2004 AIR/NPEC RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSAL

Allocating College Financial Aid on the Basis of Merit: Program Impact on Student Success in Terms of Whether and Where to Attend College

Florida Department of Education databases used:
Office of Student Financial Aid, Bright Futures Eligibility and Disbursement data
Division of Colleges and Universities, College Application, Acceptance, and Enrollment data
K-12, High School Graduates GPA and SAT/ACT data
Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), Post-high school Outcomes and National Clearinghouse College Enrollment data

Data will also be compiled from:
Barron's Profiles of American Colleges

Grant Amount Requested: $29,998

Principal Investigator:
Lora Cohen-Vogel, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Education Policy
Florida State University, 113 Stone Building
Tallahassee, FL 32312
Phone: 850-668-1413 Fax: 850-644-1258
E-mail: cohenvog@coe.fsu.edu

Authorized Institutional Representative:
Kirby W. Kemper
Vice President for Research
Florida State University, 97 S. Woodward Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Phone: 850-644-5260 FAX: 850-644-1464
E-mail: jjames@mailer.fsu.edu

_____ _____

Principal Investigator Authorized Institutional Representative

PROJECT SUMMARY

Allocating College Financial Aid on the Basis of Merit: Program Impact on Student Success in Terms of Whether and Where to Attend College

The purpose of the proposed study is to examine Florida's Bright Futures Scholarship Program and its effects on the attendance rates and college choices of the state's students. Specifically, it seeks to understand whether merit-aid programs like Bright Futures differentially impacts whether and where students of varying races/ethnicities and abilities attend college as well as the implications for racial and ability stratification among colleges. The proposed project involves new analysis of student records data available from Florida's Department of Education. College enrollment is a function of three factors: a student's application decisions, institutions' acceptance decisions, and student's final college choice. Because the Bright Futures Program may affect each of these decision-making stages differently, analyses will compare the demographic and academic composition of Florida high school graduates applying to, being accepted at, and attending different Florida colleges and universities before and after the program's implementation. Within the literature on merit aid, the study would be the first to recognize that enrollment is a function of both individual student choice and institutional preferences in the statistical model and to estimate the impact of such programs on *student-institution matches*. In a policy environment that seemingly favors merit aid to its needs-based predecessors, it is crucial for policy-makers and institutional researchers and planners alike to understand the social and economic implications of the shift.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Allocating College Financial Aid on the Basis of Merit: Program Impact on Student Success in Terms of Whether and Where to Attend College

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Prior to the late 1980s, merit-based aid represented only a tiny portion of student aid for college (McPherson and Schapiro, 1998). Today, over a dozen states have adopted broad-based merit aid programs that generally waive tuition and fees at postsecondary institutions in a student's home state (Dynarski, 2003). In Georgia, two times the number of students now receive publicly funded merit scholarships than receive need-based Pell Grants. The goals of merit-aid programs are to make college accessible to all those who qualify and to encourage high school graduates to remain in state for college. Do these politically popular programs benefit all students equally? Do they offer different types of students disparate chances to succeed in terms of whether and where they enroll in college?

The answers to these questions are central in the context of growing attention among policymakers, foundations and the media[1] to the so-called attainment gap. According to the National Governors Association, improving the postsecondary entry and completion rates of underrepresented groups is necessary to maintain the nation's international competitiveness. The Association estimates a deficit of 12 million highly skilled workers by 2020 (NGA, 9/15/03).

Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program

Florida boasts the second largest merit-based scholarship program in the nation (after Georgia's HOPE program), having awarded Bright Futures Scholarships to 110,000 new and

[1] See The National Governors Association's Higher Education Productivity Summit, September, 2003 at http://www.nga.org/nga/newsRoom/pressReleaseDetailPrint/1,1422,5885,00.html; the Social Science Research Council's announcement at http://www.ssrc.org/programs/education/transitions; and, Atlanta Journal-Constitution recent series on Georgia's HOPE program at http://www.ajc.com/metro/content/metro/hope/10hopegrades.html

continuing students during the 2002-2003 academic year alone (Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 2003). Students can qualify for one of three awards. The Florida Academic Scholars program pays one hundred percent of tuition (which includes some fees) plus $300 per semester for expenses, and requires a 3.5 grade point average, an SAT score of 1270, and 75 hours of community service to qualify. Florida Medallion Scholars must attain a 3.0 GPA and a 970 on the SAT to receive a scholarship equivalent to seventy-five percent of tuition. Finally, Gold Seal Vocational Scholars also receive seventy-five percent of tuition at a public postsecondary institution in Florida when they earn a 3.0 GPA and a 440 or above on each section (Verbal and Math) of the SAT (or equivalent CPT or ACT score).

