7	8	12	0
Moderate Priority	44	46	65	48	20	38
High Priority	33	21	23	28	48	45
Highest Priority	12	4	7	16	20	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
f. Provide additional student services to returning and older students.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	4	14	0	4	0	0
Low Priority	16	24	19	28	12	0
Moderate Priority	41	48	45	32	58	24
High Priority	30	14	29	32	19	55
Highest Priority	9	0	7	4	12	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100

g. Employ race/ethnicity as a criterion for determining students' admissibility to college.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	11	11	13	12	8	11
Low Priority	16	15	10	16	36	4
Moderate Priority	33	41	33	24	28	37
High Priority	27	26	30	28	20	30
Highest Priority	13	7	13	20	8	19
	100	100	100	100	100	100
a. Inform high school students about different ways to finance college attendance.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	1	0	0	4	0	0
Moderate Priority	11	18	10	12	8	7
High Priority	52	54	52	60	62	37
Highest Priority	36	29	39	24	31	57
	100	101	101	100	101	101
b. Inform high school students about the range of total college costs (e.g., tuition, room, board, transportation).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	2	7	0	0	0	3
Moderate Priority	17	14	23	32	15	3
High Priority	52	64	48	56	54	40
Highest Priority	29	14	29	12	31	53
	100	100	100	100	100	100
Broad option						
VI. Taking full advantage of learning aids and opportunities						
	All	ReFin	RePersis	Found	Gov	Assoc
% rating higest	15	11	16	20	12	16
% rating lowest	27	29	19	20	50	29
Highest-Lowest	-12	-18	-3	0	-38	-13
Specific options						
c. Increase incentive for students/families to save for college (e.g., education IRA, tuition savings plans).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	1	0	0	0	4	0
Low Priority	8	21	7	0	4	7
Moderate Priority	29	29	29	20	42	23
High Priority	44	39	52	56	35	40
Highest Priority	19	11	13	24	15	30
	100	100	100	100	100	100

d. Educate parents about different strategies for paying for college.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	1	4	0	0	4	0
Moderate Priority	19	18	32	22	12	10
High Priority	54	64	52	61	58	40
Highest Priority	25	14	16	17	27	50
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Pay public college tuition costs for all students maintaining a B average in high school.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	28	46	20	24	31	17
Low Priority	37	32	37	40	42	35
Moderate Priority	20	18	20	20	12	31
High Priority	12	0	20	12	12	14
Highest Priority	4	4	3	4	4	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100
f. Encourage students to study harder in college.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	5	4	4	16	4	0
Low Priority	14	32	7	20	8	4
Moderate Priority	29	21	30	16	36	39
High Priority	38	29	41	36	48	36
Highest Priority	14	14	19	12	4	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Develop programs to help Pell grant recipients improve academic performance.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	4	0	8	0	0
Low Priority	14	22	11	25	12	0
Moderate Priority	36	44	41	25	35	32
High Priority	36	19	48	29	35	46
Highest Priority	13	11	0	13	19	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Broad option

VII. Improving student grants & work-study policies.						
	All	**ReFin**	**RePersis**	**Found**	**Gov**	**Assoc**
% rating higest	43	50	45	16	31	65
% rating lowest	14	11	10	28	15	7
Highest-Lowest	29	39	35	-12	16	58
Specific options						

