

**NASSGP**

**21st**

**National Association  
of  
State Scholarship  
and  
Grant Programs**

**Annual Survey Report**

**1989-1990 Academic Year**

The National Association of State Scholarship & Grant Programs  
**NASSGP**

21st Annual Survey Report  
1989-1990 Academic Year

State/Territory Funded Scholarship/Grant Programs to  
Undergraduate Students to  
Attend Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Prepared by:  
Kenneth R. Reeher  
Executive Director  
Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

and

Jerry S. Davis  
Director of Research and Policy Analysis  
Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

January 1990

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This marks the tenth year PHEAA has prepared the NASSGP annual report. The annual collection, analysis and reporting of these data are time-consuming tasks that could not have been accomplished without the support of many persons and agencies. We want to acknowledge their contributions.

Completion of the report would have been impossible without the cooperation and support of the state grant agencies who furnish the data. We are thankful for their continued support of PHEAA and the Association in this project.

The PHEAA Research and Policy Analysis staff devotes a great amount of attention, energy, effort and care to collecting and compiling survey responses. The considerable assistance of Debbie Heberle, Miriam Cooper, Marian Dunmire, Michelle Kinard, Laura Greene and Lynn Crone in these tasks is much appreciated. Ms. Heberle deserves special recognition for her continuous communication with survey respondents to assure that their data are accurately reported in the text and tables. Ms. Dunmire deserves our gratitude for her careful attention to editing the text and typing it and the voluminous tables.

Finally, we acknowledge the members of the financial aid community, whose continued interest in and use of this report makes the final product worth our collective efforts.

Kenneth R. Reeher

Jerry S. Davis

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
	SECTION I -- SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS.....	1
	SECTION II -- COMPARATIVE PROGRAM STATISTICS, 1988-89 AND 1989-90, AND EARLIER YEARS.....	5
1	Estimated Total Grant Aid Awarded by State Programs, 1989-90, by Types of Programs.....	17
2	Dollars and Number of Awards for Comprehensive Undergraduate Competitive and Non-Competitive State Scholarship and Grant Programs Based on Need, Actual 1988-89 and Estimated for 1989-90.....	18
3	Dollars and Number of Awards for Comprehensive Need- Based Aid Programs for Graduate/Professional School Students, Actual 1988-89 and Estimated for 1989-90.....	25
4	Dollars and Number of Awards for Non-Need-Based State Programs for Undergraduate Students, Actual 1987-88 and Estimated for 1989-90.....	28
5	Dollars and Number of Awards for Non-Need-Based State Programs for Graduate/Professional School Students, Actual 1988-89 and Estimated for 1989-90.....	33
6	Other Programs Administered by the State Agency.....	36
7	State-Funded Student Aid Programs Administered by State Agencies Other than the Responding Agency.....	43
8	Estimated Percentages of Awards and Dollars by Sector for Comprehensive Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship and Grant Programs.....	46
9	Estimated Number of Awards and Dollars by Sector for Comprehensive Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship and Grant Programs.....	51
10	State Student Incentive Grant Program Activities by States.....	53
11	Selected Program Characteristics, 1989-90.....	54
12	Eligible Institutions.....	64
13	Comments to Aid Survey Readers to Better Understand Agency Positions.....	74
	SECTION III -- POLICY ISSUES AND CONCERNS.....	77
	Significant Program Changes Planned in 1989-90 and 1990-91.....	77
	New Financial Aid Programs to be Implemented in 1990-91 or 1991-92.....	77
	State Funds Appropriated To Institutions For Financial Aid.....	78
	Factors NASSGP Agencies Consider Most Important in Reauthorization.....	80
	Using SSIG Allocations For Work-Study Programs.....	81
14	Comments Regarding Significant Changes in Current Programs or Operations Planned for 1990-91 Award Year.....	83
15	Comments Regarding New Student Aid Programs for 1990-91 or 1991-92.....	85
16	States With Appropriations To Institutions Specifically for Financial Aid Award Purposes.....	88
17	Most Important Changes States Would Like to See in Reauthorization of Title IV Programs.....	89

TablePage

	SECTION IV -- DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED AID AMONG STUDENT CATEGORIES.....	93
18	Estimated 1989-90 Award Distribution by Student Categories for Comprehensive Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship and Grant Programs.....	96
	SECTION V -- RANKINGS OF STATE GRANT PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.....	97
19	Estimated Grant Dollars Per Resident Population, 1989-90, By States.....	101
20	Estimated Grant Dollars Per Resident College-Age Population, 1989-90, by States.....	102
21	Estimated Grant Dollars to Undergraduates in 1989-90 Per Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment, By States.....	103
22	States Ranked by Proportions of Full-Time Undergraduates Receiving Awards.....	104
23	Total State Grants As A Percentage of Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education in 1989-90.....	105
	SECTION VI -- TRENDS IN STATE PROGRAMS DURING THE 1980s.....	106
	New State Grant Programs in the Decade.....	106
	Trends In Need-Based Grant Aid Dollars Among The States.....	109
	State Grants And Federal Grants Compared.....	111
24	State Undergraduate Need-Based Grant Programs Started In the 1980s.....	117
25	State Graduate Need-Based Grant Programs Started in the 1980s.....	118
26	State Undergraduate Non-Need-Based Grant Programs Started in the 1980s.....	119
27	State Graduate Non-Need-Based Grant Programs Started in the 1980s.....	121
28	Aggregate Dollars of Awards for Comprehensive Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship and Grant Programs By States, Grouped by Award Dollar Volumes, 1980-81 to 1989-90.....	122
29	Percentages of Need-Based State Grant and Pell Grant Dollars Awarded to Public, Private and Proprietary Institutions' Students, 1980-81 to 1989-90.....	124
30	Percentages of SEOG Grants Awarded to Public, Private And Proprietary Institutions' Students, 1980-81 to 1989-90.....	125
31	Changes in Average College Costs, Aggregate Need-Based State Grants, And Aggregate Pell Grants to Colleges, 1980-81 to 1989-90.....	126
32	Need-Based State Grant Dollars As A Percent of Combined State Grants, Pell Grants to Colleges and SEOG Dollars, 1980-81 to 1989-90.....	127
	SECTION VII -- NASSGP OFFICERS AND DIRECTORY.....	128

## SECTION I

### SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS

In 1989-90, states are expected to award almost \$2.1 billion in grant aid to over 1.7 million students in postsecondary education, representing a 12 percent increase over last year's \$1.86 billion awarded. As in previous years, about three-fourths of the dollars will go to undergraduates from comprehensive need-based programs. For the seventh consecutive year, these programs' dollars will exceed \$1 billion.

Although expected growth rates are always slightly higher than actual ones, this year's expected 11.6 percent growth in need-based aid to undergraduates indicates that the actual rate will be the second highest of the 1980s, exceeded only by the 11.4 percent increase between 1983-84 and 1984-85. Last year's growth rate was only 3.4 percent, while this year, 20 states expect annual growth rates in excess of 10 percent. No more than 14 states experienced such higher growth rates during the past three years. So this year represents a very positive reversal of the slow growth rate between 1985-86 and 1988-89.

Twenty-nine states have non-need-based undergraduate programs expected to increase award dollars by 18.3 percent to over \$202 million. The five-year growth rate for non-need-based grants to undergraduates is 71 percent, almost double the 39 percent rate for need-based grants. The growth in one kind of non-need-based aid, merit-based scholarships, is especially large. The 22 states with such programs expect to award \$77 million in 1989-90, 41 percent more than last year and more than double the amount awarded five years ago. But only 11 states with scholarship programs are expected to spend more than \$1 million, representing 96 percent of all scholarship dollars.

Tuition equalization grant programs in six states expect to award over 44 percent of non-need-based grant dollars this year. Grant dollars from these programs have grown by about 61 percent in five years, but by only 5 percent since last year.

Support for non-need-based grant programs in states with need-based ones generally has increased since 1984-85. In 17 of the 29 states with both types of programs, the non-need-based ones have grown at higher rates. Six states have increased their non-need-based dollars by more than their need-based ones: Ohio, Florida, North Carolina, New York, Missouri and Georgia. However, for the nation as a whole, state undergraduate need-based dollars have grown by more than five times as much as non-need-based dollars since 1984-85, \$453 million versus \$84 million.

Aggregate need-based aid to graduate/professional school students is expected to grow by only 4 percent, to \$32.9 million. Only 23 states have such programs and 92 percent of the dollars are awarded by the eight states that each award at least \$1 million annually. New York's Tuition Assistance Program alone accounts for \$11.4 million, or 35 percent of the total. Since 1984-85, this aid aggregate amount has grown by 88 percent, but representing only \$15.4 million.

Aggregate non-need-based grants to graduate/professional students in 14 states are expected to grow by 38 percent to \$15.1 million. However, over 80 percent of expected growth will occur in just two states, New York and Alaska. Since 1984-85, dollars of non-need-based aid to graduate/professional school students have increased by 70 percent. But six fewer states this year than five years ago have such programs. Under 3 percent of need-based and non-need-based state grant dollars go to graduate/professional school students.

This year's expected distributions of need-based undergraduate grant awards and dollars among students at different institutional types are similar to those of the past five years, with 59 percent of recipients attending public colleges, 31 percent attending private colleges, 5 percent attending proprietary schools and the remaining 5 percent attending other types of institutions. About 48 percent of dollars will go to private college students, 42 percent to public college students, 6 percent to proprietary school students and the remaining 4 percent to students at other institutional types.

The proportion of recipients who are independent or self-supporting continues to increase, most likely because increasing proportions are 26 years of age or older. This year, 38 percent are expected to be independent, up from 32 percent in 1986-87 and from 27 percent in 1982-83. In 1982-83, under 14 percent of the recipients, but this year over 23 percent, are 26 or older.

This is the second year for use of the Congressional Methodology to determine need for federal student aid. In total, 33 states use some form of the CM in at least one of their programs. Five states have their own need analysis systems; four use the Pell grant system exclusively and the remaining states use the Uniform Methodology and/or another system for assessing applicant need.

This year, 13 states expect over one-third of their need-based grant dollars to come from their federal SSIG program allocations, with ten expecting half or very nearly half (over 47 percent) from this source. Hawaii, Maine, North Dakota and Virginia are expected to increase considerably their matches of SSIG funds.

State grant awards are typically available to students at many types of postsecondary institutions. About half the programs which identified types of institutions where awards can be used make awards to students at public and private, two-year and four-year colleges and at least one other type of postsecondary institution. About eight out of ten programs make awards to four-year college students, over six out of ten make them to two-year college students and almost four out of ten make them to students at vocational-technical schools and nursing schools. Slightly over half the state grant programs are need-based; about 35 percent require demonstration of "merit" to receive either need-based or non-need-based awards. Need-based programs furnish far more aid dollars to students than do non-need-based ones.

Twenty states reported plans to implement, within the next two years, one or more new financial aid programs, including tuition savings plans, scholarship programs, tuition-remission programs, alternative loan programs and "community service" or work-study programs.

Thirty-one states listed their major concerns for Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Seventeen wanted increased funding for the SSIG program. Other leading topics of concern included: changes to the Congressional Methodology, especially to the treatment of student earnings; increased funding for the Pell Grant program; simplification of the financial aid delivery system; and providing more flexibility to states in administering the Paul Douglas Scholarship program.

Collectively, states spend about \$113 per capita "college-age" resident, only \$8.44 per resident of all ages, and about \$305 per full-time undergraduate student. About 24 percent of all full-time undergraduates nationwide receive state grants. Compared to what states appropriate for higher education operating expenses, they generally spend little on state grant awards. Aggregate state grant amounts represent only 5.3 percent of total appropriations for operating expenses, with 17 states spending less than 2 percent and only five more than 10 percent.

Section VI reviewed major trends in state grant aid for the 1980s. Of the 77 grant programs created during the decade and operating in 1989-90, 31 were need-based and 46 non-need-based. Aggregate aid from the new programs totals \$118.6 million, or less than 6 percent of the \$2.09 billion states expect to award this year. Therefore, creating new programs has added relatively little to the total aid available to students. The new non-need-based programs are, however, expected to award one-third of total non-need-based grant dollars, so these programs have made a significant difference in total non-need-based dollars available to students.

The growth in non-need-based programs is primarily the result of creating scholarship programs for students in general or for those preparing for careers in education or the health professions. These awards represent about 68 percent of expected award dollars from new non-need-based undergraduate programs; over 25 percent of expected dollars from all such programs.

Annual aggregate need-based grants to undergraduates almost doubled between 1980-81 and 1989-90, rising from \$836 million to almost \$1.61 billion, a 92.1 percent increase. Twenty-two states more than doubled their annual dollars awarded, with five more than tripling theirs: Massachusetts, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico and Wyoming. Only four states are expected to award fewer need-based grant dollars this year than at the beginning of the decade: Alaska, Idaho, Mississippi and Utah. The median ten-year growth rate for all states is about 86 percent. In total, states are expected to award over \$11.8 billion in need-based grants during the decade.

Annual aggregate state need-based grants to undergraduates grew at a higher rate for the decade than annual Pell Grant awards, 92.1 percent versus 74.7 percent. Annual SEOG grants grew at only 18.5 percent. Because average annual costs paid by state grant recipients more than doubled, the growth in these major government grant programs did not keep pace with the growth in student costs. Over half the growth in Pell Grants occurred in awards to proprietary school students. During the decade, aggregate Pell Grants to public and private institutions' students grew by only 40 percent. Aggregate state grants to such students grew by about 89 percent.

Between 1980-81 and 1989-90, aggregate need-based state grants grew at higher rates than aggregate SEOG grant and Pell Grants to college students in

all but six states. In 1989-90, in 17 states, need-based state grants to college students represent at least 20 percent of combined state grants, SEOG grants and Pell Grants to college students. In 11 states, over one-third of grant dollars are from state programs: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. If state grant dollars had not increased at over twice the rate of their Pell Grant dollars, the nation's college students would have been in much more dire need of publicly-funded grants by the end of the decade.

## SECTION II

### COMPARATIVE PROGRAM STATISTICS 1988-89, 1989-90, AND EARLIER YEARS

In the 1989-90 academic year, states are expected to award approximately \$2.1 billion in grant aid to students through state-funded aid programs (see Table 1). This is the first year the grand total exceeded \$2 billion, having first exceeded \$1 billion in 1981-82. Over 76 percent will be awarded to undergraduates through need-based programs administered by state financial aid agencies, which will award almost 10 percent to undergraduates in non-need-based grants. Graduate and professional school students are expected to receive just over 2 percent of the agencies' grant dollars through need- and non-need-based programs, the remaining amount, about 11 percent, to be awarded by other state agencies or institutions acting in their behalf.

Fourteen states should award over \$50 million each, for a total of \$1.66 billion, or about 79 percent of the aggregate grant dollars awarded by all states. They are, in rank order: New York, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Indiana, Iowa, Florida and North Carolina. Another nine states expect to award at least \$20 million, for a grand total of almost \$237 million, or 11 percent of the total. They are, in rank order: Wisconsin, Connecticut, Oklahoma, Virginia, Georgia, Maryland, Colorado, Tennessee and Puerto Rico. Therefore, 23 states are expected to award 90 percent of all grant aid.

Another ten states should award at least \$10 million, for a total of \$133 million or 6 percent of the total. They are, in rank order: South Carolina, Missouri, Washington, Kentucky, Alabama, West Virginia, Vermont, Rhode Island, Oregon and Utah.

The remaining 19 states will award 4 percent of the grant aid, with all but four of them awarding under \$5 million in 1989-90. The exceptions are: Louisiana, \$9.7 million; New Mexico, \$8.3 million; Kansas, \$7.6 million; and Hawaii, \$6 million.

These data show that the vast majority of state grant aid is awarded by a small number of states. The five states that award over \$100 million account for half the aid dollars, with New York alone accounting for 20 percent of the total.

#### Undergraduate Need-Based Grant Aid

Three-fourths of state grant dollars should be awarded to undergraduates through need-based, comprehensive grant and scholarship programs. For the seventh consecutive year, these programs' award dollars are expected to exceed \$1 billion. The expected award volume for 1989-90, \$1.606 billion, represents an expected 11.6 percent increase over last year's \$1.440 billion (see Table 2). The total award dollars for earlier years were: for 1987-88, \$1.392 billion; for 1986-87, \$1.338 billion; for 1985-86, \$1.234 billion; 1984-85, \$1.153 billion; and 1983-84, \$1.035 billion. Therefore, since 1983-84, aggregate need-based dollars awarded by states to undergraduates have grown by over 55 percent. Although the average annual growth rate for the six years

was 7.62 percent, 20 percent of the \$571 million growth expected since 1983-84 occurred between 1983 and 1984 and another 29 percent is expected between 1988 and 1989.

Expected growth rates are always higher than actual growth rates. For example, the expected growth rate for 1987-88 to 1988-89 was 7.8 percent, the actual growth rate, 3.4 percent; the expected rate for 1986-87 to 1987-88 was 6.2 percent, the actual rate, 4.0 percent; and the expected rate for 1985-86 to 1986-87 was 13.4 percent while the actual rate was only 8.4 percent. Therefore, the expected 11.5 percent growth rate for this year is very likely an overestimate of actual growth. Nevertheless, this year's actual growth rate is likely to be one of the highest of the decade. The actual growth rates for preceding years are as follows:

1980 to 1981	6.3 percent	1981 to 1982	7.8 percent
1982 to 1983	8.1 percent	1983 to 1984	11.4 percent
1984 to 1985	7.0 percent	1985 to 1986	8.4 percent
1986 to 1987	4.0 percent	1987 to 1988	3.4 percent

Because so much aggregate need-based undergraduate aid is awarded by so few states (the ten states with the largest programs are expected to award \$1.25 billion, or 78 percent of all the aid in 1989-90), major changes in a few of the larger states have major effects on changes in aggregate dollar volumes. Therefore, the year-to-year growth rate patterns for all states must be examined to better assess the changes. The data for 1984 to 1989 are as follows:

<u>Annual Percent Changes</u>	<u>1984 to 1985</u>	<u>1985 to 1986</u>	<u>1986 to 1987</u>	<u>1987 to 1988</u>	<u>1988 to 1989</u>
Increase 20 Pct Plus	8	4	7	6	11
Increase 15 to 19 Pct	6	3	5	1	3
Increase 10 to 14 Pct	7	6	2	3	6
Increase 5 to 9 Pct	10	6	10	11	7
Increase 1 to 4 Pct	5	6	12	12	6
Under 1 Pct Change	12	9	4	5	12
Decrease 1 to 4 Pct	1	8	4	11	7
Decrease 5 to 9 Pct	1	7	6	1	0
Decrease 10 Pct Plus	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
All States	52	52	52	52	52

These data show that the median growth rate between 1984-85 and 1985-86 was about 7.5 percent. The median between 1985-86 and 1986-87 was under 1 percent; the median between 1986-87 and 1987-88, 4.3 percent; the median between 1987-88 and 1988-89, 3.3 percent; and this year's expected median growth over 1988-89 is 5.7 percent.

It is especially noteworthy that this year 11 states anticipate growth rates in excess of 20 percent. Nebraska expects a 94 percent increase, from \$1.052 to \$2.037 million; Indiana, 64 percent, from \$35.692 to \$58.395 million; North Dakota, 58 percent, from \$976,000 to \$1,540,000; Tennessee, 44 percent, from \$11.977 to \$17.295 million; Maine, 43 percent, from \$1.408 to \$2.008 million; Florida, 31 percent, from \$16.552 to \$21.700 million; Kansas, 29 percent, from \$5.540 to \$7.129 million; Hawaii, 26 percent, from \$598,000

to \$755,000; Illinois, 26 percent, from \$143.373 to \$180.800 million; Delaware, 24 percent, from \$829,000 to \$1,029,000; and California, 23 percent, from \$129.264 to \$158.985 million. Three additional states expect growth rates in excess of 16 percent: Vermont, 19 percent, from \$9.264 to \$11.021 million; Maryland, 18 percent, from \$12.841 to \$15.185 million; and Oklahoma, 17 percent, from \$9.861 to \$11.535 million.

All told, these 14 states' aggregate growth of \$110.6 million represents about 67 percent of total expected growth of \$166.7 million in award dollars from all 52 states. The growth in Illinois, California and Indiana represents over 54 percent of the total growth.

Over 1,371,000 undergraduates are expected to receive awards from need-based programs, representing a 3.9 percent increase over last year's 1,319,000 recipients. The number of expected recipients in 1989-90 is only 4.2 percent more than the 1984-85 number, 1,316,000. Between 1984-85 and 1988-89, the number of recipients averaged 1,311,000. Thus, it appears that this year represents a significant increase in numbers of grant recipients as well as in numbers of dollars awarded.

For the fourth consecutive year, the average grant award is expected to exceed a thousand dollars, at \$1,171, which represents an 7.2 percent increase over last year's average award of \$1,092. Since 1984-85, the average grant award has grown by 34 percent, from \$877 to the anticipated \$1,171.

#### Graduate Need-Based Grant Aid

This year, 23 states reported that their need-based grant programs for graduate and professional school students expect to increase aggregate award dollars by 4 percent, from \$31.503 million to \$32.872 million (see Table 3). Five years ago, in 1984-85, states awarded only \$17.471 million in need-based grants to graduate and professional school students. So the five-year growth rate in need-based grants to graduate and professional school students exceeds the rate for such aid to undergraduates, 88 percent versus 39 percent. However, only 2 percent of need-based grant dollars go to graduate and professional school students.

The vast majority of this type of aid, over 92 percent, is awarded by the eight states that each award \$1 million or more annually. New York's Tuition Assistance Program alone accounts for \$11.4 million, or about 35 percent of the total.

Most state need-based programs aid undergraduates as well as graduate and professional school students. Noteworthy exceptions include California's Graduate Fellowships program, expected to award almost \$3 million in 1989-90; Massachusetts' Medical/Dental/Veterinarian Scholarship and Graduate Student Grant programs, expected to award, respectively, \$3.5 million and \$2.5 million; and North Carolina's Board of Governors Medical and Dental Scholarship programs, expected to award \$1.1 million.

#### Non-Need-Based Undergraduate Grant Aid

Table 4 shows that 29 states have grant programs that award undergraduates without considering their financial needs. These programs

traditionally have been grouped into three categories: (1) "tuition equalization programs," to help reduce differences between tuition costs at private and public colleges and universities; (2) "scholarship programs," to give meritorious students incentives to attend in-state institutions; and (3) "categorical aid programs," to encourage participation in particular study areas, such as mathematics or science, or programs that aid dependents of special constituents, such as veterans or policemen.

In 1989-90, these programs are expected to award over \$202 million to almost 249,000 undergraduates, representing an 18.3 percent growth in grant dollars and an 11.6 percent growth in recipients since last year. Five years ago, in 1984-85, 28 states awarded \$118.4 million to about 235,000 students. Therefore, the five-year dollar growth rate of 71 percent is almost double the 39 percent rate for need-based grant programs. The number of non-need-based grant recipients has grown by slightly more than the number of need-based recipients, 5.9 percent versus 4.1 percent. In 1984-85, only 9.3 percent of aggregate grant aid awarded to undergraduates was non-need-based, but this year about 11.2 percent will be so awarded.

Although aggregate non-need-based dollars to undergraduates are expected to increase by over 18 percent this year, almost 63 percent of the expected \$31.218 million increase will occur in just four programs: the academic scholarship programs of Illinois, Florida and Missouri and Ohio's tuition equalization program.

In addition to Ohio, five southern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina and Virginia) have tuition equalization grant programs for students attending private colleges. These programs are expected to award \$94.4 million, or over 46 percent of all the aggregate non-need-based aid to undergraduates in 1989-90. In 1988-89, these six programs awarded \$89.8 million, so the expected growth rate is about 5.1 percent. Aggregate dollars awarded through these six programs was \$58.7 million five years ago in 1984-85. So their five-year growth rate is about 61 percent. However, 44 percent of the aggregate \$35.7 million growth occurred only in Ohio. The five-year growth rate for the five southern states was only 37 percent.

While these six states were increasing their tuition equalization grant program funding by 61 percent during the past five years, they were increasing their aggregate need-based grant aid by only 25 percent, from \$73.9 million in 1984-85 to an expected \$92.4 million in 1989-90. Only Florida and Virginia increased need-based grant aid at a greater rate than their tuition equalization grants. Only Florida and Ohio annually spend more on need-based grants than on tuition equalization grants.

Twenty-two states reported having 25 generally available non-need-based merit scholarship programs with awards for many types of curricula at both public and private institutions. These programs are expected to increase their awards from \$54.4 million in 1988-89 to \$77 million in 1989-90, or by 41 percent. However, 36 percent of the increase is attributable to the \$8.1 million funding of the Illinois Merit Recognition Scholarships program and another 22 percent is attributable to the \$5 million increase in the Florida Undergraduate Scholars' Fund. The \$2.5 million increase in Missouri Higher Education Academic Scholarships represents another 11 percent of the total increase in aggregate merit-based general scholarships. The expected growth rate of these three programs is 87 percent, while the expected growth rate for

the remaining 22 programs in 19 states is only 18 percent. It is noteworthy that in two years the Florida and Missouri programs have almost quadrupled their award dollars.

Half the 22 states expect to spend more than \$1 million on their merit scholarship programs in 1989-90. They include: New York, \$17.2 million; Florida, \$16.2 million; Illinois, \$8.1 million; Colorado, \$7.7 million; Missouri, \$6.5 million; New Jersey, \$5.4 million; Maryland, \$5 million; Ohio, \$3.6 million; Oklahoma, \$1.9 million; Georgia, \$1.07 million; and Massachusetts, \$1.02 million. So in all, these 11 states are expected to award 96 percent of all the generally available merit-based scholarships.

The growth in non-need, merit-based state scholarship programs is a recent phenomenon. In 1984-85, only 12 of the 25 programs identified in Table 4 awarded, in the aggregate, only \$32 million. So in five years, aggregate aid from these types of programs has more than doubled.

In 1989-90, 56 "categorical aid" programs in 22 states are expected to award \$30.6 million in non-need-based grant or scholarship aid. Last year "categorical aid" programs awarded \$26.6 million, so the expected growth rate is about 15 percent. The three largest programs are: Illinois's Veterans Grant program, \$8.0 million and its National Guard Scholarships program, \$3.2 million, and New York's Health Services Corp, \$3 million.

Only five other programs are expected to award over \$1 million this year: the Ohio War Orphans' Grant program, \$1.931 million; the New Mexico Athletic Grant program, \$1.926 million; New York's Empire State Challenger Scholarship program, \$1.347 million, and its Professional Opportunity Scholarship program, \$1.325 million; and the Alabama Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship program, \$1.012 million.

Therefore, eight programs are expected to award \$21.7 million or 71 percent of the aggregate aid from categorical programs. This means that the remaining 48 programs expect to award, on the average, only about \$185,000. Thus it can be said the "categorical aid" programs generally are quite small.

As noted above, need-based grant awards to undergraduates are expected to grow by 39 percent since 1984-85, non-need-based grant awards by 71 percent, even though only 29 states have non-need-based programs. In states with both types of programs, the five-year growth rate for non-need-based programs is 97 percent, from \$102.5 million to \$202.1 million, while the five-year growth rate for their need-based programs is only 26 percent, from \$886.5 million to \$1.1203 billion. Put another way, in 1984-85 states with both types of programs awarded \$8.65 in need-based aid for every dollar of non-need-based aid to undergraduates. In 1989-90, the expected ratio is \$5.54 to \$1. In 1984-85, 10.6 percent of the awards to undergraduates were non-need-based, while in 1989-90, it is expected to be 15.2 percent.

In 17 of the 29 states with both types of programs, non-need-based have, since 1984-85, grown at higher rates than need-based. Six of these states have increased their non-need-based dollars by more than their need-based ones. These states include: Ohio, \$10.8 million versus \$5.9 million; Florida, \$17 million versus \$7.7 million; North Carolina, \$5.1 million versus \$20,000; New York, \$5.1 million versus \$180,000; Missouri, \$6.5 million versus \$1.7 million; and Georgia, \$5.4 million versus \$965,000.

These findings suggest that support for non-need-based types of aid programs is increasing in many states even as college costs are increasing and driving student financial need upward. However, three states, Michigan, Utah and Washington, reported non-need-based aid in 1984-85 but none in 1989-90. The aggregate non-need-based aid these three awarded in 1984-85 totaled \$15.8 million, with \$15.2 million reported by Michigan alone.

#### Non-Need-Based Graduate/Professional School Student Aid

Fourteen states have 31 non-need-based grant programs serving graduate and/or professional school students (see Table 5). These programs are expected to award \$15.1 million to 4,100 students in 1989-90, representing 38 percent more dollars than the \$10.9 million awarded to 3,426 students last year. However, 34 percent of the \$4.2 million growth is expected in New York's programs and 47 percent in Alaska's programs. The growth rate in the other 12 states is only 13 percent, from \$6.3 million to \$7.1 million.

Only five states expect to award at least \$1 million in 1989-90. They are: New York, \$6.0 million; Alaska, \$2 million; Virginia, \$1.2 million; Colorado, \$1.1 million; and Florida, \$1.06 million. In all, these five states are expected to award 75 percent of all grant dollars.

In 1984-85, 20 states awarded \$8.9 million in non-need-based grants to 3,146 students. Thus in five years grants to graduate/professional school students have grown by 70 percent, while the number of recipients has grown by only 30 percent. States who reported aid to graduate/professional school students in 1984-85 but NOT this year include: Delaware, \$24,000 in 1984-85; Georgia, \$600,000; Indiana, \$150,000; Louisiana, \$95,000; Maine, \$125,000; New Hampshire, \$620,000; and Tennessee, \$39,000. Ohio reported a 1989-90 program award of \$378,000 but none in 1984-85. Therefore, the 14 states with programs in both years awarded twice as many dollars in 1989-90 as in 1984-85, \$7.2 million versus \$14.7 million. But 73 percent of that five-year growth occurred in just New York's programs. The remaining 13 states' aggregate awards grew by 61 percent, from \$5.4 million to \$8.7 million.

Just as many need-based programs for graduate/professional school students also make awards to undergraduates, so do 12 of the 31 non-need-based programs. New York's Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships program, the largest of those exclusively for graduate/professional school students, is expected to award \$2.14 million to 240 students this year. Alaska's investment in WICHE's (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) program is expected to total \$1.1 million. No other exclusive program is expected to award more than \$1 million in 1989-90.

#### Other Aid Programs Administered By NASSGP Agencies

In addition to need-based and non-need-based state grant programs for undergraduates and graduate/professional school students, NASSGP agencies also administer a variety of other aid programs. These include "loan forgiveness" programs, work-study programs, institutional matching funds, federal Douglas Scholarship and Byrd Honors Scholarship programs, and a variety of loan programs. The 214 programs of 44 states are described in Table 6.

Twenty-nine NASSGP agencies serve as administrators of the federal Paul Douglas Scholarship program for prospective teachers and 12 administer the

federal Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship programs. Twenty-five NASSGP agencies administer the federal Stafford Student Loan and PLUS/SLS Loan programs for their states.

Seventeen agencies administer state-funded work-study or employment programs for their states. They include: California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Virginia and Washington. The two largest are in Colorado and Washington.

Two of the newer types of aid programs to be offered by states are the "scholarship loan" and the "loan forgiveness" programs. In the former, students are offered scholarships to prepare for career employment, usually in education, that become loans only if recipients fail to meet program employment or service criteria. Similarly, in "loan forgiveness" programs, loan awards received by students are "forgiven," or repaid by the state, in exchange for service in an occupation the state considers critical to its development. NASSGP agencies in 14 states administer one or more of these two types of programs. They include: California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont and Washington.

#### Other State-Funded Aid Programs

Table 7 lists 70 state-supported aid programs that 23 respondents reported were administered by other agencies in their states. Most of these programs assist health professions students, aid veterans or their dependents, or provide tuition waivers to various student groups. In a few instances, the programs serve racial-ethnic minority group members.

#### Undergraduate Need-Based Grants by Institutional Types

Table 8 displays percentages of respondents' estimated proportions of their various need-based program awards and dollars to undergraduates enrolled at in-state public, in-state private, and out-of-state postsecondary institutions. Table 9 displays the numbers represented by those percentages. Because not all respondents could provide percentages for every 1989-90 need-based program, percentages from 1988-89 or 1987-88 were applied to this year's award and dollar amounts, causing a slight imprecision in the numerical data.

Respondents' estimates indicate that 54.0 percent of this year's award dollars will go to students at in-state private institutions, about 44.7 percent to students at in-state public institutions and the remaining 1.3 percent for study at out-of-state institutions.

Although over half the need-based undergraduate dollars will go to students at in-state private institutions, these students represent only 36.1 percent of recipients. About 62.0 percent will attend in-state public institutions and 1.9 percent will attend institutions outside their home states. Private colleges' students generally receive greater percentages of dollars than awards because their costs, and consequently their financial needs, are higher than those of other students. In 1989-90, the overall average award to in-state private institutions' students is about \$1,788; for students at in-state public institutions, \$862; and for students at

out-of-state institutions, \$812. The average awards for 1988-89 and 1987-88 are as follows:

	<u>In-State Public</u>	<u>In-State Private</u>	<u>Out-of-State</u>
1988-89	\$808	\$1,746	\$781
1987-88	\$798	\$1,581	\$776

Therefore, in two years the average award to private institutions' students is expected to rise 13.1 percent; the average for public institutions' students by 8.0 percent, and the average award to out-of-state institutions' students by only 4.6 percent.

Here are the estimated distributions of award dollars for this year and the past five years:

	<u>In-State Public</u>	<u>In-State Private</u>	<u>Out-of-State</u>
1989-90	44.7%	54.0%	1.3%
1988-89	43.8	54.8	1.4
1987-88	45.4	53.1	1.5
1986-87	42.6	55.9	1.5
1985-86	41.3	57.1	1.6
1984-85	43.3	55.2	1.5

Given the fact that, in more than a few instances, respondents estimate dollar distributions each year, there seems to have been no dramatic changes in distribution of award dollars among undergraduates at in-state institutions. Out-of-state institutions' undergraduates, however, may be receiving a very slightly smaller proportion of the dollars.

Here are the estimated distributions of recipients for this year and the preceding five years:

	<u>In-State Public</u>	<u>In-State Private</u>	<u>Out-of-State</u>
1989-90	62.0%	36.1%	1.9%
1988-89	62.0	36.0	2.0
1987-88	61.7	36.2	2.1
1986-87	61.0	37.1	1.9
1985-86	60.1	38.0	1.9
1984-85	59.5	38.6	2.0

Although the data again suggest no dramatic changes since 1984-85, there may be a slight trend toward larger proportions of awards going to in-state public institutions' undergraduates. In the few years under analysis, the distributions of dollars and recipients have remained remarkably stable. It is noteworthy that the distributions displayed above are very similar to those of 1981-82, the first year these types of data were collected.

Only 18 programs in 13 states reported awards to undergraduates to attend institutions in other states. Only six states expect to award more than 10 percent of their need-based undergraduate dollars to students attending out-of-state institutions. They are: Rhode Island, 41.8 percent; Delaware, 41.0 percent; Alaska, 38.1 percent; the District of Columbia, 33.3 percent;

Vermont, 29.4 percent; and New Hampshire, 18.0 percent. These percentages are quite similar to those of 1988-89 and 1987-88.

The data in Table 9 show that the five states that will award the most dollars to students at in-state public institutions are, in rank order: New York, California, Illinois, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Those who will award the most dollars to students at in-state private institutions are, in rank order: New York, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania and Michigan.

Only 10 states will make more awards to in-state private than to in-state public institutions' undergraduates. They are: District of Columbia, Iowa, Hawaii, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas and Puerto Rico. Last year Puerto Rico made slightly more awards to in-state public institutions' students, while Hawaii made considerably more.

Although only 10 states will make more awards to in-state private than to in-state public institutions' undergraduates, 21 will award more dollars to private institution students. They include: California, 5 percent more; Connecticut, twice as many; the District of Columbia, three times as many; Hawaii, 22 percent more; Maine, twice as many; Massachusetts, 50 percent more; Michigan, three times as many; Missouri, five times as many; New York, 43 percent more; Ohio, 6 percent more; Pennsylvania, 19 percent more; South Carolina, all to private institutions; South Dakota, 13 percent more; Texas, six times as many; Vermont, 2 percent more; and Puerto Rico, 7 percent more. Hawaii, Indiana, Maine and Puerto Rico are new additions to this year's list. Tennessee expects to spend 12 percent less on in-state private institutions' students in 1989-90, versus the 7 percent more it spent in 1988-89.