Our goal for the study is to examine the effects of the Bright Futures Scholarship Program on the attendance rates and college choices of Florida's students. Specifically, we ask, does the merit-aid program differentially affect whether and where students of varying races/ethnicities and abilities attend college, and what are the implications for racial and ability stratification among colleges? For the project, we will use data compiled by various state agencies to assemble a database that includes the *universe* of Florida's high school graduates from 1996 through 2003. The seven-year time frame will allow us to explore the level and distribution of college enrollment before and after the implementation of Bright Futures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Success: Access to Higher Education

The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University is concerned that the replacement[2] of need-based programs with merit-aid programs will actually make "the inequities in college

---

[2] See also Heller (2003). Recently, some experts have questioned whether state funding for merit-aid programs has indeed been shifted from need-based programs (see Longanecker (2002)).

participation worse" (Heller & Marin, 2002, p. 2). From this perspective, these income "neutral" programs actually favor students from better-off families who, on average, obtain the highest grades and SAT scores (which are used to award the scholarships)[3]:

> From a civil rights standpoint, shifting from need-based to "merit" aid means shifting funds from blacks, Latinos, and Native Americans to whites and Asians, from city and rural residents to suburban residents, from children from one-parent families to those who have two parents (p. 3).

In fact, little is known about whether merit-aid scholarship programs encourage disparate access to higher education among different subpopulations of students.

Formative research conducted in Georgia showed that between 1993, when that state's HOPE program was instituted, and 1997 Black enrollment rates at four-year public and private colleges rose 21 and 16 percent, respectively, compared with 5 and 12 percent rate increases among whites (Cornwell, Mustard, & Sridhar, 2002; Sridhar, 2001). However, students who, absent the scholarship, would have attended college out of state largely accounted for these increases. In fact, less than 10 percent of HOPE scholarships have been awarded to students who would not have otherwise attended college (Cornwell & Mustard, 2002), suggesting that the funds are being disbursed to students who, without the award, would have been able to cover the cost of tuition. In fact, a recent review by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution found that the family incomes of the majority of HOPE scholars are too high to qualify for federal need-based aid[4]. At Georgia Southern University, the parental income of 7 in 10 HOPE Scholarship recipients exceeded the state's average ($41,707) (Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 2003).

Student Success: Not Whether, But Where?

[3] To add insult to injury, they say, merit-based programs are replacing needs based programs at the same time that tuition costs are soaring and affirmative action policies are being discontinued.
[4] Includes scholars whose families did not apply for the federal aid.

In addition to studying the impact of Bright Futures on the rate of college attendance, we will explore its effects on the college choices of students of varying abilities and races/ethnicities. While early evidence suggests that merit-aid programs may modestly expand access to higher education, scholars increasingly concur that policy evaluation should focus not only on whether but also where a student attends college. Harvard Professor Carolyn Hoxby, in the introduction of a new volume entitled *College Choices: The Economics of Where to Go, When to Go, and How to Pay for It* writes, "opportunities to attend college have sufficiently expanded that almost every young person who is eligible and likely to benefit from college does try it at some point, in some form" (p. 3). As a result, "a new or important policy has little effect on attendance, but does significantly affect students' other college choices" (p. 3).

Researchers have long explored the role of postsecondary education in individual economic opportunity and collective economic development. For example, at an individual level, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that the annual income of people with associates degrees is significantly less than the income of their counterparts with bachelors degrees (United States Census Bureau, 2002). Increasingly, however, it is not only whether but also where a student attends college that significantly affects life chances.

First, the type of institution a student attends impacts the likelihood of degree attainment. New analyses of the High School and Beyond (HS&B) and NELS_88 datasets show that college type is *the* most important institutional factor related to college completion (Melguizo, 2003). Net of student intentions to graduate, students who first attend a four-year institution are more likely to finish college than those who transfer to a four-year college from a two-year. Hispanics, and Mexican-Americans in particular, are more likely to begin postsecondary education at two-year institutions, and, according to Melguizo, are less likely to earn a baccalaureate degree as a result.

Second, peer effects seem to grant students different opportunities both during college and throughout their lives. Hoxby (1997) documents rising stratification by student aptitude among baccalaureate-granting colleges over the last 50 years (1997), and argues that such stratification disadvantages low-ability students who are increasingly enrolled in institutions with few high-performing peers. Moreover, she documents that aptitude sorting among colleges and universities contributes to the observed growth in the income dispersion among college-educated Americans (Hoxby & Terry, 1999). We speculate that the linkage between institutional stratification and income dispersion may in part be explained by the social networks that arise from the college experience. Social networks comprised of high-performing students may offer more and better work prospects because the network members' career potential is higher. Additionally, more selective institutions lend prestige to their graduates, and this prestige "opens doors" as well.

In sum, students' college choices have implications for college completion, career opportunities, and lifetime earnings. Next, we theorize about the possible consequences of merit aid for the distribution of students throughout Florida's postsecondary institutions.

Stratifying Institutions by Ability? Changes in the relative prices of institutions (between two- and four-year; in-state and out-of-state) as a result of merit-based aid should impact a student's decisions about the institutions to which he applies and ultimately enrolls. While the benefit from merit aid of attending college in state is the same at all institutions, differences among a state's colleges in quality (both perceived and 'real' in terms of revealed preferences) will create competition among aid recipients for admission. Competition is manifested in student application decisions and college admission decisions (Kim, 2004). We expect this competition to stratify institutions by ability, and to the extent that student ability is correlated with parental wealth, by income. Due to the marginal benefits to scholarship recipients of staying in Florida,

for example, individuals who prior to Bright Futures would have chosen to attend college out of state may be occupying more slots at Florida's top universities, constraining the enrollment options of lower performing (and lower income) students.

