

**HEARING ON
INNOVATIVE PATHWAYS TO
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE
ATTAINMENT
APRIL 4, 2006**



**ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON STUDENT FINANCIAL
ASSISTANCE**



**SUMMARY OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S HEARING
WASHINGTON COURT HOTEL, WASHINGTON DC
APRIL 4, 2006**

BACKGROUND

The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (Advisory Committee) serves as an independent source of advice and counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Education on student financial aid policy. It was established by Congress through the Higher Education Amendments of 1986 and began operation in 1988. The congressional mandate requires that the Advisory Committee conduct objective, nonpartisan, and independent analyses on important aspects of the student assistance programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act (HEA).

According to its authorizing statute, the purpose of the Advisory Committee is to provide extensive knowledge and understanding of the federal, state, and institutional programs of postsecondary student assistance and to provide technical expertise with regard to systems of need analysis and application forms. In addition, the Advisory Committee is required to make recommendations that will result in the maintenance of access to postsecondary education for low- and moderate-income students. Throughout its existence, the Advisory Committee has examined the barriers to access confronting such students and translated research on access and persistence into policy solutions for enhancing student assistance programs at the federal, state, and institutional levels.

PURPOSE OF THE HEARING

To officially launch its new three-year study, *Innovative Pathways to Baccalaureate Degree Attainment (Innovative Pathways Study)*, the Advisory Committee held a one-day hearing to discuss issues relative to the study and obtain public comment. Over the course of three years, the Advisory Committee will produce a series of reports that highlight creative and promising approaches to ensure that students from low- and moderate-income families who aspire to a baccalaureate degree are able to move through the access and persistence pipeline in an efficient, effective, and timely manner. These reports, which will include recommendations for stakeholders at various levels, will be designed to encourage federal, state, and institutional policymakers to embrace practices that, over time, have the promise of narrowing income-related gaps in baccalaureate degree completion. For the purposes of the study, the Advisory Committee is describing an "innovative pathway" as a particularly creative and promising way to help low- and moderate-income students stay in and move through the access and

persistence pipeline as identified by the Committee in its 2002 report, *Empty Promises: The Myth of College Access in America*.

The hearing brought together the higher education policy and research communities in an effort to review examples of innovative pathways at key points in the education pipeline. The primary purpose of the hearing was to present the study plan to the community, obtain feedback on the plan, and hear from representatives of selected innovative programs. The hearing was divided into four sessions, the first three of which examined innovative programs at three critical junctures in the education pipeline, and a fourth and final session that allowed for public comment. The sessions covered the following topics:

- Innovative Pathways in Middle School and High School
- Innovative Pathways in the Transition from High School to College
- Innovative Pathways in Higher Education
- Public Comment and Discussion

Each session featured several brief presentations by program administrators and researchers on the critical elements and successes of their respective programs. The final session allowed a variety of members of the higher education community to voice feedback and opinions on the *Innovative Pathways Study* and the study's proposed agenda.

HEARING PARTICIPANTS

KEYNOTE SPEAKER

- *The Honorable Ric Keller, U.S. House of Representatives, Chairman, 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, House Committee on Education and the Workforce*

PANELISTS

Session I: Innovative Pathways in Middle School and High School

Presenters: *Ms. Cheryl Orr, Senior Communications Associate, Indiana Commission for Higher Education, and Staff Liaison, Indiana's Education Roundtable*

Mr. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, California State University

Ms. Joie Jager-Hyman, Doctoral Student at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy, and Coordinator of the College-Access Initiative at Satellite Academy High School (New York City)

Ms. Karen Lanning, Vice President, Communications and Outreach, National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs

Session II: Innovative Pathways in the Transition from High School to College

Presenters: *Dr. Cheryl D. Blanco, Director, Policy Analysis and Research, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education*

Dr. Nancy Hoffman, Vice President, Youth Transitions and Director, Early College High School Initiative, Jobs for the Future

Dr. Arsallah Shairzay, Dean, Early College, Friendship Public Charter School Collegiate Academy (Washington DC)

Ms. Marcia Weston, Director of College Goal Sunday Operations, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators

Session III: Innovative Pathways in Higher Education

Presenters: *Ms. Ann Puyana, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Valencia Community College*