#### SSIG Program Activities By States

Table 10 displays State Student Incentive Grant Program activities by states and territories. The 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico reported SSIG expenditures of \$71.3 million in 1988-89 and anticipate spending \$71.6 million in 1989-90.

As in previous years, the nine states expecting the largest expenditures are: California, \$11.2 million; New York, \$6.07 million; Texas, \$3.92 million; Illinois, \$3.90 million; Pennsylvania, \$3.16 million; Michigan, \$2.97 million; Ohio, \$2.85 million; Massachusetts, \$2.31 million; and Florida, \$2.25 million. These nine states receive about 54 percent of SSIG allocations. Fourteen other states receive at least \$1 million in allocations. In all, 23 states receive at least \$1 million in SSIG allocations.

This year 10 states expect very nearly half (over 47 percent) of their need-based award dollars to come from SSIG allocations. Another three states expect their SSIG allocations to exceed one-third of their need-based award dollars. The median percentage of SSIG funds as a percent of total need-based award dollars is about 10.1 percent. The average for the 52 states and territories is 18.4 percent with a standard deviation of 17.7 percent, which indicates that there is a large variation in percentages.

Four states are expected to make considerable improvements in their "state matches" of SSIG allocations in 1989-90. Hawaii expects to go from a 50-50 match to a 61-39 one. Only 12.5 percent of North Dakota's 1989-90 dollars, versus 19.4 percent of its 1988-89 ones, will come from its SSIG

allocations. Maine's changes are comparable, going from 18.5 percent in 1988-89 to 12.8 percent in 1989-90. This year only 19.9 percent of Virginia's need-based grant dollars will come from the SSIG program, versus 26 percent in 1988-89 and 37 percent in 1987-88. The other states' 1989-90 matching ratios are similar to those of 1988-89.

#### Years of Program Initiation

One way to consider trends in state grant aid is to examine the years in which various programs were implemented. Table 11 shows when the 207 programs with initiation dates first began to make student awards. Over 22 percent, 46 programs, began after 1984-85, while half were started after 1976-77. It is evident that state grant program growth is a relatively recent phenomenon, with 77, or 37 percent, of programs beginning operation in the 1980s.

Prior to 1980, the vast majority of new state grant programs were comprehensive, undergraduate need-based programs, serving a wide variety of students who demonstrated financial need and attended many different kinds of postsecondary institutions. In recent years the new programs are most often non-need-based and designed to serve special categories of students and/or meet special state needs. Section VI will discuss the trends in program types for the 1980s.

This year is the first operating year for six programs in three states. The two largest programs are in Nebraska. The new State Scholarship Award program, which is need-based for undergraduates and replaces the old Incentive Grants program, is expected to award \$1.276 million to about 2,500 students in 1989-90. The new Scholarship Assistance Program is expected to provide \$760,000 in need-based awards to undergraduates, but the expected number of recipients is unknown.

Kansas has implemented two need-based programs for undergraduates, the Nursing Scholarship Program, expected to award \$670,000 to 200 students, and the Minority Scholarships Program, expected to award \$141,000 to 94 students. Iowa has implemented a need-based program for minority undergraduates, the Minority Grants for Economic Success, expected to award \$50,000 to 50 students. Iowa has also added a new non-need-based program for professional school students, the Osteopathic Grant Program, expected to award \$396,000 to 132 students.

#### Need Analysis Methodologies Used By State Programs

Nineteen states use only the Congressional Methodology (CM) of need analysis for their need-based programs (see Table 11). California, New Mexico and Washington use the CM for one program and a modified version of the CM for others. Texas uses the CM, a modified version of the CM, and the Pell Grant system for its programs. Indiana, Oregon and Vermont use a modified CM. Alabama and Maryland use the CM for some programs and the Uniform Methodology (UM) for others. North Carolina uses the UM and a modified CM for its programs. Illinois and Michigan use a modified CM for some programs and leave the choice of need analysis to the recipients' institutions for others. Massachusetts does this, but uses an unmodified CM as well. Florida uses the CM, the UM and the Pell Grant system. Alaska and Nebraska use the UM for their programs, while New Jersey uses a modified version of the UM and the GAPSFAS system.

Four states (New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, South Dakota and Tennessee) use the Pell Grant system exclusively, while Nevada uses the Pell Grant system and the UM, and the District of Columbia uses the Pell Grant and GAPSFAS systems along with any the institutions may use. Wyoming has a state system but also allows for institutional choice. Five states have their own state systems for determining need: New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and South Carolina.

It is evident that the Congressional Methodology, or modifications of it, is the most frequently-used system of need analysis by states and their programs. In total, 33 states use some form of the Congressional Methodology to award aid to their students.

#### Maximum Annual Grant Awards

Table 11 displays the maximum award dollar amounts for 193 grant programs. The median is \$2,070, up by about 5 percent over the 1988-89 median of \$1,970.

The largest maximum awards are for graduate students in the health professions. North Carolina's Board of Governor's Medical Scholarship maximum is \$21,094; its Board of Governor's Dental Scholarship, \$11,115. New York's Health Service Corp maximum is \$15,000; its Health Care maximum, \$10,000. Alabama's Chiropractic Scholarship and Florida's Graduate Scholars Fund maxima are \$10,000.

Florida's Confederate Memorial Scholarship award of \$150 is the lowest reported maximum award. New York's Regents College Scholarship and Regents Nursing Scholarship programs and South Dakota's Tuition Equalization Grant programs have \$250 award maxima.

About 57 percent of programs have award maxima between \$1,000 and \$3,000, while 15 percent have maximum awards of less than \$1,000 and 30 percent have maximum awards of more than \$3,000. The frequency distribution of this year's maximum awards closely resembles the one for 1988-89.

#### Merit and Need-Based Eligibility Criteria

Over 54 percent (116 of 214) of the programs that identified need or non-need, merit or non-merit eligibility criteria for their programs are need-based. Students must demonstrate financial need to qualify for an award. About 20 percent of need-based aid programs (23 of 116) also require applicants to meet merit criteria to receive an initial award. Merit is usually measured by academic aptitude test scores and/or grade point averages. (Virtually all programs require recipients to demonstrate "merit" in the form of satisfactory academic progress to receive a renewal award.)

About 52 percent of non-need-based grant programs (51 of 98) employ merit criteria in establishing applicant eligibility, primarily because many are merit scholarships. In all, about 35 percent of programs (74 of 214) require applicants to demonstrate merit to receive an initial award.

The majority of programs continue to award grants based on applicants' demonstrated need and the vast majority of student grant dollars are need-based awards.

### Program Eligible Institutions

About 47 percent (101 of 216) of programs for which respondents identified types of institutions where their awards can be used are considered "comprehensive." That is, the awards can be used at public and private, two-year and four-year colleges and at least one other type of postsecondary institution (see Table 12). Awards from 22 other programs (10 percent) can be used at public and private two-year and four-year colleges but no other institutional types. Another 22 programs offer awards for use at public and private four-year colleges only. Twenty-one programs offer awards for use exclusively at private institutions, with 14 offering awards for only private colleges. Another 36 programs (17 percent) make awards exclusively to public institutions' students, with 13 serving two-year and four-year colleges and 13 serving only four-year colleges.

Here is a breakdown of the number of programs and states with programs that serve students at each institutional type:

	<u>States</u>	<u>Programs</u>	<u>Pct of Programs</u>
Four-Year Public Colleges	51	181	83.8%
Four-Year Private Colleges	51	165	76.3
Two-Year Colleges	51	148	68.5
Two-Year Private Colleges	48	136	63.0
Public Voc-Tech Schools	38	77	35.6
Private Voc-Tech Schools	36	70	32.4
Public Nursing Schools	37	84	38.9
Private Nursing Schools	38	87	40.3

About eight out of 10 programs serve students attending four-year colleges. Only one state, Wyoming, has no programs to serve private four-year colleges because it has none, while South Carolina has no programs to serve four-year public college students. Over one-third of the programs serve students who attend non-collegiate postsecondary institutions.

Since 1984-85, the number of programs serving four-year public colleges has grown by 47 percent, from 123 to 181. The number serving four-year private colleges has grown by 41 percent, from 117 to 165; serving two-year public colleges, 49 percent, from 99 to 148; serving two-year private colleges, 40 percent, from 97 to 136; serving public vocational-technical schools, 20 percent, from 64 to 77; serving private (proprietary) vocational-technical schools, 23 percent, from 57 to 70; serving public nursing schools, 31 percent, from 64 to 84; and serving private nursing schools, 45 percent, from 60 to 87. A great deal of the growth in programs serving nursing schools occurred since last year, when only 69 programs served public nursing schools and 78 served private nursing schools.

Table 13 displays the responses of states that offered comments believed to help readers better understand their programs' circumstances.

TABLE 1

ESTIMATED TOTAL GRANT AID AWARDED  
BY STATE PROGRAMS, 1989-90,  
BY TYPES OF PROGRAMS  
(amounts in millions)

	Need-Based Aid		Non-Need-Based Aid		Other Aid*	Total Grants
	Undergrads	Grads	Undergrads	Grads		
ALABAMA	\$ 2.196	\$ 0.049	\$ 4.670	\$ 0.101	\$ 4.891	\$ 11.907
ALASKA	0.228			1.984		2.212
ARIZONA	3.383	0.017				3.400
ARKANSAS	3.905		0.749		0.173	4.827
CALIFORNIA	158.985	3.018				162.003
COLORADO	9.682	0.866	8.790	1.104		20.442
CONNECTICUT	20.929			0.200	11.677	32.806
DELAWARE	1.029	0.167	0.203		0.183	1.582
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1.069	**				1.069
FLORIDA	21.700		33.558	1.055		56.313
GEORGIA	5.005		15.810		1.458	22.273
HAWAII	0.755				5.198	5.953
IDAHO	0.346	0.145	0.147			0.638
ILLINOIS	180.800		19.385		4.125	204.310
INDIANA	58.395		0.920			59.315
IOWA	32.101		0.800	0.396	25.635	58.932
KANSAS	7.129		0.035		0.386	7.550
KENTUCKY	13.858					13.858
LOUISIANA	2.006		0.723		7.000	9.729
MAINE	2.008					2.008
MARYLAND	15.185	0.283	5.803	0.096	0.055	21.422
MASSACHUSETTS	59.494	6.000	1.569		21.251	88.314
MICHIGAN	72.821	3.272			1.218	77.311
MINNESOTA	68.000				1.589	69.589
MISSISSIPPI	1.243		0.051	0.697		1.991
MISSOURI	10.814		6.543		0.260	17.617
MONTANA	0.417					0.417
NEBRASKA	2.037					2.037
NEVADA	(0.352)	(0.048)				(0.400)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.922	0.003	0.010		0.800	1.735
NEW JERSEY	84.804	0.568	5.717	0.600		91.689
NEW MEXICO	(5.024)	(0.285)	(2.950)			(8.259)
NEW YORK	380.570	11.430	24.739	5.968	0.385	423.092
NORTH CAROLINA	(4.489)	(1.500)	(23.297)		(22.837)	(52.123)
NORTH DAKOTA	1.540		0.082			1.622
OHIO	50.700		25.605	0.378		76.683
OKLAHOMA	11.535	1.570	2.080	0.290	17.070	32.545
OREGON	10.770					10.770
PENNSYLVANIA	133.429		0.585			134.014
RHODE ISLAND	10.134		0.120		1.000	11.254
SOUTH CAROLINA	18.191				1.581	19.772
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.504	**	0.090			0.594
TENNESSEE	17.295		0.205		2.527	20.027
TEXAS	24.967	2.413			84.667	112.047
UTAH	1.068			0.968	8.491	10.527
VERMONT	11.021	0.151			0.212	11.384
VIRGINIA	8.284		16.861	1.228		26.373
WASHINGTON	13.624	0.001			0.511	14.136
WEST VIRGINIA	5.272				6.605	11.877
WISCONSIN	39.181	**			1.879	41.060
WYOMING	0.241					0.241
PUERTO RICO	16.812	1.086			2.300	20.198
Totals	\$1,606.249	\$32.872	\$202.097	\$15.065	\$235.964	\$2,092.247
Percent	76.8%	1.6%	9.6%	0.7%	11.3%	100.0%

\* Aid reported under this heading includes grant aid administered by other state agencies, tuition fee waiver programs administered by state and institutions, special programs for veterans, matching programs, etc.

\*\* Reported a grant program for graduate students but could not report dollars awarded. Amounts are included in undergraduate figures for these states.

Figures in ( ) are 1988-89 data.

TABLE 2

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE COMPETITIVE  
AND NON-COMPETITIVE STATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANT PROGRAMS BASED ON NEED,  
1988-89 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1989-90: ACADEMIC YEARS COMPARATIVE DATA REPORT

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
ALABAMA								
Student Assistance Program	3,926	(3,926)	N.C.	\$2.196	\$2.196	N.C.	\$ 559	\$ 559
ALASKA								
Student Incentive Grants	167	152	- 9.0	0.234	0.228	- 2.6	1,401	1,500
ARIZONA								
Incentive Grant Program - Undergraduates	5,011	4,975	- 0.7	3.508	3.383	- 3.6	700	680
ARKANSAS								
Student Assistance Grant	9,357	11,906	+27.2	3.903	3.905	+ 0.1	417	328
CALIFORNIA								
Cal Grant A	45,000	45,505		85.231	105.137			
Cal Grant B	24,923	31,167		40.113	50.695			
Cal Grant C	2,361	2,369		3.720	3.069			
Bilingual Teacher Grant - Undergraduates	72	20		0.192	0.070			
Law Enforcement Personnel	8	9		0.008	0.014			
All Programs	72,364	79,070	+ 9.3	129.264	158.985	+ 23.0	1,786	2,011
COLORADO								
Student Incentive Grants	(2,710)	3,200		(1.994)	1.970			
Student Grants	(10,465)	11,000		(7.326)	7.637			
Extended Studies Tuition Grant	(60)	(60)		(0.025)	0.025			
Private School Student Grants**	(20)	(20)		(0.050)	0.050			
All Programs	(13,255)	14,280	+ 7.7	(9.395)	9.682	+ 3.1	(709)	678
CONNECTICUT								
Scholastic Achievement Grants	3,500	3,500		3.116	3.061			
Independent College Student Grant Program	6,500	6,000		12.900	12.235			
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	7,500	8,000		5.133	5.633			
All Programs	17,500	17,500	N.C.	21.149	20.929	- 1.0	1,209	1,196

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
DELAWARE								
Postsecondary Scholarships - Undergraduates	1,048	1,266	+20.8	0.829	1.029	+ 24.1	791	813
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates*	770	790	+ 2.6	1.075	1.069	- 0.6	1,396	1,353
FLORIDA								
Student Assistance Grants	15,174	21,500		16.452	21.527			
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships	16	18		0.070	0.083			
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	0	45		0.000	0.090			
All Programs	15,190	21,563	+42.0	16.522	21.700	+ 31.3	1,088	1,006
GEORGIA								
Student Incentive Grant Program	14,828	14,099	- 4.9	5.197	5.005	- 3.7	350	355
HAWAII								
Student Incentive Grants	890	900	+ 1.1	(0.598)	0.755	+ 26.3	672	839
IDAHO								
Student Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	811	804	-0.9	0.348	0.346	- 0.6	429	430
ILLINOIS								
Monetary Award Program	100,000	109,000		142.300	179.700			
Student-to-Student Matching Grants	2,080	2,100		1.073	1.100			
All Programs	102,080	111,100	+ 8.8	143.373	180.800	+ 26.1	1,405	1,627
INDIANA								
Higher Education Grants	27,962	36,500		25.769	43.096			
Freedom of Choice Grants	8,019	9,000		9.923	15.299			
All Programs	35,981	45,500	+26.5	35.692	58.395	+ 63.6	992	1,283
IOWA								
Minority Grants for Economic Success	0	50		0.000	0.050			
Tuition Grant Program	14,021	14,260		28.740	30.683			
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants	3,979	3,648		1.310	1.368			
All Programs	18,000	17,958	- 0.2	30.050	32.101	+ 6.8	1,669	1,788
KANSAS								
State Scholarships	1,051	1,108		0.940	1.018			
Tuition Grants	(3,600)	3,400		4.600	5.300			
Nursing Scholarships	0	200		0.000	0.670			
Minority Scholarships	0	94		0.000	0.141			
All Programs	4,651	4,802	+ 3.2	5.540	7.129	+ 28.7	1,191	1,485
KENTUCKY								
Student Incentive Grants	15,555	17,300		6.676	7.412			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
KENTUCKY (cont.)								
Tuition Grant Program	5,510	6,075		5.846	6.446			
All Programs	21,065	23,375	+11.0	12.522	13.858	+ 10.7	594	593
LOUISIANA								
Incentive Grants	3,245	3,343	+ 3.0	1.947	2.006	+ 3.0	600	600
MAINE								
Incentive Grants	3,326	4,400	+32.3	1.408	2.008	+ 42.6	423	456
MARYLAND								
General State Scholarships	9,888	11,400		10.089	11.639			
Senatorial Grants - Undergraduates	6,058	7,395		2.544	3.328			
Jack F. Tolbert Scholarships	276	308		0.192	0.200			
Children of Deceased Firemen	1	3		0.001	0.003			
Professional Scholarships - Undergraduates	36	32		0.015	0.015			
All Programs	16,259	19,138	+17.7	12.841	15.185	+ 18.3	790	793
MASSACHUSETTS								
General Scholarship	39,806	39,000		57.720	55.694			
Christian Herter Memorial Scholarship	80	80		0.539	0.550			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Incentive Grants	121	100		0.184	0.150			
Part-Time Grants	7,100	5,375		4.000	3.100			
All Programs	47,107	44,555	- 5.4	62.443	59.494	- 4.7	1,326	1,335
MICHIGAN								
Competitive Scholarships	23,785	25,000		25.460	26.194			
Tuition Grants - Undergraduates	20,749	22,609		46.983	43.474			
Educational Opportunity Grants	(1,700)	(1,700)		(1.019)	1.050			
Adult Part-Time Grants	(4,400)	(4,400)		(2.005)	2.103			
All Programs	50,634	53,709	+ 6.1	75.467	72.821	- 3.5	1,490	1,356
MINNESOTA								
Scholarship and Grant Program	67,936	55,800		66.100	66.000			
Part-Time Grant	6,670	(6,670)		2.193	2.000			
All Programs	74,606	62,470	-16.3	68.293	68.000	- 0.4	915	1,089
MISSISSIPPI								
Student Incentive Grants	2,253	2,200	- 2.4	1.251	1.243	- 0.6	555	565
MISSOURI								
Student Grants	8,271	8,600	+ 4.0	10.234	10.814	+ 5.7	1,237	1,257
MONTANA								
Incentive Grants	(1,300)	(1,300)	N.C.	(0.420)	0.417	- 0.7	323	321
NEBRASKA								
State Scholarship Award Program	2,612	2,500		1.052	1.276			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
NEBRASKA (cont.)								
Scholarship Assistance Program	0	N/A		0.000	0.761			
All Programs	2,612	2,500	- 4.3	1.052	2.037	+ 93.6	403	510
NEVADA								
Student Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	(352)	(352)	N.C.	(0.352)	(0.352)	N.C.	(1,000)	(1,000)
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
Incentive Grants	1,474	1,600		0.779	0.775			
Nursing Education Grants - Undergraduates	130	158		0.107	0.147			
All Programs	1,604	1,758	+ 9.6	0.886	0.922	+ 4.1	552	524
NEW JERSEY								
Tuition Aid Grants	36,380	36,680		58.408	65.808			
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergraduates	12,371	12,500		14.070	14.928			
Garden State Scholarships	6,213	5,600		3.515	3.568			
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	418	900		0.211	0.500			
All Programs	55,382	55,680	+ 0.5	76.204	84.804	+ 11.3	1,376	1,523
NEW MEXICO								
Incentive Grants	(6,000)	(6,000)		(4.153)	(4.153)			
Student Choice	(292)	(292)		(0.394)	(0.394)			
Three Percent Scholarships**	(740)	(740)		(0.477)	(0.477)			
All Programs	(7,032)	(7,032)	N.C.	(5.024)	(5.024)	N.C.	(714)	(714)
NEW YORK								
Tuition Assistance Program - Undergraduates	288,541	292,800		349.218	369.570			
Aid for Part-Time Study	10,166	(10,166)		5.974	11.000			
All Programs	298,707	302,966	+ 1.4	355.192	380.570	+ 7.1	1,189	1,256
NORTH CAROLINA								
Student Incentive Grants	(4,967)	(4,967)		(3.229)	(3.229)			
Minority Presence Scholarship Fund - Undergraduates	(1,900)	(1,900)		(1.140)	(1.140)			
American Indian Scholarship Fund - Undergraduates	(198)	(198)		(0.120)	(0.120)			
All Programs	(7,065)	(7,065)	N.C.	(4.489)	(4.489)	N.C.	(635)	(635)
NORTH DAKOTA								
Student Financial Assistance Program	2,043	2,540	+24.3	0.976	1.540	+ 57.8	478	606
OHIO								
Instructional Grants	(68,000)	69,000	+ 1.5	50.865	50.700	- 0.3	748	735

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
OKLAHOMA								
Tuition Aid Grants - Undergraduates	13,210	15,480		9.841	11.510			
Bill Willis Scholarship Program	26	25		0.020	0.025			
All Programs	13,236	15,505	+17.1	9.861	11.535	+ 17.0	745	744
OREGON								
Need Grants	16,952	15,300		9.506	10.100			
Cash Awards	761	820		0.552	0.600			
Barber and Hairdresser Grants	99	115		0.050	0.070			
All Programs	17,812	16,235	- 8.9	10.108	10.770	+ 6.5	567	663
PENNSYLVANIA								
State Grants	114,308	120,000		118.977	133.420			
POW/MIA Program	10	9		0.009	0.009			
All Programs	114,318	120,009	+ 5.0	118.986	133.429	+ 12.1	1,041	1,112
RHODE ISLAND								
Scholarship and Grant Program	9,599	9,500	- 1.0	8.967	10.134	+ 13.0	934	1,067
SOUTH CAROLINA								
Tuition Grants	7,933	7,476	- 5.8	17.810	18.191	+ 2.1	2,245	2,433
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates*	918	900		0.356	0.354			
Tuition Equalization Grants	612	600		0.150	0.150			
All Programs	1,530	1,500	- 2.0	0.506	0.504	- 0.4	331	336
TENNESSEE								
Student Assistance Awards	19,650	24,599	+25.2	11.977	17.295	+ 44.4	610	703
TEXAS								
Tuition Equalization Grants - Undergraduates	14,045	13,565		19.041	21.444			
Nursing Scholarships--Undergrad	0	N/A		0.000	0.156			
Public Educational SSIG Grants - Undergraduates	4,849	5,050		2.789	2.846			
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	546	550		0.436	0.470			
Tax Reimbursement Grants-Undergrad	0	106		0.000	0.051			
All Programs	19,440	19,271	- 0.9	22.266	24.967	+ 12.1	1,145	1,296
UTAH								
Incentive Grants	1,700	1,690	- 0.6	1.081	1.068	- 1.2	636	632
VERMONT								
Incentive Grants - Undergraduates	7,945	7,996		8.616	10.062			
Part-Time Student Grants	1,508	1,634		0.480	0.653			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
VERMONT (cont.)								
Non-Degree Student Grant Program - Undergraduates	909	1,082		0.168	0.306			
All Programs	10,362	10,712	+ 3.4	9.264	11.021	+ 19.0	894	1,029
VIRGINIA								
College Scholarship Assistance Program	7,413	8,000		5.851	5.953			
Virginia Transfer Grant	747	850		1.218	1.560			
Undergrad Stdt Fin. Assistance Program	715	850		0.993	0.771			
All Programs	8,875	9,700	+ 9.3	8.062	8.284	+ 2.8	908	854
WASHINGTON								
State Need Grants	16,560	19,404		12.857	13.623			
Assistance to Blind Students - Undergraduates	2	2		0.001	0.001			
All Programs	16,562	19,406	+17.2	12.858	13.624	+ 6.0	776	702
WEST VIRGINIA								
Higher Education Grant Program	5,686	5,500	- 3.3	5.204	5.272	+ 1.3	915	959
WISCONSIN								
Tuition Grants	8,326	8,600		12.237	13.235			
Higher Education Grants	34,469	35,700		18.439	19.642			
Indian Student Grants - Undergraduates*	928	1,040		1.099	1.233			
Handicapped Student Grants	72	80		0.105	0.117			
Talent Incentive Grants	3,577	4,500		3.384	4.327			
Private School Student Minority Grants	329	355		0.386	0.417			
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grants	276	300		0.192	0.210			
All Programs	47,977	50,575	+ 5.4	35.842	39.181	+ 9.3	747	775
WYOMING								
Incentive Grants	531	(531)	N.C.	0.212	0.241	+ 13.7	399	454

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
PUERTO RICO								
Supplementary Assistance Program -								
Undergraduates	(9,282)	(9,282)		2.712	2.712			
Educational Fund	(7,500)	(7,500)		4.000	5.000			
Legislative Awards	20,000	(20,000)		9.100	9.100			
All Programs	36,782	(36,782)	N.C.	15.812	16.812	+ 6.3	430	457
Grand Totals:								
Need-Based Undergraduate Aid	1,318,685	1,371,565	+ 4.0%	\$1,439.555	\$1,606.249	+ 11.6%	\$1,092	\$1,171

\* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

\*\* Portion of these awards can be made without regard to need.

Figures in ( ) are 1988-89 data from last year's report or 1989-90 data not available.

TABLE 3

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE NEED-BASED AID PROGRAMS  
FOR GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS,  
ACTUAL 1988-89 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1989-90

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
ALABAMA								
Chiropractic Scholarships	16	16	N.C.	\$ 0.046	\$ 0.049	+ 6.5%	\$2,875	\$3,063
ARIZONA								
Incentive Grant Program - Graduates	25	25	N.C.	0.018	0.017	- 5.6	720	680
CALIFORNIA								
Bilingual Teacher Grant - Graduates	50	14		0.135	0.049			
Graduate Fellowships	856	802		2.781	2.969			
All Programs	906	816	- 9.9%	2.916	3.018	+ 3.5	3,219	3,699
COLORADO								
Graduate Grants	(750)	740	- 1.3	(0.827)	0.866	+ 4.7	(1,103)	1,170
DELAWARE								
Postsecondary Scholarships - Graduates	130	156	+20.0	0.135	0.167	+23.7	1,038	1,071
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
Incentive Grants - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
IDAHO								
Student Incentive Grants - Graduates	97	96	- 1.0	0.146	0.145	- 0.7	1,505	1,510
MARYLAND								
Senatorial Grants - Graduates	187	229		0.079	0.103			
Professional Scholarships - Graduates	324	288		0.132	0.135			
Family Practice Medicine Scholarship	5	6		0.038	0.045			
All Programs	516	523	+ 1.4	0.249	0.283	+13.7	483	541
MASSACHUSETTS								
Medical/Dental/Veterinarian Scholarship	950	1,000		3.250	3.500			
Graduate Student Grant Program	1,500	1,500		2.500	2.500			
All Programs	2,450	2,500	+ 2.0	5.750	6.000	+ 4.3	2,347	2,400
MICHIGAN								
Tuition Grants - Graduates	1,562	1,702	+ 9.0	3.536	3.272	- 7.5	2,264	1,922
NEVADA								
Student Incentive Grants - Graduates	(48)	(48)	N.C.	(0.048)	(0.048)	N.C.	(1,000)	(1,000)
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
Nursing Education Grants - Graduates	1	2	+100.0	0.002	0.003	+50.0	2,000	1,500
NEW JERSEY								
Educational Opportunity Fund - Graduates	177	180	+ 1.7	0.536	0.568	+ 6.0	3,028	3,156

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
NEW MEXICO								
Graduate Fellowships	(40)	(40)	N.C.	(0.285)	(0.285)	N.C.	(7,125)	(7,125)
NEW YORK								
Tuition Assistance Program - Graduates	12,023	12,200	+ 1.5	10.801	11.430	+ 5.8	898	937
NORTH CAROLINA								
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	(76)	(76)		(0.832)	(0.832)			
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	(31)	(31)		(0.268)	(0.268)			
Minority Presence Scholarship - Graduates	(600)	(600)		(0.360)	(0.360)			
American Indian Scholarships - Graduates	(77)	(77)		(0.040)	(0.040)			
All Programs	(784)	(784)	N.C.	(1.500)	(1.500)	N.C.	(1,913)	(1,913)
OKLAHOMA								
Tuition Aid Grants - Graduates	1,468	1,720	+17.2	1.342	1.570	+ 17.0	914	913
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Incentive Grants - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
TEXAS								
Tuition Equalization Grants - Graduates	1,486	1,435		2.001	2.254			
Public Educational SSIG Grants - Graduates	144	150		0.151	0.154			
Tax Reimbursement Grants-Graduates	0	1		0.000	0.001			
Nursing Scholarship-Graduates	0	N/A		0.000	0.004			
All Programs	1,630	1,586	- 2.7	2.152	2.413	+12.1	1,320	1,521
VERMONT								
Incentive Grants - Graduates	72	73		0.122	0.143			
Non-Degree Student Grant Program - Graduates	18	21		0.005	0.008			
All Programs	90	94	+ 4.4	0.127	0.151	+18.9	1,411	1,606
WASHINGTON								
Assistance to Blind Students - Graduates	1	1	N.C.	0.001	0.001	N.C.	1,000	1,000
WISCONSIN								
Indian Student Grants - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Number of Monetary Awards</u>		<u>Percentage Change</u>	<u>Payout Dollars (Millions)</u>		<u>Percentage Change</u>	<u>Average Award Amount</u>	
	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>		<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>		<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
<hr/>								
PUERTO RICO								
Supplementary Assistance Program -								
Graduates	(3,718)	(3,718)	N.C.	1.086	1.086	N.C.	292	292
<hr/>								
Grand Totals:								
Need-Based Graduate Aid	26,432	26,947	+ 1.9%	\$31.503	\$32.872	+ 4.3%	\$1,192	\$1,220
<hr/>								

\* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.  
Figures in ( ) are 1988-89 data from last year's survey or 1989-90 data not available.

TABLE 4

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR NON-NEED-BASED STATE PROGRAMS  
FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS,  
ACTUAL 1988-89 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1989-90

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
ALABAMA								
Student Grants Program	6,400	6,500		\$ 3.001	\$ 3.488			
National Guard Education Assistance Program - Undergraduates	613	597		0.158	0.145			
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program - Undergraduates	297	306		0.921	1.012			
Police Officer's and Firefighter's Survivor's Education Assistance Program	19	17		0.030	0.025			
All Programs	7,329	7,420	+ 1.2%	4.110	4.670	+ 13.6%	\$ 561	\$ 629
ARKANSAS								
Governor's Scholars Program	344	347		0.674	0.694			
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship	14	16		0.033	0.034			
Law Enforcement Officers' Depend. Schlshp	8	12		0.013	0.021			
All Programs	366	375	+ 2.5	0.720	0.749	+ 4.0	1,967	1,997
COLORADO								
Undergraduate Merit Awards	(9,025)	10,200		(7.217)	7.662			
Veterans Tuition Assistance	(40)	7		(0.025)	0.015			
National Guard Tuition Assistance	(500)	670		(0.349)	0.349			
Law/POW Dependents Tuition Assistance	(8)	6		(0.016)	0.021			
Diversity Grant	(75)	350		(0.190)	0.493			
Nursing Scholarship	(50)	80		(0.100)	0.200			
Private School Student Grants**	(20)	(20)		(0.050)	0.050			
All Programs	(9,718)	11,333	+ 16.6	(7.947)	8.790	+ 10.6	818	776
DELAWARE								
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	4	4		0.006	0.008			
Diamond State Scholarships	197	189		0.196	0.189			
Bradford Barnes	0	1		0.000	0.006			
All Programs	201	194	- 3.5	0.202	0.203	+ 0.5	1,005	1,046

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
FLORIDA								
Tuition Voucher Fund	15,174	13,800		16.452	16.673			
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	5,052	7,000		11.151	16.196			
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veterans/POW/MIA	42	47		0.035	0.048			
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	20	23		0.003	0.003			
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grant - Undergraduates*	302	400		0.101	0.119			
Critical Teachers Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program - Undergraduates*	996	1,634		0.340	0.499			
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	14	20		0.014	0.020			
All Programs	21,600	22,924	+ 6.1	28.096	33.558	+ 19.4	1,301	1,464
GEORGIA								
Tuition Equalization Grants	14,221	14,932		13.501	14.594			
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	17	21		0.029	0.042			
Governor's Scholarship Program	726	729		0.921	1.066			
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	314	360		0.094	0.108			
All Programs	15,278	16,042	+ 5.0	14.545	15.810	+ 8.7	952	986
IDAHO								
State of Idaho Scholarships	76	98	+ 28.9	0.114	0.147	+ 28.9	1,500	1,500
ILLINOIS								
National Guard Scholarships	3,185	3,726		2.694	3.200			
Descendants Grants	47	57		0.077	0.085			
Merit Recognition Scholarships	0	8,100		0.000	8.100			
Veteran Grants	11,502	11,650		7.889	8.000			
All Programs	14,734	23,533	+ 59.7	10.660	19.385	+ 81.8	723	824
INDIANA								
Hoosier Scholarships	811	816		0.406	0.408			
Contract for Space Program	0	N/A		0.000	0.512			
All Programs	811	816	+ 0.6	0.406	0.920	+126.6	501	500
IOWA								
Scholarship Program	1,612	1,945	+ 20.7	0.729	0.800	+ 9.7	452	411
KANSAS								
Vocational Scholarship Program	95	100	+ 5.3	0.037	0.035	- 5.4	389	350
LOUISIANA								
T. H. Harris Scholarships	2,037	2,344		0.611	0.703			
High School Rally Scholarships	0	40		0.000	0.020			
All Programs	2,037	2,384	+ 17.0	0.611	0.723	+ 18.3	300	303

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
MARYLAND								
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	46	44		0.037	0.035			
Delegate Scholarships - Undergraduates	1,118	1,558		1.088	1.519			
Reimbursement of Firemen - Undergraduates	134	139		0.120	0.128			
Distinguished Scholar Program	1,206	1,162		2.776	3.459			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Program - Undergraduates	67	69		0.131	0.189			
Teacher Education - Distinguished Scholar	30	38		0.092	0.114			
Nursing Scholarships - Undergraduates	177	188		0.233	0.279			
Occupational and Physical Therapy	0	40		0.000	0.080			
All Programs	2,778	3,238	+ 16.6	4.477	5.803	+ 29.6	1,612	1,792
MASSACHUSETTS								
Honor Scholarships	600	480		0.750	0.500			
Fire/Police/Corrections/War Orphans	109	50		0.106	0.050			
Commonwealth Scholars	1,020	1,019		1.020	1.019			
All Programs	1,729	1,549	- 10.4	1.876	1.569	- 16.4	1,085	1,013
MISSISSIPPI								
POW/MIA/Law/Fireman Scholarship	12	16	+ 33.3	0.032	0.051	+ 59.4	2,667	3,188
MISSOURI								
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	2,083	3,300		4.073	6.532			
Public Service Office or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	1	9		0.002	0.011			
All Programs	2,084	3,309	+ 58.8	4.075	6.543	+ 60.6	1,955	1,977
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
War Orphans Scholarships	10	10	N.C.	0.010	0.010	N.C.	1,000	1,000
NEW JERSEY								
Public Tuition Benefits	21	20		0.028	0.032			
POW/MIA Tuition Grants	7	6		0.025	0.029			
Distinguished Scholars Program	3,079	3,680		3.078	4.245			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid Program	101	90		0.093	0.089			
Veterans Tuition Credit Program	290	280		0.074	0.072			
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	446	900		0.445	1.250			
All Programs	3,944	4,976	+ 26.2	3.743	5.717	+ 52.7	949	1,149
NEW MEXICO								
Athletic Grants	(706)	(706)		(1.926)	(1.926)			
Three Percent Scholarship**	(1,263)	(1,263)		(0.964)	(0.964)			
Vietnam Veterans	N/A	N/A		(0.060)	(0.060)			
All Programs	(1,969)	(1,969)	N.C.	(2.950)	(2.950)	N.C.	(1,498)	(1,498)
NEW YORK								
Regents College Scholarships	53,633	58,000		12.770	13.900			

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
NEW YORK (cont.)								
Regents Nursing Scholarships	1,379	1,800		0.315	0.420			
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships - Undergraduates	142	277		0.595	1.325			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Awards	686	1,000		0.649	0.850			
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	1,127	1,650		2.474	3.300			
Empire State Challenger Scholarships - Undergraduates	580	641		1.143	1.347			
Children of Veteran/Police Officer/Firefighter/Corrections Officer Awards	736	880		0.292	0.396			
Health Services Corps - Undergraduates	225	267		2.557	3.021			
Transit Corps of Engineers Program - Undergraduates	0	N/A		0.000	0.180			
All Programs	58,508	64,515	+ 10.3	20.795	24.739	+ 19.0	355	383
NORTH CAROLINA								
Legislative Tuition Grants	(24,330)	(24,330)	N.C.	(23.297)	(23.297)	N.C.	(958)	(958)
NORTH DAKOTA								
Scholars Program	N/A	N/A		(0.111)	0.082	- 26.1	N/A	N/A
OHIO								
Academic Scholarship Program	3,522	3,590		3.612	3.591			
War Orphans Scholarship Program	1,146	1,146		1.852	1.931			
Student Choice Grants	34,835	36,375		16.109	20.083			
All Programs	39,503	41,111	+ 4.1	21.573	25.605	+ 18.7	546	623
OKLAHOMA								
Future Teachers Scholarship Program	147	120		0.160	0.180			
Academic Scholars Program	225	500		0.662	1.900			
All Programs	372	620	+ 66.7	0.822	2.080	+153.0	2,210	3,355
PENNSYLVANIA								
Scholars in Education Awards	222	226	+ 1.8	0.554	0.585	+ 5.6	2,495	2,588
RHODE ISLAND								
Governor's Academic Scholars Program	48	48	N.C.	0.120	0.120	N.C.	2,500	2,500
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Superior Scholar Scholarship	68	60	- 11.8	0.090	0.090	N.C.	1,324	1,500
TENNESSEE								
Academic Scholars Program	34	50		0.132	0.200			
Dependent Children Scholarship	2	1		0.010	0.005			
All Programs	36	51	+ 41.7	0.142	0.205	+ 44.4	3,944	4,020

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
VIRGINIA								
Tuition Assist. Grant Program-Undergrad.	13,154	15,364		17.478	16.308			
Eastern Shore Assistance Program	25	27		0.025	0.025			
Virginia Scholars Program	179	176		0.532	0.528			
All Programs	13,358	15,567	+ 16.5	18.035	16.861	- 6.5	1,350	1,083
Grand Totals:								
Non-Need-Based Undergraduate Aid	222,828	248,759	+ 11.6%	\$170.879	\$202.097	+ 18.3%	\$ 767	\$ 812

\* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

\*\* Portion of these awards are made with regard to need.