Stratifying Institutions by Race? Other factors may also be at play. While Bright Futures and other merit-aid programs reduce the total cost of college and, as a result, make attendance possible where it may not have otherwise been, the additional expenses associated with college may constrain student choice of institution. Students with limited means may chose institutions closest to home, saving the cost of room and board which for residents accounts for about half of college-related expenses in Florida and which the Bright Futures program does not cover (OPPAGA, 2003). Because parental income and student race are highly correlated, choice of institution may be more constrained for minorities.

In addition to comparing the distribution of students by race across Florida's colleges before and after Bright Futures, the study will specifically track enrollment at the state's top institutions. Even when legal mandates[5] preclude using race as a factor in college admission decisions, the nation's top institutions develop strategies to promote equal access and integration. Aggressive recruitment strategies, a de-emphasis on standardized test scores in admission decisions, and assigning points to applicants who have overcome hardships are among these strategies. Grodsky (2002) has shown that more elite institutions prefer African American and to a lesser extent Latino applicants to non-Hispanic white applicants, all else being equal, and this institutional preference creates fairly uniform postsecondary opportunities across race/ethnic groups. Programs like Bright Futures that award college aid solely on the basis of merit (SAT scores and GPAs, both of which are higher on average for non-Hispanic whites than for blacks

[5] The Fifth Circuit in Hopwood prohibited weighing race as a factor in admissions, although the Eleventh Circuit did not take such a stand. Florida's Governor has endorsed a plan called "One Florida" that uses an executive order to prohibit using race in admissions decisions at state institutions.

and Hispanics) may run counter to this opportunity-equalizing feature of more selective institutions' admission preferences.

Finally, research suggests that cultural norms and social networks in part account for student application and enrollment decisions. While Bright Futures Scholarships may increase student subgroups' chances of attaining some form of postsecondary education, its effect on student preferences for certain types of institutions may vary among different subgroups. For example, data reveal that a disproportionately high percentage of black college students earn bachelors degrees from historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). With few HBCUs in Florida, (and many more in neighboring Alabama (14) and Georgia (10)), a shift to Florida institutions from out-of-state HBCUs as a result of the cost-reducing effect of Bright Futures could mean a rising competitiveness among Florida's HBCU applications and/or a shift away from out-of-state HBCUs and towards the state's non-HBCU options by Black Florida high school graduates. The implications of such a shift are largely unknown, though there is some evidence that HBCUs improve Black students' completion rates and earning potential as compared to non-HBCUs (Constantine, 1995).

PROPOSED WORK PLAN

Data

To explore the level and distribution of enrollment in Florida's postsecondary institutions before and after Bright Futures, the proposed project involves new analysis of data available primarily from Florida's Department of Education, as well as supplemental data from *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*. The Florida Department of Education annually collects information from school districts and other sources (e.g. postsecondary institutions) for all high school graduates. The database consists of student academic performance in high school, scores

on standardized exams (e.g. SAT, ACT, CPT), free or reduced price lunch eligibility, race, Bright Futures eligibility, and postsecondary enrollment decisions. The databases (from the Department of Education Divisions of K-12, FETPIP, Colleges and Universities, Office of Student Financial Aid) can be merged into one megafile by matching student social security numbers and other identifying information. As of this proposal's writing, data requests are being submitted to Florida's Department of Education. The Florida Department of Education's Data Warehouse will help facilitate these requests. Physical and electronic access to the data will be limited to the project investigators to guarantee confidentiality. Accompanying the data requests are security plans to protect the confidentiality of the student records. These plans are modeled after two written by the Principal Investigator[6] to the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education as part of a request for restricted-use survey data. Both plans were approved by the agency. Additionally, the proposed project shall be approved by the Institutional Review Board of Florida State University before work begins.

We will select students from the database who graduated high school in either 1996, 1997, or 2001. The 1996 high school cohort graduated one year before the first Bright Futures Scholarships were awarded. The 1997 cohort graduated the year Bright Futures was created. Before the program's implementation, most of these students had sent applications, received offers from colleges, and selected the college they would attend. The 1997 cohort represents an appropriate comparison group, since the only major difference between like students in the two cohorts (1996 and 1997) was the availability of Bright Futures scholarship money. Thus, changes in application, acceptance, and enrollment patterns are likely due to the financial benefit that Bright Futures gave the 1997 cohort. Students graduating high school in 2001 began their high school careers during the first year of implementation (1997). Compared to the 1997 graduating

[6] Plans were submitted formally by the P.I.'s advisors at Vanderbilt University.

cohort, the 2001 cohort provides an opportunity to look at the behavioral responses (e.g., SAT preparation) of students and institutions to the incentives Bright Futures presents. The size of the graduating cohorts has grown each year, but in general each contains between 95,000 and 105,000 students who received regular diplomas from Florida high schools.