Mr. Josh Wyner, Vice President, Programs, Jack Kent Cooke Foundation

*Ms. Betty Gebhardt, Program Administrator, Educational Opportunity Grant,
Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board*

Dr. Bob Bontrager, Director, Partnership Programs, Oregon State University

Session IV: Public Comment and Discussion

Presenters: *Ms. Melanie Amrhein, President, National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs*

Ms. Amy-Ellen Duke, Senior Policy Analyst, Center for Law and Social Policy

Mr. David Hawkins, Director of Public Policy, National Association for College Admission Counseling

Ms. Natasha Janson, Research and Policy Analyst, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

Ms. March Kessler, Program Director, Educational Credit Management Corporation Foundation

Ms. Jennifer Brown Lerner, Program Associate, American Youth Policy Forum

*Ms. Shirley Ort, Associate Provost and Director of Scholarships and Student Aid,
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill (representing The College Board’s Task Force
on Access for Students from Low-Income Backgrounds)*

SUMMARY OF HEARING

SESSION I: Innovative Pathways in Middle School and High School

Session one panelists provided insight on innovative practices occurring in middle and high schools that are designed to better align secondary and postsecondary academic standards and to provide college awareness and early information programs. The first half of the session focused on institutional and state efforts to increase the number of academically prepared students entering postsecondary institutions. The second half examined early intervention efforts designed to increase college awareness and provide students with early financial aid information.

Ms. Cheryl Orr, senior communications associate at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and staff liaison to Indiana's Education Roundtable, presented remarks on the successful efforts of the Education Roundtable to increase academic preparedness and college enrollments. Ms. Orr described the impact of Indiana's Core 40 high school curriculum. She noted that in the 1980s, Indiana was ranked 40th in the percentage of students going directly to college, whereas today it is ranked 10th. Other evidence of the program's effectiveness include significant gains in high school diploma completion across all racial and ethnic groups, and increased college completion rates across the same groups. Because data also show a strong correlation between college persistence and the level of high school curriculum completed by students, in April 2005 the Indiana state legislature made CORE 40 the required high school curriculum for all students, but with an opt-out provision. CORE 40 will also serve as the requirement for admission to the state's four-year universities and receipt of state financial aid to attend four-year institutions. These changes will affect students entering high school in 2007.

Following Ms. Orr's presentation, Mr. Allison Jones, assistant vice chancellor of the California State University system (CSU), spoke about CSU's Early Assessment Program (EAP), which seeks to align high school math and English preparedness in California's K-12 school system with CSU's admission standards. The EAP is a collaborative effort among the California State Board of Education, the California Department of Education, and CSU, and is designed to work in tandem with the 11th grade California Standards Test. The test provides an early warning system for students who are under-prepared for college, allowing them to take appropriate steps in 12th grade, such as participation in EAP, to assure college readiness. Students who successfully complete the EAP are exempt from CSU placement testing and remediation, should they decide to attend one of the system's universities. The goal of the CSU board of trustees in implementing this program is to reduce the need for remediation in English and math to 10 percent by 2007.

Ms. Joie Jager-Hyman, doctoral student at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Coordinator of the College Access Initiative at Satellite Academy (NYC), then described the findings of her study of early awareness and early financial aid information programs

implemented at the K-12 district level in public schools. Some of the promising practices identified by Ms. Jager-Hyman include integrating financial aid information into the classroom experience; establishing partnerships with outside educational organizations; creating a district-level position or department to oversee the distribution of early information, as the Chicago and Los Angeles public school systems have done; and requiring students to complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) whether or not they plan to immediately enroll in a postsecondary program. Significant barriers to early information identified by district leaders include lack of funding, competition with other school reform efforts, and lack of a designated liaison, among others. In surveying parents from the Satellite Academy—an alternative school for at-risk students—Ms. Jager-Hyman found significant disparities between parental expectations and ensuing circumstances. For example, 94 percent of parents think their child will enroll in college right after high school, while only 55 percent of graduates do so. In addition, while over 90 percent of families surveyed are eligible for a Pell Grant, less than half of the parents were aware of it, while 70 percent were aware of student loans.