Figures in ( ) are 1988-89 data from last year's survey or 1989-90 data not available.

TABLE 5

DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR NON-NEED-BASED STATE PROGRAMS  
FOR GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS,  
ACTUAL 1988-89 AND ESTIMATED FOR 1989-90

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
ALABAMA								
National Guard Education Assistance Program - Graduates	39	38		\$ 0.040	\$ 0.036			
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program - Graduates	19	20		0.059	0.065			
All Programs	58	58	N.C.	0.099	0.101	+ 2.0%	\$ 1,707	\$ 1,741
ALASKA								
West. Interst Comm. for Higher Ed. (WICHE)	N/A	N/A		N/A	1.100			
WAMI	N/A	N/A		N/A	0.884			
All Programs	N/A	N/A		N/A	1.984	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO								
Graduate Fellowship	(530)	600	+ 13.2%	(1.052)	1.104	+ 4.9	1,985	1,840
CONNECTICUT								
High Technology Graduate Scholarship Program	20	20	N.C.	0.200	0.200	N.C.	10,000	10,000
FLORIDA								
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grant - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A			
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program - Graduates*	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A			
Regents Scholarships	1	1		0.005	0.005			
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	53	60		0.265	0.300			
Graduate Scholars' Fund	59	75		0.590	0.750			
All Programs	113	136	+ 20.4	0.860	1.055	+ 22.7	7,611	7,757
IOWA								
Osteopathic Grant Program	0	132	N/A	0.000	0.396	N/A	0	3,000
MARYLAND								
Delegate Scholarships - Graduates	47	65		0.045	0.063			
Reimbursement of Firemen - Graduates	1	1		0.002	0.002			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Program - Graduates*	6	6		0.011	0.016			
Nursing Scholarships - Graduates	9	10		0.012	0.015			
All Programs	63	82	+ 30.2	0.070	0.096	+ 37.1	1,111	1,171

State/Program	Number of Monetary Awards		Percentage Change	Payout Dollars (Millions)		Percentage Change	Average Award Amount	
	1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90		1988-89	1989-90
MISSISSIPPI								
Southern Regional Education Board Program	49	56		0.351	0.395			
Graduate and Professional Scholarships	75	70		0.305	0.302			
All Programs	124	126	+ 1.6	0.656	0.697	+ 6.3	5,290	5,532
NEW JERSEY								
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	86	95	+ 10.5	0.513	0.600	+ 17.0	5,965	6,316
NEW YORK								
Lehman Fellowships	73	60		0.318	0.220			
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	185	240		1.649	2.140			
Health Services Corps - Graduates	49	58		0.600	0.709			
Empire State Challenger Scholarships - Graduates	802	884		1.578	1.859			
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships - Graduates	98	193		0.414	0.920			
Transit Corps of Engineers Program - Graduates	0	N/A		0.000	0.120			
All Programs	1,207	1,435	+ 18.9	4.559	5.968	+ 30.9	3,777	4,159
OHIO								
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowships	95	108	+ 13.7	0.341	0.378	+ 10.9	3,589	3,500
OKLAHOMA								
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	19	36		0.029	0.050			
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	18	20		0.104	0.120			
Minority Professional Study Grants	31	30		0.115	0.120			
All Programs	68	86	+ 26.5	0.248	0.290	+ 16.9	3,647	3,372
UTAH								
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)	72	66	- 8.3	0.967	0.968	+ 0.1	13,431	14,667

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Number of Monetary Awards</u>		<u>Percentage Change</u>	<u>Payout Dollars (Millions)</u>		<u>Percentage Change</u>	<u>Average Award Amount</u>	
	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>		<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>		<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
<b>VIRGINIA</b>								
Tuition Assistance Grant Program - Graduates	990	1,156	+ 16.8	1.316	1.228	- 6.7	1,329	1,062
<b>Grand Totals:</b>								
Non-Need-Based Graduate Aid	3,426	4,100	+ 19.7%	\$10.881	\$15.065	+ 38.5%	\$ 3,176	\$ 3,674

\* Data could not be broken down into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

Figures in ( ) are 1988-89 data from last year's survey or 1989-90 data not available.

TABLE 6

## OTHER PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE AGENCY

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
ALABAMA								
Guaranteed Student Loan Program	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		\$83,000,000	30,000
ALASKA								
Student Loan Program	\$63,000,000			X		X	\$54,100,000	11,380
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$37,125*	Und	X			X	\$30,250	7
ARIZONA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$239,439*	Und				X		
Teacher Loan Program	\$100,000		X			X	\$90,000	18
ARKANSAS								
Emergency Secondary Education Loan	\$51,000	Und	X			X	\$51,000	21
Teacher and Administrator Grant Program	\$173,000	Und/Grad		X		X	\$173,000	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$168,866*	Und	X			X	\$169,209	35
CALIFORNIA								
Guaranteed Loan (Old)	\$133,000	(Program collects for loans made in 1966 and 1967)						
California Loan Programs	\$18,786,000	Und/Grad						
Stafford Loans	(included in CLP)	Und/Grad		X	X		\$888,000,000	303,174
PLUS/SLS	(included in CLP)	Und/Grad		X		X	\$359,000,000	133,006
Assumption Program of Loans for Education	\$1,294,000	Und/Grad	X			X	\$855,192	387
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$799,500*	Und	X			X	\$799,500	533
Work Study	\$750,000	Und/Grad			X		\$750,000	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program	\$2,107,911*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$2,107,911	521
COLORADO								
Work Study	\$7,662,000	Und	X (75%)			X (25%)	\$7,650,000	6,000
CONNECTICUT								
Educational Loans to Encourage Excellence in Teaching	\$140,000	Und	X			X	\$151,000	36
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$227,064*	Und	X			X	\$233,500	47
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$91,500*	Und	X			X	\$91,500	61
DELAWARE								
S. Christa McAuliffe	\$200,000	Und	X			X	\$163,000	78
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$45,540*	Und	X			X	\$60,333	13
Optometric Institutional Aid	\$20,000	Grad		X		X	\$20,000	5
Robert C. Byrd Scholarship	\$18,000*	Und	X			X	\$18,000	12
Nursing Incentive	\$61,700	Und	X			X	\$61,700	31
FLORIDA								
Most Promising Teacher Scholarship/Loan	\$2,676,000	Und	X			X	\$2,675,772	699
Student Loan Forgiveness	\$353,888	N/A		X		X	\$353,880	180

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
FLORIDA (cont.)								
Public School Work Experience Program	\$257,547	Und	X		X		\$226,400	160
College Career Work Experience Program	\$841,503	Und		X	X		\$841,800	690
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship		Und	X			X	\$301,500	201
Teacher Scholarship Loan Program	\$2,760,224	Und/Grad		X		X	\$2,726,100	699
Masters' Fellowship Loan for Teachers	\$250,000	Grad	X			X	\$250,012	28
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarships	\$865,000*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$855,000	171
GEORGIA								
Osteopathic Cancellable Medical Loan	\$200,000	Grad	X		X		\$110,000	11
N. Georgia College Cancellable Military Loan	\$407,000	Und	X			X	\$400,000	100
Critical Fields Cancellable Loan (GSL)	\$4,110,000	Und					\$4,110,000	1,644
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$442,923*	Und	X			X	\$436,800	91
IDAHO								
Education and Nursing Loan Forgiveness	\$0	Und	X		X		\$29,120	29
Work-Study	\$1,000,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,200,000	1,200
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$75,000*	Und	X			X	\$75,000	15
Fowler Memorial Scholarship	\$12,000	Und	X			X	\$12,000	8
ILLINOIS								
Stafford Loan Program	Revolving funds for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X	X			
SLS	Revolving funds for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
PLUS	Revolving funds for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
Uniloan	Revolving funds for defaulted loans	Und/Grad		X		X		
INDIANA								
State Summer Work Study	\$667,099				X		\$1,334,198	2,500
Minority Teacher Scholarship	\$366,450	Und				X		
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$391,122*		X					90
Lilly Endowment Educational Awards	\$8,734,764	Und	X		X		\$10,652,341	19,780
IOWA								
Stafford Loan	N/A			X	X			52,540
PLUS/SLS Loan	\$16,360,000			X		X	\$16,360,000	7,431
Guaranteed Loan Payment	\$75,000			X		X	\$75,000	77
Occupational Therapist	\$20,000			X		X	\$20,000	12
College Work Study	\$3,154,484	Und/Grad		X	X		\$3,054,484	5,585
Nurses	\$155,000			X		X	\$155,000	200
National Guard	\$250,000			X		X	\$250,000	285
KANSAS								
Osteopathic Loan	\$530,000	Grad		X	X		\$440,000	44
Optometry Loan Program	\$202,500	Grad	X			X	\$184,900	33

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
KANSAS (cont.)								
ROTC	Tuition Waiver	Und		X		X	\$336,000	240
Career Work Study	\$489,483	Und		X		X	\$630,000	420
Youth Education Services	\$50,000	Und		X		X	\$50,000	50
KENTUCKY								
Stafford Loan Program	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		\$60,000,000	26,087
PLUS/SLS	N/A	Und/Grad		X		X	\$7,500,000	2,885
Teacher Scholarship	\$1,000,000	Und	X			X	\$1,025,000	230
Math/Science Incentive Loan	\$550,000	Und/Grad		X		X	\$350,000	155
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$263,553*	Und	X			X	\$273,634	56
LOUISIANA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$341,128*	Und	X			X	\$341,128	68
Stafford Loan		Und/Grad		X	X			
PLUS		Und/Grad		X				
SLS		Und/Grad		X				
Rockefeller Scholarships	\$80,383	Und/Grad	X			X	\$80,383	80
MAINE								
Osteopathic Loan Fund	\$170,000	Grad		X	X		\$166,500	37
Contract Program	\$1,000,000	Grad		X		X	\$1,000,000	88
Blaine House Scholars	\$2,000,000	Und/Grad				X		
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$83,938*	Und				X		
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$46,225*	Und				X		
MARYLAND								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$334,015*	Und/Grad	X			X		
Physicians Assistant/Nurse Practitioner	\$79,500	Und		X			\$79,500	
Christa McAuliffe Fellowship	\$31,200	Grad	X			X	\$31,200	
Loan Assistance Forgiveness Program	\$100,000			X	X		\$100,000	
Child Development Associates								
Scholar Assistance Program	\$26,258			X	X		\$24,000	
MASSACHUSETTS								
Gilbert Matching Grant Program	\$9,225,000	Und		X	X		\$9,225,000	5,700
Tuition Waiver for Public Institutions	\$9,686,359	Und		X	X		\$9,686,359	14,500
Consortium Scholarship Program	\$500,000	Und		X	X		\$500,000	600
Adult Learners Program	\$850,000	Und		X	X		\$850,000	1,670
Dedicated Grant	\$1,300,000	Und		X	X		\$1,300,000	1,625
Educational Employment Program	\$2,200,000	Und		X	X		\$2,200,000	1,850
Talent Waiver	\$989,439	Und	X			X	\$989,439	1,500
MICHIGAN								
Stafford Guaranteed Student Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		\$200,000,000	80,000
State Direct Loan	N/A	Und/Grad		X	X		\$18,368,372	6,831
Work Study	\$5,807,171	Und/Grad		X	X		\$5,807,171	6,000
Degree Reimbursement	\$8,525,259	Und/Grad		X		X	\$8,525,259	9,800

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
MICHIGAN (cont.)								
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$300,000*	Und	X		X		\$300,000	200
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$650,993*	Und	X		X		\$650,573	139
Indian Tuition Waiver	\$1,217,872	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,217,872	1,600
MINNESOTA								
Work-Study	\$4,300,000			X	X			
Guaranteed Student Loan	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X			
Student Educational Loan Fund (SELF)	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$41,600,000	16,000
MISSISSIPPI								
Medical Loan	\$0			X	X		\$60,000	10
Academic Common Market	\$0		X		X		N/A	75
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$185,626*	Und	X		X		\$185,626	40
Special Nursing	\$89,400	Und	X		X		\$89,400	29
William Winter Teacher Scholar Program	\$351,698	Und		X		X	\$351,698	139
Stafford/SLS	\$0		X		X		\$780,656	225
MISSOURI								
Stafford Student Loan		Und/Grad		X	X		\$98,000,000	40,000
PLUS		Und/Grad		X		X	\$9,000,000	3,500
SLS		Und/Grad		X		X	\$5,400,000	1,800
MONTANA								
Work-Study	\$391,586	Und/Grad	X (30%)		X (70%)		\$400,000	500
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
Medical Education Capitation and Loan	\$200,000			X		X	\$200,000	20
Veterinary Education Capitation and Loan	\$219,000			X		X	\$219,000	20
Optometry Education Capitation and Loan	\$45,000			X		X	\$45,000	16
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$74,745*	Und	X			X	\$70,850	15
Governor's Success Program	\$800,000	Und			X		\$800,000	
NEW JERSEY								
Guaranteed Student Loan	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$164,000,000	55,981
PLUS/SLS	\$0	Und/Grad		X		X	\$30,900,000	9,802
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$580,000*	Und	X			X	\$580,000	116
NEW MEXICO								
(need-based)	\$630,667	Und		X	X		\$1,357,200	1,044
Work-Study (non-need-based)	\$1,261,334	Und		X		X	\$506,000	440
Osteopathic Student Loan	\$150,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$80,000	10
Nursing Student Loan	\$200,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$200,000	100
Physician Student Loan	\$200,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$184,000	23
NEW YORK								
Stafford Loan Program	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$763,000,000	282,000
PLUS	\$0	Und		X	X		\$50,000,000	16,200
SLS	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$220,000,000	75,300

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
NEW YORK (cont.)								
State Supplemental Health Loan Program	\$540,000	Und/Grad		X	X		(No new loans; funding only for existing loan costs)	
Loan Forgiveness Program	\$1,600,000	Grad		X		X	\$1,450,000	145
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$1,260,486*	Und	X			X	\$1,260,486	252
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$531,325*	Und	X			X	\$510,000	340
NORTH CAROLINA								
SLS				X		X	\$6,000,000	
Insured Student Loan Program				X	X		\$47,275,000	
Tuition Remission	\$8,912,974	Und			X		\$8,912,974	
Brooks Foundation Scholarship	\$128,750	Und	X		X		\$128,750	53
Turrentine Foundation Scholarship	\$585,000	Und	X		X		\$585,000	350
Suther Scholarship	\$12,800	Und	X		X		\$12,800	16
Carrow Scholarship	\$11,750	Und	X		X		\$11,750	5
Atkinson Scholarship	\$13,500	Und	X		X		\$13,500	9
Non-Service Scholarship	\$1,371,263	Und			X		\$1,371,263	
State Contractual Scholarship	\$9,504,000	Und			X		\$9,504,000	
PLUS Loan				X		X	\$6,000,000	
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$476,122*	Und	X			X	\$476,122	99
Health, Science and Math Scholarship/Loan	\$879,743	Grad	X		X		\$2,153,057	
College Work Study Matching	\$1,436,400							
OKLAHOMA								
Stafford Guaranteed Student Loan	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$110,000,000	45,000
State Regents' Fee Waiver	\$0	Und/Grad	X		X		\$17,070,319	N/A
PLUS/SLS	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$40,000,000	24,000
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarships	\$231,378*	Und	X		X		\$231,378	61
OREGON								
Medical/Dental Student Loan	\$105,450	Grad		X	X		\$198,000	60
Teacher Corps Loan	\$139,318	Und/Grad	X			X	\$139,318	76
PENNSYLVANIA								
Stafford Student Loan	\$0	Und/Grad		X	(Sub)	(Non)	\$362,200,000	132,602
Institutional Assistance Grants	\$26,447,000			X		X	\$26,590,068	31,209
Matching Funds	\$3,937,000			X	X		\$31,700,000	45,000
Work-Study Program	\$2,413,000			X	X		\$4,800,000	2,200
Health Education Assistance Loan	\$0			X	X		\$42,000,000	4,189
Higher Education Loan Plan	\$0			X		X	\$144,400,000	42,645
Loan Forgiveness Program	\$562,680	Grad	X			X	\$562,000	390
Science Teachers Education Program	\$445,950	Grad		X		X	\$445,950	1,680
Information Technology Program for the Commonwealth (ITEC)	\$1,664,000	Grad		X		X	\$1,664,000	3,480

State/Program	1989-90 Appropriation	Eligible Students	Merit-Based		Need-Based		Approximate Value of Awards	Approximate Number of Awards
			Yes	No	Yes	No		
PENNSYLVANIA (cont.)								
PLUS/SLS	\$0	Und/Grad		X		X	\$33,500,000	9,992
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$844,048*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$844,048	170
RHODE ISLAND								
Consolidation Loan	\$0	Und/Grad		X		X	\$657,798	54
Stafford Loan Program	\$0	Und/Grad		X	X		\$31,200,342	11,299
Intern	\$6,300	Und/Grad		X		X	N/A	300
Contract	\$202,300	Grad		X	X		\$650,370	56
PLUS/SLS	\$0	Und/Grad		X		X	\$3,957,618	1,175
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$71,021*	Und	X			X	\$70,000	14
Best and Brightest Teacher Scholarship	\$200,000	Und	X			X	\$200,000	40
SOUTH DAKOTA								
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$50,137*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$49,500	15
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$33,625*	Und	X			X	\$34,500	23
TENNESSEE								
Stafford Loan		Und/Grad		X	X		\$125,894,000	38,000
PLUS		Und/Grad		X	X		\$14,000,000	3,500
Teacher Loan Scholarship Program	\$375,000	Und/Grad	X			X	\$400,000	300
SLS		Und/Grad		X	X		\$22,000,000	5,500
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$343,319*	Und	X		X		\$343,319	76
Disadvantaged Areas	\$25,000	Und/Grad	X			X	\$25,000	14
Minority Fellows	\$95,000	Und	X			X	\$95,000	19
TEXAS								
Hinson-Hazlewood Loan Program	Bond Sale Funded	Und/Grad		X	X		\$59,900,000	21,360
College Work-Study	\$2,000,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$2,000,000	N/A
Public Educational Grant (on campus)	\$23,327,605	Und/Grad			X		\$22,700,000	37,200
Good Neighbor Scholarship Program	\$683,742	Und/Grad				X		
Public Educational-Refund Grant	\$8,546	Und/Grad			X		\$8,600	9
Line Item Scholarship	\$1,275,216	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,275,000	2,400
Nursing Work Program	Fees Collection	Und/Grad	X		X		\$165,000	350
Baylor Medical Scholarship	\$31,809,414	Grad		X		X	\$31,809,414	N/A
Baylor Dental Scholarship	\$13,407,596	Grad		X		X	\$13,407,596	N/A
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$1,000,000*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$1,000,000	240
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$511,500*	Und				X		
UTAH								
Career Teaching Scholarship	\$665,800	Und	X			X	\$765,800	365
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$118,800*	Und	X			X	\$120,000	24
Perkins Loan	\$126,500	Und		X	X		\$7,802,000	6,100
VERMONT								
Honors Scholarship	\$9,000	Und				X		
Veterinary Contracts	\$203,000			X		X	\$203,000	16
Math/Science Loan Cancellation	\$82,000			X		X	\$82,000	35

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>of Awards</u>	<u>of Awards</u>
VERMONT (cont.)								
Student Employment Program	\$125,000			X	X		\$320,000	200
Nursing Loan Cancellation	\$55,000			X		X	\$55,000	225
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$27,325*	Und				X		
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$40,678*	Und			X			
VIRGINIA								
Work-Study Program	\$2,000,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$2,000,000	1,263
WASHINGTON								
State Work-Study	\$9,133,409	Und/Grad		X	X		\$33,291,000	7,398
Health Professions Loan Repayment Program	\$75,000	Grad		X		X	\$75,000	5
WICHE	\$147,200	Grad		X	X		\$147,200	23
Future Teacher Conditional Scholarship	\$300,000	Und/Grad	X			X	\$299,925	93
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$347,753*	Und/Grad	X			X	\$347,753	74
Paul Fowler Academic Excellence Scholarships	\$45,000	Und	X			X	\$45,000	30
Higher Education Opportunities Program	\$9,000	Und/Grad		X	X		N/A	50
Scholars Program	\$355,000	Und	X			X	\$355,000	589
Nurses Conditional Scholarship Program	\$225,000	Und/Grad	X			X	\$218,400	78
WEST VIRGINIA								
Institutional Undergraduate Tuition and Fee Waiver Program	\$0	Und				X	\$4,500,000	
Institutional Graduate and Professional Tuition and Fee Waiver Program	\$0	Grad				X	\$1,000,000	
Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship	\$135,900*	Und				X	\$135,900	29
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship	\$76,150*	Und				X	\$76,150	40
Higher Education Student Assistance Loan Program	\$0	Und/Grad		X		X	\$300,000	150
Underwood-Smith Teacher Scholarship	\$438,000	Und/Grad				X	\$438,000	100
Medical Student Loan Program	\$368,228	Grad		X	X		\$368,228	155
WISCONSIN								
Nursing Stipend-Loan	\$195,000	Und				X	\$195,000	130
Minority Teacher Loan Program	\$50,000	Und				X	\$50,000	30
PUERTO RICO								
Tuition Remission	\$2,300,000			X		X	\$2,300,000	10,000

\* Indicates that dollars are federal allocations to the states, not state appropriations.

TABLE 7

STATE FUNDED STUDENT AID PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY  
STATE AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE RESPONDING AGENCY

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Administering Agency</u>	<u>1989-90 Appropriation</u>	<u>Eligible Students</u>	<u>Merit-Based Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Need Based Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Approximate Value of Awards</u>	<u>Approximate Number of Awards</u>
<b>ALABAMA</b>									
Medical Scholarships/Loans	Medical Scholarship Board	\$677,000	Grad	X		X		\$656,000	218
Dental Scholarships/Loans	Dental Scholarship Board	\$176,000	Grad	X		X		\$156,000	36
Optometry Scholarships/Loans	Optometry Scholarship Board	\$149,000	Grad	X		X		\$110,000	52
Alabama G.I.	Department of Veteran Affairs	\$2,700,000	Und		X		X	\$2,700,000	2,904
Vocational Rehabilitation	State Dept. of Education	\$7,939,853	Und/Grad		X	X		\$2,190,825	3,776
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>									
Tuition Set Aside Program	Each Public College Unit	*	Und/Grad		X	X		\$11,602,000	15,000
Nursing Scholarship	Each Nursing School/College	\$75,000	Und		X	X		\$75,000	95
<b>DELAWARE</b>									
Ivy Davis Scholarship	Foster Care Review Board	\$50,000	Und/Grad		X		X	\$20,000	4
<b>GEORGIA</b>									
Rural Doctor Program	Board of Regents	\$625,000	Grad	X		X		\$696,000	87
Rehabilitation Services	Department of Human Resources	N/A	Und	X		X		N/A	N/A
Regents Scholarship	Board of Regents	\$200,000	Und	X		X		\$165,625	265
Regents Opportunity Grant	Board of Regents	\$600,000	Grad	X		X		\$596,250	159
<b>HAWAII</b>									
State Higher Education Loan Program	University of Hawaii	\$150,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,100,000	620
Tuition Waivers	University of Hawaii	\$0	Und/Grad	X		X		\$4,547,713	4,844
Nat. Guard & Reserve Tuition Waivers	University of Hawaii	\$0	Und		X		X	\$633,740	939
Vietnam Vet Tuition Waivers	University of Hawaii	\$0	Und		X		X	\$16,130	60
Teacher Incentive Tuition Waivers	University of Hawaii	\$0	Und/Grad	X			X	\$31,400	56
<b>ILLINOIS</b>									
MIA/POW Descendants Scholarships	Department of Veteran Affairs	\$433,300							430
Family Practice Residency Scholarships	Board of Higher Education	\$2,700,000							125
Nursing Loans	Department of Public Health	\$550,000							303
DCFS Stipends	Dept. of Child & Family Services	\$78,900							43
Math/Science Scholarships	State Board of Education	\$8,000							20
Teacher Shortage Area Scholarships	State Board of Education	\$553,400						\$553,350	525
Women/Minority in Admin. Scholarships	State Board of Education	\$276,200						\$276,000	375
Gifted Program Fellowships	State Board of Education	\$75,000	Grad						60
Gifted Program Traineeships	State Board of Education	\$25,000	Und						25

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Administering Agency</u>	<u>1989-90 Appropriation</u>	<u>Eligible Students</u>	<u>Merit-Based Yes</u>	<u>Merit-Based No</u>	<u>Need Based Yes</u>	<u>Need Based No</u>	<u>Approximate Value of Awards</u>	<u>Approximate Number of Awards</u>
<b>IOWA</b>									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Vocational Rehabilitation	\$1,464,558			X	X		\$1,464,558	4,300
Commission for the Blind	Commission for the Blind	\$52,087			X		X	\$52,087	134
Student Aid Set Aside	State Board of Regents				X	X		\$23,618,000	N/A
IMAGES	State Board of Regents	\$500,000			X	X		\$500,000	N/A
<b>KENTUCKY</b>									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Department of Education	N/A	N/A		X			N/A	N/A
<b>LOUISIANA</b>									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Department of Social Services	\$7,000,000			X		X		
Veteran's Benefits	Department of Veteran's Affairs				X		X		
Veterans' Education Benefits	Federal Government				X		X		
Education Majors Scholarship	State Department of Education		Und	X			X		
<b>MARYLAND</b>									
Stafford Loan Program	Higher Education Loan Corp.								
Other Race Grants	State Board of Higher Education								
<b>MICHIGAN</b>									
Tuition Incentive Program	Department of Social Services	N/A	N/A		X	X		N/A	N/A
Education Trust Program	Treasury Department	N/A	N/A		X	X		N/A	N/A
<b>MINNESOTA</b>									
Indian Scholarship	Department of Education	\$1,588,626			X	X		\$1,588,626	971
Indian Teacher Education Scholarship	Department of Education	\$150,000			X	X			
<b>MISSOURI</b>									
Teacher Education Scholarship	Elementary/Secondary Education	\$260,000	Und	X			X	\$260,000	260
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>									
Governor's Teaching Scholars Program	Department of Education	\$3,600,000	Und	X			X	\$4,275,000	570
<b>NEW YORK</b>									
College Work Study Reimbursement	State Department of Education	\$5,752,000	Und		X			**	
Native Americans	State Department of Education	\$385,000	Und		X		X	\$385,000	350
Supplemental Higher Education Loan	Dormitory Authority	(tax exempt bonds)							
Financing Program	State of New York	\$90,000,000	Und/Grad		X		X	N/A	N/A
Tuition Corps of Engineers Program	New York City Transit Auth.	\$200,000	Und/Grad	X			X	N/A	N/A
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>									
Community College Scholarships	Dept. of Community Colleges	\$380,000							
Veterans Scholarships	Department of Veteran Affairs	\$2,668,271							
Teachers Scholarships/Loans	Board of Education (K-12)	\$1,600,000							
Teaching Fellows	Public School Forum	\$4,000,000							
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>									
Vocational Rehabilitation			Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,000,000	1,000

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Administering Agency</u>	<u>1989-90 Appropriation</u>	<u>Eligible Students</u>	<u>Merit-Based Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Need Based Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Approximate Value of Awards</u>	<u>Approximate Number of Awards</u>
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>									
Teacher Loan Program	S.C. Student Loan Corp.	\$3,300,000		X		X		\$3,300,000	985
State Grant Program	Commission on Higher Education	\$8,750		X		X		\$8,750	12
Graduate Incentive Fellowship	Commission on Higher Education	\$476,000		X		X		\$476,000	110
Other Race Grant Program	Commission on Higher Education	\$104,000		X		X		\$104,000	104
SREB Contract Program (Veterinary and Optometry)	Commission on Higher Education	\$725,000		X		X		\$725,000	95
Contract with North Carolina School of Arts	Commission on Higher Education	\$17,350		X		X		\$17,350	N/A
Palmetto Fellows Scholarships	Commission on Higher Education	\$250,000		X		X		\$250,000	143
<b>TENNESSEE</b>									
Vocational Rehabilitation	Human Services	\$2,777,497		X		X		\$2,526,524	2,524
<b>TEXAS</b>									
Resident Tuition Exemptions	Public Colleges	Tuition Remission	Und/Grad		X		X	\$5,000,000	20,300
Non-Resident Tuition Waivers	Public Colleges	Tuition Adjustment	Und/Grad		X		X	\$55,000,000	40,200
<b>UTAH</b>									
Tuition Waivers		N/A	Und/Grad	X		X		\$7,323,895	N/A
Educationally Disadvantaged		\$1,167,300	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,167,300	1,760
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>									
State War Orphan Act	Department of Veteran Affairs	\$5,000	Und/Grad		X		X	\$5,000	4
Vocational Rehabilitation	Dept. of Vocational Rehabilitation	\$380,000	Und/Grad		X	X		\$1,100,000	1,150
<b>WISCONSIN</b>									
Lawton Minority	University of Wisconsin	\$1,685,200	Und		X	X		\$1,685,200	1,000
Minority Tuition	University of Wisconsin	\$132,000	Und		X	X		\$132,000	N/A
Vietnam Vets	Veteran Affairs	\$61,800	Und		X		X	\$61,800	N/A
Minority Teacher Loan Forgiveness	University of Wisconsin	\$100,000	Und		X		X	\$100,000	N/A

\* No appropriation by state. Public colleges must set aside an amount equal to 15% of the previous year's tuition revenues for financial aid to needy students.

\*\* Reimbursement to schools for their share of funds expended in participation in federal work study program.

TABLE 8

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF AWARDS AND DOLLARS BY SECTOR  
FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Percentage of Awards</u>			<u>Percentage of Award Dollars</u>		
	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
ALABAMA						
*Student Assistance Program	73.0	27.0	0.0	64.0	36.0	0.0
ALASKA						
Student Incentive Grants	50.0	11.8	38.2	50.0	11.8	38.2
ARIZONA						
Student Incentive Grants	88.0	12.0	0.0	89.0	11.0	0.0
ARKANSAS						
Student Assistance Grants	85.7	14.3	0.0	85.0	15.0	0.0
CALIFORNIA						
Cal Grant A Program	66.5	33.5	0.0	31.3	68.7	0.0
Cal Grant B Program	95.0	5.0	0.0	87.0	13.0	0.0
Cal Grant C Program	52.4	47.6	0.0	17.3	82.7	0.0
Bilingual Teacher Grants	94.0	6.0	0.0	93.2	6.8	0.0
Law Enforcement Personnel	78.0	22.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
COLORADO						
*Student Incentive Grants	94.0	6.0	0.0	93.0	7.0	0.0
*Student Grants	94.0	6.0	0.0	93.0	7.0	0.0
*Extended Studies Tuition Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
*Private School Student Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
CONNECTICUT						
Scholastic Achievement Grants	26.0	29.0	45.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
Independent College Student Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
*Aid to Public College Student Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
DELAWARE						
Postsecondary Scholarships	32.0	20.0	48.0	38.0	21.0	41.0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
*Student Incentive Grants	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3
FLORIDA						
Student Assistance Grants	61.6	38.4	0.0	51.4	48.6	0.0
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships	77.0	23.0	0.0	54.0	46.0	0.0
GEORGIA						
Student Incentive Grants	72.0	28.0	0.0	71.0	29.0	0.0
HAWAII						
Student Incentive Grants	45.0	55.0	0.0	45.0	55.0	0.0

Percentage of Awards

Percentage of Award Dollars

At In-State  
Public Inst.

At In-State  
Private Inst.

At Out-of-State  
Institutions

At In-State  
Public Inst.

At In-State  
Private Inst.