The longitudinal nature of the data will permit us to address our first goal, as we trace enrollment changes among subpopulations of students over time. Specifically, we will compare enrollment rates before and after the Bright Futures program was established. But, from our theoretical perspective, only when knowledge about changes in enrollment rates among subpopulations is augmented with information about enrollment distribution patterns across colleges will we fully unpack the implications of Bright Futures for a student's lifelong economic and social opportunities. As such, the second stage of our analysis plan will allow us to address whether and how Bright Futures affects sorting students by ability and race.

Empirics: Modeling Approach and Variables

College enrollment is a function of three factors: a student's application decisions, institutions' acceptance decisions, and student's final college choice. The potential impacts of Bright Futures that we have discussed (e.g., racial and ability sorting) affect these decision-making stages differently. We propose to analyze the three stages discretely to capture these differences.

We will begin with a series of descriptive statistical analyses that will compare the demographic and academic composition of Florida high school graduates applying to, accepted at, and attending the different types of institutions (four-year vs. two-year, public vs. private, in-state vs. out-of-state) before and after the implementation of Bright Futures. The results of these findings will provide a foundation for the questions and answers that we will address through the

next phase of our analysis. Subsequently, our statistical analysis will answer (a) what stage(s) in the college (four-year) decision process (application, acceptance, enrollment) is linked to the observed changes in college attendance, and (b) what was the relative impact of Bright Futures scholarships, students' demographic characteristics, and other factors in those decisions.

We will use sequentially estimated logistic regression to model the three discrete outcome variables: application, acceptance, and enrollment (Agresti, 1996; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1989; Madalla, 1983).[7] Ultimately, this analysis will allow us to identify a particular type of student and the probability of that student applying to, being accepted at, and enrolling in a particular Florida university.[8]

The three equations we will estimate may be written as follows:

$$A_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_{1i} S_i + \alpha_{2j} I_{jt} + u_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

$$B_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_{1i} S_i + \beta_{2j} I_{jt} + v_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

and

$$C_{ij} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_{1i} S_i + \gamma_{2j} I_{jt} + w_{ij}, \quad (3)$$

where u_{ij}, v_{ij}, and w_{ij} are random error terms.

Equation (1) represents the choice of the i^{th} student to apply to the j^{th} institution (A_{ij}) as a function of a vector of student characteristics (S_i) and a vector of institutional characteristics at the time (*t*) the student applied (I_{jt}). Included in the student characteristics are both demographic and academic information (including Bright Futures eligibility, or the academic performance measures that define that eligibility), as well as categorical variables reflecting other decisions the student made (e.g., other colleges applied to) and the high school cohort from which the

[7] Compared to other methodologies available to help evaluate our question (e.g., structural equation modeling), our methodological choice has the advantage of relative clarity in its description and specification as well as in the interpretation of its results.

[8] These probabilities are similar to transition probabilities we might estimate in a Markov process, except the transition in this case is unidirectional.

student came. The institutional characteristics include the racial and academic performance distribution of students at that institution at time *t*.

Equation (2) is limited to the subset of students accepted to a particular institution and models the choice (B_{ij}) that the j^{th} institution with characteristics I_{jt} will accept the i^{th} student with characteristics S_i. Many of the components of the student and institutional characteristics vectors in this estimation will mirror those of the application estimation. Such factors as the student and institution's demographic and academic characteristics, for example, will remain in all estimation stages. However, this stage's components will by no means be identical to the first estimation stage; other institutions to which the student applied are irrelevant at this stage, for instance.

Equation (3) estimates the effect of various student and institutional characteristics (S_i and I_{jt}, respectively) on the student's decision to enroll in the institution (C_{ij}). Again, the vectors of characteristics will vary from stage to stage, and at this stage interactions among categorical variables representing the other institutions to which a student was accepted will provide some interesting insights.

DESCRIPTION OF POLICY RELEVANCE

Nationwide, the number and size of merit-based relative to need-based programs is growing (e.g. Tennessee will implement its new HOPE program this fall), reflecting not only ideological shifts in education policy but also the political constraints of legislatures searching for acceptable ways to spend lottery dollars. In a policy environment that favors merit aid to its needs-based predecessors, it is crucial to understand the social and economic implications of the shift.

Discussions regarding the consequences of merit-based scholarship programs for racial and economic equity have thus far largely overlooked the issue of institutional stratification. The vast majority of policy-makers and institutional administrators seek to devise ways to create and sustain economic and job growth while at the same time satisfying other key postsecondary education goals that include increased *access* and *diversity*. Merit aid programs may represent the 'silver bullet'; without commitment to their study, however, we may never know.