Finally, Ms. Karen Lanning, vice president of communications and outreach at the National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs (NCHELP), provided information on ways in which guaranty agencies contribute to awareness of financial aid information. These activities fall into three main categories: providing resources and training to increase awareness, targeting services to students most in need, and creating partnerships with other organizations to leverage services. All of these activities form the foundation of the College Access Initiative, recommended by guaranty agencies as part of reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which would require guaranty agencies to coordinate with other entities in providing students with information on college financing and career planning, and would also require agencies to provide a listing of all college access and awareness resources available within each state. A work group of representatives from the nation’s guaranty agencies is developing guidelines and resources to fulfill these requirements. For example, this group is working to develop “college access templates” for each state with Mapping Your Future, an organization started by guaranty agencies in 1996 to provide online information about college and financial aid to students and schools. Students and families will be able to access their state’s information through the Mapping Your Future website, which will serve as a central location for information about all the college access and postsecondary opportunities available in each state.

Panelist presentations were followed by a discussion among panelists and Advisory Committee members. Issues under consideration included whether the Core 40 curriculum in Indiana or CSU’s EAP help students make the most of their senior year in terms of preparing for college. Also discussed were issues related to data tracking in school systems, alignment of standards, and how other sectors have utilized the lessons learned from CSU’s EAP.

SESSION II: Innovative Pathways in the Transition from High School to College

The second hearing session focused on innovative strategies designed to streamline the transition from high school to college for low- and moderate-income students; that is, those that

reduce structural barriers to college enrollment, such as inadequate counseling and academic preparation, as well as financial barriers, such as inadequate grant aid. The first part of the session was devoted to 'credit-based transition programs,' which take a variety of forms, including Advanced Placement (AP) and dual enrollment programs, and are described by a variety of terms, such as "accelerated learning options." The second part of the session included a discussion of a program designed to provide students with sufficient counseling and support in applying to financial aid.

Dr. Cheryl Blanco, director of policy analysis and research for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), presented the findings of her recent research on accelerated learning options, entitled "Moving the Needle." Dr. Blanco's report details the effects of four types of accelerated learning programs (Advanced Placement, dual enrollment, International Baccalaureate, and Tech-Prep) on the access and success of low-income students in higher education. Transcript analysis of Florida high school graduates between 1997 and 2003 served as the primary database for the study and revealed several significant findings, all of which require clarification with additional statistical research. First, time to degree was not significantly affected by accelerated learning. Second, students across different income levels were more likely to persist to degree completion if they had taken accelerated credit. Third, evidence supports the assertion that accelerated learning options are associated with higher rates of postsecondary success. However, thorny questions remain, such as whether there is a definitive causal relationship among accelerated learning, persistence, and degree completion. Also, the study reached no conclusions about which type of accelerated learning is best designed to serve low-income students and lead to baccalaureate degree completion. Further research and study is necessary.

Next, Dr. Nancy Hoffman, director of the Early College High School (ECHS) Initiative at Jobs for the Future (JFF), presented information on the ECHS Initiative. JFF is one of eleven partners in the program, which is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in partnership with other major donors. Early College High Schools (ECHS) are one form of dual enrollment programs and typically consist of small, autonomous schools serving grades 6 or 7 to 14, or 9 to 14 through formal partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions. ECHS are designed to allow students to earn an associate's degree, or two years of college credit, while they are still in high school, thereby compressing the time to associate's degree completion while also ensuring that students typically under-represented in postsecondary education will earn at least a two-year degree. ECHS also include an expectation that students will move on to baccalaureate degree completion. By 2011, there will be 229 ECHS in at least 24 states, serving over 91,000 students; there are currently 86 schools in operation, with a positive response to them that surpasses expectations. Although ECHS exist in partnership across the country, Dr. Hoffman highlighted the partnership of the New York State Department of Education and the City University of New York with the New York City public schools. She noted that JFF has developed a student information system that is tracking every student involved in their projects, and that researchers at the Harvard Graduate School of Education are studying two schools. Dr. Hoffman also noted that a Gates Foundation external evaluation has recently been

made public. In conclusion, Dr. Hoffman noted that a critical barrier to student success is the inability of ECHS students to access federal or state student aid, especially the Pell Grant.