At Out-of-State  
Institutions

State/Program

IDAHO						
Student Incentive Grants	91.0	9.0	0.0	91.0	9.0	0.0
ILLINOIS						
Monetary Award Program	64.9	35.1	0.0	42.4	57.7	0.0
*Student-to-Student Matching Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
INDIANA						
Higher Educational Awards	75.0	25.0	0.0	53.9	46.1	0.0
Freedom of Choice Grant	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
IOWA						
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Vocational-Technical Tuition Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
KANSAS						
State Scholarships	79.3	20.7	0.0	78.3	21.7	0.0
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Nursing Scholarship	85.0	15.0	0.0	85.0	15.0	0.0
Minority Scholarship	78.7	21.3	0.0	78.7	21.3	0.0
KENTUCKY						
Student Incentive Grants	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
LOUISIANA						
*Student Incentive Grants	97.2	2.9	0.0	97.6	2.4	0.0
MAINE						
Student Incentive Grants	50.0	50.0	0.0	33.0	67.0	0.0
MARYLAND						
*General State Scholarships	65.8	23.0	11.2	48.0	42.4	9.6
*Senatorial Scholarships	83.3	14.6	2.1	79.4	17.8	2.8
*Jack F. Tolbert Scholarship	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
*Children of Deceased Firemen	33.0	67.0	0.0	33.0	67.0	0.0
*Professional Scholarships	90.0	10.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0
MASSACHUSETTS						
General State Scholarships	55.0	35.0	10.0	36.0	56.0	8.0
Christian Herter Memorial Scholarship	22.0	54.0	24.0	12.0	61.0	27.0
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Incentive Grants	48.0	52.0	0.0	42.0	58.0	0.0
Part-Time Grants	58.0	42.0	0.0	58.0	42.0	0.0
MICHIGAN						
Competitive Scholarships	75.5	24.5	0.0	62.3	37.7	0.0
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Educational Opportunity Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Adult Part-Time Grants	83.0	17.0	0.0	83.0	17.0	0.0

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Percentage of Awards</u>			<u>Percentage of Award Dollars</u>		
	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
MINNESOTA						
*Scholarship and Grant Program	56.0	44.0	0.0	56.0	44.0	0.0
MISSISSIPPI						
*Student Incentive Grants	62.8	37.2	0.0	55.2	44.8	0.0
MISSOURI						
*Student Grants	47.0	53.0	0.0	16.0	84.0	0.0
MONTANA						
Student Incentive Grants	94.3	5.7	0.0	94.3	5.7	0.0
NEBRASKA						
*State Scholarship Award Program/SSIG	76.0	24.0	0.0	78.0	22.0	0.0
Scholarship Assistance Program	70.0	30.0	0.0	76.0	24.0	0.0
NEVADA						
*Student Incentive Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
*Student Incentive Grants	61.3	20.7	18.0	61.3	20.7	18.0
NEW JERSEY						
Tuition Aid Grants	78.0	22.0	0.0	65.0	35.0	0.0
Educational Opportunity Fund	84.0	16.0	0.0	67.0	33.0	0.0
Garden State Scholarships	73.0	27.0	0.0	73.0	27.0	0.0
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	90.0	10.0	0.0	76.0	24.0	0.0
NEW MEXICO						
*Student Incentive Grants	66.0	34.0	0.0	66.0	34.0	0.0
*Student Choice	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
*Three Percent Scholarships	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
NEW YORK						
Tuition Assistance Program	57.5	42.5	0.0	40.5	59.5	0.0
Aid for Part-Time Study	79.0	21.0	0.0	63.3	36.7	0.0
NORTH CAROLINA						
Student Incentive Grants	75.0	25.0	0.0	52.0	48.0	0.0
Minority Presence Scholarships	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
American Indian Scholarships	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
NORTH DAKOTA						
Student Financial Assistance	82.2	17.8	0.0	82.2	17.8	0.0
OHIO						
Instructional Grants	69.0	30.0	1.0	48.0	51.0	1.0
OKLAHOMA						
Tuition Aid Grants	89.8	10.2	0.0	87.4	12.6	0.0
Bill Willis Scholarship Program	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Percentage of Awards</u>			<u>Percentage of Award Dollars</u>		
	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
OREGON						
Need Grants	91.4	8.6	0.0	85.5	14.5	0.0
Cash Awards	56.1	43.9	0.0	55.2	44.8	0.0
Barber and Hairdresser Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
PENNSYLVANIA						
State Higher Education Grants	50.7	41.6	7.7	44.2	52.6	3.2
POW/MIA Program	66.7	11.1	22.2	78.3	4.4	17.4
RHODE ISLAND						
Scholarship and Grant Program	49.1	15.1	35.8	39.9	18.3	41.8
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
SOUTH DAKOTA						
*Student Incentive Grants	67.0	33.0	0.0	67.0	33.0	0.0
*Tuition Equalization Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
TENNESSEE						
Student Assistance Awards	73.1	26.9	0.0	53.3	46.8	0.0
TEXAS						
Tuition Equalization Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Public Educational SSIG Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
State Scholarship Program for						
Ethnic Recruitment	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Tax Reimbursement Grant	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
UTAH						
Student Incentive Grants	98.0	2.0	0.0	98.0	2.0	0.0
VERMONT						
Student Incentive Grants	39.5	21.7	38.8	33.2	34.9	31.9
Part-Time Student Grants	65.0	30.3	4.7	40.4	55.5	4.1
Non-Degree Student Grants	75.9	23.8	0.3	79.4	20.2	0.4
VIRGINIA						
College Scholarship Assistance	76.0	24.0	0.0	76.0	24.0	0.0
Virginia Transfer Grant	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Undergraduate Student Fin. Assistance	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
WASHINGTON						
State Need Grants	84.0	16.0	0.0	84.0	16.0	0.0
Assistance to Blind Students	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
WEST VIRGINIA						
Higher Education Grants	84.4	14.8	0.8	76.7	22.8	0.5

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Percentage of Awards</u>			<u>Percentage of Award Dollars</u>		
	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
WISCONSIN						
Tuition Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Higher Education Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Indian Student Grants	60.0	40.0	0.0	56.0	44.0	0.0
Handicapped Student Grants	59.0	8.0	33.0	54.0	9.0	37.0
Talent Incentive Grants	76.0	24.0	0.0	61.0	39.0	0.0
Private School Student Minority Grants	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
WYOMING						
Student Incentive Grants	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
PUERTO RICO						
*Educational Funds	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
*Legislative Awards	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
ALL STATES	62.0	36.1	1.9	44.7	54.0	1.3

\* 1989-90 data not available - used 1988-89 data.

TABLE 9

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AWARDS AND DOLLARS BY SECTOR  
FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS

<u>State</u>	<u>Number of Awards</u>			<u>Value of Awards (Millions)</u>		
	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At-In State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
ALABAMA	2,866	1,060	0	\$ 1.405	\$ 0.791	\$ 0.000
ALASKA	76	18	58	0.114	0.027	0.087
ARIZONA	4,378	597	0	3.011	0.372	0.000
ARKANSAS	10,203	1,703	0	3.319	0.586	0.000
CALIFORNIA	61,137	17,933	0	77.619	81.366	0.000
COLORADO	13,408	872	0	8.959	0.723	0.000
CONNECTICUT	8,910	7,015	1,575	6.551	13.459	0.918
DELAWARE	405	253	608	0.391	0.216	0.422
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	132	395	263	0.178	0.534	0.356
FLORIDA	13,258	8,260	0	11.110	10.500	0.000
GEORGIA	10,151	3,948	0	3.554	1.451	0.000
HAWAII	405	495	0	0.340	0.415	0.000
IDAHO	732	72	0	0.315	0.031	0.000
ILLINOIS	72,819	38,281	0	77.203	103.597	0.000
INDIANA	27,368	18,132	0	23.224	35.170	0.000
IOWA	3,648	14,260	0	1.368	30.683	0.000
KANSAS	1,123	3,679	0	1.478	5.652	0.000
KENTUCKY	12,975	10,400	0	5.559	8.299	0.000
LOUISIANA	3,249	97	0	1.958	0.048	0.000
MAINE	2,200	2,200	0	0.662	1.345	0.000
MARYLAND	13,691	4,015	1,432	8.244	5.731	1.210
MASSACHUSETTS	24,634	16,003	3,919	21.977	32.914	4.605
MICHIGAN	24,227	29,482	0	19.115	53.707	0.000
MINNESOTA	31,248	24,552	0	36.960	29.040	0.000
MISSISSIPPI	1,382	818	0	0.686	0.557	0.000
MISSOURI	4,042	4,558	0	1.730	9.084	0.000
MONTANA	1,226	74	0	0.393	0.024	0.000
NEBRASKA	1,900	600	0	1.573	0.464	0.000
NEVADA	352	0	0	0.352	0.000	0.000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	981	331	288	0.475	0.161	0.140
NEW JERSEY	44,008	11,672	0	55.762	29.042	0.000
NEW MEXICO	4,700	2,332	0	3.218	1.806	0.000
NEW YORK	176,391	126,575	0	156.639	223.931	0.000

Number of Awards

Value of Awards (Millions)

<u>State</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At In-State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>	<u>At In-State Public Inst.</u>	<u>At-In State Private Inst.</u>	<u>At Out-of-State Institutions</u>
NORTH CAROLINA	5,823	1,242	0	2.939	1.550	0.000
NORTH DAKOTA	2,088	452	0	1.266	0.274	0.000
OHIO	47,610	20,700	690	24.336	25.857	0.507
OKLAHOMA	13,926	1,579	0	10.085	1.450	0.000
OREGON	14,444	1,791	0	8.967	1.804	0.000
PENNSYLVANIA	60,798	49,933	9,278	58.912	70.192	4.325
RHODE ISLAND	4,667	1,433	3,400	4.046	1.853	4.236
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	7,476	0	0.000	18.191	0.000
SOUTH DAKOTA	603	897	0	0.237	0.267	0.000
TENNESSEE	17,982	6,617	0	9.210	8.085	0.000
TEXAS	5,706	13,565	0	3.367	21.444	0.000
UTAH	1,656	34	0	1.046	0.021	0.000
VERMONT	5,041	2,488	3,182	3.848	3.937	3.238
VIRGINIA	7,780	1,920	0	6.855	1.429	0.000
WASHINGTON	16,301	3,105	0	11.444	2.180	0.000
WEST VIRGINIA	4,641	815	45	4.045	1.202	0.025
WISCONSIN	40,091	10,457	26	23.245	15.893	0.043
WYOMING	531	0	0	0.241	0.000	0.000
PUERTO RICO	2,965	8,488	0	6.825	7.275	0.000
ALL STATES	830,878	483,674	24,764	\$716.356	\$864.630	\$20.112

TABLE 10

## STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BY STATES

State	1988-89 SSIG Used	Estimated 1989-90 SSIG Amount	1989-90 Need-Based Award Dollars Only	SSIG
				As a Percent of 1989-90 Need-Based Award Dollars
ALABAMA	\$ 1,113,944	\$ 1,069,023	\$ 2,244,625	47.6%
ALASKA	115,708	114,126	228,252	50.0
ARIZONA	1,237,000	1,223,106	3,400,000	36.0
ARKANSAS	460,068	454,548	3,904,548	11.6
CALIFORNIA	11,191,847	11,222,000	162,003,281	6.9
COLORADO	994,646	981,043	10,548,058	9.3
CONNECTICUT	946,954	935,593	20,929,438	4.5
DELAWARE	89,773	191,672	1,196,383	16.0
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	529,659	523,304	1,068,599	49.0
FLORIDA	2,287,117	2,248,551	21,700,375	10.4
GEORGIA	1,264,926	1,247,627	5,005,169	24.9
HAWAII	278,703	295,210	755,420	39.1
IDAHO	243,512	240,590	491,123	49.0
ILLINOIS	3,900,000	3,900,000	180,800,000	2.2
INDIANA	1,454,224	1,436,776	58,394,759	2.5
IOWA	629,368	617,930	32,100,435	1.9
KANSAS	807,144	796,105	7,128,592	11.2
KENTUCKY	890,556	877,449	13,858,010	6.3
LOUISIANA	973,734	1,003,016	2,006,032	50.0
MAINE	261,922	257,506	2,007,506	12.8
MARYLAND	1,321,970	1,310,361	15,467,399	8.5
MASSACHUSETTS	2,338,085	2,310,033	65,494,000	3.5
MICHIGAN	3,005,739	2,969,676	76,092,703	3.9
MINNESOTA	1,416,256	1,389,386	68,000,000	2.0
MISSISSIPPI	615,507	608,122	1,243,122	48.9
MISSOURI	1,426,026	1,419,842	10,814,121	13.1
MONTANA	200,472	198,957	416,747	47.7
NEBRASKA	522,240	515,097	2,036,450	25.3
NEVADA	(198,335)	195,956	(400,000)	49.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	253,913	250,441	925,441	27.1
NEW JERSEY	1,910,329	1,884,204	85,372,000	2.2
NEW MEXICO	(370,000)	364,709	(5,309,683)	6.9
NEW YORK	6,146,553	6,072,806	392,000,000	1.5
NORTH CAROLINA	(1,579,173)	1,560,226	(5,988,494)	26.1
NORTH DAKOTA	195,766	192,463	1,540,000	12.5
OHIO	2,882,958	2,848,368	50,700,000	5.6
OKLAHOMA	980,869	967,454	13,104,421	7.4
OREGON	938,668	922,838	10,770,000	8.6
PENNSYLVANIA	3,211,574	3,157,419	133,429,200	2.4
RHODE ISLAND	383,755	379,151	10,134,314	3.7
SOUTH CAROLINA	786,657	777,219	18,191,460	4.3
SOUTH DAKOTA	206,418	203,941	503,941	40.5
TENNESSEE	1,183,253	1,163,300	17,294,928	6.7
TEXAS	3,932,120	3,919,017	27,379,607	14.3
UTAH	540,263	533,781	1,067,502	50.0
VERMONT	182,631	180,439	11,172,904	1.6
VIRGINIA	1,548,723	1,650,340	8,284,011	19.9
WASHINGTON	1,549,257	1,304,128	13,624,190	9.6
WEST VIRGINIA	530,311	521,788	5,271,788	9.9
WISCONSIN	1,516,502	1,498,307	39,180,307	3.8
WYOMING	106,212	120,504	241,008	50.0
PUERTO RICO	647,414	650,060	17,898,300	3.6
Grand Totals	\$72,298,754	\$71,675,508	\$1,639,118,646	4.4%

Figures in ( ) are estimated from 1988-89 data.

Note: SSIG allocations received by American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory, and Virgin Islands not reported as they did not respond to the survey.

TABLE 11

## SELECTED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS, 1989-90

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90	Need Analysis	
			UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
ALABAMA				
Student Assistance Program	1975	\$2,500	UM	N
Alabama Student Grant Program	1978	\$1,200		N
National Guard Education Assistance Program	1983	\$1,000		N
Chiropractic Scholarships	1985	\$10,000	CM	N
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program	1984	\$3,996		Y
Police Officer's and Firefighter's Survivor's Education Assistance Program	1987	\$2,000		N
ALASKA				
Student Incentive Grant	1978-79	\$1,500	UM	N
ARIZONA				
Incentive Grant Program	1977	\$2,500	UM, CM, I, P Any on Sec of Ed list	Y
ARKANSAS				
Student Assistance Grant	1975	\$500	CM	N
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship	1973	N/A		N
Law Enforcement Officers' Depend. Scholshp.	1973	N/A		N
Governor's Scholars Program	1984	\$2,000		Y
CALIFORNIA				
Cal Grant A	1956	\$5,250	C	Y
Cal Grant B	1969	\$6,660	C	Y
Cal Grant C	1973	\$2,890	C	Y
Bilingual Teacher Grant		\$4,045	C	N
State Graduate Fellowship	1966	\$6,490	C	Y
Law Enforcement Personnel	1970	\$1,500	CM	N
COLORADO				
Student Incentive Grants	1977	\$2,500	CM	N
Student Grants	1971	\$2,000	CM	N
Graduate Grants	1971	\$4,000	CM	N

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Maximum Award 1989-90</u>		
COLORADO (cont.)				
Undergraduate Merit Awards	1971	Tuition & Fees		Y
Veterans Tuition Assistance	1974	\$652		N
		75% of Tuition and Fees		
National Guard Tuition Assistance	1981			N
Law/POW Dependents Tuition Assistance	1970	\$3,340		N
Graduate Fellowship	1971	Tuition + \$5,000		Y
Extended Studies Tuition Grant	1971	Tuition	CM	N
Diversity Grants	1988	\$2,500		N
		Tuition, fees, books supplies, transp.		
Nursing Scholarships	1988			N
Private School Student Grants	1988			Y
CONNECTICUT				
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	1987-88	Unmet Need	CM	N
Independent College Student Grant Program	1976	\$5,937	CM	N
Scholastic Achievement Grants	1981-82	\$2,000	CM	Y
High Technology Graduate Scholarship	1984-85	\$10,000		Y
DELAWARE				
Diamond State Scholars	1984	\$1,000		Y
Postsecondary Scholarship Fund	1978	\$1,000	CM	N
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	1974	Full Tuition		N
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Incentive Grants	1975	\$1,500	I, P, G	Y
FLORIDA				
Student Assistance Grants	1972	\$1,300	CM	Y
		No limit;		
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarship	1982	Set by tribe	UM, CM, P	Y
Tuition Voucher Fund	1979	\$1,150		Y
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	1981	\$2,500		Y
Graduate Scholars' Fund	1986	\$10,000		Y
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veterans/POW/MIA	1941	\$1,200		Y

			Need Analysis	
			UM=Uniform Methodology	
			U=Modified UM	
			CM=Congressional Methodology	
			C=Modified CM	Demonstrate
			I=Institutions Choose	Academic Merit
			S=State System	To Receive
			P=Pell System	Initial Award
			G=GAPSFAS	Y=Yes
				N=No
State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90		
FLORIDA (cont.)				
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	1986	\$2,000	CM	Y
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	1921	\$150		Y
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grant	1963	\$1,800		Y
Regent Scholarship	1983	\$5,000		Y
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	1984	\$5,000		N
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program	1983-84	\$702		Y
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	1987-88	\$1,000		N
GEORGIA				
Student Incentive Grants	1974	\$450	CM	N
Tuition Equalization Grants	1972	\$925		N
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	1972	\$2,000		N
Governor's Scholarship Program	1985	\$1,461		Y
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	1977	\$300		N
HAWAII				
Student Incentive Grants		\$2,500	CM	N
IDAHO				
Student Incentive Grants	1975	\$2,500	I	N
State of Idaho Scholarship	1974	\$1,500		Y
ILLINOIS				
Monetary Award Program	1958-59	\$3,500	C	N
Student-to-Student Matching Grants		\$1,000	I	N
National Guard Scholarships		Tuition & Fees		N
Descendants Grants		Tuition & Fees		N
Merit Recognition Scholarships	FY 1986	\$1,000		Y
Veteran Grants		Tuition & Fees		N
INDIANA				
Freedom of Choice Grants		\$2,302	C	
Higher Education Grants		\$1,737	C	N
IOWA				
Scholarship Program	1965	\$500		Y

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
 Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Maximum Award 1989-90</u>		
IOWA (cont.)				
Tuition Grant Program	1969	\$2,500	CM	N
Minority Grants for Economic Success	1989	\$3,500	CM	N
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants	1973	\$500	CM	N
Osteopathic Grant Program	1989	\$3,000		N
KANSAS				
State Scholarships	1963	\$1,000	CM	Y
Tuition Grants	1972	\$1,650	CM	N
Vocational Scholarship Program	1987	\$500		Y
Nursing Scholarships	1989	\$3,500	CM	N
Minority Scholarships	1989	\$1,500	CM	Y
KENTUCKY				
Student Incentive Grant Program	1974-75	\$500	CM	N
Tuition Grant Program	1975-76	\$1,200	CM	
LOUISIANA				
Incentive Grants	1972	\$2,000	I	N
T. H. Harris Scholarships	1940	\$300		Y
High School Rally Scholarship	1971	\$500		Y
MAINE				
Incentive Grant	1978	\$1,500	CM	N
MARYLAND				
General State Scholarships	Prior to 1970	\$2,500	UM	N
Senatorial Grants	Prior to 1970	\$1,500		N
Jack F. Tolbert Scholarships	1979	\$1,500	CM	N
Delegate Scholarships	Prior to 1970			N
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Program	Prior to 1957	\$1,000		N
Professional Scholarships	Prior to 1970	\$1,000	CM	N
Family Practice Medicine Scholarships		\$7,500	CM	
Children of Deceased Firemen	1971	\$1,000	CM	N
Distinguished Scholar	1978	\$3,000		Y
Reimbursement of Firemen	1957	\$2,600		N
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Program	1984	\$6,394		Y
Teacher Education - Distinguished Scholar	1984	\$3,000		Y

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90	Need Analysis	
			UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
MARYLAND (cont.)				
Nursing Scholarship	1988	\$2,400		Y
MASSACHUSETTS				
General Scholarships	1957	\$3,800	C,S	N
Christian Herter Memorial Scholarship	1971	1/2 cost of education	CM	N
Medical/Dental/Veterinarian Scholarships	1967	\$5,800	C,S	N
Commonwealth Scholars Grant	1984	\$1,000		Y
Graduate Student Grant Program	1984	\$4,000	I	N
Honor Scholarships	1967	\$1,512		Y
Fire/Police/Corrections/War Orphans	1946	\$1,512-FPC \$750-War Orphans		N
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Incentive Grants	1985	\$2,000	I	Y
Part-Time Grants	1986	cost of education	I	N
MICHIGAN				
Educational Opportunity Grants	1986	N/A	I	N
Adult Part-Time Grants	1986	N/A	I	N
Competitive Scholarships	1964	\$1,200 - public \$2,200 - private	C	Y
Tuition Grants	1966	\$2,300	C	N
MINNESOTA				
Scholarship and Grant Programs	1968-69	\$5,182	CM	N
MISSISSIPPI				
Student Incentive Grants	1975	\$1,500	I	N
POW/MIA/Law/Firemen Scholarship	1942	Based on tuition & room charges		N
Southern Regional Educ. Board Program	1942	\$8,050		N
Graduate and Professional Scholarships	1942	N/A		N
MISSOURI				
Student Grants	1972	\$1,500	CM	N
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	1987-88	\$2,000		Y

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
 Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90		
MISSOURI (cont.)				
Public Service Office or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	1988-89	\$1,622		N
MONTANA				
Student Incentive Grants	1976-77	\$600	CM	N
NEBRASKA				
State Scholarship Award Program	1989-90		UM	N
Scholarship Assistance Program	1989-90		UM	N
NEVADA				
Student Incentive Grants	1977	\$2,000	UM,P	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Incentive Program	1976	\$1,000	P	Y
Nursing Education Grants	1959	\$2,000	P	N
War Orphans Scholarships	1943	\$1,000		N
NEW JERSEY				
Tuition Aid Grants	1977	\$3,700	U	N
Garden State Scholarships	1977	\$1,000	U	Y
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergraduates	1968	\$1,950	U	N
Educational Opportunity Fund - Graduates	1968	\$4,000	G	N
Public Tuition Benefits	1979	\$2,920		N
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	1988	\$2,775	U	N
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	1988	\$2,000		Y
POW/MIA Tuition Grants	1975	\$14,700		N
Distinguished Scholars Program	1984	\$2,000		Y
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid Program	1985	\$2,576		N
Veterans Tuition Credit Program	1977	\$400		N
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	1977	\$7,500		Y
NEW MEXICO				
Student Incentive Grant	1980	\$2,500	CM	N
Student Choice	1984		UM	N
Three Percent Scholarships	1953	\$1,412	I	N

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90	Need Analysis	
			UM=Uniform Methodology U=Modified UM CM=Congressional Methodology C=Modified CM I=Institutions Choose S=State System P=Pell System G=GAPSFAS	Demonstrate Academic Merit To Receive Initial Award Y=Yes N=No
NEW MEXICO (cont.)				
Graduate Fellowships	1988	\$7,200		N
Athletic Grants	1953	\$2,300		N
NEW YORK				
Tuition Assistance Program	1974	\$3,650	S	N
Regents College Scholarship Program	1913	\$250		Y
Aid for Part-time Study	1984	\$2,000	Tuition minus other grant aid Schools select recipients	N
		\$1,000		
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	1984	per semester		N
Regents Nursing Scholarships	1954	\$250		Y
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	1986	\$2,000		Y
Health Services Corps	1985	\$15,000		Y
Empire State Challenger Scholarships	1984	\$4,000		Y
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships	1985	\$5,000		N
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	1985	\$10,000		N
Lehman Fellowships	1971	\$5,000		Y
Children of Veterans/Police	Veterans - 1936			
Officers/Firefighters/Correction	Police - 1982			
Officer Awards	Firefighters - 1983			
	Correction - 1987	\$450		N
Transit Corps of Engineers Program	1987	Tuition		Y
NORTH CAROLINA				
Student Incentive Grant	1975	\$1,500	UM	N
Legislative Tuition Grants	1975	\$1,100		N
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	1974	\$21,094	C	Y
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	1978	\$11,115	C	Y
NORTH DAKOTA				
Student Financial Assistance Program	1973	\$600	CM	N
OHIO				
Instructional Grants	1970	\$3,306	S	N
Academic Scholarship	1978	\$1,000		Y

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
 Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90		
OHIO (cont.)				
		Private - \$1,830 Public - Tuition & general fees		
War Orphans Scholarship	1954			N
Student Choice Grants	1984	\$590		N
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowship	1986	\$3,500		Y
OKLAHOMA				
Tuition Aid Grants	1974	\$1,000	S	N
Future Teachers Scholarship Program	1984	\$1,500		Y
Bill Willis Scholarship Program	1986	\$1,000	S	N
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	1972	\$1,388		Y
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	1975	\$6,000		Y
Minority Professional Study Grants	1977	\$4,000		Y
Academic Scholars Program	1988	\$4,000		Y
OREGON				
Need Grant	1971	\$1,710	C	N
Cash Award	1961	\$804	C	Y
Barber and Hairdresser Grants	1986	\$1,500	C	N
PENNSYLVANIA				
State Grant Program	1966	\$2,100	S	N
POW/MIA Program	1972	\$1,200	S	N
RHODE ISLAND				
Scholarship and Grant Program	1978	\$2,000	CM	Y - scholarship N - grant
Governor's Academic Scholars Program	1987	\$2,500		Y
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Tuition Grant Program	1970	\$3,760	S	Y
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Student Incentive Grants	1974	\$600	P	N
Tuition Equalization Grants	1978	\$250	P	N
Superior Scholar Scholarship	1984	\$1,500		Y
TENNESSEE				
Student Assistance Awards	1976	\$1,290	P	N

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
 Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

State/Program	Year Initiated	Maximum Award 1989-90		
TENNESSEE (cont.)				
Academic Scholars Program	1986	\$4,000		Y
Dependent Children Scholarship		\$4,900		N
TEXAS				
Tuition Equalization Grants	1971-72	\$3,150	CM, C, P	N
Public Educational SSIG Program	1975-76	\$2,500	CM, P	N
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	1981-82	\$1,000	CM, P	Y
Tax Reimbursement Grants	1985-86	\$2,500	CM, P	N
UTAH				
Incentive Grants	1975	\$2,500	CM	N
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education	1953	N/A		Y
VERMONT				
Incentive Grants	1965	\$5,200	C	N
Part-Time Student Grant	1981	\$3,900	C	N
Non-Degree Student Grant Program	1985	\$1,000	C	N
VIRGINIA				
College Scholarship Assistance Program	1973	\$2,000	CM	N
Tuition Assistance Grant Program	1973	\$1,500		N
Virginia Scholars Program	1984	\$3,000		Y
Virginia Transfer Grant	1983	\$3,166	CM	Y
Undergrad Student Financial Assistance Prog	1988	\$1,000	CM	N
Eastern Shore Tuition Assistance Program	1973	\$938		N
WASHINGTON				
Need Grant Program	1970	\$900	C	N
Assistance to Blind Students	1974	\$600	CM	N
WEST VIRGINIA				
		\$1,640 - in-state private \$1,184 - in-state public \$600 - out-of-state	CM	Y
WISCONSIN				
Tuition Grant Program	1965	\$2,172	CM	N

Need Analysis  
 UM=Uniform Methodology  
 U=Modified UM  
 CM=Congressional Methodology  
 C=Modified CM  
 I=Institutions Choose  
 S=State System  
 P=Pell System  
 G=GAPSFAS

Demonstrate  
 Academic Merit  
 To Receive  
Initial Award  
 Y=Yes  
 N=No

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Maximum Award 1989-90</u>		
WISCONSIN (cont.)				
Higher Education Grant Program	1976	\$1,800	CM	N
Indian Student Grant	1971	\$1,800	CM	N
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grant	1987	\$2,500	CM	N
Talent Incentive Grant Program	1972	\$1,800	CM	N
Private School Student Minority Grant	1986	\$2,500	CM	N
Handicapped Student Grants	1976	\$1,800	CM	N
WYOMING				
Incentive Grants	1975	\$800	I,S	N
PUERTO RICO				
Supplementary Assistance Program	1982			N
Educational Fund	1969		P	N
Legislative Awards	1952		P	N

TABLE 12

## ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS

I = In-State Only

O = Out-of-State Only

B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
<b>ALABAMA</b>									
Chiropractic Scholarships									O*
Student Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Student Grant Program		I		I					
National Guard Education Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Emergency Secondary Ed. Scholarship Program	I	I							
Police Officer's and Firefighters' Survivors' Education Assistance Program	I		I		I				
<b>ALASKA</b>									
Incentive Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B*
<b>ARIZONA</b>									
Incentive Grant Program	I	I	I	I		I			
<b>ARKANSAS</b>									
Student Assistance Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
Governor's Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
MIA/KIA Dependents Scholarship	I		I		I				
Law Enforcement Officers' Dep. Scholarship	I		I						
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>									
Cal Grant A	I	I	I	I*	I*	I*	I*	I*	
Cal Grant B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Cal Grant C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Bilingual Teacher Grant	I	I							
Graduate Fellowships	I	I					I	I	I*
Law Enforcement Personnel	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
<b>COLORADO</b>									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Student Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Graduate Grants	I	I							
Undergraduate Merit Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Veterans Tuition Assistance	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
National Guard Tuition Assistance	I		I		I		I		
Extended Studies Tuition Grant	I								
Diversity Grants	I		I				I		
Nursing Scholarships	I		I				I		

I = In-State Only  
O = Out-of-State Only  
B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
COLORADO (cont.)									
Private School Student Grants		I		I					
Graduate Fellowship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
CONNECTICUT									
Scholastic Achievement Grants	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	
Independent College Student Grant Program		I		I					
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	I		I						
High Technology Graduate Scholarship Program	I	I							
DELAWARE									
Postsecondary Scholarship Fund	B	B	B	B					
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	O*
Diamond State Scholars	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA									
Incentive Grants	B	B	B	B		B	B	B	
FLORIDA									
Student Assistance Grants	I	I	I	I		I	I	I	
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Tuition Voucher Fund		I		I					
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	I	I	I	I					
Graduate Scholars' Fund									I*
Scholarships for Children of Deceased/Disabled Veterans/POW/MIA	I		I		I				
Confederate Memorial Scholarships	I		I						
Exceptional Student Education State Training Grants	I	I	I	I					
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	I								I*
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program	B	B	B	B					
Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships	I		I						
Regents Scholarships	I								
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	I	I	I	I					I*
GEORGIA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I*
Tuition Equalization Grants	O*	I		I					
Law Enforcement Personnel Dependents Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Governors' Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I					
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	I*								

I = In-State Only  
 O = Out-of-State Only  
 B = In-State and Out-of-State

State/Program	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public	2-Year Private	Public Vo-Tech	Private Vo-Tech	Public Nursing	Private Nursing	Other (Specify)
<b>HAWAII</b>									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
<b>IDAHO</b>									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I			
State of Idaho Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I				
<b>ILLINOIS</b>									
Monetary Award Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Student-to-Student Matching Grants	I								
National Guard Scholarships	I		I						
Descendants Grants	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Merit Recognition Scholarships	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Veteran Grants	I		I						
<b>INDIANA</b>									
Freedom of Choice Grants		I		I				I	
Higher Education Grants	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
<b>IOWA</b>									
Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	I*
Tuition Grants		I		I				I	I*
Vo-Tech Tuition Grants			I		I				
Minority Grants for Economic Success		I		I				I	I*
Osteopathic Grant Program									I*
<b>KANSAS</b>									
State Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Tuition Grants		I		I		I			
Vocational Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Nursing Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Minority Scholarships	I	I	I	I					
<b>KENTUCKY</b>									
Incentive Grant Program	I	I	I	I		I*			
Tuition Grant Program		I		I					
<b>LOUISIANA</b>									
Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
T. H. Harris Scholarships	I		I						
High School Rally Scholarship	I	I	I	I			I		
<b>MAINE</b>									
Incentive Grants	B	B	B	B	B		I	I	B*
<b>MARYLAND</b>									
General State Scholarship	B	B	B	B			I	I	I*

I = In-State Only  
O = Out-of-State Only  
B = In-State and Out-of-State

[illegible]

I = In-State Only  
 O = Out-of-State Only  
 B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
MISSOURI (cont.)									
Public Service Office or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
MONTANA									I*
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I		I				
NEBRASKA									
Scholarship Assistance Program	B	B	B	B		B			
NEVADA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I		
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
Incentive Program	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	B*	
Nursing Education Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	O*
War Orphans Scholarships	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
NEW JERSEY									I*
Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I					I*
Garden State Scholarships	I	I	I	I					
Educational Opportunity Fund - Undergrad.	I	I	I	I					
Educational Opportunity Fund - Grad.	I	I							I*
MIA/POW Tuition Grants	I	I	I	I					I*
Public Tuition Benefits	I	I	I	I					I*
Distinguished Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					I*
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid Program	I	I	I	I					
Veterans Tuition Credit Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Garden State Graduate Fellowship	I	I							
Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I					I*
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
NEW MEXICO									
Student Incentive Grant	I	I	I	I	I				
Student Choice		I		I					
Three Percent Scholarships	I		I						
Graduate Fellowships	B								
Athletic Grants	B								
NEW YORK									I*,O*
Tuition Assistance Program	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Regent College Scholarships	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Aid for Part-Time Study	I	I	I	I		I*			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	I	I	I	I	I	I*			
Regents Nursing Scholarships	I	I	I	I			I	I	

I = In-State Only  
 O = Out-of-State Only  
 B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
NEW YORK (cont.)									
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Children of Veterans/Police Officers/ Firefighters/Correction Officers Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I*
Health Services Corps	B	B	B	B		B*	B	B	
Empire State Challenger Scholarships	I	I							
Regents Professional Opportunity Schlrschs.	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Regents Health Care Opportunity Schlrschs.	I	I							I*
Lehman Fellowships	I	I							
Transit Corps of Engineers Program	I	I							
NORTH CAROLINA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Legislative Tuition Grants		I		I					
Board of Governors Medical Scholarships	I	I							
Board of Governors Dental Scholarships	I								
NORTH DAKOTA									
Student Financial Assistance Program	I	I	I		I		I		
OHIO									
Instructional Grants	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	
Academic Scholarship	I	I	I			I		I	
War Orphans Scholarship	I	I	I						
Student Choice Grants		I						I	
Regents Graduate/Professional Fellowships	I	I							
OKLAHOMA									
Tuition Aid Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Future Teachers Scholarship Program	I	I	I	I					
Bill Willis Scholarship Program	I		I						
Chiropractic Education Assistance Program									O*
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	I*	I*							
Minority Professional Study Grants	I*								
Academic Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
OREGON									
Need Grants	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Cash Awards	I	I	I	I			I	I	
Barber and Hairdresser Grants						I			
PENNSYLVANIA									
State Grant Program	B	B	I	B		I	B	B	O*
POW/MIA Program	B	B	I	B		I	B	B	O*

I = In-State Only  
 O = Out-of-State Only  
 B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
RHODE ISLAND									
Scholarship and Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Governor's Academic Scholars Program	O	B	O	B					
SOUTH CAROLINA									
Tuition Grant Program		I		I					
SOUTH DAKOTA									
Student Incentive Grants	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Tuition Equalization Grants		I		I					
Superior Scholar Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
TENNESSEE									
Student Assistance Awards	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Academic Scholars Program	I	I	I	I					
Dependent Children Scholarship	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
TEXAS									
Tuition Equalization Grants		I		I					
Public Educational SSIG Grants	I		I		I				
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	I								
Tax Reimbursement Grants	I		I		I				
UTAH									
Incentive Grants	I	I	I						
Western Interstate Comm. for Higher Ed.	I	I							
VERMONT									
Incentive Grant	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
Non-Degree Student Grant Program	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	I	
Part-Time Student Grant	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
VIRGINIA									
College Scholarship Assistance	I	I	I	I					
Tuition Assistance Grant Program		I		I				I	
Virginia Scholars Program	I	I							
Virginia Transfer Grant	I								
Undergrad Student Financial Assistance Prog	I		I						
Eastern Shore Tuition Assistance Program	O								
WASHINGTON									
Need Grant Program	I	I	I		I	I			
Assistance to Blind Students	I	I	I	I					

I = In-State Only  
 O = Out-of-State Only  
 B = In-State and Out-of-State

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>4-Year Public</u>	<u>4-Year Private</u>	<u>2-Year Public</u>	<u>2-Year Private</u>	<u>Public Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Private Vo-Tech</u>	<u>Public Nursing</u>	<u>Private Nursing</u>	<u>Other (Specify)</u>
<u>WEST VIRGINIA</u>									
Higher Education Grant Program	B*	B*	B*	B*				B*	
<u>WISCONSIN</u>									
Tuition Grant Program		I		I				I	
Higher Education Grant Program	I		I		I				
Indian Student Grant	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Talent Incentive Grant Program	I	I	I	I	I		I	I	
Handicapped Student Grants	B	B	B	B	B		B	B	
Private School Student Minority Grant		I		I				I	
Vo-Tech Student Minority Grants					I				
<u>WYOMING</u>									
Incentive Grants	I		I						
<u>PUERTO RICO</u>									
Legislative Awards	I	I	I	I					
Educational Fund	I	I	I	I					

FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 12

<b>ALABAMA</b>	
Chiropractic Scholarships	O* - Chiropractic colleges.
<b>ALASKA</b>	
Incentive Grant	B* - Any nationally or regionally accredited institution.
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>	
Cal Grant A	I* - Programs must be at least two years in length or minimum of 1,800 clock hours.
Graduate Fellowship	I* - Accredited graduate/professional institutions in California.
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>	
Scholastic Achievement Grants	B* - Out-of-State - Only in reciprocal states.
<b>DELAWARE</b>	
Educational Benefits for Children of Deceased Military and Police	O* - Only when program is unavailable at a Delaware institution.
<b>FLORIDA</b>	
Graduate Scholars' Fund	I* - Public and private Florida colleges that offer graduate degrees in high technology disciplines.
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	I* - Public law schools.
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	I* - Graduate Schools
<b>GEORGIA</b>	
Student Incentive Grants	I* - Other hospital programs of study.
Tuition Equalization Grants	O* - Within 50 miles of Georgia.
North Georgia College/ROTC Grants	I* - Only at North Georgia College.
<b>IOWA</b>	
Tuition Grants	I* - Business and Bible colleges.
Scholarship Program	
Minority Grants for Econ. Success	
Osteopathic Grant Program	I* - Osteopathic Medical School
<b>KENTUCKY</b>	
Incentive Grant Program	I* - Must offer an associate degree.
<b>MAINE</b>	
Incentive Grants	B* - Regionally accredited private voc-tech.
<b>MARYLAND</b>	
Professional Scholarships	I* - Professional programs in law, dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, and nursing.
Family Practice Medicine Scholarships	I* - University of Maryland School at Baltimore
Delegate Scholarships	I* - Graduate schools.
Senatorial Scholarships	
General State Scholarship	
Children of Deceased Firemen	I* - Any institution approved by the Admin.
Edward T. Conroy Memorial Prog.	B* - Any institution approved by the Admin.
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>	
General Scholarships	B* - Out-of-state must be in states which have reciprocity with Massachusetts.
	B** - Same as B* and must be Pell eligible - tuition charging at least one year in length at in-state institutions.