a. Increase funding levels of Pell grants.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	2	4	0	4	4	0
Low Priority	7	14	0	17	4	0
Moderate Priority	12	11	10	21	19	3
High Priority	38	43	53	25	39	27
Highest Priority	41	29	37	33	35	70
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Make Pell grants an entitlement (pre-commitment of government to fund).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	10	7	7	29	15	0
Low Priority	15	29	3	14	27	3
Moderate Priority	14	7	17	10	27	10
High Priority	31	32	47	14	15	40
Highest Priority	30	25	27	33	15	47
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Increase ("front load") Pell grants for first two years of college.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	12	18	0	9	12	21
Low Priority	26	32	17	22	32	28
Moderate Priority	27	18	41	26	24	24
High Priority	25	29	35	26	20	14
Highest Priority	10	4	7	17	12	14
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Increase size of Pell grants by limiting eligibility to four years.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	19	15	10	21	24	29
Low Priority	31	26	40	17	36	36
Moderate Priority	22	26	20	29	8	25
High Priority	22	22	23	25	32	11
Highest Priority	5	11	7	8	0	0
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Increase size of Pell grants for low-income students who are admitted to college.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	6	7	0	9	8	7
Low Priority	4	7	0	4	8	0
Moderate Priority	10	11	17	13	12	0
High Priority	47	46	55	48	35	48
Highest Priority	33	29	28	26	39	45
	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Convert Pell grants to loans for students who fail to obtain academic degrees.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	37	44	35	26	35	45
Low Priority	33	37	24	26	35	41
Moderate Priority	18	11	17	30	23	10
High Priority	9	7	17	13	8	0
Highest Priority	3	0	7	4	0	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100
a. Coordinate funding for student aid with tuition tax credits.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	10	14	7	5	4	19
Low Priority	15	18	17	14	17	8
Moderate Priority	35	32	52	29	17	39
High Priority	32	29	17	48	48	27
Highest Priority	8	7	7	5	13	8
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Use academic merit to determine student aid eligibility.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	27	21	21	29	21	43
Low Priority	31	36	31	13	38	37
Moderate Priority	29	25	35	42	29	17
High Priority	10	11	10	17	13	3
Highest Priority	2	7	3	0	0	0
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Simplify methods of calculating available financial aid.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	1	0	3	0	0	0
Low Priority	10	19	0	17	8	10
Moderate Priority	30	37	28	38	12	33
High Priority	35	33	45	25	40	30
Highest Priority	24	11	24	21	40	27
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Expand access to private K-12 schools through a voucher system.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	44	36	50	44	28	60
Low Priority	28	32	23	24	40	23
Moderate Priority	17	21	20	12	28	7
High Priority	7	7	7	8	4	7
Highest Priority	4	4	0	12	0	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100

e. Strengthen GEAR UP and TRIO to equip at-risk students to succeed in college.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	9	0	5	0	3
Low Priority	8	9	7	19	8	0
Moderate Priority	26	39	24	38	8	23
High Priority	39	39	48	29	54	27
Highest Priority	24	4	21	10	29	47
	100	100	100	100	100	100
f. Increase funding for GEARUP program.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	6	13	4	11	0	3
Low Priority	9	13	7	21	8	0
Moderate Priority	37	44	22	32	46	43
High Priority	28	17	52	26	17	23
Highest Priority	20	13	15	11	29	30
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Increase funding for TRIO program.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	6	13	4	11	0	3
Low Priority	11	9	11	32	13	0
Moderate Priority	32	48	18	37	44	20
High Priority	31	26	50	16	26	30
Highest Priority	20	4	18	5	17	47
	100	100	100	100	100	100
h. Simplify and clarify eligibility for need-based aid.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Priority	3	7	0	4	4	0
Moderate Priority	25	32	17	36	19	20
High Priority	49	43	52	40	46	60
Highest Priority	24	18	31	20	31	20
	101	100	100	100	100	100
i. Increase size of need-based grants provided by the federal government.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	3	7	0	4	4	0
Low Priority	4	4	3	8	8	0
Moderate Priority	21	21	19	33	23	10
High Priority	32	29	39	21	39	33
Highest Priority	40	39	39	33	27	57
	100	100	100	100	100	100

j. Increase size of need-based grants provided by the state government.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	7			4	
Low Priority	7	11	3	8	8	3
Moderate Priority	21	21	20	42	19	7
High Priority	31	25	43	21	27	37
Highest Priority	39	36	33	29	42	53
	100	100	100	100	100	100
k. Increase funding for colleges and universities to provide need-based grants.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	3	7	0	4	4	0
Low Priority	17	32	3	20	27	3
Moderate Priority	20	21	31	28	15	3
High Priority	29	25	24	24	27	41
Highest Priority	32	14	41	24	27	52
	100	100	100	100	100	100
a.Charge higher tuition for students taking excessive number of course credits.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	33	36	36	29	13	50
Low Priority	36	40	26	46	48	23
Moderate Priority	19	20	16	17	26	15
High Priority	11	4	19	8	13	8
Highest Priority	2	0	3	0	0	4
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Provide extra federal support of institutions serving neediest students.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	5	12	7	4	0	3
Low Priority	13	32	10	13	12	0
Moderate Priority	25	16	26	26	36	23
High Priority	37	20	42	30	32	57
Highest Priority	19	20	16	26	20	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Create "rainy day" funds to limit tuition increases during hard economic times.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	3	4	3	8	0	0
Low Priority	21	31	17	24	12	21
Moderate Priority	27	19	33	36	20	24
High Priority	35	35	33	20	44	41
Highest Priority	15	12	13	12	24	14
	100	100	100	100	100	100