Dr. Arsallah Shairzay, dean of Early College, Friendship Public Charter School Collegiate Academy, provided information on ECHS in the District of Columbia. The Friendship Public Charter Schools were established in school year 1988-89 in southeast and northeast Washington DC. These charter schools partner with the University of the District of Columbia. As of 2005-06, enrollment has tripled, and the program has now served 3,600 students on five campuses. Rates of attendance, high school graduation, and college acceptances are high at 96 percent, 92 percent, and 81 percent, respectively. In addition, students from the charter schools surpass success rates in merit-based scholarship awards among the overall metropolitan population. Dr. Shairzay made three recommendations to ensure the success of students in ECHS: one, to design a K-14 system in a K-12 timeframe; two, to establish articulation agreements with postsecondary institutions to ensure transfer of credits; and, three, to expand Pell Grants and other student financial assistance to ECHS students.

The last panelist, Ms. Marcia Weston, from the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), made a presentation on College Goal Sunday (CGS), of which she is program director. CGS is a volunteer-run, state-based, and collaborative program that assists low-income families and first-generation college-bound students with completion of the FAFSA. In collaboration with the Pathways to College Network, NASFAA has developed strategies for engaging students in the program based on social marketing principles, which are less expensive and more effective than hiring a public relations firm. The program fills a critical need in most public school systems, as it is designed to supplement the college-advising role of high school counselors. Future goals for the program include providing information to middle school students; developing strategies for specific groups, such as foster youth; and diversifying funding sources.

Session two closed with a discussion among panelists and Advisory Committee members on ECHS data collection and financing, including the feasibility of providing financial aid to students enrolled in these programs. In addition, Committee members asked panelists to articulate the definition of college credit in terms of transfer agreements, and the nature of a comprehensive student financial aid strategy that would address the needs of students enrolled in credit-based transition programs.

KEYNOTE SPEAKER: Representative Ric Keller

During the second session of the hearing, Representative Ric Keller addressed the Advisory Committee and hearing participants, speaking of his experience with the Pell Grant program, the House HEA reauthorization bill (H.R. 609), and the Family-Friendly Employer Act (H.R. 1518). Representative Keller began by describing his own family circumstances and his efforts to attend college. Despite his eligibility for a Pell Grant, he still had unmet need. He approached the CEO of his mother's company for a charitable contribution, but was refused

because the company would not be eligible for a tax write-off from such a donation. However, the CEO made a personal financial contribution to his education, allowing him to go to college.

Congressman Keller then discussed the House reauthorization bill, H.R. 609, which was recently passed by the full House, despite opposition from most Democrats and from some Republicans in Congress concerned about increased costs. Keller noted that the bill reauthorizes the Perkins Loan program; increases loan limits for both graduate and undergraduate students; and strengthens the Pell Grant program by allowing for year-round Pell Grants, increasing the maximum authorized award to \$6,000, and creating Pell Plus, which awards an extra \$1,000 to high-achieving students. Representative Keller noted that there has been a 71 percent increase in Pell Grant funding under the Republican-majority Congress, and that Republicans have increased the Pell Grant maximum award, whereas it had been cut back slightly during the Clinton Administration. He also noted that the increasing number of Pell Grant recipients is the reason Congress has been hesitant to make Pell Grant funding mandatory or to increase the maximum appropriated Pell Grant.

Finally, Representative Keller described the features of the Family-Friendly Employer Act, H.R. 1518, a bill designed to provide corporations with flexibility in obtaining corporate write-offs with regard to the education of employees and their children. Under current law, a corporation is given a tax incentive to contribute to the education of its employees; however, many employees have no interest in returning to postsecondary education, and, at the same time, are trying to finance their children's education. Under the proposed legislation, a corporation could obtain a tax deduction by supporting the postsecondary education of either their employees *or* their employees' children, up to a \$2,500 deduction. Representative Keller asked hearing participants for their support with this bill in order to bring it to a floor vote.

Representative Keller ended his remarks by taking questions from the audience about issues related to the federal-state partnership in federal student aid.

SESSION III: Innovative Pathways in Higher Education

The third session of the hearing focused on programs designed to serve students who have successfully transitioned into higher education and are positioned at the next stage of the pipeline: those who are pursuing a baccalaureate degree. During this session, speakers presented information on a variety of different approaches to persistence and degree completion, including providing financial aid, improving student support services and guidance, and reducing structural barriers to transfer and articulation.