---

**MASSACHUSETTS (cont.)**

Medical/Dental/Veterinarian Scholarships	B* - Medical, dental, and veterinary colleges.
Graduate Student Grants	I* - Qualifying graduate programs only.
Fire/Police/Corrections/War Orphans	I* - Fire/Police/Corrections B* - War Orphans
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Incentive Grants	I* - Must have qualifying teacher certification program approved by Dept. of Education.

**MONTANA**

Student Incentive Grants	I* - Tribally controlled community colleges.
--------------------------	--

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Incentive Program	B* - Any eligible out-of-state institution must be regionally accredited.
Nursing Education Grants	O* - For graduate level study only.

**NEW JERSEY**

Tuition Aid Grants	I* - Proprietary institutions with degree programs approved by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education.
Garden State Scholarships	
MIA/POW Tuition Grants	
Public Tuition Benefits	
Distinguished Scholars Program	
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid Program	
Garden State Urban Scholars Program	

**NEW YORK**

Aid for Part-Time Study	I* - Degree-granting institutions only.
Tuition Assistance Program	I* - Registered business schools. O* - Six out-of-state medical programs.
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Assistance	I* - Specifically approved vocational training programs of at least 320 clock hours.
Children of Veterans/Police Officers/Firefighters/Correction Officers Awards	I* - Registered business schools.
Health Services Corps	B* - Degree-granting institutions only.
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	I* - Medical and dental schools.

**OKLAHOMA**

Chiropractic Education Assistance Program	O* - Out-of-state chiropractic schools
Minority Doctoral Study Grants	I* - Selected professional schools.
Minority Professional Study Grants	

**PENNSYLVANIA**

State Grant Program	O* - Contiguous states must have a reciprocity agreement with Pennsylvania.
POW/MIA Program	

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Higher Education Grant Program	B* - Limited to educational institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania resulting from a reciprocal agreement.
--------------------------------	---

---

TABLE 13

COMMENTS TO AID SURVEY READERS TO  
BETTER UNDERSTAND AGENCY POSITIONS

ALABAMA:	Although the Alabama Legislature recently increased maximum grant awards in the Alabama Student Grant Program to \$1,200 per year, actual grant awards are based on the number of students who apply.
ALASKA:	Because each year Alaska receives 700-800 eligible SSIG applications, we are pursuing additional state appropriations to meet the applicant demand.
CALIFORNIA:	A significant increase in grant funding coupled with redirecting funds allocated to public institutions back to the Commission has allowed Cal Grants to again cover full fees for students attending public institutions. New policies are also in place for setting the maximum grant for eligible non-public institutions.
COLORADO:	In 1989-90, Colorado Student Aid was appropriated in a lump sum for merit grants, need-based grants and work-study. A footnote in the appropriations bill specified that 30 percent be used for merit, 30 percent for need-based grants, 30 percent for work-study and the remaining 10 percent for any category--graduate or undergraduate.
CONNECTICUT:	Connecticut has a guarantee authority for Stafford Loans and state coordinating board responsible for all other state aid programs, with most aid distributed to Connecticut colleges, which select aid recipients.
FLORIDA:	The state centrally administers the state grant program, with institutions verifying student eligibility. The state places much emphasis on programs for current and future teachers to counter shortages. The undergraduate scholars program is receiving considerable support to keep our top students in the state.
GEORGIA:	The agency's Board of Directors will attempt to secure full funding for the need-based SSIG program. Currently, about 3,000 needy students are denied each year due to a lack of funds. In addition, we are seeking additional funds for the service-cancelable nursing program, due to our state's critical shortage of nurses.
ILLINOIS:	Illinois enacted a temporary increase in the state income tax, half of which was targeted at education. State funding for the Commission was increased 24 percent compared with funding for the 1988-89 year. (Support for the Commission's Monetary Award Program was up 16.4 percent.) Effective 1989-90, the Merit Recognition Scholarship program has been restructured to provide \$1,000 scholarships to students who graduate in the top 5 percent of their high school class and enroll the following academic year at an Illinois college or university. The program previously recognized the top 10 percent of each high school graduating class in the state, while the awards were for \$500, renewable for a second year. Also, the agency's name has been changed to the Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC) to more accurately reflect the scope of our activities.
IOWA:	Several new programs were advanced in fiscal year '90 to address minority student recruitment and retention, nursing and National Guard shortages.
LOUISIANA:	The Education Majors Scholarship, previously administered by GSCES, will be administered by the Louisiana Department of Education for fiscal year 1989-90 and subsequent fiscal years. Contact the Department of Education, 504-342-3475, about new policies for this scholarship. The High School Rally Scholarship has been reinstated for 1989-90 fiscal year.

**MAINE:** Osteopathic loans are awarded directly to the student. The Maine Contract Program has contractual agreements with specific professional schools to provide access for Maine students in the fields of osteopathic, dental and veterinary medicine and optometry. Capitation is paid directly to the college. Part or all of the monies are applied to the students' tuition contingent on contract terms. Both programs include a loan forgiveness provision.

**MASSACHUSETTS:** Due to significant state budgetary difficulties, the Scholarship Program is operating below the appropriated level. About 5 percent of the appropriation was vetoed at the time the Fiscal Year 1990 budget was signed.

**MINNESOTA:** Beginning 1989-90, the State Grant Program will use Congressional Methodology, replacing Uniform Methodology used in past years.

**MISSOURI:** Higher Education Academic School Program: Merit eligibility based on ACT/SAT composite test scores, fully funded. Missouri Grant Program: Need based, fund renewals with need first then non-renewals with need. Based on current funding levels, able to fund about 25-30 percent of eligible applicants.

**MONTANA:** Because Montana's SSIG program is decentralized, detailed program data for the current year is not available at this time.

**NEW JERSEY:** The Department of Higher Education and various boards that administer the state's student aid programs continue to maintain the policies that financial assistance of the highest degree possible should be made available to full-time financially needy students wishing to attend New Jersey colleges and universities. In recent years, a strong emphasis has been made to provide merit-based scholarship assistance coupled with need-based awards to academically outstanding students as a means of reducing the out-migration of qualified students.

**NEW YORK:** 1989-90 saw a continuation of the emphasis on ensuring that elementary and secondary school students are aware of the financial help available to pursue a college education if they complete high school. As a result, HESC has emphasized the availability in 1991-92 of the Liberty Scholarships which, with other student financial aid, ensures that low income students will meet the full cost of attending a public university in New York State. Students attending a private college would receive a Liberty Scholarship award equivalent to what they would receive at a State University. In 1989-90, the state's Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) maximum award was increased by 28 percent and the income eligibility ceiling for an award was raised 24 percent.

**NORTH DAKOTA:** After finally making progress in obtaining additional funding from the legislature, we face a December 5th referral of two tax measures. If successful, we would lose up to 40 percent of the grants available for the 1990-91 year.

**OHIO:** The Ohio Instructional Grant program is not needs analysis driven but provides grant awards via a tables-of-grants based on the parents' income and a portion of the student's income and the type of institution attended. The tables-of-grants are established by statute.

PENNSYLVANIA: Third consecutive year of 10 percent funding increase has enabled agency to provide increased maximum grant to low-income applicants and improve program access for moderate income families.

TENNESSEE: Due to lack of funds, we were unable to award 1,856 students who applied before our customary cut-off date of August 1st. The dollar figure associated with these students had we been able to fund them would be \$1,205,571. To provide the maximum level of assistance to students, TSAC based its award calculation on the lower Student Aid Index when a primary and secondary SAI was calculated.

TEXAS: The trend in our legislature is to provide special population programs. Although we did receive funding for our first state work-study program, 12 small programs were created for nurses and health profession students.

VERMONT: VSAC is a comprehensive agency that provides career counseling and financial aid information to middle schools, high schools and adult students. VSAC provides grant programs for students enrolled in full-time, part-time, and non-degree courses and programs. It also serves as a guarantor for Vermont's students and institutions, and provides loan capital through its Education Loan Finance Program.

VIRGINIA: The Virginia Work-Study Program (VWSP) has been positively received by institutions and employers in its first year. All jobs are in public service areas and most are off-campus. Information is that more jobs are available should funding increase in future years.

WEST VIRGINIA: The governance structure for higher education has been reorganized due to recently approved legislation. The centralized governing body, Board of Regents, was replaced by two separate boards. The administrative responsibility for executing the mandates of two boards (including the WVEEP) was assigned to the Higher Education Central Office. The Grant Program received its first state funding increase since 1984-85. The modest increase of \$95,000 was insufficient to absorb the increased costs which resulted from two tuition increases within the past year. To avoid a drastic reduction in the numbers of students to be assisted, the value of individual grants were reduced from 75 percent to 70 percent of the statutory maximum.

PUERTO RICO: These programs are operated on a decentralized basis. The Council assigns block amounts to higher education institutions, both public and private. The institutions in turn determine student's need award, individual aid, pay the student, perform all record keeping functions and submit performance report to the Council.

### SECTION III

#### POLICY ISSUES AND CONCERNS

The only part of the survey that significantly varies every year, this section deals with specific and timely issues the membership considers important. This year's issues concern the states' use of SSIG funds for work-study programs, factors relating to reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, significant new changes in state aid programs planned for this year and the next, and state budgetary allocations to institutionally administered financial aid programs.

#### Significant Program Changes Planned in 1989-90 and 1990-91

Eighteen states identified significant changes expected in their programs for this or next year (see Table 14). California, Massachusetts, Missouri and Pennsylvania reported changes, or anticipated changes, in automated grant processing.

Iowa noted consideration of ranking needy dependent grant applicants by parental contributions rather than family contributions to address disincentives to student employment in the current methodology. New York plans to increase its maximum Tuition Assistance Program award and raise its income eligibility ceiling in 1990-91, part of a two-step increase begun in 1988-89. Virginia reported that it will include a need-based component in its presently non-need-based Tuition Assistance Grant Program.

Maine and West Virginia will modify program eligibility criteria, with the former increasing medical student residency requirements and the latter adopting more stringent standards of satisfactory academic progress for renewal awards.

Vermont intends to increase funding for its non-degree grant program, Kentucky, for its Tuition Grant Program. Colorado and Tennessee also expect increased funding of their need-based programs, while Rhode Island and West Virginia are concerned about potential funding cuts.

#### New Financial Aid Programs To Be Implemented In 1990-91 or 1991-92

Twenty states reported plans to implement new aid programs within the next two years (see Table 15). Tuition savings plans will be implemented in Alabama, Illinois, West Virginia and Wisconsin, and are under consideration in Georgia and Iowa. Arizona's Student Aid Trust Fund will collect a small fee from its state university students to be matched by state appropriations and then used for supplementary financial aid.

Indiana will implement the Math Merit Scholarship to benefit college students proficient in mathematics. Wisconsin will start a scholarship program for entering freshmen in 1990-91. Alaska is considering a merit-based scholarship program and a work-study program, while Kentucky is seeking funds for an existing work-study program.

Louisiana has implemented a need- and merit-based tuition-remission plan for residents who attend its public colleges. New York will implement its Liberty Scholarship Program in 1991-92 to provide low-income students with funds to meet full public college costs. The Liberty legislation provides for elementary/secondary school partnerships with colleges to provide outreach and special services to low-income students. Rhode Island's Children's Crusade for higher Education will identify eligible third graders in 1991 and guarantee them free tuition when they achieve admission to public colleges.

Washington will establish a program in 1990-91 providing grants to needy students who live in areas underserved by public four-year colleges, to encourage them to transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions. New Jersey is considering a 1990-91 program to provide grants to needy non-traditional students to enroll for six or fewer college credits per semester. Oregon will implement an aid program for community college students not otherwise eligible for state scholarship funds due to certain economic, institutional or personal barriers. The program is part of comprehensive workforce development legislation.

Oregon and Minnesota will implement supplemental "child care" programs for students with child care needs.

Michigan will implement an alternative loan program to provide education loans to credit-worthy students and their families. Missouri plans on starting a loan program for nurses.

Oregon's new Volunteers in Service to Oregon (VISTO) will provide potential students who do volunteer work in community social service agencies with vouchers that can be exchanged for funds when they enter colleges.

Tennessee has proposed a peer counseling program in which college financial aid recipients work in high schools to help disadvantaged students make the transition from secondary to postsecondary education.

#### State Funds Appropriated To Institutions For Financial Aid

For several years, annual NASSGP report compilers have recognized that survey results do not reflect all the states' total financial commitments to student aid programs. Because virtually all public institutions use some of their general state appropriations to help fund financial aid on their campuses, these dollars could be considered part of the states' student aid support. Unfortunately, in most states the actual institutional appropriation amounts used for financial aid are not readily available, if they are available at all. Additionally, some NASSGP report users have suggested that tuition waivers should also be counted as state financial aid support. In recognition of this latter consideration, recent surveys have tried to collect tuition-waiver dollar values where they are offered from a fund specifically designated for this purpose. These data are reported in Tables 1, 6 and 7 of the report. Attempting to count unfunded tuition waivers as indirect state subsidies seems fruitless, because the data are usually unavailable from any central source. Moreover, lost tuition revenues do not represent state grant expenditures any more than do lost tax revenues from tax code provisions, designed to aid certain categories of taxpayers, represent state fiscal expenditures.

An expenditure category that can and probably should be considered in assessing state-supported student aid is legislative appropriations to campuses that are earmarked for financial aid purposes. This year's NASSGP survey asked respondents whether their states allocate funds to colleges that are specifically designated for student financial aid award purposes, e.g., a line item in the budget and allocations to colleges.

The responses displayed in Table 16 indicate that 20 states have special funds that in 1989-90 total slightly over \$349 million. The largest dollar amounts were reported by California, \$90.8 million; New York, \$63.4 million; Texas, \$45.3 million; North Carolina, \$23.3 million; Connecticut, \$18.1 million; and Virginia, \$16.9 million. Therefore, 74 percent of the expenditures were made by only 30 percent of reporting states.

Nine states indicated that their appropriations could be used to aid full-time and part-time undergraduates and graduate students. Alabama and Alaska restrict awards to full-time undergraduates. Six states restrict awards to full- and part-time undergraduates. California and Virginia restrict awards to full-time undergraduates and graduate students, Kansas, to full-time graduate students.

Florida, Maine and Washington said their appropriations could be used for all the following purposes: tuition remission, grants, scholarships, long-term loans, employment, graduate assistantships or fellowships, and federal aid program matching purposes. New York and North Carolina said their appropriations could be used for everything but loans, Delaware for everything but loans and tuition remission. Five states said their appropriations could be used only for grants: Alaska, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and Oregon.

Here are the number of states whose appropriations can be used for each type of award:

Grants	16
Tuition Remission	10
Undergraduate Scholarships	10
Assistantships/Fellowships	9
Federal Matching	8
Student Employment	7
Long-Term Loans	5

The data indicate, in conjunction with data reported in Table 1, that the maximum amount of grant dollar assistance states provide may be as much as 16 percent greater than the NASSGP report has identified (\$349 million divided by \$2.09 billion). However, the actual percentage is likely much less, because an unknown portion of the appropriations is used for non-grant aid.

While the present means of assessing state support of grants to students in this and in previous NASSGP reports may slightly underestimate states' total contributions, it considerably underestimates the contributions of some states. For example, California reported \$162 million in grant awards through specific programs (see Table 1). But it reported another \$90.8 million in state appropriations to institutions for financial aid, most of which is used for grants. Arkansas reported \$4.8 million in grant awards in specific programs but reported \$10.5 million in appropriations to institutions for

fellowships, assistantships, and undergraduate scholarships, and tuition remission.

#### Factors NASSGP Agencies Consider Most Important in Reauthorization

The survey asked respondents to describe the five most important changes they would like to see in Reauthorization of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Thirty-one states listed one or more changes, which are displayed in Table 17. Because the recommendations were many and varied, it is difficult to summarize them. However, there are some changes that seem to be important to more than a few states.

Over half the respondents (17) wanted increased funding for the State Student Incentive Grant program (SSIG). Among other recommendations for changes in the SSIG program, the District of Columbia, Hawaii and Louisiana suggested that the use of "third-party" matching funds be reinstated to allow institutions rather than states to match federal allocations. Louisiana suggested that an administrative cost allowance paid to states by the federal government be added to the SSIG.

New Jersey supported incremental growth to the SSIG to assist in the development of a national service program. Washington suggested revising the SSIG to emphasize the federal-state partnership rather than to provide states "incentives" to develop their own programs and preserve states' rights to target SSIG funds to students by whatever methods they prefer. Virginia wanted a new SSIG allocation formula mechanism to provide additional funding to states that increase their need-based grant appropriations.

The Paul Douglas Scholarship program was the target of several recommendations. Alaska, Delaware and Louisiana wanted administrative cost allowance added to it. Louisiana wanted to increase program funding; Alabama wanted to abolish it.

Several changes to the Congressional Methodology (CM) were recommended. Missouri, Pennsylvania and West Virginia suggested eliminating special need analysis provisions for displaced homemakers and dislocated workers. Connecticut, Iowa, Illinois, New Jersey, West Virginia and Wisconsin recommended changes in the treatment of student earnings so that 70 percent of them are not "taxed" in the expected family contribution. Modifying the CM's treatment of home equity was a concern to Iowa, Missouri and South Carolina. Connecticut wanted the CM revised to make it "more sensitive to the family's actual financial strength." Rhode Island wanted the CM formula to become "more equitable for all students."

Tennessee, Texas and Washington recommended "privatization" of the CM. Texas and Rhode Island advocated one need analysis system for the Pell Grant and all other Title IV programs. California, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Utah, Vermont and Virginia expressed concern for simplifying the financial aid delivery system. Kentucky and Montana said that simple procedures for determining financial aid eligibility for welfare recipients should be established.

Changes in the Pell Grant program included increasing program funding, recommended by California, Illinois, Mississippi and South Carolina. Kentucky suggested combining the Pell and Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant

programs. Pennsylvania recommended eliminating Pell Grant eligibility for less-than-half-time students.

Five states recommended that separate programs be established for proprietary school students, usually outside the parameters of the Higher Education Act: Alabama, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York and Texas.

California and Massachusetts emphasized expansion of federal outreach efforts, while Alabama recommended increasing financial support for the Trio Programs. New Hampshire wanted to increase assistance for part-time and non-traditional students, and Wisconsin recommended a minority grant program "above and beyond Pell to impact on minority young people, especially young adults who wish to enter or re-enter a postsecondary school."

#### Using SSIG Allocations For Work-Study Programs

Because the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1986 allows states to use a portion of their State Student Incentive Grant Program allocations to help fund work-study programs, the survey asked respondents if they were using or planned to use their SSIG funds for this purpose.

Only 18 states reported that they will have work-study programs in 1989-90. They are: California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, Virginia and Washington. (New York and North Carolina spend funds on work-study awards through allocations to postsecondary institutions to meet their matching requirements in the federal College Work-Study Program.) Only Iowa and Washington said they would use their SSIG allocations to help fund work-study programs in 1989-90, with Iowa expecting to use about 5 percent and Washington about 20 percent.

The survey asked states if they might use SSIG allocations to help fund a work-study program in 1990-91. All states without work-study programs this year said they would not use SSIG funds for new programs next year. Iowa and Washington planned to use SSIG funds again next year, while none of the remaining 16 states with operational programs planned to do so. But six who left this item blank, indicating the possibility of such use, were: Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana and New Mexico.

The survey asked states that had not used and don't plan to use SSIG funds for work-study programs why this was the case. Thirteen work-study states explained why they do not use SSIG funds for their programs. Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Michigan and Pennsylvania believed their work-study programs were sufficiently funded to meet the aid demanded from them.

Indiana and Virginia had independent work-study programs, with Virginia stressing that using SSIG funds would limit the ability to modify its program as it sees fit. California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Texas and Vermont said they needed their SSIG allocations to support their grant programs. Rhode Island noted that its work-study funds come from its scholarship and grant appropriations and that budgetary constraints are likely to require cutting the work-study program this year.

States that have no work-study programs indicated that their SSIG allocations were needed to fund grant programs and/or were too small to provide incentives to establish work-study programs.

TABLE 14

COMMENTS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN CURRENT  
PROGRAMS OR OPERATIONS PLANNED FOR 1990-91 AWARD YEAR

CALIFORNIA:	Implementing our new automated financial aid processing system will take place in 1990-91, allowing grant programs to announce awards earlier than ever and vastly improving our ability to provide information to schools and students. It will also allow for an improved payment system to insure that funds are available at the time students enroll.
COLORADO:	We are requesting a large increase for need-based grants.
IOWA:	The Commission may begin to rank needy dependent grant applicants by parental contribution rather than total family contribution to address student employment disincentives in the current amount methodology.
KENTUCKY:	Our Agency's 1990-92 biennial budget requests seek about \$23 million in SSIG funds each year to provide full tuition grants to financially needy full-time Kentucky resident undergraduate students in state-supported community colleges and universities, and for students attending private nonprofit colleges, an amount equal to the weighted average tuition at public institutions. Funding at this level would enable over 19,000 students to receive SSIGs in each year of the biennium. We are seeking \$7.6 million each year for KTG awards. Financially needy students (CMFC of \$2,000 or less) could receive KTG and SSIG funds of \$2,200 for enrollment at a private, non-profit college.
MAINE	The residency requirement for medical students will increase from one to three years.
MASSACHUSETTS:	Operationally, the Massachusetts Scholarship Program will collaborate with the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation for a shared data processing system.
MISSISSIPPI:	Accelerate teacher education, medical and nursing programs.
MISSOURI:	Rely more on computer (tape records) support from ACT and SAT for the academic scholarship program.
NEBRASKA:	The legislature established two separate programs: State Scholarship Award Program, which contains SSIG funds and state match; and Scholarship Assistance Program, funded by state appropriation only.
NEW JERSEY:	Given state funding constraints, we evaluate New Jersey student financial assistance programs to ensure that the goals and objectives are met. Recommend the reallocation between programs and, if necessary, consider phasing out programs that are not central to the Department of Higher Education's mission.
NEW YORK:	For the 1990-91 school year, the maximum annual award under the state's Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) will be increased again from \$3,650 to \$4,125. In addition, the income eligibility ceiling will be increased from \$42,500 to \$50,500 net taxable income. These increases are the second step in a two-step increase enacted in 1988, which provided for the increases in the 1989-90 and 1990-91 school years.

PENNSYLVANIA: As an MDE processor, changes in the student aid delivery system and the MDE processor role will change PHEAA's operations for 1990-91.

RHODE ISLAND: If the legislature changes our formula percentage as part of the budget process, the results would be reduced allocation of monies for our scholarship and grant program, thus reducing the dollar amount students would receive to attend postsecondary institutions.

TENNESSEE: There will be a legislative funding request to increase the maximum award by \$96.

VERMONT: The Vermont legislature approved additional funding to expand VSAC's non-degree grant program. For the 1989-90 fiscal year, the maximum non-degree grant has been increased to full tuition and fees up to \$250 per course. Additionally, the number of courses in which a student can be enrolled has increased to two per semester.

VIRGINIA: The Council has been directed to include a need-based component in the 1990-91 Tuition Assistance Grant Program (TAGP), designed to reduce the difference between the tuition at private and state-supported colleges.

WASHINGTON: In 1990-91, a revised State Need Grant program will be implemented and expanded to serve needy part-time students and to provide larger grants for students with dependent care needs. The state legislature has increased its funding support by 60 percent from about \$11 million in 1989-90 to \$18 million in 1990-91.

WEST VIRGINIA: The Advisory Council approved a further strengthening of the academic component, requiring filers who have completed more than 23 hours to attain a 2.25 cumulative grade point average, for the 1990-91 academic year. Without major funding increases, the program will face a further reduction in number of students assisted and/or in value of individual grants.

TABLE 15

COMMENTS REGARDING NEW STUDENT AID  
PROGRAMS FOR 1990-91 OR 1991-92

ALABAMA:	The state Treasurer's Office plans to implement the Wallace-Folsom Prepaid College Tuition Program in the spring of 1990, through which tuition expenses can be prepaid to attend a college or university in Alabama with certain restrictions.
ALASKA:	Researching non-loan financial aid alternatives such as merit based state scholarship and state work-study programs.
ARIZONA:	Arizona Student Aid Trust Fund--beginning with 1989 summer sessions in which each student who registers for classes at the three state universities will pay a \$6.00 charge when enrolling for 7 or more credit hours or \$3.00 for 6 or fewer hours. These funds, about \$1 million for 1989-90, will be matched dollar for dollar by a state appropriation. Half of the total will be allocated proportionately to each university for student aid, while the remaining half will be deposited at interest in a school aid trust fund, which will provide future supplementary student aid.
GEORGIA:	The agency will again look at the possibility of funding a "College Tuition Savings Plan" and will decentralize the SSIG program for the 1991-92 school year.
ILLINOIS:	Effective 1990-91, ISAC will offer a new long-range investment program aimed at enabling middle income families to save for college. The program will allow for periodic modest investments, i.e., \$50 a month, over an extended time period. Effective 1991-92, ISAC will offer a non-subsidized state Stafford Loan Program to assist students who cannot qualify for the existing federal loan program. Applicants will be generated by ISAC through a bond sale and the Commission will serve as a direct lender. The loans will be reinsured by the federal government. In addition, ISAC is working with the Illinois Board of Higher Education on developing a state student work program and a student volunteer/community service program. If approved, the programs would be operational no sooner than 1991-92.
INDIANA:	The Math Merit Scholarship Program, a \$1.4 million merit-based program, to benefit students who demonstrate proficiency in math.
IOWA:	The state plans to implement "Work For College Program" similar to the proposal advanced in congress this last year. A college savings initiative is being developed that may include state tax incentives and matching state contributions for low-income Iowans.
KENTUCKY:	Our agency's 1990-92 biennial budget request seeks \$2 million each year for a KHEAA Work-Study Program, \$1,840,000 of which goes to employers to supplement student wages at \$1.50 per hour. Students are employed in a career related job, must be paid at least the federal minimum wage and receive the same benefits as other employees working similar jobs. Each year, about \$170,000 goes to participating educational institutions to assist with administrative costs.
LOUISIANA:	Information on other state agencies is unknown but the Taylor Plan was implemented for first time college students this school year, 1989-90.
MARYLAND:	The Maryland Higher Education Commission is currently undertaking a comprehensive study of state student financial aid programs. Study recommendations may include the creation of new programs and/or modification to current programs.

**MICHIGAN:** The Michigan legislature has passed a Michigan Alternative Loan Program to provide an alternative source of educational loan funds for credit-worthy Michigan students and their families.

**MINNESOTA:** Beginning in 1989-90, a new Child Care Program was initiated, in which students who are not receiving AFDC are funded through their local county.

**MISSOURI:** Loan and reimbursement programs for nurses.

**NEW JERSEY:** A program is being considered for 1990-91 to aid new non-traditional part-time students who intend to enroll for six or less college credits per semester. The award will equal one-half the tuition charged an eligible student and the other half of the tuition will be provided by the institution.

**NEW YORK:** The most significant new student aid program in New York state history, the Liberty Scholarships Program, will be implemented beginning with the 1991-92 school year to provide funds to low-income students to meet non-tuition attendance cost. A Liberty Scholarship award together with a New York State Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) award and a Pell Grant should meet full public college cost. At a private college, the student would receive the same Liberty Award or the actual non-tuition attendance cost, whichever is less. Included in the Liberty Scholarship legislation is provision for Liberty Partnerships to provide counseling and support services to students in elementary and secondary grades who are at risk of dropping out. Liberty Scholarships provide an incentive for students to complete high school by providing support services.

**OREGON:** Volunteers in Service to Oregon (VISTO)--The program goal is to stimulate volunteerism among potential college students, ages 16 to 19, and provide student aid. Students receive vouchers for volunteer work in community social service agencies that can be redeemed when they enter college. The Oregon State Scholarship Commission reimburses the institutions for student vouchers. Program funds come from state lottery proceeds. Child Care--The 1989 Oregon legislative assembly provided funds for a pilot program to allow increased aid to postsecondary students with child care needs. State revenues were increased to fund this project by reducing the state child care income tax credit for families over certain adjusted gross income. Economic Self Sufficiency Financial Aid (ESSFA)--The 1989 legislative assembly also provided for a program to aid community college students who "are not otherwise eligible for state scholarship funds because of certain economic institutional or personal barriers, such as a need for child care or transportation, part-time participation in training programs or enrollment in non-credit job training courses." The program is part of comprehensive workforce development legislation aimed at improving work skills, funded through a new sports lottery game also created by the legislation. Funds are available for the program only after certain level of funding per year has been earned for intercollegiate athletics.

**RHODE ISLAND:** A new program to keep needy children in school by offering free college tuition, the Children's Crusade for Higher Education will identify eligible third graders in September 1991. They and their families will be asked to sign a contract requiring the child to stay in school, accept academic and emotional support from tutors and mentors if necessary and keep away from drugs. In return, the state will guarantee free tuition at the University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island College or the Community College of Rhode Island, provided the student earns admission, or the equivalent of state tuitions at private institutions participating in the program.

**TENNESSEE:**

1. Legislative study will address decreasing minority enrollment in postsecondary education.
2. TSAC has proposed a peer counseling program in which college financial aid recipients working in high schools serve disadvantaged students to help with financial aid application process and with transition from secondary to postsecondary education.

WASHINGTON: The state has authorized a new program for 1990-91 called the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program, which provides grants to needy "place-bound" students (living in areas underserved by public four-year institutions) who seek to transfer from a community college to private or public four-year institutions.

WEST VIRGINIA: Legislation has been passed to create a prepaid tuition plan and a savings bond plan. The former program is currently being formulated. An outside chance exists that the initial public sale will occur within the year. The current plans are to delay the implementation of the latter program until the former is well established.

WISCONSIN: 1. In 1990-91 we will start an undergraduate non-need based scholastic scholarship for entering freshmen in 1990-91. If the student maintains a 3.0 GPA at a state private or public college or university, the award can be earned for four years. The scholarship will equal \$2,000 per year. The top academic seniors from each private or public high in our state is eligible for a scholarship. 2. College Savings Bond Program will start in 1990-91 for middle income parents. The zero-coupon bond purchased will have the interest exempt from both state and federal income tax. There will also be an early redemption provision.

TABLE 16

STATES WITH APPROPRIATIONS TO INSTITUTIONS  
SPECIFICALLY FOR FINANCIAL AID AWARD PURPOSES  
(amounts in millions)

	<u>Appropriation Amounts</u>	<u>Eligible Institutions</u>	<u>Types of Recipients*</u>	<u>Types of Awards**</u>
Alabama	\$ (0.198)	4-Yr, 2-Yr Pub; Pub Vo-Tech; Nursing	FU	S, TR
Alaska	0.094	4-Yr Public	FU	G
Arizona	1.223	2-Yr & 4-Yr, Pub & Priv; Proprietary	A11	FM, G
Arkansas	10.500	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	A11	F, S, TR
California	90.817	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	FU, FG	F, C, TR
Connecticut	17.868	2-Yr, 4-Yr Pub, Priv; Other Degree Granting	FU, PU	G, W
Delaware	5.125	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	FU, PU	A11 but L, TR
Florida	9.000	4-Yr Public	A11	A11
Hawaii	0.150	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	A11	F, L, TR
Iowa	2.059	4-Yr Public	FU, PU	G
Kansas	2.000	Medical School	FG	G
Maine	(1.200)	4-Yr & 2-Yr Public	A11	A11
Nebraska	1.521	2-Yr, 4-Yr Pub & Priv	FU, PU	G
New Hampshire	0.450	2-Yr, 4-Yr Pub, Priv; Pub Vo-Tech, Nursing	FU, PU	C, S
New York	63.400	2-Yr, 4-Yr Pub, Priv; Pub Vo-Tech, Nursing	A11	A11 but L
North Carolina	(23.265)	2-Yr, 4-Yr Pub & Priv; Pub Nursing	A11	A11 but L
Oregon	1.626	4-Yr Private	FU, PU	G
Texas	45.307	4-Yr & 2-Yr Pub; Priv Med/Dental	A11	FM, G, S, TR
Virginia	(16.900)	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	FU, FG	L, F, FM, S
Washington	<u>56.567</u>	4-Yr, 2-Yr Public	A11	A11
GRAND TOTAL	\$349.270			

\* Codes for Types of Recipients:

PU = part-time undergraduates  
 FG = full-time graduate/professional school students  
 FU = full-time undergraduates  
 PG = part-time graduate/professional school students

\*\* Codes for Types of Awards:

TR = tuition remission  
 G = Grants  
 L = long-term loans  
 W = student employment  
 FM = federal matching funds purposes  
 F = graduate fellowships, assistantships  
 S = scholarships

Amounts in ( ) are 1988-89 amounts.

TABLE 17

Most Important Changes States Would Like to See  
In Reauthorization of Title IV Programs

ALABAMA:	Increase funding for the SSIG Program. Fund aid programs through JPTA for students in proprietary schools. Increase support for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to encourage innovation in educational opportunities for students. Increase support for the Trio Programs to reach the 10 million who aren't being served. Abolish funding for the Paul Douglas Scholarship Program.
ALASKA:	Revise funding formulae to provide more equitable distribution of federal funds to smaller states. Increase appropriation for SSIG and Paul Douglas Scholarship Programs. Provide an administrative cost allowance in those programs.
CALIFORNIA:	Reduce the imbalance between grant and loan funding of student aid programs through increased funding of all federal grant programs. Regarding student and institutional eligibility, include definition of independent student, need analysis criteria and participation of proprietary schools in federal loan programs. Expand the Student Incentive Grant Program. Simplify the application process, particularly for low-income and underrepresented students. Expand early outreach efforts directed towards increased participation of historically underrepresented groups in higher education, and increase financial assistance to these groups.
CONNECTICUT:	Include academic consideration in determining program eligibility as well as financial need. Make needs analysis system more sensitive to a family's actual financial strength, assessing cash flow and "lifestyle." The Congressional Methodology expectation of 70 percent of student earnings is unrealistic. Oppose linkage of community service to need-based financial aid. Modify income contingent loan concept to make repayment requirements truly "income contingent."
DELAWARE:	Add an administrative cost allowance for the Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Loan Program. Increase the SSIG program to at least \$100 million.
DIST. OF COL.:	Reinstate the use of third party matching funds in the SSIG Program.
HAWAII:	Reduce paper work. Include overhead administrative provisions. Amend regulation requiring matching funds to come <u>only</u> from state allocated fund. Any available resource to states, aside from federal, should be acceptable.
ILLINOIS:	Liberalize Stafford Loan Program terms of due diligence in recognition of existing risk-sharing in the Program. Maintain or increase current SSIG funding level in line with inflation. Maintain a free need analysis form, a central processor and a more simplified need-analysis process. Give priority to funding and operating current programs rather than creating new ones. Review and simplify independent student definition and review the necessity for unique calculations for displaced homemaker and dislocated workers. Review the equity in the CM of the 70 percent assessment of dependent student base year income. Provide adequate funding in line with inflation for Pell Grant Program.
IOWA:	Adjust home equity based on gross income. Evaluate or assess student earnings according to a sliding scale based on parental contribution level. Farm network adjustment tables for regional areas.

KENTUCKY: Consolidate the Pell Grant and SEOG Program into a single federally-administered grant program. Consolidate Perkins Loans, HEAL Loans, Nursing Loans, etc. into a single insured loan program. Provide cancellation, rather than deferment, of Stafford and Perkins Loans for verified national/community service. Do not otherwise link the receipt of student financial aid to the performance of national/community service. Require proprietary institutions to contribute as a condition of school participation, to a national student protection fund, administered by the Department of Education, against which students could assert claims in the event of school closing or failure to pay refunds. Provide automatic eligibility for all federal student financial assistance upon a verified showing that the student is a recipient of AFDC and/or food stamps. Preclude the Department of Education from issuing final regulations on any matter, which are effective on any date other than July 1st of each year. Require a minimum 90 day public comment period on all regulations.