d.Increase federal incentives for states to expand grant programs (LEAP/former SSIG).						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	4	8	3	5	0	3
Low Priority	12	16	10	10	20	7
Moderate Priority	29	40	26	38	16	28
High Priority	37	20	48	33	40	38
Highest Priority	18	16	13	14	24	24
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Expand federal funding for work-study programs.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	2	0	3	4	0	0
Low Priority	7	8	7	0	20	3
Moderate Priority	34	46	19	48	28	33
High Priority	39	27	52	36	40	37
Highest Priority	18	19	19	12	12	27
	100	100	100	100	100	100
f. Link work-study funding to service learning programs.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	13	8	13	17	8	17
Low Priority	29	31	26	21	48	23
Moderate Priority	25	42	19	38	4	23
High Priority	24	19	26	21	28	23
Highest Priority	10	0	16	4	12	13
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Target work-study funds toward low-income students.						
	Total	REcon&F	RPers& S	Found	Gov.	Assoc.
No priority	4	4	7	0	0	7
Low Priority	16	15	3	29	28	7
Moderate Priority	33	31	36	29	20	48
High Priority	34	39	42	29	40	21
Highest Priority	13	12	13	13	12	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
Broad option						
VIII. Improving student loan policies						
	All	ReFin	RePersis	Found	Gov	Assoc
% rating higest	9	7	0	4	23	10
% rating lowest	36	21	36	52	31	39
Highest-Lowest	-27	-14	-36	-48	-8	-29
Specific options						

a. Raise annual borrowing limits in federal student loan programs.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	7	4	0	22	4	7
Low Priority	23	39	10	9	40	20
Moderate Priority	34	15	40	48	24	43
High Priority	26	19	47	17	24	20
Highest Priority	10	23	3	4	8	10
	100	100	100	100	100	100
b. Reduce students' dependence on loans to finance college.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	4	15	3	4	0	0
Low Priority	9	15	7	0	19	3
Moderate Priority	29	35	35	40	31	7
High Priority	33	35	41	32	15	40
Highest Priority	25	0	14	24	35	50
	100	100	100	100	100	100
c. Extend time allowed to repay student loans.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	5	4	3	8	4	7
Low Priority	22	31	17	17	36	10
Moderate Priority	43	42	40	54	40	38
High Priority	21	12	33	13	16	28
Highest Priority	10	12	7	8	4	17
	100	100	100	100	100	100
d. Encourage states to help students repay student loans (loan forgiveness programs).						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	5	12	3	4	4	0
Low Priority	17	20	10	16	25	17
Moderate Priority	32	36	40	28	29	27
High Priority	28	16	30	40	29	27
Highest Priority	18	16	17	12	13	30
	100	100	100	100	100	100
e. Provide lines of credit for all students to cover college costs.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	18	24	18	25	0	22
Low Priority	32	28	36	21	52	26
Moderate Priority	33	40	32	33	22	37
High Priority	14	4	14	21	26	7
Highest Priority	2	4	0	0	0	7
	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Help low-income students reduce total debt burdens.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	3	8	3	4	0	0
Low Priority	5	4	10	4	8	0
Moderate Priority	15	27	10	20	12	10
High Priority	51	58	57	44	58	40
Highest Priority	26	4	20	28	23	50
	100	100	100	100	100	100
g. Improve coordination among need-based aid programs, tuition costs, and tax benefits.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	2	4	3	0	4	0
Low Priority	7	12	3	4	16	3
Moderate Priority	19	31	20	16	4	21
High Priority	39	19	50	48	32	41
Highest Priority	33	35	23	32	44	35
	100	100	100	100	100	100
h. Limit undergraduate loan eligibility to four years.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	37	42	37	33	20	52
Low Priority	33	31	27	25	52	31
Moderate Priority	23	23	37	38	12	7
High Priority	5	4	0	0	16	7
Highest Priority	2	0	0	4	0	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100
i. Limit interest subsidies to student borrowers who can demonstrate financial need.						
	Total	**REcon&F**	**RPers& S**	**Found**	**Gov.**	**Assoc.**
No priority	7	19	0	8	0	8
Low Priority	17	12	21	21	18	12
Moderate Priority	38	42	36	42	32	39
High Priority	28	19	36	17	36	31
Highest Priority	10	8	7	13	14	12
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes:

WISCAPE

University of Wisconsin-Madison
409 Education Building
1000 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706-1398

Telephone: 608-265-6342
Fax: 608-262-4881
Email: wiscape-info@education.wisc.edu
Website: www.wiscape.wisc.edu