Ms. Ann Puyana, assistant vice president for academic affairs, Valencia Community College, spoke about several of the college's strategies for persistence and retention, closing success gaps, and articulation. Valencia works hard to ensure that students feel connected and directed: that they feel welcome and acknowledged, even at the level of the classroom; that they make social as well as academic connections; and that they are actively engaged in their learning. The

college provides a set of electronic tools, "LifeMap," that covers education and career planning, including transition and financial planning. To close student success gaps, Valencia has developed supplemental instruction for gateway courses that tend to create problems for students, as well as a Student Life Skills course. Florida's articulation strategies are well-developed, and they include a state-wide common course numbering system, guaranteed state university admission with an associate's degree, state and institutional data sharing, and educational partnerships. Valencia's data indicates that their students are making progress in all areas.

Following Ms. Puyana, Mr. Josh Wyner, vice president of programs for the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation, presented information on the foundation's recently launched Community College Transfer Initiative. Since 2002, the Cooke Foundation has provided a limited number of highly competitive scholarships to community college students who wish to transfer to a baccalaureate degree granting institution. Because the awards are substantial, and only 20 to 30 are made per year, the process is competitive, and the program's mission is to serve high-achieving, low-income students. With this new initiative, the Cooke Foundation has awarded \$27 million to eight selective colleges and universities to increase the number of transfer students that attain a baccalaureate degree at these schools. The grants will support efforts by the institutions to develop or expand community college transfer programs that include significant outreach to and recruitment of community college students and support services for transfer students. Each institution has also committed to using its own funds to provide additional financial aid and scholarships to transfer students. In his experience working on this issue, Mr. Wyner noted that transfer students face the following challenges: many students assume that transfer to highly selective colleges is not possible, there is less financial aid available for transfer students, the available transfer advising is inadequate, and adapting to the increased volume of work and the social life of a baccalaureate program is often difficult. Postsecondary institutions, particularly elite ones, need to be sensitive to several things: one, that the disparities in institutional aid awards have negative motivational effects on transfer students; two, that closing popular majors to transfers is not equitable; three, that there needs to be more transparency in admissions policies for transfer students; and, four, that duplicative course requirements for transfer students impede access to highly selective institutions.

Washington State's use of the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) as a bridge between the associate and baccalaureate degrees was the topic of Betty Gebhardt's presentation. Ms. Gebhardt is EOG program administrator at the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board (WHECB). In the late 1980s, Washington State's community college enrollments were 24 percent above the national average, while its upper-division and graduate enrollments were 13 percent below. To correct this imbalance, the legislature built more upper-division campuses, raised four-year public enrollment caps, and created the EOG to fill existing capacity. To participate in the program, students must be "place-bound" (i.e., be unable to complete college due to family commitments, health concerns, monetary inability, or other similar factors), must have completed the equivalent of an associate's degree, and must be returning to or transferring into a four-year institution. In addition, schools must package the

EOG for participating students as a form of self-help, to reduce work-loan burden. The primary population served is the non-traditional student. These efforts increased the baccalaureate degree completion rate from 68 percent to 85 percent, and were confirmed as cost effective for the state. In addition, EOG students earn more credits than other students in the same time periods.

The session's final panelist, Dr. Bob Bontrager, director of the Degree Partnership Program (DPP) at Oregon State University (OSU), provided information on DPP's successes. OSU and Linn-Benton Community College (LBCC) established DPP in 1988 as a joint admission/concurrent enrollment program with a single admission application and fee, coordinated financial aid, coordinated academic advising, and enhanced articulation. The program currently enrolls approximately 3,800 students. In terms of academic performance and graduation statistics, the three-year transfer graduation rate at LBCC among DPP students was 19 percent, while among non-DPP students it was 9 percent. Out of more than 1,000 transfer students who have graduated from OSU, DPP students have a slightly higher GPA and take a slightly lower number of OSU credits than do non-DPP transfer students. The tuition difference between DPP students and those who start and finish at OSU has been approximately \$4,000. OSU and LBCC are currently involved in a research effort that analyzes access, persistence, and graduation rates, as well as enrollment reporting and funding policies, for transfer students.