LOUISIANA: Provide administrative cost allowance for the State Student Incentive Grant Program and the Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program. Increase funding for the Paul Douglas Teacher-Scholarship Program. Allow use of institutional matching funds as well as state-appropriated funds in matching the federal allotment for SSIG funds.

MAINE: Increase funding level of SSIG. Remove "ability to benefit" terms from regulations of all Title IV programs.

MASSACHUSETTS: Provide federal incentives to establish regional Higher Education and Financial Aid Information Centers. Expand early awareness efforts and early commitments of financial aid. Increase partnership among all financial aid participants: aid officers, government officials, lending community, etc. Simplify delivery process. Integrate loan counseling effort.

MISSISSIPPI: Provide full funding for Pell Grants and SSIG. Increase the ratio of gift aid vs. loans. Stabilize the MDE process. Increase emphasis and direction of default control in the Stafford and Perkins Loan Programs. Separate funding of proprietary education student financial aid.

MISSOURI: Amend definition of dependent/independent student. Eliminate asset (home/farm) evaluation in need analysis. Eliminate displaced/dislocated worker in need analysis. Simplify delivery system where possible.

MONTANA: Maintain the SSIG program and increase its authorization level. Make it easier to process student eligibility for those on social welfare programs. Reduce loan defaults for first-year students who do not complete their program, especially proprietary school students. Maintain student loan programs (Stafford, SLS, PLUS), guarding against lenders sharing the risk for defaults.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Make a firm commitment to the continuation of SSIG. Increase assistance for part-time and non-traditional students.

NEW JERSEY: Establish separate funding and program basis for proprietary schools in Title IV programs. Maintain SSIG funding and support incremented growth to assist in the development of a national service program. Modify the treatment of student earnings by limiting the contribution from student earnings to 50 percent for incoming freshmen, for very low-income families, permit assumptions of student summer savings. Modify the overaward calculation policy for the Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program. Provide for a NASSGP representative on the National Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.

NEW YORK: Provide for a new federal emphasis on grants instead of loans. Specifically, reauthorization should include a federal program which, like the SSIG Program, provides federal matching funds to states for grants which help low income students meet full cost of attending a public university in each state. Federally supported student financial aid programs should provide administrative funds to state agencies to emphasize the availability of student financial aid for college to provide a real alternative to dropping out of school and to drugs. Establish a separate vocational training program for proprietary schools rather than continue their participation in the Pell Grant and Stafford Loan Programs. The goals and academic structure of vocational training programs at proprietary schools are sufficiently different from those of collegiate institutions to warrant a separate program. Reauthorization should provide states with incentives to establish a single student financial aid agency to oversee the administration of federally-funded programs and to coordinate such programs with state-financed student financial aid programs.

NORTH DAKOTA: Restructure the Congressional Methodology, which currently moves too much money to some groups of students, too little to others. Reaffirm the federal commitment to fund programs started at their behest, strengthening the federal/state partnership.

PENNSYLVANIA: Ensure a free form for federal aid only in all MDE forms but retain combined federal/state/institutional forms. Eliminate displaced homemaker/dislocated worker categories from application process. Increase funding of the SSIG Program. Eliminate "less than half-time" eligibility in the Pell Grant Program.

RHODE ISLAND: Increase the states' SSIG allocations. Reassess the Congressional Methodology to have formula that is more equitable for all students. Provide full funding of the Pell Grant Program. Expand the Stafford Loan Program to increase eligibility and lengthen the repayment period to reduce defaults. Design one need analysis calculation for all Title IV programs.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Increase funding in the Pell Grant Program with eligibility requirements loosened so that more middle income families qualify. Eliminate home equity in family contribution calculation. Change Stafford Loan Program to reduce massive profits by lending institutions.

TENNESSEE: Take the Congressional Methodology out of the law itself and use a more realistic assessment process. Establish more stringent standards for institutional participation in Title IV programs and closely monitor new institutions for a three-year probationary period. Eliminate the Income Contingent Loan Program and allocate those funds toward grant assistance. Eliminate dependent student borrowing under the SLS program. Limit freshman borrowing to Perkins or Stafford with the parent as a co-signer. Establish stricter requirements for the determination of independent students.

TEXAS: Move all programs to a single need analysis system (no separate Pell calculation). Maintain or increase SSIG funding. Develop separate aid programs for proprietary school students. Provide funding to help junior colleges/voc (nonprofit) schools publicize their programs and better compete with proprietary schools. Move need analysis back to private servicers with federal oversight. Do not leave it as requiring federal law for change.

UTAH: Simplify delivery and administration of all Title IV programs.

VERMONT: Increase emphasis on grant aid, particularly with increases in the SSIG program. Examine needs analysis and delivery systems to ensure timeliness and equity. Revise institutional eligibility criteria to safeguard students against exploitation.

VIRGINIA: Establish eligibility formulas for Pell Grant and campus based programs. Simplify need analysis and delivery system regarding data elements and a revised application process for continuing students. Assure base level funding for SSIG, but provide a mechanism for additional funding to states on a matching basis for additional need-based appropriations. Move Robert Byrd Scholarship from Title V into Title IV and give administrative responsibility to higher education agency, if it continues to be funded. Eliminate upper 10 percent rank from Paul Douglas requirements. Make interest and cash repayment requirements applicable as for Perkins or Stafford, i.e., no interest accrual while student is in school even if agencies have been notified students are no longer going into education.

WASHINGTON: Reauthorize the SSIG program to establish a partnership between the federal and state governments, rather than encouraging states to develop their own programs. Depolitize the method by which needs analysis systems are developed, establishing a method by which needs analysis is developed and modified by a "panel of experts" and not by the full Congress or Department of Education. Preserve state's right to target SSIG and matching funds to needy students by whatever method it prefers.

WEST VIRGINIA: Retain current financial aid programs, as they have been effective in making education affordable to many of our citizens. Eliminate special treatment in the need analysis process for both dislocated workers and displaced homemakers to simplify the process. In addition, reduce the 70 percent taxation rate on student earnings. Allow states to establish their own refund policy which was rescinded by a recent ruling of the SSIG staff.

WISCONSIN: Change the CM to enable dependent students not to have to count 70 percent of earnings and 35 percent of assets. Increase the SSIG funding. Eliminate questionable proprietary schools from federal aid with an aggressive attitude and continued efforts. Provide additional grant money versus money allocated for loan programs. Create programs to provide different types of students with increased grants rather than relying on one program for all. Example: A minority grant program above and beyond Pell to impact on minority young people, especially young adults who wish to enter or re-enter a post-secondary school.

## SECTION IV

### DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED AID AMONG STUDENT CATEGORIES

Each year the survey asks respondents to estimate the percentages of need-based undergraduate awards and dollars received by various student categories. Not all respondents can answer for every category, because the data are not collected or are not readily available from their files. However, between 39 and 91 percent of need-based dollars awarded to undergraduates is represented in various item response categories. Therefore, respondents' estimates likely provide a realistic, if not totally statistically valid, picture of important characteristics of grant recipients. Moreover, because in succeeding survey years the same program respondents usually answer the same items, year-to-year comparisons are possible--if caution is used in interpreting the changes. The data referenced below for earlier years appeared in previous NASSGP survey reports.

Table 18 shows that about 96 percent of expected 1989-90 recipients are full-time and 4 percent are part-time students. Between 1984 and 1985, the proportion of part-time recipients rose from under 2 percent to over 4 percent but has remained under 5 percent since then. Thus, it appears that state grant programs are not responding to increasing demands for aid from part-time students.

This year, 55 percent of expected recipients are students who previously have received grants from their programs. This represents a slight decrease from 1988 and 1987 proportions, 56.1 percent and 57.2 percent, respectively. About 21.6 percent of recipients are freshmen who graduated from high school in 1989. Last year, 21.2 percent of recipients were immediate high school graduates. The 1987 proportion was 22.9 percent; the 1986 proportion, 21.1 percent; the 1985 proportion, 22.8 percent. Thus, there seems to be little change in these proportions over time.

From 1981-82 through 1989-90, the proportion of recipients who attended public colleges has remained very stable, ranging from a high of 60.7 percent in 1983 to a low of 59.1 percent in 1985 and 1986. This year's proportion is 59.6 percent. The proportion of recipients who attended private colleges has remained almost as stable, ranging from a 1982 high of 33.4 percent to a 1987 low of 29.4 percent. This year's proportion is 30.8 percent; last year's, 30.2 percent. The data suggest there may be a very slight downward trend in the proportion of recipients attending private colleges.

Before 1984, less than 5 percent of recipients attended proprietary, business, trade, and technical schools. Since then slightly over 5 percent attended these types of schools.

Given the nature of these data as estimates and the fact that not all states annually report data on types of schools their recipients attended each year, the most conservative statement that can be made about recipient institutional enrollment patterns is that they have remained stable during the 1980s.

Since 1982 a steady increase has occurred in proportions of state grant recipients who are considered independent or self-supporting by their grant programs. The percentage rose from 26.5 percent in 1982 to 29.2 percent in 1983, held at about 29 percent until the 1986 increase to 31.8 percent, increased to 33.8 percent in 1987, rose to 36.6 percent in 1988, and is at 38.1 percent for 1989. Therefore, since 1982, the proportion of independent recipients has grown by 11.6 percentage points, from 26.5 percent to 38.1 percent.

The most likely explanation for this increase in proportions of independent recipients is that increasing proportions of state grant recipients are 26 years of age or older. In 1982, only 13.6 percent of recipients were this age. This year, 23.2 percent will be this age, a difference of 9.6 percentage points. From another viewpoint, in 1982 71.6 percent of recipients were between ages 18 and 21, while this year only 59.2 percent fit this description. Thus the recipient population is becoming older.

The majority of recipients for whom gender is known is female. This year, 58.9 percent are female, compared to last year's 58.5 percent. In 1987, the proportion was 57.3 percent; in 1982, 57.1 percent. Thus, it appears that a rather consistent, slightly increasing majority of recipients is female.

Only about one-third of states report data on their recipients' racial-ethnic group memberships. These data suggest that a continually decreasing percentage of recipients are Black students. In 1981 more than one out of four recipients were Black. Between 1982 and 1984, the proportion dropped to one out of five. From 1985 through this year, it has fallen to about one out of every six. The proportion of recipients of Asian ethnicity doubled between 1981 and 1987, from 3.2 percent to 7.0 percent, decreased to 5.5 percent in 1988, and increased to 6.1 percent this year. The proportion of recipients of Hispanic ethnicity remained stable, averaging about 7.5 percent between 1981 and 1985, dropping to 6.3 percent in 1986, then rising slightly to 6.8 percent in 1987 and 1988, and now rising to 7.9 percent in 1989.

This year is the first in the past five that fewer than 40 percent of grant recipients have annual family incomes of less than \$10,000. Here are the frequency distributions for the five most recent years:

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Less than \$10,000	40.5%	42.9%	43.5%	43.5%	39.0%
\$10,000 to \$29,999	50.6	47.0	44.8	43.1	43.7
\$30,000 and Above	8.9	10.1	11.7	14.4	17.3
Median Income	\$12,714	\$12,491	\$12,338	\$12,351	\$14,273

Because of income inflation and different proportions of state grant recipients whose incomes are known each year, it is difficult to positively assert that there has been a major change in family incomes of grant recipients this year. However, the data suggest that, as costs rise and financial need increases, more recipients from families with incomes above \$30,000 are qualifying for state grants. It should be noted that one reason so many recipients have "family" incomes below \$10,000 is that many are

independent or self-supporting. About two-thirds of independent students will have incomes below \$10,000.

Although more state grant recipients have incomes of more than \$30,000, their average grant awards are not increasing as much as those of recipients with lower incomes. Here are the average grant awards to students with known incomes for the past five years:

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Less than \$10,000	\$ 956	\$1,136	\$1,189	\$1,178	\$1,209
\$10,000 to \$29,999	1,056	1,114	1,154	1,204	1,274
\$30,000 and Above	1,175	1,116	1,172	1,150	1,209

Between 1985 and 1989, the average grant to "upper-income" recipients grew by only 2.9 percent. The average grant to recipients with incomes below \$10,000 grew by 26.5 percent; the average grant to recipients with incomes between \$10,000 and \$29,999, by 20.6 percent. The average grants for the lowest and highest income recipients are so similar because the highest income students are more likely to attend higher cost institutions and, therefore, have greater financial need and qualify for relatively high awards.

TABLE 18

ESTIMATED 1989-90 AWARD DISTRIBUTION BY CATEGORIES  
FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS

TOTAL OF ALL STATES REPORTING

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of States in Sample</u>	<u>Number of Recipients in Sample</u>	<u>Total Dollar Value in Sample</u>	<u>Percent of Recipients in Sample</u>	<u>Percent of Dollars in Sample</u>
Full-Time Undergraduates	44	1,134,176	\$1,417,547,588	95.97%	97.38%
Part-Time Undergraduates (90.6%)	44	47,589	\$38,190,774	4.03%	2.62%
1989 High School Graduates	22	190,212	\$237,012,730	21.57%	20.44%
Other Freshman Applicants	22	91,173	\$119,291,570	10.34%	10.29%
Soph, Jr, & Sr First-Time App.	22	114,728	\$145,397,973	13.01%	12.54%
Renewal Applicants (72.2%)	22	485,760	\$658,041,291	55.08%	56.74%
4-Year Public Colleges	39	479,861	\$448,251,967	40.10%	30.62%
2-Year Public Colleges	39	233,022	\$173,099,221	19.47%	11.82%
4-Year Private Colleges	39	344,592	\$665,377,623	28.80%	45.45%
2-Year Private (Jr) Colleges	39	23,500	\$39,646,572	1.96%	2.71%
Proprietary/Business/Trade/Tech	39	59,951	\$93,700,148	5.01%	6.40%
Public Vo-Tech Schools	39	26,381	\$16,045,634	2.20%	1.10%
Hosp Nursing & Allied Health	39	6,622	\$9,605,846	0.55%	0.66%
Out-of-State Institutions (91.2%)	39	22,781	\$18,405,331	1.90%	1.26%
Dependent Students	29	710,918	\$930,919,696	61.90%	65.14%
Independent Students (89.0%)	29	437,591	\$498,203,439	38.10%	34.86%
Males	24	231,461	\$295,306,867	38.98%	39.65%
Females	24	332,233	\$419,471,735	55.95%	56.33%
Sex Unknown (46.4%)	24	30,071	\$29,939,136	5.06%	4.02%
White	18	315,357	\$371,077,528	62.43%	58.56%
Black	18	82,546	\$96,065,739	16.34%	15.16%
American Indian	18	5,726	\$6,223,681	1.13%	0.98%
Asian	18	31,004	\$50,806,119	6.14%	8.02%
Hispanic	18	39,717	\$63,469,932	7.86%	10.02%
Race Unknown (39.4%)	18	30,819	\$45,998,755	6.10%	7.26%
18-21 Years Old	13	412,896	\$554,264,027	59.25%	59.50%
22-25 Years Old	13	121,096	\$157,534,263	17.38%	16.91%
26 Years and Older	13	161,643	\$218,479,856	23.20%	23.45%
Age Unknown (58.0%)	13	1,191	\$1,208,060	0.17%	0.13%
Gross Family Income					
\$ 0-\$ 9,999	38	426,109	\$515,270,029	38.98%	38.09%
\$10,000-\$19,999	38	281,988	\$365,166,987	25.79%	27.00%
\$20,000-\$29,999	38	195,602	\$243,198,612	17.89%	17.98%
\$30,000-\$39,999	38	117,633	\$135,149,968	10.76%	9.99%
\$40,000 & Above (84.2%)	38	71,858	\$93,915,209	6.57%	6.94%

Numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of all dollars represented by the amounts in the samples.

## SECTION V

### RANKINGS OF STATE GRANT PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

During the past few years, several annual NASSGP report users have requested per capita rankings of state grant awards, some of which are provided in this section.

Table 19 displays the 1989-90 rank order of states' need-based grants to undergraduates and total grants in per capita dollars by their estimated 1989 resident populations. Only ten states expect to spend more than \$10 per resident on need-based grants in 1989-90. They are, in rank order: New York, Vermont, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Rhode Island and Massachusetts. Another five states (Wisconsin, Michigan, Connecticut, California and South Carolina) expect to spend at least \$5 per resident on undergraduate need-based grant aid. The national average, based on the total number of dollars divided by the total population, is \$8.44. Fifteen states expect to spend less than \$1 per resident on need-based grants. Eight of these states are among the 15 smallest in population.

Eleven states expect to spend more than \$10 per resident in total grant aid in 1989-90. They are, in rank order: New York, Iowa, Vermont, Illinois, Minnesota, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Indiana and Connecticut. Only four (New York, Illinois, New Jersey and Pennsylvania) are among 11 largest in population. Seven states expect to spend less than \$1 per resident: Nevada, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Mississippi, South Dakota and Arizona. Only South Dakota and Wyoming are among the seven smallest states.

The relationship between population sizes and amounts spent is not particularly strong. Only 62.7 percent of states rank in the same halves of distributions of grants and population, 17 of the highest-ranking grant states having larger populations, 15 of the lowest-ranking grant states having smaller populations.

Vermont ranks second in per capita need-based grant dollars but 50th in population, Rhode Island, ninth in per capita need-based grant dollars but 43rd in population. On the "negative" side, Texas ranks third in population but 34th in per capita grants; North Carolina, tenth in population but 41st in grants; and Florida, fourth in population but 30th in grants. When their total grants are considered, these three states rank in the top half of per capita grant distributions.

Ranking states on a per capita total population basis may not necessarily be the best ranking method, since younger residents are not college-age and many older residents do not attend postsecondary education. So Table 20 displays the 1989-90 rank order of states' undergraduate need-based grants and total grants in per capita dollars based on estimated 1990 populations between ages 20 and 24, the traditional "college-age" group.

In comparing the need-based grant per capita rankings of Tables 19 and 20 and, it is found that 22 states' ranks are changed when "college-age" cohort data are used. However, most change by only one position, with only two states' ranks changing by more than two positions when need-based grants are

considered. West Virginia moved from 26th on the total population ranking to 23rd on the "college-age" cohort population ranking, the District of Columbia, from 29th to 32nd. While 24 states changed ranks in total grants per capita when the "college-age" cohort population was used, only two changed by more than two positions. Hawaii fell from 23rd on the total population rankings to 26th on the cohort rankings; Alaska fell from 30th to 34th. Therefore, adjusting the ranks for "college-age" populations has little effect on overall state rankings. States rank similarly on both measures.

Only four states spend more than \$200 on need-based grants for every resident between ages 20 and 24: New York, Vermont, Minnesota and Illinois. The national average, based on total number of dollars divided by the cohort population, is \$86.91. Twelve states spend less than \$10 in undergraduate need-based grants per "college-age" population and another six spend between \$10 and \$19.

Only five states spend more than \$200 in total grants for every "college-age" resident: New York, Iowa, Vermont, Illinois and Minnesota. The national average is \$113.20. Five states spend less than \$10 (Nevada, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho and Mississippi) and another four (Arizona, South Dakota, Nebraska and New Hampshire) spend under \$20 per "college-age" resident.

Since different proportions of the "college-age" cohort in each state actually enroll in college, it may be better to rank per capita state grant expenditures on the basis of enrolled students. Table 21 displays the ranking on the basis of full-time undergraduates in each state. Full-time undergraduates, rather than all undergraduates, were used because about 96 percent of all need-based state grant aid goes to full-time students.

In the aggregate, the number of need-based dollars per full-time student is \$242. The number of state grant dollars of all kinds is \$305. Only five states expect to award more than \$500 in need-based grants per full-time undergraduate: New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Minnesota and Vermont. Pennsylvania expects to award \$404. No other state is expected to award more than \$400. But nine others are expected to award at least \$200: Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Connecticut, Massachusetts, California, Rhode Island, Wisconsin and South Carolina. Eighteen are expected to award under \$50 per student.

When non-need-based as well as need-based grant dollars are considered, six states expect to award more than \$500 per student: New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Iowa, Minnesota and Vermont. Connecticut and Pennsylvania expect to award more than \$400. Fifteen other states are expected to award more than \$200. Only ten states anticipate spending less than \$50.

Another way of ranking state grant expenditures is by percentages of full-time undergraduates receiving grants, as shown in Table 22. These rankings were obtained by dividing the number of anticipated awards listed in Table 2 by the number of full-time undergraduates, to get the percentages for the first column. To get the percentages for the second column, the number of non-need-based awards to undergraduates (listed in Table 4) was added to the number of need-based awards and the total divided by the number of full-time undergraduates. The percentages in the last column are probably slightly inflated, because some non-need-based grant recipients, especially scholarship

winners, are likely to have received need-based grants. Data on unduplicated counts of state grant recipients are not available.

On the average for the nation, one out of every five full-time undergraduates receives a need-based state grant award. But more than one out of three receive awards in just six states: New York, 54.5 percent; Vermont, 48.6 percent; Minnesota, 46.1 percent; New Jersey, 40.9 percent; Illinois, 36.4 percent; and Pennsylvania, 36.3 percent. And fewer than one out of ten receives an award in 24 states, only four of which are expected to award more than \$10 million in grants this year: Florida, Missouri, South Carolina and Texas. The rest are states with relatively small programs.

When non-need-based as well as need-based awards are considered, about 24 percent of full-time students in the nation receive state grants. Ohio is added to the six states mentioned above in which more than one-third of students receive state grants. And the number of states in which fewer than 10 percent receive awards falls from 24 to 21. When non-need-based awards are considered, more than 10 percent of students in Florida, North Carolina and Virginia receive state grants. When non-need-based awards are considered, the proportion receiving awards in Colorado rises from 13.9 percent to 24.9 percent.

A final way of ranking states' grant expenditures is to compare them to total state tax fund appropriations for higher education operating expenses. The data are displayed in Table 23. The relationship is expressed in terms of state grant dollars as a percent of state tax fund appropriations. For example, New York expects to spend \$423,092,000 on state grants and it appropriated \$3,185,945,000 for higher education operating expenses. Therefore, its percentage is 13.3 percent, ranking second in state percentages.

State rankings on total state grant dollars spent generally correspond closely to total state tax fund appropriations. The higher a state ranks in state grant dollars awarded, the higher it is likely to rank in total appropriations. For example, only four states ranked in the top half of the distribution of total appropriations and did not rank in the top half of the distributions of state grant dollars: Alabama, 19th in appropriations but 27th in state grants; Arizona, 23rd versus 38th; Kentucky, 24th versus 26th; and Louisiana, 25th versus 33rd. Four states ranked in the top half of the state grant dollar distribution but in the bottom half of the appropriations distribution: Iowa, 12th in state grants but 27th in appropriations; Connecticut, 16th versus 28th; Oklahoma, 17th versus 29th; and Colorado, 21st versus 26th. The data indicate that amounts states spend on higher education in general are better predictors of what they might spend on their state grants than are their population sizes.

The data also indicate that, compared to what states appropriate for higher education operating expenses, they generally spend little on state grant awards. Aggregate state grant amounts represent only 5.3 percent of total appropriations for higher education operating costs. The per state average is only 4.2 percent, with 17 states spending amounts equivalent to less than 2 percent of their operating appropriations. Only five states' grant dollar expenditures represent more than 10 percent of their total appropriations: Vermont, 10.0 percent; New York, 13.3 percent; Illinois, 12.2 percent; Iowa, 11.7 percent; and Massachusetts, 10.8 percent.

When these data were compared to similar rankings for 1988-89, it was discovered that 25 states' grant dollar percentages of total appropriations had increased slightly, 16 states' percentages had remained almost identical and the remaining nine states' grant dollar proportions of total expenditures had decreased slightly. In 1985-86, aggregate grant dollars represented 4.9 percent of total appropriations for operating expenses and last year they represented about 5.3 percent. The most conservative and reasonable conclusion that can be reached with these data is that growth in state grant dollars has fairly closely paralleled growth in state education appropriations in the past few years.

TABLE 19

ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS PER RESIDENT POPULATION,  
1989-90, BY STATE

State	Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates	State	All Grant Aid	State	Estimated Total 1989 Population*
1. New York	\$21.43	1. New York	\$23.82	1. California	28,074
2. Vermont	\$19.79	2. Iowa	\$21.20	2. New York	17,761
3. Minnesota	\$15.82	3. Vermont	\$20.44	3. Texas	17,451
4. Illinois	\$15.59	4. Illinois	\$17.61	4. Florida	12,535
5. Iowa	\$11.54	5. Minnesota	\$16.19	5. Pennsylvania	11,844
6. Pennsylvania	\$11.27	6. Massachusetts	\$15.06	6. Illinois	11,599
7. New Jersey	\$10.83	7. New Jersey	\$11.71	7. Ohio	10,787
8. Indiana	\$10.53	8. Pennsylvania	\$11.31	8. Michigan	9,266
9. Rhode Island	\$10.15	9. Rhode Island	\$11.30	9. New Jersey	7,827
10. Massachusetts	\$10.15	10. Indiana	\$10.70	10. North Carolina	6,602
11. Wisconsin	\$ 8.16	11. Connecticut	\$10.07	11. Georgia	6,524
12. Michigan	\$ 7.86	12. Oklahoma	\$ 9.91	12. Virginia	6,068
NATION	\$ 6.48	13. Wisconsin	\$ 8.54	13. Massachusetts	5,863
13. Connecticut	\$ 6.43	NATION	\$ 8.44	14. Indiana	5,542
14. California	\$ 5.70	14. Michigan	\$ 8.34	15. Missouri	5,163
15. South Carolina	\$ 5.18	15. North Carolina	\$ 7.89	16. Tennessee	4,933
16. Ohio	\$ 4.70	16. Ohio	\$ 7.11	NATION	4,857
17. Oregon	\$ 3.92	17. Texas	\$ 6.42	17. Wisconsin	4,803
18. Kentucky	\$ 3.70	18. West Virginia	\$ 6.35	18. Maryland	4,665
19. Tennessee	\$ 3.51	19. Colorado	\$ 6.02	19. Washington	4,612
19. Oklahoma	\$ 3.51	20. Utah	\$ 6.01	20. Louisiana	4,510
21. Maryland	\$ 3.26	21. California	\$ 5.77	21. Minnesota	4,298
22. New Mexico	\$ 3.15	22. South Carolina	\$ 5.64	22. Alabama	4,150
23. Washington	\$ 2.95	23. Hawaii	\$ 5.31	23. Kentucky	3,742
24. Kansas	\$ 2.87	24. New Mexico	\$ 5.18	24. Arizona	3,649
25. Colorado	\$ 2.85	25. Maryland	\$ 4.59	25. South Carolina	3,507
26. West Virginia	\$ 2.82	26. Florida	\$ 4.49	26. Colorado	3,393
27. North Dakota	\$ 2.32	27. Virginia	\$ 4.34	27. Oklahoma	3,285
28. Missouri	\$ 2.09	28. Tennessee	\$ 4.06	28. Connecticut	3,257
29. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 1.74	29. Alaska	\$ 3.92	29. Iowa	2,782
30. Florida	\$ 1.73	29. Oregon	\$ 3.92	30. Oregon	2,680
31. Maine	\$ 1.67	31. Kentucky	\$ 3.70	31. Mississippi	2,680
32. Arkansas	\$ 1.62	32. Georgia	\$ 3.41	32. Kansas	2,485
33. Delaware	\$ 1.56	32. Missouri	\$ 3.41	33. Arkansas	2,414
34. Texas	\$ 1.43	34. Washington	\$ 3.07	34. West Virginia	1,871
35. Virginia	\$ 1.37	35. Kansas	\$ 3.04	35. Utah	1,750
36. Nebraska	\$ 1.29	36. Alabama	\$ 2.87	36. New Mexico	1,595
37. Arizona	\$ 0.93	37. North Dakota	\$ 2.44	37. Nebraska	1,590
38. New Hampshire	\$ 0.83	38. Delaware	\$ 2.40	38. Maine	1,203
39. Georgia	\$ 0.77	39. Louisiana	\$ 2.16	39. Hawaii	1,121
40. South Dakota	\$ 0.71	40. Arkansas	\$ 2.00	40. New Hampshire	1,116
41. North Carolina	\$ 0.68	41. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 1.74	41. Nevada	1,049
42. Hawaii	\$ 0.67	42. Maine	\$ 1.67	42. Idaho	1,013
43. Utah	\$ 0.61	43. New Hampshire	\$ 1.55	43. Rhode Island	996
44. Alabama	\$ 0.53	44. Nebraska	\$ 1.29	44. Montana	808
45. Montana	\$ 0.52	45. Arizona	\$ 0.93	45. South Dakota	708
46. Wyoming	\$ 0.48	46. South Dakota	\$ 0.84	46. North Dakota	664
47. Mississippi	\$ 0.46	47. Mississippi	\$ 0.74	47. Delaware	658
48. Louisiana	\$ 0.44	48. Idaho	\$ 0.63	48. Dist. of Columbia	615
49. Alaska	\$ 0.40	49. Montana	\$ 0.52	49. Alaska	565
50. Nevada	\$ 0.34	50. Wyoming	\$ 0.48	50. Vermont	557
50. Idaho	\$ 0.34	51. Nevada	\$ 0.38	51. Wyoming	503

\* Population amounts are in 1,000s.

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are from Column One and Column Six in Table 1 of this Report. Resident population estimates are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 1017, Projections of the Population of States by Age, Sex, and Race: 1988 to 2010, Washington: USGPO, 1988.

TABLE 20  
ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS PER RESIDENT COLLEGE-AGE  
POPULATION, 1989-90, BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>All Grant Aid</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Estimated Population Age 20-24, 1990*</u>
1. New York	\$289	1. New York	\$322	1. California	2,214
2. Vermont	\$256	2. Iowa	\$317	2. Texas	1,371
3. Minnesota	\$219	3. Vermont	\$265	3. New York	1,315
4. Illinois	\$213	4. Illinois	\$241	4. Illinois	847
5. Iowa	\$173	5. Minnesota	\$224	5. Florida	836
6. Pennsylvania	\$158	6. Massachusetts	\$193	6. Pennsylvania	823
7. New Jersey	\$152	7. New Jersey	\$164	7. Ohio	778
8. Indiana	\$143	8. Pennsylvania	\$162	8. Michigan	706
9. Rhode Island	\$130	9. Indiana	\$146	9. New Jersey	558
10. Massachusetts	\$130	10. Rhode Island	\$144	10. North Carolina	538
11. Wisconsin	\$114	11. Oklahoma	\$141	11. Georgia	530
12. Michigan	\$103	12. Connecticut	\$138	12. Virginia	504
13. Connecticut	\$ 88	13. Wisconsin	\$119	13. Massachusetts	458
NATION	\$ 87	NATION	\$113	14. Indiana	407
14. California	\$ 72	14. Michigan	\$110	15. Tennessee	366
15. Ohio	\$ 65	15. Ohio	\$ 99	16. Maryland	364
16. South Carolina	\$ 64	16. North Carolina	\$ 97	NATION	362
17. Oregon	\$ 58	17. West Virginia	\$ 94	17. Missouri	360
18. Oklahoma	\$ 50	18. Texas	\$ 82	18. Wisconsin	344
19. Kentucky	\$ 50	19. Colorado	\$ 78	19. Louisiana	342
20. Tennessee	\$ 47	20. Utah	\$ 77	20. Washington	339
21. Maryland	\$ 42	21. California	\$ 73	21. Minnesota	310
22. New Mexico	\$ 42	22. South Carolina	\$ 69	22. Alabama	305
23. West Virginia	\$ 41	23. New Mexico	\$ 68	23. South Carolina	285
24. Washington	\$ 40	24. Florida	\$ 67	24. Kentucky	280
25. Kansas	\$ 40	25. Maryland	\$ 59	25. Arizona	277
26. Colorado	\$ 37	26. Hawaii	\$ 58	26. Colorado	261
27. North Dakota	\$ 32	27. Oregon	\$ 58	27. Connecticut	237
28. Missouri	\$ 30	28. Tennessee	\$ 55	28. Oklahoma	231
29. Florida	\$ 26	29. Virginia	\$ 52	29. Mississippi	202
30. Arkansas	\$ 24	30. Kentucky	\$ 49	30. Iowa	186
31. Maine	\$ 23	31. Missouri	\$ 49	31. Oregon	185
32. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 21	32. Georgia	\$ 42	32. Kansas	180
33. Delaware	\$ 21	33. Kansas	\$ 42	33. Arkansas	165
34. Nebraska	\$ 18	34. Alaska	\$ 42	34. Utah	137
35. Texas	\$ 18	35. Washington	\$ 42	35. West Virginia	127
36. Virginia	\$ 16	36. Alabama	\$ 39	36. New Mexico	121
37. Arizona	\$ 12	37. North Dakota	\$ 34	37. Nebraska	111
38. South Dakota	\$ 10	38. Delaware	\$ 32	38. Hawaii	102
39. New Hampshire	\$ 10	39. Arkansas	\$ 29	39. Maine	88
40. Georgia	\$ 9	40. Louisiana	\$ 28	39. New Hampshire	88
41. North Carolina	\$ 8	41. Maine	\$ 23	41. Nevada	79
42. Montana	\$ 8	42. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 21	42. Rhode Island	78
43. Utah	\$ 8	43. New Hampshire	\$ 20	43. Idaho	68
44. Hawaii	\$ 7	44. Nebraska	\$ 18	44. Montana	53
45. Alabama	\$ 7	45. South Dakota	\$ 12	44. Alaska	53
46. Wyoming	\$ 7	46. Arizona	\$ 12	46. Delaware	50
47. Mississippi	\$ 6	47. Mississippi	\$ 10	47. Dist. of Columbia	50
48. Louisiana	\$ 6	48. Idaho	\$ 9	48. South Dakota	48
49. Idaho	\$ 5	49. Montana	\$ 8	48. North Dakota	48
50. Nevada	\$ 4	50. Wyoming	\$ 7	50. Vermont	43
51. Alaska	\$ 4	51. Nevada	\$ 5	51. Wyoming	36

\* Population in 1,000s

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are from Column One and Column Six in Table 1 of this Report. Resident population estimates are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 1017, Projections of the Population of States by Age, Sex, and Race: 1988 to 2010, Washington: USGPO, 1988.