DISSEMINATION PLAN

Our dissemination plan follows a multi-pronged approach. First, we intend to publish articles in quality, refereed journals in the fields of higher education and economics. Second, because conference attendance improves our research and provides access to policymakers and interested scholars, we will pursue presentation opportunities at two national conferences (in addition to the AIR Forum and NPEC conference), at a minimum. Potential conferences include the American Educational Research Association, the American Education Finance Association, the Association for the Study of Higher Education, and the National Bureau of Economic Research Conference on Higher Education. Third, we will seek out and take advantage of opportunities to speak at various academic and policy forums (in the state and beyond) concerned with Bright Futures, HOPE, and similar merit-aid programs. Fourth, we have been invited to submit our research on Bright Futures to a new resource center created by the Social Science Research Council. Their initiative entitled "Transitions to College: From Theory to Practice" focuses on the extent to which conditions for opportunity and success are available to all American adolescents as they navigate the transitions from secondary school to college completion and the workplace. (See http://www.ssrc.org/programs/education/transitions.) Fifth,

we intend to expand Lora Cohen-Vogel's Florida State University website to make these Bright Futures findings widely accessible.

DISCUSSION OF INNOVATIONS

Three innovations characterize our proposal. First, an extensive review of the scholarly literature reveals that the vast majority of the empirical work on merit-based aid in higher education has focused on Georgia's HOPE scholarship program. Where Florida and other state's merit-aid programs appear among the analyses of state merit-aid programs, generally only program specifics are discussed (e.g. size of program, program implementation date). As a result, much of the policy discussion around merit aid for college relies solely on the Georgia experience. Because program components and state contexts (e.g. demographics, supply of postsecondary institutions) differ, generalizing about program efficacy on the basis of one case is unwise. Our proposal represents the first extensive, empirical study of merit aid in a state outside of Georgia.

Second, the database we are assembling is innovative in that it is an unusually comprehensive combination of data sets collected from a variety of institutions and levels of government. Unlike most other studies of college attendance decisions and college persistence and performance, which are based on data from an individual institution or a sample of students or institutions (e.g., IPEDS), this study analyzes data from the universe of students and institutions in Florida.[9]

Third, our study is unique as it estimates the impact of merit-aid programs on *student-institution matches*. It recognizes that enrollment is a function of both individual student choice and institutional preferences and behavior. We are not aware of any work on merit-aid programs

[9] Statistical significance of the results becomes a trivial concern given the size of the population in the data set.)

that extend their analyses to pre-enrollment decisions, namely, student application and institution acceptance decisions.

DISCUSSION OF AUDIENCE

We anticipate that our findings will be of substantial interest to state level policymakers. In 2002-2003, over $202 million of state revenue were used to fund the Bright Futures program. DOE projections for the current school year top $230 million (www.fldoe.org/gr/pdf/11-20-03). Information about the changes in both the level and dispersion of students in the state's colleges and universities is crucial for evaluating the program's outcomes. If a primary goal of Bright Futures is to extend college access to traditionally underserved populations and we find that they are better served as a result, policymakers may work even harder to ensure that the program is fully supported - even expanded - every year. If, however, we find a lower probability that certain subpopulations of the state's students attend Florida's more selective universities, for example, then it begs the question whether access alone is sufficient to provide the opportunities policy makers envisioned.

Equally interested will be administrators and institutional research and planning professionals in the state's colleges and universities. Without information about the macro policy environment, such researchers cannot adequately evaluate the effectiveness of their own programs to drive enrollment change at their schools. With over a quarter of Florida's state university presidents having served in elected office in the state, there is ever greater attention among administrators to the linkages between state level policy and demographic trends on campus.

References Cited

Agresti, A. (1996). *An Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kempner, M. & A. Jones. (2003, November 11). College is already affordable, likely for most recipients. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution.* Available from http://www.ajc.com/metro/content/metro/hope/11need.html

Constantine, Jill M. (1995). The effect of attending historically black colleges and universities on future wages of black students. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* April, pp. 531 - 546.

Cornwell, C. & Mustard, D. (2002). Race and the effects of Georgia's HOPE scholarship. In D. Heller & P. Marin (Eds.), *Who Should We Help? The Negative Social Consequences of Merit Scholarships*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

Cornwell, C., Mustard, D., & D. Sridhar, D.J. (2001). The enrollment effects of merit-based financial aid: Evidence from Georgia's HOPE scholarship. Paper presented at the National Bureau of Economic Research Conference on Higher Education Access, Cambridge, MA.

Dynarski, S. (2004). The new merit aid. In C. Hoxby (Ed.), C*ollege Choices: The Economics of Where to Go, When to Go, and How to Pay for It.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grodsky, E. (2002). Constrained opportunity and student choice in American higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2002). Available from *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Publication No. AAT 3060591.

Heller, D. & Marin, P. (2002). *Who Should We Help? The Negative Social Consequences of Merit Scholarships.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

Heller, D. & Rasmussen, C. (2001). Do merit scholarships promote college access? Evidence from two states. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.

Hosmer, D.W. & Lemeshow, S. (1989). *Applied Logistic Regression.* New York: The Free Press.

Hoxby, C. (1997). How the changing market structure of U.S. higher education explains college tuition. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper*: 6323. Available from http://www.nber.org.