The session closed with a discussion among panelists and Advisory Committee members about the challenges facing transfer students and recommendations for the federal financial aid programs. These challenges include gaps in student financial aid, the unique funding challenges faced by transfer students, and current requirements of the federal student aid programs that can negatively impact community college and transfer students. The discussion ended with an examination of the extent to which students may feel forced into two-year colleges because state and federal governments have been unable to expand access to four-year institutions.

SESSION IV: Public Comment and Discussion

The last session of the hearing was designed to solicit comments from the education community regarding the design and/or content of the *Innovative Pathways Study*. Representatives from the policy, secondary, and higher education communities provided comments on the study, or addressed innovative strategies that were not formally discussed at the hearing. In advance of the hearing, Advisory Committee staff conducted focus group meetings with representatives from the community as part of their formulation of a draft *Innovative Pathways Study* plan; session four was an extension of that process.

Ms. Melanie Amrhein, president of the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP), asked the Advisory Committee to remind Congress of the amount of need-based aid that the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP) program has leveraged and the declining purchasing power of the Pell Grant program. She asked that

Congress not reinvent the wheel as it examined the federal student aid programs and early financial aid information programs; just that it make the programs better.

Ms. Amy-Ellen Duke, senior policy analyst at the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), requested that the Advisory Committee consider the needs of nontraditional students, especially adults seeking to obtain postsecondary credentials needed for better paying jobs. These students need 'career pathways initiatives,' which are designed to accommodate student and workforce needs. These students face difficulties, such as inconvenient times for course offerings, lack of funding resources allocated to the colleges that typically serve them, and a significant need for remediation.

Mr. David Hawkins, director of public policy for the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC), commented that the Committee's study is headed down the right path and that current research supports it. He asked that the Committee examine in detail the problems faced by secondary school counseling systems. The average public high school student to counselor ratio is currently 315:1, and postsecondary preparation is typically 7th or 8th on the list of responsibilities counselors assume. He suggested that the Committee focus on ways to decrease that ratio; take a closer look at the different roles assigned to school counselors in the various federal education statutes, especially the No Child Left Behind Act and the Perkins Act; and examine the requirements for counselor preparation and degree attainment.

Ms. Natasha Janson, research and policy analyst at the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), reminded Committee members that NAICU members represent a diverse array of private institutions, not just elite, highly selective colleges and universities. There is a need to collect more information on low-income students who attend private institutions, and on the financial aid that they receive. Private colleges have significant success with low-income students, as they often offer more mentoring and other types of integration efforts.

Ms. March Kessler, program director of the Educational Credit Management Corporation (ECMC) Foundation, urged the Committee to examine the "Realizing the College Dream" curriculum that the ECMC Foundation developed to provide students with early financial aid information in 10 modular units. ECMC Foundation has currently partnered with Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) and TRIO programs to implement this curriculum. She also recommended that the Committee look at the College Access Program in Manassas, Virginia. She stressed the importance of student tracking and data collection.

Ms. Jennifer Brown Lerner, program associate at the American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF), suggested that the Committee examine each type of credit-based transition program, such as dual enrollment and ECHS, under its own particular parameters and not examine them all as one group. Work in those areas is limited by a lack of available data. She also noted that the

financing structure of such programs, and the 'double-dipping' issue, are important to analyze in order to ensure that additional costs are not passed on to participating students.

Ms. Shirley Ort, associate provost and director of scholarships and student aid at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, spoke as a representative of The College Board's Task Force on Access for Students from Low-Income Backgrounds. She noted that, in developing programs that serve the interests of the entire educational pipeline, there is a need for the K-12 system to push and the higher education system to pull. She noted as an example that The College Board could offer to waive Advanced Placement Test fees for low-income students, and that, in return, institutions might consider waiving admissions fees for the same population.

A question and answer period followed the presenters' remarks, during which several issues were discussed. First, participants weighed the need for more data relative to innovative programs in order to determine success rates, and the potential role of the federal government in developing such data. Second, the unique problems related to high school counseling were addressed. Third, Committee members asked for guidance on issues and potential pitfalls or unintended consequences to avoid in the examination of innovative programs.