TABLE 21

ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS TO UNDERGRADUATES IN 1989-90  
PER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT, BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>Need-Based Aid to Undergraduates</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Undergraduate Grant Aid</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Fall, 1988 Undergraduates</u>
1. New York	\$684	1. New York	\$729	1. California	663,685
2. New Jersey	\$622	2. Illinois	\$669	2. New York	556,173
3. Illinois	\$592	3. New Jersey	\$664	3. Texas	411,310
4. Minnesota	\$502	4. Iowa	\$563	4. Pennsylvania	330,584
5. Vermont	\$500	5. Minnesota	\$513	5. Illinois	305,308
6. Pennsylvania	\$404	6. Vermont	\$509	6. Ohio	293,595
7. Indiana	\$373	7. Connecticut	\$449	7. Michigan	250,690
8. Iowa	\$309	8. Pennsylvania	\$405	8. Florida	229,296
9. Michigan	\$290	9. Indiana	\$379	9. Massachusetts	226,532
10. Connecticut	\$288	10. Massachusetts	\$363	10. North Carolina	192,572
11. Massachusetts	\$263	11. Oklahoma	\$334	11. Wisconsin	172,775
NATION	\$242	NATION	\$305	12. Virginia	164,199
12. California	\$240	12. Michigan	\$295	13. Indiana	156,437
13. Rhode Island	\$234	13. Texas	\$267	14. Alabama	151,932
14. Wisconsin	\$227	14. North Carolina	\$263	15. New Jersey	136,282
15. South Carolina	\$204	15. Ohio	\$260	16. Minnesota	135,533
16. Ohio	\$173	16. Rhode Island	\$260	17. Georgia	133,861
17. Kentucky	\$148	17. Florida	\$241	18. Missouri	133,808
18. Maryland	\$143	18. California	\$240	19. Washington	133,443
19. Tennessee	\$138	18. West Virginia	\$240	NATION	130,091
20. Oregon	\$133	20. Wisconsin	\$238	20. Tennessee	124,888
21. New Mexico	\$128	21. Hawaii	\$218	21. Louisiana	115,288
22. Oklahoma	\$125	22. South Carolina	\$213	22. Maryland	106,404
23. West Virginia	\$107	23. New Mexico	\$203	23. Iowa	103,950
24. Washington	\$102	24. Maryland	\$198	24. Colorado	102,992
25. Florida	\$ 95	25. Colorado	\$179	25. Arizona	97,097
26. Colorado	\$ 94	26. Georgia	\$166	26. Kentucky	93,405
27. Kansas	\$ 90	27. Tennessee	\$160	27. South Carolina	92,818
28. Missouri	\$ 81	28. Virginia	\$153	28. Oklahoma	91,961
29. Maine	\$ 72	29. Utah	\$152	29. Oregon	81,092
30. Arkansas	\$ 69	30. Kentucky	\$148	30. Kansas	79,548
31. Texas	\$ 61	31. Oregon	\$133	31. Mississippi	78,714
32. North Dakota	\$ 52	32. Missouri	\$132	32. Connecticut	72,597
33. Virginia	\$ 50	33. Washington	\$106	33. Utah	62,822
34. Delaware	\$ 48	34. Kansas	\$ 95	34. Arkansas	56,989
35. Nebraska	\$ 38	35. Arkansas	\$ 85	35. Nebraska	52,948
36. Georgia	\$ 37	36. Louisiana	\$ 84	36. West Virginia	49,411
37. Arizona	\$ 35	37. Alabama	\$ 77	37. Rhode Island	43,345
38. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 31	38. Maine	\$ 72	38. New Mexico	39,192
39. Hawaii	\$ 28	39. Delaware	\$ 66	39. Dist. of Columbia	34,905
39. New Hampshire	\$ 28	40. North Dakota	\$ 56	40. New Hampshire	32,836
41. Nevada	\$ 24	41. New Hampshire	\$ 53	41. Idaho	29,810
42. Alaska	\$ 23	42. Nebraska	\$ 38	42. North Dakota	29,745
42. North Carolina	\$ 23	43. Arizona	\$ 35	43. Maine	27,858
42. South Dakota	\$ 23	44. Dist. of Columbia	\$ 31	44. Hawaii	27,352
45. Louisiana	\$ 17	45. South Dakota	\$ 27	45. Montana	24,403
45. Montana	\$ 17	46. Nevada	\$ 24	46. Vermont	22,055
45. Utah	\$ 17	47. Alaska	\$ 23	47. South Dakota	21,706
48. Mississippi	\$ 16	48. Idaho	\$ 17	48. Delaware	21,460
48. Wyoming	\$ 16	48. Montana	\$ 17	49. Wyoming	14,665
50. Alabama	\$ 14	50. Mississippi	\$ 16	50. Nevada	14,377
51. Idaho	\$ 12	50. Wyoming	\$ 16	51. Alaska	10,005

Sources of Data: Grant Aid Dollars are from Columns One, Three, and Six in Table 1 of this Report. Enrollment data from Center for Education Statistics, Postsecondary Education Statistics Division, Washington, D.C.

TABLE 22

STATES RANKED BY PROPORTIONS OF FULL-TIME  
UNDERGRADUATES RECEIVING AWARDS

<u>State</u>	<u>Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Need-Based Aid</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Aid</u>
1. New York	0.545%	1. New York	0.661%
2. Vermont	0.486	2. Vermont	0.486
3. Minnesota	0.461	3. Minnesota	0.461
4. New Jersey	0.409	4. New Jersey	0.445
5. Illinois	0.364	5. Illinois	0.441
6. Pennsylvania	0.363	6. Ohio	0.375
7. Wisconsin	0.293	7. Pennsylvania	0.364
8. Indiana	0.291	8. Indiana	0.296
9. Kentucky	0.250	9. Wisconsin	0.293
10. Connecticut	0.241	10. Kentucky	0.250
11. Ohio	0.235	11. Colorado	0.249
12. Rhode Island	0.219	12. Connecticut	0.241
13. Michigan	0.214	NATION	0.239
14. Arkansas	0.209	13. New Mexico	0.230
NATION	0.201	14. Georgia	0.225
15. Oregon	0.200	15. Rhode Island	0.220
16. Massachusetts	0.197	16. Arkansas	0.215
16. Tennessee	0.197	17. Michigan	0.214
18. Maryland	0.180	18. Maryland	0.210
19. New Mexico	0.179	19. Massachusetts	0.204
20. Iowa	0.173	20. Oregon	0.200
21. Oklahoma	0.169	21. Tennessee	0.197
22. Maine	0.158	22. Iowa	0.191
23. Washington	0.145	23. Florida	0.177
24. Colorado	0.139	24. Oklahoma	0.175
25. California	0.119	25. North Carolina	0.163
26. West Virginia	0.111	26. Maine	0.158
27. Georgia	0.105	27. Virginia	0.154
28. Florida	0.086	28. Washington	0.145
29. North Dakota	0.085	29. California	0.119
30. South Carolina	0.081	30. West Virginia	0.111
31. South Dakota	0.069	31. Missouri	0.089
32. Missouri	0.064	32. North Dakota	0.085
33. Kansas	0.060	33. South Carolina	0.081
34. Delaware	0.059	34. Alabama	0.075
34. Virginia	0.059	35. South Dakota	0.072
36. New Hampshire	0.054	36. Delaware	0.068
37. Montana	0.053	37. Kansas	0.062
38. Arizona	0.051	38. New Hampshire	0.054
39. Nebraska	0.047	39. Montana	0.053
39. Texas	0.047	40. Arizona	0.051
41. North Carolina	0.037	41. Louisiana	0.050
42. Wyoming	0.036	42. Nebraska	0.047
43. Hawaii	0.033	42. Texas	0.047
44. Louisiana	0.029	44. Wyoming	0.036
45. Mississippi	0.028	45. hawaii	0.033
46. Idaho	0.027	46. Idaho	0.030
46. Utah	0.027	47. Mississippi	0.028
48. Alabama	0.026	48. Utah	0.027
49. Nevada	0.024	49. Nevada	0.024
50. District of Columbia	0.023	50. District of Columbia	0.023
51. Alaska	0.015	51. Alaska	0.015

TABLE 23

TOTAL STATE GRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS  
FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN 1989-90  
(amounts in \$1,000s)

State	Percent*	State	Amount	State	Amount
1. Vermont	19.0%	1. New York	\$423,092	1. California	\$5,740,737
2. New York	13.3%	2. Illinois	\$204,310	2. New York	\$3,185,045
3. Illinois	12.2%	3. California	\$162,003	3. Texas	\$2,624,288
4. Iowa	11.7%	4. Pennsylvania	\$134,014	4. Illinois	\$1,675,322
5. Massachusetts	10.8%	5. Texas	\$112,047	5. Florida	\$1,367,712
6. Pennsylvania	9.8%	6. New Jersey	\$ 91,689	6. North Carolina	\$1,458,516
7. New Jersey	8.0%	7. Massachusetts	\$ 88,314	7. Ohio	\$1,427,041
8. Rhode Island	7.8%	8. Michigan	\$ 77,311	8. Michigan	\$1,408,009
9. Minnesota	7.4%	9. Ohio	\$ 76,683	9. Pennsylvania	\$1,361,361
10. Indiana	7.3%	10. Minnesota	\$ 69,589	10. New Jersey	\$1,142,805
11. Oklahoma	7.2%	11. Indiana	\$ 59,315	11. Virginia	\$1,107,480
12. Connecticut	7.1%	12. Iowa	\$ 58,932	12. Minnesota	\$ 946,779
13. Michigan	5.5%	13. Florida	\$ 56,313	13. Georgia	\$ 884,669
14. Ohio	5.4%	14. North Carolina	\$ 52,123	14. Maryland	\$ 823,348
NATION	5.3%	NATION	\$ 41,420**	15. Massachusetts	\$ 815,998
15. Wisconsin	5.2%	15. Wisconsin	\$ 41,060	16. Indiana	\$ 814,021
16. West Virginia	4.7%	16. Connecticut	\$ 32,806	17. Washington	\$ 790,383
17. Texas	4.3%	17. Oklahoma	\$ 32,545	NATION	\$ 786,528***
18. Colorado	4.0%	18. Virginia	\$ 26,373	18. Wisconsin	\$ 784,141
19. Utah	3.9%	19. Georgia	\$ 22,273	19. Alabama	\$ 776,641
20. North Carolina	3.6%	20. Maryland	\$ 21,222	20. Tennessee	\$ 727,449
20. Florida	3.6%	21. Colorado	\$ 20,442	21. South Carolina	\$ 612,508
22. South Carolina	3.2%	22. Tennessee	\$ 20,027	22. Missouri	\$ 603,535
23. Missouri	2.9%	23. South Carolina	\$ 19,772	23. Arizona	\$ 569,982
24. New Mexico	2.8%	24. Missouri	\$ 17,617	24. Kentucky	\$ 550,182
24. California	2.8%	25. Washington	\$ 14,136	25. Louisiana	\$ 522,912
24. Tennessee	2.8%	26. Kentucky	\$ 13,858	26. Colorado	\$ 504,757
27. Oregon	2.7%	27. Alabama	\$ 11,907	27. Iowa	\$ 502,293
28. Maryland	2.6%	28. West Virginia	\$ 11,877	28. Connecticut	\$ 463,796
29. Georgia	2.5%	30. Rhode Island	\$ 10,254	29. Oklahoma	\$ 453,090
29. Kentucky	2.5%	31. Oregon	\$ 10,770	30. Kansas	\$ 444,788
31. Virginia	2.4%	32. Utah	\$ 10,527	31. Mississippi	\$ 432,971
32. New Hampshire	2.3%	33. Louisiana	\$ 9,729	32. Oregon	\$ 395,898
33. Hawaii	2.0%	34. New Mexico	\$ 8,254	33. Arkansas	\$ 301,200
34. Louisiana	1.9%	35. Kansas	\$ 7,550	34. New Mexico	\$ 296,410
35. Washington	1.8%	36. Hawaii	\$ 5,953	35. Hawaii	\$ 292,456
36. Kansas	1.7%	37. Arkansas	\$ 4,827	36. Nebraska	\$ 290,491
37. Arkansas	1.6%	38. Arizona	\$ 3,400	37. Utah	\$ 272,201
38. Alabama	1.5%	39. Alaska	\$ 2,212	38. West Virginia	\$ 251,505
39. Delaware	1.4%	40. Nebraska	\$ 2,037	39. Maine	\$ 176,868
40. Alaska	1.3%	41. Maine	\$ 2,008	40. Alaska	\$ 176,023
41. North Dakota	1.2%	42. Mississippi	\$ 1,991	41. Idaho	\$ 158,247
42. Maine	1.1%	43. New Hampshire	\$ 1,735	42. Nevada	\$ 146,636
43. South Dakota	0.7%	44. North Dakota	\$ 1,622	43. Rhode Island	\$ 144,522
43. Nebraska	0.7%	45. Delaware	\$ 1,582	44. North Dakota	\$ 139,911
45. Arizona	0.6%	46. Idaho	\$ 638	45. Wyoming	\$ 116,183
46. Mississippi	0.5%	47. South Dakota	\$ 594	46. Delaware	\$ 115,541
47. Idaho	0.4%	48. Montana	\$ 417	47. Montana	\$ 109,416
47. Montana	0.4%	49. Nevada	\$ 400	48. South Dakota	\$ 85,995
49. Nevada	0.3%	50. Wyoming	\$ 241	49. New Hampshire	\$ 74,393
50. Wyoming	0.2%			50. Vermont	\$ 59,936

\* Percentage equals total grant dollars divided by total tax funds.

\*\* Amount equals total grant dollars divided by 50.

\*\*\* Amount equals total tax funds divided by 50.

Source of Tax Fund Data: Center for Higher Education, Illinois State University,  
Grapevine, October-November, 1989.

## SECTION VI

### TRENDS IN STATE GRANT PROGRAMS DURING THE 1980s

Since this year's survey, the tenth compiled by PHEAA, marks the end of a decade, it seems appropriate to review reports issued in the 1980s and describe some observed data trends. It is hoped that the review will be a useful as well as an interesting addition to the usual annual report.

#### New State Grant Programs In The Decade

Perhaps the best way to begin the review is to describe the 77 new state grant programs that were created in the 1980s and remain in existence this year.

Table 24 displays the basic data for 28 undergraduate need-based grant programs implemented by 17 states since 1980. These programs are expected to award \$42 million in grants this year, representing about 2 percent of all total undergraduate need-based grant dollars. Ten of the programs are expected to award over \$1 million, with the largest being New York's Aid for Part-time Study program, funded at \$11 million.

Five new programs aid part-time students in: New York, funded at \$11 million this year; Massachusetts, \$3.1 million; Michigan, \$2.1 million; Vermont, \$653,000; and New Jersey, \$500,000. These programs are expected to provide over one-fourth of all need-based grant dollars states will award to part-time undergraduates this year.

For members of racial-ethnic minority groups, Florida, Kansas, Texas and Wisconsin implemented new need-based programs that should award \$1.11 million to undergraduates in 1989-90. Wisconsin also started a \$210,000 program for minority students in vocational-technical study fields. Michigan's Educational Opportunity Grant, funded at \$1.05 million, and Puerto Rico's Supplementary Assistance program, funded at \$2.7 million, are new programs to aid extremely needy students.

Connecticut, Nebraska, New Jersey and Oklahoma introduced new need-based scholarship programs expected to award \$7.4 million in 1989-90. New programs for undergraduates at specific types of institutions or in special study fields were started by: Connecticut, for public college students, funded at \$3 million in 1989-90; Virginia, for transfer students, \$1.56 million; New Mexico, for private college students, funded at \$394,000; Vermont, for non-degree-seeking undergraduates, funded at \$306,000; Massachusetts, for prospective teachers, funded at \$150,000; and Oregon, for barbers and hairdressers, funded at \$70,000.

The 28 new need-based programs generally were created to meet special perceived needs of particular student groups, rather than to increase aid to all undergraduates in general.

One-third of these programs have grown substantially since their initial implementation years. Vermont's Part-Time Student Grants program has grown from \$27,000 in 1981-82 to \$653,000 in 1989-90; its Non-Degree Student Grant

program, from \$69,000 in 1985-86 to \$306,000 this year. New Jersey's Part-Time Tuition Aid Grants program has more than doubled since its creation last year, \$211,000 versus \$500,000. New Mexico's Incentive Grants program has grown from \$720,000 in 1980-81 to its current \$4.15 million. New York's Aid for Part-Time Study program grew from \$3.2 million in 1984-85 to the current \$11 million. Oregon's Barber and Hairdresser Grants program grew from \$30,000 in 1986-87 to this year's \$70,000. Connecticut's Aid for Public College Students Grants program grew from \$3.5 million in 1987-88 to the current \$5.6 million, and Florida's Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships program grew from \$20,000 in 1981-82 to \$83,000 in 1989-90.

Massachusetts' Teacher Incentive Grants and Part-Time Grants programs are funded at lower levels in 1989-90 than in their initial years, as is Texas' State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment.

Only three new need-based grant programs exclusively for graduate/professional school students were implemented in the 1980s (see Table 25). By far the largest was Massachusetts' Graduate Student Grant program, which awarded \$1.5 million in 1984-85 and expects to award \$2.5 million this year. New Mexico's Graduate Fellowships program is expected to award \$285,000 this year, the same amount as awarded in 1988, its initial year. Alabama's Chiropractic Scholarships program, created in 1985-86 and awarding \$48,000, is expected to award \$49,000 this year. Vermont and Puerto Rico created undergraduate programs that also award graduate/professional school students. This year, these two programs are expected to award over \$1 million, with Vermont's program awarding only \$8,000.

In the aggregate, the five new programs that make awards to graduate/professional school students are expected this year to award \$3.9 million, representing 12 percent of the total need-based grant aid awarded to such students.

During the 1980s, states created more non-need-based than need-based undergraduate grant programs, 38 versus 28. And the new non-need-based ones are expected to award 68.8 percent more dollars than the need-based ones in 1989-90, \$75.1 million versus \$44.5 million. Moreover, the 38 new non-need-based undergraduate programs created by 20 states are expected to award 37 percent of all non-need-based dollars awarded to undergraduates this year. Clearly, the creation of new non-need-based programs has had a significant effect on the amounts of such aid available to undergraduates. However, it should be noted that over 48 percent of grant dollars from these new programs, \$36.3 million of \$75.1 million, are expected to come from only two programs: Ohio's "tuition equalization" Student Choice Grants programs, \$20.1 million; and Florida's Undergraduate Scholars Fund, \$16.2 million (see Table 26 for the data).

In addition to Florida, 13 other states, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee and Virginia, implemented new non-need-based scholarship programs for undergraduates in general. New Hampshire created a Governor's Scholars Awards program in 1986-87, which was funded at \$122,000, but the program was terminated for the 1989-90 academic year.

These 14 states' scholarship programs are expected to award \$45.5 million in 1989-90. But only Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, New

Jersey, New York and Ohio have scholarship programs expected to award more than \$1 million, and their programs' award dollars represent 96 percent of total scholarship dollars to be awarded by the 14 states, with Florida's program alone awarding 36 percent of the total.

Other new scholarship programs were aimed at assisting specific student groups. Five were for prospective teachers in Alabama, Florida, Massachusetts and Oklahoma. They are expected to award almost \$2 million in 1989-90. Three were for nursing or other health professions students in Colorado, Maryland and New York. New York's program is substantially larger than those in Colorado and Maryland.

Kansas implemented, in 1987-88, a scholarship program for vocational students which is funded at \$35,000 this year. Iowa, in 1984-85, created a \$1.4 million grant program for prospective science and mathematics teachers, but in 1989-90 these awards were merged with the state's general scholarship program. In 1987-88, Florida created a Challenger Astronauts Memorial Scholarships program, which is expected to award \$20,000 this year. New York's 1985-86 Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarship program is expected to award \$1.3 million this year.

Non-need-based programs for Vietnam veterans were established by New Jersey in 1984-85, funded at \$89,000 this year; and by New York in 1984-85, funded at \$850,000 this year. Members of the National Guard benefited from new programs in Alabama, funded at \$145,000 this year, and in Colorado, funded at \$349,000 this year. Children of police officers, firefighters and corrections officers received scholarships from new programs in Alabama, funded at \$25,000 in 1989-90 and in New York, funded at \$396,000.

It appears that the growth in undergraduate non-need-based state grant programs is primarily the result of creating scholarship programs for students in general or for students who are preparing for careers in education or the health professions. These programs' awards represent about 68 percent of expected awards from new non-need-based grant programs and over 25 percent of expected awards from all non-need-based programs in 1989-90.

Nine states implemented 18 new non-need-based grant programs to serve graduate/professional school students during the decade, but only eight were exclusively for such students. These 18 programs are expected to award \$7.9 million, which represents about 52 percent of the 1989-90 total aid of this type (see Table 27). By far the largest programs are New York's Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships program, funded at \$410,000 in 1985-86 and expected to award \$2.14 million this year, and its Empire State Challenger Scholarship program, awarding \$843,000 in 1985-86 and expected to award \$1.86 million this year. In fact, New York's five programs are expected to award \$5.75 million this year, representing 73 percent of the dollars from new, and 38 percent of the dollars from all, non-need-based programs for graduate/professional school students.

During the decade, Florida implemented three programs exclusively for graduate/professional school students that are expected to award \$1.06 million in 1989-90. Maryland and Massachusetts started new programs to assist graduate nursing students. Maryland's program is expected to award \$15,000, but Massachusetts anticipates no awards through its program this year. Connecticut's unique High Technology Graduate Scholarship fund expects to

award \$200,000 this year, double the amount awarded in its initial year, 1984-85. Iowa's new-this-year Osteopathic Grant program expects to award \$396,000 to professional students.

All told, 77 new grant programs were created during the 1980s and remain in operation this year. Of these, 31 were need-based and 46 non-need-based. Ten of the new programs were implemented in New York; four in Colorado, Massachusetts and New Jersey; three in Maryland and Ohio; and two in Connecticut, Missouri, New Mexico, Texas, Vermont, Virginia and Wisconsin. Therefore, 54, or 70 percent, of the 77 new programs were implemented in just 15 states.

Aggregate aid from the new programs totals \$118.6 million, or about 5.7 percent of the total \$2.092 billion in grants that states are expected to award this year. The new non-need-based grant programs are, however, expected to award one-third of the total non-need-based grant aid of 1989-90. So the new non-need-based programs made a significant difference in total non-need-based grant dollars available to students at the end of the decade. The new need-based programs made much less of a contribution to total need-based dollars, under 5 percent.

#### Trends in Need-Based Grant Aid Dollars Among The States

Since the NASSGP surveys at the beginning of the decade did not collect data on need-based grants to graduate students or on any non-need-based grants, it is impossible to compare trends in these grants for the full ten years. It is, however, possible to compare trends in need-based aid to undergraduates, which historically have represented three-fourths of grant dollars awarded by the states.

Between 1980-81 and 1989-90, the aggregate need-based grant dollars to undergraduates almost doubled, rising from \$836 million to almost \$1.61 billion, a 92.1 percent increase (see Table 28). The growth rate in aggregate grant dollars during the first four years of the decade was slightly higher than for the last four years, 37.9 percent versus 30.1 percent.

Although the growth in aggregate dollars was 92.1 percent, the average growth in dollars per state for the decade was 113.2 percent. The median growth rate was 86 percent. Five states' programs experienced tremendous growth during the 1980s. Puerto Rico should award almost twelve times as many dollars in 1989-90 as in 1980-81, \$1.46 million versus \$16.8 million. New Mexico expects to award almost seven times as many dollars in 1989-90 as it did in 1980-81, \$5.024 million versus \$720,000; Oklahoma, almost six times as many, \$11.535 million versus \$2.041 million. Wyoming expects to almost quadruple its dollars, from \$52,000 to \$241,000. Massachusetts is expected to more than triple its award dollars, \$59.494 million versus \$16.365 million.

Here are the percentage growth rates for other states expected to have experienced more than a 50 percent growth rate by the end of the decade:

Over 150 Percent:	Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Tennessee and Washington
-------------------	---

100 to 149 Percent:	Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia and West Virginia
75 to 99 Percent:	Arkansas, California, Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, Ohio and Wisconsin
50 to 74 Percent:	Alabama, Colorado, Maine, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania and South Carolina.

Growth rates in four states were between approximately 40 and 49 percent: Hawaii, 46.3 percent; New Hampshire, 46.1 percent; Georgia, 40.2 percent; and Kansas, 39.8 percent. The District of Columbia expects a 35.5 percent growth rate; North Carolina and Nevada, about 22 percent; Montana and South Dakota, about 18 percent; and Missouri, slightly over 10 percent.

Since state grant recipients' costs more than doubled during the decade (see Table 31), it appears that only 22 of the 52 states increased their aggregate grant dollars at rates that kept pace with costs.

Four states are expected to award fewer need-based grant dollars this year than they awarded at the beginning of the decade. Idaho expects a 32.4 percent loss, \$346,000 versus \$512,000. Utah's award dollars are expected to decline by 29 percent, from \$1,504,000 to \$1,068,000. Alaska expects a 26.9 percent loss, \$228,000 versus \$312,000. And Mississippi expects to award 4.5 percent fewer dollars this year than in 1980-81, \$1,243,000 versus \$1,302,000.

Eight of the 15 states with the largest grant programs experienced larger growth rates in the last than in the first four years of the decade: California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Five of the 15 largest states experienced larger growth rates in the first four years: Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio and Texas. New Jersey and Iowa experienced similar growth rates during both periods.

Growth rate patterns are comparable for the next 17 largest states, those that are expected to award at least \$5 million this year. Seven of the 17 experienced larger growth rates in the later years: Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, New Mexico, Tennessee and Virginia. Six experienced larger growth rates in the earlier years: Colorado, Oklahoma, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island and West Virginia. Georgia, South Carolina, Vermont and Washington experienced similar growth rates during both periods.

The 20 smallest states, those that award under \$5 million and frequently under \$1 million per year, were more likely to have experienced larger growth rates in the earlier than in the later years. Ten had higher rates in the first four years than in the last four: Alabama, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. Only six had higher growth rates in more recent years: Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire and North Dakota. Alaska, Arizona, Idaho and Mississippi had similar growth rates in both sets of years. Therefore, looking at long-term growth rates for the decade, larger states seem to be in a growth period while smaller states more likely are not.

At the beginning of the decade, four states with the largest programs, New York, Illinois, California and Pennsylvania, awarded 59.4 percent of

aggregate need-based dollars to undergraduates. This year's expected proportion is down to 53.2 percent. However, the 15 largest states at the beginning and end of the decade awarded similar percentages of total dollars in both years, 87.8 percent and 86.3 percent, respectively. Thus the vast majority of state grant dollars continue to be awarded by only a few states.

To some extent, however, this concentration is not surprising. The 15 states with the largest programs enrolled, in 1988-89, over 63 percent of the nation's full-time undergraduate students. As shown in Section V, there is a positive relationship between numbers of students enrolled in states and the amounts states spend on their grant programs.

At the beginning and end of the decade, the top 20 states in terms of need-based grant dollar expenditures generally were the same. Here are the rankings:

<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
1. New York	1. New York
2. Illinois	2. Illinois
3. California	3. California
4. Pennsylvania	4. Pennsylvania
5. New Jersey	5. New Jersey
6. Michigan	6. Michigan
7. Ohio	7. Minnesota
8. Minnesota	8. Massachusetts
9. Indiana	9. Indiana
10. Wisconsin	10. Ohio
11. Massachusetts	11. Wisconsin
12. Iowa	12. Iowa
13. Texas	13. Texas
14. Florida	14. Florida
15. South Carolina	15. Connecticut
16. Missouri	16. South Carolina
17. Connecticut	17. Tennessee
18. Oregon	18. Puerto Rico
19. Tennessee	19. Maryland
20. Kentucky	20. Kentucky

Eleven states held their same rankings in both years. Four changed ranks by more than one position: Ohio fell from seventh to tenth; Massachusetts rose from 11th to eighth; Connecticut rose from 17th to 15th; and Tennessee rose from 19th to 17th. Missouri and Oregon dropped off the "top twenty" list. Missouri ranked 16th in 1980-81, 24th in 1989-90; Oregon ranked 18th in 1980-81, 25th in 1989-90. Maryland moved from 21st in 1980-81 to 19th in 1989-90, while Puerto Rico moved from 37th to 18th. As noted above, Puerto Rico expects to award almost 12 times as many grant dollars this year as in 1980-81.

#### State Grants and Federal Grants Compared

Another way to view the trends in state grant aid in the 1980s is to compare them to trends in the Pell Grant and Supplemental Opportunity Grant (SEOG) programs. Need-based state grant award dollars to undergraduates and Pell Grant and SEOG award dollars to undergraduates are compared because these grants are generally available to the widest numbers of needy undergraduate

students. In many cases, these three types of aid are received by the same students.

Table 29 shows how aggregate need-based undergraduate state grant dollars compare to Pell Grant dollars for the decade. For each year of the 1980s, state grant dollars represented about one-third of Pell Grant dollars. States are expected to award \$11.881 billion in grants during the 1980s; Pell Grant awards are expected to total \$33.834 billion.

However, when annual growth rates are compared, state grants are expected to have grown at a greater rate than Pell grants between 1980-81 and 1989-90, 92.1 percent versus 74.7 percent.

State grant and Pell Grant dollars are distributed differently among students in different sectors of postsecondary education. For the decade, it is estimated that the dollar percentages from the two sources were distributed as follows:

	<u>Public Institutions</u>	<u>Private Institutions</u>	<u>Proprietary Institutions</u>
State Grants	43.2%	50.0%	6.8%
Pell Grants	55.1	22.2	22.7

It was previously noted in this report that the percentage distribution of state grant dollars among students at different institutional types remained quite stable during the past five years. But between 1980-81 and 1989-90, public institutions' students appear to have slightly increased their share of state grant dollars from 41.0 percent to 44.2 percent; private institutions' students decreased their share, from 54.0 percent to 49.4 percent; and proprietary schools' students increased their share, from 5.0 percent to 6.4 percent. Given the nature of annual distribution estimates of state grant dollars, it is likely that there was little change in percentage distributions of state grant dollars among students at different institutional types during the decade.

This is not the case for Pell Grant dollars. In 1980-81, public institutions' students got 60.1 percent of the dollars, while this year they are estimated to receive only 51.0 percent. Private institutions' students' share of Pell Grant dollars dropped from 27.5 percent in 1980-81 to the estimated 19.0 percent in 1989-90. Proprietary school students' shares of Pell Grant dollars more than doubled, rising from 12.4 percent to the estimated 30.0 percent.

The relatively stable distribution of state grant dollars and the changing distribution of Pell Grant dollars resulted in very different growth rates for dollars available to students in each sector. Here are percentage growth rates in dollars between 1980-81 and 1989-90:

	<u>Public Institutions</u>	<u>Private Institutions</u>	<u>Proprietary Institutions</u>
State Grants	107.0%	75.8%	145.9%
Pell Grants	48.2	20.7	322.7

The growth rates of state grant dollars to public and private college students are over twice the rates for Pell Grant dollars. The Pell Grant dollar growth rate for proprietary school students is over twice the rate for state grants. Over 53 percent of growth in Pell Grant dollars between 1980-81 and 1989-90, \$1.08 billion of \$2.023 billion, was in Pell Grants to proprietary school students, which more than quadrupled during the decade. Pell Grant dollars to public and private colleges' students grew by only 40 percent.

The third major source of generally available publicly-funded grant dollars is the SEOG, whose awards are estimated to total \$3.88 billion for the 1980s (see Table 30). This amount represents about one-third of state grant dollars and slightly over one-tenth of Pell Grant dollars for the decade. SEOG dollars and state grant dollars are somewhat similarly proportionately distributed among students at the three sectors:

	<u>Public Institutions</u>	<u>Private Institutions</u>	<u>Proprietary Institutions</u>
SEOG Grants	49.5%	41.5%	9.0%
State Grants	43.2	50.0	6.8

Between 1980-81 and 1989-90, SEOG grant dollars are expected to grow by only 18.5 percent, a much lower rate than for state grants (92.1 percent) or Pell Grants (74.7 percent). Private and proprietary institutions' students are expected, in 1989-90, to get slightly greater proportions of SEOG dollars than they did in 1980-81; public institutions' students, slightly less. When the slight distribution changes are considered, increases in SEOG dollars to students at each institutional type for the decade are:

	<u>Public Institutions</u>	<u>Private Institutions</u>	<u>Proprietary Institutions</u>
SEOG Grants	10.5%	24.7%	38.0%
Pell Grants	48.2	20.7	322.7
State Grants	107.0	75.8	145.9

It is quite clear from these percentage growth rates that state grant dollars to public and private college students increased by much greater rates than either Pell Grant or SEOG grant dollars. In part, this is because proportionately more state grant dollars than federal grant dollars are awarded to public and private college students; proportionately fewer are awarded to proprietary school students.

Because so many state grant dollars go to college students, it was considered appropriate to compare year-to-year trends in state grants and Pell Grants to colleges to trends in college costs. The data are displayed in Table 31.

Average college costs paid by state grant recipients more than doubled during the decade, rising from \$4,195 in 1980-81 to \$8,863 in 1989-90. These average costs are weighted by the numbers of recipients attending four-year and two-year, public and private colleges. Because proportionately fewer state grant recipients at two-year public colleges receive state grants,

weighted average costs for state grant recipients are somewhat higher than weighted average costs paid by all college students.

The decade's growth rate in average college costs, 111.3 percent, was higher than the growth rate for aggregate need-based state grants to undergraduates, 92.1 percent. But it was much higher than the growth rate for aggregate Pell Grants to college students, 39.6 percent. The 1980-81 to 1989-90 growth rate for aggregate SEOG grants to public and private college students is estimated at less than 17 percent. Clearly, college students' costs rose at a much higher rate than did their access to increased generally-available need-based grant aid from state and federal governments.

It is worth noting that, while aggregate state need-based grant dollars represent only one-third of aggregate Pell Grant dollars, they represent about 48 percent of 1989-90 Pell Grant dollars available to college students, \$1.606 billion versus \$3.312 billion. In 1980-81, state grants represented only 35 percent of Pell Grants available to college students, \$836 million versus \$2.372 billion. It is apparent that if state grant dollars had not increased at over twice the rate of their Pell Grant dollars, the nation's college students would have been in much more dire need of publicly-funded grants by the end of the decade.

This report has mentioned several times that state grant aid is not equally or even proportionately available to students in every state. Therefore, it was considered valuable to compare state grants as a proportion of total Pell Grants to colleges, SEOG, and state grants in each state for the decade. Table 32 shows the frequency distributions of state need-based grant dollars to undergraduates as a percentage of combined dollar amounts of state grants, Pell Grants to college students, and SEOG grants.

In 1980-81, the median percentage of state grants as a proportion of grants from the three sources was 11.2 percent. In 1980-81 there were only five states in which state grant dollars represented at least one-third of generally available state and federal grant dollars to college students: New York,, 43.7 percent; Illinois, 43.0 percent; New Jersey, 40.7 percent; Pennsylvania, 36.8 percent; and Indiana, 33.3 percent.

By 1989-90, the median percentage had risen to 14.3 percent and there were eleven states in which state grant dollars represented at least one-third of the total: New Jersey, 57.7 percent; Connecticut, 51.2 percent; Illinois, 50.6 percent; New York, 49.9 percent; Vermont, 48.3 percent; Pennsylvania, 44.0 percent; Indiana, 42.3 percent; Massachusetts, 39.9 percent; Rhode Island, 38.6 percent; Minnesota, 37.6 percent; and California, 36.9 percent. Michigan's percentage was just under one-third, at 31.6 percent.

When states' 1980-81 and 1989-90 percentages were compared, only six states were found to have significantly lower percentages at the end of the decade, which means that state grant dollars grew at a faster rate than federal grant dollars in 46 states. Their changes were as follows:

	<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
Alaska	14.3%	6.7%
Colorado	18.6	16.5
Idaho	5.8	1.5
Kansas	15.1	11.4
Missouri	16.1	11.6
Utah	10.9	2.2

Alaska, Idaho and Utah each have programs expected to award less than \$1.1 million in 1989-90. Other expected awards are: Missouri, \$10.8 million; Colorado, \$9.7 million; and Kansas, \$7.2 million. Missouri increased its state's grant dollars from 1980-81 to 1989-90 by only 10.2 percent; Kansas, by 39.8 percent; and Colorado, by 52.1 percent.

Here are the states' percentage distributions in 1989-90:

Under 5 Percent:	Alabama, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming
5 to 9.9 Percent:	Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota and Puerto Rico
10 to 14.9 Percent:	Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Texas, West Virginia and Virginia
15 to 19.9 Percent:	Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee and Washington
20 to 24.9 Percent:	Maryland and Ohio
25 to 29.9 Percent:	Iowa, South Carolina and Wisconsin
30 to 34.9 Percent:	Michigan
35 to 39.9 Percent:	California, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Rhode Island
40 to 44.9 Percent:	Indiana and Pennsylvania
Above 45 Percent:	Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, New York and Vermont

Only two of 17 states in which state grants represent at least one-fifth of generally available government grants to college students are not among the 20 states with the largest grant programs: Rhode Island and Vermont. Both states rank very high in per capita grant expenditures, even though the total dollars they award are under \$12 million annually.

Of the 21 states in which state grants represent under 10 percent of generally available government grants to college students, all but Georgia and Puerto Rico are expected to award less than \$5 million in need-based grants this year. Eight are expected to award less than \$1 million in 1989-90.

Only Florida, Kentucky, Puerto Rico and Texas are among the top 20 states with largest programs and grant dollar expenditures representing under 20 percent of available government grants. These states receive large amounts of Pell Grants because they have many low-income students.