Hoxby, C and B. Terry. (1999). Explaining rising income and wage inequality among the college-educated. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper*: 6873. Available from http://www.nber.org.

Hoxby, C. (2004). C*ollege Choices: The Economics of Where to Go, When to Go, and How to Pay for It.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kim, Dongbin (2004). The effect of financial aid on students' college choice: Differences by racial groups. *Research in Higher Education*, 45 (1), 43–70.

Longanecker, D. (2002, March). Is merit-based student aid really trumping need-based aid**?** *Change*, 34 (2). Available from http://www.findarticles.com

Madalla, G. S. (1983). *Limited Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McPherson, Michael S. and Morton Owen Shapiro (1998). *The Student Aid Game: Meeting Need and Rewarding Talent in American Higher Education.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Melguizo, T. (2004). What types of institutions are doing a better job graduating minorities? A comparative analysis for African American, Hispanic, and white students in the U.S. in the last two decades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

National Governors Association (NGA). (2003, September 15). Containing costs, increasing access, and maintaining quality among issues at higher education productivity summit [Conference Proceedings]. Available from http://www.nga.org/nga/newsRoom/

Office of Program, Planning, and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA). (2003). *Information Brief: College Attendance Costs Vary and Result From Higher Tuition, Room, and Board*, Report No. 03-33.

Sridhar, D.J. (2001). Postsecondary enrollment effects of merit-based financial aid: Evidence from Georgia's HOPE scholarship program. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Georgia, 2001). Available from *Dissertation Abstracts International*.

United States Census Bureau. (2002, March) [Educational attainment: People 18 years old and over, by total money earnings in 2001 by age, race, hispanic origin, and sex]. Available from http://ferret.bls.census.gov/macro/032002/perinc/new04_001.htm

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Principal Investigator
Lora Cohen-Vogel, Ph.D.

Specializing in education politics and policy, Lora Cohen-Vogel is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education at Florida State University. Using large-scale databases and sophisticated analytical tools (e.g. Hierarchical Linear Modeling), she has conducted a variety of quantitative studies including a dissertation project that was awarded an American Educational Research Association (AERA) Dissertation Grant in 2001. The project which analyzed data from the National Center for Education Statistic's *Schools and Staffing Survey* was a frontrunner for AERA's Division of Educational Policy and Politics Outstanding Dissertation Award and has been presented before the AERA Grants Board. It was in this setting that Lora became acquainted with Barbara Schneider and other scholars whose work on transitions to and success in college stimulated her interest in postsecondary education. Since that time Lora has studied the factors that explain the diffusion of merit aid policies throughout America's Southeast. Lora earned her doctorate from Vanderbilt University and her baccalaureate degree from Colgate University. A selection of her publication and presentations follows as part of an abbreviated curriculum vitae.

Brief Curriculum Vitae: Lora Cohen-Vogel

EDUCATION

Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 2002
Doctor of Philosophy, Leadership and Policy Studies

Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
Bachelor of Arts Degree, Psychology (minor: Education) 1992

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Assistant Professor of Education Policy, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Florida State University. Tallahassee, FL. Fall, 2002 – present.

Analyst, Education Policy Team, Gubernatorial Campaign: Bredesen for Governor. Nashville, Tennessee. 2002.

Research Fellow, Department of Leadership and Organizations, Vanderbilt University. Co-authored articles using large, national data sets; edited book proofs and manuscripts; helped procure $500,000 from W.T. Grant Foundation to study the consequences of court-ended desegregation; contributed to multiple grant proposals. 1997-2001

Research Assistant, Peabody Center for Education Policy, Vanderbilt University (Professor James W. Guthrie). 1997-1998

HONORS & ACHIEVEMENTS

Dissertation Award (Finalist), American Educational Research Association. 2003.
First Year Assistant Professor Award, Florida State University. 2003.
Postdoctoral Fellowship, Spencer Foundation. Hosting institution: Center for Social Organization of Schooling, Johns Hopkins University. Awarded & declined, 2002
University Graduate Fellowship for Outstanding Scholarship, Vanderbilt University. 1997-2001
Roe L. Johns Award, American Education Finance Association. Topic: Student performance after school finance reform. 2000
Honors Thesis, Colgate University. Topic: Student performance and new testing technologies. 1992

SELECT PUBLICATIONS

Referred Journals

Goldring, E. and Cohen-Vogel, L (Under review, *Teachers College Record*). Neighborhood capacity in the postbusing era: What does "closer to home" really mean for families and schools?

Cohen-Vogel, L. (2003). Coupling public school choice and accountability: Implications for school governance. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 78 (4).

Smrekar, C. & Cohen-Vogel, L. (2001). The voices of parents: Rethinking the intersection of family and schools, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76 (2).

Cohen-Vogel, L. & Cohen-Vogel, D. (2000). School finance reform in Tennessee: Inching towards adequacy. *Journal of Education Finance*, 26 (3).

Working Books

Cohen-Vogel, L. & Herrington, C. (Eds.). *The Politics of Teacher and Administrator Training: The Quality Controversy.* Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association. Published simultaneously as a special issue of *Educational Policy*.

SELECT PRESENTATIONS

Invited Presentations

Cohen-Vogel, D. & Cohen-Vogel, L. Equity and adequacy in Tennessee's system of public education. Presentation to the Tennessee General Assembly, Nashville, Tennessee. September, 2000.

National Conferences

Cohen-Vogel, L. School governance and leadership at the intersection of public school choice and performance-based accountability. American Educational Research Association, National Awardee Conference, Washington, DC October, 2003.

Cohen-Vogel, L. When schools of choice are held accountable, who's in charge? American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. April, 2003.

Cohen-Vogel, L. & Goldring, E. A return to neighborhood schools: What's in store for school-community partnerships? American Education Finance Association, Orlando, FL. March, 2003.

Cohen-Vogel, L. & Cohen-Vogel, D. The distribution of new dollars and relative performance gains: Tennessee schools after full implementation of the BEP. American Educational Finance Association, Austin, Texas. March, 2000.

Cohen-Vogel, L. & Goldring, E. School choice in the quasi-marketplace: Magnet schools and the dilemma of local control. American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. April, 1999.

SPONSORED RESEARCH

First-Year Assistant Professor Award, 2003. Federal-to-state and state-to-state education policy diffusion: The case of *No Child Left Behind.* Council on Research and Creativity, Florida State University.

Dissertation Grant Award, American Educational Research Association. Sponsored jointly by the National Science Foundation, National Center for Education Statistics, and Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Topic: School governance and leadership at the intersection of public school choice and performance-based accountability. 2001-2002.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Educational Research Association
American Political Science Association
American Education Finance Association

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Editorial Board Member, *Peabody Journal of Education.* 2002 - present
Reviewer, *Peabody Journal of Education.* 2002 – present
Reviewer, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* 2003 - present
Electronic Editor, Politics of Education Association. 2002 – present
Member, Committee on Research and Development in State Politics in Education, Politics of Education Association. 2002 – present
Discussant, American Educational Research Association. 2002
Reviewer, American Educational Research Association Conference, Divisions A and L. 2001 - present

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Co-Investigator
Daniel Cohen-Vogel, Ph.D.

Daniel Cohen-Vogel is an economist with a decade of experience analyzing state government policies and programs. He is currently Senior Policy Analyst in the Florida Legislature's Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, where his primary focus has been conducting quantitative studies on state policies that fund post-secondary education, including student performance effects of the Bright Futures Scholarship Program. Prior to this position, he worked in the Tennessee legislative branch, jointly wearing the hats of Staff Economist to the Comptroller of the Treasury and Principal Policy Analyst in the Offices of Research and Education Accountability. There, along with this proposal's principal investigator, Dan testified before the Tennessee General Assembly on the impact of the state's education finance formula (the Basic Education Program) on student test performance and finance equalization efforts. Dan also staffed and testified before an ad-hoc committee of the General Assembly concerning legislative solutions to a school finance equity lawsuit. Dan earned his masters and doctorate from the University of California, Berkeley, and his baccalaureate degree from the University of Pennsylvania. A selection of his published reports and papers follows as part of an abbreviated curriculum vitae.

Brief Curriculum Vitae: Daniel Cohen-Vogel

Education

Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, Agricultural and Resource Economics. 1998.
M.S., University of California, Berkeley, Agricultural and Resource Economics. 1994.
B.A. (*Magna Cum Laude*), University of Pennsylvania, History / Middle East Studies. 1991.

Areas of Concentration

Disciplines: Applied Microeconomics, Program Evaluation, Policy Analysis
Subjects: K-12 and Postsecondary Education Finance, State Tax Policy, Deregulation and Privatization

Positions

Senior Legislative Policy Analyst, Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, Florida Legislature. 2002-2004.

Staff Economist to the Comptroller and Principal Legislative Analyst, Offices of Research and Education Accountability, Tennessee Comptroller of the Treasury. 1998-2002.
Special staff assignments: Legislative Taxation Taskforce; Joint Business Tax Study Committee; Senate Teacher Salary Equity Subcommittee; Senate Budget Working Group; Basic Education Program (BEP) Review Committee.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Vanderbilt University, Department of Economics and Business Administration. 2000-2001.

Editor, United Nations Development Programme, Latvia. 2001.

Consultant, Management Analysis & Planning, Inc., Sacramento, California. 1998-1999.

Visiting Research Fellow, Vanderbilt Institute of Public Policy Studies. 1997-1999.

Graduate Student Researcher, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California, Berkeley. 1994-1995, 1996-1998.

Visiting Research Fellow, Department of Agricultural Economics and Management, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot Campus. 1995.

Fellowships and Grants

U.S. Department of Justice, Edward Byrne Memorial Grant Program. 2001-2002.

Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, Research Program on Building Regional Environmental Cooperation. 1997-1998.

Social Science Research Council, International Pre-dissertation Fellowship Program. 1995-1996.

Fulbright, Institute of International Education Fellowship (awarded and declined). 1995.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship. 1993-1994.