TABLE 24  
STATE UNDERGRADUATE NEED-BASED GRANT PROGRAMS  
STARTED IN THE 1980s  
(\$ amounts in millions)

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Original Year Payout Dollars</u>	<u>Estimated Payout Dollars 1989-90</u>
CONNECTICUT			
Aid for Public College Students Grant Program	1987	\$3.500	\$5.633
Scholastic Achievement Grants	1982	2.430	3.061
FLORIDA			
Seminole/Miccosukee Indian Scholarships	1981	0.020	0.083
Jose Marti Scholarship Challenge Grant	1986	Unknown	0.090
IOWA			
Minority Grants	1989	--	0.050
KANSAS			
Nursing Scholarship	1989	--	0.670
Minority Scholarships	1989	--	0.141
MASSACHUSETTS			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Incentive Grants	1985	0.222	0.150
Part-time Grants	1986	4.000	3.100
MICHIGAN			
Educational Opportunity Grants	1986	(1.000)	1.050
Adult Part-time Grants	1986	(2.000)	2.103
NEBRASKA			
State Scholarship Assistance	1989	--	0.761
NEW JERSEY			
Garden State Scholarships	1988	3.515	3.568
Part-time Tuition Aid Grants	1988	0.211	0.500
NEW MEXICO			
Incentive Grants	1980	0.720	(4.153)
Student Choice	1984	(0.250)	(0.394)
NEW YORK			
Aid for Part-time Study	1984	3.200	11.000
OKLAHOMA			
Bill Willis Scholarship Program	1986	0.020	0.025
OREGON			
Barber and Hairdresser Grants	1986	0.030	0.070
TEXAS			
State Scholarship Program for Ethnic Recruitment	1983	0.478	0.470
Tax Reimbursement Grants--Undergraduate	1985	Unknown	0.051
VERMONT			
Part-time Student Grants	1981	0.027	0.653
Non-Degree Student Grant Program--Undergraduate	1985	0.069	0.306
VIRGINIA			
Undergraduate Student Financial Assistance	1988	0.993	0.771
Virginia Transfer Grant	1983	Unknown	1.560
WISCONSIN			
Vo-Tech Minority Student Grants	1987	0.171	0.210
Private School Minority Student Grants	1986	0.375	0.417
PUERTO RICO			
Supplementary Assistance Program--Undergrad	1981	2.700	2.712
TOTAL			\$44.507

TABLE 25

STATE GRADUATE NEED-BASED GRANT PROGRAMS  
 STARTED IN THE 1980s  
 (\$ amounts in millions)

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Original Year Payout Dollars</u>	<u>Estimated Payout Dollars 1989-90</u>
ALABAMA			
Chiropractic Scholarships	1985	\$0.048	\$0.049
MASSACHUSETTS			
Graduate Student Grant Program	1984	1.500	2.500
NEW MEXICO			
Graduate Fellowships	1988	(0.285)	(0.285)
VERMONT			
Non-Degree Student Grant Program			
--Graduates	1985	0.002	0.008
PUERTO RICO			
Supplementary Assistance Program			
--Graduates	1981	0.800	1.086
TOTAL			\$3.928

TABLE 26  
STATE UNDERGRADUATE NON-NEED-BASED GRANT PROGRAMS  
STARTED IN THE 1980s  
(\$ amounts in millions)

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Original Year Payout Dollars</u>	<u>Estimated Payout Dollars 1989-90</u>
<b>ALABAMA</b>			
National Guard Education Assistance Program -- Undergraduates	1984	\$0.164	\$0.145
Emergency Secondary Education Scholarship Program -- Undergraduates	1984	0.869	1.012
Police Officers' and Firefighters' Survivors' Education Assistance Program	1987	0.025	0.025
<b>ARKANSAS</b>			
Governor's Scholar's Program	1984	0.199	0.694
<b>COLORADO</b>			
National Guard Tuition Assistance	1980	0.058	0.349
Diversity Grant	1988	(0.190)	0.493
Nursing Scholarship	1988	(0.100)	0.200
Private School Student Grants**	1988	(0.050)	0.050
<b>DELAWARE</b>			
Diamond State Scholars	1984	0.200	0.189
<b>FLORIDA</b>			
Undergraduate Scholars' Fund	1981	0.798	16.196
Critical Teachers Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program--Undergraduates*	1984	0.080	0.499
Challenger Astronauts Mem. Scholarships	1987	0.007	0.020
<b>GEORGIA</b>			
Governor's Scholarship Program	1985	0.226	1.066
<b>ILLINOIS</b>			
Merit Recognition Scholarships	1986	Unknown	8.100
<b>IOWA</b>			
Science and Math Grants (merged with Scholarship program in 1989)	1984	1.444	0.000
<b>KANSAS</b>			
Vocational Scholarship Program	1987	0.025	0.035
<b>MARYLAND</b>			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Program -- Undergraduate	1986	0.181*	0.189
Teacher Education--Distinguished Scholar	1984	(0.020)	0.114
Nursing Scholarships--Undergraduate	1988	0.233	0.279
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>			
Commonwealth Scholars	1984	0.794	1.019

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Original Year Payout Dollars</u>	<u>Estimated Payout Dollars 1989-90</u>
MISSOURI			
Higher Education Academic Scholarships	1987	\$1.811	\$6.532
Public Service Office or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program	1988	0.002	0.011
NEW JERSEY			
Distinguished Scholars Program	1985	0.685	4.245
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Aid Program	1985	0.097	0.089
NEW YORK			
Vietnam Veterans Tuition Awards	1984	0.550	0.850
Empire State Scholarships of Excellence	1986	0.809	3.300
Health Services Corps--Undergraduate	1985	0.617	3.021
Empire State Challenger Scholarships--Undergrad	1985	0.931	1.347
Regents Prof. Opportunity Schshps--Undergrad	1985	0.010	1.325
Children of Veterans/Police Officers/ Firefighters/Correction Officers Award	1985	0.341	0.396
Transit Corps of Engineers--Undergraduates	1987	Unknown	0.180
OHIO			
Student Choice Grants	1984	4.200	20.083
Academic Scholars Program	1988	0.662	1.900
OKLAHOMA			
Future Teachers Scholarship Prog.--Undergrad	1984	0.074	0.180
RHODE ISLAND			
Governor's Academic Scholars Program	1987	0.060	0.120
SOUTH DAKOTA			
Superior Scholar Scholarship	1984	0.018	0.090
TENNESSEE			
Academic Scholars Program	1986	0.050	0.200
VIRGINIA			
Virginia Scholars Program	1984	0.150	0.528
TOTAL			\$75.071

\* Data could not be broken into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

\*\* Portions of these awards are made with regard to need.

Figures in ( ) are data from previous year's survey, or 1989-90 data not available.

TABLE 27  
STATE GRADUATE NON-NEED-BASED GRANT PROGRAMS  
STARTED IN 1980s  
(\$ amounts in millions)

<u>State/Program</u>	<u>Year Initiated</u>	<u>Original Year Payout Dollars</u>	<u>Estimated Payout Dollars 1989-90</u>
ALABAMA			
National Guard Education Asst. Prog.--Grads	1984	\$0.018	\$0.036
Emergency Secondary Education Assistance Program -- Graduates	1984	0.046	0.065
CONNECTICUT			
High Technology Graduate Scholarship	1984	0.100	0.200
FLORIDA			
Graduate Scholars Fund	1986	0.090	0.750
Regent Scholarship	1983	0.005	0.005
Virgil Hawkins Fellowship	1984	0.170	0.300
Critical Teacher Shortage Tuition Reimbursement Program -- Graduates*	1984	N/A*	N/A*
IOWA			
Osteopathic Grants	1989	--	0.396
MARYLAND			
Christa McAuliffe Teacher Education Program --Graduates	1986	N/A*	0.016
Nursing Scholarships -- Graduates	1988	0.012	0.015
MASSACHUSETTS			
Nursing Graduate Grant	1986	0.300	0.000
NEW YORK			
Regents Health Care Opportunity Scholarships	1985	0.410	2.140
Health Services Corps--Graduates	1985	0.139	0.709
Empire State Challenger Scholarship--Graduates	1985	0.843	1.859
Regents Professional Opportunity Scholarships --Graduates	1985	0.015	0.920
Transit Corps of Engineers--Graduates	1987	Unknown	0.120
OHIO			
Regents Graduate Professional Fellowships	1987	0.203	0.378
OKLAHOMA			
Future Teachers Scholarship Program--Graduates*	1984	0.018	0.000
TOTAL			\$7.909

\* Data could not be broken into graduate versus undergraduate categories. Therefore, all data is listed under undergraduate category.

TABLE 28

AGGREGATE DOLLARS OF AWARDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE  
NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS BY STATES, GROUPED BY  
AWARD DOLLAR VOLUMES, 1980-81 to 1989-90  
(amounts in millions)

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1980-1984</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1985-1989</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1980-1989</u>
California	\$ 85.540	\$158.985	+ 7.7%	+ 41.5%	+ 85.9%
Illinois	85.573	180.800	+ 28.8	+ 47.8	+111.3
New York	245.507	380.570	+ 54.9	+ 4.6	+ 55.0
Pennsylvania	<u>79.879</u>	<u>133.429</u>	<u>+ 10.2</u>	<u>+ 37.8</u>	<u>+ 67.0</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$496.499	\$853.784	+ 35.1%	+ 22.8%	+ 80.0%
Connecticut	\$ 7.189	\$ 20.929	+ 33.7%	+ 88.6%	+191.1%
Florida	11.527	21.700	+ 21.2	+ 46.4	+ 88.3
Indiana	23.255	58.395	+ 7.5	+120.8	+151.1
Iowa	15.544	32.101	+ 42.9	+ 43.4	+106.5
Massachusetts	16.365	59.494	+119.6	+ 36.9	+263.5
Michigan	27.821	72.821	+ 18.1	+ 26.3	+161.7
Minnesota	26.500	68.000	+ 69.4	+ 49.5	+156.6
New Jersey	43.649	84.804	+ 31.9	+ 30.1	+ 94.3
Ohio	27.402	50.700	+ 63.5	+ 12.7	+ 85.0
Texas	12.981	24.967	+ 71.7	+ 31.2	+ 92.3
Wisconsin	<u>21.397</u>	<u>39.181</u>	<u>+ 15.2</u>	<u>+ 40.9</u>	<u>+ 83.1</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$233.630	\$533.092	+ 42.9%	+ 40.9%	+128.2%
Kentucky	\$ 6.627	\$13.858	+ 24.4%	+ 58.2%	+109.1%
Maryland	5.741	15.185	+ 28.2	+121.4	+164.5
Missouri	9.817	10.814	- 7.0	+ 12.1	+ 10.2
Oklahoma	2.041	11.535	+217.8	+ 40.0	+465.2
Oregon	6.660	10.770	+ 34.2	+ 13.2	+ 61.7
Puerto Rico	1.548	16.812	+689.1	+ 36.6	+1053.1
Rhode Island	4.616	10.134	+ 63.8	+ 29.0	+119.5
South Carolina	11.069	18.191	+ 24.0	+ 20.1	+ 64.3
Tennessee	6.475	17.295	+ 26.7	+ 83.3	+167.1
Vermont	4.875	11.021	+ 48.1	+ 42.7	+126.1
Washington	<u>4.677</u>	<u>13.624</u>	<u>+ 53.6</u>	<u>+ 54.3</u>	<u>+191.3</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$64.056	\$149.239	+ 37.4%	+ 54.7%	+133.0%

TABLE 28 (continued)

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1980-1984</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1985-1989</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u> <u>1980-1989</u>
Colorado	\$ 6.364	\$ 9.682	+ 37.9%	+ 4.3%	+ 52.1%
Georgia	3.569	5.005	+ 13.2	+ 11.0	+ 40.2
Kansas	5.100	7.129	- 5.1	+ 27.1	+ 39.8
New Mexico	0.720	(5.024)	+ 42.4	(+243.9)	+597.8
Virginia	3.829	8.284	+ 14.2	+ 87.6	+116.3
West Virginia	<u>2.462</u>	<u>5.272</u>	<u>+ 97.0</u>	<u>+ 2.0</u>	<u>+114.1</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$22,044	\$40,396	+ 60.9%	+ 5.5%	+183.3%
Alabama	\$ 1.427	\$ 2.196	+ 57.1%	- 2.1%	+ 53.9%
Arizona	1.639	3.383	+ 43.7	+ 40.9	+106.4
Arkansas	2.046	3.905	- 85.3	- 4.9	+ 90.9
Delaware	0.453	1.029	+ 18.3	+ 36.1	+127.2
Dist. of Columbia	0.789	1.069	+ 40.6	- 3.3	+ 35.5
Louisiana	1.062	2.006	+ 81.8	+ 0.1	+ 88.9
Maine	1.179	2.008	- 32.7	+148.2	+ 70.3
Mississippi	1.302	1.243	- 0.4	- 3.5	- 4.5
Nebraska	1.196	2.037	- 8.9	+ 86.4	+ 70.3
North Carolina	3.694	(4.489)	+ 20.4	(+ 1.1)	+ 21.5
North Dakota	0.585	1.540	+ 20.0	+ 90.6	+163.2
Utah	<u>1.504</u>	<u>1.068</u>	<u>+ 10.7</u>	<u>+ 5.6</u>	<u>- 29.0</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$16.876	\$25.973	+ 30.1%	+ 17.1%	+ 53.9%
Alaska	\$ 0.312	\$ 0.228	- 22.8%	- 5.4%	- 26.9%
Hawaii	0.516	0.755	- 4.5	+ 25.0	+ 46.3
Idaho	0.512	0.346	- 0.6	- 32.0	- 32.4
Montana	0.353	0.417	+ 8.2	- 5.2	+ 18.1
Nevada	0.287	(0.352)	+ 44.3	(- 15.0)	+ 22.6
New Hampshire	0.631	0.922	- 7.8	+ 39.7	+ 46.1
South Dakota	0.427	0.504	+ 24.4	- 19.2	+ 18.0
Wyoming	<u>0.052</u>	<u>0.241</u>	<u>+292.3</u>	<u>+ 18.1</u>	<u>+363.5</u>
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 3.090	\$ 3.765	+ 8.6%	+ 1.9%	+ 21.8%
GRAND TOTAL	\$836.195	\$1,606.249	+ 37.9%	+ 30.1%	+ 92.1%

TABLE 29  
Percentage of Need-Based State Grant and  
Pell Grant Dollars Awarded to Public, Private  
and Proprietary Institutions' Students, 1980-81 to 1989-90

	<u>Need-Based State Grant Dollars</u>				<u>Pell Grant Dollars</u>			
	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Proprietary</u>	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Proprietary</u>
1980-81	\$ 0.836	41.0%	54.0%	5.0%	\$ 2.708	60.1%	27.5%	12.4%
1981-82	0.889	40.6	53.8	5.6	2.499	59.8	26.1	14.1
1982-83	0.958	42.0	51.8	6.2	2.580	56.6	26.0	17.4
1983-84	1.035	44.1	49.9	6.0	2.989	56.2	23.8	20.0
1984-85	1.153	43.9	49.4	6.7	3.053	56.3	22.9	20.8
1985-86	1.234	41.8	49.4	8.8	3.597	55.9	21.7	22.4
1986-87	1.338	42.8	49.0	8.2	3.460	54.4	20.7	24.9
1987-88	1.392	45.7	47.1	7.2	3.754	53.3	20.1	26.6
1988-89	1.440	43.3	49.9	6.8	4.463	52.5	19.5	28.0
1989-90	<u>1.606</u>	<u>44.2</u>	<u>49.4</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>4.731</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>19.0</u>	<u>30.0</u>
Decade	\$11.881	43.2%	50.0%	6.8%	\$33.834	55.1%	22.2%	22.7%
Pct Change in Dollars, 1980-1989	+92.1%	+107.0%	+75.8%	+145.9%	+74.7%	+48.2%	+20.7%	+322.7%

\* Dollar amounts in billions.

Sources: Pell Grant dollar distributions were furnished by the Office of Student Financial Assistance, United States Department of Education. Data for 1980 through 1987 are actual dollars awarded; the data for 1988 and 1989 are estimates.

TABLE 30

Percentages of SEOG Grants Awarded to Public,  
Private and Proprietary Institutions' Students,  
1980-81 to 1989-90

Percent To Different Institutions

	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Pct Change</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Proprietary</u>
1980-81	\$368.8	--	51.9	39.6	8.5
1981-82	366.9	- 0.5%	50.7	41.5	7.8
1982-83	351.9	- 4.1	50.2	41.7	8.1
1983-84	352.9	+ 0.3	49.8	41.8	8.4
1984-85	374.5	+ 6.1	49.4	41.9	8.7
1985-86	411.4	+ 9.9	48.5	41.9	9.6
1986-87	392.9	- 4.5	49.0	41.4	9.6
1987-88	411.9	+ 4.8	48.9	41.4	9.7
1988-89	408.3	- 0.9	48.5	41.7	9.8
1989-90	<u>436.9</u>	<u>+ 7.0</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>9.9</u>
Decade	\$3,876.4	+18.5%	49.5%	41.5%	9.0%
Pct. Change in Dollars, 1980-1989			+10.5%	+24.7%	+38.0%

\* Dollar amounts in millions.

Note: Percentage distributions for 1987-88 through 1989-90 are estimates.

Sources: Office of Student Financial Assistance, United States Department of Education.

TABLE 31

Changes In Average College Costs, Aggregate Need-Based  
State Grants, and Aggregate Pell Grants to Colleges,  
1980-81 to 1989-90

	<u>Average College Costs</u>		<u>Aggregate State Grants</u>		<u>Pell Grants to Colleges</u>	
	<u>Dollars</u>	<u>Pct Change</u>	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Pct Change</u>	<u>Dollars*</u>	<u>Pct Change</u>
1980-81	\$4,195	--	\$0.836	--	\$2.372	--
1981-82	4,707	+12.2%	0.889	+6.3%	2.147	-9.5%
1982-83	5,205	+10.6	0.958	+7.8	2.131	-0.7
1983-84	5,735	+10.2	1.035	+8.0	2.121	-0.5
1984-85	6,018	+4.9	1.153	+11.4	2.418	+14.0
1985-86	6,478	+7.6	1.234	+7.0	2.791	+15.4
1986-87	6,823	+5.3	1.338	+8.4	2.598	-6.9
1987-88	7,529	+10.3	1.392	+4.0	2.755	+6.0
1988-89	8,098	+7.5	1.440	+3.4	3.213	+16.6
1989-90	8,863	+9.4	1.606	+11.5	3.312	+3.1
Decade		+111.3%		+92.1%		+39.6%

\* Dollar amounts in billions.

Note: State grants for 1989-90 and Pell Grants for 1988-89 and 1989-90 are estimates.

TABLE 32  
Need-Based State Grant Dollars As A Percent of Combined  
State Grants, Pell Grants to Colleges, and SEOG Dollars  
1980-81 to 1989-90

<u>State Percent</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>
Under 4.0 Pct	8	7	7	10	6	10	10	10	10	8
4.0 to 7.9 Pct	13	13	9	10	11	8	7	5	7	8
8.0 to 11.9 Pct	7	5	7	5	6	6	7	9	8	9
12.0 to 15.9 Pct	6	7	8	5	8	9	4	4	8	7
16.0 to 19.9 Pct	3	3	3	5	4	2	6	8	2	3
20.0 to 23.9 Pct	4	3	4	3	2	1	2	0	1	0
24.0 to 27.9 Pct	2	4	2	4	2	4	1	1	2	4
28.0 to 31.9 Pct	4	3	4	2	4	2	3	3	2	2
32.0 to 35.9 Pct	1	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	3	0
36.0 to 39.9 Pct	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	4
40.0 to 43.9 Pct	3	0	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	1
44.0 to 47.9 Pct	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	2	1
48.0 to 51.9 Pct	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
52.0 or Above	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
All Percentages	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
Median	11.2%	12.7%	13.5%	12.7%	13.5%	12.6%	13.3%	14.7%	13.0%	13.3%
First Quartile	5.2%	5.5%	6.5%	6.3%	6.4%	6.0%	6.7%	7.2%	6.7%	6.8%
Third Quartile	21.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	28.0%	27.3%	29.9%	29.3%	29.0%	28.0%

SECTION VII

NASSGP OFFICERS AND DIRECTORY

# 1989-90 NASSGP DIRECTORY

## Association Officers

President: Gary D. Smith, Pennsylvania

President-Elect: Francis J. Hynes, New York

Past President: Shirley A. Ort, Washington

Secretary: Edward M. Shannon III, South Carolina

Treasurer: Douglas L. Collins, Oregon

Council Members: Porfirio R. Diaz, Arizona  
Sheila Joyner, Oklahoma

## Past Presidents

1966-67	Arthur S. Marmaduke (California)	1977-78	Haskell Rhett (New Jersey)
1967-68	Joseph D. Boyd (Illinois)	1978-79	Kenneth R. Reeher (Pennsylvania)
1968-69	Ron Jursa (Michigan)	1979-80	Ron Jursa (Michigan)
1969-70	Kenneth R. Reeher (Pennsylvania)	1980-81	Eileen D. Dickinson (New York) and Ernest E. Smith (Florida)
1970-71	Elizabeth L. Ehart (New Jersey)	1981-82	Ernest E. Smith (Florida)
1971-72	Jeffrey M. Lee (Oregon)	1982-83	Barry M. Dorsey (Virginia)
1972-73	Walter G. Hannahs (New York)	1983-84	Gary K. Weeks (Oregon)
1973-74	Richard H. Johnston (Wisconsin)	1984-85	H. Kenneth Shook (Maryland)
1974-75	Ronald J. Iverson (Vermont)	1985-86	John E. Madigan (Rhode Island)
1975-76	Hugh Voss (Missouri) and Stan Broadway (North Carolina)	1986-87	Debra Wiley (Colorado)
1976-77	Stan Broadway (North Carolina)	1987-88	R. Ross Erbschloe (Arizona)
		1988-89	Shirley A. Ort (Washington)

1989-90 STATE GRANT AGENCY DIRECTORY

ALABAMA

Alabama Commission on Higher Education  
One Court Square, Suite 221  
Montgomery, Alabama 36197-0001  
Telephone: 205-269-2700

Tom A. Roberson  
Deputy Executive Director  
Joseph T. Sutton  
Executive Director  
William H. Wall  
Associate Director  
Jan B. Hilmyer  
Staff Assistant

ALASKA

Alaska Commission on Postsecondary  
Education  
P.O. Box FP  
Juneau, Alaska 99811  
Telephone: 907-465-2854  
Jane Byers Maynard  
Executive Director  
Diane Barrans  
Programs Coordinator

ARIZONA

Arizona Commission for Postsecondary  
Education  
3030 North Central Avenue, Suite 1407  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
Telephone: 602-255-3109  
Porfirio Diaz  
Executive Director  
L. R. "Louie" Bustillo  
Associate Director

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Department of Higher Education  
1220 West Third Street  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201  
Telephone: 501-371-1441  
Rosemary McGinnis  
Coordinator of Financial Aid  
Becky Collins  
Assistant Coordinator of Financial Aid  
Julie Moore  
Financial Aid Analyst

CALIFORNIA

California Student Aid Commission  
1515 "S" Street  
North Building, Suite 500  
P.O. Box 942845  
Sacramento, California 94245-0845  
Telephone: 916-445-0880  
Samuel M. Kipp III  
Executive Director  
Scott Freedman  
Deputy Director, Operations  
Greg Gollihur  
Deputy Director of Government Relations  
Jacqueline Tsang  
Deputy Director, Administration  
Peter Prentiss  
Manager, Application, Evaluation and  
Processing Branch  
Robert Quider  
Manager, School and Lender Service  
Branch  
Becky Stilling  
Manager, Pre-claims and Claims Branch  
Ken Tarr  
Manager, Collections Branch

COLORADO

Colorado Commission on Higher Education  
1300 Broadway, Second Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Telephone: 303-866-2723  
David A. Longanecker  
Executive Director  
John Ceru  
Coordinator, Student Aid Programs  
Sharon Hart  
Financial Analyst

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Department of Higher Education  
61 Woodland Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06105-2391  
Telephone: 203-566-2618  
John J. Siegrist  
Director of Student Financial Aid  
Patricia Santoro  
Assistant Director of Student  
Financial Aid

#### DELAWARE

Delaware Postsecondary Education Commission  
820 North French Street, Fourth Floor  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801  
Telephone: 302-571-3240

Marilyn R. Baker  
Associate Director  
John F. Corrozi  
Executive Director

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia Office of  
Postsecondary Education, Research,  
and Assistance (OPERA)  
1331 H Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202-727-3685  
Eloise S. Turner  
Chief, District of Columbia Office  
of Postsecondary Education,  
Research, and Assistance  
Jane E. Andersen  
Program Manager, District of Columbia  
State Student Incentive Grant  
Section (OPERA)

#### FLORIDA

Office of Student Financial Assistance  
Florida Department of Education  
1344 Florida Education Center  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Telephone: 904-488-1034  
Richard T. Lutz  
Director, Office of Student  
Financial Assistance  
M. Elizabeth Sweeney  
Administrator of State Programs,  
Office of Student Financial Assistance

#### GEORGIA

Georgia Student Finance Authority  
2082 East Exchange Place, Suite 200  
Tucker, Georgia 30084  
Telephone: 404-493-5402  
Stephen Dougherty  
Executive Director  
Robert G. McCants  
Deputy Executive Director  
David Gray  
Director, State Programs

#### HAWAII

Hawaii State Postsecondary Education  
Commission  
2444 Dole Street, Room 209  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822  
Telephone: 808-948-8213  
Carl H. Makino  
Administrative Assistant to Commission  
Albert Simone  
Administrative Officer

#### IDAHO

Idaho State Board of Education  
650 West State Street, Room 307  
Boise, Idaho 83720  
Telephone: 208-334-2270  
William Hargrove  
Public Affairs Officer

#### ILLINOIS

Illinois Student Assistance Commission  
Executive Offices:  
500 West Monroe Street, Third Floor  
Springfield, Illinois 62704  
Telephone: 217-782-6767  
Larry E. Matejka  
Executive Director  
Sheila J. Pruden  
Director, Strategic Planning and  
Policy Analysis  
Robert Clement  
Director, Agency Relations

Illinois Student Assistance Commission  
Program Operations:  
106 Wilmont Road  
Deerfield, Illinois 60015  
Telephone: 312-948-8500  
Joel Mahran  
Chief Operating Officer  
Chris Peterson  
Director, Client Services

#### INDIANA

State Student Assistance Commission  
of Indiana  
964 North Pennsylvania Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1088  
Telephone: 317-232-2350  
Natala K. Hart  
Executive Director  
S. Kathleen White  
Director, Scholarship/Grant,  
Special Programs  
Dennis Obergfell  
Director, Indiana Education Loan  
Programs

#### IOWA

Iowa College Aid Commission  
201 Jewett Building  
Ninth and Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309  
Telephone: 515-281-3501

Gary W. Nichols  
Executive Director  
John W. Heisner  
Director, Program Administration  
Stuart M. Vos  
Director, Finance and Claims  
Administration

#### KANSAS

Kansas Board of Regents  
Capitol Tower, Suite 609  
400 S.W. Eighth Street  
Topeka, Kansas 66603  
Telephone: 913-296-3517  
Clantha Carrigan McCurdy  
Director of Student Financial Aid  
Stanley Z. Koplik  
Executive Director

#### KENTUCKY

Kentucky Higher Education Assistance  
Authority  
1050 U.S. 127 South, Suite 102  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601  
Telephone: 502-564-7990  
Roger Tharp  
Director, Program Administration  
Paul P. Borden  
Executive Director  
Edwin C. Manzer  
Director, Fiscal Affairs  
Joyce A. Bryan  
Manager, Student Aid Programs

#### LOUISIANA

Governor's Special Commission on  
Education Services  
P.O. Box 91202  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-9202  
Telephone: 504-922-1011  
LA Watts: 1-800-626-0115  
Jack L. Guinn  
Acting Executive Director  
Kevin Cunningham  
Legal Counsel  
Julia G. Wagner  
Director, Loan Division  
Winona Kahao  
Scholarship/Grant Director  
Pat Storey  
Pre-claims, Claims & Collection  
Administrator  
Feltus Stewart  
Loan Administrator  
Susan Bohall  
Client Services

#### MAINE

Maine Department of Educational  
and Cultural Services  
State House, Station 119  
Augusta, Maine 04330  
Telephone: 207-289-2183  
Nancy E. Wasson  
Consultant

#### MARYLAND

State Scholarship Administration of the  
Maryland Higher Education Commission  
16 Francis Street, Suite 219  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401  
Telephone: 301-974-5370  
Janice Breslin  
Interim Executive Director  
L. Leslie Bennett  
Associate Director

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher  
Education, Scholarship Office  
150 Causeway Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114  
Telephone: 617-727-9420  
Elizabeth K. Fontaine  
Director, Scholarship Office  
Bridget Lynch  
Office Manager, Scholarship Office  
Karen Struthers  
Assistant Director, Scholarship Office

#### MICHIGAN

Michigan Higher Education Assistance  
Authority  
P.O. Box 30008  
Lansing, Michigan 48909  
Telephone: 517-373-3394  
H. Jack Nelson  
Acting Interim Director of Student  
Financial Assistance Services  
Jean Maday  
Supervisor, Scholarship/Grant Programs,  
Student Financial Assistance Services

#### MINNESOTA

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating  
Board  
Capitol Square Building, Suite 400  
550 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
Telephone: 612-296-9656  
H. James Leskee  
Director of Financial Aid  
Cheryl Maplethorpe  
Manager, State Financial Aid Programs

#### MISSISSIPPI

Board of Trustees of State Institutions  
of Higher Learning - Student Financial  
Aid  
3825 Ridgewood Road  
Jackson, Mississippi 39211-6453  
Telephone: 601-982-6570  
Dottie C. Strain  
Director for Student Financial Aid  
Ann Hajj  
Student Counselor/Office Administrator  
Kay Coleman  
Student Counselor  
Sally Williams  
Student Loan Counselor

#### MISSOURI

Coordinating Board for Higher Education  
101 Adams Street  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101  
Telephone: 314-751-2361  
Dan Peterson  
Senior Associate for Student Financial  
Aid Programs (Grants)  
Madelyn Peregrin  
Senior Associate for Student Financial  
Aid Programs (Loans)  
Jacque Straub  
Student Financial Aid Associate (ISC)  
Karen Misjak  
Student Financial Aid Associate (Lenders)  
Arnold Woods  
Student Financial Aid Associate (Schools)

#### MONTANA

Montana Guaranteed Student Loan Program  
33 South Last Chance Gulch  
Helena, Montana 59620  
Telephone: 406-444-6594  
William J. Lannan  
Director, Montana Guaranteed  
Student Loan Program

#### NEBRASKA

Nebraska Coordinating Commission  
for Postsecondary Education  
Capitol Building, Sixth Floor  
P.O. Box 95005  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509  
Telephone: 402-471-2847  
Bruce Stahl  
Executive Director

#### NEVADA

State Department of Education  
400 West King Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
Telephone: 702-885-3101  
Marcia Reardon  
Associate Superintendent  
Mike Aleustoy

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire Postsecondary Education  
Commission

Two Industrial Park Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-8512  
Telephone: 603-271-2555

James A. Busselle  
Executive Director  
Ronald Wilson  
Student Aid Coordinator

#### NEW JERSEY

New Jersey Department of Higher Education  
Office of Student Assistance  
4 Quakerbridge Plaza, CN 540  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625  
Telephone: 609-588-3268

John F. Brugel  
Assistant Chancellor  
Brett E. Lief  
Deputy, Assistant Chancellor  
Richard J. Innocenzi  
Director, Office of Student Loan  
Bruce Kniering  
Director, Office of Information  
Systems  
Brett E. Lief  
Acting Director, Office of Grants and  
Scholarships  
Lutz Berkner  
Coordinator, Student Assistance Research

#### NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Commission on Higher Education  
1068 Cerrillos Road  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-4295  
Telephone: 505-827-8300

James McLaughlin  
Director of Planning and Program  
Development

#### NEW YORK

New York State Higher Education  
Services Corporation  
99 Washington Avenue, Room 1438  
Albany, New York 12255  
Telephone: 518-473-0431

Cornelius J. Foley  
President  
Francis J. Hynes  
Vice President, Grants & Scholarships

#### NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina State Education  
Assistance Authority  
P.O. Box 2688  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515-2688  
Telephone: 919-549-8614

Stan C. Broadway  
Executive Director  
Charles F. George, Jr.  
Associate Director  
Debra Redden  
Assistant Director for Health,  
Science and Mathematics  
Julia Martin  
Manager, Scholarship and Grant  
Programs

#### NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State Board of Higher  
Education  
State Capitol, 10th Floor  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505  
Telephone: 701-224-4114  
Clark J. Wold  
Associate Commissioner for  
Student Affairs

#### OHIO

Ohio Board of Regents  
30 East Broad Street, 36th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: 614-466-7420

Charles W. Seward III  
Director  
Thomas Lee Rudd  
Assistant Director  
Barbara K. Metheney  
Administrator  
Susan Minturn  
Assistant Administrator

#### OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher  
Education  
500 Education Building  
State Capitol Complex  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105  
Telephone: 405-521-2444

Sheila Joyner  
Director, Oklahoma Tuition Aid  
Grant Program  
Sarah Kelley  
Assistant Director, Oklahoma Tuition  
Aid Grant Program

#### OREGON

Oregon State Scholarship Commission  
1445 Willamette Street  
Eugene, Oregon 97401  
Telephone: 503-686-4166  
Jeffrey M. Lee  
Executive Director  
Douglas L. Collins  
Deputy Director  
James A. Beyer  
Director, Grant Programs

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania Higher Education  
Assistance Agency  
660 Boas Street  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102  
Telephone: 717-257-2500  
Kenneth R. Reeher  
Executive Director  
Thomas R. Fabian  
Executive Deputy Director  
Gary D. Smith  
Deputy for Grants  
Jerry S. Davis  
Director, Research and Policy  
Analysis

#### RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island Higher Education  
Assistance Authority  
560 Jefferson Boulevard  
Warwick, Rhode Island 02886  
Telephone: 401-277-2050  
Elwood G. Farber  
Executive Director  
Anthony M. Ferraro  
Deputy Director

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina Higher Education  
Tuition Grants Commission  
Post Office Box 12159  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
Telephone: 803-734-1200  
Edward M. Shannon III  
Executive Director  
Margaret P. Shannon  
Assistant Director

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Department of Education and Cultural  
Affairs, Office of the Secretary  
700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-2291  
Telephone: 605-773-3134  
Roxie Thielen  
Administrative Aide  
James O. Hansen  
Department Secretary

#### TENNESSEE

Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation  
Parkway Towers, Suite 1950  
404 James Robertson Parkway  
Parkway Towers  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219  
Telephone: 615-741-1346  
Ron Gambill  
Executive Director  
Karen Myers  
Program Administrator  
Naomi Derryberry  
Systems Analyst

#### TEXAS

Texas Higher Education Coordinating  
Board  
P.O. Box 12788, Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711  
Telephone: 512-462-6325  
Mack C. Adams  
Assistant Commissioner for  
Student Services  
Jane Innis Caldwell  
Director of Special Programs  
Gustavo O. DeLeon  
Director of Grant Programs  
Bill Stewart  
Director, Loan Program Operations

#### UTAH

Utah State Board of Regents  
355 West North Temple  
3 Triad, Suite 550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1205  
Telephone: 801-538-5256  
David A. Feitz  
Assistant Commissioner for  
Financial Aid  
Brenda B. Jensen  
Program Assistant

#### VERMONT

Vermont Student Assistance Corporation  
P.O. Box 2000, Champlain Mill  
Winooski, Vermont 05404  
Telephone: 802-655-9602  
Donald R. Vickers  
Associate Executive Director  
Edward P. Franzeim, Jr.  
Director, Grant Programs  
Richard Ackerman  
Director, Fiscal Affairs  
Britta Anderson  
Director, Federal Affairs,  
Research and Planning

#### VIRGINIA

State Council of Higher Education  
for Virginia  
James Monroe Building  
101 North 14th Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219  
Telephone: 804-225-2141  
Gordon K. Davies  
Director  
Barry M. Dorsey  
Associate Director  
Debra Wiley  
Acting Coordinator  
James Alessio  
Assistant Director

#### WASHINGTON

Washington Higher Education Coordinating  
Board  
917 Lakeridge Way, Mail Stop GV-11  
Olympia, Washington 98504  
Telephone: 206-753-3571  
Shirley A. Ort  
Deputy Director for Student Financial  
Aid and Government Relations  
Betty Fallihee  
Assistant Director for Audit, Research  
and Support Services  
Martin Harding  
Policy Associate for Research  
John Klacik  
Associate Director & Grants Manager

#### WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia Higher Education  
Central Office  
P. O. Box 4007  
Charleston, West Virginia 25364  
Telephone: 304-348-2101  
John F. Thralls  
Acting Senior Administrator & Director  
of Student & Educational Services  
Robert E. Long  
Grant Program Coordinator  
Sherri L. Sumpter  
Grant Program Administrator  
Diana P. Wood  
Financial Aid Administrator

#### WISCONSIN

Higher Educational Aids Board  
P.O. Box 7885  
Madison, Wisconsin 53707  
Telephone: 608-266-1665  
Jon E. Litscher  
Executive Secretary  
Donovan K. Fowler  
Administrator, Program and Policy

#### WYOMING

Wyoming Community College Commission  
122 West 25th Street  
Herschler Building, Second West  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002  
Telephone: 307-777-7763  
James Meznec  
Executive Director

#### PUERTO RICO

Council on Higher Education  
Box 23305, U.P.R. Station  
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931  
Telephone: 809-758-3350  
Ramon Burgos-Diaz  
Associate Executive Director