University of California Regents Fellowship. 1993-1994.

Select Journal Articles and Book Chapters

"Restructuring Means Changes and Choices for Tennesseans." *Tennessee's Business*, Vol. 11, 8-13. 2001, 8-13.

"School Finance Reform in Tennessee: Inching Toward Adequacy." *Journal of Education Finance*, Vol. 23, 297-317. 2001. (with L. Cohen-Vogel)

"Actual versus Stated Willingness to Pay: A Comment." *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 22, 376-381. 1997. (with Zilberman)

"Forecasting the Production Benefits and Incidence of a Public Program." *Advances in Econometrics*, Vol. 12, 303-317. 1997. (with Osgood, Parker, and Zilberman)

Select Reports

"Florida Prepaid College Program is Fiscally Sound; Numerous Options Exist for Mitigating Effects of Large, Sustained Long-Term Tuition Increases." OPPAGA Report No. 03-22. 2003.

"Best Financial Management Practices Review of the School District of Indian River County." OPPAGA Report No. 03-44. 2003.

"Measuring the Size and Cost of Florida State and Local Government." OPPAGA Report No. 03-19. 2003.

"Funding Public Schools: Is the BEP Adequate?" Report to the Tennessee General Assembly. 2003.

"Tennessee Schools on Notice, 2001-2002." Report to the Tennessee General Assembly. 2002.

"Analysis of *An Economic Report to the Governor of the State of Tennessee*." Reports to the Tennessee State Funding Board. 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999.

Select Presentations

American Education Finance Association, Orlando, Florida. March 2003.

Southeast Evaluation Association, Tallahassee, Florida. January 2003.

Tennessee State Funding Board, Nashville, Tennessee. May 2002; April 2001; May 2000; March 1999.

Tennessee House of Representatives District 92, Memphis, Tennessee. April 2002.

Tennessee General Assembly, Senate Teacher Salary Equity Subcommittee, Nashville, Tennessee. March 2001.

American Education Finance Association Annual Conference, Austin, Texas. March 2000.

Southeast Decision Sciences Institute Annual Conference, Wilmington, North Carolina. February 2000.

Tennessee General Assembly, Joint Business Tax Study Committee, Nashville, Tennessee. September 1999.

BUDGET and BUDGET NARRATIVE

PERSONNEL			
Principal Investigator			
Fall 2004 salary @ .25 FTE			$5,898
Associated Fringe			$1,084
Summer 2004 salary @ 2/9 of academic year salary (approx .68 FTE)			$10,500
Associated Fringe			$1929
Graduate Student Research Assistant Stipend (PhD student) (Fall '04 & Spring '05)			
Stipend: $13/hr for 20 hr/wk for 17 pay periods (bi-weekly)			$8840
Associated Fringe			$26
	Subtotal	**$**	**28,277**
TRAVEL			
2005 AIR Conference, San Diego (2 persons for 3 days)			
Airfare from/returning to Tallahassee, FL			$825
Transportation (To/From airport; Airport parking)			$120
Lodging in San Diego (3 nights with tax)			$525
Meals ($21 x 2 persons x 3 days)			$126
	Subtotal		**$1,596**
MATERIALS & SUPPLIES			
Copies & postage			$100
SPSS statistical software license (one year)			$25
	Subtotal		**$125**
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS		**$**	**29,998**

Budget Narrative: **Personnel (**salary & fringe benefits) covers the salary of Dr. Lora Cohen-Vogel (Principal Investigator) equal to 0.25 of her biweekly salary for the Fall 2004 semester and about 0.68 (grant stipulates that amount should not exceed 2/9ths of regular academic year salary) for Summer 2004. Additionally, one graduate student stipend will be funded for Fall 2004 and continuing through Spring 2005. Dr. Daniel Cohen-Vogel's salary is not covered by the grant. Fringe benefits were calculated at 18.379% of salary, as stipulated by the university financial officer. **Travel** will be used to offset the cost of travel for Drs. Cohen-Vogel to the annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) to be held in May, 2005 in San Diego, California.

CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

The principal investigator, Dr. Lora Cohen-Vogel, is employed full time by Florida State University. She is beginning her fourth semester as an assistant professor in the College of Education. She has no current or pending support for the proposed study. The project should grant Dr. Cohen-Vogel partial release time during Fall 2004 and partial summer salary to conduct the study. Dr. Daniel Cohen-Vogel will not receive compensation. He is employed as a Senior Analyst with the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability, Florida Legislature.

FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHER RESOURCES

Data cleaning and analysis will be conducted on an existing PC in Lora Cohen-Vogel's work office on the Florida State University campus. The computer's capacity is sufficient to perform the task at hand. The proposed budget includes a small fee necessary to maintain a license for *SPSS*, the statistical computing software to be employed for the project. Data results and subsequent manuscripts will be printed on a university-owned printer in the office, and small costs associated with printing have been included in the proposed budget. File cabinets with locks are already present in the office, and upon approval of our request to Florida's Department of Education will be the storage facility for the original data, data output, and other sensitive material.